

CYRIL OF ALEXANDRIA'S INTERPRETATION OF MATTHEW AND LUKE'S
QUOTATION OF HOSEA: A STUDY ON PATRISTIC EXEGESIS
OF INTER-TEXTUAL OCCURRENCES

by

JohnMark Beazley

box 342

Marc Cortez and James DeYoung

Guided Research Project

March 20th, 2009

Thesis:

Cyril's exegesis of inter-textual quotes demonstrates a greater influence of the New Testament context on the meaning of the Old Testament passage than the Old Testament affects the New Testament.

Outline:

- I. Introduction
- II. Cyril
 - A. *Sitz im Leben*
 - B. Cyril's Exegesis
 - 1. Σκοπος and τελος of Scripture
 - 2. Exegetical Trends
 - 3. Senses of Scripture
 - 4. Symbols in Scripture
- III. Exegesis of Inter-textual Occurrences
 - A. Cyril's Reading of Luke
 - 1. Noting the Quoting
 - 2. Luke's Quoting of Hosea
 - B. Cyril's Reading of Hosea
 - 1. Methodology
 - 2. On the Historicity of Hosea
 - 3. Exegesis of Hosea Passages Quoted in the New Testament
 - a. Quoted outside of Matthew and Luke
 - b. Quoted within Matthew and Luke
 - c. Lukan Allusions
 - C. Cyril's Reading of Matthew
 - D. Theological Connections
 - 1. Hosea 6, Matthew 9, and Luke 6
 - 2. Movement of Theological Meaning
- IV. Conclusion
 - A. Summary
 - B. Appropriation

I. Introduction

This study was undertaken to answer a current question faced by the author. This question being, “How does one interpret the New Testament’s quotation from and allusion to the Old Testament?” This simple question on a topic of some complexity led this author to ask the question, “How did the Church Fathers read and interpret these inter-textual occurrences?” It is this second question that this paper will wrestle with and begin journeying towards an answer. To embark upon a work that seeks input from voices in the past upon problems of the present¹ is to operate in some distinction from a current presupposition in scholarship. Wilken disdainfully notes this common “presupposition that... critical thought has made a quantum leap beyond the assumptions of the earlier philosophical and theological tradition, and that theology, with impunity, can do its work without reference to the classical sources.”² This study is done with the expectation that a classical source can offer perspectives and thoughts that the current context could be bettered for having engaged.

Though this work is driven by a curiosity of the past and a desire for input to a problem of the present, this work will not focus how one can incorporate patristic praxes into one’s own hermeneutic. The focus of this work will be that of an historical inquiry into the exegesis of Cyril of Alexandria. Cyril of Alexandria was chosen because he not only represents Alexandrian³ exegetical practices, but also was an important ecclesial

¹ This is not to say that such things as the New Testament’s use of the Old Testament was not an issue for prior generations of Christians, only to acknowledge that it remains a topic at present.

² Robert L. Wilken, *Remembering the Christian Past*, Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1995, page 27.

³ The reason the Alexandrian Cyril was chosen for this study has less to do with a desire to study Alexandrian exegesis over that of Antiochene and more to do with the simple fact that there are extant commentaries from Cyril on both a Gospel and Hosea.

figure during and after his lifetime.⁴ Added to these qualifications, there is the very useful fact that his commentary on Luke and Hosea are extant along with significant fragments of his commentary on Matthew. These three commentaries will be the starting point for looking at his exegesis of inter-textual phenomena.⁵

Interest in this historical figure will be revealed in the actual care taken when seeking to understand that past as opposed to merely using it for one's own end. It is hoped that by so doing it will be possible to avoid strip-mining entire swaths of history to emerge with one nugget ripped from its context and thrust into service within a foreign polemic.⁶ This interest in the history of this man's exegesis will be evidenced in this work through an approach that seeks to outline his thoughts in his context. The particulars of this paper will limit the attention paid to his life and times to a bare minimum so that the focus can be upon his hermeneutical practices. These hermeneutical practices will be viewed in general and particular attention will be paid to matter of his exegesis of inter-textual occurrences within Scripture. This limitation exists not to create a means by which to take liberties with Cyril's thoughts, but to focus upon one particular aspect of his thoughts.

⁴ As a theologian, Cyril was no small personage in the Christological debates of his day, so much so that even Theodoret (who spent most of his life opposing Cyril) adopted Cyril's terms for speaking about the doctrine of Christ. (McGunkin, page 17). For the present, Cyril "represents a definitive theological vision for Eastern Christianity's understanding of Christ, and the mystery of redemptive deification which the incarnation has effected." (McGunkin page 17) He appears to have been the first to have used patristic florilegium to establish doctrine (Russell, page 50) As a churchman, Cyril was the bishop of the rather important see of Alexandria, and was president of the Council of Ephesus in 341 A.D. (Russell, page 47)

⁵ This point is the reason that the more seminal figure Origen was not chosen for this study; Origen's commentaries are only partially extant. Note Appendix 1 for a brief discussion of Origen's reading of inter-textual phenomena in Matthew's Gospel.

⁶ "When one wants to give an account of the present, it is entirely legitimate, by a "regressive process," to delve into the past in order to do outlines and preparations for the present and see how the present is anticipated in a more remote time. What is much less legitimate, if one wishes to know the past, is to be primarily interested in it only to detect elements in it that might bear some relationship to the present. ... if the past is not appreciated in and for itself, what is essential will have eluded us." (Henri de Lubac, *Medieval Exegesis vol. 1: The Four Senses of Scripture*, trans. Marc Sebanc, Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998, page XVIII.)

Much patristic exegesis is replete with inter-textual connections based upon theological and perceived connections of grammatical and thematic natures. Cyril is no exception to this. This paper will demonstrate that when Cyril deals with inter-textual occurrences within the Biblical text proper, the context of the other passage does not influence the exegesis of the passage at hand in a substantive manner. This is not to say that the inter-textual occurrence never receives direct treatment in his exegesis, but to say that such occurrences do not, in and of themselves, warrant direct treatment of the texts quoted from. Thus, it appears he was not seeking to exegete inter-textual occurrences but rather the textual occurrences within their own exegetical framework.

The book of Hosea in conjunction with Matthew and Luke's quotations from this book will be the Biblical starting point for the study. Hosea itself provides a place in which Patristic assumptions about the Biblical text will be prominently displayed in their understanding of the historical or allegorical nature of Hosea's union with a prostitute. Beyond that, Matthew's quotation of Hosea 11:1 in 2:15 is a quotation that continues to elicit debate about the validity of the quote and the meaning of the quote for both passages.⁷

With such overt statements, it will be possible to see how or if the beginning assumptions concerning the book are played out in the inter-textual uses. Matthew and Luke quote from Hosea in four passages: Matt 2:15, 9:13, 12:7, and Luke 23:30. These uses are of three distinct flavors with Matthew 2:15 using Hosea 11:1 in an explicit prophetic fulfillment concerning the Messiah. In 9:13 and 12:7, the Evangelist places

⁷ Blomberg presents several views of Matthew's use of Hosea 11:1 ranging from views that Hosea 11:1 was messianic in nature to simply a matter of typology (Beale and Carson, pages 7-8). On a different tact, there is the option presented by McCasland in the essay entitled "Matthew Twists the Scriptures" in which he, unsurprisingly, argues Matthew missuses Hosea 11:1 (Beale, pages 147-148).

Hosea 6:6 in the mouth of Jesus as He rebukes the Pharisees for not understanding God. Finally, Luke 23:30 sees Jesus quoting Hosea 10:8 as he predicts coming judgment on Jerusalem while *en route* to the place of his crucifixion. Thus, it will be possible to discern if or how the content of the inter-textual quote impacts the exegesis of the quote in its New Testament context. Before dealing directly with Cyril's inter-textual approach, it is worthwhile to examine the man and his basic approach to interpreting Scripture.

As the topic of the New Testament's use of Old Testament material is large, and at times an amorphous topic, this paper will primarily focus on those uses that appear in the form of quotations and deal secondarily with allusions. For the sake of simplicity and sanity, this paper will follow the United Bible Society's list of New Testament quotations and allusions of the Old Testament as given in the 4th edition of *The Greek New Testament*.

II. Cyril of Alexandria

A. Cyril's *Sitz im Leben*

Cyril lived from 378 until 444.⁸ He followed his uncle as Bishop of Alexandria and spent the last thirty-two years of his life as bishop. While bishop, he entered into a multitude of theological and ecclesial controversies, ranging from an anti-Origen campaign to a Christological controversy with Nestorius.⁹ In these and other controversies, Cyril demonstrated various shades of diplomatic ability that at times verged on the thuggish and unbecoming of one of the most powerful churchmen of the

⁸ Norman Russell, *Cyril of Alexandria*, New York, NY: Routledge, 2000, page 3.

⁹ For further information on the life and times of Cyril, Russell and Yoo (Chul H. Yoo, "Cyril of Alexandria: Fifth Century Exegesis and the Rhetorical Schools." M.A. Thesis, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, 2002.) both offer significantly more details on him.

day.¹⁰ He is remembered in scholarship mostly for his work in this Christological controversy, even though the bulk of Cyril's extant writings are exegetical works.¹¹

B. Cyril's Exegesis

1. The Σκοπος of Scripture

To place properly Cyril's exegesis within his framework, one must first examine his perception of the σκοπός (goal) and τέλος (end) of Scripture. Cassell offers a working definition of σκοπός as, "[t]he unified manner in which the book progressed towards a certain goal... while the conclusion at which the book eventually arrived was known as the τέλος."¹² Rightly interpreting the text requires that one understands the τέλος, as only then will one have the needed perspective to understand the goal and its progression in the text. For Cyril, "the τέλος of the entire Bible... was Christ and his coming."¹³

Keating describes, "Cyril reads the Bible in terms of its *skopos* or purpose, which is the divine plan of salvation culminating in Christ, the Incarnate Word."¹⁴ As a justification for reading the text in this way, Cyril looks to passages such as Matthew 5:17 and John 4:24 as providing the hermeneutical keys to interpret the Old Testament

¹⁰ The oft quoted view of Cyril's junior Theodoret is, "His departure delights the survivors, but possibly disheartens the dead; there is some fear that under the provocation of his company they may send him back again to us... Care must therefore be taken to order the guild of undertakers to place a very big and heavy stone on his grave to stop him coming back here." (Russell, page 3; John J. O'Keefe, "Incorruption, Anti-Origenism, and Incarnation: Eschatology in the Thought of Cyril of Alexandria", in *The Theology of St. Cyril of Alexandria: A Critical Appreciation*, ed. by Thomas G. Weinandy and Daniel A. Keating, New York, NY: T&T Clark, 2003, page 187; et. al.). Among other dubious deeds include: leading a mob to confiscate Jewish Synagogues, leading mobs in direct disobedience to the local prefect, being implicated with the murder of a leading pagan philosopher (Russell, pages 7-9), and beginning the council of Ephesus before those men who would oppose his views had arrived (Russell, pages 46-47).

¹¹ John J. O'Keefe, page 188.

¹² David J. Cassel, "Key Principles in Cyril of Alexandria's Exegesis." *Studia Patristica* XXXVII (2001): page 414.

¹³ *Ibid*, page 414.

¹⁴ Daniel A. Keating, *The Appropriation of Divine Life in Cyril of Alexandria*, New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2004, page 14.

christologically.¹⁵ The use of these verses from the New Testament as hermeneutical keys to read the Old Testament reveals Cyril's understanding that both Testaments are a unified whole.¹⁶

Within the unified whole of Scripture, Cyril recognized that each of the authors of Scripture had a particular σκοπός and τέλος for their individual works. Wilken notes that Cyril discusses the historical setting and the σκοπός of the author at the beginning of each commentary on the Minor Prophets,¹⁷ yet offers that for Cyril, the goal of Scripture "is not to provide us with an account of the lives of the saints of old. Far from that. Rather its scopos [sic] is to give us knowledge of the mystery [of Christ] through those things which the word about him might become clear and true."¹⁸ Kerrigan, likewise, notes some of the uses of σκοπός by Cyril regarding both the individual works of Scripture and the Scripture as a whole¹⁹ and offers that the σκοπός of the author affects both the literal and spiritual meaning of a particular text.²⁰ That is to say that each author had their own purpose in writing and the meaning (whether it be literal or spiritual) of a text cannot be incongruent with the authors intended purpose.

In conjunction with his understanding of the σκοπός of Scripture is Cyril's understanding of the unity of Scripture. While each human author has a particular σκοπός they are unified in their theology, in particular, Christ. Indeed, the very origin of the Old and New Testaments requires the doctrine in both to be harmonious.²¹ As an example,

¹⁵ *Ibid*, page 15.

¹⁶ Cassel, page 413.

¹⁷ Robert L. Wilken, "Cyril of Alexandria." in, *Handbook of Patristic Exegesis Volume Two*, ed. by Charles Kannengiesser, Boston, MA: Brill, 2004, page 842.

¹⁸ Cyril, *Glamphya in Numerum.*, PG 69, 308c. as quoted by Wilken, 2004, page 847.

¹⁹ Alexander Kerrigan, *St. Cyril of Alexandria: Interpreter of the Old Testament*, Rome, Italy: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1952, pages 95-108.

²⁰ *Ibid*, page 88.

²¹ *Ibid*, page 132.

Cyril held in the creation account of Genesis 1:26-27 that Moses taught the two most central truths of the Christian revelation, the triune nature of God and the glory of divine inhabitation with man.²² Indeed, Cyril tried to refute the Hellenists (philosophically inclined pagans) with the assertion that the great men of the Old Testament were fundamentally Nicene Christians in their faith.²³ This connects to the prophets, who, in Cyril's view, had a clear understanding of the future and were proclaiming the truth of Christ before the incarnation.²⁴ Therefore, Cyril's understanding of the σκοπός of Scripture affirms the particular historical situation into which the author wrote, and a recognition of the fulfillment of revelation in the person of Christ.²⁵

2. Exegetical Trends

Patristic figures can fall into two broad categories: Latin or Greek, depending upon which language they spoke and wrote. Within the Greek speaking church, there emerged two general approaches to exegesis. These two approaches derive their names not from a particular style, but from the city associated with their development: Alexandrian and Antiochene. The basic distinction between the two is that Antiochenes tended to shy “away from the use of allegory and sought the sense determined by the author, which they determined by close attention to the historical meaning of individual

²² William J. Malley, *Hellenism and Christianity*, Roma: Universita Gregoriana Editrice, 1978, page 267.

²³ *Ibid*, page 262. Whether or not he succeeded in this endeavor is another topic. What is important is to recognize is that his approach was such that he asserted Trinitarian doctrine was knowingly taught by the author of Torah.

²⁴ Cyril's understanding of prophetic foreknowledge is explicitly seen in his exposition of Luke 3:4-6, “The blessed Esias was not ignorant of the scope of John's preaching, but of old, even long before the time, bearing witness of it, he called Christ Lord and God;” (Cyril Patriarch of Alexandria, *Commentary on the Gospel of Saint Luke*, trans. R. Payne Smith. Astoria, NY: Studion Publishing, 1983, page 69.)

²⁵ “If one does not understand Christ as the σκοπός of Scripture then one cannot rightly interpret the text, but is like the Jews who possess the text but live in the shadow of the types apart from the spiritual significance of the Bible.” (Susan Wessel, *Cyril of Alexandria and the Nestorian Controversy*, New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2004, page, 43.)

words of scripture.”²⁶ In contrast, Alexandrian exegesis engages with allegory in an attempt to access the spiritual meaning²⁷ of scripture. In more practical terms, the distinction can fall apart as one deals with individuals like Cyril.

Because of variances in exegetical practices from the nicely perceived boundaries between Alexandrian and Antiochene exegesis, Cyril is often labeled eclectic in his methodology in that he can appear to draw from both Alexandrian and Antiochene sources.²⁸ It could be likely that such perceived eclecticism posits that there might be less of a dichotomy at work in Greek Patristic exegesis. Thus, it is important to evaluate Cyril on his own terms as Keating suggests.²⁹ Doing this requires a working knowledge of Cyril’s time and history, as his own terms appear intrinsically wrapped within the history and tradition of his time. However, in understanding Cyril within this, it remains important that one does not assume the voices of his contemporaries speak for Cyril, as Cyril may not always be a harmonious voice on this historical stage that has been constructed.

Regarding his exegesis of both Hosea and the Gospels, Cyril is far more linked to the historical occurrences than others of Alexandrian origin such as Origen³⁰ or Didymus the Blind. Whereas Origen held that Simon of Cyrene did not carry the cross of Jesus

²⁶ Joseph W. Trigg, *Biblical Interpretation*, Message of the Fathers of the Church vol. 9. Wilmington, DE: Micheal Glazier Inc. 1988, page 31.

²⁷ The definition and mode by which this meaning was reached has variances between Alexandrian authors.)

²⁸ Keating, 2004, pages 13-14.

²⁹ *Ibid*, page 5.

³⁰ This is not to say that Origen denied the historicity of the Bible as his contemporary pagan allegorists would do with pagan texts, (Kerrigan, page 117) but that there are portions of Scripture that Origen would view as intentionally not giving historical meaning but only moral and spiritual meanings.

because John records that Jesus carried the cross himself,³¹ Cyril holds that both accounts are historical with Simon carrying the cross only the final part of the trip.³² Rather than doubting the historical veracity of this passage, Cyril notes that it is important for Jesus to carry the cross, because the cross is His government “by which he became King of the World.”³³ Therefore, he views both accounts as historical and still finds spiritual significance in the text. In the Old Testament, Cyril’s care for the historicity of the text is quite evident in his introduction to Hosea wherein he castigates those who would doubt or deride the literal union of Hosea and Gomer.³⁴ With a slightly different take, he views the locusts of Joel as an oblique reference to foreign invaders and not as literal locust.³⁵ Cyril links this discussion of locusts to historical invaders of the nation of Israel while at the same time offering that there is a spiritual and moral lesson to be seen as the locusts could be the passions that attack virtues within a man.³⁶ In these examples it is clear that Cyril affirms the historicity even while offering spiritual meanings. In keeping with the σκοπος of Scripture, Cyril still “understands the OT typologically in view of Christ, though not to the same extent as Origen and Didymus.”³⁷

³¹ Allan Menzies, *The Ante-Nicean Fathers: Volume X, Added Volume Peter, Tatian, Commentaries of Origen*, Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1980, page 464. Origen then proceeds to offer the spiritual meaning of Simon carrying the cross.

³² Cyril Patriarch of Alexandria, 1983, page 605.

³³ Cyril Patriarch of Alexandria, *Commentary on the Gospel of Saint Luke*, page 606.

³⁴ Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentary on the Twelve Prophets, Volume I*, Fathers of the Church Volume 115, trans. Robert C. Hill, Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2007, pages 39-40.

“No argument would persuade us to repudiate the text, to condemn the unlikelihood of the facts, to dismiss the tastelessness of the even itself, or even to think (as some commentators do) that there was no marriage or marital intercourse with Gomer when the sacred text says that the conception took place and the birth as well, cites also the child’s name, and mentions the woman’s father and in addition to that the woman’s actual name.”

³⁵ *Ibid*, page 263.

³⁶ *Ibid*, pages 264-265.

³⁷ Hubertus R. Drobner, *The Fathers of the Church: A Comprehensive Introduction*, trans, Siegfried S. Schatzmann, Peabody, MS: Hendrickson Publishers, 2007, page 468.

It is difficult to discern if such a divergence in exegetical practice from his predecessors³⁸ in the Alexandrian school is simply a matter of Cyril's personal approach or fits within a broader historical exegetical trend. Simonetti traces the historical trend in exegesis towards a modified allegory that paid closer heed to the literal meaning of the text.³⁹ The school of thought in Alexandria appears to have not been influenced much by this trend prior to Cyril. Didymus the Blind remained a faithful disciple of Origen regarding exegetical practices during this time.⁴⁰ Simonetti offers that at first glance Cyril would be faithful to the Alexandrian heritage with his christological and allegorical methods of finding symbols with the prophecies of Isaiah.⁴¹ However, a closer view reveals a far greater development of the literal sense than his Alexandrian exegetical predecessors, which moderates their practice of finding the spiritual meaning of every Scripture passage.⁴² In this care for the literal meaning, he appears to share much the same concerns as Theodore and Theodoret while even surpassing Jerome in his care for the meaning of the literal.⁴³ In a way, it appears as though Cyril draws from both exegetical worlds to develop an exegetical method lacking in great uniqueness and yet clearly his own.

This divergence from the Alexandrian tradition should not be discussed apart from the anti-Origenist feelings of Cyril's day. Cyril's uncle Theophilus had convoked a

³⁸ In particular, Didymus the Blind died in 398 (F. L. Cross, *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1963, page 398) when Cyril would likely have been in his mid twenties (Kannengiesser, page 840).

³⁹ Malino Simonetti, *Biblical Interpretation in the Early Church: An Historical Introduction to Patristic Exegesis*, trans. John A. Hughes, Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994, page 77 et. al.

⁴⁰ *Ibid*, page 77.

⁴¹ *Ibid*, page 79.

⁴² *Ibid*, page 80.

⁴³ Kerrigan, page, 110.

council to condemn Origen in 400.⁴⁴ In a similar vein, Cyril was not remiss in fighting the Origenism of his day.⁴⁵ Although he does not appear to wholeheartedly embrace his uncle's attacks against Origen,⁴⁶ Cyril is remembered in the history of Severus as a man who would condemn and excommunicate any of the faithful who read Origen.⁴⁷

Whether or not this last statement is an accurate portrayal of Cyril is a debatable matter. It does however further the notion that Cyril did not devote himself to studying Origen's legacy as Didymus had done,⁴⁸ but found other sources of theological and exegetical thought to shape his own.

While there might be historical trends towards a higher regard for the literal meaning of the text before and during the life of Cyril, there are also challenges outside the Church that appear to influence Cyril's practical regard for the literal meaning. The challenge posed by the Emperor Julian the Apostate's *Contra Galilaeos* caused Cyril to respond with assertions: there is nothing mythical in Scripture,⁴⁹ an interpretation that does not conform to historical facts is erroneous,⁵⁰ and in defending Mosaic antecedence of Greek philosophers, he fully defends the historicity of the literal reading of the patriarchal histories.⁵¹ This response is more than the reaction of a concerned churchman making polemical statements to affirm the faithful and destroy heresy, but represents the aged Cyril's view of Scripture as the focus of his rebuttal of the apostate and now

⁴⁴ Cross, page 993.

⁴⁵ O'Keefe, page 189.

⁴⁶ This is not to say that Cyril wholeheartedly followed in his uncle's footsteps. Wessel notes there is a striking absence of mention of Theophilus' anti-Origenist campaign from both Cyril's works and the proceedings at Ephesus. (Wessel, page 33.)

⁴⁷ Kerrigan, page 11.

⁴⁸ Charles Kannengiesser, *Handbook of Patristic Exegesis Volume Two*, Boston, MA: Brill, 2004, page 725.

⁴⁹ Malley, page 311. In this case, Cyril is speaking of the serpent speaking to Eve.

⁵⁰ *Ibid*, page 352. In particular, Julian tried to interpret Balaam's prophecy concerning the star of Jacob to David or those ruling in Israel at the time. Cyril rebuts that it must be interpreted as referring to Christ for none of the kings ever conquered those countries nor accepted them in brotherhood.

⁵¹ *Ibid*, pages 261-264.

deceased Emperor Julian. Likewise, there was the problem posed by the Jews of Alexandria. Wilken notes several scholars have posited that Cyril's regard for the literal arises from his interactions with Jews.⁵² Wilken does not say as much about Cyril's exegesis though he does note several instances in which Cyril's exegesis is influenced by Jewish sources,⁵³ and traces out a picture of Cyril's interaction with Jews concerning Scripture.⁵⁴

3. Senses of Scripture

Cyril's concern for the literal meaning of the text is evident in his view of the senses of Scripture. Cyril's understanding of the number of senses in Scripture and how they work is rather important to understanding how he read Scripture. The number of senses in Scripture is a matter of some debate and disagreement. Some hold that there is but one sense of Scripture and (if that sense is the literal) subsequently there is but one meaning. Some hold there are multiple senses of Scripture, and so it is possible that there are multiple meanings within the same text or even verse. Unfortunately, Cyril's understanding of the senses of Scripture is likewise a matter of debate and disagreement. The debate does not center on whether Cyril saw more than one sense in Scripture, but whether he viewed two or three senses in Scripture. Simonetti holds Cyril engages with three levels of meaning in Scripture: the literal sense, the spiritual sense (Christological), and the moral sense (the application of the text to the listeners' lives). The distinction is evident in Cyril's more attentive interpretation of the literal sense. This he develops to

⁵² Wilken, 1971, page 6.

⁵³ *Ibid*, pages 58-59.

⁵⁴ Cyril castigates Jews for failing to understand the types found in the Old Testament (Wilken, pg 61.), and in specific cites their observance of Shabbat as a misunderstanding of Scripture and the practice of circumcision as being worthless.

the point where he does not offer a spiritual sense and will often find the moral sense in the literal sense.⁵⁵

Quite conversely, Kerrigan holds, Cyril shies away from the three senses of Origen and appears to follow Didymus' conception of two senses of Scripture, namely the literal and the spiritual.⁵⁶ A definite strength to Kerrigan's position is "Cyril never uses the term *το ψυχικόν* (unspiritual) to designate a sense of Scripture"⁵⁷ as Origen did. That Cyril does not directly mention a 'moral sense' of Scripture is a huge strength to his point as well. In the few places that Cyril alludes to a moral sense,⁵⁸ Kerrigan holds that this is not a subtle pointing to a third sense, but an application of the spiritual sense to the soul.⁵⁹ Another point to consider is that Cyril uses the same terms to define the objects of the senses as he does to speak about the senses.⁶⁰ From this, it would seem best to follow Cyril's own overt definitions concerning the number of senses in Scripture and thus to side with Kerrigan. Therefore, when "Cyril reads the events of the Old Testament as models of types of salvation in Christ, and as moral exemplars of the way of life we are to lead in Christ,"⁶¹ it would be best to understand this as the expected outcome from rightly interpreting the Scripture and not a third sense within the text.

The two senses Cyril sees in Scripture are the spiritual sense and the literal sense.⁶² The differentiation between these lies primarily "in the objects described by them; the sense is literal if the objects envisaged by it are *τὰ αἰσθητά*; it is spiritual if they

⁵⁵ Simonetti, 1994, page 79.

⁵⁶ Kerrigan, pages 32-33.

⁵⁷ *Ibid*, page 32.

⁵⁸ Cyril attaches the term *ἐθικαὶ ὑφηγησείς* to the spiritual meaning of some verses in Exodus in his work *De adoratione in spiritu et veritate* as found in PG, vol 69, page 385 ff. (Kerrigan, page 33)

⁵⁹ Kerrigan, page 33.

⁶⁰ *Ibid*, page 124.

⁶¹ Keating, page 15.

⁶² In working with these two senses, Cyril shows himself to be influenced by some form of platonic dualism.

belong to the category of τὰ νοητά and τὰ πνευματικά.”⁶³ Cyril’s definition for these categories shows the literal involves objects such as: past events, legal enactments, and material prosperity promised in some prophetic oracles.⁶⁴ The objects of the spiritual sense⁶⁵ are “the various realities that belong to Christ’s mystery.”⁶⁶ As such, there are places where the spiritual meaning will be the same as the literal meaning since the literal is discussing Christ’s mystery.

Cyril is quite emphatic that one must go beyond the literal sense and arrive at the spiritual sense because the literal sense is not always adequate. Wilken notes Cyril’s exegesis of the bronze serpent as a place where the historical is not adequate,⁶⁷

The letter does not satisfy the spiritually mature. They are satisfied only with mysteries hidden in types. By transforming the bare narrative, one moves the focus away from the particular thing [the type] to what is more general and universal, i.e. to what is true and not simply historical.⁶⁸

This demonstrates an exegetical approach that both cares for the historical meaning as well as reading the Old Testament with an eye towards understanding the text with a redemptive history and canonical approach (as understood with reference to reading the OT in light of the σκοπός and τέλος). In reading the text, Cyril “is less interested in understanding what Moses or Zechariah or Paul or Matthew ‘meant’ than he is

⁶³ Kerrigan, page 33. τὰ αἰσθητά (things discerned by the senses), τὰ νοητά (conceivable things), and τὰ πνευματικά (spiritual things).

⁶⁴ *Ibid*, page 44.

⁶⁵ Kerrigan lists 14 distinct words/phrases that Cyril uses to describe the spiritual sense. (pages 112-115.)

⁶⁶ *Ibid*, page 131. Note also Kerrigan states that Cyril equated the things within Christ’s mystery with the intelligible world of Plato.

⁶⁷ Wilken, 2004, page 847.

⁶⁸ Cyril of Alexandria, *Glamphra in Numbers*, Patrologia Graeca Vol. 69 ed. by J. P. Minge, column 641a; quoted in Robert L. Wilken, 2004, page 847.

understanding what Christ means.”⁶⁹ It is this spiritual meaning that allows one to arrive at the σκοπός of Scripture,⁷⁰ namely Christ.

4. Symbols in Scripture

Those things that belong to the spiritual sense do so based upon content that speaks of spiritual things. How Cyril determined what belonged to the spiritual sense is partly illustrated by how he accesses the spiritual meaning of a passage.⁷¹ Oft times Cyril’s point for accessing the spiritual meaning in a passage is the use of metaphors and symbolic language. The use of symbolic language does not always necessitate a spiritual meaning, but by its very nature is open to being read with referents that would be objects of the spiritual sense. The use of symbolic language though was not to be interpreted in a wooden fashion.

For Cyril of Alexandria, there were no such literal claims for figural language. Language, especially biblical language, necessarily signified something else—the entirety of the sacred Christian drama, which consisted in the Fall, the Incarnation, and the Redemption. It was heretics... who degraded the figurality of language into false literalism, failing to understand that biblical language was referential and symbolic, a signifier who signified constituted Christ’s sacred drama. Cyril’s way of understanding language as overtly referential and symbolic meant that there was little danger of his falling prey to the tricks of figural language, which were simply a shadow and type of the greater Christian truth that stood beyond the biblical text.⁷²

This makes a great blanket statement, but ultimately glosses over some of Cyril’s distinctions between the literal and spiritual sense of Scripture. Though there may not be literal claims for figurative expressions, symbols and metaphors are used to describe

⁶⁹ Robert Louis Wilken, “Cyril of Alexandria as Interpreter of the Old Testament”, in *The Theology of St. Cyril of Alexandria: A Critical Appreciation*, ed. by Thomas G. Weinandy and Daniel A. Keating, New York, NY: T&T Clark, 2003, page 21.

⁷⁰ Ibid, page 3.

⁷¹ This work will not answer how Cyril determined what was spiritual and what was literal as doing so would require a separate work.

⁷² Wessel, page 8.

things that fall under both the literal and spiritual sense of Scripture. In some places there is a distinct ambiguity as to whether these symbols are to be understood in the literal sense, the spiritual sense, or both (such as the locusts in Joel's vision).⁷³ Within the spiritual sense, one discovers symbols developed in God's plan of salvation are transformed into something new (i.e. even more Christological in referent).⁷⁴ All this to say, that though Cyril will often look at symbolic language and see a place from which to access the spiritual sense; the spiritual sense is signified by more than mere metaphor.

III. Exegesis of Inter-textual Occurrences

Cyril is a profoundly inter-textual exegete connecting multiple passages together in his work on any given passage. These connections are not based upon the explicit connections of the New Testament authors, but appear to be based more upon conceptual and theological connections noticed by Cyril himself.⁷⁵ He will at times make mention of the New Testament's quotation of an Old Testament passage, though his exegesis of the New Testament passage appears unaffected by this quotation. His reading of the Old Testament on the whole demonstrates a greater influence of the context and meaning of the New Testament passage wherein the Old Testament passage is quoted than influence of the Old Testament passage upon the meaning of the New Testament passage that quotes it. Wilken offers three examples where he views Cyril's exegesis of an Old Testament text is guided by the use of that text in the New Testament: Melchizedek (Gen 14) in light of Hebrews 7:1-10, the Passover (Ex 12) in light of John 1:29, and the bronze serpent (Ex 20:1-10) in light of John 3:14.⁷⁶ This does not throw out the thesis that

⁷³ Kerrigan, page 87.

⁷⁴ Malley, page 364.

⁷⁵ Robert L. Wilken, 2004, page 847.

⁷⁶ *Ibid*, page 847.

Cyril's exegesis of a New Testament passage is unaffected by the inter-textual quotation. This rather illustrates Cyril's general approach that engages in more of a transfer of theological and exegetical meaning from the New Testament into the Old than from the Old into the New. This is not all that remarkable as Cyril's own thoughts concerning the τέλος and σκοπός of Scripture could lead one to suspect him of this tendency.

A. Cyril's Reading of Luke

1. Noting the Quoting

Cyril's exegesis of Luke reveals a practical disregard for the context of the Old Testament passages quoted by Luke. While there are exceptions to this statement the statement does not appear to be invalidated by these exceptions. The standard approach is to note that the Old Testament is quoted, as seen in Cyril's comment on Luke 4:5-8,⁷⁷ "It is written, *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve.* Seasonably He made mention of this commandment, striking as it were his (Satan's) very heart."⁷⁸ In this example, Cyril notes the source of the phrase is a commandment and that is the extent of his notation upon the inter-textual quote. The few times Cyril makes note of the source of an Old Testament quote, this is the manner in which it is done.⁷⁹ The clearest example of noting an Old Testament source is in his work on Luke 3: 4-6 and Luke's quote of Isaiah 40:3, "The blessed Esaias was not ignorant of the scope of John's preachings, but of old, even long before the time bearing witness of it, he called Christ Lord and God."⁸⁰ This passage presents one of the longer notes on an inter-textual

⁷⁷ Quoting Deuteronomy 6:13

⁷⁸ Cyril Patriarch of Alexandria, 1983, page 89.

⁷⁹ As in Luke 7:27 and the use of Malachi 3:1 it is noted, "the prophet's voice testified" (that is the voice of the prophet Malachi) page 163, Also in Luke 10:27 Cyril note these statements are commands from the writings of Moses. (Cyril Patriarch of Alexandria, 1983, page 489.)

⁸⁰ Cyril Patriarch of Alexandria, 1983, page 69.

quote, noting both the source and giving a brief foray into Cyril's understanding of the knowledge of the prophets of old. This note however is the end of his inter-textual notations on this passage,⁸¹ and in all likelihood is employed as an opportunity to explain how Cyril understood prophecy to operate.

Most often, Cyril apparently reads over the Old Testament quote without making mention of it as in Luke 23:30's use of Hosea 10:8.⁸² The variances between these approaches is not too significant for the thesis of this paper as neither approach is concerned with elucidating the New Testament text by looking into the Old Testament text quoted by Luke. However, the variance between noting the source or not has some importance for understanding Cyril's exegesis. That he notes the source of the quote demonstrates that he is aware of the context and source and chooses not to engage with that knowledge in his reading of the Gospel account. Based on the moments when he notes the source of the quote, it would be far too cavalier to accuse him of not being aware of the Old Testament sources of the quotes he passes over without comment (though such may be the case in a few of these verses). Rather, when he passes over a quote, it is quite possibly due to the focus of the message he proclaims from the text, as mentioning further detail might prove detrimental to the perspicuity of his homily. Such is likely the case with Cyril's reading of the pericope in which Luke 23:30 is situated. While making mention of the meaning of the quote in the historical context of

⁸¹ Smith notes the remainder of this passage is dubiously attributed to Cyril and quite possibly from another hand. Of equal importance, Cyril's commentary on Isaiah could have been written before his commentary on Luke as he (or another) quotes a passage from his Isaiah commentary in his commentary on this passage (Smith, page 70). Again, the specter of odd texts arises and cast some aspersions upon whether or not Cyril was the one who made use of his commentary on Isaiah or the hand of another thought fit to insert it at this particular junction. As it stands, Smith makes note of the quote from the commentary on Isaiah yet does not include the text quoted.

⁸² Cyril Patriarch of Alexandria, 1983, page 606. Also, he reads over passages such as: Luke 4:18-19 and the use of Isaiah 61:1-2 and 58:6; Luke 7:27 and the use of Malachi 3:1; Luke 10:27 and the use of Deuteronomy 6:5 and Leviticus 19:18; Luke 13:35 and the use of Psalm 118:26; etc...

Luke's/Jesus' usage, Cyril appears far more concerned with engaging and expositing the spiritual meaning of Jesus' enigmatic statement about the green and the dry tree.⁸³

Out of the twenty-six quotes from the Old Testament in the Gospel of Luke,⁸⁴ Cyril discusses the Old Testament context of only one: Luke 4:10-11 and the use of Psalm 91:11-12. The impetus of this exposition of Psalm 91 finds its basis in the theological issues of the day, in particular, Arian theology and specifically, the Arian reading of this psalm. Keeping with Cyril's verbose style he lays out why both Satan and the Arians have wrongly understood this Psalm to refer to the Christ.

But see how maliciously he endeavors by use of the Scriptures to humble the glory of the Lord... For the application of the Psalm refers not to Christ, nor does the Sovereign need angels. ... Some however, wrongly refer the Psalm to the person of the Lord and taking the verses together thus read: *Because Thou, O Lord, art my hope, Thou has made the Most high Thy refuge*. They say, therefore, that the Lord had as his refuge the Most High, even the Father Who is in heaven. And their pretext for such a way of understanding it is, that Satan so took the verses... For Satan being false and a deceiver, applies what is said of us to the person of Christ the Savior of us all. But we do not understand it in Satan's fashion; though if the Arians have so understood it, then there is no cause for astonishment; for they follow their own father... Satan then has made use of these verses as though the Savior were a common man. For being entirely darkness, and having his mind blinded, he understood not the force of what was said, that the psalm is spoken in the person of every just man who is aided by the Highest, even the God of heaven.⁸⁵

Viewing this quote in conjunction with his exegesis of inter-textual quotes elsewhere, it appears as though he provides a tacit approval of the other inter-textual quotes made in Luke. Though to a certain extent this is an argument from silence, over twenty repeated moments of silence with one verbose lambasting of improperly reading the context

⁸³ *Ibid*, pages 606-607.

⁸⁴ Following the UBS Index of Quotation, *The Greek New Testament 4th Edition*, ed. Barbara Aland, Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, and Bruce Metzger, Biblia Druck: D-Stuttgart, 1998, page 889.

⁸⁵ Cyril Patriarch of Alexandria, 1983, page 90.

appears a rather stark contrast and provides some legitimacy for the argument from his silence.

While the direct quotes from the Old Testament receive minimal to no recognition in Cyril's exegesis, apparent allusions to the Old Testament receive not only a mention of the Old Testament source, but often receive extensive comment in his exegesis. One of the better examples of this is in Cyril's commentary on Luke 20:10-18.⁸⁶ The quote of Psalm 118:22⁸⁷ in Luke 20:17 receives no elucidation and no comment on the Psalm or that Jesus quotes from a Psalm. The preceding parable about the vineyard (Luke 20:10-16) is immediately linked to the 79th Psalm and Isaiah 5. Cyril notes, "Now if any one will examine with penetrating eyes of the mind the purport of what is here said, he will find the whole history of the children of Israel briefly summed up in these words."⁸⁸ He then proves this point by quoting the words directed to Christ from Psalm 79:8 where the psalmist speaks of God taking a vine out of Egypt, clearing the land for it, and establishing it. Furthermore, Cyril says Isaiah speaks the same thing and quotes Isaiah 5:1 and 3 to prove his point. For Isaiah says, "*My beloved had a vineyard on a hill, in a fertile place.*"⁸⁹ This enigmatic statement is clarified by the third verse, "*For the vineyard of the Lord of hosts is the man of Judah, a plant new and beloved.*" He, therefore, Who planted the vineyard is God."⁹⁰ From this it is evident that what would be considered an allusion to Isaiah 5:1⁹¹ is of greater importance for Cyril to exposit in this passage than the actual quote concerning the cornerstone within the same passage. This

⁸⁶ Cyril's comment on the first half of the parable is not known to be extant.

⁸⁷ The stone that the builders rejected has become the cornerstone. Psalm 118:22 (ESV)

⁸⁸ Cyril Patriarch of Alexandria, 1983, page 531.

⁸⁹ *Ibid*, page 531.

⁹⁰ *Ibid*, page 531.

⁹¹ *The Greek New Testament 4th Edition*, page 895. *Commentary on the New Testament Use of The Old Testament*, ed. G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson, Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2007, pages 360-362.

greater value is seen in how the allusion sets the definition of the objects of the parable and provides the means by which Cyril finds the meaning of the parable. Conversely, the quote provides nothing to the exegesis of how Cyril defines the cornerstone and interprets its significance.

2. Luke's Quoting of Hosea

Unfortunately, in the extant work on Luke, Cyril failed to comment upon Luke 21:22 and 24:46 wherein it appears that Hosea 9:7 and 6:2 are alluded to in their respective order. Because of this, it is not possible to compare these inter-textual allusions and his exegesis of them with the direct quote of Luke 23:30 to see if these uses of Hosea follow the recurring pattern of Cyril focusing upon the context of allusions without focusing on direct quotes from the Old Testament. Fortunately, Cyril's treatment of Luke 23:30 is extant in his commentary.

It is unsurprising that Cyril makes no note of the inter-textual use in Luke 23:30. Cyril arrives at Luke 23:30 and the words of Hosea 10:8 being spoken from the mouth of Jesus and directly passes on to the significance of the words without mentioning the inter-textual usage.⁹² Instead, he places more emphasis on the enigmatic statement of "If they do this to the green tree, what will become of the withered?"⁹³ (Luke 23:31). It is not unexpected that Cyril would look at this enigmatic phrase and declare it "is pregnant with a spiritual signification."⁹⁴ The spiritual signification is that the green symbolizes Christ and his great deeds and glory and the withered symbolizes Israel lacking anything admirable and worthy of mercy. The conclusion is that as the Romans showed no mercy

⁹² Cyril Patriarch of Alexandria, 1983, page 606.

⁹³ *Ibid*, page 606.

⁹⁴ *Ibid*, page 606.

to Christ, so they would show less mercy on the Jews.⁹⁵ This spiritual interpretation illustrates how Cyril finds the spiritual meaning based upon the object considered pointing to or symbolizing Christ.

Interestingly enough, Cyril uses other verses from Hosea to begin building the theme of Israel's punishment at the hands of Romans in consequence of their rejection of Jesus. Earlier in this same homily, two verses from Hosea seven (13 and 16) are used with Isaiah 5:7 to expound on the cry to crucify the Lord recorded by Luke. These three verses are used as proof how

the Lord had reprov'd them by the voice of the prophet Isaiah... And in another place He said of them, *Woe unto them, in that they have gone far from me; wretched are they, for they have sinned against Me; but I redeemed them and they spoke falsely against Me (7:13).* And again, *Their princes shall fall by the Sword, because of the rudeness of their tongue (7:16).*⁹⁶

These inter-textual connections are then connected to other inter-textual connections and these then show how their desire for the death of Jesus lead to the ruination of the Jews as evidenced in the Roman destruction of Israel.⁹⁷ While these passages are not what would currently be considered inter-textual allusions,⁹⁸ Cyril appears to find them connected on the basis of how spoken words are linked first with sin and second with affliction. He then builds off of this connection his understanding of the New Testament passage.

Before entering into Cyril's work on Hosea, it is worth noting Cyril's use of Hosea 6:6⁹⁹ in his commentary on Luke's Gospel. Although Luke does not quote Hosea 6:6, Cyril briefly mentions this verse while expounding the sixth chapter of Luke. This

⁹⁵ *Ibid*, pages 606-607.

⁹⁶ *Ibid*, page 604.

⁹⁷ *Ibid*, pages 604-607.

⁹⁸ At least any mention of such are absent in Beale and Carson, pages 392-394, The UBS Text, and the Nestle-Aland text.

⁹⁹ For I desire steadfast love and not sacrifice, the knowledge of God rather than burnt offerings. (ESV)

could be a case of Cyril's confusion of unique material from Matthew's Gospel (12:7)¹⁰⁰ with the parallel narrative in Luke.¹⁰¹ However, given the quote itself, it appears as though Cyril added the Matthean material and then added the latter half of the verse from Hosea to complete the Hosean thought, "*But God said, I require mercy, and not sacrifice; and the acknowledgement of God, and not whole burnt offerings.*"¹⁰² From his incorporation of the entirety of the Hosean passage it is evident that Cyril was aware of the greater context of the verse beyond Matthean use of this text. This awareness is both evident and yet lacking in his exegesis, as he notes "[b]y mercy then is signified, Justification and grace in Christ; even that which is by faith. For we have been justified, not by the works of the law that we have done, but by His great mercy. And sacrifice means the Law of Moses."¹⁰³

His inter-textual awareness might be lacking because he does not appear to bring into the picture the prophet's σκοπός and how that relates to the meaning of these words. His awareness, however, is quite evidenced in his theological understanding of the passage in Hosea through the lens of the New Testament. Such appears in a portion of his comment on Hosea 6:6,

Christ is truly *mercy* from the Father, his purpose being to remove sins, forgive faults, to justify by faith, to save the lost... Therefore, *knowledge of God* is better than *sacrifices and holocausts* when achieved in Christ; it is through him, and in him that we have come to know the Father, and are enriched with justification by faith.¹⁰⁴

¹⁰⁰ I desire mercy, and not sacrifice (ESV)

¹⁰¹ Smith even notes, Cyril was "most familiar with St. Matthew's Gospel, and not only does he make his ordinary quotations from it, but even introduces its readings into the Commentary, after correctly giving St. Luke's text at the head of the Homily." Cyril Patriarch of Alexandria, 1983, page 30.

¹⁰² Cyril Patriarch of Alexandria, *Commentary on the Gospel of Saint Luke*, 1983, page 122. Note also that Matthew's quotation of Hosea 6:6 is "I desire mercy, and not sacrifice" while Cyril quotes "But God said, I require mercy, and not sacrifice; and the acknowledgement of God, and not whole burnt offerings."

¹⁰³ Ibid, page 122.

¹⁰⁴ Cyril of Alexandria, 2007, page 143.

In this, there is a clear conceptual parallel between the *Jesus, mercy, and justification by faith* in both passages. The very oddities of this quote and its relation to Cyril's reading of inter-textual quotes demonstrate both his lack of concern or confusion about the particulars of the passage and his understanding of the theological unity of Scripture. A discussion on the theological connections between the Old Testament passage and the New Testament passage will be reserved for a later portion of this paper, where this passage will be dealt with in greater depth.

B. Cyril's Reading of Hosea

Cyril's general lack of focus on the Old Testament passage in his reading of the passages where the evangelists deemed fit to quote the Old Testament does not mean that he cannot find the New Testament quotation to be of far greater importance in his reading of the Old Testament. In light of Cyril's understanding of Scripture, it could well be worthwhile to ask if Cyril will see in the Old Testament passages quoted in the New Testament a place from which to see Christ in the Old Testament? The answer to this question is not affirmed as strongly as one may wish for the sake of a thesis statement, yet is affirmed through comparing the constancy and the inconstancy in his reading of Luke against his reading of Hosea. Before entering straightaway into discovering that answer, it behooves one to get a feeling for the journey and view Cyril's own framework for reading Hosea.

1. Methodology

In the prologue of his commentary on the *prophetas minores*, Cyril outlines his exegetical method in contrast to unnamed others.

People generally find it easy, in fact, to adapt the commentary they give to what seems the intention of the Holy Spirit, in some cases moving easily from the facts,

or the visible events that happened and, as it were, fall within their vision, to interior and spiritual realities, and in other cases penetrating in quite an obscure fashion to the events at a physical level. As far as possible we shall present the characters' own intentions-laments and proclamations, references to past happenings, and predictions of the future. There is need therefore, for clear discernment of each detail to the extent possible, necessarily preserving the sequence of ideas and the difference in character, this being the way for our treatment to be completely clear, uncomplicated, and free of all difficulty¹⁰⁵

In this statement Cyril, in a way, carves out the middle ground of exegetical practices of his day. Instead of creating a commentary such as Didymus the Blind (who would be a case of “moving easily from the facts, or the visible events that happened and, as it were, fall within their vision, to interior and spiritual realities”) or Theodore of Mopsuestia (a case of “penetrating in quite an obscure fashion to the events at a physical level”), Cyril will deal with the characters' own intentions without unduly dwelling on the physical details. When viewed in light of Cyril's understanding of prophecy and the *τέλος* of Scripture, there is an implicit assurance that there will be occasions where the prophets will intentionally and knowingly speak of Christ. Yet, Cyril's self-stated objectives are directed to elucidating the author's setting, intended meaning, and fulfillment of prophetic statements.

2. On the Historicity of Hosea

Cyril's methodology stated in the prologue quickly encounters a passage that had elicited (and still elicits) multiple interpretations. This passage is the command that God gave Hosea to marry “a wife of prostitution” and his subsequent marriage to Gomer. At this point Cyril makes explicit his feeling about the literal and spiritual sense of Scripture as he rejects both the view that the marriage with Gomer was not factual or was tasteless.

No argument would persuade us to repudiate the text, to condemn the unlikelihood of the facts, to dismiss the tastelessness of the event itself or even to

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid*, page 28.

think (as some commentators do) that there was no marital intercourse with Gomer, when the sacred text says a conception took place and a birth as well, cites also the child's name, and mentions the woman's father and in addition to the woman's actual name.¹⁰⁶

Opposed to other commentators (whom he does not mention by name), Cyril takes the view that Hosea demonstrated his godliness by obeying God's command without hesitation and by marriage saved Gomer from being vile and promiscuous.¹⁰⁷ Both obedience to God and marriage are good things, therefore there is nothing tasteless or unhistorical in the passage. This wholehearted affirmation of the historicity of the text does not displace Cyril's understanding of the spiritual significance. Cyril looked at the causal statement "*Because the land has prostituted itself by forsaking the Lord*"¹⁰⁸ and declared, "[t]he action... would in fact be understood as a type of spiritual happening."¹⁰⁹ Thus, it is not a literal prostitution that has occurred but a forsaking of the Lord for the worship of Baals and the golden heifers at Dan and Bethel. This demonstrates Cyril's method of reading figurative language in a figurative and not a literal(istic) manner and, in this case, a point of accessing the spiritual meaning.

3. Exegesis of Hosea Passages Quoted in the New Testament

a. Passages Quoted outside of Matthew and Luke

Cyril's understanding of the spiritual and the literal meaning have been clearly portrayed in the first few verses of Hosea. It is worthwhile not to belabor the point and go on to examine the Hosean passages quoted in the New Testament, with particular care given to those used in Matthew and Luke. There are six verses in Hosea that are quoted

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid*, pages 39-40.

¹⁰⁷ *Ibid*, pages 42-47. That Gomer did not remain in this high estate is her own fault and not the fault of Hosea.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid*, page 48.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid*, page 48.

in the New Testament; Matthew and Luke quote three of these verses and the other three are quoted by Paul (two in Romans, and one in 1 Corinthians). For two of Paul's quotations from Hosea, Cyril offers no clear evidence that he is aware of the quotation. In commenting on Hosea 1:10, he makes no mention of Paul's quotation of it in Romans 9:26.¹¹⁰ Instead, he reads the passage with a historical perspective noting this prophecy was fulfilled after the crucifixion of Jesus in the expulsion of the Jews from their land and the destruction of the Temple. These historical facts clearly prove the Jews are no longer sons of God.¹¹¹ In a similar manner, Cyril makes no mention of Paul's quotation of Hosea 2:23 in Romans 9:25.¹¹² The focus of this passage is again a delineation of who are the people of God and how they became such.¹¹³ That Cyril does not mention the Apostle's quotation of these words does not mean that his exegesis is unaffected by the context in which Paul quotes these two verses. The context of Romans 9 is clearly a discussion regarding the identity of the people of God. That Cyril then reads these two verses in Hosea as speaking to the same issue of the identity of the people of God should not be overlooked. However, it is difficult to posit that the meaning Cyril found in these verses is purely derived from Paul's use in Romans, for it is rather likely that these verses in Hosea are discussing the identity of the people of God.

Cyril's exegesis offers a distinct feel when one reads his comment on Hosea 13:14.¹¹⁴ Once again, Cyril makes no mention of Paul's quotation of this verse in 1

¹¹⁰ "And in the very place where it was said to them, 'You are not my people,' there they will be called 'sons of the living God.'" (ESV)

¹¹¹ Cyril of Alexandria, 2007, page 60.

¹¹² and I will sow her for myself in the land. And I will have mercy on No Mercy, and I will say to Not My People, 'You are my people'; and he shall say, 'You are my God.' (ESV)

¹¹³ Cyril of Alexandria, 2007, pages 92-93.

¹¹⁴ Hosea 13:14 ποῦ ἡ δίκη σου θάνατε ποῦ τὸ κέντρον σου ἕδη
1 Corinthians 15:55 ποῦ σου, θάνατε, τὸ νίκος; ποῦ σου, θάνατε, τὸ κέντρον;

Corinthians 15:55. He looks at this passage as teaching about what Christ has accomplished by his sacrificial death. Interestingly enough, he offers, “Paul in his wisdom interpreted it this way for us, saying, ‘The goad of death is sin, and the power of sin is the Law.’” This, of course, is a quote of 1 Corinthians 15:56. Without mentioning Paul’s quotation, he explicitly follows Paul’s interpretation of this verse in Hosea to define the meaning of this verse. Within his exegesis of this passage, there is no hint of a theologically motivated polemic against heretics, Jews, or pagans. Therefore, it would seem this is a clear example of Cyril finding the meaning of an Old Testament passage *via* the context in which it is set in the New Testament passage wherein it is quoted.

b. Passages Quoted in Matthew and Luke

Turning to the three passages quoted in Matthew and Luke, Cyril does not continue to demonstrate an approach that finds the meaning of a Hosean passage *via* the context in which it is quoted in the New Testament. Instead, he exhibits an approach that is inconsistent from verse to verse. In one place he will exegete as though the New Testament has no bearing upon the meaning, in another it will determine the meaning, and then in the last it will be noted and be of little impact.

Further interpretive influence is evidenced in the textual variance between Hosea 13:14 (δίκη) and 1st Corinthians 15:55 (νίκος). It is of no small importance that Cyril demonstrates a shift in wording during his exegesis. His reading of Hosea notes “Death, where is your vengeance?” whereas in further mentions of this phrase, he writes “victory of death” and “Death where is your victory?” This would be an important piece of evidence for discerning further influences of Paul’s quote were it not for the uncertainty as to whether or not Cyril’s original document may have read νίκος, since there is a textual note regarding Cyril’s commentary in Pusey’s work. That preceding scholars feel that δίκη is a preferred reading does lend some credence to the position that Cyril reads νίκος into his comments instead of continuing to read δίκη as the Hosea text he quotes at the beginning of his comment reads. This could well be a part of Cyril reading not only theology, but the actual words of Paul’s usage of this passage back into the context of Hosea (Cyril of Alexandria, 2007, pages 245-246).

The quote of Hosea 11:1¹¹⁵ in Matthew 2:15¹¹⁶ is good place to begin viewing Cyril's exegesis of Hosea passages quoted by Matthew and Luke. In his comment, Cyril makes no mention of any New Testament quotation of the verse. Rather, Cyril is concerned with drawing a moral lesson from the history of the people of Israel. Even though God loved them and brought them out of Egypt they departed from right thinking in vast numbers causing God to depart from them.¹¹⁷ In this, there is no mention of a New Testament verse or an implicit use of a New Testament verse. It seems as though at this verse Cyril is content to read Hosea purely within the context of the Old Testament and the history contained therein.

Such is not the case with the other two passages in Hosea. Looking at Hosea 6:6,¹¹⁸ Cyril is quite content to see the judgment of God as clearly stated in Jesus. It is Jesus who will bring people to "honesty, goodness, compassion, love for one another, and true and an unambiguous knowledge of God"¹¹⁹ unlike those who follow the types and shadows of the Law.¹²⁰ So, when God says, "*I want mercy and not sacrifice, knowledge of God rather than holocausts*"¹²¹ Cyril quotes Matthew 7:12 and John 13:35 "So everything you want people to do to you do likewise to them... By this all will know that you are my disciples if you have love for one another"¹²² to display how important love is to God. It is in light of the New Testament that Cyril arrives at the meaning of this verse. However, there is no mention of Matthew's Gospel or Jesus speaking these same

¹¹⁵ "Because Israel was an infant and I loved him, and I called his children to leave Egypt. Just as I called them, so they departed from my sight." (Cyril of Alexandria, 2007, page 210)

¹¹⁶ This was to fulfill what the Lord had spoken by the prophet, "Out of Egypt I called my son." (ESV)

¹¹⁷ Cyril of Alexandria, 2007, pages 210-211.

¹¹⁸ "My judgment will go forth as a light. Because I desire mercy and not sacrifice, knowledge of God rather than holocausts." (Cyril of Alexandria, 2007, page 141)

¹¹⁹ Cyril of Alexandria, 2007, page 142.

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*, pages 141-142.

¹²¹ *Ibid.*, page 142.

¹²² *Ibid.*, page 142.

words to a later generation. In keeping with his understanding of the σκοπός and τέλος of Scripture, Cyril overtly interprets this verse with a Christological understanding in light of a New Testament context presented without the passages wherein these words are spoken from the mouth of Christ.

In distinction from the previous two verses, Cyril clearly notes Jesus quoting Hosea 10:8. However in noting the quotation, Cyril does not mention the variance in the texts of Luke 23:30¹²³ and Hosea 10:8.¹²⁴ This textual variant is evidenced in the texts Cyril quotes in his commentaries; Hosea 10:8 in Cyril's text reads "*They will say to the mountains, Cover us, and to the hills, Fall on us*"¹²⁵ whereas Luke 23:30 is "Then shall they begin to say unto the mountains, Fall on us; and to the hills, Cover us."¹²⁶ This variance in texts is of interest in that when Cyril comments on Hosea 10:8, he notes "Christ used identical words: 'Then you will say to the mountains, Cover us, and to the hills, Fall on us.'"¹²⁷ In so noting the usage, Cyril does not note the variance in the wording between the text he was using of Hosea and the text he was using of Luke.¹²⁸ While this obviously demonstrates his awareness that these words were quoted in Luke, the New Testament usage has no overt bearing on his understanding of the verse. Instead, Jesus' usage is noted to speak of the coming destruction for the Jews who

¹²³ τότε ἄρξονται λέγειν τοῖς ὄρεσιν, Πέσατε ἐφ' ἡμᾶς, καὶ τοῖς βουνοῖς, Καλύψατε ἡμᾶς·

¹²⁴ καὶ ἐροῦσιν τοῖς ὄρεσιν καλύψατε ἡμᾶς καὶ τοῖς βουνοῖς πέσατε ἐφ' ἡμᾶς

¹²⁵ Cyril of Alexandria, 2007, page 199.

¹²⁶ Payne, page 604.

¹²⁷ *Ibid*, pages 199-200.

¹²⁸ It may be possible that Cyril had a text of Luke at hand or in mind while writing his commentary on Hosea that varies with the text of Luke he had when expositing that Gospel. The odds of this actually being the case are slim because there is no note of a textual variant regarding the wording of Luke 23:30. Such lack of important variants cannot be said for Hosea 10:8 in which *Codex Alexandrinus* follows the order that is visible in Luke 23:30 (Beale and Carson, page 395). A far more likely option is that Cyril was aware of the quote in Luke 23:30 while being incognizant (or perhaps unconcerned) of the change in word order between the two passages. Such could easily be the case if he believed that the two passages were synonymous.

rejected him. And this is then used to support the notion that “the enormity of disasters sometimes present death... as very desirable to the general run of people.”¹²⁹ So, the meaning of these words have a general meaning as seen in Jesus’ quote and have a specific historical meaning in reference to the coming Babylonian conquest and captivity.¹³⁰

c. Lukan Allusions

Having already examined how in Cyril’s commentary on Luke he has a propensity to spend a greater time explaining the importance of an Old Testament allusion in the New Testament passage wherein there is an allusion, it is worthwhile to examine a couple of passages in Hosea to see if Cyril finds allusions in the New Testament to be as important for interpreting the Old Testament passage.

In Cyril’s work on Luke 21, there is no comment on the pericope in which verse 22¹³¹ is located. As inter-textual allusions within Luke have been previously discussed, it does not limit the ability to read his comment on Hosea 9:7¹³² and see what, if any, effect this allusion has on his interpretation. Cyril’s comment on Hosea 9:7 contains neither nuggets nor flakes that even glimmer of a Lukan allusion to this passage.¹³³ Likewise, when one turns to Cyril’s comment on Hosea 6:2¹³⁴ it is devoid of any apparent connection to Luke 24:46.¹³⁵ Instead of linking “days” to the days Christ was dead and then raised, Cyril reads the days as referring to the three periods of human history with

¹²⁹ Cyril of Alexandria, 2007, page 200.

¹³⁰ *Ibid*, page 200.

¹³¹ “for these are days of vengeance, to fulfill all that is written.” (ESV)

¹³² “The days of punishment have come, the days of your retribution have come, and Israel will be distressed, like the demented prophet, someone spirit-filled” (Cyril of Alexandria, 2007, page 180.)

¹³³ Cyril of Alexandria, 2007, pages 180-181.

¹³⁴ After two days he will revive us; on the third day he will raise us up, that we may live before him. (ESV)

¹³⁵ and said to them, “Thus it is written, that the Christ should suffer and on the third day rise from the dead, (ESV)

the third day being the time when Christ was made manifest. The phrase “*we shall rise and live in his presence*”¹³⁶ is interpreted to speak of how through the death of Christ one is no longer outside of God’s vision, but has access to God through Christ.¹³⁷ Such exegesis further reveals Cyril’s view of the centrality of Adam and Christ being the second Adam in his understanding of the Biblical narrative, and in silence offers something of his exegesis of inter-textual occurrences. While arguments from silence are often tenuous by nature, silence in exegesis does speak, although softly.¹³⁸ The message of silence for allusions in their Old Testament context compared with the propensity for explanation of Old Testament allusions when used in the New Testament demonstrates some concerns Cyril had in his exegesis.

C. Cyril’s Reading of Matthew

Cyril’s commentary on Matthew is dealt with lastly due to its limited impact on this study. This lengthy commentary on the Gospel according to Matthew is preserved in fragmentary form.¹³⁹ As such, there is a distinct difficulty in properly examining his

¹³⁶ Cyril of Alexandria, 2007, page 139.

¹³⁷ *Ibid*, pages 138-139.

¹³⁸ 1 Peter 2:10 is said to allude to four verses in Hosea (1:6, 9; 2:1; and 2:23). In Cyril’s comment on these verses in Hosea there is no mention of 1 Peter’s allusion to them. Rather, there is a repeated theme of the rejection of the Jews as the people of God and the inclusion of the Gentiles with the believing remnant of Israel. (Cyril of Alexandria, 2007, pages 54-58, 64, 92-93) Interestingly enough, this interpretation has some obvious parallels with 1 Peter 2:10 “Once you were not a people, but now you are God’s people; once you had not received mercy, but now you have received mercy.” (ESV) Likewise in Hosea 6:5 and the allusion in Ephesians 6:17, there is no mention of the New Testament in Cyril’s comment. Cyril of Alexandria, 2007, page 141.) Turning to Hosea 1:10 and the allusion in Romans 9:27-28, Cyril quotes Isaiah 10:22-23 (which is in turn quoted in Romans 9:27-28), making no mention of Romans. This consistent silence while commenting on Hosean verses alluded to in the New Testament furthers the argument from silence made in the body of this paper.

¹³⁹ This is a particularly frustrating set of circumstances, as Cyril’s comment on Matthew 2:15 and the Evangelist’s quotation of Hosea 11:1 is not among the remaining fragments of his commentary. Especially since it is among one of the verses that Emperor Julian the Apostate apparently made use of in his work *Contra Galilaeos*.

Julian is thoroughly unpersuaded by Matthew’s use of OT prophecies to interpret the life of Jesus. While commenting on Hosea 11:1, Jerome quotes Julian: ‘ The words that were written concerning Israel, Matthew the Evangelist (2:15) transferred to Christ, that he might mock the

exegesis of Matthew's quotation of the Old Testament. There are few extant passages in Cyril's work that cover portions in which the evangelist actually quotes from the Old Testament. Even in these limited places, the difficulty is compounded because the entirety of Cyril's comment on the passage has not survived.¹⁴⁰ In spite of this, it is possible to examine what remains and make some observations regarding how well his practice coheres with his practices in Luke and Hosea.

An example of Cyril's exegesis of Matthew's quotation of the Old Testament being overshadowed by theology is evident in Matthew 27:46 and the use of Psalm 22:1 in the mouth of Jesus. No mention is made of the Psalm, as the focus is on how Jesus says such words as man and not as God.¹⁴¹ In a different vein, the quote of Exodus 20:12 and 21:17 in Matthew 15:4 are noted as commands of God, and then the focus turns to moral exhortations for the readers.¹⁴²

The one notable exception to this practice of overlooking the Old Testament in his exegesis of the Gospel According to Matthew is in Matthew 21:9.¹⁴³ Concerning Matthew 21:9 and the evangelist's quotation of Psalm 118:25-26, Cyril's fragment begins

simplicity of those Gentiles who believed' ... In his (Julian's) view, Mathew misuses the text from Hosea (Cook, pages 290-291.)

Though it is Cyril's response to *Contra Galilaeos* that serves as the primary source of Julian's work (Cook, 284.), Cyril's *Contra Iulianum* offers no exegetical rebuttal of Julian's interpretation of this passage. The cause of this absence could likely be due to the fact that Cyril's rebuttal of Julian is incomplete, quite likely due to Cyril's (un?)timely death. (Malley, page 244.). Alas, but that passage in which Cyril's comment would certainly have elucidated his view of Scripture, inter-textual quoting, and prophecy is unpreserved and possibly even unwritten!

¹⁴⁰ Nota Bene: Matthean allusions of Old Testament passages will not be included due to the same difficulty in finding enough words to piece together what Cyril was actually saying and doing with the text.

¹⁴¹ Joseph Reuss, *Matthaus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirke*, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1957, page 265.

¹⁴² *Ibid*, pages 212-213.

¹⁴³ While the fragments of Cyril's commentary on Matthew examined in this paper demonstrate a practical overlooking of the Old Testament context of quotes made by Matthew, it does not mean that Cyril actually did such in the commentary. It is possible that the missing passages contain a far greater interaction with the Old Testament contexts than is revealed in the extant fragments. Such would seem less than likely given Cyril's fairly consistent methodology and practice in his commentary on Luke runs fairly parallel to the perceived practices in his commentary on Matthew, but it is a stretch to make bold assertions about a non-extant text.

by quoting Ὡσαννὰ τῷ υἱῷ Δαυίδ εὐλογημένος.¹⁴⁴ He then notes the Hebrew that is in the 118 Psalm (117 in LXX) as shown in the transliteration: ANNA AΔΩNAI ΩΣΙΑΝNA, AΔΩNAI AΣΛΙΑΝNA, BAPOYX ABBA BΣIAM.¹⁴⁵ In this quote of the Hebrew text¹⁴⁶ there is no note of a text break and so it appears as though Cyril quotes verse 25, while omitting one word, and the first portion of 26. From the passages hitherto examined, it is quite rare for Cyril to offer a quote from the other passage in an inter-textual quote. His self-stated reasons for the quote and actual exegesis are lacking since the fragment ends with BΣIAM. It would seem logical (to this author) that Cyril notes the Hebrew to explain the origins of the word Ὡσαννὰ that the people are crying when Jesus enters Jerusalem. Beyond that, it is difficult to determine his reasons for incorporating a significant quote of transliterated Hebrew into his discussion of Matthew 21:9.

D. Theological Connections

There are several instances in which Cyril offers no overt connection between the Old Testament and New Testament context, yet will find the same meaning for the quoted words in each passage and even the same theological significance. This opens a distinct possibility that even though Cyril makes no note of an inter-textual quotation, his actual exegesis is guided by his reading of the other passage. Therefore, it is worthwhile

¹⁴⁴ Reuss, 1957, page 232.

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid*, page 232.

¹⁴⁶ אָנָּא יְהוָה הוֹשִׁיעָה נָּא אָנָּא יְהוָה הַצְּלִיחָה נָּא 118:25 (Note, it would appear that either אָנָּא יְהוָה הַצְּלִיחָה נָּא becomes AΔΩNAI AΣΛΙΑΝNA in Cyril's work, or Cyril is making use of a text (either Hebrew through a Jewish acquaintance or the Hexapla) at variance with the Masoretic Text at this point. The practice of having a א disappear in the transliteration seems a little odd to this author. No answer will be posited in this work since determining the nature of Cyril's sources for Hebrew transliteration is well beyond the scope of this project.)

בְּרוּךְ הָבֵא בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה בְּרִכְנוּכֶם מִבֵּית יְהוָה 118:26 (Quoted from the 4th Edition of the Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia. The words omitted in Cyril's transliteration are italicized)

to re-examine a couple of passages to attempt a better understanding of how Cyril actually connects inter-textual quotations.

1. Hosea 6, Matthew 9, and Luke 6

For this paper, the most interesting passage to re-examine is Hosea 6:6 and Matthew 12:7 (and 9:13) in conjunction with Cyril’s comment on Luke 6 that inserts Hosea 6:6 into Luke. In these passages, Cyril makes no note of any inter-textual quoting or source. Yet in the three passages examined in his commentaries, Cyril makes parallel theological comments. In Hosea, Luke, and Matthew, Cyril mentions *Jesus, mercy, and justification by faith* in his comment on the words “*I want mercy and not sacrifice, knowledge of God rather than holocausts.*”¹⁴⁷ Note the parallels between Luke 6 and Hosea 6 as they are rather striking.

Comment on Hosea 6	Comment on Matthew 9	Comment on Luke 6
<p>“Christ is truly <i>mercy</i> from the Father, his purpose being to remove sins, to forgive faults, to justify by faith, to save the lost and make them proof against death. ... Therefore, <i>knowledge of God</i> is better than <i>sacrifices and holocausts</i> when achieved in Christ; it is through him and in him that we have come to know the Father, and are enriched with justification by faith.”¹⁴⁸</p>	<p>“For He desires a faithful righteous man, not that written in the law, namely the appointed sacrifices... Therefore by faith we were justified, a gift apart from works of the law.”¹⁴⁹</p>	<p>“But God said, I require mercy, and not sacrifice: and the acknowledgment of God, and not whole burnt offerings. What is meant by mercy? and what by sacrifice? By mercy then is signified, Justification and grace in Christ; even that which is by faith. For we have been justified, not by the works of the law that we have done, but by his great mercy. And sacrifice means the law of Moses.”¹⁵⁰</p>

¹⁴⁷ Cyril of Alexandria, 2007, page 142.

¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, page 143.

¹⁴⁹ Author’s own translation. Reuss, 1957, page 187.

¹⁵⁰ Cyril Patriarch of Alexandria, 1983, page 122.

Between Hosea 6 and Luke 6 there is an apparent dissonance between Cyril's understanding of what "mercy" signifies. This is evident in how "mercy" is viewed as "Christ" in Hosea 6, but in Luke 6 it is viewed as "justification and grace in Christ." The apparent dissonance however is far more apparent than substantive as Hosea 6 then delineates the purpose of Christ which reveals a purpose having strong parallels with the significance of "mercy" in Luke 6: justification by faith. It is the idea of justification by faith that appears as central within Cyril's comment on each of these three passages. Then with justification by faith being central to the meaning, it is evident that either a grand happenstance occurred in Cyril's commentary that he would have such parallels regarding this inter-textual occurrence, or, far more likely, Cyril views a theological connection between these passages based upon the shared content. That is, the inter-textual quote, though unacknowledged in his exegesis, is interpreted to have the same significance regardless of context within the canon or passage of the particular book.

How then should these theological connections be viewed? The very substance of these comments suggests a couple of options: either Cyril was connecting inter-textual occurrences quite apart from any overt notation, or that certain words and phrases consistently have the same theological meaning and referent. Legitimate reasons exist for both positions. For the former, it would appear arbitrary and arrogant to assume that Cyril could not intentionally build his theological reading off an unnoted inter-textual occurrence, as his exegesis will routinely have unnoted quotes from other biblical passages. For the latter, it is quite possible that Cyril simply viewed the set of words

being used in all three passages as having a consistent referent and meaning.¹⁵¹ Thus, Paul could have quoted these same words in an epistle and Cyril’s comment would have held consistent regarding the centrality of justification by faith in the meaning. In all likelihood, the answer lies in a combination of both options. It would appear ludicrous to claim that Cyril was unaware of the inter-textual quotation because he quotes the Hosea passage in Luke. Likewise, Cyril’s theological meaning is, in all likelihood, not reliant upon the context of which particular book quotes it, as it appears to have a greater context, a theological context.

2. Movement of Theological Meaning

Cyril’s reading of the Old Testament clearly reveals a movement of theological significance from the New Testament into the Old Testament. This is particularly evident in Cyril’s discussion of justification by faith and noting the “mercy” of God to be Christ. Such notions are obviously derived from the New Testament. That Cyril finds the Old Testament speaking to such things should come as no surprise given his understanding of the *τέλος* and *σκοπός* of Scripture being the person and work of Christ. What might appear surprising is the opportunities Cyril passes to mention Christ. This lack of

¹⁵¹ Cyril’s interpretation of Hosea 10:8 and Luke 23:30 provide some support that even though the quoted words are understood with different historical referents, the actual phrase signifies the same thing.

Comment on Hosea 10:8	Comment on Luke 23:30
<p>“In fact, things will reach such a state of misery and terror that they will choose rather to be under the <i>mountains and hills</i> than live to see the things they were forced to unwillingly endure. ... Excess of troubles, you see, and the enormity of disasters sometimes present death, harsh though it may be, as very desirable to the general run of people. ... <i>Fall on us</i> and anticipate the ferocity of the Babylonian sword and the inglorious and intolerable misery of life in captivity.</p>	<p>“How or in what manner? Because when the war fell upon the country of the Jews, they all perished utterly, small and great; and infants with their mothers, and sons with their fathers, were destroyed without distinction. Then, He says shall men count it above all price to be crushed under the hills and mountains; for in extreme miseries those misfortunes which are less severely cruel become, so to speak, desirable.”</p>
<p>(Cyril of Alexandria, 2007, pages 199-200.)</p>	<p>(Cyril Patriarch of Alexandria, 1983, page 606.)</p>

consistent Christological comment¹⁵² in exchange for reading a passage within the historical setting (understood as the setting described in the Historical Books in the Bible) appears to be far more an Antiochene practice than Alexandrian one. This apparent inconsistency could fit within Cyril's understanding of the σκοπός of Hosea. It is also possible that Cyril found other theological and moral concerns within these passages that he could have deemed more pertinent for his intended readers than Christological comments.

Given how Cyril is considered to place near equal emphasis on the historical meaning of the Scripture as Theodore and Theodoret did, Cyril's exegesis reveals some distinctions in the movement of theological meaning from the New Testament into the Old Testament. Cyril's work on Hosea lucidly demonstrates a greater movement of New Testament theology into it than Theodore of Mopsuestia's work on Hosea.¹⁵³ Conversely, Theodoret of Cyrus' work on Hosea demonstrates an awareness of the New Testament¹⁵⁴ similar to that of Cyril with the notable exception of methodology. Cyril engages the text in such a way that there can be more than one meaning in a particular passage because there can be both a spiritual and literal meaning. Theodoret engages

¹⁵² This again is an argument from silence following a similar approach as noted on page 33. While what Cyril wrote is of primary importance, what Cyril did not write is also worth noting when viewing his exegesis. If he does not offer a Christological comment where one could be expected from an Alexandrian exegete, then the absence is worth noting.

¹⁵³ Theodore makes no mention of anything that could be construed as even an allusion to distinctly New Testament theology or text during his comment on the passages from Hosea that are quoted in the New Testament (Hosea 1:10, 2:23, 6:6, 10:8, 11:1, 13:14). (Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Commentary on the Twelve Prophets*, The Fathers of the Church vol. 108, trans. Robert C. Hill. Washington D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2004, pages 44, 52, 66, 83, and 86.)

¹⁵⁴ Theodoret consistently connects the passages of Hosea quoted in the New Testament to other New Testament passages and so reads a theology from the New Testament into the book of Hosea. Therefore, Theodoret can quote Matthew 18:20 (For where two or three are gathered in my name, there am I among them. ESV) when discussing Hosea 1:10 and how God is not pleased merely by numbers. (Theodoret of Cyrus, *Commentaries on the Prophets: Volume Three Commentary on the Twelve Prophets*, trans. Robert C. Hill, Brookline, Mass: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 2006, page 42.) He engages in similar practices in commenting on Hosea 2:23 (page 46) and 6:6 (page 56)

with the text in such a way that there is only the literal meaning, yet at the same time he finds things that clearly prefigure Christ and prophetic statements that can only be understood as being fulfilled in the person of Christ.¹⁵⁵ While there is a similarity with Theodoret in theologically connecting the New Testament into Hosea, Cyril demonstrates a greater incorporation of New Testament contexts in which a verse in Hosea is quoted than Theodoret.

The likeliest reason for Cyril's theological reading in this manner is directly linked to his understanding of the spiritual sense of Scripture. If one does not understand the symbols that represent "the various realities that belong to Christ's mystery"¹⁵⁶ as speaking of Christ, then one would have failed to rightly interpret Scripture with its own literary context. In Cyril's attempt to interpret Scripture rightly, he is nearly obligated to speak about the Old Testament through the paradigms and clarity brought by the New Testament. Therefore it is rather expected to have this New Testament flavor brought to Old Testament texts.

The one instance in which the context of the Old Testament plays a preeminent role in interpreting a New Testament passage is Psalm 91:11-12 as quoted in Luke 4:10-11; this was done to disprove Arian Christology by reading a Psalm in a non-Christological manner. With Christology at the center of the reasoning for the extended comment and overt influence, it displays the influence of New Testament theology as being the very thing that drives the Old Testament text into the New Testament context. In regards to the Hosea passages, Cyril's reading and notation demonstrate that even if he

¹⁵⁵ A good example of this is Theodoret's comment on Hosea 13:14, "While this happened as a type in the case of the return of the Jews... it attained real and complete fulfillment after the resurrection of our Savior, since with the resurrection of our first-fruits we all attained the hope of resurrection." (Theodoret of Cyrus, page 80.)

¹⁵⁶ Kerrigan, 1952, page 131.

is not consistently discussing how a particular verse or passage is used in the New Testament, he is often reading New Testament ideas and passages in Hosea. This shows Cyril is not an exegete who is concerned with a pure Old Testament reading undefiled by notions of the New Testament. For Cyril it is only in light of the New Testament that the types and shadows of the Old Testament can be rightly interpreted. However, Cyril would likely recoil in horror from the very notion of being accused of reading New Testament theology into the Old Testament. He was reading a text that was clearly already about Christ.¹⁵⁷ Not reading the Old Testament in this manner would simply muddle the meaning and result in one never understanding it any better than the Jews who continue in the stubborn rejection of God as their fathers did.

IV. Conclusion

A. Summary

The diversity in Cyril's exegesis of the inter-textual quotes examined in this work reveal a man who was not primarily concerned about following the connections to the Old Testament made by New Testament authors. Despite this lack of direct and consistent concern, Cyril's direct comments are sufficient to grasp how the New Testament authors' connections between Testaments influence his reading of the text. Thus it is not one or two passages that can truly demonstrate his praxes, but a multiplicity of passages. When viewed broadly, Cyril's exegesis demonstrates a greater propensity to interpret the Old Testament text quoted in the New Testament in the light of the New

¹⁵⁷ The value of discussing whether Cyril's theology preceded his exegetical practices or whether his exegetical practices led to his theology is rather unimportant at this point in this paper. While the answer would prove interesting to this discussion, it would also needlessly convolute and extended this paper because determining a good answer to this question would be an entire paper unto itself. Perhaps the simple answer, "both Cyril's exegesis and theology grow and build off of each other," will suffice for the present.

Testament's usage and interpretation. This propensity is quite coherent with his exegetical practices traced in this paper. For an individual who viewed Moses (i.e. the author of Torah) as teaching Trinitarian doctrine and Christ as the goal and conclusion of the entirety of Scripture, it would be utterly incoherent for him to offer a reading of the Old Testament that would appear as anything but heavily influenced by Jesus and the Apostles.

That his New Testament exegesis reveals a far greater lack of concern for the context of the inter-textual quote is probably best understood within the same paradigm that made a greater use of the New Testament in his Old Testament exegesis of quoted passages. There is little reason to read the types and shadows into the perspicuous revelation of God evidenced in the person and teaching of Jesus. When this theological paradigm is added to Cyril's engagement with inter-textual quotes, his praxes are understandable. Indeed, it is Cyril's theological paradigm and issues that appear to be the driving force behind the instances where he does offer serious engagement with the other Testament's context of an inter-textual quote.¹⁵⁸

Regarding his exegesis as a whole, it is difficult to discern what lies behind his exegetical actions. Cyril did not offer a treatise in which he elucidates why he exegetes Scripture in the manner that he did. This leaves the matter rather open to speculation about his reasoning and the influences behind his exegesis. There are a multitude of possible influences upon his exegetical methods (philosophical, Jewish, Antiochene, Alexandrian, etc...). That so many things could appear to have an influence on and in his exegesis could well point to a man who sought the strengths from a variety of sources, or a man who was influenced by the times in which he lived. It is also worth considering

¹⁵⁸ This practice appears to be very consistent with Origen's practice as outlined in the appendix.

that Cyril was a bishop. He could well have been aware of things in the text and not made mention of those things for the sake of focusing on the message he desired to leave with his people.

B. Appropriation

After such a historical/exegetical investigation, it is not inappropriate to ask what can be gained from such a study and what should be utilized in the present. What follows will not be a full critique of Cyril. Instead, the following discussion will attempt a dialogue in which aspects of Cyril's thought and practice can both challenge and be challenged.

In so keeping with the focus of this work, the first topic addressed should be Cyril's reading of the Old Testament in light of the New. What does Cyril offer for the present exegete? The first thing that stands out is Cyril's greater concern for reading the Old Testament in light of the New Testament passage that quotes it. From Cyril's work examined in the paper, it is quite clear that Cyril does not treat this movement anywhere near an imperative. Even though Cyril demonstrated awareness of an Old Testament passage being quoted in the New Testament, he does not avail himself of each quoted passage as a chance to speak of Jesus and the meaning of this quote in the New Testament. Thus one cannot posit that Cyril would encourage exegetes and expositors of the present to connect how the New Testament's quotations of an Old Testament verse affects the meaning and theology of every Old Testament passage that is quoted by the New Testament in every instance.¹⁵⁹ At the same time, it seems that Cyril would look at a practice of Old Testament exegesis that avoids engagement with the New Testament and doubt that it would even qualify as a Christian reading of Scripture. To him, it would

¹⁵⁹ This is not to say that Cyril would have discouraged such a work.

seem rather fallacious to try and read the types and symbols of the Old Testament apart from the clarity that is brought by the Jesus who is the τέλος of the Law.

While Cyril would encourage exegetes judiciously to incorporate New Testament theology into their reading of the Old Testament, it seems as though he himself failed to leave much of an example for how to read the Old Testament context into the New Testament. There does not appear to be much reason for the variance in his approach when compared with his treatment of allusion passages. It appears to this author that Cyril could well have overlooked the connections with Old Testament passages that the Evangelists wished to make within their works and so missed aspects or nuances of the text. Thus Cyril's reading of the New Testament's use of the Old does not set forth the most helpful exegetical paradigm.¹⁶⁰

That theological issues seem to drive Cyril's directed comment on inter-textual passages appears to be a bit of a double-edged sword. In one sense, it seems quite important that those who handle the Scriptures engage the theological issues of the day when one comments (or exposit) on verses related to the issue. Quite clearly, this is both commendable and worthy of emulation. In another sense, this theological motive gives the appearance that such inter-textual connections are only made for the sake of polemic. This seems to move the work of inter-textual exegesis from that of understanding the text and explaining it to that of using the text to prove a point. Perhaps it would be best to do the former without neglecting the latter.

There are several other exegetically interesting aspects to Cyril's approach that are worth discussing and engaging. In regard to his basic understanding of the text of

¹⁶⁰ Had Cyril discussed the use of Hosea 11:1 by Matthew in his commentary on Hosea, he could well have answered Julian's charge that Matthew misused Hosea before Cyril was even aware of such.

Scripture, Cyril held some views that even if not worth emulating are worth pondering. The most obvious of these is the two senses of Scripture that Cyril conceived. It would be difficult, if not absurd, to abuse Cyril with the idea that by seeing a spiritual meaning and using allegory he destroyed or did grave injustice to the authorially intended meaning of the text. While it is quite beyond this work to determine how many senses there are in Scripture, Cyril's sets forth an example that treats both senses as worthy of esteem. Further, his high view of the literal and his understanding of how the literal and the spiritual meanings function synergistically sets forth a helpful paradigm for exegetes trained in the historical grammatical method to examine the concept of literal and spiritual meanings.¹⁶¹

Another point worth pondering is Cyril's assertion that the Old Testament authors were Trinitarian in their theology and that the prophets who spoke of Christ did so with a full knowledge of Christ. It is worth pondering whether or not Moses who saw and spoke with God would have been in complete ignorance of the Trinitarian nature of God. Concerning the knowledge of the prophets, it is difficult to assert that they were ignorant of the object of their prophecy. Though both of these might be questions that go largely without firm answers, they certainly provide no small amount of importance for how one would approach the meaning of Old Testament passages.

Cyril's dual understanding of σκοπός and τέλος, in that each individual work collected in Scripture has its own distinct σκοπός and τέλος and yet the whole of Scripture shares the same σκοπός and τέλος, could be a helpful paradigm for doing Biblical Theology. In the aspects of Cyril's exegesis touched on in this paper, the τέλος

¹⁶¹ Whether or not there are multiple senses in Scripture and whether or not Cyril was correct in his relating of these senses to each other will remain unanswered in this paper.

of Scripture was presented as Christ with some further aspects of his person and work attached. Having this unifying theme does not destroy the particulars of each author's work and what the author attempted to bring about within that author's context. While one could offer a different/ differently nuanced τέλος of Scripture, it seems that a good Biblical theology will likewise maintain the integrity of both the individual works within the whole and the whole.

Perhaps one of the more important things to be gained from Cyril as an exegete is the apparent eclectic nature of his exegetical methods. There are many good answers as to what shaped Cyril's exegesis, and no single one of them makes for a complete answer. Cyril did not follow in the footsteps of those Alexandrian figures such as Origen and Didymus. At the same time, Cyril was not purely Jewish, neoplatonic, or Antiochene in his exegesis. In his exegesis, he reveals aspects of each of these sources (and perhaps others). In so doing, Cyril sets an example of an exegete who engages with the broader world of thought and interpretive practices in his exegesis, which is something that is well worth emulating.

Bibliography

Allenbach, J., A. Benoit, D.A. Bertrand, A. Hanriot-Coustet, P. Maraval, A. Paulte, and P. Prigent, *Biblia Patristica Volume I*, Paris, France: Centre National De La Recherche Scientifique, 1975

-, *Biblia Patristica Volume II*, Paris, France: Centre National De La Recherche Scientifique, 1977.

-, *Biblia Patristica Volume III*, Paris, France: Centre National De La Recherche Scientifique, 1980.

-, *Biblia Patristica Volume IV*, Paris, France: Centre National De La Recherche Scientifique, 1987.

-, *Biblia Patristica Volume V*, Paris, France: Centre National De La Recherche Scientifique, 1991.

Ambrose of Milan, *Exposition of the Holy Gospel of Luke*, 2nd ed., trans. Theodosia Tomkinson, Etna, CA: Center for Traditionalist Orthodox Studies, 2003.

Archer, Gleason L. and Chirichigno, G. C., *Old Testament Quotations in the New Testament: A Complete Survey*, Chicago, IL: Moody Press, 1983.

Beale, G. K., *Right Doctrine from the Wrong Texts?*, Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1994.

Beale, G. K. and Carson, D. A. *Commentary on the New Testament Use of The Old Testament*, Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2007.

Blowers, Paul M., Angela R. Christman, David G. Hunter, and Robin D. Young, *In Dominico Eloquentio: Essays on Patristic Exegesis in Honor of Robert Louis Wilken*, Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2002.

Bray, Gerald, *Biblical Interpretation Past and Present*, Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 1996.

Burrows, Mark S. & Paul Rorem, *Biblical Hermeneutics in Historical Perspective*, Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1991.

Carroll, Thomas K. *Preaching the Word*, Message of the Fathers of the Church volume 11. Wilmington, DE: Micheal Glazier Inc, 1984.

Carson, D. A. and John D. Woodbridge, *Scripture and Truth*, Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1992.

Cassel, David J. "Key Principles in Cyril of Alexandria's Exegesis." *Studia Patristica* XXXVII (2001): pages 413-420.

Cook, John Granger, *The Interpretation of the New Testament in Greco-Roman Paganism*, Peabody, MS: Hendrickson Publishers 2000.

Cross, F. L. *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1963.

Cyril of Alexandria, *Commentary on the Twelve Prophets, Volume I*, Fathers of the Church Volume 115, trans. Robert C. Hill, Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 2007.

-, *On The Unity of Christ*, trans. John A. McGunkin, Crestwood, NY: Saint Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1995.

-, *Select Letters*, ed. and trans. Lionel R. Wickman, Oxford: Claredon Press, 1983.

-, *Commentary on the Gospel of Saint Luke*, trans. R. Payne Smith. Astoria, NY: Studion Publishing, 1983.

de Lubac, Henri, *Medieval Exegesis vol. 1: The Four Senses of Scripture*, trans. Marc Sebanc, Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998.

Dockery, David S., *Biblical Interpretation Then and Now: Contemporary Hermeneutics in Light of the Early Church*, Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1992.

Drobner, Hubertus R. *The Fathers of the Church: A Comprehensive Introduction*, trans, Siegfried S. Schatzmann, Peabody, MS: Hendrickson Publishers, 2007.

Ferreiro, Alberto, ed., *The Twelve Prophets*, Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture Old Testament XIV, ed. Thomas C. Oden. Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 2003.

Froelich, Karlfried, *Biblical Interpretation in the Early Church*, Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press, 1984.

Hatch, Edwin, *The Influence of Greek Ideas on Christianity*, New York, NY: Harper & Brothers Pulbishers, 1957.

Harmon, Steven R. "A Note on the Critical Instruments for the Retrieval of Patristic Biblical Exegesis" *Journal of Early Christian Studies*, 11 no. 1 Spring 2001, pages 95-107.

Hauser, Alan J. and Watson, Duane F., *A History of Biblical Interpretation Vol. 1 The Ancient Period*, Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2003.

Hawthorne, Gerald F. *Current Issues in Biblical and Patristic Exegesis*, Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1975.

Heine, Ronald E. *Reading the Old Testament with the Ancient Church: Exploring the Formation of Early Christian Thought*, Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2007.

Just Jr., Arthur A., ed., *Luke*, Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture New Testament III, ed. Thomas C. Oden. Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 2003.

Kannengiesser, Charles, *Handbook of Patristic Exegesis Volume One*, Boston, MA: Brill, 2004.

-, *Handbook of Patristic Exegesis Volume Two*, Boston, MA: Brill, 2004.

Keating, Daniel A., *The Appropriation of Divine Life in Cyril of Alexandria*, New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Kerrigan, Alexander, *St. Cyril of Alexandria: Interpreter of the Old Testament*, Rome, Italy: Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1952.

Koen, Lars, "Partitive Exegesis in Cyril of Alexandria's Commentary on the Gospel according to St. John" *Studia Patristica* XXV (1991): pages 115-121.

Lawler, Michael G. and Gail S. Risch, *Practical Theology: Perspectives From the Plains*, Omaha, NE: Creighton University Press, 2000.

Lingshirm, William E. and Mark Vessey, *The Limits of Ancient Christianity: Essays on Late Antique Thought and Culture in Honor of R. A. Markus*, Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press, 1999.

Menzies, Allan, *The Ante-Nicean Fathers: Volume X, Added Volume Peter, Tatian, Commentaries of Origen*, Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1980.

Malley, William J., *Hellenism and Christianity*, Roma: Universita Gregoriana Editrice, 1978.

McKinon Steven A., *Cyril of Alexandria, The Old Testament, and Images of Christ for the Church*, Portland, OR: Theological Research Exchange Network. Presented at the Southeastern Regional Evangelical Theological Society Meeting, 1999.

Minge, J.-P. *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Seu Bibliotheca Universalis, Integra, Uniformis, Commoda, Oeconomica, Omnium SS. Patrum, Doctorum Scriptorumque Ecclesiasticorum ... : Series Graeca ...* Subtitle Varies.; Vol. 16 and 87 in Three Parts, V. 86 in Two Parts.; Greek and Latin. Parisii: Migne, 1857

Pentiuc, Eugen J. *Long Suffering Love: A Commentary on Hosea with Patristic Annotations*, Brookline, Mass: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 2002.

Pusey, P. E. *Sancti patris nostri Cyrilli archiepiscopi Alexandrii in XII prophetas*, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1868.

Quasten, Johannes, *Patrology Vol 3*, Allen, TX: Christian Classics.

Reuss, Joseph, *Lukas-Kommentare Aus Der Griechischen Kirche*, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1984.

-, *Matthaus-Kommentare aus der griechischen Kirke*, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1957.

Russell, Norman, *Cyril of Alexandria*, New York, NY: Routledge, 2000.

Saebo, Magne, *Hebrew Bible/Old Testament, The History of Its Interpretation: Volume I Antiquity*, Gottigen, Germany: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1996.

Sweet, Henry Barclay, ed., *The Old Testament in Greek* 4th ed., London: Cambridge, 1912.

Simonetti, Manilo, ed., *Matthew 1-13*, Ancient Christian Commentary on Scripture, New Testament I, ed. Thomas C. Oden. Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press, 2001.

-, *Biblical Interpretation in the Early Church: An Historical Introduction to Patristic Exegesis*, trans. John A. Hughes, Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994.

The Greek New Testament 4th Edition, ed. Barbara Aland, et al., Biblia Druck: D-Stuttgart, 1998.

Theodore of Mopsuestia, *Commentary on the Twelve Prophets*, The Fathers of the Church vol. 108, trans. Robert C. Hill. Washington D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 2004.

Theodoret of Cyrus, *Commentaries on the Prophets: Volume Three Commentary on the Twelve Prophets*, trans. Robert C. Hill, Brookline, Mass: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 2006.

Torrance, T. F. *Divine Meaning: Studies in Patristic Hermeneutics*, Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1995.

Trigg, Joseph W. *Biblical Interpretation*, Message of the Fathers of the Church vol. 9. Wilmington, DE: Micheal Glazier Inc. 1988.

Weinandy, Thomas G. and Keating, Daniel A. *The Theology of St. Cyril of Alexandria: A Critical Appreciation*, New York, NY: T&T Clark, 2003.

Wessel, Susan, *Cyril of Alexandria and the Nestorian Controversy*, New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Wilken, Robert L., *Judaism and the Early Christian Mind: A Study of Cyril of Alexandria's Exegesis and Theology*, London: Yale University Press, 1971.

-, *Remembering the Christian Past*, Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1995.

Wolfson, Harry A. *The Philosophy of the Church Fathers*, 3rd ed. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1970.

Yoo, Chul H., "Cyril of Alexandria: Fifth Century Exegesis and the Rhetorical Schools." M.A. Thesis, Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, 2002.

Zeigler, Joseph, ed., *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum*, Vol XIII, Duodecim Prophetarum, Germany: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967.

Appendix 1. Origen's Inter-Textual Reading in Matthew

The extant portion of Origen's commentary on Matthew covers the latter half of the Gospel. In so doing, he does not deal with the Hosean passages quoted by Matthew. This is the primary reason why Cyril was the primary source of attention in this paper. Origen's reading of Matthew often engages the Old Testament text beyond Cyril's reading, even in regards to inter-textual quotations. A good example of this is in Origen's work on Matthew 15:1-9. When discussing the quotations of Exodus 20:12 and Leviticus 20:9 (or the other from some one of the books of the Pentateuch¹⁶²), Origen mentions the origination of the quotes much as Cyril might do in other passages.¹⁶³ The difference comes in Origen's discussion of Matthew's quote of Isaiah 29:13. Origen quotes Isaiah 29:10-12 and 29:15 to provide the greater context of the quote. In addition to this, Origen allows this context to color the meaning of the Matthew passage.¹⁶⁴

This procedure of engaging with the context of inter-textual quotations is not a consistent approach. Origen glosses over the quote of Deuteronomy 19:15 in Matthew 18:16.¹⁶⁵ Likewise, The quotes of Genesis 1:27, 5:2, 2:24, and Deuteronomy 24:1 in Matthew 19 receive no mention that they even exist in the text.¹⁶⁶ These absences, among others, point to an exegetical method that engages with inter-textual matters as they might touch upon other concerns of the author when dealing with the passage. In those places where Origen's point arises from the quote, then the quote is of utmost

¹⁶² Menzies, page 439.

¹⁶³ Based upon the previous notations on Cyril's mention of Old Testament passages. Regarding this passage, the fragment of his work on Matthew does not mention in which book these commands are found. (Reuss, 1957, pages 211-212.)

¹⁶⁴ Menzies, pages 439-440.

¹⁶⁵ Ibid, pages 492-492.

¹⁶⁶ Ibid, pages 494-496.

importance.¹⁶⁷ However in places where the point arises from words other than the quote, then the quote is utterly ignorable.

¹⁶⁷ Note, Origen's reading of Matthew 15:1-9 as previously discussed and also of Matthew 19:18-19, where the menagerie of OT texts quoted is central to his allegorical reading (Menzies, pages 505-507).