



## Origeniana Duodecima

### Origen's Legacy in the Holy Land—A Tale of Three Cities: Jerusalem, Caesarea and Bethlehem

#### Abstracts

Jerusalem, June 25-29, 2017



**The Center for the Study of Christianity**  
Established by Hubert and Aldegonde Brenninkmeijer-Werhahn

האוניברסיטה העברית בירושלים  
THE HEBREW UNIVERSITY OF JERUSALEM



**Aliau-Milhaud, Agnès**, “Bethabara and Gergesa (Origen, C1o VI, 204-211): Geographical Digression or Exegesis?”

In the interpretation of John 1, 28 (“This happened in Bethany beyond the Jordan, where John was baptizing”), Origen corrects the text, replacing Bethany by Bethabara for geographical reasons. Then, similarly, he replaces Gadara by Gergesa in Matthew 8, 28, and does the same for other biblical names. All this sounds like a scholarly digression in his exegesis. Still, what’s his point? Does he really want to reestablish the geographical truth? This digression is, in fact, deeply related to the exegesis of the verse of John. Indeed, it introduces many words, symbols and themes of the interpretation, such as the importance of water, the attitude of welcoming or rejecting God, the idea of purification. All themes very useful for Origen to build his interpretation about the Jordan river and baptism. Consequently, the names of the biblical places do not inspire exegesis, as we could expect. In fact, while restoring the “acoluthia,” the coherence of the biblical text, Origen creates a symbolical geography.

**Bandt, Cordula**, “Temple Worship in the Exegesis of Psalms by Origen and his Successors”

Most of the psalms were written in times either of Solomon’s or of the Second temple and many of them are genuinely connected with the temple worship, be it as part of the official liturgy, be it as expression of personal piety. The paper will examine in how far this aspect is taken into account by Origen and other early Christian exegetes in their interpretation of the psalms and which was the perception of that worship in their minds, more than a century after the temple had been destroyed.

**Baranov, Vladimir**, “First Responses to Iconoclasm in Byzantium and Origen's Tradition: The Cases of Constantinople and Palestine”

Origen was not only a theologian and philosopher who build up the first coherent system of Christian gnosis. In his writings, Origen also codified a mystical tradition of intellectual vision of God, which transcended the temporal sensible vision of the material world. The legacy of Origen’s “theology of hearing” based on the revelation of God and scripture expanded to eighth century Byzantium when it became relevant again, forming the basis for Iconoclastic epistemology. However, Origen’s all-embracing attitude toward the varying degrees of mystical knowledge of God or spiritual maturity was used at the early stages of the controversy in the Iconophile response of Constantinopolitan Patriarch Germanus, which is analyzed in the paper along with the different response of the Palestinian Iconophile John of Damascus.

**Berglund, Carl Johan**, “Discerning Quotations from Heracleon in Origen’s *Commentary on the Gospel of John*”

Heracleon’s *hypomnēmata* on the Gospel of John is an important source to second-century reception of the New Testament and a witness to the transition from writing original Christian compositions to commenting on the Scriptures. Unfortunately, it is only extant via quotations made by Origen, and the difficulty of evaluating to which extent these accurately reflect Heracleon’s

views has frequently been underestimated. Among the forty-eight instances where Origen refers to his predecessor are not only verbatim quotations but also summaries, paraphrases, and assertions that may be more influenced by “Valentinians” contemporary to Origen than by Heracleon’s actual words. Discerning between these four modes of attribution would put scholarship on Heracleon on a much more secure footing. This paper will discuss criteria for discerning between verbatim quotations, summaries, interpretative paraphrases and pure assertions in Origen’s attributions to Heracleon, and present some preliminary results of such an analysis.

**Blaski, Andrew, “Jews, Christians, and the Conditions of Christological Interpretation in Origen’s Work”**

Throughout his written corpus, Origen repeatedly asserts that it was only “after the advent of Jesus that the inspiration of the prophetic words and the spiritual nature of the law came to light” (*PArch* 4.1.6; *HomEz* 14.2.3). However, he simultaneously remarks that “those who have been perfected in former generations have known no less than the things which were revealed to the apostles by Christ” (*ComJn* 6.24), producing what appears to be a glaring self-contradiction in his work. Indeed, it was Moses who first “saw in his mind the truth of the Law and the allegorical meanings” (*ComJn* 6.22), Aaron who “knew that circumcision was spiritual” (*HomLev* 6.3.5), and Joshua who “understood the true distribution of the land” (*ComJn* 6.22). As a result, scholars have occasionally presented the patriarchs and prophets as exceptions in Origen’s work, gifted (through the Holy Spirit) with an intimate knowledge of Christ prior to his bodily coming. In this paper, however, I intend to demonstrate that Origen does not think in terms of “exceptions,” but rather fully upholds the validity of both remarks. For him, Christological interpretation is indeed only possible as a result of Christ’s coming, but Christ’s coming is first and foremost an individualized, noetic encounter, unrestricted by time or space. In Origen’s own words, “Christ came noetically even before he came in a body” (*ComJn* 1.37). The conditions for interpreting the Scriptures pneumatically therefore remain constant for all people in all times. This paper simultaneously reevaluates the divide Origen draws between “Jewish” and “Christian” models of reading, which, as a result of these points, must stretch as far back as the Law itself.

**Bostock, Gerald, “Origen's Unique Doctrine of the Trinity: Its Jewish and Egyptian Sources”**

The early Church adopted Jewish monotheism and its belief in divine agents of the one God. Origen saw the Seraphim of Isaiah 6 as symbols of the Son and the Spirit who were strictly subordinate to the one God as the agents of man’s redemption, but remained divine. The oneness of God was not a mathematical unity, and the Father was the self-existent source of creation and of all other beings. Together with the eternal generation of the Son and the joint action of the Son and Spirit in redemption, these concepts constituted his unique Trinitarianism. These concepts can all be paralleled in the theology of Ancient Egypt. Origen’s synthesis of Jewish monotheism and Egyptian theology was later undermined by the extreme reaction of the Church to Arianism. Insistence on the co-equality of Father, Son and Spirit produced a fundamental incoherence and the loss of a bridge to the monotheistic faiths of Judaism and Islam.

**Boulnois, Marie-Odile**, « Mambré : Du chêne de la vision au lieu de pèlerinage »

Le chêne de Mambré est le lieu d'une théophanie célèbre rapportée en *Genèse* 18 qui a suscité une exégèse d'une richesse remarquable. La présente communication sera centrée moins sur l'histoire de l'intérêt croissant pour ce marqueur topographique de la manifestation divine à Abraham. Celle-ci est très représentative de l'évolution des lieux saints. Le lieu désigné comme « le chêne de Mambré » dans la Septante, à la différence des targums, du Texte massorétique et de la Vulgate, a en effet été l'objet d'une attention toute particulière d'abord dans l'exégèse spirituelle d'Origène à la suite de Philon, mais aussi dans des récits à caractère légendaires, jusqu'à devenir un objet de vénération au fur et à mesure du développement des pèlerinages en ce lieu de culte païen, dont la christianisation nous est rapportées par Eusèbe de Césarée.

**Buchinger, Harald**, “Pascha and Biblical Feasts in the Newly Identified Homilies on the Psalms and in the Larger Origenian and Palestinian Framework”

Origen's newly identified homilies on the psalms contain several references to Pascha and other biblical feasts, mostly connected with anti-Jewish polemics. Although these passages generally fit to what is known from other works of Origen on the topic, they add to the complexity of the picture and pose historical and theological questions about the early Christian celebration of Easter and the understanding of the biblical traditions. The proposed communication will assess these texts within the framework of Origen's writings and in the wider context of Palestinian sources from Justin to Eusebius.

**Cain, Andrew**, “Jerome's Appropriation of Origen in his Pauline Commentaries and the Architecture of Exegetical Authority”

Jerome's heavy reliance on Origen as an exegetical source for the commentaries he composed on four Pauline epistles in 386, shortly after he had moved to Bethlehem, is well documented. In this paper I focus instead on the nuances of his representation of this reliance and argue that in the prefaces to the commentaries he strategically portrays himself as a Latin Origen in order to shore up intellectual authority for himself at a time when he was an amateur at systematic biblical interpretation and struggled to define his *opus Paulinum* in contradistinction to the Pauline commentaries of his chief Latin exegetical rival Marius Victorinus.

**Carlson, Stephen**, “Origen's Use of Papias”

The extent of Origen's library can be inferred at least in part from those he cites in his vast body of work, but Origen's citation practices and the partial preservation of his literary output greatly complicate this endeavor. A less direct and appreciated way to gauge the extent of his library is to look for its influence among those who succeeded him in Caesarea, especially Eusebius of Caesarea whose *Ecclesiastical History* shows his considerable acquaintance with pre-Origenian writers. This article seeks to add to our knowledge of Origen's impressive library by taking a closer look at one candidate for his collection quoted extensively by Eusebius of Caesarea—the second-

century chiliast and commentator of Jesus tradition, Papias of Hierapolis—and arguing that two passages in Origen’s *oeuvre* betrays his knowledge of Papias, as well as his influence on Eusebius.

**Celia, Francesco**, “Origen's Teaching in Caesarea: Reconsidering the Study of the Scriptures According to Gregory of Neocaesarea's *Oratio Panegyrica*”

Even though contemporary scholars deny that the Hellenic traits characterizing the *Oratio Panegyrica* can confirm that Origen was more of a Greek philosopher than a Christian theologian (Koch), and that Gregory Thaumaturgus remained a pagan (Knauber), many consider Gregory’s *cursus studiorum* trustworthy to the extent that they take it to represent the practical plan of Origen’s teaching. Consequently, two interrelated issues still seem in need of clarification: first, how could a biblical scholar like Origen have left the study of the Scriptures only to the end of a mostly philosophical training? And second, can this somehow corroborate the idea that Origen’s teaching did not necessarily aim at the conversion of his pupils? By reappraising some passages of the *Oratio*, this paper will argue that Gregory has left clear, though intentionally covert, evidence that the study of the Scriptures was introduced earlier than is usually assumed, and that the objective of Origen’s teaching was indeed catechetical.

**Cerioni, Lavinia**, “‘Mother of Souls’: The Holy City of Jerusalem in Origen's *Commentary and Homily on the Song of Songs*”

The *Commentary and Homilies on the Song of Songs* (hereafter CCt and HCt) have often been described as Origen’s finest works, for they encapsulate most of his mature theological doctrines. In these books, the references to the city of Jerusalem assume different meanings, depending on Origen’s exegetical purpose. This article will focus particularly on three instances: 1. The role of the ‘daughters of Jerusalem’ in Origen’s mystical ascent (*e.g.* CCt II, 1, 1-6); 2. The opposition between the earthly Jerusalem and the heavenly Jerusalem (*e.g.* CCt Prologue IV, 18-23); 3. Origen’s evaluation of the Old Testament (*e.g.* CCt II, 1, 23-27). By thoroughly investigating the texts and making comparisons to contemporary patristic works, this article aims to illustrate the different exegetical uses of the city of Jerusalem in Origen of Alexandria’s crowning works.

**Ciner, Patricia**, “Commentary on the Gospel of John: The History and Content of a Masterpiece Written Between Alexandria and Caesarea”

The *Commentary of the Gospel of John* was written during two different moments of Origen’s life. The first five books, as well as the beginning of the VI, belong to the tumultuous Alexandrian period. The others, of which only numbers VI, X, XIII, XIX, XX, XVIII and XXXII have been conserved, were written in Caesarea. Some specialists affirm that, as the result of problems he had in Alexandria, Origen modified his speculative style, becoming more biblical and catechetical in Caesarea. This hypothesis, which can perhaps be applied to other texts, does not hold true for the *Commentary of the Gospel of John*, as there is thematic continuity from the first to the last book. This continuity, which we will call biblical-philosophical, is reflected in the following doctrines that appear throughout this masterpiece: Logos, preexistence, apocatastasis and mystical union.

**DelCogliano, Mark**, “Eusebius of Caesarea's Defense of Origen in the Debate Between Paulinus of Tyre, Eusebius of Nicomedia, Asterius of Cappadocia, and Marcellus of Ancyra”

The letter of Eusebius of Nicomedia to Paulinus of Tyre (which I would date to ca. 321), urging him to write to Alexander of Alexandria in support of Arius, was the first in a cascade of documents. In addition to the letter that Paulinus wrote to Alexander, at some point after the Council of Nicaea Asterius of Cappadocia penned a defense of Eusebius's letter to Paulinus. In response, Marcellus of Ancyra attacked not only Asterius, but also Eusebius of Caesarea, Eusebius of Nicomedia, Paulinus of Tyre, and Narcissus of Neronias. In turn, in 336-337 Eusebius of Caesarea published two works against Marcellus, *Contra Marcellum* and *De ecclesiastica theologia*. Origen is prominent in these debates, even when not explicitly named: not only was his theology a principal source for the figures mentioned here, but also his theological legacy was heavily contested, especially by Marcellus.

This proposed communication focuses on *Contra Marcellum* 1.4.1-27, a section of the work in which Eusebius of Caesarea quotes several texts of Marcellus, fragments which in turn quote from and criticize Paulinus's letter to Alexander and Asterius's defense of Eusebius of Nicomedia. Marcellus's criticism of Paulinus and Asterius segues into a criticism of Origen: while Paulinus had explicitly quoted a passage from Origen, certain statements of Asterius led Marcellus to connect his ideas with Origen. Aside from theological disagreements, Marcellus's basic complaint is that the teaching of Paulinus and Asterius is wrong because of their reliance on Origen, and Marcellus identifies the cause of Origen's errors as the use of improper sources and faulty theological method. Throughout this section, however, Eusebius of Caesarea defends Origen against the attacks of Marcellus.

In my remarks, I will discuss the reception of Origen's ideas by the various figures in the debate as preserved in *Contra Marcellum* 1.4.1-27; the theological issues were, for the most part, over how to understand terms with corporeal connotations when applied to God (such as “Father,” “Son,” and “begetting”). Then I will examine how these ideas of Origen sparked a debate between Marcellus and Eusebius of Caesarea over proper theological method; the issues covered include (1) the dialectic between continuity and innovation, (2) the validity of using the church fathers (that is, ecclesiastical tradition) as an authoritative resource in addition to scripture, (3) the problems of a selective use of ecclesiastical authorities as well as of the use of non-Christian sources (Plato is the issue here), and (4) the necessity of self-consistency (Marcellus had accused Origen of self-contradiction). In his response to Marcellus, Eusebius defends the theological method and thus the theology not only of Paulinus and Asterius but also of Origen, thereby affirming, and perhaps even promoting, the continued use of Origen in the theological debates of his era.

**Dively Lauro, Elizabeth**, “History and Context of Origen's Relation of the Two Seraphim to the Son and Holy Spirit”

Origen's identification of the Son and Spirit as the two seraphim in the prophet's vision in Isaiah 6 (in his extant homilies on Isaiah) led to later accusations of Origen as proto-Arian and, ultimately, to the fourth anathema by Justinian against Origen in 553 A. D. Scripture describes these two seraphim as surrounding the Lord's throne, first covering the Lord's face and feet with their wings and then flying and shouting, “Holy, Holy, Holy.” Some church fathers after Origen considered these activities to define the two seraphim as separate entities in service of and, thus, subordinate

to the Lord. Because Origen's designation of the Son and the Holy Spirit as the two seraphim found disfavor with church teachers in the conciliar era of the fourth and fifth centuries, even Jerome, later in his career, avoided referring to or even mentioning his earlier translation of Origen's homilies on Isaiah.

First, this paper considers the fate of this association within the Origenist controversy as well as how Jerome's translation of Origen's homilies on Isaiah affects how Origen's treatment of this association is handed down to us. Then, this paper seeks to understand Origen's reasons for making this association, in order to determine whether he intended a subordinationist view of the Trinity. To that end, this paper considers Biblical, etymological, Jewish and Christian precedents that likely influenced Origen's association, including the probable reasons why Origen's "Hebrew teacher," as mentioned in *De Principiis* 1.3.4 and 4.3.14, suggested this association to him. In addition to briefly considering the history and precedents, as well as briefly reflecting on Origen's own ontological understanding of the Trinity, I provide a textual analysis to bring into relief Origen's intended audience and message. This textual analysis, when combined with the history, precedents and his ontological understanding of the Godhead, shows why Origen can make this association without necessarily considering himself subordinationist. In addition, his own priorities, separate from Trinitarian concerns per se, begin to surface. Indeed, Origen's exegetical, pastoral and theological richness is only found when we avoid strict characterization and acknowledge that Origen's broad-minded use of allegory fuels both sides of the Origenist controversies on conciliar matters without any clear intention on his part to preliminarily campaign for either side. This paper demonstrates the value of lifting the superimposed readings of Origen from the past and learning to read him in his own voice.

**Fallica, Maria**, "On the Resurrection of the Body: Origen's Shadow in the Debates Between Lelio Sozzini, John Calvin and Heinrich Bullinger"

This paper proposes to investigate a particular case study related to the complex *Nachleben* of Origen in the XVI century. The aim is to understand how the confessional debates of this age influenced the late understanding of Origen by scholars and theologians. The case study concerns of a central theological point, the resurrection of the bodies, which is strictly related to the relationship between body and soul in Origen's thought. I am speaking about the debate between Lelio Sozzini, John Calvin and Heinrich Bullinger, in the '40; both Bullinger and Sozzini wrote a treatise about that. In his treatise, Bullinger described Origen as the fountainhead of an error that spread out during the centuries: the transmutation of the risen substance of the body. Origen and his tradition around the destiny of the body was explicitly and implicitly at stake in this debate, which was very important for the late radical views of the Socinianism on the resurrection. The paper will provide an analysis of Bullinger's accusation of Origen. Then, I will analyze more broadly the influence of Origen's thought in the discussion around the resurrection of the bodies in the XVI century.

**Fernandez, Pedro Daniel**, « Alexandrie et Césarée: La continuité de l'itinéraire pédagogique d'Origène »

Cet exposé a pour but de montrer la continuité de l'itinéraire et le curriculum pédagogique qu'Origène enseignait à la fois à l'école d'Alexandrie et à l'école de Césarée. Dans ce sens nous

allons tenir à l'objectif primordial de sa pédagogie que visait à: Montrer que la présence éternelle du Fils de Dieu qui guide toutes les étapes d'existence par les quelles doivent traverser les créatures intellectuelles ou νοῦς (création primaire, création secondaire etes paces célestes - *caelestia loca*, *Prin, II,11,6*) et en même temps les créatures intellectuelles continuent leur apprentissage pendant toutes ces étapes.

**Fernández, Samuel**, “‘That Man Who Appeared in Judaea’ (Prin II,6,2): The Soteriological Function of the Humanity of the Son of God According to Origen's *De principiis*”

Studies on the Christology of *De principiis* are normally focused on Christ's divinity or on the soul of Jesus, because the treatise speaks so much about the Son as eternal Logos and about the soul of Christ, but not so much about the Son as a man. As a result, the study of the humanity of the Son of God according to *De principiis* has been neglected, although this book offers a very interesting material on it. That's why the present paper aims to study the humanity of the Son of God, and particularly the soteriological function of obedience and submission to God of “that man who appeared in Judaea” (*Prin II,6,2*).

**Fürst, Alfons**, “Body and Soul in Origen's Theology”

The question about how mind, soul and body are related to each other in Origen's theology is as old as the controversial discussions about his anthropological and soteriological concepts as a whole. It is usually discussed in connection with his eschatology – especially with the status of the body in the resurrection. Origen is here widely reproached for his alleged spiritualization (or at least spiritualizing tendency) and his disregard of the (human) body and of matter in general. In recent research, however, it has been suggested that his assessment of the body is in fact much more positive – that the body in Origen's thought is not evil and that matter is not the cause of evil; free will is. Moreover, according to recent research, matter actually plays a mediating role in his soteriology. It mediates goodness and truth, and when trying to comprehend spiritual realities, a human being has to start with the corporeal senses. In this understanding, Origen thus goes beyond Plato and ascribes essential goodness to matter and body. The most famous expression of this positive assessment is his theory of ‘spiritual senses’.

The proposition of the goodness of matter and body provides a new approach to the main topics of the Origenian concept of world and humankind and calls for debate. How does this affect, for instance, the concept of the incarnated Son as mediator and the relationship of the human souls to the soul of Christ? Through and in Christ's body and soul, united with the Logos, the connection and the mediation of heaven and earth is established, and thus matter and body open up the way toward salvation for the human person. If the incarnated Son reveals the mystery of Christ, then matter is entirely positive and good (but can easily be abused for evil purposes). What does this mean for the preexistent body and the bodily resurrection? For Origen, the soul is always connected to a body; even in the preexistent world (only the Trinity is incorporeal). What about the resurrected body? And furthermore, in a universal cosmic dimension we can ask about the status of matter within the creation as a whole: In Origen's concept of salvation, nature and history are the ‘movement’ of God. Given this, matter and body are not only a medium of the comprehension of God and of salvation but truly its expression. They are not only a kind of tool which is no longer necessary when human beings have reached the goal of salvation, but the remaining mode of the

encounter between God and man. Thus, the new research approach opens up for new ways of understanding theological problems, but it is also a matter of debate in itself – for to which degree does it find support in Origen’s texts? All these matters are open for debate in the panel.

**Girolami, Maurizio**, “Bible and/or Tradition in the Works of Origen, Rufinus, and Jerome”

In the preserved Greek text of Origen we cannot find the expressions 'apostolic tradition' and 'ecclesiastical tradition'. This absence draws our attention to the relationship between Origen and the earlier Christian tradition, that put in the apostolic tradition the rule of faith. In the apostolic origins Irenaeus had already found the seal of authenticity for the words, transmitted orally and in writing, and the rites and customs of the Christian Churches. Perhaps the controversy with the Gnostics, and above all with their conception of tradition as the source of truth, had provoked Origen to give greater attention exclusively to the Scriptures, globally and jointly read in Christological terms. The positions of the two greatest origenian translators, Jerome and Rufinus, are very different. They were friends but they became enemies precisely over their conception of the Scriptures: a *fidele depositum* of the Holy Spirit sent by the apostles themselves (Rufinus) or as a tool to seek the original sense *iuxta Hebraica veritatem* (Jerome).

**Goldberg, Maya**, “Teaching Theodore of Mopsuestia to the Syrians: Anti-Allegorism in the Anonymous Commentary on the Minor Pauline Epistles in Ms Diyarbakir 22”

A natural principle in Theodore of Mopsuestia’s historico-grammatical approach to biblical exegesis is a strict rejection of allegorical, or spiritual, interpretation, as exemplified in the introductions to his commentaries on the Psalms and Ecclesiastes, as well as in his commentary on Gal 4:24. Although never mentioned by name, it had probably been Origen who for Theodore embodied the allegorical approach to Scripture. In this paper, we will look into how this objection, manifested so fiercely in Theodore’s full commentaries, was transmitted in the anonymous Syriac exegetical compilation found in Ms Diyarbakir 22, and particularly in the section dedicated to the Minor Pauline Epistles.

**Hartog, Paul**, “Origen the Librarian and the Institutional Legacy of His Caesarean Library”

Origen was an author, linguist, and theologian, but he was also a librarian. This paper will examine the cultural context of his library, trace its continuation under Pamphilus, reconstruct the contents of the collection, and discuss the long-term contributions of the materials. The thirty-thousand-volume Caesarean library that grew out of Origen’s private collection flourished throughout Late Antiquity. Gregory Thaumaturgus described some of the contents, and Eusebius produced a complete catalog list. When Emperor Constantine wanted fifty copies of the Bible, he contacted the Caesarean library to accomplish the task. Jerome still referred to the *bibliotheca Origenis et Pamphili*. Investigation of the Caesarean library thus allows one to consider the *institutional* legacy of Origen. Scholars have investigated how later authors borrowed from Origen’s writings (*literary* legacy), how later translators interacted with his Hexapla (*linguistic* legacy), and how later thinkers reacted to his theological ideas (*theological* legacy). Scholarship, however, has tended to neglect Origen’s role as a Caesarean librarian and the legacy of his library. Viewed through this

*institutional* lens, Pamphilus becomes a collection caretaker as well as an apologist. Eusebius becomes a bibliographical researcher as well as a theological heir. And Constantine becomes a customer of the library's scriptorium.

**Hengsternann, Christian**, "*Voluntas et propositum: The Notion of Will in Jerome's and Rufinus's Translations of Origen's On First Principles and the Commentary on Romans*"

Jerome and especially Rufinus of Aquileia tend to be sharply criticized for their extant Latin translation of Origen's major works of the Alexandrian and Caesarean periods. Their translations, as they are frequently charged in modern scholarship, amount to loose paraphrases rather than precise translations. However, while their orthodox "corrections" continue to be a formidable obstacle to the interpretation of the theology of the Trinity in the large extant corpus of Origen's homilies, Jerome's and Rufinus's great philosophical merit in their careful rephrasing of Origen's momentous Greek concept of the freedom of the *mind* in a distinctly Latin vocabulary of free *will* has not been duly appreciated yet. Indeed, in the field of the theory of action, which is one of the key attainments of Origen's new metaphysics of freedom, their original translations of the *On First Principles* and the *Commentary on Romans* are comparable to Seneca's voluntarist reappraisal of the Stoic notion of freedom in his Letters and Dialogues. Building on the classical work of Dihle, Kahn and Frede on the notion of will in antiquity, this paper explores Jerome's and Rufinus's pivotal role in the shaping of a Latin conception of Origenian free will.

**Hermanin de Reichenfeld, Giovanni**, "From Capernaum to Jerusalem: Origen's Sacred Geography of the Holy Land in his Commentaries on the Gospels"

Among Origen's interpretations of the metaphorical and spiritual significations of physical places mentioned in the Gospels, the exegesis on Capernaum is most interesting. In his commentaries on John and Matthew, Origen proposes an elaborate exegesis of Capernaum, the etymology of which he deems to be 'field of exhortation'. In particular, the focus on Jesus' journey from Capernaum to the Temple in Jerusalem (*Jn,2*) appears as one of the most significant and daring pieces of exegesis in Origen's production, especially with regard to the relationship between the material world and the spiritual journey of the soul. In addition, this topic encourages a deeper consideration of the relationship between historicity and spirituality in Origen's exegesis of the Gospels. Hence, by closely analyzing Origen's quotations, this paper aims at investigating in depth Origen's 'geography of the sacred', focusing in particular on the relationship between Capernaum and Jerusalem as part of his wider interpretation of the Holy Land.

**Hirshman, Marc**, "Origen, Copyists and Books of *Aggada*"

There is literary evidence for the existence of written books of *aggada* in Palestine of the early third century c.e.. This apparently new development is excoriated by Jewish sages of that century - in accord with the predominantly oral nature of the rabbinic movement. R. Yohanan, the preeminent amora of the mid-third century adopts a new stance and encourages the use of book of *aggada*. The paper explores the possible correlation between the prodigious output of Christian

literature produced by Origen and his successors in Caesarea and the rabbinic encouragement of books of aggada.

**Hoogerwerf, Cornelis**, “Origen, ‘Destroyer of the Scriptures’? Origen and Theodore of Mopsuestia on Eph. 5:31-32”

According to Theodore of Mopsuestia Origen was the one to blame for introducing pagan methods of interpretation of the Bible into the church. Theodore's preface to Psalm 118 LXX contains apart from polemics against Origen also the 'right' interpretation of Eph. 5:31-32, in which Pseudo-Paul connects Gen. 2:24 (about marriage) to the mystery of Christ and the church. In this paper, I will compare Origen's exegesis with that of Theodore and identify key differences in the hermeneutics of these Biblical interpreters.

**Interi, Tommaso**, “‘A Place to Worship the Lord our God’: Origen's Exegesis of the Holy Land in his Homilies on Prophets”

As recent studies have pointed out, Origen regularly explains biblical places named in the Bible as allegories referring to spiritual meanings. In the homilies on *Isaiah*, *Jeremiah* and *Ezekiel*, the frequent mentions of geographical locations are also consistently interpreted along this standard in original and distinctive ways, as compared with the previous interpretations of biblical geography among the Christian authors of the first three centuries. After a preliminary inspection of these different explanations, the paper will focus on the few cases where Origen refers to the promised land as *ἀγία γῆ* or *terra sancta*. In particular, *Hier VII* and *HEz XI* can be compared due to some recurring themes dealt from complementary points of view. This analysis will, on the one hand, deepen and enrich Origen's concept of “holy land” in the perspective of pre-Constantinian Christianity; on the other hand, it will provide meaningful examples of his rhetorical and preaching techniques, while highlighting that his interpretations are presented as works in progress, whose nuances are liable to be influenced by the biblical context, in order to fit into a wider coherent framework.

**Irshai, Oded**, “A New Temple: Eusebius' Address on the Occasion of the Consecration of the New Church in Tyre (ca.315 CE)”

Eusebius of Caesarea is known to us as the "Father of Church History" and as a leading ecclesiastical figure in the first decades of the 4th century. He should also be remembered as the most prominent church leader to document the horrendous universal persecutions against Christianity during the days of the Tetrarchy (303-311/2) and at the same time too as the person who universally shared his deep elation in face of the initial rays of hope for a new era, the era of the Christians. The outpouring of emotion and joy is easily spotted in his address on the consecration of the new basilica in Tyre under the leadership of Paulinus the local bishop (Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, 10). The address delivered on the behest of Paulinus has so far attracted only scanty attention, devoted, and rightly so, to the implicit Zerubbabel New Temple symbolism emanating from it. It is my contention that lurking behind this address might have been a rather more mundane but at the same time highly ambitious motive based on a mutual intellectual

and literary project that linked Paulinus and Eusebius. In what follows I argue that the conceptual framework, which Eusebius laid down in his address, was aimed at universalizing the idea of the church as superseding the Jewish Temple of Jerusalem.

### **Jacobsen, Anders-Christian, “Body and Soul in Origen’s Theology”**

The question about how mind, soul and body are related to each other in Origen’s theology is as old as the controversial discussions about his anthropological and soteriological concepts as a whole. It is usually discussed in connection with his eschatology – especially with the status of the body in the resurrection. Origen is here widely reproached for his alleged spiritualization (or at least spiritualizing tendency) and his disregard of the (human) body and of matter in general. In recent research, however, it has been suggested that his assessment of the body is in fact much more positive – that the body in Origen’s thought is not evil and that matter is not the cause of evil; free will is. Moreover, according to recent research, matter actually plays a mediating role in his soteriology. It mediates goodness and truth, and when trying to comprehend spiritual realities, a human being has to start with the corporeal senses. In this understanding, Origen thus goes beyond Plato and ascribes essential goodness to matter and body. The most famous expression of this positive assessment is his theory of ‘spiritual senses’.

The proposition of the goodness of matter and body provides a new approach to the main topics of the Origenian concept of world and humankind and calls for debate. How does this affect, for instance, the concept of the incarnated Son as mediator and the relationship of the human souls to the soul of Christ? Through and in Christ’s body and soul, united with the Logos, the connection and the mediation of heaven and earth is established, and thus matter and body open up the way toward salvation for the human person. If the incarnated Son reveals the mystery of Christ, then matter is entirely positive and good (but can easily be abused for evil purposes). What does this mean for the preexistent body and the bodily resurrection? For Origen, the soul is always connected to a body; even in the preexistent world (only the Trinity is incorporeal). What about the resurrected body? And furthermore, in a universal cosmic dimension we can ask about the status of matter within the creation as a whole: In Origen’s concept of salvation, nature and history are the ‘movement’ of God. Given this, matter and body are not only a medium of the comprehension of God and of salvation but truly its expression. They are not only a kind of tool which is no longer necessary when human beings have reached the goal of salvation, but the remaining mode of the encounter between God and man. Thus, the new research approach opens up for new ways of understanding theological problems, but it is also a matter of debate in itself – for to which degree does it find support in Origen’s texts? All these matters are open for debate in the panel.

### **James, Mark, “Hermeneutic Reason in Origen and the Ishmaelean Midrash”**

Both before and after he relocated to Caesarea, Origen had a tendency to label Jewish interpretation of scripture “irrational” (ἄλογος). Though his charge has often struck scholars as unfair, I argue that it makes sense in relation to the exegetical procedures of the Palestinian rabbis in the school of Ishmael. According to Azzan Yadin-Israel, the Ishmaelean rabbis described the interpretation of scripture as a process of *imitatio scripturae*, beginning with the uninterpreted sense of scripture (כשמועו) and patterned after its observable behaviors (מדות) of scriptural language. Origen’s notion of scripture’s verbal sense (κατὰ λέξιν/κατὰ ῥητὸν) and of its habits (ἔθου) function nearly

identically to these Ishmaelean categories. Taking these as a fixed point of comparison, I argue that Origen's charge of Jewish irrationalism is a reflection of their different conceptions of reason (ἵ7, λόγος). If the Ishmaelean rabbis understood reason as a restrained activity exercised in subordination to the guiding activity of scripture itself, for Origen reason is a bold and speculative activity that leads the interpreter beyond the verbal sense and observable habits of scripture.

**Johnson, Aaron, "Cities Divine and Demonic in Eusebius of Caesarea"**

As one of the most significant thinkers not only to inhabit a leading city in late antique Judaea-Palaestina but also to inhabit a central place within the intellectual tradition of Origen, Eusebius of Caesarea deserves consideration for the ways in which he developed biblical interpretive techniques for making sense of cities. Previous expositions of Eusebius' thought have adopted a chronological framework for understanding his approach to the cities, places, and broader territory of the Holy Land: a more negative approach to Jewish cities and places, especially Jerusalem and its Temple Mount, found expression in Eusebius' pre-Constantinian works, it has been argued, whereas a positive evaluation quickly exhibited his conceptual agility in responding to Constantine's new interest in the Holy Land in his post-Constantinian writings. Such a chronological approach masks, however, evidence within Eusebius' corpus that is contradictory of such a tidy schema. The present contribution to the Origeniana Duodecima conference seeks to identify two key components that were essential for Eusebius' attitude toward the places and cities of the Holy Land: first, his theological conceptualization of inhabited places as never neutral but always bound by relations to spiritual forces, whether divine or demonic; second, his interpretive criteria for determining whether to understand biblical references to particular cities (especially Jerusalem) as having a physical-historical referent or rather a spiritual-ecclesiological one. Eusebius' under-studied *Commentary on the Psalms* will receive special focus in this inquiry. Analysis of both of these components is key for appreciating what otherwise might first appear as contradictory interpretive movements within single works. Due attention to Eusebius' thinking in these areas hopes to complement the many discussions by other conference participants of Origen himself as well as the richness of his legacy to later philosophical, theological and biblical-exegetical ways of thinking.

**Johnson, Samuel, "'To Preserve the Words of Moses': The Sacrifice of the Law in Origen's Homilies on Leviticus"**

Of first regard concerning Origen's reception in the Holy Land is attending to how the Holy Land received Origen himself. This paper considers the indelible marks left on Origen's exegetical legacy by his permanent sojourn in Caesarea Maritima. Recent scholarship has offered increasing insight into the question of Jewish-Christian interactions at play in Origen's *oeuvre*. These developments, in turn, have opened up an opportunity to reappraise Origen's theology of the Jewish Law precisely as seen in light of his immense homiletic output on the Old Testament while a priest in Palestine. With reference to these historical inroads, especially as they pertain to the contemporaneously developing notions of sacrifice between Jewish and Christian communities, this essay will offer a close analysis of Origen's understanding of exegesis as sacrifice in the

*Homilies on Leviticus*. In the end, it will demonstrate how, for Origen, it is precisely the *preservation* of the “words of Moses” to which his interpretive “sacrifice” of the Law is ordered – a simultaneous preservation of Hebrew Scripture and Holy Land that resists facile reduction, and to which his own life remained equally bound.

**Junni, Jussi**, “Being and Becoming in Celsus and Origen”

The goodness of the Creator has been recognized as the primary motive of the creation in early Christian theology. This particular view can be found in the *Timaeus* of Plato as well. According to Plato, the Demiurge formed the things that are becoming by looking at the eternal that is. This means that the visible world is good because it has been formed after good eternal ideas. This relationship between being and becoming has been discussed by Celsus and Origen in the *Contra Celsum* of the latter, and according to Celsus, being is associated with truth and becoming with error. Origen seems to deny this Celsian point of view and suggests that the things that are becoming function as steps of contemplation of the nature of intelligible things. In this paper, I will discuss the differences between Celsian and Origenian interpretations of *Timaeus* according to the relationship between being and becoming, and respectively to the goodness of the world.

**Karfikova, Lenka**, “Is Romans 9:11 a Proof for or Against the Soul's Preexistence? Origen and Augustine in Comparison”

In his *De principiis* (I,7,4; II,9,7) and his Commentary on John (II,31,191-192) Origen quotes Rom. 9:11 (“though they were not yet born and had done nothing either good or bad ...”) as a biblical confirmation for his idea of soul’s preexistence, a theory developed against Valentinian anthropology. In his later writings (such as Commentary on Romans) the focus on preexistence seems to disappear in Origen’s interpretation of Rom. 9:11 being replaced by the traditional idea of God’s foreknowledge or eliminated by Rufin’s translation (cf. C. Hammond Bammel, A. Castagno Monaci e.a.). For Augustine on the contrary, Rom. 9:11 is a proof against the soul’s preexistence, as we can see in the writings of his late period (cf. *De anima et eius origine*, I,12,15; III,7,9). In his early works Augustine seems to have considered the preexistence of soul quite seriously (*Lib. arb.* III,20,57-58), if not assumed (*Ep.* 7), cf. the debate O’Connell vs. O’Daly e.a. In my contribution, I will analyse the use of Rom. 9:11 and the idea of preexistence in both authors.

**Keith, Zachary**, “Riding on the Heads of Dragons: Origen's Scriptural Influence in Saint John of Damascus”

In the eighth century Origen’s writings continue to influence Christian theology, despite the earlier condemnation. My paper explores the ways that Origen’s use of Scripture provides the foundation for John Damascene’s use of Scripture. John demonstrates some familiarity with Origen’s corpus, which he might have encountered in his monastic life near Jerusalem. The most important texts for this project are John’s *Expositio fidei*, and Origen’s *Contra Celsum* and *Commentarii in evangelium Joannis*. I compare the Scriptural passages that both theologians cite, paying special attention to the similarity between the excerpts and how the passages are incorporated into their

texts. While it is not possible at this time to prove the existence of the *Contra Celsum* in John's milieu, his indebtedness to Origen's writings is striking.

**Kharanauli, Anna**, "Hexapla: *Ekdosis* of Alexandrian Grammarian 'Made in Caesarea'"

Origen is presentative and successor of the Alexandrian grammar school. His "Alexandrian roots" are shown in various details of his life and work: in creating a working infrastructure, in collecting the working material, in preparing excerpts from different texts and in the mode of commenting them, as well as in the terminology used in his works. Alexandrian roots are manifested in his approach to the textual criticism: in his conservatism as a text-critic as well as in uncategorical judgement in the evaluation of variants. In addition, Origen considers the Septuagint as an inspired text and believes a divine economy is one of the causes of changing the text as well. In the paper I will try to discuss Origen's project considering the context to which he belonged and the philological and theological positions declared by himself. I think this is an only correct way to evaluate Hexapla adequately as an innovative *ekdosis* based on the traditions of Alexandrian Philology and completed according to the new realities and objectives in Caesarea.

**Kouremenos, Nikolaos**, "The Interpretation of the Song of Songs in Shenute's 'As I Sat on a Mountain': Examining the Influence of Origen's Hermeneutic Principles on Coptic Literature"

Shenoute the Great, archimandrite of the White Monastery in Sohag, is considered to be one of the firmest adversaries of Origenism in Egypt during the 5th century. The early Origenistic controversies describe the reaction of certain cycles to some aspects of monastic spirituality related more or less to Origen. The impact, however, of Hellenistic philosophical and religious background, of which an important factor was Origen, on later Christian literature and particularly on Christian interpretation of Scriptures in the so-called Alexandrian tradition goes beyond and extends surprisingly to authors of anti-Origenistic tendencies as well. The present essay aims to demonstrate through the textual analysis of the Shenute's homily *As I sat on a Mountain* that the influence of the Origen's hermeneutic principles, as they have expressed in his Caesarian commentaries and homilies on the Song of Songs, can be also identified in the hermeneutic approach of the abbot of Sohag to the same biblical text.

**Lee, Justin**, "'Seek and Ye Shall Find': Rufinus and the Search for Origen's Trinitarian Orthodoxy"

Rufinus notes that "Wherever... I have found in [Origen's] books anything contrary to the reverent statements made by him about the Trinity in other places, I have either omitted it as a corrupt and interpolated passage, or reproduced it in a form that agrees with the doctrine which I have often found him affirming elsewhere." This paper will compare some of the major Trinitarian statements in the Latin of *On First Principles* with those in Origen's other Greek works which may be the "reverent statements" he refers to. By doing so, I will shed some light on Rufinus' motivation as a translator of Origen, particularly as to what he saw in Origen that was so clearly orthodox and what in Origen needed to be fixed to make him more palatable. My analysis will focus mostly on some of Origen's positive Christological statements, such as *Jo.* 2.16, 6.188, and *Cels.* 8.12.

**Limone, Vito**, “Οὐσία in Origen: Origen’s Use of the Term in Light of the *Homilies on the Psalms*”

Though οὐσία (“substance”), which is a key-word in classical philosophy, plays a prominent role in the philosophical lexicon occurring in Origen’s writings, it has not been given the attention it is worth. The main purpose of this paper is to study Origen’s use of the term οὐσία in the recently discovered *Homilies on the Psalms*. Nevertheless, since in the philosophical debates in the early imperial era this term conflates various meanings from different schools and backgrounds, it will be studied in light of two core doctrines concerned with it and widespread in the context contemporary to Origen, namely, the definition of substance as existence and the distinction between corporeal and incorporeal substances. In this respect, the paper will consist of the following sections: first of all, an overview of the use of this term in the early imperial philosophical backdrop, with focus on the aforesaid doctrines recalled by the lexicographical source on which Origen’s *On Prayer* 27, 8 depends upon; secondly, a general look at the use of the term in Origen’s extant Greek texts, esp. his *Commentary on John* and *Against Celsus*; finally, a collection and study of the occurrences of the term in his *Homilies on the Psalms*.

**Lipatov-Chicherin, Nikolai**, “Tradition about Adam's Burial on Golgotha and the Origenist Controversy of the Late Fourth Century”

The paper considers the extent to which Origen’s references to tradition about Adam’s burial on Golgotha influenced the subsequent development of this story in the literary form. It also tries to establish whether later authors had direct access to the oral sources known to Origen or were creatively developing his information. The late fourth century controversy about Adam’s burial is viewed against the background of the overlapping debates about the authority of Origen’s teaching. Comparison of texts by Jerome and Epiphanius reflecting contemporary preaching on Adam in the Church of the Resurrection leads to identification of the unnamed preacher as bishop John II of Jerusalem. Close correspondences between the views with which Jerome charges him and statements in the homily *On the Passion and Cross of the Lord* (preserved under the name of Athanasius of Alexandria) allow to attribute the homily to John, which gives a better understanding of the doctrinal and homiletical positions of the Origenist bishop of Jerusalem.

**Marchetto, Valentina**, “‘Jerusalem... is the Divine Soul’ (FrLam VIII): The Holy Land in Origen’s Early Works”

As Lorenzo Perrone stated in his essay *Origene e la ‘Terra Santa’*, the importance of the Palestinian background in Origen’s biography has not to be analysed only with respect to the two final decades of his life, i.e. the years that Origen spent in Caesarea. In fact, in the writings he composed during his first years in Alexandria, Origen frequently focused on some specific issues, namely the Holy Land, Jerusalem, the Hebrew Bible and its exegesis. On the one hand, Eusebius offers the chronology of Origen’s first journeys and works providing a witness which Nautin calls in question and Perrone defends. On the other hand, Origen stands against a complex theological and exegetical background with some Gnostic and Hellenistic influences, as well as Jewish ones, whose importance scholars often underestimate. This paper aims to examine Origen’s first works

(*CPs* 1-25; *Prin*; *Clo* I-V; *FrGn*), in order to grasp the meaning of the themes linked to Jerusalem, the Temple, the promised Land, with a special focus on the *Commentary on Lamentations*.

**Markschies, Christoph**, “Local Knowledge vs. Religious Imaging: Origen and the Holy Land”

From the beginning of Holy Land research (especially in England and Germany on certain information about places mentioned in the Bible were taken from the works of Origen. But is Origen really a key to learn something about geography of the Holy Land in late antiquity and the centuries before? Perhaps it is more a perspective from the teacher’s and preacher’s chair in Caesarea than local knowledge from small places in the Galilee and Jordan valley. This question will be discussed with certain interesting examples from different genres of Origen’s writings.

**Minonne, Francesca**, “Origen and the Grammatical Process of διόρθωσις in the Library of Caesarea”

In Origen’s days, grammatical analysis was an essential part of scholars’ interaction with texts. Origen, who was trained as a grammarian, applied such a method also in the library of Caesarea. The explanation of the syntactical structure of sentences and the reflection on their morphological characteristics aimed to define and preserve the sacred text in its original form. In this period of extreme fluidity of written texts, the role of copyists and Christian intellectuals was extremely important in the process of reading, correcting and interpreting texts. Origen pays particular attention to the disagreements among the copies of the Scriptures and to the γραφικὰ ἀμαρτήματα, whether unintentional or deliberate. In this sense, the grammatical reconstruction functions as a basis for justifying the literal interpretation of texts, on which it is possible to develop the allegorical meaning, which makes use of more philosophical and rhetorical tools. Therefore, the practice of διόρθωσις is already a kind of ἔκδοσις of the sacred texts and steers the theological exegesis toward the interpretation Origen assumes as correct.

**Mirotadze, Natia**, “Georgian Versions of I Samuel: Witnesses for the Hexaplaric Readings”

Translation, place and date of the Georgian Bible are unknown. Caesarian – so called Hexaplaric – trace is noticeable only in a few Books of the Georgian Bible. But it is more eminent in the old Georgian versions of Samuel-Kings, exactly the manuscripts containing these Books have Hexaplaric signs as well. My paper deals with the old Georgian version of I Samuel which is especially rich with the Hexaplaric Material. I will attempt to classify this material chronologically to find out if the existence of these readings is presumable in the original Georgian translation, or they are the result of late recensional process. Thus, it will be possible to define the time when the Hexaplaric – i.e. Caesarian – text gained an impact on the formation and development of the Georgian scripture.

**Mirotznik, Jesse**, “Origen and the *Sifra* – A Comparative Genre Analysis”

The extent and nature of Jewish contact with Origen in Caesarea has been the subject of much debate within literature on Origen. Much of this scholarship has sought to uncover the historical question of the intellectual impact of Caesarean rabbis on Origen's thinking (and, occasionally, the reverse) and focuses almost exclusively on aggadic material. My paper, by contrast, will attempt to demonstrate, through a comparison of selections from Origen's homilies on Leviticus and the *Sifra* (roughly contemporary analyses originating in the Land of Israel), that Origen's homilies on biblical legal material contain significant elements which strongly resemble, in their exegetical assumptions and the targets of their interpretive attention, the genre of rabbinic midrash halakhah.

**Misiarczyk, Leszek**, “Origen as a Source of the Evagrian Eight Passionate Thoughts”

In the studies on Evagrian texts, different sources of his teachings about eight passionate thoughts were proposed. Some scholars proposed Philo of Alexandria and his *De opificio mundi* 79 as his source, but we find only two of the same terms (γαστριμαργία, λῦπαι) as in Evagrius. Other scholars proposed *Rule of Community* 4,9-11 discovered among Qumran texts where there can be found greed, sloth, pride and arrogance, wrath (anger) and the spirit of fornication, but Evagrius not knowing Hebrew language certainly was not inspired by texts from Qumran. Some other researches proposed preserved in Greek *Testament of Ruben* II, 1, but there are only two terms common with Evagrius: πορνεία and ὑπερεφάνια. In the New Testament, we do not find the list of eight or seven deadly sins, but in different texts appear three terms utilized by Evagrius: impurity (πορνεία), greed (φιλαργία) and pride (ὑπερεγανία). In the *Shepherd* of Hermas (36, 5 and 38,3-5), with the exception of acedia are present all bad deeds: gluttony, impurity, greed, sadness, anger, vanity and pride, but some of them are expressed by other terms. In this work, there are only three terms the same as in Evagrius: πορνεία, λύπη, κενοδοξία and ὑπερεγανία and *Shepherd* of Hermas cannot be a direct source for Evagrius. It should be excluded also a direct impact of the stoic teachings about passions on Evagrius because in their writings there is only one term, λύπη common to the texts of monk of Pontus. It is a fact that Origen was Christian author who most frequently alluded to the subject of passionate thoughts. All Greek terms to describe the eight passionate thoughts appear in the writings of Origen both preserved in Greek as well as those translated in Latin, but not in the same order as in Evagrius. It seems that Evagrius assumed as the starting point of his teaching the three temptations, which according to the Gospel Satan tempted Jesus, gluttony, greed and vainglory and enlarged them to eight passionate thoughts but their specific names he took from Origen. I'll try to show in my paper that Origen is a direct source of Evagrian list of eight passionate thoughts.

**Monaci, Adele**, « Eusèbe de Césarée et la Palestine »

Le développement des *loca sancta* à Jérusalem et en Palestine a marqué un changement significatif dans l'histoire religieuse du IV<sup>me</sup> siècle. Les écrits d'Eusèbe de Césarée sont des documents indispensables pour reconstruire cette étape; par contre, le rôle joué par Eusèbe dans ce contexte a fait l'objet d'interprétations divergentes : il suffit de penser aux études de P.W.L. Walker et de R.L. Wilken, qui sont encore deux points de repère pour le sujet ; pour Walker, Eusèbe est surtout un conservateur déguisé, qui reste, malgré tout, fidèle au spiritualisme origénien; en revanche,

pour Wilken Eusèbe aurait connu un changement radical, documenté par la *Vie de Costantin*. Je voudrais reconsidérer la question en partant de l'hypothèse que, si on veut comprendre une transformation qui s'est produite dans un temps très court., il faut analyser les textes d'Eusèbe dans un ordre chronologique rigoureux et qu'il faut éviter d'expliquer les textes appartenant à une période précise à la lumière d'autres textes écrits avant ou après. La période qui sera examinée ici est celle qui va de la fin de la persécution (311-313) au Concile de Nicée (324/325), lorsque la défaite d'Arius et l'initiative, adoptée par Constantin et Macarius, évêque de Jérusalem, de construire l'Eglise du Saint-Sépulcre auraient obligé Eusèbe de se repositionner sur la scène de la géopolitique ecclésiastique. Les écrits d'Eusèbe examinés ici sont la *Démonstration Evangélique*, le *Discours pour l'Eglise de Tyre*, l'*Onomasticon* et les *Martyrs de Palestine*. Mon but est de souligner la complexité de la pensée d'Eusèbe face à la valorisation : 1. des lieux de culte et des lieux bibliques; 2. de la Palestine.

1.a) Dans sa polémique contre le culte juif, Eusèbe souligne le rapport dialectique entre le sensible et l'intelligible, mais il met en place aussi la dialectique entre l'unicité du lieu de culte de la religion mosaïque et la pluralité des lieux de culte de la religion chrétienne; il s'agit là du fondement idéologique qui favorisera la création d'une nouvelle géographie religieuse. 1.b) Contrairement à la doctrine origénienne des sens spirituels, Eusèbe comprend l'importance de "voir avec ses yeux" et surtout de ce qu'on peut voir "jusqu'à présent": c'est dans ce contexte apologétique qu'il mentionne les lieux liés à la vie de Jésus. 1.c) Dans le *Panegyrique* adressé à l'évêque de Tyr, Eusèbe utilise un langage qui témoigne d'un processus d'assimilation du lieu de culte chrétien au Temple de Jérusalem; ce langage n'est pas que pure rhétorique; il établit un rapport étroit entre l'église en pierre et le texte sacré. 2.a) Les études plus récentes ne considèrent plus l'*Onomasticon* un guide pour les pèlerins qui venaient de l'Occident; elles soulignent plutôt son but apologétique; c'est à dire la tentative de rendre romaine et chrétienne la Palestine juive. Toutefois, cette interprétation n'explique pas l'aspect structurel plus significatif de ce texte, qui assigne à chaque lieu de précises coordonnées géographiques selon le système de repère romain. L'*Onomasticon*, à mon avis, répond déjà aux intérêts et aux curiosités de lecteurs qui avaient une certaine familiarité avec la Palestine et qui, en parcourant ses routes, pouvaient savoir à l'avance quels lieux bibliques ils auraient rencontrés sur leur chemin. 2.b) Plus qu'au *Chronicon* ou à l'*Histoire Ecclésiastique*, l'*Onomasticon* devrait être associé au *Martyrs de Palestine*: l'un et l'autre écrit reflètent un changement d'attitude par rapport aux lieux liés à Jésus et aux saints. Avec les *Martyrs de Palestine*, Eusèbe rappelle aux lecteurs que son pays est aussi un pays de martyrs; si Rome a Pierre et Paul, de la Palestine, qu'il appelle "notre pays", vient le Sauveur de toute l'humanité. Dans l'*Histoire Ecclésiastique* ainsi que dans cet écrit, Eusèbe vise surtout à souligner la valeur universelle des vertus des martyrs; mais il ne nie pas les formes déjà traditionnelles du culte des martyrs et, en quelque cas, les corps des martyrs témoignent d'un lien particulier avec la ville où ils ont été mis à mort.

**Morlet, Sébastien**, "Συμφωνία: an Origenian theme and its legacy in Eusebius of Caesarea"

The paper shall illustrate a few aspects of the legacy of Origen's "symphonic" exegesis (presented at the Origen conference in 2009) on one of his most famous spiritual disciples, Eusebius of Caesarea.

**Moss, Yonatan**, “‘Oil Emptied Out’: Transformations in Late Ancient Understandings of *Kenosis* and the Revelation of Torah”

“Your name is oil emptied out; therefore maidens loved you” (Cant. 1.3). Within the late ancient exegetical treatments of this verse the oil (or “perfume”) is commonly associated with the core element of the interpreter’s religious tradition: Christ for Christians and Torah for Jews, (although there are also exceptions to this pattern). An examination of the string of extant late ancient interpretations of this verse, beginning with Origen and ending with the fifth-century midrashic compilations, shows an interesting transition from a public, open and accessible understanding of the revelation of this core religious element to a limited, closed, and elusive understanding of it. Oil’s different natural qualities of are alternately invoked in order to justify the wildly varying religious ideologies anchored in this verse. My paper traces the verse’s exegetical developments alongside their concomitant ideological shifts, and it attempts to contextualize these shifts within a broader social and historical framework.

**Newman, Hillel**, “Jerome in the Holy Land: The Legacy of Origen and the Legacy of the Jews”

The works of both Origen and Jerome attest to frequent consultation with the Jews of Palestine on matters of biblical exegesis and – especially in the case of Jerome – the Hebrew language. It has, however, long been recognized that Jerome occasionally copies traditions in the name of the Jews from the writings of Origen without acknowledging his source. Contrary to the claims of Bardy and Nautin, it may nevertheless be demonstrated that Jerome’s considerable acquaintance with Jewish tradition is largely unmediated by Origen and must be attributed for the most part to direct dependence on Jewish teachers and, less frequently, to written sources unavailable to Origen. Jewish *aggada* also informs his accounts of local traditions pertaining to sites along the routes of Christian Holy Land pilgrimage and is appropriated even in homage to Bethlehem itself

**Niehoff, Maren**, “‘In the Image of God’: A Dispute Between Origen and the Rabbis”

Following previous work, I plan to choose a specific passage in the Book of Genesis, probably the notion of pre-created items, and investigate the interpretations of Origen and the rabbis in Genesis Rabbah. I will focus on possible exegetical contacts, either polemics or borrowings, seeing that the idea of items created before the creation plays a special role in the definition of religious identity. While the rabbis emphasize items with special Jewish significance, such as the Temple, Origen chooses to connect the creation to Christ (especially in his Commentary on John). I will ask to what extent the interpreters were aware of each other and shaped their position in light of the Other.

**Pålsson, Katarina**, “Likeness to the angels: Origen, Jerome and the question of the resurrection body”

During the first Origenist controversy, Jerome was compelled to distance himself from Origen's thought, which he had previously been very influenced by. He did this by portraying Origen as a heretic and presenting his own views as orthodox, precisely in contrast to the Origenist heresy that

he constructed. In this paper it is shown how Jerome used this strategy in dealing with the question of the resurrection body in *Contra Joannem*, a polemical work against bishop John of Jerusalem. Comparisons are made to an earlier polemical work, *Adversus Jovinianum* (written before the outbreak of the Origenist controversy), in order to show in which ways Jerome's subsequent need to distance himself from Origen effected the ideas that he expressed. It is also argued that despite his anti-Origenist polemics, a continuity can be seen in Jerome's thinking, which makes an idea of a definitive break with Origenism questionable. Above all, it is questioned whether Jerome's new insistence on the resurrection of the flesh and all body parts implicated a denial of his earlier views on the possibility to transcend sexual differentiation.

### **Patrich, Joseph, “Caesarea Maritima in the Time of Origen”**

In the 3rd c. CE Caesarea Maritima, a Roman colony, was a prosperous city, the administrative capital of the Roman province of *Iudaea-Palaestina*. The Roman governor, of a senatorial rank, resided in Herod's *praetorium*. Being administered municipally by a *curia* and *decuriones*, the official language was Latin, but Greek and Aramaic were spoken there as well. Pagans, Jews, Samaritans and Christians lived there side by side. Being a maritime city, it had a cosmopolitan flavor. Many Greco-Roman and Oriental cults are attested in the city coins, the statuary and other finds. In addition of being a center of Hellenistic culture, it had a Jewish academy, which was headed by R. Hoshayah and R. Abbahu, and a Christian one headed by Origen. In my lecture I'll describe the city he was living in: its paved streets (some of them colonnaded and decorated with statues); the public and religious buildings; the entertainment structures, the dwellings, the water supply and the harbor.

### **Pazzini, Domenico, « De Alexandrie à Césarée: la voie négative du Commentaire sur Jean »**

L'examen des épinoias dans *Clo* I,125-292 est bien analysé. La contribution de H. Crouzel lors de son article “Le contenu spirituel des dénominations du Christ selon le Livre I du *Commentaire sur Jean* d'Origène”, paru dans *Origeniana Secunda* (1975) 131-150, est déterminante. Toutefois il reste encore à comprendre le plan et le dessein du traité à l'intérieur du premier livre du *Commentaire*. Je propose l'hypothèse d'une “voie négative” ou d'un “lieu négatif”. Le discours d'Origène repose sur un renvoi constant du sens que prend “Logos” dans la première proposition du prologue. Il en est de même pour l'énonciation du rapport λόγος / σοφία dans *Clo* I,111. Origène fait siennes les interrogations des milieux culturels d'Alexandrie mais en diffère toujours la réponse à un moment successif. Le milieu de Césarée le conduit à une stratégie inverse mais en même temps convergente. J'analyse quelques textes du *Clo* XIII, XIX, XX, XXVIII, XXXII dans lesquelles la question repose non pas sur le Logos mais sur le Jésus historique dont la réponse est continuellement différée. La “voie négative” semble être le critère constitutif de l'unité du *Commentaire*.

**Perrone, Lorenzo**, “Origen and His Legacy in the ‘Holy Land’: Fortune and Misfortune of a Literary and Theological Heritage”

Origen was already acquainted with the Land of Israel before he moved to Caesarea in the middle of his intense life. Travels through the region of Syria and Palestine contributed for him to create the favourable conditions for a new beginning in his already celebrated career as a renowned theologian. His living in Caesarea, without being a dramatic change, permitted to Origen to develop his literary activity even more than in Alexandria and did not hinder his further travels and contacts abroad. In addition, he came into a more direct and personal relationship with the traditions of Judaism and with the Jewish sages, though he was now also involved in ecclesiastical service as an official preacher in the church. Thus the sojourn in Palestine was not only a positive way out from the hard crisis that Origen went through in Alexandria during the conflict with bishop Demetrius because of his activity and theological program as a Christian teacher, but it determined to a large extent also the survival of his literary and theological heritage. It was not Alexandria that preserved it, despite the influence that Origen exerted on Dionysius of Alexandria, Didymus the Blind and other exponents of the Alexandrian School. On the contrary, it was the region that would soon become the ‘Holy Land’ that assumed this fundamental task. If Pamphilus and Eusebius selected and transmitted Origen’s literary heritage to posterity, Jerome in spite of his turn of mind in the wake of the first Origenist crisis contributed together with his former friend Rufinus to bequeath this heritage to the western world and to assure its subsequent reception throughout the Middle Ages until its modern discovery. The Land of Israel then, during Late Antiquity, acted as the main place for the survival of Origen’s legacy and the spread of Origenism.

**Piscini, Gianluca**, « Trois versions de Phinees. *Nombres* 25,7-13 dans la tradition alexandrine (Philon, Origène, Cyrille) »

Plusieurs auteurs juifs et chrétiens citent et interprètent les actions de Phinees racontées en *Nb* 25. Les exégèses les plus riches de ce texte se trouvent dans les œuvres de trois auteurs alexandrins : Philon, Origène et Cyrille. Cette contribution portera sur leur interprétation des actions de Phinees, pour montrer aussi bien l'originalité de chaque auteur que l'émergence d'une tradition exégétique concernant *Nb* 25. On s'attardera particulièrement sur l'exégèse d'Origène, qui marque une étape fondamentale dans cette tradition (et plus généralement dans la lecture chrétienne de ce texte, car cet auteur “christianise” l'interprétation philonienne), et sur celle de Cyrille (sans doute la moins étudiée des trois), qui reprend de manière très originale les réflexions de Philon et Origène.

**Podbielski, Marcin**, “Evagrius of Pontus and the Gnostic Principle of Mathetic Identity”

Recent discussions on Evagrius of Pontus have been focused on the question whether his doctrine is identical with the so-called Origenism that was condemned at the Second Council of Constantinople or whether it is rather a reinterpretation of original teaching of Origen. Much less focus is given to Medio- and Neoplatonic influences on Evagrius and on analogies between his manner of thinking and philosophical principles implied in some Gnostic texts. In my paper, I will propose an analysis of Evagrius’ claims that have a metaphysical bearing, which will not only turn attention to especially Medioplatoic echoes in Evagrian framework of reality, but also to a specifically Gnostic principle on which the consistency of his views seems to rely. Reliance on

this principle, that might be called “a principle of mathetic identity,” makes one ask the question whether the label of Origenist is fully applicable to Evagrius.

**Prinzivalli, Emanuela**, “The City of God and the Cities of Men according to Origen”

Jerusalem is a central *locus* where Origen deploys the polyvalent symbolism typical of his hermeneutics. Whereas on the one hand, his polemic with the Jews brought Origen to devalue the earthly Jerusalem (even if he avoids the risk of totally denying it, as did Marcion), his *forma mentis* and confrontation with the Valentinians required to propose for the heavenly Jerusalem an interpretative richness capable of rendering his ideas more convincing than those of his adversaries. One can compare, then, the many and various meanings Origen gives to the city Jerusalem to those, all different one from another, he gives in his exegesis of the other cities mentioned in Scripture.

**Ramelli, Ilaria**, “Origen's Legacy in the Dialogue of Adamantius: A Reassessment”

The *Dialogue of Adamantius* represents a remarkable aspect of Origen's legacy. The mystery surrounding it extends to its author, its date of composition, its double redaction, and its relations to Origen, a "Maximus," Eusebius, Methodius, the Philocalists, and Rufinus. A systematic study of it is a substantial desideratum; I am preparing an Oxford critical edition and a commentary. As I shall show, Adamantius' doctrines, his way of arguing, his Scriptural quotations and exegesis, and many other points correspond to Origen's authentic ideas and methodologies. Hence the identification of Adamantius with Origen supported by the Cappadocians and Rufinus, who read the original Greek. Assessing the reliability of Rufinus' translation is also crucial from the doctrinal viewpoint, since it includes passages on *apokatastasis* that are absent from the extant Greek. I shall argue for the anteriority of Rufinus' version to the extant Greek and point out parallels with another late-antique text translated by Rufinus, whose version was considered to include interpolations and modifications of the Greek (in connection with 'Origenism') until a Syriac version proved that Rufinus was faithful to his *Vorlage*, while the extant Greek modified the original. Something similar occurred with our *Dialogue*.

**Risch, Franz Xaver**, „Die Stufen des Tempels”

Von der Auslegung der Gradualpsalmen durch Origenes ist nicht mehr viel erhalten, aber es ist deutlich erkennbar, daß er die fünfzehn Stufenlieder auf die fünfzehn Stufen des Tempels bezog; wahrscheinlich dachte er dabei an die siebenstufige und die achtstufige Treppe im Tempel Ezechiels. In ihrer Einheit repräsentieren die Stufen einen kontinuierlichen Prozeß von der Kriegserwartung des Volkes bis zur Gottesbegegnung. Eusebius hat das Konzept aufgegriffen, aber ekklesiologisch vereinfacht. Dagegen kann die Auslegung des Origenes als Aufstieg gelesen werden, der sich von der rationalen Mystik der Philosophen und der Merkava-Mystik deutlich unterscheidet.

**Rizzi, Marco**, “Philosophical Eclecticism and Grammatical Exegesis at Origen’s School in Caesarea”

It is a commonplace in the field of Origenian studies that Origen’s allegorical reading of the Bible relies on some philosophical assumptions (for instance: the Platonist dualism between sensible and intelligible, the stoic logic, and so on), which implicitly drive his hermeneutics of the Scripture and shape his interpretative tools. The paper aims at qualifying such a view, by deepening two aspects of Origen’s life and scholarly activity: on the one side, his training and teaching as a γραμματικός in the early years of his life, which influenced also the work in the library in Caesarea, and, on the other side, his philosophical eclecticism, which emerges clearly from the Thanksgiving oration ascribed to Gregory Thaumaturgus. It emerges a more nuanced picture of Origen’s debt to philosophy, which surely plays a central role in his hermeneutics, but within a larger, more dynamic and complex relationship with whole heritage of Greek παιδεία.

**Salminen, Joonas**, “Origen the Alexandrian Ascetic? Eusebius' Description in the Light of Clement's Practical Instructions”

Origen was a Christian author with high standards regarding ascetic life. In addition to his works, one of the most generous sources on Origen is Eusebius’ description in *Historia Ecclesiastica* (especially HE 6.1-8 and passim.). I argue that the description Eusebius gives does not reflect ascetic practices of the late second and early third century Alexandria. On the contrary, it seems favourable that Eusebius’ description of Origen’s way of life reflects ascetic practices of the fourth century Palestine. This contradicts also how Eusebius depicts the relationship between Clement and Origen in HE (6.1). In the light of Clement’s descriptions of the early stages of Christian asceticism in Alexandria (e.g. *Paed.* 2.9; 2.10; *Strom.* 3.7) it seems plausible that Eusebius had an interest to create a link between Origen and the Holy Land with his description of Origen’s way of life in Alexandria; it was also important for him to create a close link between Origen and Clement. However, asceticism in Clement and in Eusebius’ description are hard to reconcile with one another. The connection between Clement and Origen is also highly contested in scholarship. My paper will offer a general overview on this question and with concrete textual examples demonstrates how Eusebius’ portrait of Origen is more informative about the ascetic practices of the Holy Land and Palestine than about Origen in Alexandria.

**Satran, David**, “What Friend is not to be Feared as a Future Enemy?” Thoughts on the First Origenist Controversy (393-403)

This presentation offers a suggestion for understanding the emotional intensity of the Origenist Controversy at the end of the fourth century (393-403) on the basis of deep changes in the social complexion and institutional makeup of early imperial Christianity. Aspects of the crisis can be reassessed in light of the rapid transformation from patterns of personal authority to frameworks of doctrinal and ecclesiastical control. Among the characteristics of the emerging social and religious fabric which come to expression in the Origenist Controversy are shifting perceptions of the nature of personal identity, trust and friendship.

**Scherbenske, Eric**, “Selection, Preservation, and Production of Origen's Legacy: The Archetype of Codex von der Goltz (Athos Lavra 184 B. 64) and the Library of Caesarea”

Late-ancient writers repeatedly recounted the preeminence of Origen's works in the library at Caesarea—a preeminence secured not only by Origen's residence there, but also by Pamphilus's collection and preservation (cf. e.g. Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, 6.32; Jerome, *Vir. ill.*, 75). But the library's role in securing Origen's writings did not end with Pamphilus's labor; for example, Jerome informs that Euzoius directed the library's preservation of Origen's works on parchment (*Vir. ill.*, 113). This paper explores the role of the library in the formation of Origen's legacy beyond the initial acquisition and preservation of his works under Pamphilus. Specifically, I examine how Codex von der Goltz, a tenth-century scriptural manuscript that has been traced back to a fourth/fifth-century archetype likely produced in Caesarea, can illuminate the library's role in shaping Origen's legacy. How does this archetype, circumscribed by marginal notations drawn primarily from Origen, relate to other textual practices concerned with Origen's work like Euzoius's preservation or Basil of Caesarea and Gregory of Nazianzus's selection, excerption, and dissemination in the *Philocalia*? The select exegesis deployed in this archetype also invites comparisons with other textual compilations, whether these be florilegia, which were deployed increasingly in theological controversies, or late-ancient antecedents to classical scholia and/or catena. This archetype emerges, I argue, as a transitional product, where the selection, extraction, and linkage of exegesis to the scriptural text do not yet approach the order of catena or classical scholia, but still surpass the simple marginal annotation frequently found in scholars' texts; these practices assisted in presenting an image of Origen, constructed, I argue, so as to defend and shape his legacy in response to issues raised during the first Origenist controversy. Situating the production of this archetype alongside other efforts to select, preserve, and promulgate Origen's legacy expands possibilities for investigating manuscripts and their potential use for things other than simple textual transmission.

**Shtrubel, Anita**, “The Perception of Language and its Importance to Origen in *Contra Celsum*”

*Contra Celsum* employs a recurrent theme in its defense of Christianity: the superiority of the Christian language. Origen responds in many cases to Celsus' claims by presenting elaborate explanations on how the language used by Christians is better than the one used by Jews, philosophers, and especially those involved in magic. In the examples which Origen provides about the use of language by each group, it appears that the function of words depends on who is speaking them. In *CC*, Origen presents every aspect of the reading and writing of scripture, from the text's divine inspiration to the reader's willingness to receive it. Using literary tools, he unpacks the essence of any religious act which is textual or speech-related. In examining his work, two important perceptions of language become apparent: that language is at the basis of religion, and that it can affect reality.

**Sievers, Joseph**, “Origen, Josephus, and Jerusalem”

While Origen was not the first to cite Josephus, he was the first Christian author to use his work on quite a few occasions, in contexts of apologetics and polemics. Origen has practically no use for Josephus in his strictly exegetical work. As a matter of fact, the main references to Josephus's

biblical parallels are in a garbled account of the Queen of Sheba and in references to the last kings of Judea prior to the Exile. Origen relies on Josephus's testimony primarily to deal with the fall of Jerusalem and to confirm the actions and importance of New Testament figures. Among these he mentions not only James and his brother Jesus, but also John the Baptist of Pilate. He uses the latter for an amazing defense of Jewish fidelity to the Torah. Later, the Venerable Bede was to say that among the greatest scholars he knew, namely Origen, Jerome, Augustine, and Josephus, the last one served to "confirm" the truth of the others' affirmations. This paper will discuss the role(s) that Josephus plays in Origen's writings.

**Spataro, Roberto**, "A Mystical Vision of the Holy Land: Considerations on Origen's Homilies on the Book of Joshua"

Origen's *Homilies on the Book of Joshua*, delivered approx. between 245-247 in Caesarea, offer a spiritual interpretation of many places of the Holy Land mentioned in this Biblical Book. Particularly I would like to focus on the following interpretations: the Jordan river (Hom. IV), the city of Jericho (Hom. VI and VII), the mount of Garizim (Hom. IX) and the cities of Lachis, Libna, and Hebron (Hom. XIII). These interpretations offer a mystical vision of the geography of the Holy Land. It becomes somehow transfigured through the Christological, Ecclesiological, ascetical and moral meanings that Origen discovers. Moreover, I would like to quickly mention other Church Fathers, both Greek and Latin, in whom there are some echoes of Origen's exegesis, such as Hilarious of Poitiers and Gregory of Nyssa, commenting on the passage of the Jordan river, and Caesarius of Arles and Gregory of Nazianzus, speaking on the fall of Jericho.

**Tamarkina, Irina**, "Sharing Places and Dividing Memories: Space, Memory and Community in the Miaphysite and Chalcedonian Polemics of the Fifth and Sixth Centuries"

My paper explores how Miaphysite and Chalcedonian biographical narratives of the fifth and sixth centuries written in the Holy Land and Syria employed the discourse of space to articulate the self-presentation of their community, to construct the identity of their religious opponents and to conceptualize the differences between them. Scholarship has explored how individual texts of both communities asserted physical or symbolic ownership of the holy sites to enhance their claim on orthodoxy. My project shifts focus to broader spatial rhetoric as a means of constructing religious identities in the conflict between the Miaphysites and the Chalcedonians. In particular, my paper explores how the concepts of sacred space, space of visions, divergent modes of inscribing their presence on the religious landscape of the Holy Land, and typology of spatial interactions between the members of rival communities were used as identity markers. My paper shows the centrality of space oriented rhetoric in drawing lines of demarcation between the two communities, since it actively drew on the earlier biblical and early Christian polarized discourses of space. Significantly, the narratives of these communities demonstrate the close familiarity with their rivals' spatial rhetoric. These texts consistently responded to their rivals' spacial criticism by creating counter narratives that inverted and subverted their opponents' space related idioms. As a result, biographical texts created by the Miaphysites and the Chalcedonians in the Holy Land and Syria formed a closely interconnected discourse community, despite the antagonistic rhetoric and confrontational self-presentations

**Tobon, Monica**, “Sins and the Flesh: Evagrius, Jerusalem and the *krisis* of Christ”

Jerusalem was the setting for the decisive turning point in Evagrius’ life. Following his abrupt departure from Constantinople he was welcomed by Rufinus and Melania to their monastery on the Mount of Olives. In due course, whilst suffering a protracted illness which doctors were unable to diagnose but Melania discerned to have a spiritual cause, he embraced the monastic life and thereupon regained his health. This paper argues that he understood this pivotal illness to be a judgement, *krisis*, of Christ by analogy with the Hippocratic sense of *krisis* as a critical moment in the course of a disease. Since virtue and vice are realised materially in the body’s constitution, the illness was both the embodiment of his spiritual malaise and the providential catalyst for his conversion. In assigning spiritual causes to physical infirmity Evagrius and Melania follow biblical teaching, but in seeking a scientific understanding of the mechanisms involved as the basis for his ascetic teachings Evagrius draws upon Greek philosophy and medical theory.

**Toda, Satoshi**, “The So-Called Hellenization of Christianity and Origen”

Although controversial in multiple respects, the so-called Hellenization of Christianity remains one of the major problems in the history of ancient Christianity. And as on any major problem related to ancient Christianity, Origen should be studied in detail also on this problem. Special attention will be paid to the works of Jean Daniélou, since apparently Daniélou studied the problem of Hellenization having a unique perspective on the entire history of early Christianity down to the fourth century. Actually, his *Message évangélique et culture hellénistique*, one of the seminal works of the subject, deals less with Origen than with Clement of Alexandria, but this, in itself, demands explanation; furthermore, it might be possible to treat Origen as a witness of the very process of Hellenization. Thus in this paper Origen’s view on Greek philosophy and the tradition (Christian as well as Biblical), among others, will be discussed, of course taking also into consideration more recent studies on Origen.

**Tondini, Raffaele**, “Photius as Origen's reader (and editor)”

It’s widely known that Photius has been a reader of Origen, and this is shown not only by the chapters he devotes – directly or indirectly – to Origen in his *Bibliotheca* (*Capp.* 8, 117, 118), but also by some of his other works. For instance, it has not been properly underlined that the first of the *Amphilochia* (*Amph.* 1,805-855) betrays a direct knowledge of Origen’s *Commentary on John*. But if Photius witnesses the circulation of Origen’s works in the ninth century, it’s equally worth asking if he has played an active role in their transmission, and this problem can be solved only exploiting manuscripts as historical sources. Indeed, a possible answer can be found in two important origenian manuscripts (*Marc. Gr.* 143: *Commentaries on Matthew and John*; *Marc. Gr.* 47: *Philocalia*) presenting introductions and marginal notes that can be interpreted as traces of an editorial work datable in the ninth century. It is reasonable to connect this editorial enterprise with patriarch Photius and his circle.

**Trostyanskiy, Sergey, “Time and Eternity in Origen of Alexandria's Conception of God the Word's Generation”**

Origen of Alexandria's conception of generation of God the Word has delineated the Word's unqualified coming-to-be as eternal and everlasting (*aeterna ac sempiterna generatio*). According to Origen, though the Father's being is ontologically prior and the Son's being is posterior (their relation being causally determined and their being conceptually distinct), this relation cannot be framed into the schema of prior in time vs. posterior in time. Moreover, some sort of perpetuity or infinitely extended temporality is present in such a generation. A conflation of un-extended eternity and ever-extended perpetuity presented multiple *aporiai* to the scholars of our time. In this presentation I aim to rethink Origen's conception through the lenses of Plotinus' theory of time, paying special attention to Plotinus' semantic terms in order to reconcile apparently irreconcilable poles within the nexus of ideas associated with Origen's conception.

**van 't Westeinde, Jessica, “Jerome and his Jewish Relations in the Holy Land”**

Jerome is often portrayed as copying Origen to great extent. But to what extent is this judgement valid? Jerome claims to have had individual contact with Jews wherever he went: the Syrian desert, Rome, and Bethlehem. Does his approach to Jews and his interaction with Jews mimic or differ from Origen's? Applying the Erfurt-methodology of “Lived Ancient Religion” and “Individualisation” (Rüpke et al.), in this paper I propose to search for patterns of everyday life and interaction across rhetorically imposed religious boundaries. I am not looking at “Judaizers” and the accusations cast at Jerome for being a Judaizer himself (cf. Rufinus), but rather I wish to investigate Jerome's actual interaction with individual Jews. I will argue that Jerome's approach is not unique, but, possibly like Origen's and Eusebius's, it is rather part and parcel of everyday life of residents in the Holy Land.

**von Stockhausen, Annette, “The Synod of Jerusalem (a. 400) in the Anti-Origenist ‘Letter Dossier’ of Jerome”**

While the role of Theophil of Alexandria in the so called First Origenistic Controversy has been intensively investigated (cf. recently by K. Banev, *Theophilus of Alexandria and the First Origenist Controversy: Rhetoric and Power*, Oxford, 2015), the position of the Palestinian episcopate (above all, John of Jerusalem) has so far been rather underexposed. In my presentation I should therefore like to analyse the letter of the synod of Jerusalem in 400 (transmitted only by Jerome, ep. 93) and the dissent of bishop Dionysius of Lydda (ep. 94). My special interest is with the context of transmission of these two letters in a dossier of several letters in connection with the First Origenistic Controversy, which was compiled by Jerome (ep. 63, 86, 89, 91, 87, 88, 51, 95, 90, 92, 96, 93, 94), and its "Sitz im Leben".

**Wdowiak, Magdalena,** “The Seven Songs in Origen's Commentary on the Song of Songs and the Midrash of the Ten Songs”

This lecture examines the issue of seven songs listed by Origen in the Prologue to the Commentary on the Song of Songs and the ten songs of the Bible as listed by Rabbinic sources. Origen describes six songs as preceding the final, seventh song, that is the Song of Songs, interpreted as a marriage hymn of the Bridegroom and the Bride. Regarding the similarity of the Origen's seven songs and the Ten Songs of the Midrash the following questions appear: Is there any connection or interdependence between them? Why did Origen and the Midrash select the same songs? Which list is earlier: Origen's or that of the Midrash? What are the differences and the reasons for the differences between the two lists? I aim to examine the sources and previous scholarship on the topic in order to explore these avenues of enquiry.

**Young, Robin D.,** “The Fragmentation and Reapplication of Origen's Psalms Homilies: Evagrius' Psalms Scholia and the Rereading of an Interpretive Collection”

From the mid-third century -- when Origen composed and delivered his *Homilies on the Psalms* for a Christian assembly in Caesarea -- to the late-fourth century, when Evagrius of Pontus worked as a teacher among the monastic settlements in lower Egypt, numerous Christian authors had composed interpretive homilies or commentaries on the Psalms. By that time, the Psalms had become an integral part of Christian worship, particularly expressed in monastic practice of various kinds. Against this background, Evagrius, a close reader of Origen, seems to have departed from his contemporaries' work and returned to the earlier thinker's *Homilies on the Psalms* in order to craft his own *Scholia on the Psalms*, which themselves informed his large and intricate *Kephalaia Gnostika*. Yet, at the same time, he read Origen's homilies against the background of the earlier and more esoteric works of Clement of Alexandria, renewing his own meditative practices with a return to the philosophy of Aristotle. In doing so, Evagrius turned Origen's purposes in a different direction, toward the interiorization not only of communal worship but also of the site for that worship – the Temple and the high priesthood. The path for that interiorization ran through the Psalms, through complex *theoria* and *gnosis*. An analysis of the relationship between these three authors, and their texts, will show in detail not only the ongoing engagement with Origen among his third-generation readers, but how Evagrius' interpretation of the Psalms mediated the *Homilies* in a significantly different context, bringing them to bear upon the solitary gnostic whose teacher he considered himself to be.

**Zaganas, Dimitrios,** “Origen's Legacy in the Hexaemeron of Anastasius of Sinai: A First Assessment”

Anastasius of Sinai's *Hexaemeron* (CPG 7770) is an important, yet neglected and largely unexplored, early Byzantine commentary, whose first edition in Greek appeared only ten years ago. The predominantly allegorical character of Anastasius' method betrays acquaintance with and inspiration by Origen's (now mostly lost) exegetical work on Genesis, while the explicit references to Origen in Anastasius' *Hexaemeron* take usually the form of criticism and sarcasm. The purpose

of this paper is to examine Anastasius' complex attitude towards Origen, in order for us to uncover and assess, for the first time, the legacy of Origen in Anastasius' commentary on Gen. 1-3.

**Zaleski, John**, “‘The *Nous* is the Head of the Soul’: Remaking Origen's and Evagrius's Anthropology for the Church of the East”

This paper reappraises Origen's reception in the Church of the East through an examination of Babai the Great's (d. 628) commentary on the *Kephalaia Gnostika* of Evagrius Ponticus. Scholars have long viewed Babai's commentary as an attempt to strip the *Kephalaia Gnostika* of its groundings in Origen's theology, particularly Origen's views on the *nous* and the soul. This paper argues that, rather than eliminating Evagrius's Origenism, Babai adapted the Origenist anthropology of the *Kephalaia Gnostika* and conformed it to the views of Theodore of Mopsuestia. This synthesis of Origenist and Theodoran anthropology was, I argue, an essential component of Babai's efforts to reform East Syrian monastic theology. The paper thus broadens our understanding of Origen's legacy in the Christian East, showing that the questions about Origen that exercised monks like Barsanuphius of Gaza in sixth-century Palestine played an important role in shaping monasticism in Mesopotamia on the eve of Islam.

**Zhyrkova, Anna**, “Philosophical Premises of Origen's Teaching on Christ as an Ontological Unity”

The paper will offer an analysis of philosophical premises of Origen's theological account of the relation between the Divine Logos and humanity in Christ. His well-known doctrine of Logos combined with human body through a union with Jesus' soul, and thereby united with humanity as such, will be scrutinized in the light of the Stoic theory of *krasis*, reconstructed in contemporary studies on Stoicism. In this theory, the concept of *krasis* explains the manner in which the tenor, or divine breath, viewed as the active corporeal element, informs and qualifies the matter, i.e. the corporeal substrate. In order to emphasize the role of this Stoic doctrine in Origen's account of the union, the philosophical presuppositions adopted in Origen's Christology will be contrasted with those that can be identified in the works of thinkers of third and fourth centuries, who are usually described as his followers, or at least considered to be significantly influenced by his doctrine.

**Zocchi, Elisa**, “‘Where the Human Senses Become Spiritual, Faith Becomes Sensory’: Corporeality and Spiritual Senses in Balthasar's Reading of Origen”

In his first articles, Hans Urs von Balthasar strongly criticized a tendency towards spiritualism, which began with Origen and pervaded the patristic period. At the same time, Balthasar's love for Origen is well-known - he composed an anthology of his writings and considered him a real man of the Church. The aim of this talk is to understand how these two aspects can coexist; I suggest that one crucial point of this relation is the value of human body. The central point will be Balthasar's account of the spiritual senses, which describes the perceptive senses of our spiritual and earthly bodies (in contrast to Karl Rahner, who views the spiritual senses as a tool of mystical experience of God). Balthasar's reading underlines that we can only know the invisible God through the visible images: the spiritual senses are only “activated” by Christ's coming into this

corporeal world. The body is therefore the “theater” that God has set as point of contact with him: corporeality has, therefore, a “pervasive sacramental structure”.