

Anders-Christian Jacobsen

CHRIST – THE TEACHER OF SALVATION

A Study on Origen's Christology and Soteriology



ADAMANTIANA 6

Adamantiana
Band 6

ADAMANTIANA

Texte und Studien zu Origenes und seinem Erbe
Texts and Studies on Origen and His Legacy

Herausgegeben von / Edited by Alfons Füst

Wissenschaftlicher Beirat / Advisory Board

Sarah Hutton (Aberystwyth), Anders-Christian Jacobsen (Aarhus),
Olivier Munnich (Paris), Marco Rizzi (Mailand), Martin Wallraff (Basel)

Band 6

CHRIST – THE TEACHER OF SALVATION
A Study on Origen's Christology and Soteriology

Anders-Christian Jacobsen

 **Aschendorff**
Verlag

Münster
2015

© 2015 Aschendorff Verlag GmbH & Co. KG, Münster

Das Werk ist urheberrechtlich geschützt. Die dadurch begründeten Rechte, insbesondere die der Übersetzung, des Nachdrucks, der Entnahme von Abbildungen, der Funksendung, der Wiedergabe auf fotomechanischem oder ähnlichem Wege und der Speicherung in Datenverarbeitungsanlagen bleiben, auch bei nur auszugsweiser Verwertung, vorbehalten. Die Vergütungsansprüche des § 54 Abs. 2 UrhG werden durch die Verwertungsgesellschaft Wort wahrgenommen.

Gesamtherstellung: Aschendorff Druckzentrum GmbH & Co. KG, 2015

Gedruckt auf säurefreiem, alterungsbeständigem Papier ♻️

ISBN 978-3-402-13718-5

Preface

For me the publication of this book is an important stage of a long walk with Origen from Alexandria. My interest in Origen's theology began already when I was a student of theology. I therefore decided to include Origen in my PhD dissertation on theological anthropology and eschatology, a study which increased my interest in Origen's theology. During the work on my PhD dissertation I became aware of some deficits and problems related to the treatment of Origen's Christology and soteriology in modern research on Origen so I decided to produce a comprehensive study of Origen's Christology and soteriology. I was warned about the extent of the project, but I was too young to take these warnings seriously. Having finished the project I am glad that I did not listen to the warnings.

During this long process I have experienced a great amount of inspiration and generosity from many people to whom I wish to express my gratitude. I was first inspired to work on patristics and especially on Origen by some of my teachers in theology: Jens Holger Schjørring, Anna Marie Aagaard and, later, Niels Henrik Gregersen who became my PhD supervisor. As a PhD student I began to look outside Aarhus University and was greatly inspired by the following scholars: Samuel Rubenson at Lund University who kindly adopted me into his patristic seminar; Wolfgang Bienert at Philipps-Universität in Marburg who hosted me for half a year and introduced me to the International Origen Conferences; Lorenzo Perone who hosted me twice in Pisa and Bologna and is a good friend as well as a continuous 'Gesprächspartner' in matters concerning Origen; Jörg Ulrich at Martin-Luther-Universität in Halle-Wittenberg who has been my close friend and affiliate in many matters for more than ten years, and who also hosted me for a longer period in Halle; Karla Pollmann who has inspired my work in many ways, not least on the theoretical level; and Peter Martens and his students at Saint Louis University who read and commented on a preliminary version of the manuscript.

During the years of working on this book the Faculty / Department of Theology at Aarhus University was my permanent base. Without this base I could not have written the book. It is therefore of utmost importance for me to express my sincere thanks and gratitude to our late dean Carsten Riis who supported me and my project in many ways, to all my colleagues in theology who create a god environment for research, to my closest colleagues and friends in the *Centre for the Study of Antiquity and Christianity*, especially its leader, Jakob Engberg, who is always friendly, helpful and encouraging, and not least to my students during the years who had to endure all my talking about Origen.

Kind people have helped preparing the manuscript for print: My former teacher Anna Marie Aagaard has read and commented closely on every sentence in the book; Edward Broadbridge has revised and improved my English; René Falkenberg, Birgitte Bøgh and Mirjam Blumenschein have read the proofs and organized the footnotes and the bibliography. I am very grateful for that.

I also want to thank the Carlsberg Foundation, Aarhus University Research Foundation and the former Faculty of Theology for supporting the project by providing scholarships and research leaves and by covering the costs related to publication of the book.

Professor Alfons Fürst accepted kindly to include the book in “Adamantiana”. I am thankful for that. It is hard to imagine a better place to publish a book on Origen.

Finally, and not least, I give my sincere and heartfelt thanks to my wife Birthe and our children, Kathrine and Andreas, who for many years and without much complain have accepted my time and thought consuming dedication to Origen. This book is dedicated to them with love.

The book is a slightly revised version of my higher doctoral dissertation submitted to the Faculty of Arts, Aarhus University 14.08.2013.

Aarhus

Anders-Christian Jacobsen

Content

Preface	5
---------------	---

INTRODUCTION

1. Reading Origen's Christology and soteriology	13
1.1 Unity in diversity	13
1.2 A new methodological approach	14
1.3 Origen's Christology and soteriology in the tradition	15
1.4 Theses	15

PART I:

INTRODUCTORY QUESTIONS AND METHODOLOGY

2. The history of scholarship on Origen's Christology and soteriology	20
2.1 Charles Kannengiesser	20
2.2 Relevant monographs	23
2.3 Summary	33
3. A chronological overview of Origen's works	34
3.1 Treatises	34
3.1.1 <i>On First Principles</i>	34
3.1.2 <i>Dialogue with Heraclides</i>	35
3.2 Commentaries	35
3.2.1 <i>Commentary on John</i>	35
3.2.2 <i>Commentary on Song of Songs</i>	37
3.2.3 <i>Commentary on Romans</i>	38
3.2.4 <i>Commentary on Matthew</i>	38
3.3 Homilies	38
3.3.1 <i>Homilies on Luke</i>	39
3.3.2 <i>Homilies on Song of Songs</i>	39
3.3.3 <i>Homilies on Jeremiah</i>	39
3.3.4 <i>Homilies on Joshua</i>	40
3.4 Origen's apology: <i>Against Celsus</i>	40

4.	Textual types and audiences	42
4.1	Treatises	44
4.2	Commentaries	47
4.3	<i>Scholia (excerpta)</i>	49
4.4	Homilies	49
4.5	Apologetic writings – <i>Against Celsus</i>	53
4.6	Summary	54
5.	The transmission of Origen’s writings	56
5.1	The Greek texts	57
5.2	The Latin translations	58
5.3	Transmission of the individual writings	62
5.3.1	<i>On First Principles</i>	62
5.3.2	<i>Commentary on John</i>	64
5.3.3	<i>Commentary on Song of Songs</i>	64
5.3.4	<i>Commentary on Romans</i>	65
5.3.5	<i>Commentary on Matthew</i>	66
5.3.6	The Homilies	68
5.3.7	<i>Homilies on Luke</i>	68
5.3.8	<i>Homilies on Song of Songs</i>	70
5.3.9	<i>Homilies on Jeremiah</i>	71
5.3.10	<i>Homilies on Joshua</i>	71
5.3.11	<i>Homilies on Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers</i>	72
5.3.12	<i>Against Celsus</i>	72
5.4	Conclusion	73
6.	Origen’s allegorical and noetic hermeneutics	75
6.1	<i>On First Principles</i>	80
6.2	Commentaries	88
6.2.1	<i>Commentary on John</i>	88
6.2.2	<i>Commentary on Song of Songs</i>	90
6.3	Homilies	94
6.3.1	<i>Homilies on Song of Songs</i>	94
6.4	Apologetic writings – <i>Against Celsus</i>	96
6.5	Conclusion	102

PART II:
INTERPRETATION OF INDIVIDUAL WRITINGS

Introduction	104
7. <i>On First Principles</i>	104
7.1 Christology and soteriology in <i>On First Principles</i>	104
7.2 Christ's divinity – God of God and God for us	106
7.3 Christ's humanity – the mystery of the incarnation	113
7.4 Conclusion	116
8. <i>Dialogue with Heraclides</i>	118
9. <i>Commentary on John</i>	121
9.1 Christology and soteriology in <i>Commentary on John</i>	122
9.2 Books I–V	122
9.2.1 Substance and relation in Origen's Christology and soteriology .	122
9.2.2 Christ as mediator in creation	124
9.2.3 Subordination and emanation	125
9.2.4 <i>Epinouia</i> , accommodation, and emanation	130
9.3 Books VI–XIII	133
9.3.1 Subordination, emanation, participation, <i>epinouia</i> , and accommodation	134
9.3.2 Redemption – Christ as sacrificial lamb	135
9.3.3 Jesus' identity	136
9.3.4 Christ's works – pedagogical soteriology	138
9.4 Books XIX–XXXII	144
9.4.1 Jesus' many <i>epinouiai</i>	144
9.4.2 Pedagogical soteriology: Perfected man as saviour	145
9.4.3 The goal of salvation	149
9.5 Conclusion	151
10. <i>Commentary on Song of Songs</i>	154
10.1 The path to knowledge of Logos	155
10.2 The path to union with Logos	158
10.3 Conclusion	160
11. <i>Commentary on Romans</i>	162
11.1 The Adam-Christ typology	162
11.1.1 The nature of the typology	162
11.1.2 The motive of secrecy	163

11.2	Adam's sin and its consequences	165
11.3	Christ	167
11.3.1	The work of Christ	167
11.3.2	What is salvation?	169
11.3.3	Who will be saved?	172
11.3.4	When will salvation take place?	174
11.4	Minor Christological or soteriological topics in the commentary	175
11.4.1	Atonement and sacrifice	175
11.4.2	Christ as example	179
11.5	Conclusion	181
12.	<i>Commentary on Matthew</i>	182
12.1	The being and work of Logos	182
12.2	Jesus Christ's divine and human nature	183
12.3	Purification as part of salvation	186
12.4	Pedagogical soteriology	187
12.5	Knowledge as the way to salvation	188
12.6	Accommodation – Christ's adjustment to human beings	191
12.7	The human imitation of Christ	192
12.8	Human likeness to, or participation in, Christ	193
12.9	The death and resurrection of Jesus Christ	195
12.10	Conclusion	198
13.	<i>Homilies on Luke</i>	200
13.1	The incarnation of Christ and his birth through a virgin	201
13.2	The two natures of Christ	202
13.3	The universality and ubiquity of Christ	204
13.4	Salvation in Christ	206
13.5	Killing the old self	207
13.6	Redemption as liberation from spiritual enemies	208
13.7	Salvation as healing	210
13.8	Salvation as redemption from the bonds of the body	211
13.9	Salvation as becoming like Christ	213
13.10	Conclusion	214
14.	<i>Homilies on Song of Songs</i>	216
14.1	Moral purity as a prerequisite for the soul's meeting and uniting with Logos	217
14.2	Logos' incarnation and accommodation	220
14.3	Conclusion	222

15. <i>Homilies on Jeremiah</i>	224
15.1 Audience	224
15.2 Christology in <i>Homilies on Jeremiah</i>	225
16. Christology in <i>Homilies on Joshua</i>	229
16.1 The audience for the homilies	229
16.2 The hermeneutic	229
16.3 Joshua – Jesus	230
16.4 Moses and Jesus	231
16.5 To conquer the enemies and settle in the Promised Land	233
16.6 Conclusion	239
17. Apologetic writings – <i>Against Celsus</i>	240
17.1 Christology and soteriology in <i>Against Celsus</i>	240
17.2 Did God become human in Jesus of Nazareth?	240
17.3 Christ – God and man	244
17.3.1 Union without fusion of the two natures in the incarnate Christ	244
17.3.2 Fusion of the divine and the human in the Incarnate	248
17.3.3 The divine is not “confined” in Jesus at the incarnation	250
17.5 Why did God become man – soteriology in <i>Against Celsus</i>	252
17.5.1 Soteriology in a historical perspective	252
17.5.2 Incarnation and soteriology	253
17.6 Christology and soteriology	256
17.7 Conclusion	257

PART III:
A SYSTEMATIC PRESENTATION OF ORIGEN’S CHRISTOLOGY
AND SOTERIOLOGY

18. Origen’s theological system	260
18.1 The scholarly discussion on Origen’s theological system	260
18.2 Origen’s theological system – a brief sketch	261
18.3 Creation and fall	265
18.4 Salvation	268
18.5 The end of salvation history	269

INTRODUCTION

1. Reading Origen's Christology and soteriology

The present study sets out to present a comprehensive reading of Origen's Christology and soteriology building on a new methodological approach to the study of Origen's works. This new methodology is founded on Origen's own hermeneutical principles and his awareness of which textual types suit his different audiences. The methodology is thus based on internal principles present in Origen's own corpus to enable the reader to reach a comprehensive and coherent understanding of Origen's Christology and soteriology.

1.1 Unity in diversity

The idea for this study was born during my PhD work on Origen's anthropology and eschatology. It struck me how difficult it was to gain an overview of Origen's Christology and soteriology, and how sporadic and divergent are the scholarly interpretations of these two subjects. I therefore set out to find cohesion in the many Christological and soteriological statements found in Origen's works. The belief that this is possible rests on my understanding of Origen as a theologian who thinks systematically and who develops his theology, including his Christology and soteriology, on the basis of certain fundamental principles.¹ These principles maintain a unity in the diversity that characterises everything in the imperfect world that is the human condition. It is therefore crucial to the present work that Origen's Christology and soteriology are understood as a coherent unity expressed in a necessary diversity of ideas and statements. According to Origen, there is only one creating, saving, and perfecting Logos, and only one salvation. However, as a result of the diversity of all created things, this sole Logos must reveal himself and make his presence felt in an endless number of ways.

1 The claim that Origen thinks systematically and develops his theology according to a number of fundamental principles does not include any claims about Origen being a systematic theologian in the modern sense of the word.

1.2 A new methodological approach

To reach an understanding of Origen's Christology and soteriology that respects both their diversity and yet their underlying unity, we need to know not only the reason for the diversity but also to apply a particular approach to interpreting his work. Scholarship has often tended to search directly for the unity in Origen's theology – and ignore the diversity. This is a serious mistake, since it glosses over a number of significant elements in the theology and focuses on the unity while arguing that the diversity is merely a veil to cover it. This is not *entirely* wrong, since Origen is indeed an idealising Platonist; but he is also a realist. He is convinced that God's goodness and mercy and greatness are very much to be found in meeting human beings where he finds them through Logos. In Origen's view, to understand and apprehend God is closely linked to understanding the benefactions of God and Logos for humanity. A study of Origen's Christology and soteriology must therefore dwell on its complexity and diversity before it asks about the unity behind them. In the present study this view finds concrete expression in the attempt primarily to understand the works singly and to focus on the various Christological and soteriological ideas within them. Only when this is achieved can we try to put together a systematic overview of these ideas in the hope of reaching an understanding of the unity behind the diversity. This is one of the points on which the present study can contribute to a new evaluation. To the best of my knowledge no one has previously analysed Origen's Christology and soteriology with a view to formulating an adequate representation of their complexity. I believe that the outcome of this study will be a more plausible view of Origen's Christology and soteriology precisely because it builds on a prior delineation of the complexity.

To uncover this unity in the diversity of Christological statements a specific approach to Origen's theology is required, one which he himself describes in *On First Principles* IV 2 and elsewhere. In brief, this hermeneutic builds on an allegorical interpretation of the Bible, which Origen believes to be inspired by Logos. Into these biblical texts Logos has laid down a number of spiritual levels, so that the Bible may speak to all people whatever their level. According to Origen, this form of inspiration means that there is a diversity of statements in the Bible which nevertheless deal with one and the same Logos, and one and the same salvation. To be understood thoroughly, inspired Scripture must be interpreted by an inspired interpreter, such as Origen. Moved by Logos, the interpreter manages both to understand the diverse statements about the one true Logos and his work and to carry them forward for the benefit of the various recipients to whom they are addressed. As the inspired interpreter of the inspired Bible, Origen is able to bring to light, to understand, and to pass on the deepest spiritual meanings of the biblical statements, even though they are expressed in simple form in the Bible. Moreover, he is able to assess when it is most expedient for the recipient *not* to

be initiated into the deeper spiritual meanings of the words but to be made aware only of their simple meaning on the literal surface. As a result we find in Origen's works – as in the Bible – multiple and diverse statements about Christology and soteriology, some addressed to the uneducated and untrained Christians, others to the spiritually mature. And we can only understand these statements if we are aware that they belong to different spiritual levels. Interpretation of Origen's corpus therefore presupposes a thorough study of the individual works and the intended audience for the various types of writing.

1.3 Origen's Christology and soteriology in the tradition

There is good reason to regard Origen's Christology as the culmination of the Logos and Wisdom-christologies of the 2nd and 3rd centuries. This can be argued through a comparison of the christologies of Justin Martyr and Irenaeus with that of Origen. Similarly, we could argue that Origen's Christology has had a great influence on posterity through its reception in later Christological formulations, for instance in connection with the dogma of the 4th and 5th centuries. A significant point in this context would be that it is especially the complexity in Origen's Christology and soteriology that has inspired so many and various commentators, some by the one element, others by another. The wealth of Christological and soteriological expressions in Origen has made it possible and meaningful for many, consciously or unconsciously, to relate to his Christology either through a continuation or a rejection of some of its elements. Neither of these approaches is the subject of the present study, however. Finally, there are elements in Origen's Christology and soteriology that can help to overcome problems in modern Christology and soteriology engendered by a one-sided focus on Nicaean and Chalcedonian Christology with their ontological aspects of the two-nature doctrine. I am thinking in particular of the ideas of subordination and emanation, and the accommodation theory to which they are linked; of the function of the idea of participation; and lastly of Origen's pedagogical soteriology. Also on this point the present study limits itself to creating a basis for including Origen's Christology in a present-day Christology.

1.4 Theses

The above can be summarised in the following theses that this study seeks to justify:

1. Origen's Christology and soteriology are marked by multiple forms of expression, but behind the diversity there is a unity, in that all these forms of expres-

sion point to the one Logos and his sole work of creation and salvation. On a primary level the diversity points towards a unity, but God's goodness and will for human salvation find expression not least in the diversity of ways in which Logos addresses himself to humanity.

2. Origen's Christology and soteriology may be conceived as a coherent unity if they are first understood in all their diversity and complexity – and not the other way round. The diversity of expressions of Christology and soteriology in Origen's works is a consequence of his addressing different audiences. Origen continues the efforts of Logos to address human beings in ways which are understandable for them. To understand Origen's Christology and soteriology the allegorical hermeneutics that he himself has developed must be employed.
3. It is the complexity and the diversity in Origen's Christology and soteriology that have determined them as a major influence, positive and negative, on the subsequent formation of dogma and as the precondition for them remaining inspirational.

This last thesis will only be justified by implication in the present study, but the basis for further studies will be established.

The argumentation above leads to the division of the study into three main sections: The first main section comprises a survey of scholarship on the subject, a chronological overview of the works of Origen, a chapter on textual types and audiences of Origen's works, a chapter on the tradition of the source material, and finally a major chapter on Origen's hermeneutic. This part of the study, which does not directly deal with the Christology, may seem unnecessarily comprehensive to the reader. However, its range is due to the need to present not merely a general introduction to Origen's life and work; it is also a methodological precondition for demonstrating the complexity of Origen's Christology. A thorough presentation of the various genres, the inner chronology of the various works, as well as Origen's hermeneutic, are all essential to an explication of the complexity of his Christology. This section can thus be regarded as the methodological part of the study.

The second and more extensive section comprises an analysis of Origen's works, which is undertaken on the principles adumbrated in this introduction and developed in the first section of the study. In my endeavour to grasp the complexity of Origen's Christology and soteriology and to identify possible chronological dislocations in it, individual chapters on the Christology will deal with a broad and representative selection of Origen's works, but I shall not include chapters on all his works. Only thus can it be made clear whether Origen expresses himself differently in the various textual types aimed at different audiences. This procedure has the disadvantage of occasional repetitions of themes which appear

in more than one of Origen's texts, but is compensated for by the overview the approach gives of the Christology and soteriology in the individual texts.

In the third and last main section the attempt is made in various ways to systematize the insights achieved in the analyses in the previous section. Here the study traces the unity of Origen's Christology and soteriology with its point of origin in the complexity. I examine a number of main themes, culminating in a systematic description of their content and function in Origen's Christology and soteriology. The themes in question are: Christ's relation to God the Father including subthemes such as subordination, emanation, the two-nature doctrine, and participation; and Christ's relation to humanity, including subthemes such as Christ as co-creator, Christ's incarnation, and Origen's pedagogical soteriology. It is a number of these individual elements that have influenced, positively or negatively, the formation of Christological dogma and which can perhaps inspire a reformulation of classical Christology relevant for our time. I thus attempt to 'reconstruct' a coherent Christology and soteriology as I imagine it must have looked to Origen's inner eye. The single quotation marks around 'reconstruct' denote the natural supposition that such a systematic Christology and soteriology can only have a hypothetical character, since nowhere in the transmitted works does Origen present any coherent view of it. I am in no doubt, however, that his many and various statements on these two subjects are a result of his systematic thought on them, though this may never have existed outside Origen's head. Perhaps it was described in one of the texts that have not come down to us; or perhaps he assumes that his systematic thought was known to those whom he was addressing. Whatever the case, in the circumstances his systematic thought is a hypothesis, since it can only be substantiated from the diversity of statements in the texts that we do have access to. Such an attempt at 'reconstruction' will doubtless be regarded as illegitimate by some. I nevertheless see it as an important theological task to think alongside, and in continuation of, the historical material, provided that it is made clear when we are dealing with a description and when we are dealing with a construction. In the last part of the third section I am therefore thinking along with Origen on systematic theology and not merely describing his work in its historical context.

PART I:
INTRODUCTORY QUESTIONS
AND METHODOLOGY

2. The history of scholarship on Origen's Christology and soteriology

Modern inquiries into Origen's work as a whole are so vast and complex that it is impossible to write an all-inclusive history of them. The same is true of the research into his Christology and soteriology. However, it is helpful for the reader of this book to have a certain knowledge of the history of Origen scholarship in general and of the history of research in his Christology and soteriology specifically. Such a basic introduction will help the reader to locate the present work in the landscape of Origen studies. To provide such knowledge without losing myself in an attempt to write a comprehensive history of Origen research I have chosen the following strategy: With the help of several sketches I shall provide a short introduction to the general history of Origen scholarship. I shall point out the most important aspects for the study of Origen's Christology and soteriology, and I shall provide a somewhat longer but still brief description of some monographs that I consider most important to my project.

The various attempts that scholars have made to describe the structures and dividing lines in Origen research have had different foci, but certain important questions seem to have directed and divided much of modern Origen research: Was Origen a systematic thinker or not? Was he a man of the church or a kind of heretic? Was he mainly influenced by Greek philosophy or by the Bible? Was he a dogmatician or a biblical exegete? Was he a spiritual man rather than a scholastic thinker? Presented like this the questions can seem strange, since they obviously spring from a modern mind and not from Origen himself. Would theologians in the second and third century characterize themselves as either exegetes or dogmaticians? Would theologians of the time have asked themselves whether they were mainly inspired by the biblical or by the platonic traditions? And as to whether Origen was a heretic or not, the question is equally anachronistic, since it is asked from a post-Nicene perspective. Methodological questions have also been important, the most obvious example being whether Origen scholarship could rely on the Latin translations of his works or only on those texts preserved in Greek. However awkward some of these questions may seem, they have played an important role in Origen scholarship – and will prove to be not so far-fetched after all. I shall try to throw a little more light on some of them and to point out why in some cases they are relevant to Origen's Christology and soteriology.

2.1 Charles Kannengiesser

In 1999 C. Kannengiesser was invited to open a conference on Origen as “Maestro di vita spirituale”. The conference was arranged by the Italian research group on

Origen and the Alexandrian tradition. Kannengiesser entitled his lecture *A Century in Quest of Origen's Spirituality*² and centered it around four themes: 1) The image of Origen in modern biographies on him, 2) Origen as a biblical interpreter, 3) Origen as a systematic thinker, and 4) Origen as a Christian believer. The last point focusses on what Kannengiesser himself thinks should be the core of future Origen research. In this way Kannengiesser happens to give a brief introduction to some of the most important trends in modern Origen research.

Kannengiesser points to the strange fact that Eusebius' biography of Origen in his sixth book of his *Historia Ecclesiastica* remained almost unchallenged until P. Nautin published his book *Origène. Sa vie et son œuvre* in 1977.³ Even after P. Nautin had shown that Eusebius partly used oral traditions with hagiographic elements in his biography of Origen, many Origen scholars still reproduced Eusebius. A prominent example of this is H. Crouzel, who claimed that Nautin's biography is too hypothetical.⁴ Crouzel was on the other hand a chief spokesman for the concept of Origen as a spiritual person and devoted many pages of his own Origen biography⁵ to this theme. Others talked about Origen as a mystic⁶ or ignored⁷ the spiritual elements of his theology. Depending on what these authors mean by 'spiritual' or 'mystical' this theme is also of importance for our understanding of Origen's Christology and soteriology. If as in Crouzel's case it includes a diversity of topics, it is not very helpful. On the other hand if, as in the case of Daniélou, it depicts how the soul ascends step by step back to its divine point of departure it is important for our understanding Origen's soteriology.

The second topic which Kannengiesser includes is Origen as a biblical interpreter.⁸ Kannengiesser sees the growing interest from 1950 onwards in Origen's exegesis as reflecting a general awareness of new exegetical methods. The first example of this new interest in Origen as an exegete was the publication in 1950 of H. de Lubac's book, *Histoire et Esprit. L'intelligence de l'Écriture d'après Origène*. According to de Lubac, Origen's allegorism was not just a borrowing from Philo of Alexandria and from the Alexandrian interpreters of Homer but an actual reception of Pauline hermeneutics. Origen's exegesis was a genuine spiritual endeavor. This interest in Origen's allegorical exegesis has been taken up by many

2 The article was published in the proceedings from the conference, see KANNENGIESSER, *A Century*.

3 KANNENGIESSER, *A century 8–10*, on NAUTIN, *Origène*.

4 KANNENGIESSER, *A century 9*, on CROUZEL, *Origène*.

5 CROUZEL, *Origène*. English translation by WORRALL in 1989: CROUZEL, *Origen*.

6 DANIÉLOU, *Origène*. English translation from 1955 by MITCHELL, *Origen*, see 293–309. Daniélou described Origen's mysticism as a theory about the soul's mystical ascension.

7 DE FAYE, *Origène* (vols. 1–3).

8 KANNENGIESSER, *A century 10–13*.

other scholars and remains an important topic in Origen scholarship.⁹ According to Kannengiesser, de Lubac claimed that Origen's allegorical exegesis had a Christological focus.¹⁰ Kannengiesser sees this as a trend in the mid-20th century, but it is far from always being the case that discussions of Origen's exegesis have anything especially to do with his Christology. This is, however, the case in the present study, as I have explained in the introduction. In my opinion, Origen's allegorical hermeneutic is the key to understanding how he expresses his Christology and soteriology. Origen's exegesis will therefore be the theme of a whole chapter in this book.

The third theme that Kannengiesser includes in his presentation of 20th century Origen research is Origen as a systematic thinker.¹¹ Kannengiesser correctly considers this theme as very important in Origen research. He mentions E. de Faye's book as an example of an interpretation of Origen as a systematic theologian. De Faye counted Origen's system as being of a neo-platonic type, whereas G. Bardy¹² argued, according to Kannengiesser, against this definition in favor of seeing Origen more as a biblical interpreter.¹³ W. Völker¹⁴ joined the critique, claiming that Origen focused on spiritual perfection. In his book *Pronoia und Paideusis* from 1932¹⁵ H. Koch later criticized Völker and argued that Origen was a systematic thinker whose theology and philosophy built on Stoic and Middle-Platonic structures. In an important book from 1966 with the title *Der ursprüngliche Sinn der Dogmatik des Origenes* F. H. Kettler claimed that he had isolated the basic structures in Origen's theology. H. Crouzel, one of the most dominant Origen scholars in the second half of the 20th century, was probably the strongest adversary of the idea that Origen had a theological or philosophical system as the basis of his thinking, according to Kannengiesser:

Here our quest for Origen's spiritual identity pursued along the twentieth century faces a first requirement, which is to clarify what we really mean by 'systematic'. Such a systematic precision is the more necessary, as Henri Crouzel conducted for several decades a personal crusade against anyone attempting to categorize Origen as a systematic thinker.¹⁶

9 See chapter 7 on Origen's exegesis for a survey of the most important literature on this topic.

10 KANNENGIESSER, *A century* 11.

11 Ibid. 13–15.

12 BARDY, *Origène*.

13 KANNENGIESSER, *A century* 14.

14 VÖLKER, *Das Vollkommenheitsideal*.

15 KOCH, *Pronoia*.

16 KANNENGIESSER, *A century* 13.

Evidence of this “crusade” is found throughout Crouzel’s work, including an article entitled *Origène est-il un systématique?*¹⁷ Kannengiesser asks why so many scholars have taken this question as a ‘dilemma’ between for example an exegete *and* a systematic thinker or a spiritual man *and* a systematic.¹⁸ Kannengiesser’s question is important because the supposed ‘dilemmas’ that have characterized this discussion are not dilemmas at all. Kannengiesser is not the only one who has taken this discussion to be a trend in modern Origen scholarship. U. Berner has written a whole book employing this question as the guiding principle in describing and classifying contributions to Origen research.¹⁹ I state my case here and now that I consider Origen a systematic thinker whose theology develops on the basis of a systematic idea which is never clearly described in his works but which underlies all that he writes and even all that he preaches in his sermons. I shall return to this in the chapter devoted to Origen’s theological system, which I do not see as being in conflict with his identity as an exegete, as a spiritual father, or as a devoted believer and man of the church.

As his fourth theme in the modern history of Origen scholarship Kannengiesser mentions Origen as a believer.²⁰ It never becomes totally clear what he means by this, but he seems to find a new tendency to focus on Origen as a believing Christian. I am not convinced that Kannengiesser’s examples can be interpreted in this way, even though he clearly hopes that the trend will move center-stage in Origen scholarship. Now, fifteen years after Kannengiesser delivered his speech to the conference in Milan, I cannot see that his wish has come true.²¹

2.2 Relevant monographs

In the following pages I shall present some of the monographs relevant to the theme of this book, particularly the major research contributions to Origen’s Christology and soteriology. Later, I shall also refer to similar contributions to the subject included in books which do not have this as their main theme.²² For the immediate purpose I exclude all articles, as well as all monographs related to

17 Reprint in: CROUZEL, *Origène et la philosophie* 179–215.

18 KANNENGIESSER, *A century* 14.

19 BERNER, *Origenes*.

20 KANNENGIESSER, *A century* 15–19.

21 A number of introductions to Origen scholarship exist, e.g., CROUZEL, *Die Origenes-Forschung*; CROUZEL, *The Literature on Origen*; TRIGG, *Origen and Origenism*; BIENERT, *Einleitung*; PERRONE, *Zur gegenwärtigen Lage*.

22 Examples of such books are GRILLMEIER, *Jesus der Christus*, vol. 1, 266–280; POLLARD, *Johannine Christology*; STRUTWOLF, *Gnosis als System*; DE FAYE, *Origène*, vol. 3, 179–230, and BARDY, *Origène*.

the methodological chapters in this book. The literature pertaining to these topics will be presented and discussed in the relevant chapters. It is impossible to organize this presentation thematically because most of the works presented discuss several different aspects of Origen's Christology and soteriology. I have therefore decided to present the works in a simple chronological order beginning with the oldest.

Hal Koch

Even though H. Koch's *Pronoia und Paideusis*, published in 1932, is not primarily about Origen's Christology and soteriology but rather a book on Origen and Platonism, I mention it first because Koch deals with a theme of major importance to Origen's Christology and soteriology. In describing Origen's positive relations to Platonism Koch discusses how God relates to the world and guides its rational beings. The theme is reflected in the title of Koch's book, and is expressed in the argument that fallen rational beings can be led back to their divine origin through a process of education and upbringing (παίδευσις) through God's merciful providence (πρόνοια). Koch expresses it thus:

Da ist ein bestimmter Grundgedanke, der überall wiederkehrt: der Gedanke an die Erziehung der gefallenen Vernunftwesen durch die Vorsehung. Hier liegt Origenes' eigentliches Interesse. Gott ist für ihn vor allem der große Lehrer, der auf jede Weise die Seelen leitet und erzieht, so dass diese, ohne ihr freies Selbstbestimmungsrecht zu verlieren, zu ihrem himmlischen Ursprung zurückgeführt werden. Wir stehen hier dem Grundmotiv seiner ganzen Theologie gegenüber.²³

Logos plays an important role in this motif of upbringing which, according to Koch, Origen has borrowed from Platonism. Salvation is upbringing, with Logos as the pedagogue. However, this leaves no room for the traditional motifs of atonement and redemption in Origen's Christology and soteriology. Koch is right to claim the centrality of upbringing in Origen's theology, but not to the exclusion of all other motifs.

Aloisius Lieske

A. Lieske's *Die Theologie der Logosmystik bei Origenes* from 1938 deals with an important theme in Origen's Christology and soteriology that is still relevant even if the discussion is different now from in 1938. Lieske belongs to a group of mainly

23 KOCH, *Pronoia* 18. Concerning Koch's identification and discussion of this motif in Origen's theology, see the first part of KOCH, *Pronoia* 13–162.

catholic Origen scholars who since the 1930s have argued against a strong tendency in Origen research to claim that Origen confused Christian theology with Greek philosophy and therefore presented bad theology. Lieske and his tradition (Völker before him and Daniélou, Lubac, Crouzel and others after him) claim that Origen shows his theological and spiritual strength precisely in his so-called mystical theology – and that this theology is only superficially influenced by Platonic philosophy. Lieske is critical of Völker's one-sided focus on Origen's personal religious experience as the only important aspect in his theology,²⁴ and the claim Origen combines this with a strong intellectual, moral and dogmatic²⁵ drive. Liese argues that:

Es scheint, als löse sich Origenes' Vollkommenheitslehre unter dem Einfluss der Gnosis und des beginnenden Neuplatonismus in ein logisches, stark differenziertes Stufensystem auf [...]. Und doch ist das nur die eine Seite origenistischer Vollkommenheitstheologie.

And a little later on the same page:

Hand in Hand mit dieser stark intellektualistisch-moralisierenden Frömmigkeitslehre geht nämlich eine mehr personale realmystische Logosverbundenheit, die im Wachstum des inneren Lebens den Begnadeten immer deutlicher zur religiösen Erfahrung oder Erkenntnis wird.²⁶

Even though Lieske clearly belongs to a tradition in Origen scholarship that stresses a personal mystical experience as the most important driver in Origen's theology, he does allow for other factors. He defines Origen's concept of the rational beings' mystical union with Logos as a higher level of divine life, for the soul is included through the special gift of grace given by Logos in a 'Logosmystik' which plays a crucial role in Lieske's book.²⁷ The goal is a complete unity of love with God the Son and God the Father,²⁸ a return to the original creation of human beings in the image of Logos. This was only partially destroyed by the fall and can be re-created through participation in Logos.²⁹ This process is described through various images such as bride mysticism,³⁰ the birth and growth of Logos

24 Concerning Lieske's critical remarks against Völker, see LIESKE, *Die Theologie der Logosmystik* 8–13.

25 LIESKE, *Die Theologie der Logosmystik* 14, describes the aim of his book as follows: "Darum soll die Aufgabe dieser Arbeit sein, die dogmatische Bedeutung seiner Logosgemeinschaft im Lichte seiner trinitätstheologischen Logoslehre zu schauen."

26 *Ibid.* 4.

27 *Ibid.* 25, 30.

28 *Ibid.* 51–61.

29 *Ibid.* 60.

30 *Ibid.* 61–67.

in believers,³¹ the growing likeness of human beings to Logos,³² and the role of the church in the process of growth.³³

Lieske thus presents a coherent and systematic interpretation of the eschatological aspect of Origen's Christology and soteriology as to how human beings reach the final goal of unity with Logos and God the Father. In presenting this theme Lieske also has to discuss other areas of Origen's Christology and soteriology and his book is thus an important contribution to these themes.

Henri Crouzel

H. Crouzel has left a decisive mark on Origen research in the second half of the 20th century. He has written a vast number of books and articles on almost every aspect of Origen's work including his Christology and soteriology. Crouzel appears to know almost by heart all of Origen's writings as well as their biblical and philosophical contexts. Despite it therefore being hard to argue against his interpretations I am somewhat skeptical about his results, due to his fundamental attitude. Time and again he uses the Nicene orthodoxy as his yardstick. This in principle is foreign to the study of Origen's own theology. For instance, in relation to Origen's Christology and soteriology Crouzel's bias can be seen in his argument that Origen's definition of the Son's relation to the Father contains no subordinationist ideas that go against the Nicene definitions, and that his use of the terms οὐσία and ὑπόστασις is, if not the same, then at least not contrary to the Nicene use of these terms. Thus, even though Crouzel presents many valuable interpretations of Origen's works we must be on guard against those which tend to make Origen's theology orthodox according to later definitions. Examples of this can be found in his general introduction to Origen's work and theology.³⁴

The most important work of Crouzel for the present purpose is his first book on Origen's theology from 1956 with the title *Théologie de l'image de Dieu chez Origène*, according to which Origen's concept of God's image has two main aspects: Christ as the image of God and human beings as the images of Christ. The first of these is particularly relevant to my thesis. Crouzel discusses, for example: how Christ or Logos is generated from God; whether Christ as the image of God is co-substantial with God or is of another substance different from the substance of God the Father; whether Christ the Son is subordinate to God the Father; and in what sense Christ mediates between God the Father and human beings. Here and there we again find Crouzel's post-Nicene bias, but he does

31 Ibid. 67–71.

32 Ibid. 100–161.

33 Ibid. 74–99.

34 CROUZEL, *Origène* 243–257.

allow that Origen's theology is strongly influenced by in particular Platonic philosophy, as when Origen describes Christ as the mediator in creation as a theme that Origen develops under the influence of Plato's *Timaeus*. Crouzel also points to the influence of Platonic philosophy in Origen's description of Christ as the mediator in the salvation and perfection of all humanity, an interpretation which brings Crouzel in line with the 'mystical' Origen of W. Völker and A. Lieske.

Marguerite Harl

Closest to my project thematically and methodologically is M. Harl's book *Origène et la fonction révélatrice du Verbe Incarné* from 1958, in which she describes Origen as a learned Christian trying to communicate Christianity to other learned persons of his time, most of whom were Platonists of some kind or other. In doing so Origen had to explain several ideas which seemed strange or even impossible to a Platonic mind. One of these was the idea that God had revealed himself to humanity in Jesus of Nazareth. The problem was not the idea of divine revelation as such, for this was not foreign to philosophers in Origen's time.³⁵ The problem was the Christian version of the idea, according to which God *made himself human* in order to reveal himself to all humanity.³⁶ This conflicted with several basic assumptions of Platonic philosophy such as: the impossibility of mixing the divine and the human – or the immaterial and material sphere; and the inference of change in the godhead from not being father to being father. Being a Platonist himself Origen sought to explain that the Christian idea of revelation did not violate the Platonic concept of the world and led him to write about the concept of revelation in several of his works. This central Christological and soteriological idea is the theme of Harl's book.

Harl reaches the interesting conclusion that Origen modified the concrete biblical expressions of God's self-revelation in a more spiritual direction to suit his Platonic context. It is a long process rather than a particular incident, and salvation is likewise a pedagogical process of spiritual enlightenment.³⁷ Such ideas are central to my work, as are other of Harl's interpretations, though she concentrates on one theme only, Christ as the revealer of God, whereas my work covers several other aspects of Origen's Christology and soteriology.

Harl's book is also important for methodological reasons. She is aware that Origen expresses his Christology and soteriology in many different ways and therefore she constructs her investigation in a way which she thinks can grasp some of the reasons for these differences. She focuses on a possible chronological

35 HARL, *Origène et la fonction révélatrice* 86–101.

36 *Ibid.* 100f.

37 *Ibid.* 219–242.

development in Origen's Christology and soteriology, and thus analyzes the texts in chronologically defined groups to test for any development in Origen's thinking about Christ as the revealer of God.³⁸ She mentions other possible reasons for the diversity, such as Origen's various contexts (exegetical, pastoral, and apologetic), and various audiences.³⁹ However, although her awareness of these differences is particularly important, she does not always follow her own methodology. Thus, even though she groups Origen's works chronologically in succeeding chapters, she ends up including works from all periods in most of the chapters. For instance, in her chapter on Origen's *Commentary on Matthew*,⁴⁰ which is a late work, she mainly includes examples from his *Commentary on John*, which at least partly is an early work. She offers no separate interpretation of the individual works, preferring thematically organized chapters. She thus loses the opportunity to draw any safe conclusions about a chronological development in Origen's thought. It is also a problem that she includes almost no homilies in her work. This is probably a result of the trend in the 1950s to exclude all the works not transmitted in Greek but only in Latin translations. This is the case for almost all of Origen's sermons, except for those on Jeremiah from which she includes a few examples, and for a number of homilies on the Psalms which has recently been discovered. She is therefore unable to come to any conclusion on the differences in the Christology and soteriology in the various textual types that Origen employs – an idea which she only briefly mentions in her introduction.

I for my part do not think that the possible chronological developments in Origen's work are especially relevant to the differences in Origen's Christology and soteriology. I believe – and Harl also hints at this – that it is the changing contexts and audiences that determine the various genres in which Origen expresses his Christology and soteriology.

Gerhard Gruber

In 1962 G. Gruber presented an investigation of the term ζωή (life) in the theology of Origen.⁴¹ It is Gruber's intention to describe the different meanings of the term *life* in Origen's work, but his subtitle – *Wesen, Stufen und Mitteilung des wahren Lebens bei Origenes* – shows that he is primarily interested in the soteriological and eschatological aspect of the term: How is true life obtained? Having briefly described the various meanings of 'life' in Origen's texts,⁴² he goes on to define and

38 Ibid. 20–24.

39 Ibid. 20 f.

40 Ibid. 219–242.

41 GRUBER, ΖΩΗ.

42 Ibid 9–36.

describe what true life means.⁴³ According to Origen, true life is given by God and lived in close relation to God. In the rest of the book he discusses how this life can be achieved by human beings, and concludes that it comes through Christ and the Spirit.⁴⁴ This makes Gruber's book interesting for our purpose, for his answer is soteriological and Christological by nature. Under such themes as 'life as relation to the Spirit and to Christ', and 'life as one of Christ's *epinoia*' Gruber discusses how Christ lives in Christians and how Logos adapts himself to individual human beings.

Matthias Eichinger

In his work from 1969, *Die Verklärung Christi bei Origenes. Die Bedeutung des Menschen Jesus in seiner Christologie*, M. Eichinger examines Origen's interpretation of the transfiguration of Jesus in Mt 17,1–11. In Jesus' ascent with his chosen disciples, in his transfiguration on the mountain and in their subsequent descent together, Origen sees the spiritual ascent of humanity in consequence of God's descent to fallen humanity. God can be known through Jesus' resurrection and his bodily condition thereafter.⁴⁵ This is a fundamental structure in Origen's thinking, according to Eichinger, and it has two poles: The first is fallen humanity (Menschen-*unten*) and Christ incarnate (Jesus in Knechtsgestalt); the second is the spiritually matured human being (Mensch-*oben*) and Jesus in his elevated status (Jesus in Gottesgestalt).⁴⁶ In the introduction to chapter four Eichinger states that Origen does not see Christ's transfiguration as merely one incident among others,

[...] sondern dass er vielmehr die Verklärung Christi als Paradigma der christologischen Gesamtstruktur erblickt. Denn auch da, wo er zum Aufzeigen der Möglichkeit der Verklärung die Lehre von den verschiedenen Gestalten Christi je nach dem Erfassungsvermögen des Menschen vorbringt, reduziert er seine Betrachtung doch auf zwei Gestalten Christi, die sich als Grenzpole entgegenstehen: der unverklärte Christus ist der fleischgewordene und der kata sarka erkannte und die Torheit dem Menschen-*unten* verkündete Jesus, der verklärte Jesus ist der kata gnosis geschaut und in Weisheit dem Menschen-*oben* verkündete Logos. Dem verklärten Christus, dem Logos in Gottesgestalt, kommt die Funktion des Zieles der Offenbarung zu, dem unverklärten Christus, dem Logos in Knechtsgestalt, ist die Funktion der Ermöglichung des Aufstieges zum Offenbarwerden des Logos in Gottesgestalt eigen.⁴⁷

43 Ibid. 37–127.

44 Ibid. 131–326.

45 EICHINGER, *Die Verklärung Christi* 196.

46 Ibid. chs. 2 and 3.

47 Ibid. 63.

These main themes and this fundamental structure in Origen's Christology are seen as expressions of Christ's ongoing attempts to accommodate to the possibilities for human beings to recognize him. Eichinger finds two different concepts of the body of Logos in Origen's interpretation of the transfiguration. In the one, Origen differentiates between Logos before incarnation (Logos in Gottesgestalt) and the incarnated Logos (Logos im Knechtsgestalt), but not between different forms of the body of Logos. In this concept there is thus no transformation of the body of Logos.⁴⁸ In the other concept, Origen focuses on the transformation of the body of Logos into different forms in order to be recognizable to human beings at different spiritual levels.⁴⁹ This sharp distinction between the two aspects of Logos' incarnation and accommodation to the conditions of fallen human beings is in my view unconvincing. According to Eichinger, Origen does not understand the incarnated Logos and the body of the incarnated Christ to be a unity. Even if Origen intended to speak against docetism⁵⁰ he did not manage to present an undocetic concept of the incarnated Logos. Logos' human body in its untransfigured form does not play any significant role in Origen's Christology and soteriology.⁵¹ Again I am not persuaded.

Origen's most important text on the transfiguration is to be found in his *Commentary on Matthew*,⁵² but Eichinger also finds important texts on the theme in *Against Celsus*.⁵³ Eichinger is right in pointing out that these quite widespread occurrences of the transfiguration motif indicate it to comprise in one way or another a paradigmatic character in Origen's Christology.

Eichinger's contributions to the understanding of Origen's Christology and soteriology are important. His strongly systematic interpretations of Origen's treatment of the transfiguration contribute significantly to an understanding of Origen's concepts of incarnation and accommodation.

James A. Lyons

In 1982 J. A. Lyons' book *The Cosmic Christ in Origen and Teilhard de Chardin: A Comparative Study* was published. In this he first presents an overview of the history of cosmic Christology and follows this, in chronological order, with Origen's and de Chardin's concepts of the subject. Although Lyons is apparently more interested in de Chardin and searches mainly for ideas in Origen that are compa-

48 Ibid. ch. 3.

49 Ibid. ch. 4.

50 Ibid. 70–74.

51 Ibid. 201–203.

52 In *Matth. comm.* XII 36.

53 E. g. *Cels.* II 64; IV 15 f.; IV 68 and VI 77.

rable to de Chardin's, his description of Origen's concept of cosmic Christology is nevertheless interesting. Most important for Lyons is the idea of Christ as mediator between the supreme God and his creation, which is a major theme in de Chardin. In Origen this idea leads to a subordinationist and emanationist Christology, with Christ as the active mediator in creation between God the creator and the created cosmos. According to Origen, the entire cosmos is created by Christ, not merely humanity, a cosmic perspective that Lyons also finds in de Chardin. So even though Origen's Christology is not the focus of Lyons' book, he provides us with a careful description of the cosmological aspects of Origen's Christology and in this context offers a fine description of the subordinationist and emanationist aspects of Origen's Christology.

Gerardus Q. Reijners

In 1983 G. Q. Reijners published a monograph with the title *Das Wort vom Kreuz. Kreuzes- und Erlösungssymbolik bei Origenes*. Reijners' purpose was to investigate and describe Origen's use of the imagery of the cross and redemption in relation to its usage prior to his own. Reijners first registers how Origen uses the imagery and differentiates between Old Testament types ('Vor-Bilder') of Christ's cross and Old Testament prophecies of Christ's death on the cross ('Weissagungen').⁵⁴ His interest in Old Testament types of Christ's death on the cross leads naturally to an interest in how Origen uses typological interpretation and differentiates between this and allegorical interpretation. According to Reijners, Origen differs from the previous tradition in claiming not only a historical-typological relation between the Old Testament types and Christ's realization of these types but also an allegorical interpretation of the Old Testament types and prophecies of Christ. These can be interpreted at different levels, while the New Testament stories realizing the Old Testament types and predictions must similarly undergo an allegorical interpretation that looks for meaning beneath the literal-historical level of the texts.⁵⁵ In the last chapters of his book Reijners discusses several important themes: Origen's interpretation of Is 52,13–53,12 on the Lord's suffering servant; different kinds of redemptive symbolism such as the motif of 'Christus Victor'; Christ as a ransom to the Devil for sinners; and Christ's descent into the land of the dead to release those held captive there by the Devil.⁵⁶ In this interpretative part of his book Reijners presents a number of important points that are helpful to an understanding Origen's Christology and soteriology.

54 REIJNERS, *Das Wort vom Kreuz* chs. 1–2.

55 *Ibid.* ch. 3.

56 *Ibid.* chs. 4–6.

John N. Rowe

In 1987 J. N. Rowe published a monograph entitled *Origen's Doctrine of Subordination: A Study in Origen's Christology*, in which he examines a number of Christological and soteriological themes, such as the idea of Logos as mediator in creation, Logos as the communicator of knowledge of God and salvation, the incarnation of Logos, and the concept of Christ's two natures. Unfortunately, Rowe does not interpret Origen's Christology on its own conditions but on the background of modern criteria such as historical criticism of the Bible and a Barthian concept of revelation, so it contributes little to a proper understanding of Origen's Christology and soteriology.

Michel Fédou

In 1995 M. Fédou published a study on the Christology of Origen under the title *La Sagesse et le Monde. Essai sur la christologie d'Origène*. The title seeks to express an important topic in Origen's Christology which at the same time is a common Christological topic, namely the relation between Christ as Wisdom of God and the world. The title correlates well with the general nature of Fédou's book, which treats many of the classic questions which must be asked of Origen's Christology. Among these topics are: the relation between Logos, the Bible, and the different names which Origen uses for Christ;⁵⁷ the meaning of the cross in Origen's Christology;⁵⁸ and the relation between Christ as Wisdom of God and God the Father.⁵⁹ Chapter 8 on kenotic Christology is especially helpful, since here Fédou discusses a theme which is common among the early Greek Church Fathers, but which is rarely dealt with in such depth in relation to Origen's theology. This idea is developed on the basis of Phil 2,5–11. According to Fédou, Origen's fundamental conception of Christ's incarnation is that through Christ God makes himself the servant of humanity. Fédou argues that Origen's kenotic Christology never goes to the extreme of making the divine aspect of the incarnated Christ disappear, and although he is right in this, his claim also shows that he often evaluates Origen's Christology according to later Nicene dogmatic standards and terminology – a fault that he shares with other French Catholic Origen scholars. Fédou's essays do not present a new coherent interpretation of Origen's Christology and soteriology, but they contain an interesting interpretation of important themes in Origen's Christology.

57 FÉDOU, *La Sagesse* ch. 6.

58 *Ibid.* ch. 5.

59 *Ibid.* ch. 7.

2.3 Summary

This presentation of various studies of Origen's Christology and soteriology reveal no particular tendency. There is a certain agreement among Origen scholars as to which Christological and soteriological themes are central and therefore unavoidable in a monograph. This, however, is the closest we come to a common understanding of Origen's Christology and soteriology, a situation that is at least partly due to an almost total lack of methodological consideration. This lack of methodology creates an incoherence, since some studies discuss only one aspect of Origen's Christology and soteriology, other discuss the subject in only one or only a few of Origen's writings, while still others pick up elements from all of Origen's writings without considering the differences between their themes, their textual types, or their audiences. As a result, practically all the expressions of Christology and soteriology in Origen's writings are misguidedly taken to be at the same spiritual level which is not the case. As indicated in the introduction I intend to present a general method for reading Origen's theology and to use this methodology to carry forward Origen's Christology and soteriology in its totality and complexity.

3. A chronological overview of Origen's works

In this section I date the writings of Origen that I shall be examining in individual chapters in order to see if his Christology changes in the course of his life. The chronological relationship between Origen's works⁶⁰ could play an important part in the complex picture of his Christology and soteriology that I seek to portray. I do not attempt to draw up my own chronology, but refer to the efforts of others to date Origen's works.⁶¹ I have chosen not to follow any particular scholar but instead to take my bearings from the most recent scholarship in relation to the individual works. I treat the works not in their chronological order but as different types of text. In the individual groups of textual types I present the texts in chronological order.

3.1 Treatises

3.1.1 *On First Principles*

On First Principles was written while Origen was living in Alexandria. We must therefore assume that the work was completed before 231.⁶² Origen probably began it in around 220.⁶³ H. Crouzel and M. Simonetti do not believe that *On First Principles* emerged from Origen's teaching of catechumens (pre-220) or his teaching in Caesarea (post-231). The conclusion must therefore be that *On First Principles* was written in the course of the 220s in Alexandria.

60 In Jerome's Letter 33 to Paula he lists all the works by Origen that he knows of. According to CROUZEL, Origen 37, these probably include all the works of Origen that Jerome had seen in the library in Caesarea. Jerome divides the works into 4 main spheres: 1) Commentaries and *scholia (excerpta)* on the Old Testament; 2) Commentaries and *scholia* on the New Testament; 3) Homilies on the Old Testament; 4) Homilies on the New Testament. Jerome's focus is thus on Origen's exegetical works. His other works receive only scattered mention in the letter (cf. CROUZEL, Origen 37–39, which reproduces Jerome's list). Also in Eusebius, hist. eccl. VI, do we find scattered references to Origen's works.

61 Several complete overviews and datings of Origen's works exist, e.g. NAUTIN, Origène 363–412. A schematic overview of Origen's works and their suggested date of composition can be found in VOGT, Origenes Kommentar, vol. 3, 378–391. Chronologies are also drawn up in the many general introductions to Origen's life and work, e.g. CROUZEL, Origen 37–49, which contains a complete chronology of all the writings of Origen – both those that survived and those that were lost – which are mentioned in Jerome and Eusebius.

62 Cf. Eusebius, hist. eccl. VI 24,3.

63 LIES, Origenes' "Peri archon" 7; CROUZEL/SIMONETTI, Origène, vol. 1, 11 f.

3.1.2 *Dialogue with Heraclides*

It is impossible to say anything definite about the date of Origen's *Dialogue with Heraclides* on the basis of internal evidence in the text. J. Scherer, the editor and translator of the French edition of the text in *Sources Chrétiennes*, points to some similarities in wording and theological themes in the latest part of Origen's literary activity. This could indicate a late dating of the work, which Scherer supports by citing Origen's critical discussion of the idea that the soul dies together with the body.⁶⁴ This could be a reference to an Arabian heresy which was strong in the mid-240s. Scherer concludes that it is reasonable to think that the text is from the period 244–249.⁶⁵

3.2 Commentaries

3.2.1 *Commentary on John*

Origen's *Commentary on John* is an immense opus, which he worked on for most of his writing life. Book XXXII (on John 13), was probably the last volume, although Origen was far from having dealt with all the chapters in John. *Commentary on John* as a whole cannot therefore be classified as either an early or a late work. However, there are several remarks in the work that enable us to date the individual books more precisely.

In Book I Origen says that he started work on the commentary shortly after his return from a journey, although he does not mention to what destination. P. Nautin thinks the reference is to Origen's first trip to Palestine in 230.⁶⁶ If this is the case, Origen must have begun work on *Commentary on John* after completing *On First Principles* and *Commentary on Genesis*, which, according to Nautin, were written before Origen's first trip to Palestine. The purpose of the journey was to enlist support from the bishops there in his conflict with Demetrius, Origen's bishop in Alexandria. Among other things the conflict had to do with these two works. In the introduction to Book V Origen intimates that he has again been on a journey. Nautin believes this refers to the trip which Eusebius⁶⁷ also describes as being to Emperor Alexander Severus's mother in Antioch in 231–232.⁶⁸ According to Nautin, this means that Books I–IV must have been written in Alexandria in

64 Dial. 10,20–12,19.

65 SCHERER, *Entretien* 19–21.

66 NAUTIN, *Origène* 366–371. 425–427.

67 Eusebius, *hist. eccl.* IV 21,3 f.

68 NAUTIN, *Origène* 427.

230–231, while parts of Book V may have been written in Antioch in 231–232.⁶⁹ At the beginning of Book VI Origen says that he began the work in Alexandria.⁷⁰ In the meantime, the conflict between himself and Bishop Demetrius grew so bitter that he was forced to stop working on the commentary until he had left Alexandria and had arrived in Caesarea in Palestine, which became his future domicile.⁷¹ Nautin believes that the move, or flight, to Caesarea probably took place in 234 (cf. chapter 6). If these dates hold good, the conflict between Origen and Demetrius forced the former to make a lengthy pause in *Commentary on John*, namely from 232 until 234. However, many scholars do not follow Nautin's late dating of the move from Alexandria to Caesarea, and argue that this move already took place in 232.

Not until Book XXXII does Origen give us a chronological definition of the origins of Books VI–XXXII. In the introduction to Book XXXII, which was probably the last in the commentary,⁷² Origen expresses not only a partial tiredness over the work and a concern that he cannot complete it; he also refers to one of the homilies on the Gospel of Luke.⁷³ The comment on his tiredness suggests that Book XXXII comes late in his authorship, while the reference to the homilies on Luke places *Commentary on John* at a later date. According to Nautin, *Homilies on Luke* was written between 239 and 242.⁷⁴ Consequently he dates Book XXXII of *Commentary on John* to the year 248.⁷⁵

This dating of the *Commentary on John* is corrected at certain points by R. E. Heine.⁷⁶ Like Nautin, Heine thinks that Books I–V were written in Alexandria, but he dates Origen's move from Alexandria to Caesarea differently, preferring the end of 232 or possibly early 233,⁷⁷ but in either case around the turn of that year. According to Heine, the next books were written in Caesarea in the period 233–235. This period is defined at one end by the move from Alexandria to Caesarea and at the other by the persecution under Emperor Maximinus I (235–238), during which Heine believes Origen hid in Caesarea in Asia Minor. To this group of books belong with certainty Books VI–X, since in *On Prayer* Origen refers to *Commentary on John*.⁷⁸ The consensus is that *On Prayer* was written in the period

69 Ibid. 425–427.

70 In Ioh. comm. VI 8.

71 In Ioh. comm. VI 9.

72 This is in addition to Origen's own remarks in Book XXXII supported by the fact that Jerome had no knowledge of more than the 32 books in *Commentary on John*, cf. Hieronymus, epist. 33.

73 In Ioh. comm. XXXII 1–3.

74 Cf. NAUTIN, Origène 401–409, and the dating of the homilies below.

75 NAUTIN, Origène 412.

76 HEINE, Commentary (Books 13–32) 4–18.

77 Ibid. 4.

78 Since in orat. 15,1 Origen refers to in Ioh. comm. X 246.