

Recovering Origen's Pauline Exegesis: Exegesis and Eschatology in the Commentary on Ephesians

RICHARD A. LAYTON

Origen's *Commentary on Ephesians* is preserved only in fragments excerpted in a Byzantine catena, which are inadequate for reconstructing Origen's interpretation of this letter. This article investigates the possibility that a commentary on the same text by Jerome preserves the interplay in Origen's commentary between the investigation of specific exegetical problems and the interpretation of the eschatological vision presented in Ephesians. This thesis is pursued in a detailed examination of five passages that are critical to the eschatology of Origen's commentary. Although Jerome does not permit the reconstruction of Origen's exact words, it may be possible to recover from the Latin commentary the structure and the flow of the exegetical inquiry the Alexandrian exegete conducts. In particular, Jerome's attestation to Origen's commentary may support a reappraisal of Origen's complex thought obscured by the subsequent conflict over the theologian in the late fourth century.

INTRODUCTION

Origen was the first exegete to comment systematically on the Pauline corpus, expounding on all but two of the documents accepted by early Christians as letters of Paul.¹ Despite this massive exegetical labor, piecing together Origen's reading of Paul remains a formidable task. None of the

1. Jerome, *ep.* 33 and the marginal annotations in Athos *Laura* 184, Codex von der Goltz, provide record of commentaries on Rom, Gal, Eph, Phil, Col, 1 and 2 Thess, Titus, and Phlm and homilies on Heb, Gal, Titus and both the Corinthian and Thessalonian correspondence. See P. Nautin, *Origène: Sa vie et son oeuvre* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1977), 225–60.

expositions on Paul survives in integral form, and only three have weathered the centuries in more than isolated fragments.² One survivor is a three-volume commentary on Ephesians, of which thirty-seven fragments are preserved in a Byzantine catena.³ This commentary could be valuable for understanding Origen's Pauline interpretation. Origen assigned to Ephesians a central place in the Pauline corpus,⁴ defining this epistle as the spiritual "heart" of Paul's letters, a repository of mysteries at which the apostle only hinted in other correspondence.⁵

Origen's *Commentary on Ephesians* is significant within the horizon of the third-century reception of the Pauline letters. This commentary, however, also influenced the course of the fourth-century Origenist controversy.⁶ The imagery of Ephesians moves in celestial realms and encompasses the vast reaches of eternity, inviting cosmological speculation. The language of Ephesians is particularly vivid at precisely the points where Origen's teachings kindled controversy. Not surprisingly, the lingering effects of the Origenist controversy pose the most difficult barrier to recovering Origen's exposition. The date of the original production of the catena to Ephesians can be assigned only in general terms to the seventh or eighth centuries.⁷ Even this general time frame, however, indicates that

2. F. Cocchini, *Il Paolo di Origene: Contributo alla storia della recezione delle epistole paoline nel III secolo*, Verba Seniorum, n.s. 11 (Roma: Edizioni Studium, 1992), 74–93, offers an excellent survey of the extant witnesses to the Pauline commentaries.

3. Edited by J. A. F. Gregg, "The Commentary of Origen upon the Epistle to the Ephesians," *JTS* 3 (1902): 234–44, 398–420, 554–76.

4. Few modern commentators regard Ephesians as a genuine letter of Paul, but the authenticity of the letter was unchallenged in antiquity. To correspond to Origen's outlook, I will refer to "Paul" as the author of the text.

5. Jerome, *Ephes.* 1. prol. (Vall. 539–40): "This is the central letter of the Apostle both in order and in meaning. I do not mean 'central' in the sense that it follows the first ones and is greater in length than the final ones, but rather 'central' even as the heart of a living being is the center." For this as Origen's view, see R. Layton, "Origen as a Reader of Paul: A Study of the *Commentary on Ephesians*," Ph.D. diss., University of Virginia, 1996, 310–30.

6. See E. A. Clark, "The Place of Jerome's Commentary on Ephesians in the Origenist Controversy: The Apokatastasis and Ascetic Ideals," *VC* 41 (1987): 154–71; eadem, *The Origenist Controversy: The Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992), 121–51; K. Romaniuk, "Une controverse entre saint Jérôme et Rufin d'Aquilée à propos de l'épître de saint Paul aux Ephésiens," *Aegyptus* 43 (1963): 84–106.

7. K. Staab, *Die Pauluskatenen nach den handschriftlichen Quellen untersucht* (Roma: Scripta Pontificii Instituti Biblica, 1926), 69, assigns the original form of the collection to the seventh century. Staab, however, does not account for the presence in the collection of fragments from John Damascene, which suggest a *terminus post*

the scholars responsible for excerpting Origen's commentary worked under the shadow of his condemnation at the fifth ecumenical council in 553. The catena excerpts provide lavish witness to Origen's investigations of textual difficulties, but preserve only glimpses of the theological reflection Origen brought to the epistle. The condemnation of Origen left an obvious impress on the fragments, reining in his flights of speculation in light of sixth-century orthodoxy. Although indispensable, the fragments are far from adequate for reconstructing Origen's interpretation of Ephesians.

A commentary on the same text produced by the Latin scholar Jerome might enable restoration of the primary themes, recurrent motifs, and chief aims that Origen pursued in commenting on Ephesians. The ability of this commentary to testify to Origen often has been suggested, but Jerome's relationship to Origen in the Ephesians commentary is itself disputed. Jerome published his commentary in 386, shortly after his permanent resettlement to Bethlehem.⁸ In composing the *Commentary on Ephesians*, along with three other expositions of the Pauline letters, Jerome ventured for the first time to publish an independent full-length commentary. As Jerome professed—and as modern scholars have amply documented⁹—he availed himself fully of Origen's commentary to compensate

quem in the eighth century. The study of G. Dorival, "Des commentaires de l'Écriture aux chaînes" in C. Mondésert, ed., *Le monde grec ancien et la Bible* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1984), 361–86, also supports a later date. The format of the catena exhibits characteristics that Dorival identifies with production in Constantinople, a development that he dates to ca. 700. A *terminus ad quem* to the collection is easier to judge. The primary witness to the catena, Paris Coislin 204, is dated near the beginning of the eleventh century. A second manuscript, Athos Pantocrator 28, from the early tenth century, represents an abridged version of the same collection. The abridgment of the catena in a tenth-century manuscript suggests a *terminus ad quem* of the compilation in the ninth century. On the dating of Coislin 204 and Pantocrator 28, see Staab, *Pauluskatenen*, 53–54, 246–59.

8. P. Nautin, "La date des Commentaires de Jérôme sur les Epîtres Pauliniennes," *RHE* 74 (1979): 5–12, supersedes the earlier estimate by F. Cavallera, *Saint Jérôme, sa vie et son oeuvre* (Louvain/Paris: Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense, 1922), 1:130–44, who dated Jerome's Pauline commentaries to an extended period of 387–89.

9. A. Harnack, "Anhang: Origenistisches Gut bei Hieronymus," in *Der kirchengeschichtliche Ertrag der exegetischen Arbeiten des Origenes*, TU 42.4 (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1919), 141–68; F. Deniau, "Le *Commentaire* de Jérôme sur *Ephésiens* nous permet-il connaître celui d'Origène?" in H. Crouzel, G. Lomiento, and J. Rius-Camps, eds., *Origeniana: Premier colloque international des études origénienes* (Montserrat, 18–21 septembre 1973), *Quaderni di "Vetera Christianorum"* 15 (Bari: Istituto di letteratura cristiana antica, 1975), 163–80; C. Bammel, "Die auluskommentare des

for his inexperience.¹⁰ The extent, however, to which Jerome modified or corrected the bold theology of Origen remains disputed.¹¹ Given that Jerome “filtered” Origen’s commentary through the screen of his own concerns, how confidently can Origen’s own aims and procedures be recovered?¹² This question, difficult to answer under any circumstances, is complicated by the role that the *Commentary on Ephesians* played in the bitter dispute between Jerome and his rival, Rufinus.

When composing the Ephesians commentary, Jerome knew of the mounting criticism of Origen, but this hostility had yet to manifest itself in direct attack on adherents to Origen’s theology.¹³ After the eruption of open controversy in 393, Jerome found himself defending his use of Origen in

Hieronymus: Die ersten wissenschaftlichen lateinischen Bibelkommentare,” in *Cristianesimo Latino e cultura Greca sino al sec. IV*, Studia Ephemeridis “Augustinianum” 42 (Roma: Institutum Patristicum “Augustinianum,” 1993), 187–207; eadem, “Origen’s Pauline Prefaces and the Chronology of His *Pauline Commentaries*,” in G. Dorival and A. le Boulluec, eds., *Origeniana Sexta: Origen and the Bible. Actes du Colloquium Origenianum Sextum. Chantilly, 30 août–3 septembre 1993* (Leuven: University Press, 1995), 495–513; R. E. Heine, “Recovering Origen’s Commentary on Ephesians from Jerome,” *JTS* (forthcoming).

10. Jerome, *Ephes.* 1. prol. (Vallarsi 543–44). See also Jerome, *Gal.* 1. prol. (Vall. 369–70): “Recognizing the weakness of my abilities, I have followed the commentaries of Origen . . . which alone would suffice for the task at hand.”

11. Harnack, “Origenistisches Gut,” 168, judges that the exegetical achievement of Jerome in the Pauline commentaries is due “exclusively to Origen.” Bammel, “Pauluskommentare des Hieronymus” and “Origen’s Pauline Prefaces” deems these commentaries to be “largely plagiarised from Origen” (“Pauline Prefaces,” 496). Heine, “Recovering Origen’s Commentary” concludes that “very little” of Jerome’s exegesis to Eph 3.4–11 fails to show significant relationship to Origen. More cautious judgments are offered by Deniau, “*Commentaire de Jérôme sur Ephésiens*,” and F. Pieri, “Mit und nach Origenes: Über einige christologische Themen im Epheserbriefkommentar des Hieronymus,” in W. Bienert, ed., *Origenes in den Auseinandersetzungen des 4. Jahrhunderts: Colloquium Origenianum Septimum, 25–29 August 1997* (Leuven: Peeters, 1998), 617–25, both of whom see Jerome as critically appropriating Origen and correcting his source where necessary. Clark, “Place of Jerome’s Commentary,” judges that Jerome has subtly shifted Origen’s exegesis from a cosmological to a moral-ascetic framework.

12. I owe the metaphor of the “filter” to Y.-M. Duval, “Vers le Commentaire sur Aggée d’Origène,” in L. Lies, ed., *Origeniana Quarta: Die Referate des 4. Internationalen Origeneskongresses (Innsbruck, 2.–6. September 1985)*, Innsbrucker Theologische Studien 19 (Innsbruck-Wien: Tyrolia Verlag, 1987), 7–15.

13. See Y.-M. Duval, “Traces de lecture du *Peri Archôn* d’Origène avant le départ de Rome de Jérôme en 385,” in idem, ed., *Jérôme entre l’Occident et l’Orient*, Etudes Augustiniennes (Paris, 1988), 139–51.

biblical exegesis.¹⁴ Responding to a challenge made by Jerome,¹⁵ Rufinus combed through the Ephesians commentary to expose evidence of his adversary's covert Origenism.¹⁶ Identifying fifteen passages that he judged to promote an Origenist cosmology, Rufinus hammered home an argument as direct as it was repetitious: Jerome's commentary advanced the same theology that he subsequently sought to ban as heresy. Jerome acknowledged that the passages cited by Rufinus contained an "Origenist" theology, but denied that he endorsed the controversial positions in his commentary.¹⁷ The task of the commentator, Jerome instructed, was to compile the wisdom of the ancients in a concise form, and not to provide a definitive interpretation. To this end, Jerome had collected competing views from Origen, Didymus, and Apollinaris, and added, on occasion, his own perspective. It was the duty of the reader to test the value of these diverse, or even contradictory, opinions. While Origenist doctrines appeared in the commentary, Jerome conceded, the commentator's criticism of Origen could be discerned by a careful reader. This defense clouds, more than clarifies, Jerome's use of his predecessor's exegesis. Jerome's claim that he compiled several different sources collapses when the commentary is compared to the catena fragments of Origen. A preponderance of the multiple opinions, which Jerome submits as general evidence of his use of diverse sources, derives from Origen's commentary, not from Jerome's editorial activity.¹⁸ Jerome's apology must be treated with suspicion if his value as a witness to Origen is to be accurately assessed.

The thesis proposed here is that Jerome preserves the intricate interplay in Origen's commentary between the investigation of specific exegetical problems and the interpretation of the eschatological vision presented in Ephesians. If this is the case, Jerome provides a witness to Origen that is superior in significant respects to the Greek catena. As the central "mystery" of the letter identified by Jerome and Origen touches God's

14. On the chronology of the initial phases of the Origenist controversy, see K. Holl, "Die Zeitfolge der ersten origenistischen Streits," *Sitzungsberichte d. Berl. Akad.* (1916): 226–75, repr. in idem, *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte II* (Tübingen, J. C. B. Mohr, 1928), 310–50; P. Nautin, "Études de Chronologie hiéronymienne (393–397)," *REAug* 18 (1972): 209–18; 19 (1973): 69–86, 213–39, 251–84.

15. Jerome, *epp.* 61.2, 84.2; *adv. Io. Hier.* 17.

16. Rufinus, *apol.* 1.22–2.4.

17. Jerome, *Ruf.* 1.15–17. See Layton, "Origen as a Reader of Paul," 174–88.

18. See Layton, "Origen as a Reader of Paul," 196–201, as well as the careful analysis of Heine, "Recovering Origen's Commentary," suggesting that Origen is the only source of multiple opinions in Jerome's comments to Eph 3.5–7 and 3.8–9.

achievement of the ultimate destiny of creation, an examination of eschatology goes to the heart of Jerome's capacity to attest to Origen's now fragmentary commentary. In what follows, the relationship between exegetical investigation and eschatological speculation will be examined in five passages that are critical to the eschatology of the commentary. Translations of key portions of these passages are provided in the Appendix ("App.").¹⁹

As Jerome published his commentary before his entanglement in the hostility against Origen, the recovery of Origen's exegesis from Jerome and the assessment of Jerome's perception of Origenism are interlocking problems. It will be necessary to examine to what degree Jerome identifies an "Origenist" eschatology in the commentary, and what measures, if any, he takes to correct or modify that eschatology. Direct comparison of the catena excerpts with Jerome's commentary is possible in three of the selected cases. This comparison not only enables firm confidence regarding the general dependence of the Latin scholar on Origen, it also can assist in the recovery of valuable material lost through abridgment of Origen's commentary in the catena.²⁰ Determining the presence of Origen material in the remaining two passages is more difficult. Francis Deniau proposed a series of criteria to isolate an Origen stratum from the Latin commentary, and Ronald Heine further refines these indicators in a forthcoming article.²¹ The following list is selected and adapted from these studies. One or more of the following characteristics in Jerome's commentary provide evidence that he preserves Origen's exegesis: 1) comments that reflect the historical context of Origen and/or theological issues chiefly of significance in the first half of the third century; 2) passages that reflect vocabulary or exegetical methods characteristically employed by Origen; 3) comments that are based on biblical cross-references that Origen elsewhere uses to explicate the meaning of a text; 4) passages that apply ideas or conclusions drawn from other portions of the *Commentary on Ephesians* that can be demonstrated to be derived from Origen. As Ronald Heine

19. Translations of Origen's commentary are from Gregg's edition (n. 3 above), citing the number and the line of the fragment. Translations of Jerome are from the Vallarsi edition (reprinted in PL 26) emended by the forthcoming edition of F. Pieri. I am grateful to Dr. Pieri for advance use of his edition.

20. On the limits of catena evidence for recovering Origen's exegesis, see R. Heine, "Can the Catena Fragments of Origen's Commentary on John be Trusted?" VC 40 (1986): 118–34; J. Scherer, *Le Commentaire d'Origène sur Rom. iii.5–v.7* (Cairo: Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale, 1957), 67–83.

21. Deniau, "Commentaire de Jérôme sur *Ephésiens*"; Heine, "Recovering Origen's Commentary."

observes, confidence in attributing material to Origen increases when several of these individual criteria are present. Material identified by Jerome and Rufinus in their respective apologies is omitted from the above list. While such passages can confidently be assigned to Origen, using the apologies to recover the *Commentary on Ephesians* risks distorting Origen's exegesis in the direction of later critiques of Origenism. Rufinus culled Origen material from Jerome's commentary in order to convict his opponent of Origenism, not to demonstrate his extensive reliance on an earlier source. Likewise, Jerome had incentive to acknowledge dangerous theological opinions as stemming from Origen, while claiming less controversial remarks as his own production.²² Neither Rufinus nor Jerome attended to the function of the supposedly "Origenist" material within Origen's own commentary. Use of these two polemical treatises in recovering Origen's thought must proceed with caution.

A final preliminary comment on the criterion of characteristic exegetical techniques and vocabulary (no. 2 in the above list) is necessary. The eschatology contained in Origen's exposition can only be fully understood if the theological opinions he advances are addressed in terms of their exegetical function in the commentary. The extant Greek fragments and Jerome both attest that Origen employed a technique of commentary known as "Problems and Solutions." In this method, inquiry into the text proceeds by identifying an array of possible *solutiones* to a precisely framed *quaestio*.²³ The catena preserves numerous occasions in which Origen directs his inquiry by posing a question, which bears testimony to the multitude of problems the Alexandrian exegete detected in this short epistle. Jerome retained this interrogative mode of commentary, and to a significant degree Origen's *quaestiones* shape his own

22. Jerome, *Ruf.* 1.22, defends his comments to Eph 1.4 by attributing the doctrine of pre-existence to Origen and claiming a less controversial opinion as his own view. Jerome likely appropriated both opinions from Origen, a point noted by Bammel, "Pauluskomentare des Hieronymus," 204 n. 13, and discussed in more detail in Layton, "Origen as a Reader of Paul," 220–36. For another instance of Jerome's use of this strategy, see the discussion of Eph 2.7 below.

23. For Origen's use of the *quaestiones* technique, see the valuable series of articles by L. Perrone: "La parrhesia di Mose: L'argomentazione di Origene nel Trattato sul libero arbitrio e il metodo delle 'quaestiones et responsiones,'" in idem, ed., *Il cuore indurito del Faraone: Origene e il problema del libero arbitrio* (Genova: Marietti, 1992), 31–64; "La preghiera come 'problema': Osservazioni sulla forma del Περὶ εὐχῆς di Origene," in G. A. Privitera, ed., *Paideia Cristiana: Studi in onore di Mario Naldini* (Roma: Gruppo editoriale internazionale, 1994), 323–34; "Perspectives sur Origène et la littérature patristique des 'Quaestiones et Responsiones,'" in *Origeniana Sexta*, 151–66.

exposition.²⁴ The appearance of *quaestiones* formulae and the proposal of *solutiones* to specific exegetical questions support an initial presumption that a passage derives from Origen. The demonstrable presence of Origen's exegesis, however, does not preclude the possibility that Jerome adapted an underlying *quaestio* for his own purposes.²⁵ It will be necessary to show both that Jerome identified the same problems as did his predecessor, and that he also followed Origen's methods for resolving the issue and adopted his conclusions. In the following analysis, special attention will be paid to the function of *quaestiones* in shaping Origen's presentation of eschatological issues.

1. Eph 1.14: "Which is the pledge of our inheritance, for the redemption of the possession, for the praise of his glory."²⁶

In Eph 1.14, Paul concludes an extended benediction with an expression of eschatological hope. The members of the community have been "sealed by the Holy Spirit of promise" (1.13). This seal in the Holy Spirit both binds together the believers in the present and also constitutes a "pledge" of their future "inheritance" (1.14). Origen begins his exegesis of this text, as he often does, by formulating a *quaestio* to direct his interpretation (App. 1A). Is the "Holy Spirit of promise" a possession of all believers, or is it a *charism* restricted to a certain portion of the community? The resolution to this *quaestio* turns on the meaning of the term "pledge" (*arrhabōn/pignus*) which Origen derives from the everyday language of contracts (App. 1B).

Before glossing this key expression, Origen recalls a distinction he

24. An initial estimate of Jerome's reliance on Origen to frame both *quaestiones* and *solutiones* can be reached by comparison with the Greek excerpts. Forty-three passages in Jerome's commentary exhibit the *quaestiones* technique. Of these, nineteen possess complete matches in the Greek fragments, and simple abridgment in the catena likely accounts for nine more passages with partial matches. In sum, more than 60 percent of the passages can be attributed in their entirety to Origen. In fourteen of the fifteen remaining cases, the catenist has censored Origen's comments on manifest theological grounds. For discussion, see Layton, "Origen as a Reader of Paul," 196–209 and Table 2.

25. See, e.g., Jerome, *Ephes.* 1.1.1a (Vall. 543). In commenting on the initial verse of Ephesians, Jerome begins with a question Origen raises about Paul's use of prepositions, but directs the investigation to support an anti-Arian polemic (see Layton, "Origen as a Reader of Paul," 210–20). For another instance in which Jerome redirects the exegetical question to advance his own aims, see the discussion of Eph 5.6 below.

26. The translation of verses from Ephesians is my own from *Novum Testamentum Graece*, ed. E. Nestle et al., 26th ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1981).

made in commenting on the preceding verse. In Eph 1.13, Paul identifies the Ephesians as among those who have heard the "word of truth" by which they have been "sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise." Origen distinguishes the "word of truth"—an esoteric teaching disclosed only to the perfect—from the general "proclamation" available to the entire church. While the Ephesians, "who are sharers in the ineffable words under the guidance of Paul (cf. 2 Cor 12.2)," obtained the "word of truth," the fractious Corinthians received only the "proclamation" (1 Cor 2.4).²⁷ As perfect saints, the Ephesians have obtained the "Holy Spirit of promise" and therefore can share in the knowledge that Paul received in his mystic rapture to the "third heaven."²⁸ The experience of the Ephesians points to a general distinction: "even if someone believes, but has not progressed to an extent that he hears the 'word of truth,' he would not receive the seal of the 'Holy Spirit of promise.'"²⁹ In Origen's view, the expression "Holy Spirit of promise" is not synonymous with the Holy Spirit, but refers to a particular mode of participation in that Spirit. The "sealing" in that spirit is not experienced by the entire church, but distinguishes those who have "progressed" in the gospel.

The sealing in the spirit of promise (Eph 1.13) enables Origen to contrast the present state of diverse Christian groups. Proceeding to 1.14, he suggests that this same differentiation permits insight into the future rewards anticipated by the church. He questions whether anyone who participates in any fashion in the Holy Spirit obtains the same "pledge of inheritance." A better way of understanding this pledge, Origen offers, is in terms of a down payment (App. 1B). The "pledge" is not a flat sum, but is a deposit made in proportion to the ultimate inheritance to be received by each of the saints. In the present organization of the church the outlines of the future perfection already are visible. Origen suggests that the perceptive observer could discern the difference in "pledges" obtained by the saints, and "could already speak about a greater and lesser inheritance stored up for the co-heirs of Christ (Rom 8.17, cf. Eph 3.6)."

Origen seeks to forge a link between present and future realities through the "pledge of inheritance." He is also concerned to define the relationship

27. Origen, *comm. in Eph.*, Fr. 8.11–20. Origen often contrasts the perfection of the Ephesians to the communal conflict and moral failings of the Corinthians. See, e.g., Origen, *princ.* 3.2.3–4; *comm. in 1 Cor.*, Fr. 1.1–8; 18.12–16; 21.1–9; *comm. in Eph.*, Fr. 33.28–37.

28. For Paul's mystic journey as the source of esoteric knowledge, see Origen, *comm. in Mt.* 17.33, *hom.* 4.2 in *Exod.*, *Cels.* 6.6, *Jo.* 10.5.28, 13.48.316, and esp. *hom.* 24.3 in *Jos.*: Paul was able to share the "ineffable words" with close associates.

29. Origen, *comm. in Eph.*, Fr. 8.29–39.

between the spiritual and the physical in the doctrine of the last things (App. 1C). Origen is quick to assert that the “pledge” must be viewed as a spiritual, not a physical, reality. Even as the “spirit of promise” possessed in the present is an internal, noetic reality, the “pledge of inheritance” points to a future perfection that also will be incorporeal. Nothing physical can compare to the perfection of mind that contemplates the divine realities, by which the saints are “completely trained” for the “praise of the glory of God” (Eph 1.14).

Origen strives to extract from the text the entire range of meaning in the expression “pledge.” He exploits the concepts “pledge” and “seal” to express an integral connection between the present Christian experience and the ultimate perfection to be gained through continued progress. The consummation of the world will not effect a rupture with the present order, but will complete the work already taking place through participation in the Holy Spirit. In these comments, Origen allows for individual distinctions to persist in the end times. The “pledge” is not a single sum made to all the believers, but a deposit held by each saint in a greater or lesser amount. We are now able to attend briefly to Jerome’s filtration of Origen’s comments. Jerome clearly aims to communicate the substance of Origen’s thought. He faithfully transmits Origen’s gloss of the term “pledge,” and insists on the internal, spiritualized nature of that deposit. The most significant alteration Jerome makes is to rephrase the governing *quaestio* as a positive statement: “Whoever, therefore, received not simply the Holy Spirit, but also the ‘Holy Spirit of promise,’ obtains at the same time the ‘pledge of inheritance,’ which inheritance is eternal life” (App. 1A). This modification diminishes the subtlety of Origen’s interpretation, which treats the relationship between the present experience of spiritual advance and the ultimate “inheritance” as a matter for investigation. Although Origen’s thought suffers slightly from its translation into the Latin commentary, Jerome has preserved both the exegetical focus and the eschatological vision he found in his source material.

2. Eph 2.6: “*And raised us up with him and seated us with him in the heavenly places in Christ Jesus.*”

In the opening verses of chapter two, Paul recalls for the Ephesians the remarkable change brought about by God’s action in Christ. The Ephesians had been “corpses” held under the control of the opposing powers “that now work in the sons of disobedience” (2.2). In a demonstration of infinite compassion, God chose that moment of moral lifelessness, “while we were yet dead in transgressions,” to bring the believers to new life in

Christ (2.5). Describing the salvation of the believers as an already accomplished fact, Paul goes a step further: God "has raised together and seated together" the believers with Christ in the heavens (2.6). This declaration of a present enjoyment of eschatological benefits poses the central interpretive problem of this verse, not only because it apparently contradicts the experience of the believers, but also because it stands in tension with the futuristic eschatology assumed elsewhere by Paul.³⁰

As is the case with Eph 1.14, the exegesis begins with a *quaestio*, this time preserved by Jerome (App. 2A). How has God, who has raised and saved us, [also] made *us* to sit in the heavens at Christ's right hand? While believers will affirm that God has exalted Christ, and established him as ruler of all (Eph 1.21), common experience seems to belie the assertion that the saints enjoy this privilege in the present world. The mutual witness of the catena and Jerome attests to two solutions Origen devises to resolve this apparent contradiction (App. 2B–C).³¹ Origen attributes the incautious assertion of the apostle either to the prophetic custom of representing future events as already achieved, or to a concept of the resurrection as a spiritual, rather than physical, event. The final sentence (App. 2D), which appears only in Jerome, qualifies the preceding analysis by proposing a partial enjoyment of eschatological benefits by the saints.

The *quaestio* investigates the apparently improper application of the aorist tense (*synēgeiren* and *synekathisen*) for an anticipated, future event. Origen elsewhere frames *quaestiones* in this commentary designed to explain the unexpected attributions of present availability of eschatological rewards.³² The mutual witness in the two commentaries of alternative *solutiones* provides solid evidence that the *quaestio* simply has fallen from the catena witness, and should be assigned to Origen. The controlling *quaestio* permits the interpreter to examine competing understandings of the resurrection experience and its availability to Christians in the present life.

The first alternative resolves the *quaestio* by locating the eschatological rewards anticipated in this verse solely in the future, explaining the use of the aorist as a stylistic peculiarity of Scripture. While regarding this solution as simplistic, Origen acknowledges the sound philological basis underlying this resolution. Whoever attributes the use of the aorist in Eph

30. Origen, *comm. in Rom.* 5.9 (PG 14:1047–48), citing Eph 2.6.

31. The catenist has deleted the array of scriptural crossreferences Origen employs. More significantly, the Greek fragment omits the *quaestio* with its explicit reference to Eph 1.20–21.

32. Origen, *comm. in Eph.*, Fr. 2.39–42, Fr. 9.103–107, with parallel discussions in Jerome.

2.6 to the prophetic representation of future events can appeal to the customary usage (*mos Scripturarum* = *synētheia*) of the prophets. This position offers a viable solution to the *quaestio*, which Origen himself employs on occasion to explain variances in the Bible from classical usage.³³ His dissatisfaction is that it fails to yield an adequate appreciation for the full significance of Paul's declaration.³⁴ He is anxious that a reader will circumscribe the language of Scripture to foreclose participation in the reality of the resurrection in the present life. For this reason, Origen advances an alternative that accepts the aorist verbs in Eph 2.6 at face value.

Anyone, Origen maintains, who has advanced beyond a material concept of the resurrection will resolve the grammatical peculiarity on the basis of this more sophisticated understanding. "Whoever sees that the kingdom of Christ is an intelligible reality will not hesitate to say that this saying is already true," he asserts (App. 1C). He nevertheless places this second alternative on philological footing, appealing to the *synētheia* of Scripture to refer in physical terms to the interior reality of the kingdom. When understood properly, Eph 2.6 is consistent with the *noetic* concept of the kingdom articulated by Phil 3.20, Luke 17.21 and Matt 5.21. Origen clearly prefers this interpretation, and presses the choice of verb tense in this case to support his view of the resurrection life.³⁵

In the unparalleled final sentence, Jerome qualifies the preceding exposition: "this also may be said (*potest autem et hoc dici*), that as we have received the pledge of the Holy Spirit (Eph 1.14), but have not yet obtained its complete fullness, so also we sit and reign with Christ, without yet attaining the perfect sitting in the heavens" (App. 2D). This statement softens the dichotomy of the two alternative interpretations by withholding full attainment in the present of eschatological benefits. Does Jerome here modify or gently critique the view he found in his source material?

33. Origen, *comm. in Eph.*, Fr. 24.2; *Jo.* 32.4.51–52 (GCS 10:432). On Origen's appeal to *synētheia*, see B. Neuschäfer, *Origenes als Philologe*, SBA 18.1–2 (Basel: Friedrich Reinhardt Verlag, 1987), 143–45, with the examples p. 401 n. 36.

34. Cf. Origen, *Jo.* 13.538–39; *comm. in Eph.*, Fr. 19.56–60; *comm. in Mt.* 15.22. On Origen's opposition to a "simple" understanding of the resurrection, which equates the resurrection body with the present body, see H. Crouzel, "La doctrine origénienne du corps ressuscité," *BLE* 81 (1980): 175–200, 241–66, esp. 177–79. See also G. Dorival, "Origène et la résurrection de la chair," *Origeniana Quarta*, 291–321; F. Cocchini, *Paolo di Origene*, 151–56. For a recent view of Origen's understanding of the resurrection body, see M. J. Edwards, "Origen's Two Resurrections," *JTS* n.s. 46 (1995): 502–18.

35. Cf. Origen, *Comm. in Eph.*, Fr. 2.39–48, *hom.* 1.13 in *Gen.*, *comm. in Mt.* 10.14.

Or, has the catena abridged Origen's own avowal of an eschatological reservation? While it is difficult to determine with certainty the provenance of an individual sentence in Jerome's commentary, two considerations can be offered.

In the first place, Jerome introduces the qualification by the phrase *potest autem et hoc dici*, an expression which prompts further consideration of the already developed position. This formula belongs to the vocabulary of the *quaestiones* technique and reflects the general exegetical structure for commenting on Eph 2.6 that Origen establishes. Throughout the comments to Eph 2.6, Jerome almost literally reproduces the technical vocabulary by which Origen directs the investigation.³⁶ The addition of a qualifying consideration would be consistent with Origen's approach to the problem, and Jerome may preserve here Origen's concluding remarks to Eph 2.6. A second consideration concerns Jerome's appeal to the metaphor of the pledge. Jerome alludes to the previous discussion regarding the "pledge of the Holy Spirit" in Eph 1.14, a passage based entirely on Origen's analysis. As the initial explication of the "pledge" derives from Origen, one might suspect that Jerome also reflects Origen's view in this case. This conjecture is strengthened by Origen's use of the "pledge" to defer the achievement of perfection. In commenting on Eph 1.14, Origen contrasts the possession of a "pledge" to the attainment of an "inheritance." He explains that "each one is for the 'praise of the glory of God,' (Eph 1.14) now having received the 'spirit of the promise' as a 'pledge of the inheritance,' but later receiving the inheritance itself."³⁷

An appeal Origen makes to the concept of the "pledge" in his *Commentary on John* may further illumine his concerns in commenting on Eph 2.6. In his encounter with the Samaritan woman, Jesus declares, "but the hour is coming and now is, when the true worshippers will worship the Father in spirit and truth" (John 4.23). Origen reads this promise through the yearning of Paul to see God "face to face" instead of "in a mirror" (1 Cor 13.12). In the present age, Origen explains, those who venerate God "by the pledge of the spirit" (2 Cor 5.5) are able to be "true

36. See the terms emphasized in bold print in App. 2: ὁ μὲν ἀπλούστερον ἐκλαμβάνων = *quidem qui simplicius est responsurus*; οὐκ ὀκνήσει = *non deliberabit* (reading with Pieri emendation). Cf. Jerome, *Ephes.* 2.3.14–15 (Vall. 602): *potest ergo et hoc dici* introduces a qualification possibly directed against the emanationist cosmogony of the Valentinians. If this is the case, both the expression and the polemical comment could derive from Origen.

37. Origen, *comm. in Eph.*, Fr. 8.64–66.

worshippers.” Perfect worship, however, depends on perfect knowledge: “if whoever sees ‘in a mirror’ does not see the truth . . . and Paul and those like him now see in a mirror, it is clear that as he sees, so also he worships God, and he worships God ‘in a mirror.’ But when the hour shall come which is to begin after the present age, then worship will be in the truth, which is beheld ‘face to face’ and no longer ‘in a mirror.’”³⁸ Origen’s reservation of perfect knowledge has a polemical edge. Origen’s opponent, Heracleon, had used Jesus’ assertion to promote the superiority of gnostic worship on the grounds that the gnostic elect had obtained knowledge in “truth” about the Father.³⁹ Origen’s employment of the “pledge” indirectly meets this claim as a means to preserve access to genuine, albeit partial, “truth.”

Several criteria converge that indicate Origen is the source of this final, unparalleled sentence: it expresses an idea elsewhere reflected in Origen’s commentary in terms of exegetical vocabulary suitable to the *quaestiones* technique, and may apply to a polemical situation encountered in the first half of the third century. Despite the absence of a catena parallel, it is probable that Jerome preserves a statement of Origen now lost through the fragmentary transmission of Greek commentary. Jerome’s witness to Eph 2.6 improves upon the catena evidence by preserving the *quaestio* that defines the inquiry and by reflecting this final qualification to the exegesis. Both of these elements also unite Origen’s exegesis of this verse with prior passages of Ephesians. The *quaestio* compares the designation of Christ as sovereign over creation (Eph 1.20–21) with the coregency offered to the saints. The concluding remark ties this promise to the earlier mention of a “pledge” (Eph 1.14). Jerome here enables the recovery of Origen’s thought as it is embedded in the text of the epistle.

3. *Eph 2.7: “So that in the ages to come he might show the immeasurable riches of his grace in kindness toward us in Christ Jesus.”*

In Eph 2.6, Paul declares that God has “raised [you] together and seated [you] together in the heavens in Christ Jesus.” In Eph 2.7, the apostle explains the purpose for this dramatic reversal experienced by the saints. By means of the coregency, God’s “immeasurable riches of grace” will become manifest. The catena has omitted Origen’s comments, so the recovery of Origen must proceed solely on the basis of Jerome.

Although Eph 2.7 continues the eschatological frame of the preceding

38. Origen, *Jo.* 13.18.112–13 (GCS 10:242–43).

39. *Ibid.* 13.19.114.

verse, the exegesis focuses on the manifestation of God's nature accomplished by these final divine actions. The coregency of the saints with Christ aims at an unequivocal demonstration of God's "kindness" (*chrēs-totēs* = *bonitas*). Jerome begins by extolling the magnitude of God's beneficence, manifest in God's inexplicable removal of sinful humanity from this "age of disturbance" to be coregnant with Christ. The fullness of God's beneficence will be demonstrated not only in the next age, but also "in all the future ages" (App. 3A). The commentator then introduces a hypothetical interlocutor—identified as a "careful reader" (*diligens lector*)—who is troubled by the extravagant exaltation of humanity this reading envisions. Does the promise of coregency imply that humans are exalted even above the angelic powers? The commentator, acknowledging the risk of insisting too firmly on one solution,⁴⁰ responds that perhaps humans will reign only over the apostate powers (cf. Eph 1.21), who will be subjected to the governance of Christ and the saints (App. 3B). Finally, Jerome advances an alternative understanding through the figure of "another interpreter" (*alius*). The proof of God's kindness lies not in the eschatological rewards, but rather in God's prior action to save believers in the death of Jesus Christ "while we were yet sinners" (Rom 5.7–8) (App. 3C).

How much of this dialogical investigation derives from Origen, and with what fidelity does Jerome preserve Origen's exegesis? In his polemic against Jerome, Rufinus seizes on the exchange between Jerome and *diligens lector*, noting that Jerome's answer affords some role, even if subordinate, to the devil in the ultimate cosmic order. How could Jerome have the effrontery to condemn the Origenists for offering the possibility of repentance to the devil?⁴¹ Jerome retorts that Rufinus has misconstrued his comments, which compile three separate opinions. In the first (App. 3A), Jerome offers his own view; in the second (App. 3B), the commentator addresses an objection raised by Origen, here introduced under the cover of *lector diligens*; lastly (App. 3C), Jerome proposes a third alternative supplied by Apollinaris.⁴² Jerome's defense conveniently limits Origen's contribution to the passage to the extent of dangerous theological opinion. Any attempt to recover Origen's exegesis will necessarily come to terms with this representation of Jerome's activity as commentator.

40. *Quod quia periculosum est respondere*. This introductory qualification does not necessitate that Jerome anticipates controversy in his reply to *diligens lector*. Jerome, *Gal.* 2.4.8–9 (Vall. 453), uses the same expression to clarify the status of the Law.

41. Rufinus, *apol.* 1.37.

42. Jerome, *Ruf.* 1.24.

In contrast to the passages previously considered, no explicit *quaestio* directs this exegesis. A unifying theme, however, in all three paragraphs of the comment may respond to an implicit *quaestio*. Each paragraph concerns the means by which God's "kindness" is demonstrated. There is philological justification for such an inquiry, since, in the phrase "immeasurable riches of his grace in kindness," the term "kindness" appears redundant. The commentary offers two explanations, both of which are grounded in the immediate context of the epistle. Jerome first suggests that the nature of God's *bonitas* is illuminated by Eph 2.6 with its eschatological implications (App. 3A). In the alternative, Jerome controls the manifestation of *bonitas* through the saving death of Christ, pointing forward to the apostle's assertion of Eph 2.8, "for by grace you have been saved through faith" (App. 3C). While various theological problems arise within this exposition, the commentary never strays far from the exegetical question of determining the scope of God's *bonitas* praised in this instance.

In his apology, Jerome claims that he initially develops his own interpretation of the verse. There are several reasons to question this claim. The first paragraph is predicated on the interpretation of 2.6, which I have argued to be *entirely* based on Origen. The initial explanation of the manifestation of the divine "kindness" simply extends the implications of this exegesis to the assertions of 2.7. Moreover, Jerome's assertion that God will demonstrate preference for humanity over the other rational creatures "not only in one but in all future ages" conforms with Origen's theory of the eternity of worlds. Origen consistently draws attention to the plural in this verse to justify his view that there will be a succession of ages beyond this one.⁴³ The continuity with Origen's comments on Eph 2.6 and the distinctive reading of the "ages to come" justify questioning Jerome's claim that he has developed his own view in these comments.

In the *Contra Rufinum*, Jerome attributes the digression undertaken in the second paragraph (App. 3B) to Origen. In this paragraph, Jerome anticipates an objection from a "careful reader" that God has shown preference to humanity over all the heavenly powers. The objection of *lector diligens* is consistent with the strenuous opposition Origen elsewhere mounts against those who "suppose that the humans saved in Christ are greater than the holy angels."⁴⁴ The figure of "careful reader"

43. Origen, *princ.* 2.3.5, *Jo.* 13.351, *or.* 27.15, *comm. in Mt.* 15.31.

44. Origen, *comm. in Mt.* 10.13, 15.27.

appears frequently in Jerome's commentaries, including several instances in the *Commentary on Ephesians*.⁴⁵ By use of this device, the commentator can force a deeper examination of a *quaestio*, sometimes citing a biblical text that stands in apparent contradiction with the proposed interpretation.⁴⁶ In the present case, *diligens lector* does not propose a variant interpretation, but forces a re-examination of the *already advanced opinion*. Jerome's initial comments link the eschatological promises of Eph 2.6 with the rule ascribed to Christ over the powers in Eph 1.21. The objection raised by the "careful reader" qualifies this anticipated exaltation of humanity; humans will exercise sovereignty only over those apostate powers that have rebelled against God. This explanation clarifies the relationship between Christ's enthronement over the heavenly powers (Eph 1.21) and the anticipated sovereignty of humans as coregnant with Christ (Eph 2.6). The objection of *lector diligens* is coherent only as a continuation of the initial premise. Both sets of comments must derive from Origen.

Despite Jerome's protests in the *Contra Rufinum*, his comments to Eph 2.7 offer only two, not three, alternatives. The two interpretations both define the manifestation of God's *bonitas* to humanity. In the first alternative, the commentator reserves the full manifestation of God's *bonitas* until the fulfillment of the eschatological promises of Eph 2.6 and in the "ages to come." In the second alternative, the exegete discerns God's *bonitas* in the salvific action in Christ (App. 3C). In exegetical terms, the reference to God's *bonitas* applies not to the coregency declared in Eph 2.6, but rather to God's saving action effected through grace, as praised in Eph 2.8. In light of the coherence of these comments, it is difficult to accept at face value Jerome's subsequent description of this passage as a *pastiche*. There is, unfortunately, no external evidence against which to test Jerome's attribution of the final opinion to Apollinaris.⁴⁷ A look at Origen's theory of God's *bonitas*, however, identifies a polemical background that might inform the comments to Eph 2.7.

45. P. Antin, "S. Jerome et son lecteur," *RSR* 34 (1947): 82–99, repr. in idem, *Recueil sur saint Jérôme*, Collection Latomus 95 (Bruxelles: Latomus, 1968), 345–63, esp. p. 349.

46. See Jerome, *Ephes.* 1.1.9a (Vall. 555), 3.6.12 (Vall. 674).

47. Jerome, *Ephes.* 1. prol. (Vall. 541–42) claims to have used the scholia (*commentarioli*) of Apollinaris in his commentary, but no fragments of such a work are extant. The possibility can not be ruled out that Jerome mediates an Apollinarian critique that retains Origen's exegetical structure. See E. Mühlenberg, "Apollinaris von Laodicea und die origenistische Tradition," *ZNW* 76 (1985): 270–83.

In Rom 5.7, the prooftext adduced by Jerome, Paul argues: “Indeed rarely will anyone die for a righteous person—though perhaps for a good person someone might actually dare to die.” Marcion had exploited the contrast between the “righteous” and the “good” in this text to advance his distinction of the two deities.⁴⁸ Origen’s rebuttal of Marcion in his *Commentary on Romans* bears striking resemblance to the comments Jerome attributes to Apollinaris:

[I]t is to be weighed how great is this man, and how great his love for us, who did not flee at that time he suffered to endure death for the impious and the unrighteous. In this is surely the proof of his perfect divine kindness (*summae divinae bonitatis indicium*). For unless he were the Son of that Father, and came from that being, of whom it is said, that “no one is good except one, God the Father” (Mark 10.18), he surely would not have been able to demonstrate such goodness toward us. Then, since by this proof of such great kindness (*ex hoc tantae bonitatis indicio*) he himself is recognized to be good, for this good man perhaps someone will even dare to die.⁴⁹

The appeal in two different contexts to Rom 5.7 as the *indicium bonitatis* of God appears to be more than coincidental. The Latin *bonitas* in both Rufinus’ translation of Origen and in Jerome’s commentary translates the Greek term *chrēstotēs*.⁵⁰ The term does not appear in Rom 5.7, which indicates that the use of the prooftext in Jerome’s commentary is not motivated by simple wordplay, and conversely, that Origen’s appeal to God’s *chrēstotēs* in the *Commentary on Romans* is intentional.⁵¹ In response to those who would divide the “just” and “severe” demiurge from the “good” and “kind” Father, Origen insists that all the qualities must equally be predicated of both Father and Son.⁵² It would not be surprising to find that the reference to God’s *chrēstotēs* in Eph 2.7 should elicit a defense against Marcionite restriction on divine “kindness.” Origen, in fact, draws this connection later in the Ephesians commentary. In Eph

48. Origen, *comm. in Rom.* 4.10 (PG 14:998–99).

49. Origen, *comm. in Rom.* 4.10 (PG 14:998).

50. Jerome translates *chrēstotēs* in Eph 2.7 by *bonitas*. Rufinus makes the same equation in Rom 2.4 (PG 14:874), Rom 3.12 (PG 14:934), and Rom 11.22 (PG 14:1194).

51. Cf. Origen, *comm. in Rom.* 8.11 (PG 14:1194), *hom. 4.4 in Jer.* On the importance of God’s *chrēstotēs* to Origen, see F. Cocchini, “Origene interprete del linguaggio di Paolo nel *Commento alla lettera ai Romani*: Problemi esegetici e storici,” ASE 1 (1984): 109–28.

52. Origen, *princ.* 2.5; Jo. 1.35.253–60.

5.9, Paul declares that the “fruit of the light is in all goodness (*agathōsynēi*) and in righteousness and in truth.”⁵³ Origen pounces on the combination of “goodness” and “righteousness” to discredit “those who divide the just [god] from the good [god], and suppose that the creator is the just one, above whom they further suppose is the good god.”⁵⁴ Anti-Marcionite polemic recurs throughout Jerome’s commentaries, and could well be in view in adducing Rom 5.7 to explain God’s “kindness” in Eph 2.7.⁵⁵

The coherence of the *quaestio* implicit in Jerome’s exposition, and the echo of anti-Marcionite polemic, renders it likely that the entire passage derives from Origen. The commentator seeks to explicate the proper context for the manifestation of God’s *bonitas*. One explanation is to link this reference directly to the preceding eschatological anticipation of Eph 2.6; the alternative is to preempt Marcionite division of God’s “kindness” and “justice.” Taken as a whole, the comments in Eph 2.7 conform to Origen’s *quaestiones* technique of commentary and also address an abiding exegetical issue. The most serious objection to this conclusion—that Jerome attributes the final paragraph to Apollinaris in his apology against Rufinus—is hollow. We already have seen that Jerome misrepresents his contribution to the comments to this verse, and he could easily be moved by polemical interests to deny Origen’s positive contribution to his exposition altogether.

Despite the diffuse appearance, the comments prove on closer examination to constitute a tightly focused investigation of the means by which God’s actions demonstrate *bonitas*. Other issues, including the eschatological and anthropological implications of the apostle’s statement, recede in importance. The reference to the penitence of the opposing powers in Eph 2.7 is incidental to Origen’s fundamental aim of elucidating the dimensions of God’s “kindness.” Although the Origenist controversy brings this incidental reference to the foreground, Origen only alludes to the *apokatastasis* to resolve a perceived incongruity in the text of the epistle. The “Origenist” filtration of the comments to Eph 2.7 does not

53. For Origen, God’s “goodness” (*agathotēs*) and “kindness” (*chrēstotēs*) are interchangeable qualities. See Origen, *comm. Rom.* (Tura Papyrus) 3.9–18 (Scherer 140.15–18).

54. Origen, *comm. in Eph.*, Fr. 25.35–36, with parallel in Jerome (Vall. 645–46), who translates “goodness” (*agathōsynēi*) in this verse by *bonitate*.

55. Jerome defends the unity of the godhead against Marcionite dualism on each occasion that such a theme appears in the catena fragments: cf. Origen, *comm. in Eph.*, Fr. 2.19–20 (to Eph 1.3); Fr. 25.35–36 (to Eph 5.9); Fr. 31.8–12 (to Eph 6.1–3, with parallel passages in Jerome). I owe this observation to Heine, “Recovering Origen’s Commentary.”

occur in Jerome's transmission of his source, but in the effort by Rufinus to score a point against his opponent. The Origenist controversy has colored the reception of Jerome's exposition, not his original use of Origen's commentary.

4. Eph 4.16: "From whom [i.e., Christ] the whole body, joined and knit together by every ligament with which it is equipped, as each part is working properly, promotes the body's growth in building itself up in love."

In Eph 4.16, Paul culminates a sustained exhortation for Christian unity in spite of the increasing differentiation of the leadership structure of the community. The Ephesians ought to maintain "unity of Spirit" (4.2) because they were called under "one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all" (4.5–6). Despite this unity, each member has received God's grace "according to the measure of Christ's gift" (4.7), which enables the various officers of the church to fulfill their duties (4.11). Through these gifts, Christ continues to care for his "body" (4.12), until the time when all have achieved the "measure of the full stature of Christ" (4.13). To this end, "we" must be aware of the deceptions of false teaching (4.14) and assist one another in their maturation into Christ, who is the "head" (4.15), by which the whole body is joined (4.16).

In this exhortation, eschatological and Christological themes merge in the complex metaphor of Eph 4.16. Christ, as the "head" of the "body," is both the source of the diversity of offices, and the goal to which the entire structure strives. This invocation of Christ's unified body as the goal of the diversity of offices invites the commentator to inquire into the ultimate status of the hierarchy. Does Paul regard the present church offices as a means to achieve the ultimate end, or do these offices anticipate the shape of the eschatological community? Without posing an explicit *quaestio*, Jerome brings together several threads of the central mystery of Ephesians in his discussion of Eph 4.16.

Jerome begins with a dense summary of the argument from 4.13 to 4.16, in which he attempts to embrace Paul's shifting metaphors under an eschatological perspective (App. 4A–B). He then explicates the central image of an eschatological restoration of the body of Christ by means of two similes (App. 4C–D). Finally, Jerome applies these illustrations to a theory of the "restitution of all things" (*in restitutione omnium*), invoking the terminology of the *apokatastasis* to characterize the eschatological

unity (App. 4E).⁵⁶ Unlike the incidental reference to eschatological teachings in the comments to Eph 2.7, the doctrine of the *apokatastasis* is advanced as the aim of the verse. In these comments, we encounter the single passage in Jerome's commentary where the doctrine of the *apokatastasis* is the primary subject under examination. If Origen's thought can be recovered from the filtration it has undergone through Jerome, this passage could prove valuable for understanding the eschatology censored by the catenist.

Jerome establishes an eschatological focus from the outset, declaring that Paul's words disclose the nature of the end of things (*in fine rerum*). Jerome unfolds the eschatological metaphor of Eph 4.16 through the specific vocabulary of the surrounding verses, and the theory of the *restitutio* is embedded in the wider context of the epistle. Jerome presents the *restitutio* as the achievement of the "fullness" of Christ (Eph 4.13), a term that he presses in an eschatological direction throughout the commentary. In commenting on Eph 1.23, "the fullness of him who fills all in all," Jerome contrasts the current partial participation in God with the reception of the "fullness" that believers will enjoy at the end time. Each of the saints currently participates in God through the possession of individual virtues. "At the end of things and the consummation of the world," by contrast, "God will fill all things in all, so that in like manner that God is filled with all virtues, so also all creatures will have all things, which earlier individuals had possessed one at a time."⁵⁷ Christ, who has embodied that fullness in his incarnation, is the agent by which this fullness will be achieved. In commenting on Eph 4.8–10, Jerome asserts "before Christ descended and ascended, all things were empty, and in need of his fullness."⁵⁸

Jerome unites these eschatological and Christological dimensions of "fullness" in 4.16. At the end of times, the saints will receive completely Christ's fullness. The reception of Christ's fullness involves, reciprocally, the assimilation of those who have been filled into the one who fills.⁵⁹ The image of the "perfect man" (Eph 4.13) governs Jerome's description of this assimilation; the believers will grow into "that man" who was indicated both by the prophets and John the Baptist (Zech 6.12, John 1.30).

56. See Origen, *hom.* 14.18 *in Jer.* and discussion of A. Mehat, "'Apocatastase': Origène, Clément d'Alexandrie, Act. 3, 21," VC 10 (1956): 196–214.

57. Jerome, *Ephes.* 1.1.23 (Vall. 569).

58. Jerome, *Ephes.* 2.4.10 (Vall. 614).

59. Origen, *comm. in Eph.*, Fr. 9.126–30, reflects the same thought in condensed form.

The “perfect man” is the ideal incarnate in Christ toward which all believers strive, leaving behind their previous lives as immature “children,” or even as irrational “women.”⁶⁰

By linking the reception of Christ’s “fullness” with the assimilation into the “perfect man,” Jerome establishes one of the interpretive poles about which 4.16 turns: the unity of all believers as a single “body.” Jerome introduces a second axis, which points to individuation and distinction within this united body (App. 4B). If the concept of “fullness” provides the key motif for the first axis, then the second interpretive pole turns on another *Stichwort* from Ephesians, that of “measure.” Each member will grow into the body of the “perfect man” according to its “own measure,” alluding to Paul’s assertion that each member receives individual gifts “according to the measure of the gift of Christ” (4.7).⁶¹ Before arriving at the present verse, Jerome twice has employed the “measure” of Christ’s gift to legitimate differentiation in offices in the one body of Christ.⁶² In 4.16, Jerome applies this principle to the metaphor of the body: each member of the body increases in a fashion “suitable to its own measure.” This individuating principle comes to the fore in Jerome’s discussion of the *restitutio omnium*. At the end time, Jerome asserts, each member will receive a rank conforming to “the measure of faith,” and the perfection of each member will be in accordance with “its measure and its office.”

Jerome balances the two poles of unity and individuation to propose a theory of the *restitutio omnium* that accounts for both the “fullness” of the body of Christ and the realization of the perfect “measure” in each member. This theory cleaves closely to the surrounding terminology of the apostle’s exhortation. Jerome completes this argument with yet more vocabulary imported from Eph 4.13, which promises that all will attain to a “unity of knowledge (*agnitio*) of the Son of God.” Jerome construes the term *agnitio* in the sense he obtains from Origen as a “remembrance” or a “recognition.”⁶³ This meaning of *agnitio* provides the hinge on which

60. Cf. Jerome, *Ephes.* 3.5.28a (Vall. 658).

61. Jerome, *Ephes.* 2.4.7 (Vall. 611) (following Origen, *comm. in Eph.*, Fr. 17.16–21), insists that the “measure” refers to the capacity of an individual, not to a limit on God’s gift.

62. Jerome, *Ephes.* 2.4.8 (Vall. 613); 2.4.11–12 (Vall. 616): each member has received gifts according to the measure of the gift of Christ, but not the same gifts (Eph 4.8); the “measure of the gift of Christ” is the premise for appointment of ecclesiastical officers (Eph 4.11–12). Origen, *comm. in Eph.*, Fr. 17.28–32 also bases ecclesiastical offices on the reception of the “measure of the gift of Christ.”

63. Compare Jerome, *Ephes.* 2.4.16 (Vall. 619) with 1.1.15–18 (Vall. 563) (= Origen, *comm. in Eph.*, Fr. 9.25–31).

the *restitutio omnium* turns. In the restitution of all things "each one will receive his place according to the measure of faith and knowledge (*agnitionis*) of the Son of God (whom therefore he is said to 'recognize' [*agnoscere*] since he had previously known him, but later ceased to know him), and will begin to be that which he once had been" (App. 4E). The Platonic epistemology of recollection links *archē* and *telos*, binding the advance toward perfection (Eph 4.13) with the eschatological theory of *restitutio* (Acts 3.21). The "knowledge" of the Son formally connects the *restitutio omnium* and the eschatological vision of Ephesians 4.16, but also operates as the material basis upon which the restoration will be achieved. "Knowledge" is the "measure" by which each member of Christ's body will assume its rightful place in the restoration.

This theory of the *apokatastasis* permeates Jerome's entire exegesis of Eph 4.16, and even the two illustrations balance the motifs of unity and individuation. Although both similes illustrate the composition of an entire "body" from individual "members," each example highlights a different aspect of the relationship between part and whole. The first (App. 4C), which depicts a physician restoring a torn body to its former integrity, emphasizes the *apokatastasis* as a restoration of the body to its primitive condition. In the second image (App. 4D), that of the growth of a child, the emphasis falls on the harmony achieved in the organism despite the different rates of growth of each individual part. The two images aptly reflect the interpretive poles of "fullness" and "measure" that structure the comments to Eph 4.16. The first simile emphasizes the wholeness of the restored body, while the second simile asserts the natural harmony that results from the attainment by each individual member of its prescribed "measure."

In this compact presentation, Jerome develops a theory of the *apokatastasis* in tight connection with the whole flow of the argument from Eph 4.1 through 4.16. His use of favorite scriptural citations of Origen in constructing this theory provides strong indication that Origen is the underlying source.⁶⁴ The more difficult question concerns the opacity of Jerome's filtration of his source. How transparently can Origen's explication be recovered from Jerome's indirect witness? In his apology, Jerome claims to have summarized "Origen's very lengthy interpretation," not omitting "any of his examples and assertions." Afterward, he asserts, he

64. See, e.g., Origen, *comm. in 1 Cor.*, Fr. 53, citing 1 Cor 13.12 in conjunction with Eph 4.13; *Jo.* 1.22(23).137; 1.32(37).236 identifying "Man" as a title of Christ. For more detailed analysis, see Layton, "Origen as a Reader of Paul," 271–84.

appended his own conclusions, in which he refuted two heresies: one that holds that “all rational creatures [will be] changed back into angels,” and another that maintains “each and every thing shall be in the same state in which it was created.”⁶⁵ Jerome attributes these teachings to the heresies of Origen.

If Jerome’s self-representation were accepted, it would be impossible to discern with confidence the relationship between the exegesis of Eph 4.16 and Origen’s theory of the *apokatastasis*. For this reason, a closer examination of the contested paragraph is warranted. In his critique of the “two heresies,” Jerome applies to the theory of the *apokatastasis* the second simile—taken from Origen—of the natural growth of a child. By means of this image, Origen asserts that while individual parts obtain their own “measure,” nevertheless their growth is directed toward the overall good of the body: “so that it appears that [the members] grow not for themselves, but for the body.” Jerome then describes the *apokatastasis* using the twin concepts of measure and fullness:

In the same way (*Ita*), therefore, in the restitution of all things (Acts 3.21), when Christ Jesus, the true physician, comes to heal the entire body of the church . . . each one will receive his place according to the measure of faith and recognition of the Son of God . . . and will begin to be that which he once had been. Nevertheless, this will not take place in the manner taught by another heresy (*aliam heresim*), that all are to be placed in a single age, that is all will be reformed into angels. Rather, every member will be perfect in accordance with its measure and its office: for example, the apostate angel will begin to be that which it was created to be, and man, who had been cast out of paradise, will again be restored to the cultivation of paradise. All these things will be done in such a way that everyone will be joined to one another in love. When member rejoices together with member (1 Cor 12.26) and delights in the advance of another, the body of Christ—which is the church of the first born—will dwell in the heavenly Jerusalem (Heb 12.22), which the Apostle calls in another place the “mother of the saints” (Gal 4.26).

This clarification extends the illustration of a child’s bodily growth to insist on the continued existence of an individual “measure” or “office” in the ultimate restoration. It is clear that only one heresy—not two as Jerome later claimed—is in view. The argument with *aliam heresim* turns on a narrow exegetical question: does the *restitutio omnium* consist of the establishment of a “single age” for all members, or does each member

65. Jerome, *Ruf.* 1.26–27 (CCL 79:26).

obtain a place in the body of the "perfect man" according to its proper "measure"? The dispute hinges on the meaning of the obscure phrase "measure of age" (*metron hēlikias*) by which the believers will obtain the "fullness of Christ" and meet in the "perfect man" (Eph 4.13).

The attacked heresy interprets the *restitutio* into the "perfect man" solely by reference to the achievement of a single "age," while overlooking the distinctiveness of individual "measure." The conclusion Jerome reaches, namely the persistence of distinct "members" in the fully matured "body," flows directly from the illustration taken from Origen. In his *Commentary on John*, Origen appeals to the organic unity in differentiation of 1 Cor 12 as the model for the arrival at the "perfect man." When the "true and perfect body of Christ" is raised, the many members will be assembled into the single body of the "perfect man." Nevertheless, "the distinction of the foot and the hand and the eye and the ear and the nose which fill out individually the head, which are the feet and the rest of the members weaker and humbler and the unbeautiful and beautiful is a matter for God alone to effect." Despite these persistent distinctions, God will eliminate the causes of discontent, giving "superior honor to the lesser member more than in the present, so that in no way 'might there be division in the body, but that each of the members will take care of each other' (1 Cor 12.23)."⁶⁶

There are further signs that this polemic derives from Origen's reading of Eph 4.16. Jerome does not hesitate in rebutting *aliam heresim* to suggest an eschatological restoration of the "apostate angel," who "will begin to be that which it was created to be," a reminiscence of Origen's well-known universalism. In light of the unity of Jerome's comments, the pattern of scriptural citations suggests that Jerome draws the polemic as well as the positive exposition from his source material. It is doubtful that Jerome had Origen in view as the proponent of *aliam heresim* when he composed the commentary. In the subsequent controversy with Rufinus, however, Origen offered a convenient means to deflect criticism.

It is easier to dismiss Origen as the target of this polemic than it is to identify the teaching that Jerome attacks. Three explanations are possible. Origen may have attacked as "heretical" a reading of Eph 4.13 that anticipated the progression of "the body of Christ" into a single "age." Jerome appropriated the polemic, but lacking information on the source

66. Origen, *Jo.* 10.36(20).236–38. Compare also the use of Heb 12.22 and Gal 4.26 in Jerome's rebuttal of *aliam heresim* with the frequent citations of Origen, *comm. in Mt.* 16.15, *princ.* 4.3.8, *Cant.* prol, 4.19, 2.3.3–4, 2.3.17, 3.10.6, *hom.* 11.3 in *Lev.*, *hom.* 2.1, 3.3 in *Num.*

of the errant eschatology, left the attribution of the heresy anonymous. I have found, however, no evidence of this precise interpretation of Eph 4.13 among Origen's predecessors. Second, Origen may have added some clarifying remarks concerning the progress of each individual to maturity in Christ in conformity with his "measure," and Jerome mistakenly regarded this clarification to be targeted at an opponent. Lastly, Jerome may have known of interpretations of Eph 4.13 that he considered "heretical" on the basis of an anticipated return of "all" (*omnes*) to a "single age," which he glossed as a reformation into an angelic state.⁶⁷

Any of these possibilities permit recovery of the exposition of the metaphor of the "perfect man" that Origen applies to his theory of the *restitutio omnium*. Despite the ambiguity occasioned by the introduction of *aliā heresim*, the key points of Origen's explication of Eph 4.16 can be recovered. Origen draws together a constellation of metaphors from the letter to the Ephesians that fix the meaning of the anticipated arrival at the "perfect man." The "perfect man" focuses much of the distinctive language of Ephesians on a vision of ultimate created perfection that maintains some measure of individual distinction within an organic unity. Eph 4.16 stands at a juncture between Origen's exegetical rigor and his theological speculation, revealing a close union between his reading of Ephesians and his presentation of eschatological theories. As this exposition responds so directly to the immediate textual fabric, it would be premature to draw far-reaching conclusions about Origen's complete thought on the *apokatastasis*. Nevertheless, the comments to Eph 4.16 allow more room for individuation in the eschatological restoration than Origen's later critics asserted, an emphasis consistent with comments preserved elsewhere in the catena fragments.⁶⁸

67. It is tempting to associate the contested position with the monistic eschatology of Evagrian Origenism, which anticipated that all rational beings would rejoin the Godhead in an undifferentiated unity of "naked minds." Linking *aliā heresim* with this theory, however, is problematic. Jerome identifies the contested "single age" as an angelic state, not as a condition that transcends all corporeality. Further, Jerome's numerous complaints against Origenist eschatology in the ensuing decades show little knowledge of this theory. Some recognition of this monistic vision would be expected in subsequent writings if by 386 Jerome were already aware of such theories. See Clark, *Origenist Controversy*, 62–74 for the role of this eschatology in Evagrius's system, and pp. 121–51 for Jerome's charges against Origen.

68. Cf. Origen, *comm. in Eph.*, Fr. 24.37–45 (to Eph 5.5); Fr. 8.40–52 (to Eph 1.14).

5. Eph 5.6: "Let no one deceive you with empty words, for on account of these the wrath of God comes against the sons of disobedience."

In Eph 5.6 the Apostle admonishes the Ephesians to be wary against "empty" arguments (*kenoi logoi*). The admonition is general, and specifies neither the authors, nor the content, of the "empty words" against which believers should maintain vigilance. Among ancient commentators, only Origen and Jerome explain the phrase by reference to future punishments. In the brief remark preserved in the catena, Origen defines as "empty" arguments that enlist a "certain plausibility" in the effort "to overturn the doctrine concerning the punishments." This use of Eph 5.6 is consistent with an allusion to the verse Origen makes in his Corinthian homilies in refuting those who would presume upon God's forbearance in punishing sins.⁶⁹ Jerome expands on Origen's comments to redirect the eschatological issue. Jerome not only reasserts the doctrine of retribution, but also insists on a particular manner in which punishments will be inflicted. The "empty words" are those that deny the external application of punishment, maintaining that the pangs of conscience suffice as judgment for sin. Such teachings provide false hope to sinners, and encourage arrogance in the face of God's judgment (App. 5A–B).

A long section of Jerome's exposition without catena parallel is of chief interest for our purposes. Jerome criticizes those "who say that punishments for sins are not future" and deny external punishments on the basis that consciousness of transgression inflicts sufficient torture. They liken prophetic threats of "the worm in the heart does not die" and a "flame is kindled in the soul" (Isa 66.24, 50.11) to a fever, which does not torment the sick from without, but punishes the ill by means of their own bodies. This comparison recalls the analogy Origen draws between the punishment of sinners and the symptoms of disease in *On First Principles*, and it is possible that Jerome criticizes in these remarks an opinion he encountered in Origen's commentary.⁷⁰

Several difficulties, however, suggest some circumspection. Origen, unlike Jerome's opponent, does not restrict punishment for sin to the present life. Moreover, these teachers, Jerome maintains, do not view the tortures as "external" (*nec extrinsecus*), a summation that allows either for physical

69. Origen, *comm. in 1 Cor.*, Fr. 27.45–46: "Let no one be deceived by 'plausible words' (*pithanois logos*), 'God is merciful, kind, a lover of humanity; He will forgive sins.'"

70. Origen, *princ.* 2.10.4.

suffering resulting as a consequence of sin or for purely mental states of remorse. Jerome's declaration that "the sin itself and the consciousness of transgression serve as punishment" suggests that he has the latter position in view. This distinction, albeit fine, is of importance to Origen, who regarded the anticipated punishments as fully somatic experiences, experienced internally as a consequence of the sinner's own actions.⁷¹ Finally, it is doubtful that Origen used the admonition against "empty words" in Eph 5.6 to promote a preferred theory of the manner in which sinners would experience punishments. While Origen regarded a direct equation of the future "eternal fire" to purge sins with material fire as simplistic, he did not regard such naïve conceptions as "empty" or vain. Indeed, such views were useful to help the ordinary believer adhere to moral standards.⁷² It is possible that the first half of Jerome's attack—against those who deny the existence of future punishments—echoes Origen's comment. Origen defends the doctrine of punishments against detractors who attack the Christian doctrine of God on this basis, and the reference to "empty arguments" could have prompted such an association.⁷³ The second half of the polemic, however, with its criticism of the application of Isaianic prophecy to internal suffering is inconsistent with Origen, and almost certainly reflects Jerome's own concerns.

Jerome grounds his objections on the need to encourage penance. By providing a simulacrum of assurance, the "empty words" lead to eternal

71. See Origen, *princ.* 2.10.4–8 for his most systematic exposition of the doctrine of punishments, along with the discussion of Edwards, "Origen's Two Resurrections," 509–13 for the somatic nature of the torments. See further, Origen *comm. ser. 72 in Mt.* (GCS 38:171–72) for his explanation of how the "eternal fire" of Matt 25.41 and Isa 66.24 could be invisible and internal to bodies while remaining a physical phenomenon. It cannot be excluded, of course, that Jerome has misunderstood Origen's theory. Jerome, *ep.* 124.7 (CSEL 56:104) holds that Origen teaches the punishments are solely a mental experience: *ignem quoque gehennae et tormenta . . . non ponit in suppliciis, sed in conscientia peccatorum*. It is significant, however, that, in this letter which consists largely of extracts from *de principiis*, Jerome is unable to cite Origen's own words to support his allegation and resorts to paraphrase.

72. Origen, *Cels.* 5.16: "the ordinary interpretation of the punishments is *suitable* because they [the simple] have not the capacity for any other means of conversion and of repentance from evils, except that of fear and the suggestion of punishment" (trans. H. Chadwick, *Origen: Contra Celsum* [Cambridge: Cambridge Univ., 1953], 276, emphasis added). Origen, *hom.* 20.4 *in Jer.* (GCS 6:183), observes that many who learn a more sophisticated understanding of retribution have fallen into immoral behavior. He laments, "it would have profited them to take heed, as they formerly used to take heed, of 'their worm will not die' and that 'their fire will not be quenched' (Isa 66.24)."

73. Origen, *princ.* 2.10, *Cels.* 5.14–16, 6.25–27, 8.38–40.

punishment by encouraging sinners to hold fast in their current life (App. 5B). Ecclesiastical authorities contemporary to Jerome recognized a potential threat to penitential practices if the doctrine of punishments was questioned. Rank-and-file believers mixed anxiety about future punishment with a healthy dose of incredulity. Pacian of Barcelona, whose writings Jerome knew, could anticipate that a significant portion of his congregation looked skeptically upon the threat of physical tortures in the afterlife. The bishop responded with a strong assertion of future retribution. If penitents recoiled at the "torture of confession," let them only consider that the rich man (Luke 16.19–31) had only yet experienced the pain of punishment applied to the soul—what torture awaited him when he would be reunited to his body!⁷⁴ Basil of Caesarea also encountered in the monasteries under his care anxiety about posthumous suffering. He depicts certain brothers who approach their superior with an exegetical question. If, in the parable of the judgment imposed on two slaves (Luke 12.41–48), "one will receive many strokes and another few, how do some say that there is no end to punishment?"⁷⁵ Basil's answer is steeped in the Origenian tradition, but also shares common ground with Jerome. Adducing Isa 66.24—one of the prooftexts at issue in Jerome's comments to Eph 5.6—Basil explains that the Lucan parable concerns a difference in degree of punishment, and holds that eternal punishment is necessary to encourage sinners to repentance. He diverges from Jerome in that he does not insist on somatic punishments, but he does not press the question.

The doubts encountered by Pacian and Basil point to pastoral concerns that could prompt the vehemence of Jerome's polemic in his comments to Eph 5.6. This outburst, however, is among the most violent in any of the Pauline commentaries. The "inducements" (*persuasiones*) by which these teachers "flatter sinners" possess a certain "ornament of speech" (*florem sermonum*), but are "deceitful snares" (*decipulas fraudulentitas*) because they abet wanton defiance of God. Accusing teachers of laying "snares" heightens the polemic; Jerome elsewhere characterizes as *decipulae* the devices of Satan, the Pharisees, Origenists, and heretics in general.⁷⁶ It is

74. Pacian, *de paenitentibus* 11.5–7, in *Pacien de Barcelone: Ecrits*, SC 410 (Paris: Cerf, 1995), 142. Cf. Jerome, *vir. ill.* 106.

75. Basil, *reg. br.* 267 (PG 31:1264C–1265C). Regarding the compilation of this collection, see P. Rousseau, *Basil of Caesarea* (Berkeley: University of California, 1994), Appendix II, pp. 354–59, with further bibliography.

76. Of Satan: *Naum* 1.12–13 (CCL 76A:538); of the Pharisees: *Matt.* 3.19.3 (SC 259:66); of the Origenists, *ep.* 84.5 (CSEL 55:126); of other heretics, *Isa.* 4.10.16–19 (CCL 73:140), and Jerome's translation of Didymus, *spir.* 254 (ed. Doutreleau, SC

difficult to escape the impression that Jerome's invective is directed at a person rather than simply an opinion in Origen's commentary. In his writings of the 380s Jerome expressed increasingly open hostility to Ambrose, and the Ephesians commentary reflects one such attack.⁷⁷ In his prologue to the commentary, Jerome denigrates Ambrose's ethical writings as ostentatious discourses cobbled together with borrowed platitudes.⁷⁸ Jerome's complaint in Eph 5.6 against superficial eloquence that "flatters" (*blandiri*) recalls both the critique in that prologue and also a veiled attack Jerome inserts in *epistle* 22 (written in 384). In this treatise on virginity, Jerome warns against the "ingratiating enemy" (*blandus inimicus*) of virgins, and disavows rhetorical ornament (*pompa sermonis*), criticisms that Neil Adkin has convincingly linked to the bishop of Milan.⁷⁹

If Ambrose is the target of this attack, a sermon that the bishop wove into his *Exposition on the Gospel According to Luke* may have supplied Jerome with the necessary ammunition. Ambrose constructed the *Expositio* in part from reworked homilies, including a sermon on Luke's parable of the great feast (Luke 14.15–24).⁸⁰ He conflates this version with that of Matthew, which contains the added episode of the expulsion of guests who lack a "wedding garment" (Matt 22.11–14). Ambrose attempts to dispel false conceptions that Matthew's vivid imagery might foster. The threats in this parable and other passages do not refer to gnashing of "material teeth" (*corporaliū*), nor to some material "eternal fire," nor

386). Jerome can also use *persuasio* in polemical context to refer to deceptive reasoning. See, e.g., Jerome, *ep.* 51.6 (CSEL 54:406), translating the letter of Epiphanius to John of Jerusalem.

77. S. M. Oberhelman, "Jerome's Earliest Attack on Ambrose: *On Ephesians*, Prologue (ML 26:469D–70A)," *TAPA* 121 (1991): 377–401. See also N. Adkin, "Ambrose and Jerome: The Opening Shot," *Mnemosyne*, n.s. 46 (1993): 364–76 for an earlier attack on Ambrose in Jerome, *ep.* 22. I thank the anonymous reader for drawing my attention to the latter article.

78. Jerome, *Ephes.* 1. prol. (Vall. 539–40): *in communibus loci pompaticum iactare sermonem*. For Ambrose as the target of this criticism, see Adkin, "Ambrose and Jerome," 373.

79. See Jerome, *ep.* 22.2.2 (CSEL 54:146) with the discussion of N. Adkin, "Ambrose and Jerome," 372–73, who also notes the connection between this passage and Jerome, *Ephes.* 1. prol.

80. Ambrose, *Luc.* 7.205 (CSEL 32.4:374–75). The final form of the *Expositio* combines homilies with written commentary. The nearby allusion to the Scripture *hodie lectum* (7.202) suggests the origination of the remarks to Luke 14.15–24 in a homily. On the complex problems presented by the form of the *Expositio*, see T. Graumann, *Christus Interpres: Die Einheit und Verkündigung in der Lukaserklärung des Ambrosius von Mailand* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1994), 16–27.

to a material "worm." Citing both Isa 50.11 and 66.24 (which Jerome invokes in his polemic), Ambrose offers the analogy of a fever to explain the scriptural threats. Remorse for sins (*maestitia delictorum*) produces "fire" and the "worm" refers to the sins of the irrational soul that "prick the mind and understanding" and devour the "entrails of the conscience" (*viscera conscientiae*). Ambrose's debt to Origen's doctrine of the punishments is clear, but he goes beyond Origen's guarded formulations in denying the corporeality of the punishments. Unfortunately, when Ambrose preached this sermon cannot be determined with precision, as the *Expositio* evolved over a lengthy period.⁸¹ In the absence of firm chronology of Ambrose's writings, the bishop of Milan remains a possible target of Jerome's attack.

Even if Jerome's animosity toward Ambrose might explain the vehemence of his tone, his recasting of Origen's comments reveal the altered theological landscape of the late fourth century. At stake is no longer the reality of God's identity as a "chastiser," but the physical actuality of the torments; the verse no longer addresses the doctrine of God, but the persistence of physical experience. The status of embodiment had come under increasing focus as the ascetic enterprise gained prestige in the fourth century, and this emphasis extended to a reappraisal of eschatological expectations.⁸² To this extent, the emergence of fourth-century theological disputes begins to color Jerome's reception of Origen. Nevertheless, Jerome's comments to Eph 5.6 do not differentiate a specifically Origenist theory of the status of the resurrection body from popular doubts about eternal, corporeal punishment. It is doubtful that Origen argued against corporeal punishments in his comments to this verse, nor does Jerome expand upon this position to undertake a comprehensive re-examination of Origen's doctrine of the resurrection body.

81. The foundational work for chronology of Ambrose's writings is still J.-R. Palanque, *Saint Ambroise et l'empire romain: Contribution à l'histoire des rapports de l'église et l'état à la fin du quatrième siècle* (Paris: Editions de Boccard, 1933), see 449–51, 529–36 for discussion of the *Expositio*. F. H. Dudden, *The Life and Times of St. Ambrose* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1935), 692–93, and Graumann, *Christus Interpres*, 18–21 usefully critique Palanque's effort to extract full homilies from the current form of the composition. Despite the uncertainties, occasional allusions allow confidence that Ambrose preached some portions of the *Expositio* before Jerome composed the Pauline commentaries in 386. Ambrose, *Luc.* 7.178, does not mention Gervasius and Protasius in a reference to Milanese martyrs, an unlikely omission in a homily preached after 386.

82. P. Brown, *The Body and Society: Men, Women, and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988), esp. 222–24, 441–42; Clark, *Origenist Controversy*, 85–158.

CONCLUSIONS

In four of the five examined passages, Jerome offers a faithful, and mostly competent, witness to Origen's exegesis. Given the close connection between the investigation of exegetical questions and the exposition of eschatological theory, Jerome's fidelity to his source permits confidence that he accurately reflects Origen's treatment of eschatology in the *Commentary on Ephesians*. In the fifth passage, fourth-century disputes concerning the manner of punishments to be inflicted on sinners affect Jerome's reception and treatment of his source material. The "filter" in this case appears to respond only indirectly to Origen's comments to Eph 5.6, and is activated instead by a combination of hostility against contemporary opponents and pastoral concerns for penitential discipline. It does not appear in any of the five passages that Jerome either perceives or guards against an "Origenist" eschatology in his use of Origen's commentary.

Although Jerome does not permit the reconstruction of Origen's *ipsissima verba*, it may be possible to recover from the Latin commentary the structure and the flow of the exegetical inquiry Origen conducts. Jerome's attestation to Origen's probing of Ephesians for its eschatological vision may support a reappraisal of an aspect of Origen's thought obscured by the subsequent conflict. The letter to the Ephesians incorporates language that in some instances proclaims the final hope for believers as an accomplished fact, and in other instances exhorts the readers to await God's ultimate vindication. Although God "has put all things under [Christ's] feet" (Eph 1.22), the Ephesians ought "to make most of the time because the days are evil" (Eph 5.16). God has, Paul asserts, "raised us up with him and seated us with him" (Eph 2.6), but the apostle nevertheless exhorts the community to cease from an array of vices (Eph 4.25–32). In his commentary, Origen makes a notable effort to recognize and to interpret this tension. Origen strives to define the limits of the availability of perfection in the present life, and to balance the competing claims of communal solidarity with individual perfection. Eschatological language, Origen recognizes, is necessarily metaphorical, and his commentary takes distinctive advantage of the rich diversity of such metaphors in Ephesians. Three eschatological metaphors have been the focus of this study: the reception by the saints of a "pledge" or "seal" of the Holy Spirit; the elevation of the saints as corulers "seated with Christ;" and the progress of each member to the "fullness" of its "measure" in the "perfect man." Each metaphor opens for Origen a different set of tensions between the availability of the resurrection life in the present and the anticipated fulfillment in the future, and between individual perfection and communal wholeness. Without the witness of Jerome's commentary, Origen's

intricate working of this symbolic language would be severely damaged, and in important cases permanently lost.

Beyond the preservation of the detail of Origen's exegesis, Jerome enables deeper recognition of how Origen develops his thought with attention to the specific language of Scripture and attempts to elucidate the connection between interlocking eschatological metaphors. Origen's efforts in this commentary to balance and connect these metaphors suggest a far more textured approach to eschatology than is reflected in the subsequent summations of his views. In particular, Origen's *Commentary on Ephesians* does not support the monistic form of the *apokatastasis* ascribed to him by opponents in the later Origenist controversy. Both Origen's interpretation of the "pledge" of the Spirit and his explication of the formation of the "perfect man" allow for the persistence of individual distinction in the ultimate restoration. Origen does not attempt in this commentary to relate this position to theories of the origination of rational souls or their existence in an embodied state. This ambiguity may have permitted, or even necessitated, Origen's later admirers and critics to rationalize Origen's eschatology and integrate it into other aspects of Origen's cosmology.

Richard A. Layton is Assistant Professor in the Program for the Study of Religion at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

APPENDIX

1. Eph 1.14. Origen, *comm. in Eph.* Fr. 8.44–62; Jerome, *Ephes.* 1.1.14 (Vall. 561)

Origen	Jerome
A. You will examine whether everyone who participates in the Holy Spirit participates in the "spirit of promise," or if only that person who hears and believes the "word of truth" (1.13)—that is the "gospel of salvation" (1.13)—receives the "Holy Spirit of promise." Let us also further give attention to this matter: whether everyone who participates in the Holy Spirit in any way has the "pledge of inheritance."	A. Whoever, therefore, receives not simply the Holy Spirit, but also the "Holy Spirit of promise," obtains at the same time the "pledge of inheritance," which inheritance is eternal life.

B. It is better to understand that, as in the case of those who buy something and give a pledge, the pledge is given in proportion to the amount of the whole sum, so also the “pledge of inheritance” is given in proportion to the good things foreseen for each saint. Consequently, on the basis of the pledge, whoever can perceive the difference in potential between pledges could already speak about a greater and lesser inheritance “stored up” (cf. Col 1.5) for the coheirs of Christ.

C. For just as the “pledge of inheritance” is not something outside of us (for the “Holy Spirit of promise” is in each individual, the pledge of the promise), thus the inheritance is not something outside of the heir, but is in the mind and the soul of the heir. For nothing external can be compared to the perfection of the mind that contemplates the beauties of Wisdom and the Word of God and Truth.

B. And just as from a pledge is estimated what the future purchase will be—as for instance, from a pledge of ten *solidi*, a villa of a hundred *solidi*, and from a pledge of one hundred *solidi*, a villa of a thousand *solidi*—from the diversity of the pledges also is recognized the magnitude of the inheritance that will later be obtained.

C. For as the pledge which is granted to us is not outside us, but is within us, so also the inheritance itself, this is the kingdom of God which is in us (Luke 17.21), remains within us. For what can be a greater inheritance than to contemplate and to see with the mind the beauty of the Wisdom, and of the Word, and of the Truth, and of the Light, and to reflect upon the ineffable and magnificent nature of God, and to gaze upon the essence of everything that has been fashioned in the likeness of God?

2. Eph 2.6, Origen, *comm. in Eph.*, Fr. 10.1–13; Jerome, *Ephes.* 1.2.6 (Vall. 575)

Origen

Jerome

A. He said above that God raised Christ from the dead, and made him to sit at his right hand in the heavens above every principality, and authority, and power, and dominion, and every name which is named not only in this age, but also in the future (1.20–21). Yet now he adds: “since he also raised us with him, and made us to sit in the heavens at his right hand.” It will be asked, therefore,

how has God, who raised and saved us, made us to sit together with Christ?

B. Someone who interprets more simply will maintain that the phrase "has raised together and has seated together" is said according to the foreknowledge and predestination of God, on the grounds that what will be is something that already has occurred.

B. And one who is going to answer in a simpler manner, claims this is said according to the foreknowledge of God, by which something in the future is spoken of as if already done, and that this is the custom of the Scriptures, that future events are occasionally inflected by a past tense. [Jerome cites Ps 21.17, Isa 53.7, 53.5, 53.8]. Since, therefore, the future is always uncertain, those things which God knows as future (since before him nothing is unclear) are recorded as if already done, that human hopes may not waver and totter. Since according to the philosophers, no past events can be undone, men may regard future events as if they have already occurred.

C. But whoever sees that the kingdom of Christ is an intelligible reality will not hesitate to say that this already true in the case of the saint. Just as he is not "in the flesh" even if he is said by the more simple-minded people to be in the flesh, so also he is not on earth even if he is seen by physical sight to be on earth. For, whoever is in the spirit is not on the earth, and no one of those who are "in the heavens" is "in the flesh" but is already "in the spirit." For the dispositions of such people and the comprehension of such great and noble things are not earthly but is heavenly, for those having already their "citizenship in heaven" (Phil 3.20) having already taken their seats together "with Christ in the

C. Someone else, however, who understands the resurrection and reign of Christ spiritually, will not hesitate¹ to say that the saints already sit and reign with Christ: for just as a saint is by no means in the flesh, although he lives in the flesh,

and he has citizenship in heaven (Phil 3.20), although he walks on the earth, and has ceased from being flesh and is

1. F. Pieri, *deliberabit*. Cf. Vall., *deliberavit*.

heavens,” since also “the Kingdom of God is among” us (Luke 17.21), so that we may be seated in the heavens, sitting together with Christ and established together with the Wisdom and Word of God.

completely turned into spirit: thus he sits in heaven with Christ—for the reign of God is within us (Luke 17.21), and where our treasure is there also will be our heart (Matt 5.21), and we sit firm and strong with Christ, Wisdom, Word, Righteousness, Truth.

D. This also may be said, that as we have received the pledge of the Holy Spirit (1.14), but have not yet obtained its complete fullness, so also we sit and reign with Christ, without yet attaining the perfect sitting in the heavens.

3. Eph 2.7, Jerome, *Ephes.* 1.2.7 (Vall. 575–77)

A. How great is the magnitude of the beneficence, and how manifold is the grace, by which the Lord, having freed us from the disturbances of this age, has caused us to sit and reign with Christ, is established especially by this, that in not one, but in all the future ages, he will show his glory relating to us in the presence of all the rational creatures, and he will demonstrate his riches. We, who formerly were being held by the law of the lower world, and through offenses and sins were destined both to works of the flesh and to punishment, now we reign with Christ and we sit with him. Further, we sit with him not in some lowly place, but above every principality, and authority, and power, and dominion, and every name which can be named not only in this age, but in the future (Eph 1.21). For if Christ, having been raised from the dead sits at the right hand of God in the heavens above every principality, and authority, and power, et cetera—and we sit and reign with Christ—it is necessary that we also sit above those things above which he sits.

B. But whoever is a careful reader immediately will ask: “What then, is man greater than the angels and all the powers in heaven?” Because it is somewhat perilous to answer, he will refer principalities and authorities and powers and dominions and every name that can be named not only in this age but also in the future (especially since all things are subjected beneath the feet of Christ) not to the good part, but to the opposing part, declaring them apostate angels, and the prince of this world (John 12.31, 16.11) and Lucifer who rose in the morning (Isa 14.12), above whom the saints at the day of judgment will be seated together with Christ, granting benefits also to those who now, unbridled and using their free will evilly, wander to and fro, and fall headlong down the precipices of sin. But when they have such rulers sitting over them, they will be begin to be governed by the will of those who sit over them.

C. Someone else, however, will apply the verse “that he might show in the ages

to come the overflowing riches of his grace in kindness toward us in Christ Jesus" to that conception, that we are saved not by our merit, but by his grace, and it is proof of greater kindness to die for sinners rather than for the righteous, "for a good man perhaps someone will dare to die" (Rom 5.7), and that he will give to us, "what no eye has seen, nor ear has heard, nor has risen in the heart of man" (1 Cor 2.9). All of which has been given already in part in Christ Jesus, since nothing can be called good apart from Christ.

4. Eph 4.16, Jerome, *Ephes.* 2.4.16 (Vall. 618–20)

A. At the end of things, when we will begin to see God face to face (1 Cor 13.12), and we will arrive at the measure of the maturity of the fullness of Christ (Eph 4.13)—of whose fullness we all now have received (John 1.16)—so that Christ will be in us not partially, but fully, and having left behind the beginning steps of children, we will grow into that man, of whom the prophet says: "Behold the man, East is his name" (Zech 6.12) and John the Baptist relates: "After me comes a man who was made before me, since he was before me" (John 1.30).

B. Then, in the meeting of one faith, and of one recognition of the Son of God, whom now because of the diversity of understanding, we do not know in one and the same faith or recognition, the entire body, which earlier had been scattered and torn into different pieces, brought back together into its fashioning and joining so that in one and the same service and operation, and a completed perfection of one age, may make the entire body to grow equally, and every member receive the growth of the age suitable to its own measure. This entire building, through which the body of the church grows in parts, will be filled with mutual love.

C. Let us consider all rational creatures under the example of one rational being, and whatever we might say concerning the members and parts of this being, we know that it must be applied to each rational creature. Let us imagine that this animal is so torn into limbs, blood-vessels, and flesh that bone does not adhere to bone, nor is a nerve connected to a nerve. Eyes lie apart, nostrils sundered, hands occupy one place, feet are tossed to another, and in this fashion the other members are scattered amongst themselves and divided. Now fashion a physician of such great knowledge to come, who according to the pagan tales, might be able to imitate Aesclepius, and to raise up Virbius into a new form and new name. This man would need to restore each member to its place, and unite joint to joint and to make one body by some kind of ligature when the parts are restored.

D. One simile has brought us thus far; now let another example be applied to the same simile for what we seek to understand. Let a child grow, and as time passes unnoticed, reach perfect maturity; a hand will have its growth, the feet will perceive their increase. While we are unaware, the stomach is filled; while the eyes wander, the shoulders are enlarged. All the members through parts according to their own measure grow in such a fashion so that it appears that they grow not for themselves, but for the body.

E. In the same way, therefore, in the restitution of all things (Acts 3.21), when Christ Jesus, the true physician, comes to heal the entire body of the church, which is now dispersed and torn, each one will receive his place according to the measure of faith and recognition of the Son of God (whom he is said to “recognize” since he had previously known him, but later ceased to know him), and will begin to be that which he once had been. Nevertheless, this will not take place in the manner taught by another heresy, that all are to be placed in a single age, that is all will be reformed into angels. Rather, every member will be perfect in accordance with its measure and its office: for example, the apostate angel will begin to be that which it was created to be, and man, who had been cast out of paradise, will again be restored to the cultivation of paradise. All these things will be done in such a way, that everyone will be joined to one another in love. When member rejoices together with member (1 Cor 12.26) and delights in the advance of another, the body of Christ—which is the church of the first born—will dwell in the heavenly Jerusalem (Heb 12.22), which the Apostle calls in another place the “mother of the saints” (Gal 4.26). Therefore (as I said above) these things are very obscure to us, since they are said, in the Greek version, μεταφορικῶς. And whenever any metaphor is translated literally from one language into another, the meanings and offshoots of the expression are choked off as if by brambles.

5. Eph 5.6, Origen, *comm. in Eph.*, Fr. 25.2–5;
Jerome, *Ephes.* 3.5.6 (Vall. 643–44)

Origen

A. It seems that he calls “empty words” those that seek

Jerome

A. Words that deceive and even overthrow are “empty” and vain. Words, however, that build those who hear (Eph 4.29) are full, completed, compacted. There are many, then, who say punishments for sins are not future, nor are the torments applied externally. Rather, they say, sin itself and consciousness of transgression serves as punishment, so long as “the worm in the heart does not die” and a “flame is kindled in the soul” (Isa 66.24, 50.11), resembling a fever, which does not torment the sick from without, but by seizing the body itself it punishes, to the extent that it will take hold, without application of external torments.

B. by means of a certain plausibility to overturn the doctrine concerning the punishments imposed upon those who live wickedly.

B. Therefore he called these inducements and deceitful snares "vain" and empty "words," which seem to have a certain ornament of speech and to flatter sinners. But as long, however, as they bestow confidence, they rather lead to eternal punishment, because God is angered by nothing more than if a sinner is haughty, and being proud and unbending neither laments in tears nor requests mercy for his sin.