

LOYOLA SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY PUBLICATIONS



No. 4

The Theology of the Transfiguration in the Latin Fathers

Emmanuel Marfori y Cuello

Loyola School of Theology

THE THEOLOGY OF THE TRANSFIGURATION IN THE LATIN FATHERS

EMMANUEL MARFORI Y CUELLO

MONOGRAPHS

Number
4



© 2024 LOYOLA SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
QUEZON CITY, PHILIPPINES

The Theology of the Transfiguration in the Latin Fathers
by Emmanuel Marfori y Cuello

Translated by the author from the original dissertation in Spanish
entitled *La Teología de la Transfiguración en los Padres Latinos*

Copyright © 2024 Loyola School of Theology

All rights reserved. This book or parts thereof may not be reproduced in any form, stored in any retrieval system, or transmitted in any form by any means—electronic, mechanical, photocopy, recording, or otherwise—without prior written permission of the publisher, except as provided by Philippine copyright law. For permission requests, contact the publisher at publications@lst.edu.

First edition August 2024.

Loyola School of Theology
Katipunan Avenue, Loyola Heights, Quezon City 1108 Philippines
https://lst.edu/; https://publications.lst.edu/

Universidad de Navarra
Facultad de Teología

Emmanuel Marfori y Cuello

THE THEOLOGY OF THE TRANSFIGURATION IN THE LATIN FATHERS

A Doctoral Thesis directed by

Prof. Dr. Lucas Francisco Mateo-Seco

Pamplona
2009

Ad normam Statutorum Facultatis Theologiae Universitatis Navarrensis,
perlegimus et adprobavimus

Pampilonae, die 28 mensis aprilis anni 2010

Dr. Lucas Franciscus Mateo-Seco Dr. Ioannes Antonius Gil

Coram tribunali, die 25 mensis iunii anni 2009, hanc
dissertationem ad Lauream Candidatus palam defendit

Secretarius Facultatis

Sr. D. Eduardus Flandes

ABSTRACT

The Dissertation focuses on the principal theological affirmations of writers in Latin, mainly Church Fathers, about Jesus' Transfiguration, according to the Synoptic Gospels. After dealing with twelve complete documents on the topic, the Dissertation passes on to what thirty-eight Latin authors have to say about the Transfiguration narratives, whether they allude to it or a part of it, or mention it, or deal with it more thoroughly.

The Latin authors discussed did not do a systematic theology about Jesus' transfiguration. However, their reference to Jesus' Transfiguration can be systematized, following the ordo lectionis of the Synoptic narratives. There are interesting allegorical interpretations about, for example: "tasting" death, the six (or eight) days, the sun and the snow. The Transfiguration-event, the historicity of which was never questioned by the writers studied, mainly points to: the past (as a fulfillment of the Old Testament prophecy), the present (at the time of Jesus of Nazareth, as a cause for hope just before the Passion, and as an indication of Jesus' divinity, as the Son beloved by the Father), the future (the reference to the Church as the vestments of Jesus transfigured) and the end (as a foretaste of the coming of the Son of Man in his Kingdom).

SUMMARY

Introduction 1

Section I 1

1. Marc IV, 22, 1–16 (Tertullianus) 21
2. Commentarius in Mt 17 (Hilarius P.) 31
3. Exp.Eu.sec. Luc.7 (Ambrosius) 43
4. Homilia17 (Maximinus Arrianus) 59
5. Tractatus in Mc. 9, In Mt. 3 (Hieronymus) 63
6. Sermones78, 79, 79/a (Augustinus) 83
7. Tr.54/A in Mt (Chromatius) 103
8. Homilia51 (Leo Magnus) 117
9. HomiliaI/24Q (Beda) 133

Section II 147

1. Q.S.F. Tertullianus. 149
2. Cyprianus Carthaginiensis: Quir.,I, x 169
3. Pseudo-Cyprianus Carthaginiensis. 171
4. C. M.V. Commodianus. 173
5. Anonymus (Eusebius Verecellensis?) 175
6. Hilarius Pictauiensis 177
7. Gregorianus Iliberritani Episcopus. 199
8. Filastrius Episcopus Brixiensis 201
9. Ambrosius 203
10. Rufinus Tyrannius 249
11. Hieronymus 257
12. Augustinus 265
13. Chromatius 283
14. Faustinus 285

15. Ambrosiaster 289
16. Pseudo–Vigilius Thapsensis 297
17. Apponius. 299
18. Maximus Taurinensis. 303
19. Petrus Chrysologus 309
20. Eucherius Lugdunensis 311
21. Quodvultdeus 313
22. Vincentius Lerinensis 319
23. Arnobius Iunior. 321
24. Prosperus Aquitanus 323
25. Epiphanius Latinus 325
26. Eusebius 'Gallicanus' 331
27. Caesarius Arelatensis 333
28. Primasius episcopus Hadrumetini 337
29. Verecundus Iuncensis 339
30. Cassiodorus. 343
31. Gregorius Magnus. 345
32. Iulianus Toletanae sedis Episcopus. 353
33. Scottus Anonymus 355
34. Beda 357
35. Anonymus (Liber Questionumin Eu.) 369
36. Anonymus (Prebiarum) 373
37. Hilarius Hiberniae. 375
38. Anonymus (Enig.Ap.) 379

Section III: Theological synthesis 381

Conclusion 399

Appendices 407

Bibliography 427

Abbreviations

The abbreviations of the books consulted or mentioned in this work are generally from S. Schwertner, I*nternationales Abkürzungsverzeichnis für Theologie und Grenzgebiete* (IATG^2), Walter de Gruyter, Berlin-NewYork, ^{2}199^2.

AJT	American journal of theology
AncB	Anchor Bible
AThANT	Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments
Aug.	Augustinianum
BBKL	Biographisch–bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon
BiPa	Biblia Patristica
CChr.SL	Corpus Christianorum. Series Latina
CSEL	Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum
DTC	Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique
ET	The Expository Times
IKaZ	Internationale katholische Zeitschrift „Communio"
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature
JThS	Journal of Theological Studies
OrMan	Oración de Manasés
PL	Patrologia Latina (Migne)
PLS	Patrologia Latina (Migne), Supplementum
REAug	Revue des études augustiniennes
RECA	Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft
SagBi	Sagrada Biblia (Pamplona)
SC	Sources Chrétiennes
SEA	Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum
SVTQ	St. Vladimir Theological Quarterly
TThT	Teyler's Theologisch tidischrift
Vg	Vulgata
ZNW	Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
ZwTh	Zeitschrift für wissentschaftliche Theologie

The abbreviations for the books or docments not included in the IATG2 are:

AHIg	Anuario de la Historia de la Iglesia
ALD	A Latin Dictionary
BBKLo	Biographisch–bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon online http://www.bautz.de/bbkl
GAFFIOT	Le Grand Gaffiot Dictionnaire Latin-Français
HOPE	Handbook of Patristic Exegesis
KVS4	Kirchenschriftsteller. Verzeichnis und Sigel (4ª ed.)
KVS4pdf	Kirchenschriftsteller. Verzeichnis und Sigel (4ª ed.) en

(http://itsee.bham.ac.uk/vetuslatina/verbumdata/Fredeabbreviations.pdf)

M-AM	Missale Ambrosianum (1981)
M-HM	Missale Hispano-Mozarabicum (1991)

SAEMO	Sancti Ambrosii Episcopi Mediolanensis Opera
SagBi 1	Sagrada Biblia, Pentateuco (Pamplona)
SagBi 2	Sagrada Biblia, Libros históricos (Pamplona)
SagBi 3	Sagrada Biblia, Libros poéticos y sapienciales (Pamplona)
SagBi 4	Sagrada Biblia, Libros proféticos (Pamplona)
SagBi 5	Sagrada Biblia, Nuevo Testamento (Pamplona)

The Biblical quotes and books (and the abbreviations) mentioned in the original Thesis are from SagBi.

Am	Amos
Ap	Apocalipsis
1 Co	Primera Carta a los Corintios
2 Co	Segunda Carta a los Corintios
Col	Colosenses
2 Cro	Libro I de las Crónicas o Paralipómenos
Ct	Cantar de los Cantares
Dn	Daniel
Dt	Deuteronomio
Ef	Carta a los Efesios
Esd	Esdras
Ex	Éxodo
Ez	Ezequiel
Flm	Carta a Filemón
Flp	Carta a los Filipenses
Ga	Carta a los Gálatas
Gn	Génesis
Ha	Habacuc
Hb	Carta a los Hebreos
Hch	Hechos de los Apóstoles
Is	Isaías
Jb	Job
Jr	Jeremías
Jn	Evangelio según San Juan
1 Jn	Primera Carta de San Juan
Lc	Evangelio según San Lucas
2 M	Libro II de los Macabeos
Mc	Evangelio según San Marcos
Mi	Miqueas
Ml	Malaquías
Mt	Evangelio según San Mateo
Ne	Nehemías
Nm	Números
1 P	Primera Carta de San Pedro
2 P	Segunda Carta de San Pedro
Pr	Proverbios
1 R	Libro I de los Reyes
2 R	Libro II de los Reyes
Rm	Carta a los Romanos
1 S	Libro I de Samuel
Sal	Salmos
1 Tm	Primera Carta a Timoteo
2 Tm	Segunda Carta a Timoteo
1 Ts	Primera Carta a los Tesalonicenses
2 Ts	Segunda Carta a los Tesalonicences
Tt	Tito
Za	Zacarías

Biblical quotes in English are from the Revised Standard Version (RSV), Catholic Edition (Scepter, Princeton, NJ, 1966).

The abbreviations used in this work for the authors who write in Latin, as well as for their works, are from H. J. Frede, *Kirchenschriftsteller. Verzeichnis und Sigel*, Herder, Freiburg, 41995 (KVS4). Abbreviations for the Appendices are included. Abbreviations that do not appear in KVS4 are marked with an asterisk (*). When quoting from the works, I include the abbreviation of the author cited, to avoid confusion.

* ADOMN		Adamnanus/Adomnanus
	loc	De locis sanctis libri tres
AM		Ambrosius Mediolanensis
	118 Ps	Expositio Psalmi CXVIII
	Abr	De Abraham
	Ca	De Cain et Abel
	Dav	De apologia prophetae Dauid ad Theodosium
	ep	epistulae
	ex	Haexameron
	fi	De Fide ad Gratianum
	inc	De incarnationis dominicae sacramento
	Is	De Isaac et/uel anima
	Jac	De Iacob et uita beata
	Lc	Expositio Euangelii secundum Lucam
	mort	De bono mortis
	my	De mysteriis
	pae	De paenitentia
	Ps	Explanatio Psalmorum XII
	ptr	De patriarchis
	Sat	De excessu fratris Satyri
	sp	De Spiritu Sancto
	vg	De uirginibus
AMst		Ambrosiaster
	1 Cor	Ad I Corinthios
	2 Cor	Ad II Corinthios
	Phil	Ad Filippenses
	Gal	Ad Galatas
	q	Quaestiones Veteris et Noui Testamenti
	Rm	Ad Romanos
* AN Ap		Anonymus (De Enigmatibus ex Apocalypsi Johannis)
* AN fi		Anonymus (Liber VIII/X seu De fidei unitate)
AN **q Mt		Anonymus (Liber questionum in Euangeliis)
AN Ex		Anonymus (Prebiarum de multoribus exemplaribus)

* AN scot		Anonymus (Scottus Anonymus)
	* 2 P	Commentarius in 2 Petri
APO		Apponius
	* Ct	In Canticum
ARN		Arnobius Iunior
	exp	Expositiunculae, Lucas 4
AU		Aurelius Augustinus
	cf	Confessiones
	do	De doctrina christiana
	ep	epistulae
	Jo	Tractatus in Johannem
	Ps	Enarrationes in Psalmos
	q Ev	Quaestiones Euangeliorum
	s 43	sermo 43 (spurius)
	s 78	sermo 78
	s 79	sermo 79
	s 79/a	sermo 79/a
	tri	De Trinitate
	tri brev	Breviculus
BED		Beda Venerabilis
	Act	Expositio Actuum Apostolorum
	aed	De templo libri 2 (De aedificatione templi Salomonis)
	Apc	Expositio Apocalypseos
	cath	In Epistolas VII Catholicas
	Ct	In Cantica Canticorum
	Esr	In Ezram et Neemiam
	Gn	In Genesim
	* h I,24	Homilia I,24 in Quadragesima
	* h 21	Homilia 21
	Hab	In canticum Abacuc
	loc	De locis sanctis (cfr. Apéndice II)
	Prv	In Prouerbia Salomonis
	Sam	In I Samuhelem
	tab	De Tabernaculo
* bened		benedictio
CAE		Caesarius Arelatensis
	s 9	Sermo 9
	s 115	Sermo 115
CAr		Cassiodorus
	Ps	Expositio Psalmorum

CHRO		Chromatius Aquileiensis
	Mt	Tractatus 54A in Matthaeum
	s 8	Sermo 8 (De Ascensione Domini)
	s 22	Sermo 22 (De sancto Iohanne Baptista)
COM		Commodianus
	in	Instructiones
CY		Cyprianus Carthaginiensis
	te	Qd Quirinum (Testimonium libri 3)
EP-L		Epiphanius Latinus
	* h 29	Homilia 29 (De filio lunatico)
	* h 47	Homilia 47
EUCH		Eucherius Lugdunensis
	inst	Instructiones ad Salonium
EUS-G		Eusebius 'Gallicanus'
	h 7	Homilia 7 (De Pascha)
FAUn		Faustinus
	Ar	De Trinitate ad Augustam Flacillam (De fide contra Arianos)
FIL		Filastrius
	* Diu hae	Diuersarum hereseon liber
GR-I		Gregorius Iliberritani Episcopus
	fi	De fide Orthodoxa contra Arianos
	tr	Tractatus Origenis
GR-M		Gregorius Magnus
	Jb	Moralia in Job
	Rg	Expositiones in Librum I Regum
HI		Eusebius Hieronymus
	ep	epistulae
	Gal	Ad Galatas
	Is	In Esaiam
	Mc	Tractatus in Marci Euangelium
	Mt	In Matheum
	Phlm	In Philemonem
	Ps	Commentarioli in Psalmos
	Ps h	Tractatus de Psalmo
	Za	In Zachariam

HIL		Hilarius Pictauiensis
	hy	Hymni
	Mt	Commentarius in Matthaeum
	Ps	Tractatus super Psalmos
	syn	De Synodis
	tri	De Trinitate
IT		Itineraria
	IT-Ae	Itinerarium Aegeriae
	IT-Bu	Itinerarium Burdigalense
	IT-Pla	Itinerarium Antonini Placentini
JUL-T		Iulianus Toletanae episcopus
	aet	De comprobatione sextae aetatis
LEO		Leo Magnus
	s 51	Homilia 51
MAX		Maximus Taurinensis
	s 44	Sermo 44 (De Pentecosten)
	s 61A	Sermo 61/A (Dictum ante natalem Domini)
MAXn		Maximinus Arrianus
	* h 17	Homilia 17
PET-C		Petrus Chrysologus
	s	Sermo 131
* praef		praefatio
PRIM		Primasius
	* Ap	Commentarius in Apocalypsin
PROS		Prosperus
	Ps	Expositio Psalmorum
PS-CY		Pseudo-Cyprianus
	Jud	Aduersus Iudaeos
PS-HIL-A		Pseudo Hilarius Arelatensis (Hilarius Hiberniae)
	* cath	Tractatus Hilarii in septem Epistolas catholicas
PS-VIG		Pseudo-Vigilius Thapsensis
	Var	Opus contra Varimadum
QU		Quoduultdeus
	hae	Aduersus Quinque Haereses
	Jud	Contra Iudaeos

RUF		Rufinus Tyrannius
	sy	Expositio Symboli
TE		Tertullianus
	an	De Anima
	car	De carne Christi
	hae	De praescriptione haereticorum
	je	De ieiuno contra psychicos
	Marc	Aduersus Marcionem
	mart	Ad martyras
	mon	De monogamia
	Pra	Aduersus Praxean
	res	De resurrectione mortuorum
	sco	Scorpiace
VER		Verecundus
	cant	Commentarii super Cantica [* cant-Mn, *cant-Db.]
VIN		Vincentius Lerinensis
	com	Commonitorium excerpta

Other abbreviations

+	died
±	circa
AT	Old Testament
cfr.	confer
cit.	cited
cols.	columns
ibid.	ibidem
id.	idem
NT	New Testament
ss	and the following

PROLOGUE: THE LORD'S TRANSFIGURATION

The Transfiguration is a luminous mystery in the life of Our Lord; a meaningful and key moment not only of the glory hidden under "the shame of the Cross", but also a manifestation of the glory to which the Cross leads. It is also an anticipated manifestation of what the glorious body of the Risen Christ shall be like and to what kind of glory the righteous are called to. Since, as St. Paul writes, «Christ has been raised from the dead, the first fruits of those who have fallen asleep. For as by a man came death, by a man has come also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, so also in Christ shall all be made alive » (1 Cor 15:20-22 RSV).

The Gospels speak of the Transfiguration already at the end of Jesus' public life, situating it as a doorway to the Passion (cfr Mt 17:1-9; Mk 9:2-10; Lk 9:28-36). This passage from the second letter of Saint Peter seems to refer also to this event: «For when he received honor and glory from God the Father and the voice was borne to him by the Majestic Glory, "This is my beloved Son, with whom I am well pleased (cfr Mt 17:5)", we heard this voice borne from heaven, for we were with him on the holy mountain» (2 P 1:16-18). Thus, it is about an authentic theophany, a manifestation of God himself. The Transfiguration is the important moment in the revelation of the divine Filiation of Jesus who, just as in the Baptism in the Jordan (cfr Mk 1:11), is confirmed with a voice that comes from heaven. In both cases, the Evangelists tell us of the proclamation the Father made regarding Jesus, "(his) beloved Son" (cfr Mt 3:17; 17:5; Lk 3:22; 9:35 RSV).

The voice from heaven tells in the Transfiguration the same thing as in the Baptism, using almost the same words, with slight variants. In the Transfiguration theophany, Jesus is designated as

the *beloved Son* (Mk 9:7 RSV), specifying that He is the Only-Begotten Son; Saint Luke, instead of *beloved,* uses the term *chosen* (Lk 9:35 RSV); Saint Matthew adds the clause *with whom I am well pleased* (Mt 17:5 RSV). Both expressions, *chosen* and *with whom I am well pleased*, are read in the first of the songs of the Servant of the Lord (Is 42:1), wherein, while the glory of the Son of Man is described, the sufferings of the Lord's Servant are being evoked. Glory and cross thus appear united in one and the same consideration.

Saint Mark notes, besides, that the Transfiguration takes place six days after the Passion prophecy (Mk 9:2), insinuating that there exists a close connection between both events in Jesus' life: the Lord's Transfiguration would have the finality, among others, of revitalizing the disciples after the Passion prophecy, revealing the glory the Lord already possesses, though it be veiled in order to fulfill the divine plan of salvation[1]. Saint Luke explains the Paschal content of this theophany and the Messianic dimension of the sorrowful events that await Jesus in Jerusalem when he points out that «two men talked with him, Moses and Elijah, who appeared in glory and spoke of his departure (his death), which he was to accomplish at Jerusalem» (Lk 9:31-32 RSV). According to this, the Law (Moses) and the Prophets (Elijah) would speak with Jesus about the events of his Passion and their salvific meaning.

Jesus' glory makes itself visible to the disciples for some moments on the mountain of the Transfiguration. The Lord's transformation, the glory resplendent even in the garments, tells them in images entering the eyes the same thing as what the voice heard from heaven tells them: *He is the Beloved Son*. He is the Son of God. Upon letting them glimpse on something of his glory, Jesus confirms Peter's confession, «You are the Christ, the Son of the living God» (Mt 16:16 RSV), which, according to the Evangelist, has taken place shortly before, in Caesarea Philippi. With this

---

[1] F. Ocáriz, L-F. Mateo-Seco, J.A. RIESTRA, *El misterio de Jesucristo*, Pamplona, 2010, 314-315.

revelation, Jesus insinuates furthermore that in order to enter into glory, it is necessary to first follow the path of the Cross, and at the same time, that the Cross in itself already has aspects of glory[2].

This union between glory and the Cross is maintained after the Resurrection, although now, in the apparitions of the Risen One, the wounds produced in the Passion are contemplated from the glorious dimension of the Resurrection: the Risen One shows his disciples the glorious wounds of the nails and of the side (cfr Jn 20:20 and 27). It is because the cross not only leads to glory but also carries glory within it. Suspended on the cross, Jesus draws all things to Himself (cfr Jn 12:32).

We have called the Transfiguration a *theophany*, that is to say, a manifestation of God. In fact, the Transfiguration is a manifestation of the entire Trinity. As Saint Thomas Aquinas writes on the Thabor, "the entire Trinity appeared: the Father in the voice, the Son in the man, the Holy Spirit in the cloud"[3]. In Church Tradition, cloud and light are figures of the Holy Spirit[4].

The Transfiguration takes place in Jesus' last ascent to Jerusalem: Jesus walks towards Jerusalem and towards death as an anticipation of the end of that way, which is no other than the Resurrection. The theophany on the mountain of Transfiguration is thus found closely related to the entirety of Christ's Paschal Mystery. The glory of the Transfiguration somehow anticipates and designs the glorious functions of the glorious attributes of Our Lord's risen body, attributes about which the Evangelists have given us some details (cfr Lk 24:13-50; Jn 20:11-30). The splendor of the Transfiguration also enlightens –with firm and defined characteristics– the affirmation contained in the Symbols of the Faith about the fact that Christ, in the end of time, shall

---

[2] Cfr CCC, § 555.

[3] SAINT THOMAS AQUINAS, *Summa Theologica*, III, q. 45, a. 4, *ad* 2.

[4] Cfr CCC, § 697.

come to judge the living and the dead *with glory and majesty*. This anticipated vision of Christ's glorious coming fills the Church with hope and makes her exclaim: *Maranatha! Come, Lord Jesus!* (cfr Rev 22:20 RSV).

The Transfiguration also reveals, in an eloquent manner entering the eyes, what glory awaits man, since Christ "will change our lowly body to be like his glorious body" (Phil 3:21)[5], since, as what the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* says, the Transfiguration is an anticipated vision of the kingdom to which man is called, "the sacrament of the second regeneration: our own resurrection"[6].

The Christian path leads towards this: towards a face-to-face contemplation of the Redeemer's glory; our everyday ascetical effort must also tend towards this. The light that springs forth from the mountain of the Transfiguration and which fills the disciples with ecstatic rejoicing must illumine and fill with joy our effort to encounter the Lord's face during the entire day.

Throughout the centuries, these considerations have developed with the contemplation which the Christian people, especially in their shepherds and theologians, have done regarding the mystery of the Transfiguration. All that the first Christian theology has considered to be revealed in the Transfiguration turns out to be greatly attractive –and a great truth–: the Patristic homilies, and also the exegetical treatises, about this mystery are delightful and deep. Greek theology paid greater attention to the Transfiguration than Latin theology, but as the reader can verify, Latin theology also took it very much into account, such that the latter's *corpus doctrinale* is an authentic treasure. Here, Doctor Emmanuel C. Marfori offers, in an accessible and exact manner, the itinerary followed by Latin Patristics in this constant profundization, in this constant growth of the treasure. It is a treasure found at the base

---

[5] Cfr CCC, § 556.

[6] CCC, § 556.

of the richness with which contemporary Exegesis and Theology present this mystery.

A great part of the interest in the work of Dr. Marfori, carried out in a year's time, lies in the exhaustiveness of the chosen authors, in the fidelity with which he reproduces their texts, and in the carefulness with which he translates them. The fruit of all this effort and of all this dedication is a book in which he gathers with all the exhaustiveness possible all that the Latin Fathers have «seen» upon contemplating the mystery of the Lord's Transfiguration and the applications they have made of it. We find ourselves, therefore, before an important and useful research work, which must be acknowledged in justice, and at the same time, we congratulate its Author.

The Lord's Transfiguration is a luminous manifestation of the power of the Kingdom which is manifested in Christ. This mystery of light must also transfigure the life of the Christian, filling it with hope and joy. As Benedict XVI writes, «This "power" (*dynamis)* of the coming Kingdom appears to them in the transfigured Jesus, who speaks with the witnesses of the Old Covenant about the necessity of his Passion as the way to glory (cfr Lk 24:26f.). They personally experience the anticipation of the Parousia, and that is how they are slowly initiated into the full depth of the mystery of Jesus»[7]. The Lord's Transfiguration is offered to us as an important way in order for us to delve into the contemplation of the glory of Our Lord, that is to say, of his mystery of the Son of God and Christ.

Pamplona, 25th of January 2011,
Feast of the Conversion of Saint Paul

Prof. Dr. Lucas F. Mateo-Seco

---

[7] BENEDICT XVI, *Jesus of Nazareth*, Doubleday, USA, 2007, 318 [Libreria Editrice Vaticana, Rome 2007].

Section I

First, let's see twelve writings of nine authors about the Transfiguration, in order to search for the main theological affirmations of each work.

Even though most of the writings studied here are situated in a liturgical context (as sermones), I am not going to deal specifically about the historical–liturgical aspect: this aspect, which is highly interesting, can be made in latter works.

Introduction

The Introduction consists of the *status quaestionis*[1], with the objectives and the limitations, the methodology and the structure of this work.

I. Status QUAESTIONIS

A. Regarding the Transfiguration narratives

The Transfiguration of Jesus, as a theological topic, is nice, but is, at the same time, a difficult one[2]. Harald Riesenfeld, in his Thesis[3], had hit the nail on the head regarding the *status quaestionis*, when he explained that the hypotheses about the Transfiguration, in his time, had a rationalist echo[4].

D. F. Strauss[5] analyses Ex 24, and concludes that the Transfiguration narrative (*Verklärungsgeschichte*) is a myth about

---

1 It refers to the published research on the Biblical-Patristic doctrine on the Transfiguration of Jesus.

2 "...the Transfiguration is at once the commentator's paradise and his despair" [G. Caird, *The Transfiguration*, en A. Hastings – E. Hastings, (eds.), ET 67, Edinburgh, 1955-1956, 291]. I do not aim to comment, here, on each of the theories on the Transfiguration of Jesus. I mention some authors (1839–2008) from German-, English-, and French-speaking countries, like *flashes* or brushstrokes.

3 *Jésus transfiguré. L'arrière-plan du récit évangélique de la Transfiguration de Notre-Seigneur*, Ejnar Muksgaard, København, 1947.

4 "Les multiples hypothèses formées autour de la Transfiguration sont nées de l'attitude critique rationaliste adoptée par les savants vis-à-vis de la péricope telle quélle nous a été transmise; c'est sous l'influence de préjugés d'ordre philosophique qu'on a fait appel à différentes hypothèses pour expliquer comment le récit s'est formé et a reçu sa place actuelle dans la composition des évangiles synoptiques" (H. Riesenfeld, *Jésus transfiguré. L'arrière-plan du récit évangelique de la Transfiguration de Notre-Seigneur,* Ejnar Munksgaard, København, 1947, 1).

5 *Das Leben Jesu, kritisch bearbeitet*, Tübingen, 1839.

Christ as Moses' antitype (*Gegenbild*)[6]. Weizsäcker[7] sees the Transfiguration as a subjective apparition (*Visionstheorie*) to the three Apostles[8].

B. W. Bacon[9] sees the *Verklärungsgeschichte* as a poetic interpretation of Peter's confession[10]. Shortly afterward, E. Wendling[11] and A. Loisy[12] say that the *Verklärungsgeschichte* would have been influenced by the narrative of Jesus' Baptism[13]. Moreover, E. Lohmeyer[14] says that at least, in Jesus' transformation, one would have to see a trace of a Hellenistic myth applied to Jesus. J. Wellhausen[15] and R. Bultmann[16] have even opined that the Transfiguration narrative would have been the Resurrection story (*Auferstehungserzählung*) which, from the post-paschal time, would have been dated in a pre-paschal moment, in Jesus' earthly life[17].

But there are those who affirm that the Transfiguration is a historical event: F. Spitta[18] and D. Völter[19] offer an objective and

---

[6] Baltensweiler, cit., 12, 108. It sees the Transfiguration narrative (*Verklärungsgeschichte*) as a falsification, or if not, a poetic copy of Peter's confession of faith (cfr. Baltensweiler, cit., 12, 109-113).

[7] *Evangelische Geschichte*, 1864 (cfr. Baltensweiler, cit., 14, nota 16).

[8] E. Meyer (*Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*, 1921) widens the theory, saying that the Transfiguration is the root (*Wurzel*) of Christianity (cfr. Baltensweiler, cit., 14). A. von Harnack [*Die Verklärungsgescichte Jesu, der Bericht des Paulus, (1. Kor 15,3ff) und die beiden Christusvisionen des Petrus, 1922]* will also elaborate this theory even more (cfr. Baltensweiler, cit., 14).

[9] Cfr. Baltensweiler, cit., 14, nota 16.

[10] AJTh 6, Chicago, 1902 (cfr. Baltensweiler, cit., 123, nota 33).

[11] *Die Entstehung des Markus-Ev*, Tübingen, 1908.

[12] *L'Évangile selon Luc*, Paris, 1924.

[13] Cfr. Baltensweiler, cit., 13.

[14] *Die Verklärung Jesu nach dem Markus-Evangelium*, ZNW, Berlin, 1922.

[15] *Das Evangelium Marci*, Berlin, 1909.

[16] *Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition*, Göttingen, 1957.

[17] "Nach ihrer Auffassung handelt es ich in der Verklärungsgeschichte eigentlich um eine Auferstehungserzählung, die aus der nachösterlichen Zeit in das irdische Leben Jesu vorausdatiert worden sei" (Baltensweiler, cit., 15).

[18] *Die evangelische Geschichte von der Verklärung Jesu*, ZwTh, Jena, 1911.

[19] *De Belijdenis van Petrus en de Verheerlijking van Jezus op den Berg*, TThT 9, Haarlem, 1911.

natural explanation, but according to Baltensweiler, nobody had followed their theory[20].

So far here are some theories –I insist, not all of them– about the *Verklärung*. Now, let us see some authors of the twentieth century a bit more slowly.

F. Badcock, in his article[21], sees the Transfiguration as a prophetic vision given by Jesus Christ to the Apostles, according to their capacity[22]. It is not, for Badcock, a historical event, but a *manifestation* of Jesus' heavenly state at his Baptism and is a *revelation* that confirms the prophecies.

J. Bernardin, in his article[23], thinks that one cannot know whether the Transfiguration is a historical event, and if it were indeed a historical event, it wouldn't be known what happened[24], and insists what it presupposes faith in the pre-existing Messiah[25], although he insists on the narrative's fictionality[26].

---

[20] Cfr. Baltensweiler, cit., 14.

[21] The Transfiguration, JThS, Oxford, 1921.

[22] "...a prophetic vision (Matt. xvii 9) (...) primarily granted to our Lord Himself in which the Apostles are privileged to share so far as they had the capacity" (J. Badcock, *The Transfiguration*, JThS 22, Oxford, 1931, 325). *The Transfiguration* is the *culminating endeavour* of the Lord in order to make the Apostles see what would happen to him (cfr. ibid.). Moreover, Badcock insinuates that the Transfiguration is "...a parable not spoken but exhibited to prophetic sight" (J. Badcock, cit., 326).

[23] *The Transfiguration*, JBL 52, New York, 1933.

[24] "Whether the Transfiguration was an historical event or not, and, if so, exactly what took place at that time can never now be known" (J. Bernardin, *The Transfiguration*, JBL 52, New York, 1933, 181). Bernardin says that the Transfiguration would be "a testimonial to His disciples of His divine nature and a confirmation to them of their belief in His Messiahship, and an assurance that His foretold death was not the end but the beginning of His reign" (Bernardin, cit., 184), "a revelation of our Lord's pre-existent glory" (Id., cit., 187).

[25] "That the incident is a fiction of the later Jewish Christian community, composed as a result of the dispute with the Jews over Jesus' Messiahship, and that it presupposes on the part of the community and of the Evangelist St.

[26] For Bernardin, "that the incident could not be historical as related is proven by the fact that δοξα has no meaning in connection with the Godhead from any modern point of view" (cit., 189).

G. H. Boobyer, in his article[27], concludes that the Transfiguration represents a proof of the παρουσια[28] needed by the believers[29]. The fact that J. Höller publishes his book[30] in Munich in the same year as J. Blinzler publishes his Thesis[31] acquires relevance, because both writings of these winners of a Theology writing contest have challenged the rationalist theories about the Transfiguration before 1937[32], even with the limitation of not precisely posing the question of the historicity of the Transfiguration[33].

Harald Riesenfeld, affirming in his Thesis[34] that "...the Transfiguration offers many problems of interpretation. But the main question, that which also touches on the very heart of Tradition, is that of its theological meaning"[35], analyzes the elements or details of the *Verklärungsgeschichte* in order to arrive at the original meanin of the narrative, even though he is aware that with this, in the final analysis, one doesn't "solve" anything, if he poses the question of the *quaestio facti*[36]. For Riesenfeld, the gist of Jesus' Transfiguration is

---

[27] *Mark and the Transfiguration*, 1940.

[28] Cfr. G. Boobyer, cit., 119.

[29] "...needed evidence of the second advent hope, and how suitably the transfiguration could supply it" (Boobyer , cit., 127).

[30] „*Die Verklärung Jesu. Eine Auslegung der neutestamentlichen Berichte*" (The Transfiguration of Jesus. A Reading of the New Testament narratives), Freiburg im Breisgau, 1937.

[31] *Die neutestamentlichen Berichte über die Verklärung Jesu*, Münster, 1937. It happened that in 1932 (says Baltensweiler), there was a contest in the Faculty of Theology in Munich on the topic of the Transfiguration: as winners, the exhaustive works of Blinzler (on questions about textual critique and the Synoptics) and of Höller (on the particular exegesis and an over-all view of the topic) have been published (cfr. Baltensweiler, cit., 15).

[32] "Es ist das grosse Verdienst von Blinzler und Höller, einmal eine Bestandesaufnahme des bisher Gebotenen durchgeführt zu haben. Ihre Bücher sind unentbehrlich zur Gewinnung eines Überblickes über den Stand der Dinge vor 1937" (Baltensweiler, cit. 16).

[33] Cfr. Baltesweiler, cit., 17.

[34] *Jésus transfiguré*, København, 1947.

[35] "La Transfiguration offre plusiers problèmes à l'interprétation. Mais la question principale et qui touche au noyau même de la tradition, c'est celle de son sens théologique" (Riesenfeld, cit., 3).

[36] Cfr. Riesenfeld, cit., 4.

te crystallization of the traditional motifs, motifs that have become contextualized, in the Person of Jesus of Nazareth. Riesenfeld's Thesis seems to have caught Baltensweiler's attention, since the latter writes: "we value Riesenfeld's reasonable and profound work so much, and we considerably agree with the results [therein, that] we have to establish, with it, a lack of an over-all comprehension of the Transfiguration narrative"[37].

Arthur Michael Ramsey[38] (later, Archbishop of Canterbury) writes about God's Glory[39], the Transfiguration according to the Gospels and 2 P, according to the Church[40], the Gospel of the Transfiguration, with an Appendix about Jesus Christ, Glory and Image. J. R. Macphail affirms[41] that the Transfiguration is an entirely Biblical event. Anton Gundlach starts his anthology[42] by explaining the history of the feast of the Transfiguration[43]. Then, he speaks of the message of the holy mountain, interweaving exegetical notes with spiritual considerations, with excerpts from poems or prayers.

---

[37] "So sehr wir die gründliche und scharfsinnige Arbeit von Riesenfeld schätzen und auch mit seinen Ergebnissen weitgehend übereinstimmen, müssen wir doch bei ihm einen sehr spürbaren Mangel im Hinblick auf das Gesamtverständnis der Verklärungsgeschichte feststellen" (Baltensweiler, cit. 17).

[38] *The Glory of God and the Transfiguration of Christ*, London, 1949.

[39] The divine glory, the history of the word δοξα (in the resurrection and in the παρουσια, in the life and the Passion of Jesus, in the teachings of Paul and John, glory and Christian faith, and the praise of God's glory).

[40] In the liturgy, in the Fathers, in the East, in the *Church of England*.

[41] *The Bright Cloud. The Bible in the Light of the Transfiguration*, Oxford, 1956.

[42] *Verklärung des Herrn. Die Botschaft vom Heiligen Berg*, München, 1957.

[43] He presents the texts used in the litrugical celebration, and shows in three columns the Synoptic narratives, interpreting each element of that comparison with Biblical quotations. I am not going to tackle his every explanation. It suffices to say that it is interesting to note the care with which the author linked the explanation with the quotations from Scripture and from some authors.

Heinrich Baltensweiler affirms[44] that research about the *Verklärungsgeschichte* will only be valid if three conditions are met with[45].

George Caird writes[46] that what an earlier generation of exegetes said about a postpaschal apparition out of place, or about a product of Christological thought of the early Church, is not necessary in order to approach the Transfiguration; rather, the Transfiguration can be accepted "at its face value"[47]. Caird draws from the *Verklärungsgeschichte* an insight[48].

Édouard Divry defends his Thesis in Fribourg[49] thus: "...this research being motivated by ecumenism, I have dealt with – in this study – about the subject of the 'Thaboric light' with the desire of posing the question of a systematic reflection from mystical

---

[44] "*Die Verklärung Jesu. Historisches Ereignis und synoptische Berichte*" (The Transfiguration of Jesus. Historical event and Synoptic narratives), Zürich, 1959. After finding out the possible sources of the Transfiguration narrative, the author asks: What really happened in the Transfiguration of Jesus? He concludes that the *Verklärungsgeschichte* emphasizes the divine dimension of the inconspicuous history of Jesus.

[46] *The Transfiguration*, ET 67, Edinburgh, 1955-1956.

[47] Caird, cit., 29. That is, "a satisfactory explanation of the Transfiguration must do justice to its connexion with the Baptism, Caesarea Philippi, Gethsemane, the Crucifixion, the Resurrection, the Ascension, and the Parousia; and with the persecution of the disciples and their share (...) in the glory of (...) Christ. Nor must we forget that (...) the Transfiguration had an importance of its own" (Caird, cit., 292).

[48] "He had to discover in His own experience what obedience to God implies when it is carried through to its ultimate limits in a world which has either repudiated or misunderstood the claims of the Divine sovereignty" (Caird, cit., 293). Moreover, "He is entering a spiritual region where even Moses and Elijah can no longer bear Him company, and they come to talk with Him about the destiny that awaits Him, before bidding Him a solemn farewell" (Id., cit., 294).

[49] "*La Lumière du Christ transfiguré chez les Saints. Nouvelles approches dogmatiques sue la lumière thaborique*" (Fribourg, 2000). In the Thesis, he speaks about: the experience of prodigious light, the Patristic doctrine (on the light of the Transfiguration), and the ecumenical and speculative theology (the hypostatic property).

knowledge. Thus I express my will to contribute modestly, through a simple means, to the recent leanings of specialists in 'spiritual theology'"[50].

John Paul Heil observes[51] that each narrative on the Transfiguration presents a compact and consistent narrative of the same literary genre, generally evoking the same basic responses of the respective listeners of the Gospel familiar with that genre[52].

Émile Shoufani[53] writes spiritual considerations about the Transfiguration in an intimist tone[54], while his co-author, Christine Pellistrandi[55], speaks of ten topics[56] about the Transfiguration in art[57].

---

[50] "L'aspect oecuménique motivant en profondeur cette recherche, j'ai engagé cette nouvelle étude sur le sujet de la 'lumière thaborique' avec le désir de poser la problématique de la réflexion systématique a partir de la science mystique. J'émets ainsi le voeu de contribuer, modestement, par un simple lien, aux désirs récents des spécialistes de 'théologie spirituelle'" (É. Divry, *La Lumière du Christ transfiguré chez les Saint, Nouvelles approches dogmatiques sur la lumière thaborique*, Fribourg, 2000, XIII). Divry concludes: "[a] l'oppose des grecs, on observe chez les Latins un certain désintérêt pour les cas des transfigurés" (Id., cit., 406).

[51] "*The Transfiguration of Jesus: Narrative Meaning and Function of Mark 9:2-8, Matt 17:1-8 and Luke 9:28-36*", Roma, 2000.

[52] Heil , cit., 33.

[53] *Célébration de la Lumière, Regards sur la Transfiguration*, Paris, 2001. P. Shoufani is a Palestinian, a citizen of Israel, a Catholic priest of the Byzantine rite.

[54] "La contemplation du Christ transfiguré n'est pas une fuite dans le sacré ou le passé, elle est au contraire, pour moi, une urgente nécessité. Car elle est la seule nourriture qui puisse me donner la force de transfigurer le monde" (É. Shoufani, - C. Pellistrandi, *Célébration de la Lumière*, en É. Gondinet-Wallstein, "Collection Célébrations", Albin Michel, Paris, 2000, 31).

[55] C. Pellistrandi is a scholar on the Bible and Medieval history; she works at the Institute of Research and History of Texts (CNRS).

[56] The image of the invisible God; Jesus, the sun of justice; Jesus, the living cross; the dream of the Apostles; 'how good it is to be here'; my Beloved Son; the shadow and the light; beside Jesus; descent from the mountain; the transfigured world.

[57] A mosaic (6th c.), a Bible from Floreffe (12th c.), another mosaic (around 1100), Barna of Siena (early 14th c.), anonymous artwork (14th c.), another anonymous artwork (early 15th c.), Theophanus the Greek (15th c.), Fra Angelico (1437-1445), Bellini (1487), Raphael (early 16th c.).

Father Raniero Cantalamessa, Franciscan[58], does an Eastern mystagogical approach to the mystery of the Transfiguration, an approach in contrast to the Western pedagogical approach (according to Cantalamessa), since "the Transfiguration has never entered Western (Latin) spirituality as a mystery in itself, ...but only in relation to Easter, as an antidote to the scandal of the Passion and as a promise of the Resurrection"[59]. Nevertheless, Cantalamessa assures that the Transfiguration is a historical event[60].

Benedict XVI, ending the first part of his *Jesus of Nazareth* (2007), reflects on the meaning of the Transfiguration. Michael Figura (whose article we shall mention later) comments that Benedict XVI sees the Transfiguration as a heavenly invitation to the mount of Transfiguration, to listen to Jesus, who evokes Moses, who, in turn, had received the Torah on mount Sinai[61].

Now, I shall dwell more on some articles published in 2008 about the Transfiguration of Jesus. Klaus Berger[62] affirms[63] that

---

[58] *Il mistero della Trasfigurazione. Quale immagine di Cristo per l'uomo del duemilla?* (Àncora, 1999).

[59] Cantalamessa, *El Misterio de la Transfiguración*, Monte Carmelo, 2003, 10.

[60] Cantalamessa compares the Verklärung narratives with Pauline Christological texts, and with the Johannine Prologue (going through the distinction between the Antiochene and Alexandrian schools), presenting the face of Christ to man in the third millennium.

[61] Benedict XVI sees the Transfiguration as an invitation to recognize Jesus as the new Moses, to listen and to follow him (cfr. M. Figura, "*Theologische und mystische Bedeutung der Verklärung Jesu bei den Kirchenvätern*", in IKaZ, Freiburg, 2008/I, 12). Figura underlines: 1) That the Pope points out to a phenomenon seldom known: that Jesus takes with him the three Apostles no only to the mountain where he transfigured, but also to the mount of olives (cfr. Mk 14,33), where the angst during the prayer in the garden serves as a counterfigure (*Gegenbild*) of the Transfiguration scene; 2) Moreover, Benedict XVI sees the Transfiguration as the model of the spiritual experience (*eine geistlichen Erfahrung*) which the faithful carry out when they go up, through ascesis and contemplation, the divine mountain as a place of special nearness to God (*besondere Gottesnähe*) (cfr. Ibid.).

[62] Berger is Prefessor Emeritus of the NT of the *Evangelisch-Theologische Fakultät* of Heidelberg University.

[63] *Die Verklärung Jesu* (IKaZ, 2008).

the *Verklärung* narrative (which for him is the heart of the Gospel according to Mk[64]) is of a genre that binds sight and hearing which, although it evokes events of the OT, in el NT has the outline of a visible revelation (*bildhafte Offenbarung*) and an added spoken revelation (*zusätzliche Wortoffenbarung*), whose revealer is called the angelus interpres[65]. Berger assumes that the Transfiguration is a mystical experience of Jesus and his followers during Jesus' earthly life[66] with the sense that there is a new Revealer, not one more OT revealer[67]. Jesus' words are the new handing over of the Commandments, and the gushing forth of Jesus' blood on the Cross seals the New Covenant[68]. Regarding the *Christology* of Mk 9, Berger[69] is not partisan to seeing Mk 9 from the post-paschal perspective, and he comments that, in comparing early Jewish texts to early Christian texts, the expression "Son of God" appears only in the Transfiguration narrative[70]. Berger concludes: Mk 9,2-

[64] "Die Verklärungsgeschichte bildet die Mitte des Markusevangeliums" (K.

[65] Cfr. Berger, cit., 3. The theological meaning of the pair "seeing – hearing" is that man cannot correctly interpret Revelation all by himself. This pair is clearly seen in the Transfiguration narrative, where God himself speaks with his voice.

[66] Cfr. Id., cit., 4.

[67] Moreover, Peter's proposal is seen not only as an expression of wellbeing, but an implication of separating himself from the coming Passion; hence the voice, which also says that only Jesus is the legitimate interpreter of the Bible. Also, the voice presents the Son to his followers.

[68] "Jesu Worte sind die „novellierte Gesetzgebung" und Jesu Tod am Kreuz (Blut) ist der novellierte Bundesschluss"(Berger, cit., 6).

[69] "Eine mögliche Alternativlösung, nämlich den Text als nachösterlich anzusehen, scheidet nach unseren obigen Beobachtungen aus" (ibid.).

[70] "Nur in der Verklärung Jesu gibt es – verglichen mit den gennanten Texten aus dem Frühjudentum und der frühen Kirche – den Ausdruck, Sohn Gottes'" (Berger, cit., 8). Afterwards, Berger poses the questions of whether Jesus has a participation in God, of whether one can say that God appears in him, of whether he, through that which shines, is exclusively the Son of the Father. Then, he affirms that that which God can share is not formulated in the abstract (the "being"); rather, he is transforming Light, supra-experiential. Moreover: the contraposition of class (Jesus unlike the others) and the intensity of the Revelation have been so aesthetically tangible, even when it may perhaps deal with a mystic beauty not optically photographable. Therefore: the Christology of the *Verklärungsgeschichte* is a epiphany-theology in the service of the very first interpretation of Jesus as different from the Prophets.

9 is an implicit text on the Trinity, since every change of man, according to the parallel (narratives), always happens through the Holy Spirit[71].

Damian Dombrowski[72], in his article[73], traces a path through the history of Christian art regarding how a painting of Raphael on the Transfiguration came to be, and Dombrowski reveals that the deepest reason of the adding of the Transfiguration scene is that it is a historical and a prophetic event, in the sense that in it [the Transfiguration], the themes on the Resurrection, the Ascension and the Second Coming [of Christ] are anticipated[74].

B. Studies of Patristic Literature on the Transfiguration

There are some articles on the Transfiguration according to the Fathers of the Church, in general[75]. As far as books are concerned, Georges Habra affirms in his book[76] that "our entire spiritual life

[71] "Mk 9,2-9 ist deshalb ein implizit trinitarischer Text, weil alle Verwandlung von Menschen sich nach den Parallelen stets durch den Heiligen Geist ereignet" (*Berger*, cit., 9).

[72] He comes from the *Institut für Kunstgeschichte* of Würzburg Univeristy.

[73] *Göttliches und Menschliches in Raffaels Transfiguration* (The divine and the human in Raphael's "The Transfiguration"), in IKaZ, 2008/I.

[74] "Dies ist der tiefere Grund für die Hinzufügung der Verklärungsszene: Sie ist historisches, aber zugleich prophetisches Geschehen. Die Themen Auferstehung, Himmelfahrt und Wiederkunft sind in ihr vorweggenommen" (D. Dombrowski, *Göttliches und Menschliches in Raffaels Transfiguration*, in IKaZ, 2008/I, 32).

[75] Although I do not analyze them here, I refer the reader to two works: 1) That of P. Chamberas (*The Transfiguration of Christ: A Study in the Patristic Exegesis of Scripture*, SVTQ 14, 1970, 48-65); 2) That of A. Orbe (*La Transfiguración, en Cristología gnóstica II*, Madrid, 1976, 96-141).

[76] *La Transfiguration selon les Pères grecs* (1973).

is crystallized around the Transfiguration"[77]. Habra concludes: "it is Christ who *seems* to transfigure himself on the day of the Transfiguration, but in reality, the Apostles are those [who are transfigured], for the simple reason that Christ could not transfigure himself, having done it from the first instant of his Incarnation"[78]. On his end, M. Coune compiles (and translates, where applicable)[79] texts of the Greek Fathers of the Church about the Transfiguration of Jesus, with a short commentary on each excerpt.

Norman Russell, in his Tesis published in Oxford[80], deals with Christian deification, "from its birth as a metaphor to its maturity as a spiritual doctrine"[81]. Without entering into the debate here, in

[77] "...toute notre vie spirituelle se cristallise autour de la Transfiguration" (G. Habra, *La Transfiguration selon les Pères grecs,* Fontainebleau, 21983, 13). In fact, for Habra, the main points of the theological teachings of the Fathers (on the Transfiguration) are: 1) That "...aucune transfiguration n'a eu lieu dans le Christ Lui-même, pour la simple raison que la 'chair' du Christ a toujours été transfigurée" (Id., cit., 44); 2) That "...pour tous les Pères en effet, la Transfiguration est celle des disciples eux-mêmes, et consiste en une certaine perception mystique de la divinité du Christ à travers le voile de la chair" (Id., cit., 47); 3) That, based on Mt 16,28, the (quoted) Fathers "mettent la Transfiguration dans un certain rapport (...) avec la vision de la vie éternelle" (Id., cit., 48);

[78] "C'est le Christ qui paraît se transfigurer le jour de la Transfiguration, mais ce sont les apôtres qui en réalité le sont; pour la simple raison que le Christ ne pouvait se transfigurer, l'étant dès le premier instant de son Incarnation" (Habra, cit.)

[79] *Joie de la transfiguration d'après des Pères d'Orient*, Paris, 91985.

[80] *The Doctrine of Deification in the Greek Patristic Tradition*, Oxford, 2004. Not a few Fathers of the East have handed down to us their written theological thought on the Transfiguration, or better said, on the predominant theological-spiritual topic taken from the *Verklärungsgechichte*: the divinization. One can go to the bibliography on this topic, especially in the work of Norman Russell.

[81] N. Russell, *The Doctrine of Deification in the Greek Patristic Tradition*, de G. Clark – A. Louth (eds.) "Oxford Early Christian Studies", Oxford, 2004, 1. (I use the 2006 paperback edition.) Russell blames Harnack for the bad press regarding the term "divinization", when he (Harnack) affirms that "the 'exchange formula' (...) was fundamentally derived from the mystery cults and was consequently to be deplored" (Russell, cit, 3).

1981, E. Osborn gave clues on the methodology about the topic of the deification, which had proved to be interesting[82].

In the *XV Convegno ecumenico internationale di spiritualità ortodossa*, which had taken place in Bose (Italy) from 16 to 19 September 2007, nineteen experts (Ilarion Alfeev[83], Serafim Belonožko[84], Enzo Bianchi[85], Elena Cavalcanti[86][+], Sergej S. Choružij[87], Raffaela D'Este[88], Serhij Hovorun[89], Photios

[82] It was found to be interesting, since "...the Fathers were much more aware than we are today of the unity of theology and spirituality, and also of the unity of divine revelation" (Russell, cit., 8). In the Epilogue, Russell asks: "What, then, is the light that the ascetics see? The hermeneutic key is provided by the Gospel account of the transfiguration of Christ (Matt. 17:1-9; Mark 9:2-9; Luke 9:28-36). The light seen on Mount Tabor was not just a phantom without substance' (*Triad* 3.1.17). That is why Gregory calls it 'enhypostatic', i.e. without any hypostasis of its own (*Triad* 3.1.28). For its hypostasis is Christ; he himself is the deifying light (Triad 3.1.16). Thus Gregory does not add a fourth person to the Trinity, as his critics maintained. Nor does he follow Barlaam in seeing the energies merely as the attributes of God. The deifying light pertains to God's essence but is not itself the essence of God (...) (*Triad* 3.1.23, Meyendorff 601.28-9)" (Russell, cit., 306).

[83] Bishop of Vienna (Wien) and Austria (Osterreich) of the Patriarchate of Moscow, patrologist and theologian. He leads the representatives of the Russian Orthodox Church in the European institutions in Brussels (Belgium): Chialà, Sabino, Cremaschi, Lisa, Mainardi, Adalberto (eds.), *"Il Cristo Trasfigurato nella tradizione spirituale ortodossa*" (Atti del XV Convegno ecumenico internazionale di spiritualità ortodossa), Ed. Qiqajon Comunità di Bose, Magnano, 2008, 217.

[84] Born in 1973, he studied theology in Minsk (Bielorussia), Tessaloniki, Tübingen y Birmingham; since 2007, he is Bishop of Bobrujsk and Vychov (Bielorussia), and prorector of the Faculty of Theology of the Bielorussia State University: Chialà-Cremaschi-Mainardi (eds.), "*Il Cristo Trasfigurato* (...)", cit., 347.

[85] He is the prior of the Monastero di Bose: Chialà-Cremaschi-Mainardi (eds.), "Il Cristo Trasfigurato (...)", cit., 33.

[86] Madame Cavalcanti, who died a year before the Convegno, was a member of the Pontifical Committee of Social Sciences from 1999 (cfr. Leal, Jerónimo, *Elena Cavalcanti (1942-2006), in memoriam*, en AHIg, vol. XVI, 2007, 464-466, en http://redalyc.uaemex.mx/redalyc/pdf/355/35516050.pdf, 4 February 2009).

[87] Philosopher, physicist, mathematician, and theologian, he is the author of important studies on 20th c. Philosophy of Religion in Russia and on the Hesychast tradition. In 2005, he founded Moscow's Synergetic Institute of Anthropology: Chialà-Cremaschi-Mainardi (eds.), "*Il Cristo Trasfigurato* (...)", cit., 367.

[88] A nun from Bose: Chialà-Cremaschi-Mainardi (eds.), "*Il Cristo Trasfigurato* (...)", cit., 121.

[89] He teaches in the Theological Academy of Kiev (Ukraine), and is the President of the Department for the External Relations of the Ukrainian Orthodox Church, of the Moscow Patriarchate: Chialà-Cremaschi-Mainardi (eds.), "*Il Cristo Trasfigurato* (...)", cit., 335.

Ioannidis[90], Konstantinos Karaisaridis[91], André Louf[92], Iustin Marchiş[93], Ioannis Polemis[94], Antonio Rigo[95], Stamatis Skliris[96], Engelina S. Smirnova[97], Aleksandr V. Sorokin[98], Michel Van Parys[99], Ramy Wannous[100], Kallistos Ware[101]) had expressed many dimensions on the theme "*Il Cristo Trasfigurato*" –especially from the viewpoint of the Orthodox Churches– without excluding aspects of the topic in some Latin Fathers.

---

[90] He teaches Spirituality in the West in the University of Tessaloniki (Greece): Chialà-Cremaschi-Mainardi (eds.), "*Il Cristo Trasfigurato* (...)", cit., 245.

[91] Proto-presbyter of the Orthodox Archdiocese of Athens, and teaches Liturgy in the University of Tessaloniki: Chialà, Sabino, Cremaschi, Lisa, Mainardi, Adalberto (eds.)

[92] A Trappist monk, he was abbot in Mont-des-Cats (France) and writes on monastic spirituality and the Church Fathers: Chialà-Cremaschi-Mainardi (eds.), "*Il Cristo Trasfigurato* (...)", cit., 263.

[93] Born in Cluj (Transylvania, Rumania), monk, presbyter, theologian, rector of a monastic community in the Stavropoleos Church (Bucharest, Hungary): Chialà-Cremaschi-Mainardi (eds.), "*Il Cristo Trasfigurato* (...)", cit., 399.

[94] He teaches in the Faculty of Philology, in Athens' Department of Byzantine Philology: Chialà-Cremaschi-Mainardi (eds.), "*Il Cristo Trasfigurato* (...)", cit., 293.

[95] He teaches Byzantine Christianity in the Università di Venezia: Chialà-Cremaschi-Mainardi (eds.), "*Il Cristo Trasfigurato* (...)", cit., 277.

[96] Presbyter of the Orthodox Archdiocese of Athens, he is an iconographer and historian of art: Chialà-Cremaschi-Mainardi (eds.), *"Il Cristo Trasfigurato* (...)", cit., 153.

[97] A historian of art, she authors basic research on the history of the ancient Russian icon, and teaches in the Moscow's State University "Lomonosov": Chialà-Cremaschi-Mainardi (eds.), "*Il Cristo Trasfigurato* (...)", cit., 163.

[98] A Biblical scholar, he is rector of the parish of the "New Russian martyrs and confessors" in St. Petersburg (Russia), and is the editor of the journal "Living Water" (Voda živaja) of the Russian Orthodox Diocese of St. Petersburg and of Ladoga: Chialà-Cremaschi-Mainardi (eds.), "*Il Cristo Trasfigurato* (...)", cit., 105.

[99] A Benedictine monk, he has been an abbot of the Monstery in Chevetogne (Belgium) and Consultor to the Congregation for the Oriental Churches: Chialà-Cremaschi-Mainardi (eds.)

[100] He is from the Greek Orthodox Church of Antioch, and teaches History of the Church in the Faculty of Theology of the University of Balamand (Lebanon): Chialà-Cremaschi-Mainardi (eds.), "*Il Cristo Trasfigurato* (...)", cit., 199.

[101] Metropolitan of Diokleia of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople, he has taught at the University of Oxford, and writes a lot on Oriental Patrology and Church History: Chialà-Cremaschi-Mainardi (eds.), *"Il Cristo Trasfigurato* (...)", cit., 439.

Passing on now to the Latin Fathers, we have found –to date– only two *books* (or more precisely, anthologies) on the Transfiguration according to the Latin Fathers: 1) J. McGuckin[102] translates some texts of some Latin Fathers into English[103]. 2) M. Coune[104] translates into French some texts from Tertullian to Innocent III (!). In the aforementioned books of Coune and McGuckin, a commentary of each translation is missing.

Up to now, there are few articles about the thought of the Latin Fathers on the Transfiguration[105].

Andrew Louth[106], upon summarizing the Origenian exegesis on the Transfiguration –by considering the elements of the Transfiguration narrative[107]–, says that it is not likely that Augustine has had a direct access to Origen's exegesis[108]. Ambrose and Jerome have known Origen well, although the former does not follow the

[102] *The Transfiguration of Christ in Scripture and Tradition,* "Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity", vol.

[103] Tertullian, Cyprian of Carthage, Pseudo-Cyprian, Hillary, Ambrose, Jerome, Pseudo-Jerome, Augustine, Pseudo-Augustine, Leo the Great, Pseudo-Leo, Gregory the Great, Bede, and Ambrose Autpertus.

[104] *Grâce de la Transfiguration d'après des Pères d'Occident*, Paris, 41990.

[105] I refer the reader to two writings: 1) J. Driscoll´s article *The Transfiguration in Hilary of Poitiers' Commentary on Matthew* (Aug 24, 1984, 395-420); 2) J-L. Gourdain´s *Jérôme exégéte de la Transfiguration* (REAug 40, 1994, 365-373).

[106] He is from the Theology Department of the University of Durham (United Kingdom).

[107] *St. Augustine's Interpretation of the Transfiguration of Christ,* 2000.

[108] Louth comenta: "Origen's commentary on Matthew remained untranslated, and Jerome's translation of 39 homilies on St. Luke do not include that on the Transfiguration (though a few fragments survive in the catenae)" [*St. Augustine's Interpretation of the Transfiguration of Christ*, in "L'esegesi dei padri latini: dalle origini a Gregorio Magno" (XXVIII incontro di studiosi dell'antichità cristiana, Roma, 6-8 maggio 1999)", SEA 68, 2000, 377, note 4].

Alexandrian, and the latter does follow the Alexandrian, if only to interpret the correction done to Peter[109].

Michael Figura[110] in his article[111], establishes an interior link (*ein inneres Gefüge*) –between the Baptism, the preaching, the Transfiguration, and the Institution of the Eucharist, in Jesus' life[112], especially a link between the Baptism and the Transfiguration of Jesus[113], since the Fathers see in both events: 1) a revelation of the Trinity (prepared in a veiled way in the OT)[114]; and 2) an anthropological message[115] that prefigures the man's divinization (*ein Vorausbild der Vergöttlichung des Menschen*[116]). Figura affirms the unanimity of the occurrences of the elements of the *Verklärungsgeschichte* in the Synoptics, such that Mt and Lk –without altering the essential of Mc's Urgeschichte– have given it precision, breadth, and correction[117]. For the Synoptics, the scene

[109] Cfr. Louth, cit., 377-378. Then, Louth proposes: "We can perhaps see in both Ambrose and Jerome the forming of a specifically Latin tradition of interpretation of the Transfiguration, which is seen in the light of the verse about those who will not taste of death (an approach not found in Origen, nor anywhere else in the Greek tradition, to my knowledge, before St. Gregory Palamas in the fourteenth century): this approach underlines the eschatological dimension of the Transfiguration" (Louth, cit., 379). Moreover, Louth, regarding *Sermo* 78, admits: "...what strikes me about this extraordinary sermon is how personal it is to Augustine: christocentric, ecclesial, allusive to the deeper mysteries of the Trinity and the Incarnation, which belong to the realm of the heart, not to the world of external reality, and through all this, a powerful sense of apostolic charge to fulfil the Lord's command to love" (Id., cit., 381).

[110] He was secretary to the Commission for the Doctrine of the Faith of the German Episcopal Conference (1986 – 1996).

[111] *Theologische und mystische Bedeutung der Verklärung Jesu bei den Kirchenvätern* (IKaZ, 2008).

[112] They are the 1st, 2nd, 4th, and 5th Luminous Mysteries of the Rosary.

[113] Figura, cit., 10.

[114] "Wie die Taufe, so wird seit der Väterzeit auch die Verklärung Jesu als ein Offenbarwerden des dreifaltigen Gottes verstanden, das bereits im Alten Testament geheimnisvoll vorbereitet ist" (ibid.).

[115] Figura says that the *Doctor Angelicus* will say, centuries later, that Baptism is a sacrament of birth, while Transfiguration is that of the rebirth of Christians.

[116] Figura, cit., 10-11.

[117] Cfr. Id., cit., 12.

of the Verklärung is a unique event, extremely important in Jesus' life, an event that accentuates his divinity, giving his Apostles a preview of the glory of Christ crucified, risen and exalted, without harm to his humanity, since Jesus Christ's divine-human life is characterized by the law of lowliness and descent (cfr. Flp 2,5-11)[118]. Figura affirms that those accents were already in the Fathers of the Church, for whom theology, spiritual experience and mysticism are bound together when they interpret the Transfiguration. Figura gives two examplos of Fathers who comment on Mt: one from the East (Origen[119] of Alexandria), and another, from the West (Hillary of Poitiers[120]). Figura concludes that the spiritual message of Jesus'

[118] "Für die Evangelisten ist die Verklärungsszene ein äußerst wichtiges einmaliges Ereignis im Leben Jesu, das seine Göttlichkeit betont, seinen Aposteln einen Vorausblick auf die Herrlichkeit des gekreuzigten, auferstandenen und erhöhten Christus gibt, seiner Menschlichkeit aber keinen Abbruch tut, weil das gottmenschiliche Leben Jesu Christi durch das Gesetz der Niedrigkeit und des Abstiegs (vgl. Phil 2,5-11) bestimmt ist" (Figura, cit., 12).

[119] "Mit seiner exegetischen, theologischen und geistlichen Auslegung der Verklärung Jesu fordert Origenes die Christen aller Zeiten zu einem geistlichen Aufstieg und auch zu einem geistlichen Abstieg auf: Sie sollen sich von Jesus in die Höhe führen lassen, wo sie neue geistliche Erfahrungen machen. Diese geistlichen Erfahrungen münden für den Alexandriner immer in die Gemeinschaft mit Jesus Christus und so in die Gemeinschaft des dreifaltigen Gottes. Der geistlicht Abstieg besteht für den Schriftgelehrten letztlich darin, dass die Verklärung Jesu nicht auf den ersten Blick einleuchtet, sondern ihren Glanz erst erhält durch das ganze Christusmysterium, das leiden und Auferstehung einschließt" [Through his exegetical, theological and spiritual interpretation of Jesus' Transfiguration, Origen encourages Christians of all times to a spiritual ascent and descent, Christians who have to let themselves be guided by Jesus on high, where they can have new spiritual experiences which bring about (for Origen) a communion with Jesus Christ and with the Trinity. For Scripture experts, the spiritual descent consists in, in the final analysis, that Jesus' Transfiguration doesn't seem evident at first glance, but that his splendor is gained by all of Christ's mystery, and includes his Passion and Resurrection] (Figura, cit., 17).

[120] For Figura, Hillary thus summarizes the firm theological and spiritual message of the Transfiguration passage in Mt: "A voice from the cloud makes us understand (cfr. Mt 17,5) that this is the Son, this [is] the one in whom [the Father] is well-pleased, this is who must be listened to, as he is the fitting author of such precepts. He assures that after the sacrifice of the world, after the desire for the Cross, after the bodily death, the gory of the celestial Kingdom will follow the example of the event of the resurrection of the flesh" (HIL Mt, 17,3). (The translation is ours.)

Transfiguration, in the theology of the Fathers, interprets Flp 2,5-11[121].

C. Limits and objectives of the present work

This work aims to seek what the Western Fathers of the Church (from Tertullian to Bede) have said about the Transfiguration, in order to know what the theological *topics* (Biblical, doctrinal, moral and spiritual) are behind the *elements* of the Transfiguration–event[122].

It would mean drawing theological topics from the Patristic viewpoint (which includes Patristic exegesis[123]), without dealing with the history of each work where excerpts or entre works about the Transfiguration have been found, and this begins with reading and interpreting the reading which, in turn, the Fathers of the Church did in Latin about the Transfiguration. Delving into the Patristic texts, aside from opening very, very vast theological

[121] Cfr. Figura, cit., 18.

[122] Thus, this work is not a Biblical exegesis (*stricto sensu*) of the Transfiguration narrative. Nor does it examine the background, the history of the texts and the exegesis of the Latin text (in any of its versions) nor of the Greek (in any of its versions) of the Synoptic narratives of the Transfiguration. Nor does this work follow any of the medieval, modern and contemporary theories on the Transfiguration. It is not a theology of the Transfiguration of the Church Fathers in general. It doesn't try to "resolve in the past" any present-day polemic specifically about the Transfiguration of Jesus; otherwise, it would be anachronistic. It is with an awareness that the *Weltanschauung* (world-view) of the Church Fathers, on the one hand, is not like today (in the sense that the historico-critical method exists), but they, on the other hand, offer a wider vision of the matter at hand (when referring especially to theology as a whole, as it was understood by the Father, theology united to spiritual life, not a mere exercise of erudition). Lastly, this work doesn't deal with the complete biography of each Church Father here mentioned; rather, only some data on their lives shall be mentioned.

[123] This work is classified between the fields of Patristic exegesis and Systematic Theology (Dogma), with more emphasis on the latter, that is to say, on the main doctrinal topics.

horizons, cannot set aside the exegetical element, since, as what Mons. Patrick Descourtieux mentions, "...all the Fathers of the Church have been exegetes"[124].

II. Methodology of this work

There has been an uneasy thought in me –upon beginning the work– that there would not be anything to find, other than what Coune y McGuckin[125] have already found. Even then, I started to look for material. Following the indication of my esteemed Director of the Licentiate Thesis, Prof. Dr. Lucas Francisco Mateo-Seco, I started to look for texts of who is considered, by the majority of the experts, as the first Christian writer in Latin: Tertullian[126]. The unexpected, but happy, result of another search were many writings on the research topic in the *CChr..SL*[127] and in the *CSEL*[128].

---

[124] "Tous les Pères de l'Église one été des exégètes" [P. Descourtieux (tr.), *Commentaires sur les Psaumes I* (Psaumes 1–14), SC 515, 2008, 27]. I am not going to deal with the history of the writing of the Latin Fathers where explicit or implicit passages about the Transfiguration are found. Neither do I aim to compare the Theology of Transfiguration of the Fathers of the West to the Theology of Transfiguration of the Fathers of the East. This, however, can be done in latter works.

[125] Moreover, with the doubt that the topic of Transfiguration would be 'proper' only to the Greek Fathers, and that therefore, the present work would appear redundant. The very scarcity of monographs on the topic, aside from the works of Coune and McGuckin, increase the fear of not finding anything substantial and significant.

[126] I did not imagine that to write the Licentiate Thesis, it would already suffice to work on the basis of the material I found on that brilliant son of Carthage, who has mentioned or alluded to the Transfiguration in a third of his extant works.

[127] CChr.SL 1, 2, 4, 9, 9A, 14, 19, 20, 23, 24B, 25 25A, 27, 31, 32, 36, 38, 40, 41, 44A, 44B, 50, 50A, 60, 62, 64, 66, 68A, 69, 72, 73, 76A, 77, 77A, 77C, 78, 87, 90, 92, 93, 98, 101, 103, 107, 108B, 108F, 115, 117, 118A, 119, 119A, 119B, 121, 121A, 122, 123A, 124A, 128, 132, 133, 138A, 143, 143B, 144, 161C, 162, 162A, 175.

[128] CSEL 9, 22, 32/1, 32/2, 50, 54/1, 55, 62, 64, 65, 73, 78, 79, 81/1, 81/2, 81/3, 82/1, 82/2.

After going to the sources, and translating[129], the stage of *writing down the textual commentary* on the sermons and treatises about the Transfiguration in Latin[130] arrived.

III. Structure of this work

Section I of the work deals with the writings in toto[131] about the Transfiguration. Section II complements the first: quotes and allusions of more Latin Fathers and other authors. Then, an *iter theologicum* of the authors regarding the event and the Mystery of the Transfiguration follows. And finally, the Conclusion.

I hope that this work contributes at least a bit to the present-day man's drawing near to God, through the historical event of the mystery of the Transfiguration of Jesus Christ, under the tutelage of the Fathers of the West.

[129] In writing the Thesis first in Spanish, the scarcity of translations into Spanish of the majority of the texts I had found meant months of hard work in making the Fathers talk in Spanish, so to speak, since some authors – for a modern reader – write a very difficult and archaic Latin (Tertullian, *Hillary of Poitiers*), making much use of the ellipsis. Thanks to Prof. Mateo-Seco, I learned much Latin.

[130] I shall follow the following *order of reading*: introduction, structure, brief contextualization of the work that comments on or mentions the Transfiguration, commentary on the commentary of the Latin Fathers about the Transfiguration, conclusion. Whatever might have been the contexts on which the Latin Fathers contemplated the Transfiguration–event, their responses contained, and still do, a perennially valid doctrinal core.

[131] They're from: St. Hillary of Poitiers, St. Ambrose of Milan, Maximinus the Arrian, St. Jerome, St. Augustine, St. Leo the Great, Epiphanius Latinus, Chromatius, Arnobius the Younger, Bede the Venerable.

The Author thanks God for: the very precious support of his parents, ***Fraterno*** *(from heaven) and* ***Gloria****; the recommendation of H.E., Msgr. Leo Drona, sdb, Bishop of the Diocese of San Pablo (Philippines); Mr. Severino Estrera (for having introduced him to Cicero), of Fr. Pedro Ignacio Utrilla (for correcting the draft), of Fr. Mark Sese (for his timely suggestions in the lay-out). The Author especially gives thanks the expert and patient guidance of* ***Prof. Dr. Fr. Lucas Francisco Mateo-Seco****, Director of the Licentiate and Doctoral Theses: a master, a father, and a friend. Thanks to the prayer and moral support of many –friends and acquaintances– this labor was realized. Thanks to the Professors and the Personnel of the Faculty of Theology of the University of Navarre. Thanks to Dr. Luz F. Cuello for the bibliography made possible. Lastly, thanks to the "Vasconia" Foundation, and the Studium Theologiae Foundation, for paying for the studies and the stay of the Author in Pamplona.*

1. Marc IV, 22, 1–16 (Tertullianus)

Quintus Septimius Florens Tertullianus[1] (baptized 193), pioneer of the *latinitas christiana*[2], shows in Marc. IV (maybe 209–210[3]), his longest work[4], how Jesus revindicates and fulfills the ancient prophecy[5], against Marcion[6], who makes others believe that Moses and Elijah were in the mountain with Jesus transfigured because they were going to be destroyed by the voice[7].

---

1 Native of Carthage, a convert to Christianity around 193, a passionate and escritor culto y apasionado, Tertuliano es conocido por su "inexhaustible vigor, burning rhetoric, and biting satire. His attitude is uncompromising. Forever a fighter, he knew no relenting towards his enemies, whether pagans, Jews, heretics, or, later on, Catholics (Quasten, II, 247)"; cfr. C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, 593. "Except for St. Augustine, Tertullian is the most important and original ecclesiastical author in Latin" [Quasten, II, 247; cfr. C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 593]. Of Tertullian's 42 works known to date, 31 survive.

2 Cfr. C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, 593.

3 C. Moreschini – R. Braun (tr.), *Tertullien, Contre Marcion, tome IV* (livre IV), SC 456, 2001, 19.

4 "...le plus long des traités de Tertullien" [R. Braun, *Tertullien, Contre Marcion, tome I (livre I)*, SC 365, 1990, 7]. The length of *Marc I-V* is one-fiftth of the entire opera tertullianea (cfr. ibid.). Antonio Casamassa says that Marc is "la più estesa di quante ne ha scritte Tertuliano contro le eresie in particolare" (*Scritti Patristici, Volume II*, in "Lateranum, Nova Series, an. XXII, n. 1-4", Roma, 1956, 162). Besides, Tertullian uses the Scripture very much in defending the Catholic faith, since "Tertullian hatte erkannt, dass die wichtigste und gefährlichste Waffe der Gnostiker und Markioniten im Kampf gegen die Katholiken die Bibel war" (M. Fiedrowicz, *Theologie der Kirchenväter*, Verlag Herder, Freiburg im Breisgau 2007, 173).

5 "...showing how Jesus vindicates and fulfills ancient prophecy" [C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, 609].

6 "Iam et hoc uel maxime erubescere debuisti" (TE *Marc IV*, 22, 1, CChr.SL 1, 1954, 600).

7 "...quod illum cum Moyse et Helia in secessu montis conspici pateris quorum destructor aduenerat (...). Definiendo enim, quem audirent, quoscumque alios uetuisset audiri" (ibid.). Tertullian and Marcion both agree that the voice (cfr. Mt 17,5) suffices. But as to why it sufficed, one notices the discrepancy between the two. Tertullian corrects Marcion by saying that, indeed, Moses and Elijah were superfluous, but not because Christ annihilated them, but because the voice defined clearly who would Moses and Elijah listen to: the Son. If Marcion were to be right, God should've prohibited to be heard not only Moses and Elijah, but any and every OT character. In order to illustrate this, Tertullian mentions two prophets: "Aut numquid Esaiam et Hieremiam ceterosque, quos non ostendit, permisit audiri, si uetuit quos ostendit?" (TE *Marc IV*, 22, 2, CCL 1, 1954, 600).

Tertullian explains the dialogue between Moses, Elijah and Christ,

> "which is an indicator of familiarity. [If Marcion were right, then they should] not [have been shown] in the unity of clarity[8], which is an example of dignity and grace. Rather, [they should've been depicted] in dirty clothes, as a proof of their ruin; moreover, [they should've been seen] in the Creator's darkness, for whose dissipation he was sent. And also, [they should've been depicted as] set very far from Christ's clarity, who would have to separate from the Gospel their very voices and writings"[9].

Tertullian draws the arguments in favor of Moses and Elijah, or in other words, in favor of the unity of the Scriptures:

> "Is that the way[10] how [Christ] shows that those [Moses and Elijah] are others, [precisely] while he has them with him? Is it how [Christ shows] that [Moses and Elijah] must be dragged out, [while] he associates them with himself? Is that the way [Christ] destroys them, when [Christ] exalts them with the rays of his glory? What would their Christ [Marcion's Christ] do? I suppose, according to how absurd [Marcion's doctrine is], that he would've shown them how Marcion's Christ should've done it, or at least, he would've depicted

---

8 Cfr. Lc 9,31.

9 "...quod familiaritati indicium est, nec in consortio claritatis, quod dignationis et gratiae exemplum est, sed in sordibus aliquibus, quod destructionis argumentum est, immo in tenebris creatoris, quibus discutiendis erat missus, longe etiam discreti a claritate Christi, qui uoces et litteras ipsas eorum ab euangelio suo erat separaturus" (TE *Marc IV* 22, 2, CChr.SL 1, 1954, 600-601).

10 "*Sicin*" implies: "est-ce ainsi que?" (Gaffiot, 1457). Again, Cicero's rhetorical device of using triplets appears (*sicin... sic... sic...*). Braun coments: "...la forme sicin qu'on lit chez les Comiques (...) est parfaitement admissible ici, quoique non attestée ailleurs chez T. (...). L'absence d'apocope est normale avec l'initiale vocalique qui suit. Le mouvement oratoire justifie pleinement le recours à cette forme pour l'introduire" [C. Moreschini – R. Braun (tr.), *Tertullien, Contre Marcion, tome IV (livre IV)*, SC 456, 2001, 277, note 4].

> himself with some other [OT characters] more than [with] his prophets. However, what is more fitting to the Creator's Christ, than to manifest himself to those who preached about Him? [What's more fitting to the Creator's Christ,] than to be seen with those through whom he had been seen in the theophanies? [What's more fitting to the Creator's Christ,] than to speak with those who had spoken about Him? [What's more fitting to the Creator's Christ,] than to communicate his glory to those by whom he was called 'Lord of glory'? [It's fitting to the Creator's Christ to be seen] with the principals[11] of his people – the first as the people's informer, and the second as the reformer [of the same people], one starting the old testament and the other concluding the new testament"[12].

In order to justify Moses' and Elijah' presence with Christ[13], Tertullian presents three arguments of convenience[14]. Tertullian

---

[11] The *principales* were the princes of the municipal senates. Cfr. Bouché-Leclerq, *Manuel des Institutions Romaines*, 166, 186, n. 1; cfr. C. Moreschini – R. Braun (tr.), *Tertullien, Contre Marcion, tome IV (livre IV)*, SC 456, 2001, 278, note 5.

[12] "Sicin alienos demonstrat illos, dum secum habet? Sic reliquendos docet quos sibi iungit? Sic destruit quos de radiis suis exstruit? Quid faceret Christus ipsorum? Credo, secundum peruersitatem tales eos reuelasset, quales Christus Marcionis debuisset, aut quoscumque alios secum <ostendisset> quam prophetas suos. Sed quid tam Christi creatoris quam secum ostendere praedicatores suos? Cum illis uideri, quibus in reuelationibus erat uisus? Cum illis loqui, qui eum fuerant locuti? Cum eis gloriam suam communicare, a quibus dominus gloriae nuncupabatur? Cum principalibus suis, quorum alter populi informator aliquando alter reformator quandoque, alter initiator ueteris testamenti alter consummator noui" (TE *Marc IV*, 22, 3, CChr.SL 1, 1954, 601).

[13] Not Marcion's Christ.

[14] 1) It is more fitting for the Creator's Christ to show himself in the presence of those who prophesied about him; 2) It is more fitting for the Creator's Christ to let himself be seen by those who had seen him before through revelations or theophanies (e.g. Moses); 3) It is more fitting for the Creator's Christ to let himself to speak with those who had spoken about him. The distribution of the arguments go *in crescendo*, and *another argument* is added, *also based on the Transfiguration*. On the other hand, the expression "Lord of glory" seems to come from Ps 23,10: *Dominus uirtutum ipse est rex gloriae. Dominus* substitutes rex, implying that they are synonyms.

speaks of Peter[15] who recognizes the legitimate intimacy (*contubernium*[16]) among Jesus, Moses and Elijah. Tertullian insists that Peter experienced the alienation of reason[17]– relating *amentia* with extasis, in order to base on the Scripture the Montanist teaching[18] dear to Tertullian:

> "How would [Peter] have recognized Moses and Elijah, [if it were not for the spirit]? Because the people did not have their images or statues, by the Law's prohibition, unless he had seen them in spirit[19]?"[20].

---

[15] "Igitur et Petrus, meritum contubernium Christi sui agnoscens, <in> indiuiduitatem eius suggerit consilium (...). 'Sed nesciens, quid diceret.'" (TE *Marc IV*, 22, 4, CChr.SL 1, 1954, 601). '*Sed*' points to the Marcionite idea that Peter didn't know what he's saying because he didn't know Christ's true nature (cfr. SC 456, 280, note 1).

[16] The classical meaning of *contubernium* is the "camaraderie entre soldats qui logent sous la même tente: P. Cornelius Tacitus, *Annales*, 1, 41, 3; (...) commerce, société, intimité, liaison d'amitié; (...) tente commune: C. Iulius Caesar, *De bello ciuili*, 3, 76, 3" (Gaffiot, 426). Tertullian uses *contubernium* only here (cfr. C. Moreschini – R. Braun (tr.), *Tertullien, Contre Marcion, tome IV (livre IV)*, SC 456, 2001, 279, note 7).

[17] "Quomodo nesciens? Vtrumne simplici errore an ratione, qua defendimus in causa nouae prophetiae gratiae extasim, id est amantiam, convenire?" (TE *Marc IV*, 22, 4, CChr.SL 1, 1954, 601).

[18] "In spiritu enim homo constitutus, praesertim cum gloriam dei conspicit uel cum per ipsum deus loquitur, necesse est excidat sensu, obumbratus scilicet uirtute diuina" (ibid.). On the topic of extasis, Tertullian says: "inter nos et psychicos quaestio est" (ibid.). However, Tertullian doesn't specify what the dispute is about. When he alludes to man "having to be" in εκστασις before the divine presence, so that he might, as it were, be protected by the divine power, this very affirmation might be the disputed question. I am not dealing with the history of the question of the εκστασις.

[19] To what does Tertullian refer with spiritus? J.E.L. Van der Geest affirms: "Le Christ est *filius*, comme nous l'avons vu à propos des théophanies, *sermo* ou *spiritus*" (*Le Christ et l'Ancien Testament chez Tertullien*, Dekker & Van de Vegt – Nijmegen, 1972, 236).

[20] "Quomodo enim Moysen en Heliam cognouisset, [nisi in spiritu ?] –nec enim imagines eorum uel statuas populus habuit nec similitudines, lege prohibente– nisi quia in spiritu uiderat?" (TE *Marc IV*, 22, 5, CChr.SL 1, 1954, 601-602).

Tertullian insists that if Peter[21] had already confessed that Jesus was the Christ, the Son of God[22], then there's no reason why Peter would commit a mistake in affirming Jesus' divinity.

> "... if [in this case of the Transfiguration, Peter] erred by the earlier motive[23], then be sure yourself that on that day, no divinity was revealed by Christ and [be sure, too,] that up to now Peter wouldn't have erred, insofar as Christ, until then, wouldn't have revealed anything to him, and that at the same time, Christ didn't have to be considered as coming from some other god if not from the Creator, whose order He even expressed here"[24].

After seeing in the triune number the Scriptures' verification of the Apostolic testimony on Jesus' Transfiguration[25], Tertullian places the following scene atop the Transfiguration scene: a superior god[26] would have a right to make use of the realities of the world which belonged to the Creator God: if the Marcionite hypothesis evoked by Tertullian were true, then a cloud of the superior god would go across the God Creator's heaven, and this would imply that that "superior" god would, ironically, have to take recourse to

---

[21] According to Braun, "...au Pierre de Marcion égaré par son judaïsme, T. oppose un Pierre illuminé par la grâce et mis en état d'extase (...) cet état qu'il définit comme une *amentia* provisoire occasionnée par la venue de l'Esprit dans l'homme" [C. Moreschini –R. Braun (tr.), *Tertullien, Contre Marcion, tome IV (livre IV)*, SC 456, 2001, 280, note 2].

[22] Cfr. Mt 16,16.

[23] Ibid.

[24] "Quodsi ideo et hic errauit quia et supra, ergo certus es in illum diem quoque nullam nouam diuinitatem a Christo reuelatam et usque adhuc non errasse Petrum, Christo usque adhuc nihil eiusmodi reuelante, et tamdiu non alterius deputandum Christum quam creatoris, cuius omnem et hic ordinem expressit" (TE *Marc IV*, 22, 6, CChr.SL 1, 1954, 602).

[25] Cfr. Id., *Marc IV*, 22, 7.

[26] For Marcion, a superior, good, NT God, God the Father, is unknown to the other, evil OT God, the Creator.

the elements of his subordinate and enemy[27]. Tertullian illustrates this point with the Transfiguration:

> "So, thus, the cloud wasn't mute even now, but the already known voice from heaven bore witness anew of the Father about the Son, to whom Psalm 1 refers[28]: *You are my son, today I have begotten you*[29]*, and also by Isaiah: Who among you fears the Lord and obeys the voice of his servant?*[30]*"*[31].

Tertullian says that when the voice presents the Son, it's implied that Christ is the Filius, and that the voice is the Father's.

> "Thus, presenting Him –This is my Son[32]– it's implied: *whom I have promised anew*"[33].

Here appears the repromissio topic, by which Tertullian places in the Father's mouth the words "whom I promised" in order to

---

[27] This invalidates the Marcionite thesis on the absolute irrelevance and annihilation of the OT with the arrival of the NT. According to Braun, "T. conteste (...) selon un thème polémique habituel, le droit du dieu supérieur de se servir des réalités d'un monde appartenant au Créateur. Après l'hypothèse ironiquement présentée d'une nuée propre à ce dieu supérieur et qu'il aurait amenée avec lui à travers le ciel du Créateur, il revient à l'explication habituelle (proinde) et dénigrante (precario): ce dieu doit recourir aux éléments de son subalterne" [C. Moreschini – R. Braun (tr.), Tertullien, Contre Marcion, tome IV (livre IV), SC 456, 2001, 283, note 3].

[28] However, '*filius meus es tu...*' is not from Psalm 1, but from Psalm 2. Braun comments that "...l'erreur de chiffre (...) est sans doute imputable à T." [C. Moreschini –R. Braun (tr.), *Tertullien, Contre Marcion, tome IV (livre IV)*, SC 456, 2001, 284, note 1].

[29] Psalm 2,7: "*Tú eres mi hijo. Yo te he engendrado hoy*" (*SagBi* 3, 190).

[30] Is 50,10: "*¿Quién [de vosotros] teme al Señor, y escucha la voz de su siervo?*" (SagBi 4, 242). Tertullian uses *filius*; the Neovulgate uses servus.

[31] *"Itaque nec nunc muta nubes fuit, sed uox solita de caelo et patris nouum testimonium super filio, ad quem in primo psalmo: filius meus es tu, ego hodie genui te, de quo et per Esaiam: quis deum metuens? Audiat uocem filii eius"* (TE *Marc IV*, 22, 8, CCL 1, 1954, 602).

[32] *Lc 9,35 "Éste es mi Hijo" (SagBi 5, 449).*

[33] "Itaque iam repraesentans eum –hic est filius meus– utique subaudit: quem repromisi" (TE *Marc IV,* 22, 9, CCL 1, 1954, 602).

establish an OT–NT link[34]. Tertullian insists that one must listen

> "...only to him who had been proclaimed pronounced from the beginning[35] in order to be listened to as prophet, since he had to be considered a prophet by the people"[36].

Christ doesn't annihilate the OT; rather, there's a *decessio–successio* (from the OT to the NT)[37]:

> "Indeed, even if there be some displacement of listening, from Moses and Elijah to Christ, it isn't as if [Christ proceeded] from another god nor from another christ, but from the Creator to his Christ, according to the disposition of the Old and the succession of the New Testament. Isaiah says: it was not an angel, but God himself saved them[38], he himself now preaches and brings to fulfillment the Law and the Prophets"[39].

The transfer of the listening (from the Law and the Prophets to Christ) isn't *ex nihilo*, because the God listened to in the OT and in the NT is the same God.

---

[34] The OT promise, only *started*, was fulfilled suddenly (from the Apostles' viewpoint) in the NT. What the voice said did not only describe Jesus as the Son of the Father, but that he also became – for anyone who knew the Law and the Prophets – the fulfillment of the Lord's promise (*repromissio*).

[35] Tertullian alludes to the Son's preexistence (cfr. Jn 1,1).

[36] "Quem? <Nisi quem> ab initio edixerat audiendum in nomine prophetae quoniam et prophetes existimari habebet a populo" (TE *Marc IV*, 22, 10, CChr.SL 1, 1954, 602).

[37] This term, far from establishing discontinuity, destruction, annihilation (like Marcion pretended), it marks the distinction, the passage, the OT–AT *continuum*.

[38] Cfr. Is 63,9: "the angel of his presence saved them".

[39] "Itaque et si facta translatio sit auditionis a Moyse et Helia in Christum, sed non ut ab alio deo nec ad alium Christum, sed a creatore in Christum eius, secundum decessionem ueteris et successionem noui testamenti: non legatus, inquit Esaias, nec nuntius, sed ipse deus saluos eos faciet, ipse iam praedicans et implens legem et prophetas" (TE *Marc IV*, 22, 11, CChr.SL 1, 1954, 602).

Tertullian explains how the *decessio* and the *successio* take place:

> "... Christ even shares his glory with Moses and Elijah. But we also have all the structure of this vision in Habbakuk[40], where the spirit sometimes comes in the person of the Apostles: *Lord! I have listend to thy proclamation, and I feared*[41]. Who else [was listened to] but the one of this celestial voice: T*his is my Son, my Chosen; listen to him!*[42]*? (...) Thou shalt be known amidst two animals*[43] of Moses and Elijah, near to whom Zechariah also saw under the figure of two olives and two olive branches (cfr. Za 4,3 and Za 4,14[44])"[45].

Tertullian situates in the words of the two Prphets the Ols Testament echo of: 1) Moses' and Elijah's presence on both sides of Jesus; and 2) the luminous aspect of the Transfiguration:

---

[40] Tertullian roots the listening to the Son in Ha 3,2, and there one senses the prophet's very *personal* side, when he affirms having listened to the Lord's voice; this is understood, if he has experienced a vision [cfr. F. Andersen, *Habakkuk*, from W. Albright – D. Freedman (eds.), AncB, Doubleday, New York, 2001, 276].

[41] Ha 3,2. Unlike the text Tertullian knew, above translated, the verse in English (RSV) reads: "O Lord, I have heard the report of thee, and thy work, O Lord, do I fear".

[42] Lc 9,35: "*Éste es mi Hijo, el elegido: escuchadle*" (SagBi 5, 449).

[43] This is Ha 3,2, as the author knew it. But the verse in English and Spanish reads very differently: "In the midst of the years make it known"; "En nuestros días dalas a conocer" (SagBi 4, 1191). Here, I don't enter into the question of why there was a discrepancy in the translation or the versions in Latin.

[44] "Me contestó: '*Ésos son los dos hijos del aceite puro que asisten al servicio del Señor de toda la tierra*'" (SagBi 4, 1258).

[45] "...societatem esse etiam claritatis Christi cum Moyse et Helia. Totum autem habitum uisionis istius habemus etiam apud Abacuc, ubi spiritus ex persona interdum apostolorum: domine, audiui auditum tuum et extimui – quem magis quam uocis caelestis illius: hic est filius meus dilectus, hunc audite? (...) In medio duorum animalium cognosceris, Moysi et Heliae, de quibus et Zacharias uidit in figura duarum olearum et duorum ramulorum oleae" (TE *Marc IV,* 22, 12, CChr.SL 1, 1954, 602).

> "Since these were the ones to whom it was said: *two sons of pure oil*[46] *who stand by the Lord of the whole earth*[47]. Again, Habakkuk: *His glory covered the heavens*[48], evidently with that dense cloud, and *his brightness was like the light*[49], evidently by which his clothing shone with splendor. And if we remember the promise made to Moses, this [promise] will be found to be fulfilled here[50]"[51].

Tertullian explained God's promise to Moses, fulfilled centuries

---

[46] Cfr. Za 4,14: "two anointed". Tertullian sees Za 4,14 as the vision's Höhepunkt of Part II of Zechariah's Book I [cfr. C. Meyers – E. Meyers, Haggai, Zechariah 1–8, de W. Albright – D. Freedman (eds.), AncB, Doubleday, New York, 1987, 275] as the locus where Moses and Elijah appear prefigured, they who proclaim Christ's arrival. In Za 4,14, **רָהְצַיהִ־ינֵבְּ** means "very abundant", and not literally "children of the olive"; it thus implies productivity, pointing to the two individuals who will accompany God's resotres presence in his people (cfr. Meyers-Meyers, cit., 258). Carol Meyers and Eric Meyers observe that "'sons of oil' (...) functions in two ways. First, both governor and high priest provide a constant flow of oil to the lampstand. They support both the temple and Yahweh's sovereignty. (...) Second, the oil also represents fecundity and prosperity. As such, the trees are connected with divine favor and its attendant blessings" (Id., cit., 276).

[47] Za 4,14: "*asisten al servicio del Señor de toda la tierra*" (SagBi 4, 1258). Braun comments that "...dans cette traduction littérale de la LXX, *opimitas* répond à **πιοτης** ("graisse"). En rapport avec la "figure" des oliviers, T. paraît l'entendre dans un sens spirituel ("abondance de grâce"). Le sens dégagé par la TOB est tout autre: 'les deux hommes désignés pour l'huile'" [C. Moreschini – R. Braun (tr.), *Tertullien, Contre Marcion, tome IV (livre IV)*, SC 456, 2001, 288, note 1].

[48] Ha 3, 3–4: "*Su gloria cubre los cielos*" (SagBi 4, 1191). Tertullian quotes Ha 3, relating the sun rising in between the mountains of Teman and Paran with Jesus transfigured between Moses and Elijah.

[49] Ha 4: "*Su fulgor es como la luz*" (ibid).

[50] Cfr. Ex 33,17: "Esta petición que me has dirigido también te la concederé, porque has hallado gracia a mis ojos y te conozco personalmente" (SagBi 1, 434).

[51] "Nam hi sunt, de quibus dictum est illi: duo filii opimitatis adsistunt domino uniuersae terrae. Et rursus idem Abacuc: operuit caelos uirtus, utique nubilo illo, et splendor eius ut lux erit, utique qua etiam uestitus eius refulsit. Et si commemoremur promissionis Moysi, hic inuenietur expuncta" (TE *Marc IV*, 22, 13, CChr.SL 1, 1954, 602).

after Moses' passage on earth, in the' Transfiguration of Jesus, to Moses, who wished

> "evidently [to see] That One, that figure of which the prophet had an intuition[52]. Besides, he had already heard that [as to] God's face[53], man shall not see me and live[54]– This very thing, he said, you have spoken, I will do[55]"[56].

Tertullian describes the promise to Moses, after he asked the Lord:

> "...show me thy glory[57]. And the same thing, the Lord, [referring to] the future: I will make all my goodness pass before you[58], et cetera. (...) saying also to Aaron: If there is a prophet among you, I the Lord make myself known to him in a vision, I speak with him in a dream. Not so

---

[52] Reading between Moses' line was his desire to see the condition God would take unto himself when the Word becomes flesh, something of which Moses "had an intuition" as a prophet, Tertullian surmises. The gist of Moses' intuition in Ex 33,13 is condensed in the verb sciebat, which –in this context– doesn't seem to refer to any empirical knowledge, but rather seems to point to an intuition, a prophecy.

[53] According to Tertullian, this is from Ex 33,20: "Construyó allí un altar y lo llamó El-Elohé-Israel" (SagBi 1, 192). But this seems incongruent. What happens, then? Braun offers an explanation: "C'est par erreur que T. peut supposer déjà connu de Moïse l'énoncé d'Ex 33, 20 qui suit tout juste la scène évoquée ici. Cette méprise s'explique sans doute par le fait qu'il cite de tête un verset célèbre, qui avait déjà acquis une autonomie dans les *testimonia* théologiques. En Prax. 14, 1, il ne commet pas cette erreur" (SC 456, 289, note 5).

[54] Ex 33,20: "*ningún ser humano puede verlo y seguir vivendo*" (SagBi 1, 435).

[55] Ex 33,17: "*Esta petición que me has dirigido también te la concederé*" (SagBi 1, 434).

[56] "..eum conspectum desiderans, in quo hominem esset acturus, quod propheta sciebat, –ceterum dei faciem, iam audierat, nemo homo uidebit, et uiuet– et hunc, inquit, sermonem, quem dixisti, faciam tibi" (TE *Marc IV*, 22, 14, CCL 1, 1954, 603-604).

[57] Ex 33,18. It's worth noting that Moses is aware, at least in part, of what human language uses to refer to that being in the presence of God himself: to show his *glory*. Another thing is whether Moses, while he was on earth, knew the implications of what he asks from his Friend, the Lord.

[58] Ex 33,19: "*Yo haré pasar todo mi esplendor ante ti*" (SagBi 1, 434).

> with my servant Moses (...) with him I speak mouth to mouth, clearly - evidently, making himself seen under the human aspect[59], which he would be wearing– not in dark speech (Nm 12,6-860)"[61].

Tertullian speaks of Moses, centuries after, during the Transfiguration, seeing fulfilled his desire when he was still lived on earth:

> "Because, although Marcion didn't wish to show him [Moses] speaking with the Lord, but [merely] standing, however, standing, he didn't speak mouth to mouth but also face to face, – *with him*[62], said [Luke], not 'away from him' – in the glory of [Christ] himself; not only in his presence. And enlightened by this glory, [Moses] set himself far from Christ, not differently from how he used to set himself from [the presence of] the Creator; therefore wounding, [back] then, the eyes of Israel's sons[63], in the same way, too, now he wounds the eyes of

---

[59] Nm 12, 6–8. Braun comments that it's about "voir Dieu sous l'aspect de son Incarnation, le seul sous lequel il soit visible de l'être humain" [C. Moreschini – R. Braun (tr.), *Tertullien, Contre Marcion, tome IV (livre IV)*, SC 456, 2001, 291, note 3].

[60] "*Y si hubiere entre vosotros un profeta, mediante visiones me daré a conocer, en el sueño yo le hablo. Esto no lo hago con mi siervo Moisés; conversamos cara a cara, mediante visión, no por enigmas*" (SagBi 1, 650). Again, the repromissio topic arises in order to understand the link between the Lord's promise to Moses (cfr. Ex 33,13s.) and the Transfiguration of Jesus.

[61] "...ostende mihi gloriam tuam. Et dominus similiter de futuro: ego praecedam gloria mea, et reliqua. (...) etiam ad Aaronem dicens: et si fuerit prophetes in uobis, in uisione cognoscar illi et in uisione loquar ad eum, non quomodo ad Moysen; os ad os loquar ad eum, in specie –utique hominis, quam erat gestaturus– non in aenigmate" (TE *Marc IV*, 22, 15, CChr.SL 1, 1954, 604).

[62] Lc 9,32: "*a su lado*" (SagBi 5, 448).

[63] Cfr. Ex 34, 29–30.

[64] "Nam et si Marcion noluit eum conloquentem domino ostensum, sed stantem, tamen et stans os ad os stabat et faciem ad faciem, – cum illo, inquit, non 'extra illum' – in gloria ipsius, nedum in conspectu. De qua gloria non aliter inlustratus discessit a Christo quam solebat a creatore, proinde tunc oculos percutiens filiorum Israhelis, quemadmodum et nunc excaecati Marcionis, qui hoc quoque argumentum aduersus se facere non uidit" (TE *Marc IV*, 22, 16, CChr.SL 1, 1954, 604).

the blind Marcion, who hadn't seen that this argument also went against him"[64].

Principal affirmations

Against Marcion, Tertullian defends the true motive of Moses' and Elijah's presence in Jesus' Transfiguration: in order to show the fulfillment of the ancient prophecy (which for Moses is the granting of his request to see the face of the Lord in another montain, Sinai; a request about which Moses himself had an intuition[65]) the unity (with the consequent unity of God Creator and Father God : they're not two gods –like what Marcion would say– but the one and only God) between the OT and the NT (*decessio y successio*[66]), and at the same time, to show that Moses and Elijah serve as the *principales* of Jesus, the Son.

Tertullian affirms that behind Peter's words there lies his *amentia*, extasis, in order to comprehend that those who are beside Jesus are Moses and Elijah. If it weren't so, Peter wouldn't have made any sense in confessing earlier about Jesus, the Son of the living God.

The number three means unity among Moses, Elijah and Jesus.

The Father's mandate to listen to the Son fulfills the prophecy[67]. And so, the Father again bears witness about the Son.

[65] Cfr. Ex 33,13.
[66] Cfr. Ha 3,2; Za 4,14.
[67] Cfr. Is 50,10.

2. Commentarius in Mt 17 (Hilarius P.)

Since **Hilarius Pictauiensis**[1] [around 315–367(?)[2]] was consecrated bishop of Poitiers (350), he decidedly fought against Arrianism in the West so much, that he thereby revealed "gifts of intelligence and moderation, of coherence and firmness, which merit for him the title of Athenasius of the West"[3]. Hilary is "the first Latin bishop who conceived his pastoral teaching in the form of a continuous commentary of biblical texts"[4]. For Jean Doignon, the HIL *Mt*[5] (3556/353–355[7]) –where the part referring to the Transfiguration– "is the first commentary in Latin of the Gospel

---

1 Little is known about Hilary's life, and the data are "fragili e frammentarie" [L. Longobardo, *Ilario di Poitiers, Commentario a Matteo*, en A. Quacquarelli (dir.), "Collana di Testi Patristici" 74, Città Nuova Editrice, Roma, 1988, 5]. Hilarywas born (and died) in Poitiers, in a rich and pagan family. Although nothing is known today about his cultural formation, from his writings one can see that he has studied rhetoric and philosophy very well, perhaps in Bordeaux, "capitale dell'Aquitania, a quel tempo centro culturale di primissimo ordine" (ibid.). Moreover, "...forse ricevette il battesimo da adulto, quando già era sposato e padre di una figlia di nome Abra" (ibid.).

2 Cfr. L. Longobardo, *Ilario di Poitiers, Commentario a Matteo*, cit., 5-6. However, Msgr. Patrick Descourtieux, in the Introduction to his book –his Thesis defended in the Pontifical Athenaeum of the Holy Cross (2005)– cautions that "...ni la date de la naissance d'Hilaire, ni même celle de sa mort, ne sont connues avec certitude" [P. Descourtieux (tr.), *Commentaires sur les Psaumes I* (*Psaumes* 1–14), SC 515, 2008, 11]. As to when he got ordained a priest, Descourtieux says that "...il semble impossible de le dire" (Id., cit., 13).

3 "...le doti di intelligenza e di moderazione, di coerenza e di fermezza, che gli meriteranno la qualifica di Atanasio di Occidente" (Longobardo, cit., 5).

4 C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1002.

5 However, "la formule de l'incipit varie beaucoup selon les témoins" (J. Doignon, *Hilaire de Poitiers, Sur Matthieu*, I, SC 254, 73). HIL Mt has 33 chapters, with commentaries to every verse patterned after the *lectio*, which comments the poetry and the prose, or in other words, "l'explication des vers ou des chapitres dans l'ordre même où ils se présentent" (Id., cit., 26).

6 For Giovanni Coppa, this date places the HIL *Mt* in the first years of Hilary, bishop.

7 Kannengiesser classifies HIL Mt as Hilary's *opus primum*, before his exile (cfr. *HOPE*, cit., 998).

according to Matthew which has come to us completely"[8] Among the *commentaria in Matthaeum* in Antiquity, "only that of Hillary, together with that of Origen, present a prevailingly allegorical interpretation"[9]. Hilary analyzes the symbolical relevance of the *ratio typica* of the Gospel passage in question[10]. Finally, "Hilary of Poitier's exegesis has been born out of a symbiosis of prayer, of pastoral action and of a desire to know through the intelligence"[11].

Perhaps the *redactional origin* of this commentary[12] are some

[8] "...est le premier commentaire en latin de l'Évangile selon Matthieu qui nous soit parvenu au complet" (J. Doignon, *Hilaire de Poitiers, Sur Matthieu*, I, SC 254, 1978, 19), although the commentaries of Victorinus of Petavius and of Fortunatus of Aquileia precede Hilary's commentary (cfr. Ibid.).

[9] "...solo quello di Ilario, insieme a quello di Origene, presenta un'interpretazione prevalentemente allegorica" (L. Longobardo, *Ilario di Poitiers, Commentario a Matteo*, cit., 20, note 97). It's because "...l'opera in realtà testimonia la prima reazione della teologia tradizionale latina di fronte alla contestazione ariana: in molti casi infatti Ilario sembra polemizzare apertamente contro gli ariani, anche se non en fa espressamente il nome" (Id., cit., 20). Longobardo explains: "...questo potrebbe rientrare nelle norme di scuola di allora, secondo cui era consigliabile evitare allusioni precise e personali e usare espressioni generiche, dato soprattutto il carattere dell'opera non dichiaramente polemica" (ibid.).

[10] It is "on the level of grammatical data, through lexical clarifications and through events or sayings put in sequence in order to highlight the Gospel's ongoing significance (Kannengiesser, DSp 469-70; Doignon, *Sur Mt* 27-30)" (cfr. C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 998). What was Hilary'saim in doing exegesis? "...his primary aim was to update traditional interpretations [e.g., by Tertullian and Cyprian] in the context of the Arian controversy (In Ps 1; 126,1-3)" [C. Kannengiesser, (ed.)., *HOPE*, cit., 1003]. Moreover, "...l'esegesi di Ilario poggia su una concezione teologica della storia: questa non solo non si vanifica, ma acquisita il suo vero e definitivo significato" (L. Longobardo, *Ilario di Poitiers, Commentario a Matteo*, cit., 12). So, "...la sua opera esegetica rappresenta uno sforzo notevole di trovare un punto di incontro tra l'esegesi tradizionale in tutta la sua semplicità e l'esegesi sapiente d'Oriente e d'Occidente, un punto di convergenza tra la tradizione e la scienza allegorica" (Id., cit., 30–31).

[11] "L'exégèse d'Hilaire de Poitiers est née d'une symbiose de la prière, de l'action pastorale et d'un goût de connaître par l'intelligence" [P. Descourtieux (tr.), *Commentaires sur les Psaumes I (Psaumes 1–14)*, SC 515, 2008, 79].

[12] Here, I do not aim to do any source-search (*Quellenforschung*).

homilies preached within the liturgical celebration[13]. Although for Doignon, the possibility of not having been proclaimed as a homily is plausible a priori, there are no conclusive proofs thereof[14]. Doignon observes that, on the one hand, the order of commentary seems to be a general rule for Hilary–who establishes a continuatio in the lectio– and on the other hand, there's an inequality in the commentaries to the Gospel according to Mt[15].

Aside from the *background influences*[16], among which figures Origen, since Hilary"has been a pioneer, the first writer who adapted

[13] Cfr. L. Coppa, *Sant' Ambrogio. Esposizione del Vangelo secondo Luca (Opere esegetiche IX/I)*, cit., 36. On the other hand, "la odierna critica esclude l'ipotesi, rilevando che l'indole del *Commento* è quella di un trattato continuo e sistematico (M. Simonetti, *Letteratura cristiana antica greca e latina,* Firenze-Milano, 1969, 262)" cfr. L. Coppa, *Sant' Ambrogio. Esposizione del Vangelo secondo Luca (Opere esegetiche IX/I)*, cit., 36. Or perhaps, "comme un ouvrage destiné à la lecture de 'frères' qui constituaient peut-être le *presbyterium* de l'évêque" (J. Doignon, *Hilaire de Poitiers, Sur Matthieu*, I, SC 254, 20). Doignon reminds us that "la plupart des biographes d'Hilaire sont-ils d'accord pour reconnaître qu'il ne manifeste jamais dans l'*In Matthaeum* une agressivité dirigée contre l'erreur telle qu'elle dénoterait un affrontement personnel avec una faction d'héretiques" (Id., cit., 21).

[14] "...plausible *a priori*, 'est étayée d'aucune preuve" (J. Doignon, *Hilaire de Poitiers, Sur Matthieu*, I, SC 254, 20). For Kannengiesser, "it actually represents a continuous 'reading' of the text to a small circle of trained listeners" [C. Kannengiesser, (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 998].

[15] Cfr. J. Doignon, *Hilaire de Poitiers, Sur Matthieu*, I, SC 254, 27.

[16] "While Hilary was aware of earlier interpreters, he names only Tertullian and Cyprian" [C. Kannengiesser (ed.)., *HOPE*, cit., 1003]. "...l'influence très sensible des *topoi* des oeuvres apologétiques de Tertullien (...) ses définitions de la condition du chrétien face au monde et à César, ses points de vue sur les formes d'accès à la connaissance de Dieu et, parallèlement, sur les formes de l'aveuglement des païens, des Juifs, des hérétiques, sur la diffusion du christianisme, enfin sur le jugement final" (J. Doignon, *Hilaire de Poitiers, Sur Matthieu*, I, SC 254, 33). Moreover, "Cyprien a fourni à Hilaire la clé de plusieurs 'types' exégétiques, et ses traités parénétiques ont été largement utilisés dans l'*In Matthaeum* pour leur topique morale d'inspiration stoïcisante (17, 3)" (ibid.). "L'insegnamento di Origene, quindi, scoperto da Ilario in esilio, ha arricchito ma non modificato radicalmente la sua comprensione della Scrittura, né alterato i principi fondamentali della sua esegesi, già elaborati in precedenza de acquisiti da lui come suo metodo" (L. Longobardo, *Ilario di Poitiers*, *Commentario a Matteo*, cit., 30). However, for Kannengiesser, when Hilary writes the Commentary on Matthew, he "was obviously still unaware of Alexandrian allegorism as a method for biblical exegesis, popularized by Origen over a century before. At the time of his *In Matthaeum* he rather gives his work the special value of witnessing the archaic foundations proper to Latin culture in the history of fourth century exegesis" [C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 998-999].

Origen's thought in the Latin world"[17], Doignon notes that Hilary relates *the Gospel* with the OT and with *Pauline doctrine*[18], in order to speak of salvation[19].

Hilary relates the *acta et verba Domini (res–uerba, sermo–opus)*[20] to man's hope, by insinuating the renunciation of the desires of life, once savored[21], since, on the contrary, they'd be tending slowly towards an attractive and easy-to-get pleasure *(gaudium blandiens[22])*. Rather,

> "it has been necessary [for man] to have the authority of a true and visible example"[23]

which may be an incentive for him to lend a hand, and to look –beyond the sufferings of the present life– towards

> "the sacrifice of the [enjoyable goods] of the present [life], [which give way to] gain, security, [of the things] to come"[24].

---

[17] "...a été un pionnier, le premier écrivain chrétien à adapter la pensée d'Origène dans le monde latin" [P. Descourtieux (tr.), *Commentaires sur les Psaumes I* (Psaumes 1–14), SC 515, 2008, 17].

[18] "...l'imprégnation continue du commentaire par des réminiscence pauliniennes contribue à mettre en valeur un certain nombre de thèmes doctrinaux et spirituels essentiels pour la foi" (J. Doignon, *Hilaire de Poitiers, Sur Matthieu*, I, SC 254, 31). "Hilary calls on Paul's 1 Corinthians more than on any other authority for his own methodology; he turns to Tertullian for polemical statements, and to Cyprian for biblical *Testimonia* and liturgical ordinances" [C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 998].

[19] Since the "participation à l'éternité n'est pas seulement l'affaire de l'homme en particulier ou de l'Église. Il s'accomplit dans l'histoire, dont le peuple juif a tissé la trame et que les apôtres, issus d'Israël, sont chargés de poursuivre" (J. Doignon, *Hilaire de Poitiers, Sur Matthieu*, I, SC 254, 38). On the other hand, "the importance given by Hilary to doctrinal expositions is such that some of them belong to the commentary for no other reason but the 'instruction' of the reader" (C. Kanniengiesser, *HOPE*, cit., 999).

[20] Cfr. *HIL* Mt, 17, 1, SC 258, 1979, 60.

[21] "...cum sensum uitae homines ex uiuendi adfectu habere coepissent" (HIL Mt, 17, 1, SC 258, 1979, 60).

[22] Cfr. Ibid.

[23] Cfr. Ibid.

[24] "...fieret praesentium damnum lucro deinceps non ambiguo futurorum" [HIL *Mt*, 1, SC 258, 1979, 60.62].

Thus, in view of his imminent Passion –which is the very *example*[25] of the loss of life and of the gaining of everlasting life[26]– Jesus fixes his gaze on his listeners[27].

Hilary speaks of climbing the mountain, where at its peak Jesus transfigures himself in front of the Apostles28, since here, there's

> "...also in an event (*hecho*)[29] of this kind, there's a design[30], something to speak of, an example[31] which are an object of attention"[32].

The six-day interval prefigures the "honor of the celestial Kingdom, this is, when the time of six thousand years will have passed"[33]. The *iudicium Israël* is implied in this *honor regni caelestis*,

---

[25] Doignon observes: "...le développement sur le portée de l'*exemplum* est inspiré de la parénèse du *De patientia* de Tertullien dont le pivot est l'exemple donné par le Christ mourant et ressuscitant (Tertullien, *De patientia*, 3,3): on perd ce qui est terrestre pour gagner ce qui est céleste (Id., cit., 7,8)" (cfr. J. Doignon, *Hilaire de Poitiers, Sur Matthieu, tome II*, SC 258, 1979, 62, note 4).

[26] Cfr. HIL *Mt*, 17, 1.

[27] Cfr. Mt 16,28.

[28] Cfr. Mt 17,1–2.

[29] Ibid.

[30] "Dal punto di vista del metodo esegetico, Ilario resta fedele al principio della *ratio typica* e dell'interiorità profetica: per lui, come per i Padri nel loro insieme, l'AT è globalmente cristologico" (L. Longobardo, *Ilario di Poitiers, Commentario a Matteo*, cit., 29–30).

[31] "Come traduzione di typos, termine chiave dell'esegesi paolina, Ilario preferisce a figura i termini exemplum, usato da solo e con i verbi afferre, praebere (...)" (Id., cit., 18-19).

[32] "Et in hoc quidem facti genere seruatur et ratio et numerus et exemplum" (HIL *Mt*, 17, 2, SC 258, 1979, 62).

[33] "...sex millium scilicet annorum temporibus euolutis, regni caelestis honor praefiguratur" (ibid.). Doignon explains that "6,000" is the "...chiffre de la furée totale du monde selon une traition (cfr. A. Luneau, *L'histoire du salut chez les Pères de l'Église, Théorie des âges du monde*, Paris, 1964, 218-221). On ne verra pas ici une trace de millénarisme, et encore moins importé d'Asie Mineure en Gaule, comme le suggère M. Simonetti, 'Alle origini di una cultura cristiana in Gallia' (*Accad. naz. dei Lincei*, t. 370, Quaderno 158), Roma 1973, 117–118" (*Hilaire de Poitiers, Sur Matthieu, tome II*, 17, 1, SC 258, 1979, 63, note 6).

when there appears Christ (assisted by the Law and the Prophets[34]), who

> "shall judge Israel together with those who have borne witness to him upon announcing him"[35].

The glory of the *resurrection of the flesh* (of the just) is glimpsed at in Moses, the presence of whom serves

> "to indicate that the glory of the resurrection was reserved also, at the same time, for human bodies"[36].

A reference to the Person of Jesus Christ (*niue ac sole candidior*[37]) is seen in the references to the sun and to the snow[38]. Hilary observes

> "[that Christ shines] by the splendor of a heavenly light beyond what we could imagine"[39].

The *verba Petri* don't get any reply "because the time of sitting in this glory had not yet arrived"[40].

Hilary sees in the cloud the *divine omnipotence*[41]. One should listen to the Son[42]

---

[34] Cfr. HIL *Mt*, 17, 2, SC 258, 1979, 62.
[35] "...cum his (...) Israelem, quibus testibus praedicatus est, iudicabit" (ibid.).
[36] "...ut et humanis corporibus decreta esse resurrectionis gloria doceretur" (ibid.).
[37] Ibid. It refers to the aspect of partly seen glory regarding his divinity.
[38] Cfr. *Mt* 17,2.
[39] "...supra opinionem scilicet nostram caelestis luminis splendore conspicuus" (HIL *Mt*, 17, 2, SC 258, 1979, 62.64).
[40] "...nondum enim ut in hac gloria consisteretur erat tempus" (Id., cit., 64). Thus, Hilarycontrasts the importunity of the verba Petri with the coming *regnum caeleste*.
[41] "...diuinae uirtutis spiritu ambiuntur" (HIL *Mt*, 17, 3, SC 258, 1979, 64).
[42] Cfr. *Mt* 17,5.

"as [he] is the same, fitting author of such precepts"[43].

Hilary retakes the first topic[44] when referring to He who,

> "by an event [which serves] as an example, assures that after the sacrifice of the world, after the desire of the Cross, after bodily death, the glory of the heavenly Kingdom shall follow the resurrection of the flesh"[45].

Personifications of the Law and the Prophets are present, since

> "Moses and Elijah had appeared on the mountain in order to be a figure of the future and to give credibility to the event"[46].

Hilary interprets Jesus' order[47] in eschatological, moral and pneumatological terms,

> "because it was a prize which was reserved to faith, that the glory comes to those who do not take lightly the simple authority of his precepts –since he had seen them weak upon hearing his voice–, in such a way that it wasn't

[43] "...ut idoneus ipse praeceptorum talium auctor esset" (HIL *Mt*, 17, 3, SC 258, 1979, 64).

[44] The loss of present goods and the gain of future goods. But this time, Hilary links this topic with the resurrection of the flesh.

[45] "...qui post saeculi damnum, post crucis uoluntatem, post obitum corporum regni caelestis gloriam ex mortuorum resurrectione facti confirmasset exemplo" (HIL *Mt*, 17, 3, SC 258, 1979, 64).

[46] "Ad futuri enim formam atque ad facti fidem Moyses et Elias in monte constiterant" (ibid.).

[47] Cfr. *Mt* 17,9.

> before they have been filled with the Holy Spirit that they were able to bear witness to spiritual events"[48].

Elijah, "who has to bring the rest of Israel – whom he has to gather – towards the knowledge of God"[49], will have to reestablish it all[50]. Hilary adds:

> "by virtue of which was exercised to him [to John the Baptist] the most painful and toughest treatments, in order that, by announcing [John the Baptist] the Lord's coming, [John the Baptist] might also anticipate [Christ's] Passion through the example of unjust suffering"[51].

---

[48] "...hoc enim fidei praemium reseruabatur ut honor reddetur iis apud quos non leuis sola praeceptorum auctoritas reperiretur –infirmos enim senserat ad uocis auditum–, ut, cum essent Spiritu sancto repleti, tunc gestorum spiritalium testes essent" (HIL *Mt*, 17, 3, SC 258, 1979, 64). 1º. It's about an *eschatological* viewpoint, since the prize (=knowing Jesus in the Transfiguration-event) is given to who has faith. 2º. It's something *moral* since, aside from faith, he who wishes to obtain the said prize has to take seriously into account the precepts of God, of the Lord, of Jesus (this is attained through listening to the precepts neither only with the ear nor only with the mind, but through existential listening: putting it into practice). 3º. It's something *pneumatological*, since the thre Apostles could only take full awareness of being witnesses only after they receive the Paraclete (cfr. Hch 1,8). Thus, it's not through sheer human power that the three witnesses had been able to take charge of proclaiming the Good News –including the historical event of the Transfiguration where they have present– but by the help and primacy of the divine Spirit's action.

[49] "...reliquum quod deprehenderit ex Israel ad cognitionem Dei reuocaturum" (HIL *Mt*, 17, 4, SC 258, 1979, 64).

[50] Cfr. Mt 17,11.

[51] "...in quo grauia quaeque atque aspera exercuissent, ut Domini aduentum praenuntians passionem quoque praecurreret et iniuriae et uexationis exemplo" (HIL *Mt*, 17, 4, SC 258, 1979, 66). Thus, after evoking the first topic (=the dynamics between the present goods and future goods), Hilary adds the aspect of dying to the present "goods", in order to accept what is "tough" (=*grauia et aspera*), not only to proclaim Jesus' Passion, but also to underline the contrast between the evils suffered in this life and the glory of everlasting life obtained as the *praemium*.

[52] Here, Hilary mentions the healing of the possessed boy (cfr. HIL *Mt*, 17, 5, SC 258, 1979, 66). I don't tackle this aspect in this work, since it doesn't seem to be a topic directly related to the Transfiguration.

[53] Thus, he evokes the reaction of those who awaited Moses who was in mount Sinai (cfr. Ex 32,1-4).

Hillary, then[52], speaks of the Apostles' *imperfect faith* and of the people's *lukewarmness*[53],

> "...since, [while] the Lord was staying on the mountain and they themselves were staying amidst the multitude, a kind of lukewarmness had relaxed their faith"[54].

With the danger of reverting to their *antiqua infidelitas*[55], Hilary explains that

> "...so, [Christ] teaches them that they can't be saved, if in the time between the Gospels and his second coming, they were to walk out of the faith, as if the Lord were absent"[56].

Moreover, Hilary reminds us that in order to move mountains, one must have faith[57]. At once, Hilary interprets the mountain with a rather startling *meaning* (because it is *negative*): he calls it

> "'devil', because [the mountain represents] spirits of evil and their celestial powers, [spirits] destined to be cast out and dragged to the depths of the sea and in the depths of hell, [thanks] to [things] which anticipate it [in view of] this efficacy: fasting and prayer[58]".

Proceeding with the question of *faith in God*, Hilary explains –within *typological hermeneutics*[59]– that Jesus explains that the Apostles weren't able to cast out demons[60] since, on the contrary,

---

[54] "Nam Domino in monte demorante et ipsis cum turba residentibus, quidam tepor eorum fidem relaxauerat" (*HIL Mt*, 17, 6, SC 258, 1979, 66).

[55] Cfr. ibid. This *antiqua infidelitas* is the *lack of faith*, a lack that causes impossibility to drive out demons (cfr. Mt 17,19).

[56] "Docet igitur eos nihil salutis adferre posse, qui medio Euangeliorum et iterati aduentus sui tempore a fide tamquam Domino absente decesserint" (HIL *Mt*, 17, 6, SC 258, 1979, 66).

[57] Even if it be like a mustard seed (cfr. *Mt* 17,20).

[58] Cfr. Mt 17,21.

[59] Hence, the author says: "...ut typica ratio impleretur" (HIL *Mt*, 17, 8, SC 258, 1979, 68).

[60] Like the man who doesn't have the faith to move mountains.

"had they [that] much faith in him –because he himself [Jesus] is the mustard seed"[61]– the Apostles wouldn't only cast out from the people "those who burden [the people] with this burden of sins and the boulder of infidelity"[62]; aside from that, –like a mountain moved to the sea, by faith– "they would've been transferred for the conversion of the pagans and of [this] world"[63].

Principal affirmations

Hilario aims to wake man from the dream of an easy and superficial life, for him to start seeking the goods to come.

The ascent to the mountain of the Transfiguration after six days gives a chance to refer to the six ages of the world, after which will be presented the glory of the celestial Kingdom, a Kingdom which shall judge Israel. Moses (aside from bearing witness, together with Elijah, to Jesus' Transfiguration) prefigures the resurrection of the flesh, while Jesus' glory, through the comparisons to the sun and the snow, indicate that he shines with a heavenly light beyond human comprehension. Jesus' silence regarding Peter's proposal tells that it was not yet the time to sit in the glory, something which is only foretold, not yet definitively fulfilled. Jesus' command illustrates the seriousness of the Transfiguration event in the context of the divine plan of salvation, and in the face of human weakness. Thus, when the Holy Spirit comes, He shall make possible the timely proclamation of Jesus' Transfiguration, within the general proclamation about Christ Jesus.

Hilary reminds us of the weakness of the one following Jesus, as in the case of the Apostles, and Hilary encourages all not to be disheartened amidst life's trials, and to be clever in order not to fall back into infidelity (especially pride, which rises like a mountain), and to have faith.

---

61 "...quam fidem si in se habuissent, quia ipse est granum sinapis" (*HIL Mt*, 17, 8, SC 258, 1979, 68).

62 "...hoc peccatorum onus et grauem infidelitatis molem ab eo qui offerebatur populo eicientes" (ibid.).

63 "...ad conuersationem gentium et saeculi transtulissent" (ibid.).

3. Exp. Eu. Sec. Lc. (Ambrosius)

The episcopal ministry of **Ambrosius Mediolanensis**[1] (+397) didn't impede his love for the Scriptures[2], the exegesis of which supposed for Ambrose "a truely [sic] fundamental way of thinking, more than a method or a genre; everywhere required, everywhere present, one would not limit it to a particular category"[3]. In Ambrosian exegesis, "the *Exposition of the Gospel according to Luke*[4] is the only work which the bishop of Milan had explicitly dedicated to a NT book. This suffices to indicate that this labor is something unique in St. Ambrose' literary and theological production"[5]. The *Expositio Euangelii secundum Lucam* (377-389[6]) is Ambrose' most extensive work, equalled only by the *Expositio Psalmi CXVIII*[7].

---

1 The condensed biographical sketch is from C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1045. A native of Trier (Germany), after the death of his father, Aurelius Ambrosius (who was a *praefectus praetorio Galliarum*, a high position in the Empire), he transferred with his mother and siblings to Rome, where Ambrose started to work as *aduocatus*. Afterwards, he was named *consularis Liguriae et Aemeliae*, moving again, this time northward, to Milan. He did his work so well that Catholics and Arrians acclaimed him to be a bishop. Ambrose was baptized and consecrated bishop on 7 December 374.

2 It's what Ernst Dassmann calls reverence towards Scripture (*Schriftfrömmigkeit*) (TRE, 2,378) [cfr.

3 Nauroy, 378, cfr. C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1045.

4 Here, not the entire AM Lc will be commented on, but solely the part of book VII about Jesus' Transfiguration.

5 "Nel quadro, vasto e complesso, delle opere esegetiche ambrosiane, l'*Esposizione del Vangelo secondo Luca* è la sola che il vescovo di Milano abbia espressamente dedicato a un libro del Nuovo Testamento. Basta questo per indicare che il lavoro è qualcosa di unico nell'intera produzione letteraria e teologica di S. Ambrogio" [L. Coppa, "*Sant' Ambrogio. Esposizione del Vangelo secondo Luca (Opere esegetiche IX/I)*", from the series "Sancti Ambrosii Episcopi Mediolanensis Opera, 11", Biblioteca Ambrosiana (Milano) – Città Nuova Editrice (Roma), 1978, 9].

6 "...dal 377 alla seconda metà del 389. Sono gli anni dell'instancabile, lucida, spesso drammatica attività pastorale del vescovo (J. Palanque, *Saint Ambroise et l'Empire Romain*, 529-536)", cfr. G. Coppa, "*Sant' Ambrogio. Esposizione del Vangelo secondo Luca (Opere esegetiche IX/I)*", cit., 23. Coppa explains further that "su l'autorità dei maggiori specialisti, pensiamo tuttavia di non essere troppo lontani dal vero se proponiamo la data della fine 389 – inizio 390; è il momento della piena maturità teologica e artistica del santo" (Id., cit., 24).

7 G. Coppa, "*Sant' Ambrogio. Esposizione del Vangelo secondo Luca (Opere esegetiche IX/I)*", cit., 9.

Jerome and Augustine are the first ones to occupy themselves with Ambrose' *Expositio* on Lk, and even if "it is thought that the first commentator [of Lk] (...) is Fortunatus of Aquileia; the second (...) can't be other than Ambrose"[8]. This Expositio can't be classified either as a homily (as how it's understood nowadays), nor as in ancient oratory (in the likes of Jerome and Hilary of Poitiers)[9].

Coppa says that "it's commonplace to say that Ambrose isn't original"[10], although this doesn't take away the value of the writings of Ambrose, who was inspired above all by Origen[11]. The classic Greeks and Romans have influenced Ambrose, especially, Vergil[12] and Hilary of Poitiers[13]. By the influence of the great thinkers of

[8] "Si pensa che il primo commentatore [di Lc] (...) sia Fortunaziano di Aquileia; il secondo, nel giudizio concorde di studiosi antichi e moderni, non può esse altro che Ambrogio" [G. Coppa, "*Sant' Ambrogio. Esposizione del Vangelo secondo Luca (Opere esegetiche IX/I)*", cit., 11]. Augustine's admiration towards Ambrose' *Expositio* on Lk "segna l'inizio della straordinaria fortuna della *Expositio*" (Id., cit., 13).

[9] It's because "Ambrogio si diversifica da tutti: segue Luca nell'impianto generale, ma non sistematicamente" [G. Coppa, "*Sant' Ambrogio. Esposizione del Vangelo secondo Luca (Opere esegetiche IX/I)*", cit., 18]. Ambrose derives the literal, moral and mystical senses, according to the school of Alexandria.

[10] "...è un luogo comune che Ambrogio non è originale" [Id., cit., 25].

[11] Cfr. ibid. In the *Introduction*, Coppa declares: "L'influsso del grande alessandrino è stato pertanto poderoso nel nostro Autore; ma resta altrettanto certo che, pur partendo di là, Ambrogio ha dato una elaborazione personale, di timbro inconfondibile non solo nella forma letteraria, totalmente diversa dalla prosa origeniana, ma anche nella trattazione teologica, aperta anche ad altre sollecitazioni, e sempre animata da un alto afflato spirituale, che non di rado attinge vertici espressivi decisamente superiori alla fonte" (Id., cit., 35). Moreover, "egli [Ambrosio] non ha la tempra dello studioso puro come Girolamo, o del pensatore come Agostino. Ma la ricchezza spirituale, ch'egli continuamente rivela, indica in lui ben piú di un semplice e geniale orecchiante" [Id., cit., 26].

[12] So much so that "molto si è detto di questa presenza del grandissimo poeta latino nella *suavitas sermonis* (...) di Ambrogio, che attraeva lo scettico Agostino" (Id., cit., 27). Besides, after affirming that Vergil has been quoted at least 40 times, then follow the quotes from "Homer, Ovid, Xenophon, Pliny, Sallust and Horace, to which should be added approximately twenty reminiscences of Cicero in juridical contexts" [C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1050-1051].

[13] Coppa sees the importance given by Tissot to the influence of Hillary's commentary on Mt as a source for Ambrose' commentary on Lk. This detail is not found, to date, in the CSEL and CChr.SL editions, although the SC only quotes Hillary twice (cfr. G. Coppa, "*Sant' Ambrogio. Esposizione del Vangelo secondo Luca (Opere esegetiche IX/I)*", cit., 35-36).

Greece and Rome, Ambrose has acquired sufficient knowledge of the allegory[14], especially already as Bishop of Milan. Ambrose has drunk much from the Greek and Latin Patristic sources[15]. Besides, "following Philo[16] and Origen, Ambrose accepts the triple sense of Scripture: literal, moral and allegorical/mystical. In reality, an allegorical exegesis of a typological and moral character prevails in his works"[17]. However, Ambrose' dependence on the sources mentioned here is, for Tissot, a "verbal, material use, much more than dependence of thought ... Up to now, there's the impression that the reading of the models was before anything else, for the

[14] Like Coppa says, "l'esegesi fatta sui testi omerici ed esiodei, e, nel mondo romano in seguito, su quelli virgiliani, fornirà interessanti complementi e paralleli alla allegoria giudaica, prima, e cristiana poi, su un triplice piano: 'l'allegoria storica per cui sotto i personaggi poetici venivano individuati personaggi storici; l'allegoria *morale*, per cui persone e fatti dello stesso mondo poetico erano interpretati quali figure di un concreto insegnamento morale; l'allegoria *profetica*, per cui il mondo poetico assurgeva ad espressione di una realtà storica a venire' (G. Lazzati, *Il valore letterario della esegesi ambrosiana*, 19-20)" (G. Coppa, "*Sant' Ambrogio. Esposizione del Vangelo secondo Luca (Opere esegetiche IX/I)*", cit., 28).

[15] Even though Jerome may have made an irony of Ambrose' dependence on Hippolytus of Rome (cfr. G. Coppa, "*Sant' Ambrogio. Esposizione del Vangelo secondo Luca (Opere esegetiche IX/I)*", cit., 31), "dai moduli del pensiero mistico-allegorico di Ipplito che Ambrogio rimane impressionato: le analogie dei rapporti tra Cristo e la Chiesa, che egli (Ambrogio) non cessa appassionatamente di rilevare dalla lettura del *Cantico*, sono anche tratte da Ippolito, mentre le applicazioni di quei passi ai rapporti tra Cristo e l'anima di ispirano a Origene (cfr. G. Lazzati, *Il valore letterario della esegesi ambrosiana, 78ss)" [G. Coppa, "Sant' Ambrogio. Esposizione del Vangelo secondo Luca (Opere esegetiche IX/I)*", cit., 31]. Coppa adds that the allusions may perhaps be sheer coincidence, but at least, they give something to ponder on, and leave for future studies the research on such allusions.

[16] P. Siniscalco quotes J. Aucher (*Philonis Judaei Paralipomena Armena: libri uidelicet quoattuor in Genesim, libri duo in Exodum...,* Venetiis 1826), to whom "si deve la scoperta, non esita a definire il Vescovo di Milano con il titolo di *Philo christianus*" (P. Siniscalco, "*Sant'Ambrogio, Caino e Abele", in "Tutte le Opere di Sant'Ambrogio, Opere esegetiche II/I*", Biblioteca Ambrosiana, Milano - Città Nuova Editrice, Roma, 1984, 16).

[17] M.G. Mara: Quasten IV, 153, cfr. C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1046-1047.

Bishop of Milan, *une éveilleuse d'idées*"[18]. And so, Ambrose doesn't plagiarize[19].

For Ambrose, Sacred Scripture has universal validity[20], and he reads it with a historico-critical, moral and allegorical-mystical eye, "following and enriching the method of Philo, of Origen and the Alexandrians, of Hippolytus and of Hilary"[21]. Ambrose likes exegesis so much that "in his explanations on Scripture passages, he's harly content with the literal meaning, even when this meaning was the clearest and loftiest; he couldn't rest without first discovering the deepest meaning, the *altior sensus* under the letter"[22]. Coppa

[18] "...utilizzazione verbale, materiale, piuttosto che dipendenza reale del pensiero... Si ha talora l'impressione che la lettura dei modelli è prima di tutto, per il Vescovo di Milano, *une éveilleuse d'idées*" [G. Tissot, *Introduction* a "*Ambroise de Milan, Traité due l'Évangile de S. Luc*", SC 45, 17; cfr. L. Coppa, "*Sant' Ambrogio. Esposizione del Vangelo secondo Luca (Opere esegetiche IX/I)*", cit., 33].

[19] That is to say, that "...nel secolo quarto, poi, il concetto di 'proprietà letteraria' era ben diverso da quello giuridico-morale dei nostri tempi. S. Ambrogio, insomma, attinge idee e immagini che ritiene possano giovare ai suoi ascoltatori, senza preoccuparsi d'essere originale, perché in lui è dominante *l'animus* del pastore, non quello dello scrittore e del dotto" [G. Banterle (tr.), *Sant'Ambrogio, I sei giorni della Creazione*, in "Tutte le Opere di Sant'Ambrogio" 1 (Opere esegetiche I), Biblioteca Ambrosiana,Milano–Città Nuova Editrice,Roma, 1979, 17]. Moreover, Botte explains that "... les ancients n'avaient pas grand scrupule en matière de propriété littéraire. (...) D'autres se contentaient de reprendre les idées et de les démarquer, en les transposant dans leur propre langage" (B. Botte, *Ambroise de Milan, Des Sacrements, Des Mystères*, SC 25bis, 1961, 19).

[20] One sees Philo of Alexandria's influence, since Ambrose "sa che nella Scrittura è già contenuta tutta la sapienza delle fragili parole degli uomini" (L. Coppa, "*Sant' Ambrogio. Esposizione del Vangelo secondo Luca (Opere esegetiche IX/I*)", cit., 38).

[21] "...seguendo e arrichendo il metodo di Filone, di Origene e degli Alessandrini, di Ippolito e di Ilario" (Id., cit., 39). Moreover, "nel significato allegorico, la Scrittura rivela ad Ambrogio la sua ricchezza inesauribile, offrendogli i temi fondamentali delle spiegazioni" (cfr. ibid.).

[22] "In his expositions of scriptural passages he was seldom content with the literal meaning, even when this meaning was most clear and elevated; he could not rest until he had discovered beneath the letter a deeper sense, *altior sensus*" (Dudden, II, 455-57)", cfr. C. Kannengiesser (ed.)., *HOPE*, cit., 1046.

distinguishes between Ambrose and other Latin Fathers[23].

For Coppa, "without a doubt, the works is hard reading: in the original text and in the versions; in the content and in the literary genre. But, masterpieces are never easy to read"[24]. There's a distinction between the styles of Ambrose and Origen[25]. Ambrose' mastery of allegory[26] is "unparalleled in Latin Christianity until

[23] "...è quello che chiameremmo della 'esegesi allargata', [dove Ambrogio] apre continuamente parentesi come in un grande gioco a cerchi concentrici (...) ritornandi poi su la primitiva impostazione e conducendola avanti. (...) È una tecnica compositiva a piani diversi, che continuamente si intersecano, sia per quanto riguarda le immagini, sia per l'aspetto strettamente stilistico e grammaticale" [L. Coppa, "*Sant' Ambrogio. Esposizione del Vangelo secondo Luca (Opere esegetiche IX/I)*", cit., 40]. Coppa even dares to say that "...si tratta effettivamente di un'opera straordinaria dal punto di vista del contenuto teologico-morale-spirituale, tanto che si potrebbe chiamare la Summa theologiae di Ambrogio di Milano. Non certo nel senso che sia una trattazione scolasticamente completa, (...) ma nel senso che sono presenti, talora solo come sprazzi luminosi, e il più delle volte in forma compiuta, e revestita di mduli espressivi sempre nuovi, tutti i principali argomenti dell'insegnamento teologico di S. Ambrogio, esposti nella caratteristica angolatura pastorale a lui propria. Si ritrovano puntualmente, qui, rielaborati in una sintesi chiara e definitiva, gli assunti delle varie opere della vasta produzione letteraria ambrosiana" (Id., cit., 41).

[24] "Indubbiamente, l'opera è di difficile lettura: nel testo originale e nelle versioni; nel contenuto e nella forma leterraria. Ma i capolavori non sono mai di facile lettura" (Id., cit., 58).

[25] "...si distingue (...) da Origene, che suggerisce temi richissimi con sobrietà spesso asciutta e intellettualistica (...) [Ambrogio è] *genus aliis inimitabile*, ha scritto un letterato esperto come Erasmo" [L. Coppa, "*Sant' Ambrogio. Esposizione del Vangelo secondo Luca (Opere esegetiche IX/I)*", cit., 59]. The quid of Ambrose' literary genius –and at the same time, its difficulty– lies in that "ha la straordinaria facoltà di aprire sensi sempre piú profondi nell'amoroso sondaggio della Parola divina (...). E il poeta ch'è in lui agisce sovranamente libero: trapassa, talora asintatticamente e alogicamente da un senso all'altro, da un'espressione all'altra; allude, suggerisce, vibra. La sua prosa è classica e ricca di umori; (...) si rivolge col 'tu' agli uditori, come se si tratasse di un colloquio a due, (...). La parola è sempre ricca di significati, di polisensi che non cessa di mettere a dura prova il traduttore. (...) [Questa *Expositio*] la Scrittura la innerva e profuma, Virgilio l'illeggiadrisce virilmente" (Id., cit., 60).

[26] Franco Gori reminds that "nel periodo patristico non era ben chiara, sul piano concettuale, la distinzione fra allegria e tipologia" [*Sant'Ambrogio, Abramo (Opere esegetiche II/II)*", Biblioteca Ambrosiana, Milano–Città Nuova Editrice,Roma, 1984, 19].

the end of the Middle Ages, with the exception of Bernard of Clairvaux"[27], and although allegory linked Ambrose to the Greek sources, the latter "never alienated him from the genuinely Latin focus on ethical issues and moral behaviour"[28].

From among the 248 chapters of book VII of the AM *Lc*, we focus on chapters 6-21, on Jesus' Transfiguration[29].

Ambrose affirms[30] *the divine condescendence*, the encouragement the Lord always gives to men's weakness, as far as future reward and the rejection of the worldly and sinful is concerned. Thus, the Lord understands human weakness when he rewards the moral goods now[31], in order to carry the tough cross[32].

"And so, the good and prudent Master, in order that the faithful might not be fatigued by despair or abhorrence –since the sweet life's attraction flatters even an attentive heart– he promises them everlasting life. It's because the consoling [goods] shall be entirely burned by fear of death, by terrible terror; but[33] great anticipation of the desire for salvation is hardly equivalent to the enchantments"[34].

---

[27] C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1045-1046.

[28] Id., cit., 1046.

[29] They're chapters which are "una lunga, profonda meditazione su la conoscenza totale di Cristo, Figlio di Dio e risorto; la trattazione risente dei moduli origeniani, per i quali la sapienza *inspectiva* (...) è appunto la contemplazione dei più alti misteri di Cristo, dall'incarnazione alla risurrezione, attraverso la croce" [L. Coppa, "*Sant' Ambrogio. Esposizione del Vangelo secondo Luca (Opere esegetiche IX/I)*", cit., 99].

[31] Cfr. Lc 9,27.

[32] "...ita etiam infirmitatem mentis humanae praesentium remuneratione sustentat" (AM *Lc, VII*, 1, CChr.SL 14, 214).

[33] Here, it seems more timely the semantic nuance of *–que*: "Que nearly equivalent to autem, sed (...)" (ALD, 1509).

[34] "Ergo bonus et moralis magister ne qui desperatione frangatur aut taedio, quoniam uitae dulcis inlecebra constantem quoque mulcet adfectum, continuos uiuendi successus fidelibus pollicetur; frigent enim solacia sub metu mortis magnusque amor uitae aegre blanditias spei cum adpetitae salutis terrore compensat" (AM *Lc, VII, 1*, CChr.SL 14, 214-215).

Ambrose admits that he doesn't want to be afraid of death, and suggests that one be in Christ's presence[35], for the fulfillment of the promise in Lk 9,27[36].

Ambrose applies the pair death-life on the pair body-soul[37]. He then asks for the meaning of "not tasting death" (*gustare mortem*)[38], explaining that there are those who won't taste death until they contemplate God's Kingdom, and even those who won't even see death[39].

Ambrose links fidelity to Jesus' words[40], applying them here to many. Ambrose widens the horizon of this *sequela*, in order to include Peter[41] and the sons of thunder (a following by *the Christian's attitude toward temporal realities*[42]; a following by *the faculties of the*

---

[35] "Non satis est stare, nisi ubi Christus est stetur" (AM *Lc, VII, 2*, CChr.SL 14, 215).

[36] For Ambrose, the compensation follows being with Christ: "In quo licet ex uerbi ipsius qualitate perpendere ne tenuem quidem sensum mortis habituros qui Christi uideantur meruisse consortia" (ibid.). Ambrose reminds how man has to see the inescapability of natural death. Only he who goes on living shall escape (everlasting) death.

[37] "...mors corporis libando gustetur, uita animae possidendo teneatur" (ibid.).

[38] Cfr. Lc 9,27; AM *Lc, VII, 3*, CChr.SL 14, 215.

[39] Ambrose quotes the Psalmist: "*¿Qué hombre hay que no vea la muerte?*" [Sal 89(88),49; SagBi 3, 441]. He then asks rhetorically: "...quis est homo qui non moriatur, cum resurrectio nisi mortui esse non possit?" (AM Lc, VII, 4, CChr.SL 14, 215-216). Ambrose concedes that it is possible not to have bodily death, and names Henoch and Elijah as examples of those who haven't suffered bodily death. In order to base his affirmation, Ambrose quotes Jesus: "*si yo quiero que él permanezca hasta que yo vuelvo*" (Jn 21,22). Also, Ambrose explains that Jn 21,22 doesn't refer to the Apostle John alone, but refers to all, the majority. Ambrose compresses what was said: "...enim qui mortui uiuant, quoniam sunt qui uiuentes mortui sunt" (AM *Lc, VII, 4*, CCL 14, 215-216).

[40] "Si yo quiero que él permanezca hasta que yo vuelva" (Jn 21,22; SagBi 5, 703).

[41] "...deuotus fidelis pacificus, ut portas ecclesiae aperias, portas mortis euadas" (AM *Lc, VII, 5*, CChr.SL 14, 216).

[42] "Potes esse, si non in terra, sed in pectore Christi recumbas. Potes esse filius tonitrui, si te terrena non moueant, sed ipse potius ea quae terrena sunt mentis tuae uirtute concutias" (ibid.).

will, the intellect, and the heart[43]; a following by the communion with the Church[44]) as examples.

Peter, James and John[45] saw "the glory of the resurrection", or in order words, the Transfiguration[46]. For Ambrose, resurrection is the culmination, the seventh day after the six days of Creation, prefigured in the Transfiguration narrative[47].

Ambrose sees a triple allegorical-mystical meaning in the number "3": it can refer to the humankind[48], or to two groups of three witness each (the three Apostles; Moses, Elijah and the Father) in the Transfiguration event[49], or the Most Blessed Trinity, because

[43] "...uereatur caro potestatem animi tui et concussa subdatur" (ibid.).

[44] "Eris filius tonitrui, si fueris filius ecclesiae" (ibid.). Moreover, Ambrose quotes the scene of Jesus' giving the Woman to the beloved Disciple and vice-versa, "tunc enim incipies esse filius ecclesiae, cum in cruce uictorem uideris Christum" (ibid.). However, seeing Jesus isn't enough; there has to be an act of the will, because –indeed– one is a child of the Church only "si reconoce la voz de Cristo triunfante" (ibid.). Aside from that, Ambrose establishes a cause-effect link between seeing Christ triumphant on the Cross and being a child of the Church.

[45] Those alluded to by Jesus (cfr. Lc 9,27).

[46] Cfr. Lc 9,27s. It's also for the believer: "Ne forte quia is qui uerba Christi audit et credit resurrectionis tempore gloriam Christi uidebit?" (AM *Lc, VII, 6*, CChr.SL 14, 216-217). There's a very direct relation among listening (*audire*), obeying (*ob-audire*) and believing (*credere*) the *verba Christi* (or, the *verba Verbi*), on the one hand, and the vision of the glory of Christ himself in the resurrection of the flesh.

[47] "...mundi temporibus inpletis resurrectio futura monstratur aut quia is qui supra mundum ascenderit et huius saeculi momenta transcenderit uelut in sublimi locatus futurae resurrectionis fructum exspectabit aeternum" (*AM Lc, VII, 7*, CChr.SL 14, 217). Thus, Ambrose recommends climbing the mountain of six days/ages, in order to arrive at seeing God: "Transcendamus (...) opera mundi, ut possimus faciem ad faciem deum uidere" (AM *Lc, VII, 8*, CChr.SL 14, 217). Ambrose quotes the Prophet in order to corroborate his affirmation: "Súbete a un monte bien alto, tú, la que traes buenas noticias a Sión" (Is 40,9; SagBi 4, 193). If, in the OT, one needed to climb on high in order to proclaim good tidings, "quanto magis qui Christum euangelizat et Christum in gloriam resurgentem?" (AM *Lc, VII, 7*, CChr.SL 14, 217).

[48] Cfr. Gn 5,8–10; 9,1. "...quia ex tribus filiis Noe genus omne defluxit humanum" (AM *Lc, VII, 9*, CChr.SL 14, 217-218).

[49] "Tres (...) eliguntur qui ascenderent montem, quia et duo eliguntur qui cum domino uiderentur" (ibid.).

> "nobody can see the glory of the resurrection but he who keeps intact –with sincerity of an incorrupt faith– the mystery of the Trinity"[50].

Ambrose insists that

> "neither can the Law exist without the Word, nor can the Prophet [exist without the Word], but he prophesied about the Son of God"[51].

After explaining further that the three Apostles saw Moses' and Elijah's *gloria corporalis*[52], Ambrose reminds that the reader sees the Law and the Prophets in the Gospel if he lives out well the Commandments[53] and if one meditates on the prophecy[54] and about the Incarnation[55]. Moreover, "the mysteries teach you on his exodus[56] [Jesus' exodus from this world]"[57]. That's to say, that "today, too, Moses teaches, today, Elijah too, speaks, and today, we can see Moses in greater glory"[58]. On the contrary, he who only sees Moses, will not see Jesus, the Word made flesh[59]. Ambrose returns

[50] "...nemo potest resurrectionis uidere gloriam nisi qui integrum mysterium trinitatis incorrupta fidei sinceritate seruauerit" (ibid.).

[51] "...neque (...) lex potest esse sine Verbo neque propheta nisi qui de Dei Filio prophetauit" (AM *Lc, VII, 10*, CChr.SL 14, 218).

[52] "...illi (...) filii tonitrui corporali gloria Moysen quoque et Heliam speculati sunt" (ibid.).

[53] Cfr. Dt 6,5.

[54] Cfr. Is 7,14.

[55] "...etiam nos cotidie uidemus Moysen cum Dei Filio; uidemus enim legem in euangelio, cum legimus: *diliges Dominum Deum tuum*, uidemus Heliam cum Dei Verbo, quando legimus: *ecce uirgo in utero accipiet*" (AM *Lc, VII, 10*, CChr.SL 14, 218).

[56] Lc 9,31.

[57] "Docent (...) te de excessu eius mysteria" (AM *Lc, VII, 11*, CChr.SL 14, 218).

[58] "Et hodie Moyses docet et hodie Helias loquitur et hodie in maiore gloria Moysen uidere possumus" (ibid.). It's understood that this seeing Moses and Elijah today is through the Word whom they have prefigured and commenced (*incoado*).

[59] "Qui solum Moysen uidit, dei uerbum simul uidere non potuit" (ibid.).

to the topic of climbing, begging "God's Word, to appear before us in his form and beauty, and to comfort [us] and favorable go before [us] and reign [over us]"[60]. Ambrose refers to the climb, since one treads on mystery ground:

> "if [you] don't climb to the summit of greater prudence, wisdom shall not appear to you, neither will the knowledge of the mysteries, neither will so much glory appear to you, so much beauty there is in God's Word"[61],

but rather, the described suffering Servant shall appear[62], or worse, there shall appear

> "like a certain discourse born of man, [a discourse] with wrappings [and wrappings] of paperwork, without the splendor in virtue of the spirit"[63].

But if one meditates on Jesus Christ's life from the Incarnation, then "you start to climb the mountain"[64], that is, "...you already discern the second glory of the Word"[65].

Ambrose discovers a new angle regarding the *intellectio Scripturae*, when he sees some of Jesus' clothing at the foot of the mountain, while others are atop the mountain:

---

[60] "...Dei uerbum, ut in specie et pulchritudine sua appareat nobis et confortetur et prospere procedat et regnet" (AM Lc, VII, 12, CChr.SL 14, 218). With these words, Ambrose, in the context of his explanation on Luke's Transfiguration narrative, points to what he understands by the Transfiguration. That means, the apparition of the Word's form and beauty with the aim of comforting us, of pointing to us our life's goal, and of reigning over us: to be our Consolation, Guide and King.

[61] "...nisi altioris prudentiae cacumen ascendas, non tibi apparet sapientia, non tibi apparet mysteriorum cognitio, non tibi apparet quanta sit gloria, quanta sit species in dei uerbo" (AM *Lc, VII, 12*, CChr.SL 14, 218-219).

[62] Cfr. Is 53,2.

[63] "...quasi quidam sermo natus ex homine litterarum opertus inuolucris, uirtute spiritus non refulgens" (AM *Lc, VII, 12*, CChr.SL 14, 218).

[64] "...incipis montem ascendere" (AM *Lc, VII, 12*, CChr.SL 14, 219). Moreover, Ambrose invites us to meditate the events of Jesus' Passion, so that one may climb the mountain, and thus see Jesus transfigured.

[65] "...alteram uerbi gloriam cernis" (AM *Lc, VII, 12*, CChr.SL 14, 218-219).

> "the clothes of the Word are, perhaps, the words of the Scriptures and such [clothing are] the comprehension of the divine [sermon]"[66].

Ambrose compares the whitening of the clothing of Jesus transfigured to the *intellectio* of he who ponders on Scripture:

> "right now, the sense of the divine readings, to the eyes of your spirit, have already turned white. Therefore, the divine words [have come to be] like the snow, the clothing of the Word *intensely white, as no fuller on earth could bleach them* (Mk 9,3)"[67].

For Ambrose, Christ himself is the fuller:

> "Who is this fuller, but he who usually exposes to the divine sun the clothing of our intellect [as the] clothing of virtues washed of the bodily stains?"[68].

And if the fuller is Christ, "...the word of God is light, the word of God is snow"[69], because

> "the transparent words –by the mild sentences– fall like snow"[70].

That is to say, that "what has to be likened to the snow is only

---

66 "...fortasse uestimenta uerbi sermones sunt scripturarum et quaedam intellectus indumenta diuini" (AM *Lc, VII, 13*, CChr.SL 14, 219).

67 "...et oculis tuae mentis iam diuinarum lectionum sensus albescit. Fiunt igitur uerba diuina sicut nix, uestimenta Verbi *candida nimis, qualia fullo super terram facere non potest*" (AM *Lc, VII, 13*, CChr.SL 14, 219).

68 "Quis est iste fullo nisi qui indumenta nostri intellectus indumenta uirtutum ablutis maculis corporalibus soli solet offerre diuino?" (ibid.). Coppa observes that "...anche l'immagine del alvandaio, di cui parla il Vangelo di Mc, diventa un simbolo di Cristo" *(Sant' Ambrogio. Esposizione del Vangelo secondo Luca (Opere esegetiche IX/I)*, cit., 105, note 1 to chapter 14).

69 "Verbum Dei lux est, uerbum Dei nix est" (AM *Lc, VII, 15*, CChr.SL 14, 219-220). Ambrose of Milan again bases his affirmation on the Psalmist's words: (Antorcha es tu palabra ante mis pasos, luz en mi sendero) (SagBi 3, 535).

70 "...perspicua niuis ritu mollioribus cadunt uerba sententiis" (AM *Lc, VII, 15*, CChr.SL 14, 219-220).

> the word which, having been sent from heaven to the earth, have made fertile the [plowed] thirsty fields of our souls"[71].

Ambrose now prays: "Lord Jesus, [Would that] my understanding be refreshed by the dew of your rain! [Would that] you fill with light my earth with the brilliant whiteness of this snow!"[72].

Ambrose sees in the sleep of the three Apostles human limitation before God,

> –"the splendor of the incomprehensible divinity, pushes against the condition of our body"[73]–

because, if the bodily eyes already do not endure the rayos of the solar body, "how [could] the corruption of the members of the human [body] endure the glory of God?"[74]. Moreover, Ambrose sees in the sleep the figure of death[75], and so Peter, James and John were awakened, "in order for them to see the [outer] condition of the resurrection after [their] rest"[76]. Only he who keeps vigil shall see the glory of Christ[77].

---

[71] "...his solus sermo niuibus conparandus, qui de caelo missus in terras ieiuna nostrorum arua pectorum fecundauit" (ibid.). Here, Ambrose quotes the Law: "*Caiga como lluvia mi enseñanza, y bajen como rocío mis palabras, como llovizna sobre el césped y como nieve sobre el heno*" cfr. Dt 32,2 (Caiga como lluvia mi enseñanza, destilen cual rocío mis palabras, cual llovizna sobre el césped, como gotas en la hierba) (SagBi 1, 887-888).

[72] "Vtinam, domine Iesu, mens mea pluuiae tuae umore uiridescat, utinam terram meam niuis istius candore respergas" (AM *Lc, VII, 16*, CChr.SL 14, 220).

[73] "Premit (...) inconprehensibilis splendor diuinitatis nostri corporis sensus" (AM *Lc, VII, 17*, CChr.SL 14, 220-221).

[74] "...quomodo Dei gloriam humanorum ferret corruptela membrorum?" (ibid.).

[75] Coppa añade que "la prospettiva pasquale ed escatologica è continuamente presente" (L. Coppa, "*Sant' Ambrogio. Esposizione del Vangelo secondo Luca (Opere esegetiche IX/I)*", cit., 109, note 1 to ch. 17).

[76] "...ut resurrectionis speciem uiderent post quietem" (AM *Lc, VII, 17*, CChr. SL 14, 220-221).

[77] "...nemo (...) nisi uigilans gloriam uidet Christi" (ibid.).

For Ambrose, Peter proposed in front of the transfigured Jesus since "Peter was delighted, and [being someone] whom the seductions of this world did not attract, [he was] conquered by the grace of the resurrection"[78], much, much better then the present life[79]. Still, even if Peter did not entirely perceive what his comment implied,

> "[it was] not an imprudent indiscretion [by Peter]; rather, it adds an early devotion fruit of piety. The human condition doesn't yet[80] get in this corruptible [body], in this mortal body, [what would be implied to say] making a tent for God"[81]. Ambrose cautions to the Peter in every man that he treads the field of the mystery[82], but Ambrose assures that "...in the end, such devotion [of Peter] pleased God"[83].

Ambrose sees the divine Spirit behind the obumbratio of the cloud[84], which

> "isn't [the kind which is] accumulated by the nebulous humidity of the mountains and [accumulated by] the dark cloud, which covers the sky with the horror of darkness, but it is rather a luminous cloud which doesn't drench us with torrential rains nor with floods of humid dew, but rather [is] dew which has sprinkled the souls

[78] "Delectatus est Petrus, et quem saeculi huius inlecebrosa non caperent, gratia resurrectionis inlexit" (ibid.).

[79] Ambrose of Milan quotes Saint Paul: "*morir y estar con Cristo [es] mucho mejor*" [cfr. Flp 1,23, (el deseo que tengo de morir para estar con Cristo, lo cual es muchísimo mejor) (SagBi 5, 1160-1161)].

[80] Here, it seems apt to translate sed as "*yet*" (ALD, 1657).

[81] "...non inconsulta petulantia, sed praematura deuotio fructus pietatis adcumulat. Nam quod ignorabat condicionis fuit, quod promittebat deuotionis. Sed non capit humana condicio in hoc corruptibili, in hoc mortali corpore facere tabernaculum Deo" (AM *Lc, VII, 18*, CChr.SL 14, 221).

[82] "Si Petrus nesciuit, quemadmodum tu potes scire?" (ibid.).

[83] "Denique placuit tanta deuotio Deo" (ibid.).

[84] Cfr. Lc 9,34. "Diuini spiritus est obumbratio ista, quae non caligat affectibus hominum, sed reuelat occulta" (AM *Lc, VII, 19*, CChr.SL 14, 221). Ambrose recalls, regarding the *obumbratio* (shadow), the words of the Archangel Gabriel to Mary (cfr. Lc 1,35).

> of men with faith, sent by the voice of the almighty God"[85].

Ambrose insists that the Son is not Elijah, nor Moses, "since they had walked out [from there], as soon as[86] the Lord starts to be designated"[87]. Listening to the Son "is this perfect faith, not only of those who start but also of the perfect ones, yes, indeed, also of those who are in the heavens"[88]. That's to say, that "...in the beginning, one can see three; in the end, one[89]; well, they're one by the perfect faith"[90]. Moses and Elijah are in Christ

> "perhaps, because the Law and the Prophets [come from] the Word; moreover[91], what started through the Word, end in the Word"[92].

---

[85] "...nubem istam non fumigantium esse montium nebuloso umore concretam et coacti aeris caliginem piceam, quae caelum tenebrarum horrore subtexat, sed lucidam nubem, quae nos non pluuialibus aquis et umentis adluuione imbris inmadidet, sed de qua mentes hominum uoce Dei omnipotentis emissa fide ros rigauit (AM *Lc, VII, 20*, CChr.SL 14, 221-222)".

[86] The exact temporal meaning of *ubi* seems apt in this context, "as soon as" (ALD, 1923), more then its literal, local meaning (cfr. ibid.).

[87] "...recesserant enim illi, ubi coepit dominus designari." (AM *Lc, VII, 20*, CChr.SL 14, 221).

[88] "...uides hanc non solum incipientium, sed etiam perfectorum, immo etiam caelestium fidem esse perfectam filium dei scire" (ibid.).

[89] Coppa reminds that in Latin, "unus equivale a *solus*: di qui l'applicazione all'unità dei cristiani, che formano 'l'unico corpo di Cristo', e all'unicità e centralità di Cristo, a cui si rapporta tutto l'Antico Testamento (Legge e Profeti)" (L. Coppa, *"Sant' Ambrogio. Esposizione del Vangelo secondo Luca (Opere esegetiche IX/I)"*, cit., 111, note 1 to ch. 21).

[90] "Tres in principio uidentur, unus in fine; perfecta enim fide unum sunt" (AM *Lc, VII, 21*, CChr.SL 14, 222). The author relates this unity by faith to Jesus' priestly prayer (Jn 17). That's to say, that Moses and Elijah, on the one hand, and the Christians, on the other hand, form one body of Christ.

[91] It seems apt to translate *autem* thus, since it expresses an idea which, without being totally opposite, is "simply different" (ALD, 211).

[92] "...fortasse quia lex et prophetae ex Verbo, quae autem ex uerbo coeperunt in uerbo desinunt" (AM *Lc, VII, 21*, CChr.SL 14, 222). Ambrose bases his affirmation in Saint Paul's words: "*el fin de la Ley es Cristo, para justificación de todo el que cree*" (Rm 10,4; SagBi 5, 936).

Principal affirmations

In Saint Ambrose' exegesis, Jesus' Transfiguration shows the divine condescendence towards human weakness, and serves to remind us of the future spiritual goods.

The choice of the three Apostles-witnesses of the Transfiguration serves so that the faithful may follow Jesus, like Peter, James and John.

The triune number can refer to the human race (which God invites to salvation), or to the two groups of witnesses around the transfigured Jesus, or to the Most Holy Trinity (in the hope of seeing the glory of the resurrection, prefigured by Jesus' Transfiguration).

The unity of the Law, the Prophets and the Word is crucial for the Christian who seeks the face of the Lord. In order to In order to take a good look at the glorious second coming of the mystery of the incarnate Word, one has to climb the mountain of Christian life immersed in the meditation on the Incarnation of the Word. This ascent is so important that it can mean the true *intellectio Scripturae*, the encounter with Jesus, or not meeting him. While Jesus' follower climbs, He –the fuller– washes the soul of sins, in order that the Word may be white and snow-like, and so that it may refresh the soul from the heat of sin.

The sleeping and the rising of the three Apostles in postration prefigure death and resurrection.

Peter didn't wish to go down, not because of bad will, but because of his youthful devotion.

The cloud of the Spirit completes the Trinitophany in the Transfiguration (although only the Father's voice is heard).

Ambrose insists that Jesus is the Son (not Moses, nor Elijah) who has to be listened, since listening to the Son leads to perfect faith.

4. Homilia 17 (Maximinus Arrianus)

Non tribus uolo fieri tabernacula,
sed hic est filius meus dilectissimus,
cuius tabernaculum unum erit;
una aecclesia toto terrarum orbe diffusa,
ad similitudinem unuis Hierusale(m) ciuitatis
quae in caelo est

(Hom. 17, 5)

Maximinus, an Arian bishop (4th c.[1]), wrote the *Hom. 17*, incorporated –perhaps at the end of the 5th c. towards early 6th c.[2]– in the "only Arian book[3] which came to us intact (...) a compilation of homilies and treatises kept in Capitular Library in Verona"[4].

After matching the seventh day, *post dies sex*, with God's rest after the Creation[5], Maximinus establishes a parallelism between this divine rest, in the beginning of the *historia salutis*, and the *everlasting repose* –in the end of time– of the just who shall rest[6] in God, those who shall be raised up as well as those who are still

---

1 Cfr. J. Madey, *Maximinus*, BBKLo [http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/m/maximinus_b_g.shtml (visited 9 Mayo 2009)]. Maximinus wasn't only an Arrian bishop of the Gothic people, but he "ist bekannt als Gegner des Ambrosius von Mailand auf dem Konzil von Aquileja im Jahre 381" (ibid.).

2 Cfr. R. Gryson (cura et studio), *Scripta Arriana Latina, Pars I*, CChr.SL 87, Turnholti, Brepols, 1982, xix.

3 Written in Latin.

4 "...seul livre arien qui nous soit parvenu intact (...) un recueil d'homélies et de traités conservé à la Bibliothèque Capitulaire de Vérone" [R. Gryson (ed.), *Collectio Veronensis*, en Id. (ed.), *Scripta Arriana Latina*, CChr.SL 87, 1982, vii]. This document of an Arrian was kept "grâce à un ton particulièrement serein" (ibid.).

5 "... *post dies sex* requie(m) ostendit, quia et in die septimo requieuit d(eu)s ab operibus suis" [MAXn *h 17, 1*, CChr.SL 87, 32]. In this chapter, I kept the parentheses in the text, according to the CChr.SL.

6 "...omnes s(an)c(t)os et in lege et in profhetis [sic] cum beatis apostolis secum in sua gloria adfuturos et secum permansuros" (ibid.).

alive when the Lord comes for the second time –all represented by Moses[7] and Elijah[8]–:

"In Moses and Elijah, not only those who have died and have been buried, but also the living shall find themselves and be ushered to the clouds to meet the Lord in the heavens"[9].

It's not only that *the three Apostles* personify those who imitate the faith[10] of those "columns"[11], but there's an *allegorical-testimonial value*[12] to the sum[13] of the groups of persons before the transfigured Jesus. Still, there's a *triune testimonial value* of Jesus, Moses and Elijah, as against those who deny the OT testimony:

> "The Lord has shown himself here, in order to confuse also those who don't accept the Law and the Prophets"[14].

Moses and Elijah –by whom God had worked miracles[15]– are incorporated by Jesus as witnesses *together with* the three Apostles,

---

7 "Moyses legislator, qui describsit omnes s(an)c(t)os ab origine mundi, cum ipso ergo omnes s(an)c(t)i resurgent" (MAXn h 17, 2 CChr.

8 "In Moyse et Helia et qui mortui sunt et sepulti et uiui inuenientur et rapientur in nubibus obuiam d(omi)no in aera" (ibid.).

9 "In Moyse et Helia et qui mortui sunt et sepulti et uiui inuenientur et rapientur in nubibus obuiam d(omi)no in aera" (ibid.).

10 Cfr. ibid.

11 *"Pedro, Santiago y Juan, los que [eran considerados] columnas"* (cfr. Ga 2,9). "... quia sustentabant aeclesiae* [sic] aedificium et erigebant de inferioribus ad superiora, ut *quae sursu(m) sunt* quaererent, ubi *Cr(istu)s est in dextera d(e)i sedens"* (MAXn *h 17, 2* CChr.SL 87, 33).

12 *"...para que cualquier asunto quede firme por la palabra de dos o tres testigos"* (Mt 18,16; SagBi 5, 167-168; cfr. Dt 19,15). In MAXn *h 17 3*, CChr.SL 87, 33.

13 On the one hand, "Moses + Elijah = two"; on the other hand, "Peter + James + John = *three*".

14 "Ostendit et hic d(omi)n(u)s confundendos etiam eos qui non accipiunt legem et profhetas" (MAXn *h 17, 3,* CChr.SL 87, 33).

15 On the one hand, "Moyses de d(omi)no scribsit et i(n) typo Cr(ist)i in monte contra Amalech leuauit manus, sicut Cr(istu)s in cruce ad expugnandum diabolum" (ibid.). On the other hand, "Helia et ipse et suscitaret mortuum esse expandit, quod in cruce d(omi)n(u)s fecit, ut mortem fugaret et uitam omnibus redonaret" (ibid.).

within the plan of salvation: "...because He himself joined them to himself and added [them] to the number of the Apostles"[16].

Despite Peter's devotion (*affectus*) to address Jesus[17], the *uox Patris*[18] suggests –in the presence of the OT representatives and the Apostles[19]– *one and only one booth*, that is to say, the *only one* universal *Church* of the Beloved Son:

> "I don't want three booths to be pitched for the three, but rather *this is my beloved Son, with whom I am well pleased*[20], whose booth shall only be one: the only one Church spread throughout the world, like the only one city, Jerusalem, which is in heaven"[21].

He concludes the homily by praising the Father for having showed the Son[22].

Principal affirmations

There's a parallelism –according to Maximinus– between the seventh day (*post dies sex*) when God rested after the Creation, and the rest of the just in the Lord on the last day, when the living and the dead –represented by Moses and Elijah in Jesus' Transfiguration– are before the Son of Man.

The Father only wants one booth –the universal Church of the Son– in lieu of three, as Peter suggests.

---

[16] "...quia ipse eos sibi adiuncxit [sic] et apostolorum numero sociauit" (ibid.).

[17] Cfr. Mt 17,4. "Haec Petrus secundum affectum boni discipuli, qui diligebat ministros et amicos d(omi)ni, Moysen et Heliam" (MAXn *h 17, 4* CChr.SL 87, 33).

[18] Cfr. Mt 17,5.

[19] "In ista aeclesia Moyses et Helias, Petrus et Iacobus et Iohannes aderunt semper d(omi)no, testimonium perhibentes cum omnibus patriarcis et profhetis* s(an)c(t)isque apostolis" (MAXn *h 17, 4*, CChr.SL 87, 33).

[20] Mt 17,5: *"éste es mi Hijo, el Amadísimo"* (SagBi 5, 161).

[21] "...prout diceret: "Non tribus uolo fieri tabernacula, sed *hic est filius meus* dilectissimus, cuius tabernaculum unum erit: una aecclesia toto terrarum orbe diffusa, ad similitudinem unuis Hierusale(m) ciuitatis quae in caelo est " (MAXn *h 17, 4*, CChr.SL 87, 33)

[22] "Cum quibus et nos omnes credentes semper exultemus et gloriemur in d(omi)no Ie(s)u Cr(ist)o filio d(e)i, se(m)perque patri per ipsum gratias agentes" (MAXn *h 17, 5*, CChr.SL 87, 34).

5. Tr. In Mc 9, In Mt 3 (Hieronymus)

Eusebius Hieronymus[1] (around 347–419/420[2]), despite the opposition to his translations and exegesis, "was recognized during his lifetime as an authority in the domain of Sacred Scripture"[3]. In Jerome's *corpus exegeticum*, "...(t)he NT occupies only a modest place"[4]. Jean-Louis Gourdain maintains that "...a quick skimming on the forced quotes from the Scripture in Mk confirm the little interest of the Fathers in this Gospel"[5].

[1] He comes froma Christian family who has sent him to Rome to learn from the famous Aelius Donatus, who has placed the solid foundation of his brilliant exegetical formation, which Jerome the student will widen when he encounters masters like Origen. His admiration towards Origen's method and teaching gave way to the famous dispute with his bishop John of Jerusalem and with Rufinus, a dispute which would calm down in 402. Although Jerome did away with the erroneous part of Origen's teaching, his admiration for him did not waver; cfr. Jay, Pierre, "Jerome", in C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1097. Jerome is providentially situated "between the heritage of ancient culture and the newness of Christian experience, between Jewish traditions and the Church tradition, between the Greek East and the Latin West" [P. Jay, "Jerome", in C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1114].

[2] P. Jay, "Jerome", in C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1094. Jay places Jerome's birthplace in northeast Italy, where the town he was born in (Stridon) would be destroyed by the Goths (ibid.).

[3] P. Jay, "Jerome", in Kannengiesser, C. (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1099. Typical of Jerome's exegesis is "a return to the *hebraica ueritas*, concern for the establishing of a text, recourse to philology and to the data of history and profane disciplines as well as to Hebrew traditions to be assured of the exactitude of a literal sense (...) as the basis of any scriptural interpretation" [Jay, Pierre, "Jerome", in C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1101].

[4] P. Jay, "Jerome", in C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1102.

[5] "Un rapide coup d'oeil sur les citations scripturaires empruntées à Marc confirme le faible intérêt des Pères pour cet Évangile" (J. Gourdain, *Homélies sur Marc,* SC 494, Les Éditions du Cerf, Paris, 2005, 31).

HI Mc, 9:1-7

The authorship of this treatise[6] attributed to Jerome[7] by Dom Germain Morin, have been peacefully accepted by most experts[8]. Gourdain, following Morin, says that Jerome is the authentic author[9] of HI *Mc* (after 397[10]). Jerome's *audience*, when he moves permanently to the Holy Land, and in particular, to Jerusalem, include monks and catechumens among the faithful[11].

---

[6] This writing is called by Germain Morin *Tractatus in Marci Evangelium*, while Jean-Louis Gourdain calls it *Homélies sur Marc*, and in particular, calls *Homélie 6* the part of the Treatise on the Transfiguration. I shall follow Morin's nomenclature.

[7] Gourdain recalls that "Jérôme, né à Stridon vraisemblablement en 347, quitte définitivement Rome et l'Occident, en août 385, pour s'installer définitivement à Bethlehem en 386 jusqu'à sa mort en 419 ou 420" (J. Gourdain, *Homélies sur Marc*, SC 494, 12, note 2). He had to go away from Rome because of the calumnies arisen after Pope Damasus' death in 386: cfr. P. Jay, "Jerome", in C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1096.

[8] In 1980, Vittorio Peri relegated Jerome's role to that of a mere translator of Origen's Treatise on the Psalms. Although Peri tried to take the Treatise on the Psalms' authorship from Jerome, he also implies the same with regards to *Tractatus in Marci Evangelium*, since, as Gourdain explains, "Peri n'évoque les *Homélies sur Marc* qu'au détour d'une note (...), où il précise que leur cas est vraisemblablement identique à celui des homélies sur les *Psaumes*" (*Homélies sur Marc*, SC 494, 11, note 1). However, Pierre Jay, according to Gourdain, shall straightforwardly refute Peri's thesis, in order to give Jerome the legitimate authorship. For the detailed narrative of the controversy about the authorship here sketched, cfr. J. Gourdain (intro., trad. et notes), *Jérôme, Homélies sur Marc*, in SC 494, 9ss.

[9] "...après le début de la controverse origéniste, soit après 393 et, plus précisément, après 397, dans la deuxième phase de la querelle. On est alors dans une période très sombre de la vie de Jérôme" (Id., cit., 12).

[10] It should be remembered, too, that there were Greek and Syro-Aramaic speakers who attended the Eucharist there in the Church of Jesus' Birth. Jerome uses the Scriptures to explain the Scriptures, with a tone in dialogue with the listeners. Origen is glimpsed at on the background, because like him, Jerome concludes his preachings with a doxology.

[11] It should be remembered, too, that there were Greek and Syro-Aramaic speakers who attended the Eucharist there in the Church of Jesus' Birth. Jerome uses the Scriptures to explain the Scriptures, with a tone in dialogue with the listeners. Origen is glimpsed at on the background, because like him, Jerome concludes his preachings with a doxology.

Jerome reads the Scripture asystematically[12], but seeks the literal and spiritual senses[13]. In HI *Mc*, according to Gourdain, "the different angles of Jerome's complex personality"[14] are seen.

Gourdain thinks that HI *Mc* "can be the most beautiful and most important of all the *Homilies on Mk*"[15], which, however, aren't commentaries on the entire Gospel according to Mk. Still, Gourdain places the Treatise on the Transfiguration at the heart of HI *Mc*[16].

For Jay, it's significant that "in a homily on the Transfiguration (*In Marc. hom. VI*) that he [Jerome] gives the deepest formulation of his idea of Christian exegesis, veritable transfiguration of Scripture as a whole to [*sic*] the light of the Spirit of Christ"[17].

Jerome reminds us that "we must believe the Christ who

[12] "Jerome scarcely ever troubled to lay out in systematic fashion the rules of his hermeneutic" [P. Jay, "Jerome", in C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1104].

[13] "In reality, his exegetical practice is normally set in the traditional framework of the two great senses of Scripture: the literal sense and the spiritual interpretation" (ibid).

[14] "...les différentes facettes de la personnalité complexe de Jérôme" (J. Gourdain, *Homélies sur Marc*, SC 494, 49). Jerome's orthodoxy "se manifeste essentiellement à travers la limpidité de ses affirmations trinitaires et christologiques, contre toute hérésie (...) attentif aux préoccupations de son auditoire, soucieu de se mettre à la portée de tous, y compris des plus ignorants, adaptant son discours aux circonstances" (ibid.).

[15] "...peut-être la plus belle et la plus importante de toutes les *Homélies sur Marc*" (J. Gourdain, *Homélies sur Marc*, SC 494, 25).

[16] Thus, this Homily constitutes "une justification magistrale de l'herméneutique hiéronymienne et une réponse décisive à ses détracteurs qui l'accusent de 'faire violence à l'Écriture'" (J. Gourdain, *Homélies sur Marc*, SC 494, 27-28).

[17] P. Jay, "Jerome", in C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1109. For the quotes, I follow the division of Gourdain [*Jérôme, Homélies sur Marc*, SC 494, 2005, 150–173 (odd pages)]. The Latin text and the pagination are taken from the *editio* of Dom Germain Morin [*S. Hieronymi Presbyteri Tractatvs sive Homiliae (...) in Marci Evangelivm (...)*, CChr.SL 78].

swears"[18], since "the Truth tells the truth, in order to conquer the lie"[19]. After revealing who are the listeners implied by Jesus[20], Jerome interprets the *'non gustabunt* (they shall not taste) *mortem*', first in the physiological sense[21]. It seems that Jerome –when referring to the presence (and attention) of Moses on the mountain in the Lord's presence, when mentioning the forty days– may have been thinking that the number '40' could symbolize the *perseverance* to which is called every Christian who –like Moses– has to wait for the Lord without losing heart in every moment of his life[22].

Then, Jerome speaks of the *plura genera mortis*[23]:

"some taste[24] death, others see [death][25], some eat it[26],

[18] "...debemus Xpisto iuranti credere" (HI *Mc, 9,1[Vg=8,39*], CChr.SL 78, 477); cfr. Mc 9,1: *"En verdad os digo que hay algunos de los aquí presentes que no sufrirán la muerte"* (SagBi 5, 302). Without taking away the importance of the translation suffer (*sufrirán*), here I've chosen to translate *gustabunt* as taste (*degustarán*) instead of translating it as *suffer* (*sufrirán*), in order to make it jibe with Jerome's metaphor.

[19] "Veritas loquitur ueritatem, ut uincat mendacium" (HI *Mc 9,1 [Vg=8,39*], CChr.SL 78, 477).

[20] "Dico uobis discipulis, Iudaeis autem non loquor: clausas enim habent aures, et meus sermo eas penetrare non potest" (Id., cit.. , 478).

[21] "...qui enim stat, in eo quo stat, non gustat mortem" (ibid.). Jerome mentions Moses –being with God on the mountain (cfr. Ex 24,18)– as an example of one who is "standing".

[22] When Jerome says that "...stantibus datur, iacentibus non datur" (HI *Mc 9,1 [Vg=8,39]*, CChr.SL 78, 478), he evokes the Law given to Moses, and insinuates something else given to those who are like Moses. This *quid* can be the *mysteria*.

[23] Ibid. Jerome enumerates some verbs related to the act of feeding oneself, each with its nuance, in order to contrast them with the verb *gustare*, "to taste, to take a little of any thing" (ALD, 831). This is the reason why I chose to translate *gustare* as *taste*, instead of *suffer*.

[24] *Gustare* is to eat little by little, savoring what is eaten.

[25] *Videre* is to simply see (different from *looking*), something which, applied to gustare, can be fitted with the description, *mutatis mutandis*, depending on how one has used the sense of sight. Jerome will later clarify this notion with an example.

[26] *Comedere* can be characterized here as practically the synonym of *manducare*, feeding oneself or eating in the ordinary sense of the word, without any nuance of scarcity (eating bit by bit or tasting) or of excess (gobbling or devouring).

others devour it[27], [while] others are revivified[28]"[29].

Jerome takes such a distinction from Origen[30]. Jerome says that this tropology[31] speaks of the difficulty of not seeing death, "because [it's] difficult [to find one] who is not attacked by concupiscence, [and] one whom the trials don't cause to tremble"[32]. Jerome continues with the *mortis genera*:

> "...there's a difference between seeing and tasting [death]. He who sees, sees something, but doesn't taste [it]; he who tastes, it's necessary for him to have seen [it before]"[33],

distinguishing even more *mortis genera*:

---

[27] *Saturare* is to swallow, devour, eat too much.

[28] *Reficere* is to fill oneself.

[29] "...alii gustant mortem, alii uident, alii comedunt, alii saturantur, alii reficiuntur" (HI *Mc 9,1 [Vg=8,39]*, CChr.SL 78, 478).

[30] "Cette interprétation, qui distingue entre voir, goûter et manger est reprise d'Origène" (J. Gourdain, *Jérôme, Homélies sur Marc,* SC 494, 154).

[31] "Τροπολογια, a figurative manner of speaking, a metaphorical or tropical style" (ALD, 1904), is a term which –as Gourdain comments– "...on ne trouve en effet dans les *Tractatus sur Marc*, qu'un seul emploi de *tropologia*" (*Jérôme, Homélies sur Marc*, SC 494, 36). But, Τροπολογια acquires a new nuance here, since "...chez Jérôme, qui emprunte cet usage à Origène, cèst un des mots servant à désigner le sens spirituel" (J. Gourdain, *Jérôme, Homélies sur Marc*, SC 494, 152-153). Jerome thinks about the spiritual meaning of Τροπολογια upon mentioning the *sensus sublimior* (cfr. HI *Mc 9,1 [Vg=8,39],* CChr.SL 78, 478). To this tropology alludes the Psalmist: [cfr. Sal 89(88),49 "¿Qué hombre hay que no vea la muerte?" (SagBi 3, 441)].

[32] "Difficile enim est esse, quem concupiscentia non tentet, quem tentamenta non quatiant." (HI *Mc 9,1 [Vg=8,39]*, CChr.SL 78, 478). Upon clarifying that Mk 9,1 speaks of the *mors peccati*, Jerome bases his clarification on the prophet's warning: *"Porque el alma que pecare, ella misma morirá* (cfr. Ezeq 18,4: El que peque morirá; SagBi 4, 715).

[33] "Inter uidere et gustare differentia est. Qui uidet, uidet quidem, sed non gustat; qui autem gustat, necesse est ut uideat" (HI *Mc 9,1 [Vg=8,39]*, CChr.SL 78, 478). Jerome gives the example of a temptation presented to him upon simply physically seeing a woman (*mortem uidere*), which is something different from giving in to –desiring her– the temptation (*mortem gustare*). In this sense, HI Mc 9,1 can be considered a clarification on temptation. Jerome clarifies the fact that in order for the mors peccati to happen, it isn't necessary to go as far as *mortem comedere*, nor even to the mortem saturare (terms which can be translated, *mutatis mutandis*, to what nowadays are called "external" sins, or worse, "capital" sins); rather, one little step beyond the fragile limit from the *mortem uidere* (feeling or realizing that one is tempted) to the realm of the *mortem gustare* (consenting to the temptation: something which, in today's parlance – can be as physically invisible as an internal sin) would suffice.

> "tasting death [is] not eating [it], nor is it refreshing oneself [with it]; rather, [it's] like tasting [it] bit by bit[34] with the soul"[35].

Jerome suggests reading the pericope from *story*[36]. For Jerome, the fact that they didn't taste death3[7] made "the Apostles [see] how [He] was to reign in his glory"[38].

Jerome explains the difference between the days (eight[39] and six)[40]. Moreover, he asks him –rhetorically– not about the discrepancy, but why there were such a number of days[41]. He replies to himself: "Because if this world doesn't pass, which is understood [to happen] in six days, the true Kingdom won't appear"[42].

After explaining that Peter spoke[43] because he was "delighted by

---

[34] The verb *gustare*, by itself, already implies only trying the food; the adverb *paululum* enriches the meaning with the nuance of consuming something bit by bit.

[35] "...gustare mortem: non comedere, non refici, sed quasi paululum animo degustare" (HI *Mc 9,1 [Vg=8,39]*, CChr.SL 78, 478). Taking us to an extreme situation, Jerome presents the case of sinning on the same thing many times –with an example perhaps a bit startling–: "et frequentauero in fornicatione, iam non solum gustaui, sed et saturatus sum; (ibid.).

[36] Ibid.

[37] "Nisi me ante regnantem uiderint, non morientur" (ibid.).

[38] "...uiderunt illum apostoli transfiguratum in gloria sua qualis regnaturus esset" (HI *Mc 9,2 [Vg=9,1]*, CChr.

[39] On the topic of the eight days in Lk 9, Gourdain says: "Jérôme ici confond *Matthieu* et *Luc*. Mt 17, s'accorde, en effet, totalement avec *Marc*. Cette erreur montre bien le caractère partiellement improvisé de ces homélies, ce qui n'exclut pas du tout une préparation sous forme de notes et sans doute ici une relecture préalable du *Commentaire sur Matthieu* d'Origène" (*Jérôme, Homélies sur Marc*, SC 494, 155, note 3).

[40] "Matthaeus et primam dixerit et nouissimam, Marcus uero medias tantum dixerit" (HI *Mc 9,2 [Vg=9,1]*, CChr.SL 78, 479).

[41] "Quare non post dies novem? quare non post dies decem? quare non post dies uiginti? quare non post quattuor? quare non post quinque, nec ante aliquis numerus adsumitur, nec postea, sed sextus eligitur?" (Id., cit., 480).

[42] "Nisi enim mundus iste transierit, qui in sex diebus intellegitur, uerum regnum non apparebit" (ibid.).

[43] *"Señor, ¿quieres que hagamos tres tiendas, una para tí, otra para Moisés, y otra para Elías?* (cfr. Mc 9,5). In the Neovulgate, no aparece si vis.

the very beautiful vision"[44], Jerome suddenly speaks of the patters of his Biblical interpretation:

> "We don't deny the history, but we prefer spiritual intelligence"[45].

Jerome explains further the balance between two levels of Scripture reading: literal reading[46] and spiritual reading[47]. Moreover, *littera* and *historia* can seem to be interchangeable words *stricto sensu*, but Jerome distinguishes them[48]:

> "...neither is ours this sentence [of preferring spiritual

[44] "...delectatus uisione pulcherrima" (HI Mc 9,5 [Vg=9,4], CChr.SL 78, 479).

[45] "Non historiam denegamus, sed spiritalem intelligentiam praeferimus" (HI *Mc 9,7-8 [Vg=9,6-7],* CChr.

[46] Gourdain explains that "l'emploi du mot *historia* permet au prédicateur de souligner la valeur (...) du sens littéral" (*Jérôme, Homélies sur Marc*, SC 494, 34).

[47] This is the deepest sense, way beyond the literal sense. It's what Jerome calls *intellegentia spiritalis,* "la seule lecture vraiment chrétienne" (J. Gourdain, Jérôme, *Homélies sur Marc*, SC 494, 36). Moreover, Gourdain comments that "Jérôme est ici particulièrement clair dans la définition de ses principes herméneutiques. La lettre de l'Écriture n'est pas niée, mais celle-ci ne saurait être amputée de sa dimension spirituelle chrétienne par une lecture littérale judaïsante" (cit., 156).

[48] Pierre Jay explains that "echoing the Pauline condemnation of the 'letter', he [Jerome] reserves to *littera* restrictive connotations. On the contrary, it is *historia*, in fact more frequent, that we find in favorable contexts, often associated with terms like *ordo, ueritas, fundamentum*, which witness to the value in Jerome's eyes of this first level of interpretation which he practically never sacrifices, even when it presents hardly any difficulties" ("Jerome", in C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1104). Jerome reads the Scripture in various interpretative levels; "...in contrast to his Alexandrian predecessors, quick to seize in every figure an invitation to rise to the spiritual sense, and even more clearly than his Antiochian contemporaries, he [Jerome] brings in as a grammarian everything that has to do with the figurative sense or is related to it: figures and tropes, but also antropomorphisms (…), scripture's habits of expression, even distinction of literary styles and genres" (Id., cit., 1105).

intelligence, without denying history]: we follow the Apostles' decisión"[49].

Then, Jerome gives meaning to the names "Peter"[50] and "James"[51].

Jerome considers the importance of space (height) during the Transfiguration[52], and indicates two ways of being down [the mountain] for some: if one's one of the crowd[53], and if he follows the subhuman (animal) life)[54]. But,

---

[49] "Nec haec nostra sententia est: sequimur apostolorum sententiam" (HI *Mc 9,7-8 [Vg=9,6-7]*, CChr.SL 78, 479). Jerome bases his affirmation in Saint Paul who, in turn, interprets two OT figures: Sarah and Agar. [Cfr. Ga 4,24-26 "Todo esto tiene un sentido alegórico, porque estas mujeres representan los dos testamentos: uno, el del Monte Sinaí, que engendra esclavos, es Agar. La palabra "Agar" en árabe designa el monte Sinaí y corresponde a la Jerusalén actual, que es, en efecto, esclava junto con sus hijos. En cambio, la Jerusalén de arriba es libre, y es nuestra madre" (SagBi 5, 1106)]. This interpretation is done in the light of two holy mountains for the Jews: "...Apostolus uidelicet qui dicit quod Sarra et Agar in duo testamenta interpretentur, scilicet mons Sina et mons Sion. Hoc interpretatur in duo testamenta. 'Haec autem sunt duo testamenta'" (HI *Mc 9,7-8 [Vg=9,6-7]*, CChr.SL 78, 479).

[50] "...quis ergo de nobis fuerit πετρινος, et talem, hoc est, eam fidem habuerit, et super illum aedificetur ecclesia Cristi" (HI *Mc 9,2 [Vg=9,1]*, CChr.SL 78, 480).

[51] "...si quis fuerit Iacobus πτερνιστηρ, id est, subplantator: et Iohannes, id est, gratia Domini (cum enim subplantauerimus aduersarios nostros, tunc merebimur gratiam Χρisti): si quis habuerit sublimiora dogmata et intellegentiam excellentiorem, et meruerit uocari filius tonitrui: necesse est ut ab Iesu ducatur in montem" (ibid.).

[52] "Iesus, donec deorsum est, non transfiguratur: ascendit, et transmutatur" (ibid.).

[53] "...in montem (...) soli discipuli ascendunt, turbae deorsum remanent" (HI *Mc 9,2-3 [Vg=9,1-2]*, CCL 78, 480). Gourdain explains that "...a une distinction reprise d'Origène entre la foule et les vrais disciples, Jérôme superpose une opposition, fondée sur la pratique exégétique, entre ceux qui sont incapables de s'élever au-dessus de la lettre et ceux qui peuvent accéder au sens spirituel" (*Jérôme, Homélies sur Marc,* SC 494, 160, note 1).

[54] "...litteram sequitur, et deorsum est totus, et terram respicit more brutorum animalium" (HI *Mc 9,2-3 [Vg=9,1-2]*, CChr.SL 78, 480). On the contrary, he who obeys the divine word when climbing the mountain, that is to say, living by the Spirit, he shall see Jesus transfigured.

> "if we understand [God's word which we read] spiritually, in an instant, the holy Scriptures, this is, the clothings of the word, are transformed, and become white as the snow"[55].

Jerome reads the topic of the fuller *spiritaliter*[56]; it's required for the clothings to "be washed, to be exposed to the sun"[57], since only with much effort can one make the clothes turn to white.

Jerome consideres Jesus' Transfiguration as the condition sine qua non in order to see Moses and Elijah chatting with Jesus[58], a chat which can be read *literally*[59] or *spiritually*[60]. One has to read *spiritually*, since Moses, Elijah and Jesus converse in order to

---

[55] "Si (autem) spiritaliter intellegimus, statim scripturae sanctae, hoc est, uestimenta sermonis mutantur, et candida fiunt uelut nix" (ibid.). Gourdain comments that "...c'est certes à Origène que Jérôme reprend l'idee que les vêtements transfigurés du Christ sont la lettre de l'Écriture transfigurée par l'Esprit, mais il fait de cette remarque ponctuelle de l'Alexandrin l'ossature de son homélie, la réorganisant entièrement en fonction de cette idée" (*Jérôme, Homélies sur Marc,* SC 494, 33). Jerome distinguishes between Jesus' already white garments (which has the candidum, alluding to the literal reading) and the garments made even whiter (candidiora fiunt, to refer to spiritual reading) (Cfr. HI *Mc 9,2-3 [Vg=9,1-2],* CChr.SL 78, 480). Gourdain adds that "Jérôme montre que les vêtements transfigurés du Christ sont les lettres et les mots de l'Écriture transfigurés par l'Esprit" (J. Gourdain, *Jérôme, Homélies sur Marc,* SC 494, 39). Jerome adds a detail in order to understand the Scriptures spiritually: listening to the doctrine of the Apostles.

[56] Cfr. Mc 9,3. Jerome mentions the common meaning of "fuller", in the sense that it whitens what is dirty.

[57] "...ut [vestimenta] lauent, ut ad solem expandant" (HI *Mc 9,2-3 [Vg=9,1-2]*, CChr.SL 78, 481). Then, Jerome turns the gaze back to the Greek thinkers (Platon, Aristotle and Zeno) who'd wished to whiten their teachings like white words, but didn't get to do it.

[58] Cfr. Mc 9,4.

[59] "Moyses et Helias cum Iesu non loquuntur, euangelium nesciunt" (HI *Mc 9,4 [Vg=9,3],* CChr.SL 78, 481).

[60] "...sequuti fuerint, et uidere Dominum meruerint transformatum, et candida uestimenta eius, et omnia spiraliter intellegere quae scripta sunt: statim Moyses et Helias ueniunt, id est lex et prophetae, et conloquuntur euangelio" (ibid.).

"reveal the true sense of the text and the harmony between both Testaments"[61]. OT-NT truth and unity are glimpsed at in the *colloquium* of Moses and Elijah, who "speak facing Jesus, this is, towards the Gospel"[62], because they proclaim Christ's imminent Passion[63]. Were there no space for the OT's *intelligentia spiritalis*[64], the Transfiguration wouldn't make sense for the reader[65]. Still, OT episodes wouldn't make sense if not read in the light of the NT, in the light of Christ Jesus[66].

Jerome links the *climb to the mountain* of the Transfiguration with the *intelligentia spiritalis*:

> "truly, we live in the mountain when we understand [the Scriptures] spiritually"[67].

---

[61] "Révéler le vrai sens du texte et l'accord des deux Testaments" (J. Gourdain, *Jérôme, Homélies sur Marc*, SC 494, 36). Gourdain adds that "...c'est le sens du colloque de Moïse et Élie avec Jésus lors de la Transfiguration" (cit., note 8).

[62] "...loquuntur ad Iesum, hoc est ad euangelium" (HI *Mc 9,4 [Vg=9,3],* CChr. SL 78, 481).

[63] "Lex enim et prophetae Χρisti passionem adnuntiant" (ibid). One more detail: the author not only explains that Moses and Elijah also appear with splendor on Jesus' side, but also, that, on the contrary, ["...quamdiu non sunt cum Iesu, non habent candida uestimenta" (Id., cit., 482)].

[64] Ibid.

[65] "Si (...) legas legem, hoc est Moysen, si prophetas legas, hoc est Heliam, et non illos intellegas in Χρisto, et non intellegas quomodo Moyses loquitur cum Iesu, quomodo Helias loquitur cum Iesu, sed intellegas Moysen sine Iesu, et Heliam sine Iesu, et quomodo ei non adnuntiant passionem: nec in montem conscendunt Moyses et Helias, nec habent candida uestimenta, sed tota sordida sunt" (ibid.).

[66] For this, Jerome mentions some OT scenes: "Si enim litteram iudaice sequaris, quid tibi prodest legere quod Iudas concubuerit cum Thamar nuru sua? quid tibi prodest, quod Noe inebriatus est et denudatus est? quid tibi prodest, quia Onan filius Iudae fecit rem turpissimam, quam dicere erubesco: quid, inquam, tibi prodest?" (ibid.).

[67] "Vere (...) in morte consistimus, quando spiritaliter intellegimus" (ibid.). Then, Jerome mentions the Pentateuch in order to contrast the merely human reading (*carnaliter*) to the spiritual reading (*spiritaliter*), with the reminder that with the latter reading, the soul climbs the mountain.

In the light of the consideration that the soul climbs the mountain with the Lord when he understands the Law and the Prophets in the light of the Gospel, Jerome reasons why the three Apostles witness of Jesus' Transfiguration acted thus: "Therefore, you see how Peter and James and John –seeing themselves in the mountain, this is, in spiritual intelligence– despise the subhuman and human things, [and how, in contrast] they desire the lofty and divine things: they don't want to go down to the world [anymore]; rather, [they like] to permanently stay in the spiritual [things]"[68]. Here, Jerome shares more of his rules of interpretation:

> "[when] I understand something spiritually in a loftier way, I don't want to go down from there, I don't want to descend to the most humiliating things: in my heart, I want to make a booth for Christ and for the Law and for the Prophets"[69].

In order not to give an erroneous impression of having to forget the crowd *totaliter*, Jerome expresses the relationship *salus–res terrenae*: "...Jesus knows that if the human race is on the mountain, it won't be saved, if it doesn't go down to earthly matters"[70].

Jerome says that with the *verba Petri*, Peter *separates* the Law and the Prophets from Christo. This is not entirely positive, since "...when the unequal are equally honored, there's an injury [committed] to the greater on"[71]. Moreover, speaking of *three*

---

[68] "Vides ergo quomodo Petrus et Iacobus et Iohannes uidentes se esse in monte, hoc est in intellegentia spiritali, humilia et humana contemnunt, excelsa et diuina desiderant: nolunt ad terram descendere, sed toti in spiritalibus inmorari" (HI *Mc 9,4 [Vg=9,3],* CChr.SL 78, 482).

[69] "...ego [quando] (...) spiritaliter aliquid intellego excelsius, nolo inde descendere, nolo descendere ad humiliora: uolo in pectore meo tabernaculum facere Χριsto et legi et prophetis" (HI *Mc 9,5 [Vg=9,4],* CChr.SL 78, 482).

[70] "[Iesus] scit quia si in monte genus humanum fuerit, non saluabitur, nisi ad terrena descenderit" (ibid.).

[71] "Si quando inaequales aequaliter honorantur, maioris iniuria est. Faciamus tria tabernacula" (HI *Mc 9,5 [Vg=9,4],* CChr.SL 78, 483).

tents, on the one hand, and of the *three* Apostles witnesses of the Transfiguration, on the other hand,

> "the first [of the three Apostles] likes to take hold of the first [booth], the second [likes to take hold of] the second [booth], and the third [likes to take hold of] the third [booth]"[72].

However, there is one and only one booth, since "...if [Moses, Elijah and Jesus] don't live at the same place, they can't attain harmony"[73]. Jerome addresses Peter:

> "Oh Peter, although you climb the mountain, although you see Jesus transformed, although [you may have seen] his white clothing: however, because Christ hasn't yet suffered for you, until here you can't know the truth"[74].

Jerome goes on: "I think that this cloud is the grace of the Holy Spirit (...) the tent of the Holy Spirit, which protects us, too"[75]. God the Father recommends that Peter make only one booth[76]. Jerome gives counsel to Peter: "See the mystery of the Trinity, according –however– to my [poor] understanding[77]. Well I, all that I understand, without Christ and the Holy Spirit and the Father, I

---

[72] "...uult unus unum capere, alter alterum, et tertius tertium" (ibid.).

[73] "Nisi simul habitauerint, non possunt habere concordiam" (ibid.).

[74] "O Petre, licet in montem conscenderis, licet Iesum uideas transformatum, licet uestimenta eius candida: tamen quia Χριstus necdum pro te passus est, adhuc scire non possis ueritatem" (HI *Mc 9,5 [Vg=9,4]*, CChr.SL 78, 482). Later, Jerome tackles the topic of the tents, and tells Peter that if he were to keep on insisting on pitching three tents, these "quae lucem excluderent, et umbram includerent" (HI *Mc 9,7 [Vg=9,6],* CChr.SL 78, 483).

[75] "Mihi videtur ista nubes esse gratia Spiritus sancti (...) qui nos pariter protegit" (ibid.). Jerome profiles the characteristics of this cloud (combining them with those of the tent), describing it thus: "...nubes (...) ipsa lucida et obumbrans, hoc est unum tabernaculum non excludit solem iustitiae, sed includit" (ibid.).

[76] "Ecce ego tibi dedi tabernaculum, quod uos protegat. Noli aequaliter Domino et seruis facere tabernacula" (HI *Mc 9,7 [Vg=9,6],* CCL 78, 483).

[77] That which, for Jerome, God the Father would tell Peter.

don't want to understand [it]"[78].

Jerome sees in the Father's message[79] that neither Moses nor Elijah (servants) is *the* Father's Son; rather, "...this [*éste*] is my Son: [he's] of my nature, of my substance, staying in me, and everything I am"[80]. Therefore, one must listen to him81, because it's as if the Father were to say: "Listen to the one and only Son of God"[82]. In order not to give any place for doubt, Jerome says that Jesus remained alone with the three Apostles[83]

> "in order for them not to doubt [what the voice meant upon saying *this is my Son...*], while the Father speaks, the two are taken away, and Christ alone, stays"[84].

Moreover, Jerome gives the example of the comparison of the luminosity of two lighted lamps, with and without the sun[85].

---

[78] "Vide mysterium Trinitatis, secundum meam tamen intellegentiam. Ego enim omne, quod intellego, sine Χριsto et Spiritu sancto et Patre nolo intellegere" (HI Mc 9,7 [Vg=9,6], CChr.SL 78, 483). Here, Jerome "affirme avec grande vigueur la foi trinitaire héritée de Nicée. Le Père, le Fils et l'Esprit sont présents aux moments décisifs de la carrière de Jésus, que ce soit lors du baptême ou de la Transfiguration. Mais la Trinité demeure aussi au coeur de toute l'Écriture, c'est d'elle que procède toute interprétation légitime" (J. Gourdain, *Jérôme, Homélies sur Marc*, SC 494, 41).

[79] Cfr. Mc 9,7.

[80] "Hic est Filius meus: de mea natura, de mea substantia, in me manens, et totus quod ego sum" (HI *Mc 9,7 [Vg=9,6],* CChr.SL 78, 483). Thus, although Moses and Elijah "cari sunt, sed iste carissimus est" (ibid.).

[81] Gourdain sees here "un net effort de Jérôme pour rendre le terme nicéen d'*homoousios* par deux équivalents latins: *de mea natura, de mea substantia*" (*Jérôme, Homélies sur Marc*, SC 494, 170, note 1).

[82] "Dei Filium solum audite" (HI *Mc 9,7,* CChr.SL 78, 484).

[83] Cfr. Mc 9,8.

[84] "Ne igitur illi dubitarent, dum loquitur Pater, illi subtrahuntur duo, et solus Christus remanet" (HI *Mc 9,7*, CChr.SL 78, 484).

[85] "Si sol luxerit, lux lucernae non paret: sic et Χριsto praesente conparata lex et prophetae penitus non adparent. Non detraho legi et prophetis, quin potius laudo, quia Χριstum praedicant: sed sic lego legem et prophetas, ut non permaneam in lege et prophetis, sed per legem et prophetas ad Χριstum perueniam" (ibid.).

HI Mt, III 16,28-17,12

Jerome starts this part of the *Commentarius* (398[86]) by saying that Jesus[87] presents himself as the *Venturus*, "with the aim of showing your incredulity in the present time"[88]. After explaining the difference of days[89], he interprets Jesus' ascent with the three Apostles to the mount as the Apostles' participation in the Kingdom (*pars Regni*[90]) and the fewness of the elect[91].

Jerome interprets the Transfiguration[92] in an eschatological[93] sense, explaining carefully that

> "...where the splendor of the face is shown, and [where] the whiteness of the clothes is described, the substance isn't taken away, but is transformed into glory"[94].

For example, "...the transformation added the splendor, [and] didn't make [his] face disappear. This was the spiritual body"[95].

---

[86] "...hurriedly dictated in 398" [P. Jay, "Jerome", in C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1098].

[87] Cfr. Mt 16,28.

[88] "...ut qualis uenturus est postea, ob incredulitatem uestram praesenti tempore demonstretur" (HI *Mt*, III, 16,28, CChr.SL 77, 1959, 146).

[89] Cfr. Mt 17,1; Lc 9,28: "Sed facilis responsio est quia hic medii ponuntur dies ibi primus additur et extremus" (HI *Mt*, III, 16,28, CChr.SL 77, 1959, 146-147).

[90] Ibid.

[91] Cfr. Mt 22,14.

[92] Cfr. Mt 17,2.

[93] "Qualis futurus est tempore iudicandi talis Apostolis apparuit" (HI *Mt*, III, 17,2, CChr.SL 77, 1959, 147). Further on, Jerome comments that "...certe transformatus est Dominus in eam gloriam qua uenturus est postea in Regno suo" (ibid.).

[94] "Vbi splendor faciei ostenditur et candor describitur uestium, non substantia tollitur sed gloria commutatur" (ibid.).

[95] "Transformatio splendorem addidit, faciem non subtraxit. Esto corpus spiritale fuerit" (ibid.). Jerome observes Jesus' shining garments (cfr. Mc 9,3): "Quo autem fullo super terram potest facere, corporale est et tactui subiacet, non spiritale et aerium, quod inludat oculis et tantum in fantasmate conspiciatur" (HI *Mt*, III, 17,2, CChr.SL 77, 1959, 147).

Jerome contrasts Jesus' cutting silence before the curious people[96] with the prodigious pedagogy He employs with the three Apostles:

> "in order to increase the Apostles' faith, [Jesus] gives a sign from heaven, from where Elijah descended to where he had gone up, and Moses rising from the netherworld"[97].

After establishing a double parallelism *ascensio–descensio* and *sublimiora–terrena* when interpreting the *uerba Petri*[98], Jerome suggests praising the Most Holy Trinity for the *tabernaculum Trinitatis*:

> "...if, on the other hand, you seek three tents, don't compare in any way the servants with the Lord. Rather, pitch three tents, one to the Father and to the Son and to the Holy Spirit, as from them there is one [and only one] divinity, there may also be one [and only one] tent in your heart"[99].

The Father responds in Jesus' behalf to Peter's rather untimely query[100]. Jerome establishes –in connection to tent proposed by

---

[96] "Scribis et Pharisaeis temptantibus se et de caelo signa poscentibus dare noluit, sed prauam postulationem confutauit responsione prudenti" (HI *Mt*, III, 17,3, CChr.SL 77, 1959, 148).

[97] "...ut Apostolorum augeat fidem dat signum de caelo, Helia inde descendente quo conscenderat et Moyse ab inferis resurgente" (ibid.).

[98] As an implication that Peter "[uult] semper in sublimibus perseuerare" (HI *Mt*, III, 17,4, CChr.SL 77, 1959, 148), instead of going down the mountain; cfr. Mt 17,4.

[99] "Si autem quaeris tria tabernacula, nequaquam seruos cum Domino conferas. Sed fac tria tabernacula, immo unum Patri et Filio et Spiritui Sancto, ut quorum est una diuinitas unum sit et in pectore tuo tabernaculum" (HI *Mt*, III, 17,4, CChr.SL 77, 1959, 148).

[100] "Quia imprudenter interrogauerat propterea responsionem Domini non meretur, sed Pater respondit pro Filio" (Id., cit., 148-149). Cfr. Jn 5,37; 8,18: *"Yo no pronuncio el testimonio por mí, sino que el Padre quien me envió, Él mismo dice el testimonio por mí"*.

Peter– another double parallelism, between *superiora–terrena* and *nubes lucida–tabernaculum materiale*[101].

The prostration[102] indicates that "human frailty doesn't bear to endure the gaze of a greater glory, and trembling with all the spirit and body, falls to the ground"[103]. Why? It can be an acceptance of their error[104]; or maybe out of fear[105]; or perhaps they knew they were in God's presence[106]. Jerome reminds that one treads on the realm of the mystery[107].

Jerome sees that the Apostles, by themselves[108], "couldn't get up, [so] He himself, out of mercy, draws near and touches them, in order to drive out – with his touch – the fear, and so to stabilize the weakened body parts"[109]. Jesus, who has just transfigured himself, "...[now] heals with the command those whom he had healed with the hand"[110]. With the typical divine pedagogy, "...first, fear is cast out; and afterwards, the doctrine is handed on"[111].

---

[101] "Nubes autem uidetur lucida et obumbrat eos ut qui carnale e frondibus aut tentoriis quaerebant tabernaculum, nubis lucidae operirentur umbraculo" (HI *Mt*, III, 17,5, CChr.SL 77, 1959, 148-149). Even Moses and Elijah (=OT; *serui Domini*) have to help man to prepare the *tabernaculum Domini* in the human heart: "...serui sunt; Moyses et Helias debent et ipsi uobiscum in penetralibus cordis sui Domino tabernaculum praeparare" (ibid.).

[102] Cfr. Mt 17,6.

[103] "...humana fragilitas conspectum maioris gloriae ferre non sustinet ac toto animo et corpore contremiscens ad terram cadit" (HI *Mt.*, III, 17,6, CChr.SL 77, 1959, 149).

[104] "...uel quia se errasse cognouerant" (ibid.).

[105] "...uel quia nubis lucida operuerat eos" (ibid.).

[106] "...aut quia Dei Patris uocem loquentis audierant" (ibid.).

[107] "Quanto quis ampliora quaesierit, tanto magis ad inferiora conlabitur, si ignorauerit mensuram suam" (ibid.).

[108] Cfr. Mt 17,7.

[109] "...surgere non poterant ipse clementer accedit et tangit eos ut tactu timorem fuget et debilitata membra solidentur" (HI *Mt*, III, 17,7, CChr.SL 77, 1959, 149).

[110] "Quos manu sanauerat, sanat imperio" (ibid.).

[111] "Primum timor expellitur ut postea doctrina tribuatur" (ibid.).

Jerome thinks that it's logical that Jesus is seen alone[112], since "if Moses and Elijah were to stay with the Lord, the Father's voice would seem uncertain [as to] whom it gave a very strong testimony"[113]. Jerome attempts to recreate the composition of the place[114] and offers a theological meaning to the company of Moses, Elijah and Jesus (*unitas Testamentorum*) and to the shadow (*umbra*)[115].

Jerome established a balance of the Transfiguration with eschatological echoes: "...the pre-meditation and the glory of the triumphant Kingdom to come had been demonstrated on the mountain"[116]. It is this scenario that which Jesus didn't want to reveal before the Resurrection,

> "lest it become incredible given the prodigious character of the event [of the Transfiguration] and [lest,] after so much glory, the following [episode] of the Cross scandalize the simple souls"[117].

Jerome justifices the posing of the Apostles' query afterwards[118]

[112] Cfr. Mt 17,8.
[113] "...si Moyses et Helias perseuerassent cum Domino, Patris uox uideretur incerta cui potissimum daret testimonium" (HI *Mt*, III, 17,8, CChr.SL 77, 1959, 149-150).
[114] "...ablata nube et Moysen et Heliam euanuisse" (ibid.).
[115] "...postquam Legis et Prophetarum umbra discesserit quae uelamento suo Apostolos texerat, utrumque in Euangelio repperitur (ibid.).
[116] "Futuri Regni praemeditatio et gloria triumphantis demonstrata fuerat in monte" (HI *Mt*, III, 17,9, CChr.SL 77, 1959, 150).
[117] "...ne et incredibile esset pro rei magnitudine et post tantam gloriam apud rudes animos sequens crux scandalum faceret" (ibid.).
[118] Cfr. Mt 17,10. Jerome introduces his explanation thus: "Nisi causas nouerimus quare interrogauerint discipuli super Heliae nomine, stulta uidetur et extraordinaria eorum interrogatio" (HI *Mt*, III, 17,10, CChr.SL 77, 1959, 150-151).

on the tradition of Elijah's coming before the coming of the Savior[119]. Well then, Jerome explains further that "when [the Apostles] add: T*he scribes say that first Elijah must come*120, when they say "first", they show that if Elijah hadn't arrived, the Savior's coming wouldn't be according to the Scriptures"[121].

Principal affirmations

HI Mc gives importance to listening (by the faithful) to Jesus who swears[122] especially because there are different levels of death.

The difference of the days (eight, six) serves to speak of the six ages of creation, after which the Kingdom shall appear.

Peter and James, by their names, are examples for he who follows Jesus.

In order to be with Jesus, one must go up with Him to the mountain, reading the Scriptures *spiritaliter*. However, one can remain at the foot of the mountain if he lives a mediocre or subhuman life. Once one is before the Transfiguration of Jesus, he sees Moses and Elijah. Again, one can read this scene literally or spiritually: by reading it *spiritaliter*, one discovers the true sense of the text, and the unity of the Scriptures. Once the heavenly things are savored by spiritual and not literal reading of the Scriptures, it's understandable that one doesn't want to go back to one's old life anymore.

Peter has spoken in the presence of the transfigured Jesus

[119] "Traditio Pharisaeorum est iuxta Malachiam prophetam qui est nouissimus in duodecim quod Helias ueniat ante aduentum Saluatoris et reducat cor patrum ad filios et filiorum ad patres et restituat omnia in antiquum statum" (ibid.).

[120] Mt 17,10.

[121] "Quando autem adiciunt: *Scribae dicunt quod Heliam oporteat primum uenire*, primum dicendo ostendunt quod nisi Helias uenerit non sit secundum Scripturas Saluatoris aduentus" (HI *Mt*, III, 17,10, CChr.SL 77, 1959, 150-151).

because being present in the Transfiguration so impressed him. However, one shouldn't treat Moses, Elijah and Jesus as equals, since this harms the greatest of them.

For Jerome, history (literal reading) is important, but even more important is the spiritual intelligence, because thus, God's word is transfigured for the reader, like the snow. In order to help out here, there's the Fuller who purifies.

Inside the protection of the cloud, which is the Holy Spirit protecting us from the bad weather, man is invited to contemplate the Most Holy Trinity.

The Father's voice says that the Son is of his nature, of his substance, abiding in Him, and everything He is. In order to be clearer that that Son is Jesus, Moses and Elijah disappear from the scenario.

In HI *Mt*, Jerome sees the climb to the mountain of Jesus' Transfiguration with the three Apostles to indicate the pre-meditation, the participation in the glory of the coming Kingdom of the Son of Man, and the few who follow Jesus.

Jesus' Transfiguration doesn't change who He is, since it's only a transformation into visible glory. The Transfiguration, with the appearance of Moses and Elijah, serve to increase the faith of the Apostles (who truly needed it, unlike those who were only curious), who will face the imminent Passion.

Instead of proposing to make three material booths for Moses, Elijah and Jesus, one has to make only one immaterial booth for the Most Holy Trinity to dwell in the heart.

Before the Mystery, man knows he has to fall to the ground, upon seeing himself as nothing, upon recognizing his daring before the Mystery. Jesus, as a good divine Master, dissipates fear, and then teaches.

6. Sermones 78, 79, 79/a (Augustinus)

His Holiness Benedict XVI, in giving the catechesis on 9 January 2008, starts to speak about the last Church Father he includes in his catechesis on the Church Fathers: **Aurelius Augustinus** (13 November 354 – 430[1]), whom the Pontiff calls "the greatest of the Fathers of the Latin Church"[2], and who has, among other merits, that of having written so much, that his biographer Posidius –according to Benedict XVI– thought that "it seems impossible for one man to have written so much in his life"[3].

AU s 78

Augustine starts s 78 (Lent[4]) by linking the *visio* of the Transfiguration with Jesus' prophecy[5]. Augustine explains that this

---

1 C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1149). Having made reference to Augustine's exegesis, I don't aim to mention and explain every detail of Augustine's exegesis; I only aim to contextualize *Sermones* 78, 79 and 79A within Augustine's exegetical field. Augustine's birthdate is from Benedikt XVI., *Die Kirchenväter*, Editrice Vaticana–St. Benno Verlag, 2008, 191.

2 "Nach den großen Weihnachtsfeierlichkeiten möchte ich zu den Betrachtungen über die Kirchenväter zurückkehren und heute über den größten Vater der lateinischen Kirche sprechen, den hl. Augustinus" (Benedikt XVI., *Die Kirchenväter*, 189).

3 "Sein Biograf Possibius sagt: Es schien unmöglich, dass ein Mann so vieles in seinem Leben zu schreiben vermochte" (ibid.). Benedict XVI notes that Augustine left some 600 homilies, "aber ursprünglich war die Zahl der Predigten viel, viel größer, vielleicht sogar zwischen 3000 und 4000 – Frucht von 40 Jahren Predigttätigkeit des ehemaligen Rhetors" (Benedikt XVI, *Die Kirchenväter*, 207-208). From the *Sermones* attributed to the Bishop of Hippo, three deal with Jesus' Transfiguration.

4 Anne Marie La Bonnardière situates the preaching of *Sermo 78* during Lent, although the place and the year of its composition and proclamation are unknown [cfr. L. Carrozzi, "*Sant'Agostino, Discorsi II,1 (51-85) sul Nuovo Testamento*", cit., xi], where Carrozzi quotes La Bonnardière (whose books on the chronology are in Carrozzi's book, pp. xxxvi-xxxvii) abbreviated as "B".

5 Cfr. Mt 16,28.

detail "*...non parua quaestio est*"[6], since the mountain –where the three Apostles shall see Jesus transfigured– is not the conquered Kingdom.

Relating the mountain of the Transfiguration to the Kingdom to come, Augustine asks himself: "What is the mountain for one who posesses heaven?"[7]. For Augustine, Jesus refers to the Kingdom 'of the heavens'[8], of the heavens which *are telling the glory of God*[9]": the *regnum sanctorum*[10].

Augustine goes on to interpret allegorically Jesus' Transfiguration, when he interprets the act of Jesus transfiguring himself[11] under the prism of his being

> "Light that enlightens every man who comes to this world[12]. What this sun is to mortal eyes, that is He to the eyes of the heart"[13].

---

6 AU s 78, 1, cfr. *Sant'Agostino. Discorsi II/1 sul Nuovo Testamento*, in A. Trapè, osa (dir.), "Nuova Biblioteca Agostiniana", Città Nuova Editrice, Roma, 1982, 566.

7 "Quid est mons ei qui possidet coelum?" (AU s 78, 1, cit., 566). It's as if Augustine were to say: 'What's the mountain where the Transfiguration will take place *as compared* to gaining Heaven?'. Augustine presents what has been quoted as an example of spiritually making good use of the text, or in other words, how to do a *lectio spiritalis* of a Biblical text. In Augustine's words: "Quod non solum legimus, sed etiam oculis cordis quodam modo videmus" (ibid.).

8 A very Jewish expression.

9 Sal 19(18),1. *"...pregonan la gloria de Dios"* [Sal 19(18),2 in SagBi 3, 232]; here, Augustine bases on the Scriptures two complimentary dimensions: on the one hand, the *celestial-cosmic* dimension of the *gloria Domini*; on the other hand, the *glorious* dimension, not only of the heavens, but also of the entire creation: *Sin discurso, sin palabras, sin que se oigan sus voces. Por toda la tierra se esparce su rumor, y su pregón hasta los confines del orbe* (cfr. SagBi 3, 232): Sal 19(18),4-5. In the Neovulgate, instead of *non audiantur voces eorum*, one reads: *quorum non intellegantur voces* (ibid.).

10 AU s 78, 1, cit., 566.

11 Cfr. Mt 17,2.

12 Cfr. Jn 1,9.

13 "...se lumen esse significans quod illuminat omnem hominem venientem in hunc mundum. Quod est iste sol oculis carnis, hoc ille oculis cordis" (AU s 78, 2, cit., 566). Then the double dimension (cosmic glory, glorious cosmos) is transferred to an anthropological level (quoad nos) when Jesus is seen as the *Lumen pro homine*.

Augustine then introduces in the pair *Iesus-Lumen* an *ecclesiological element correlative to the anthropological element*, when he allegorically interprets Jesus' *vestimenta candida* as the *Ecclesia*, such that in then the Church clings to Jesus Christ[14].

Aside from this *dimension of inseparability* of the Church from Jesus Christ, Augustine presents the Church's *redeemed dimension* (God himself shall wash her from the sins of the members of the Body)[15].

Agustín passes to the *allegorical sense* of Jesus' conversation with Moses and Elijah: the sense and usefulness of the Law and the Prophets depend on their communication and union with the Gospel, in other words, with Jesus[16].

Augustine returns to the topic of the *uestimenta Iesu* in the Transfiguration, but this time, he focuses on the *uestimenta Iesu from the perspective of the sun and of one of its properties: its splendor*[17]. *"But now the righteousness*[18] *of God has been manifested apart from law"*[19].

Up to here, there's a *first concatenation of ideas:* The Kingdom (referred by Jesus as that of the heavens, of the saints); the Church

---

[14] At this point, Augustine insists on the importance of the Church' union with Jesus Christ when he compares this union with clothing clinging to the body.

[15] In order to justify his reflection, Augustine recalls three episodes from the Scriptures: the healing of the bleeding woman, the coming of the Gentiles through Paul's preaching, and a prophecy: *"Y si vuestros pecados fueran como la escarlata, los blanquearé como la nieve"* (Is 1,18).

[16] "Moyses et Elias, id est, Lex et Prophetae quid valent, nisi cum Domino colloquantur?" (AU s 78, 2, cit., 569).

[17] To introduce this aspect, Augustine cites Paul: *"...ya que el conocimiento del pecado existe por medio de la Ley"* (Rm 3,20; SagBi 5, 907).

[18] God's manifest justice/righteousness is Jesus Christ, the *Sol iustitiae*; moreover, in the Bible, 'justice' isn't limited to juridical matters, but signifies what we call nowadays 'holiness'.

[19] Rm 3,21 (cfr. SagBi 5, 908).

purified by the Son and the Spirit is introduced in the *uestimenta Iesu*; the pair *sol-splendor*[20] *(splendor solis iustitiae*[21]*, Iesus–Iesus transfiguratus*[22]*, Lumen illuminans hominem)*; a circularity among Christ, the Law and the Prophets (the last two as *testimonia* of the *splendor Iesu transfigurati*, and He as the *valor* of the Law and the Prophets).

Augustine interprets the *uerba Petri*[23] in an anthropological key[24], insinuating Peter's tiredness: "Why go to labors and pains, if one [already] has holy desires, and therefore, good conduct, in God?"[25].

The cloued overshadowed them all because, –for Augustine–,

"...he [Peter] wanted [to pitch] three tents: since [his]

---

20 The relationship between *sun* and *splendor* is that of a reality and its property (the *sun* is the astrophysical reality, and the splendor is its property).

21 Rm 3,21 can be interpreted thus: God's justice is Christ – who, in relation to the comparison to the solar body in Mt 17,2 – is called the sol *iustitiae*, whereas the non-manifestation of the Law's effect (*vigencia*) (which implies the non-manifestation of the Prophets' effect), implies the manifestation, that's to say, the splendor, of God's justice: in short, the *splendor* of Jesus Christ, the Sun of justice.

22 Jesus is the *Sol iustitiae*, whose splendor takes place in his own Transfiguration.

23 Cfr. Mt 17,4.

24 That is to say, that it reveals Peter's purely human consideration while he finds himself before the transfigured Jesus.

25 "Utquid unde discederet ad labores et dolores, habens in Deum sanctos amores, et ideo bonos mores?" (AU s 78, 3, cit., 568). It's as if Augustine had placed himself in Peter's place. One can observe within this anthropological reading *a double subjective aspect in Peter's proposal*, with a cause and effect relationship: Peter despises (the negative aspect) the current temporal realities; *for that reason,* Peter –insinuates Augustine– verbalizes (or justifies?) his desire (positive aspect) to prolong his stay with the transfigured Jesus on the mountain, since he already was enjoying the Lord's presence.

> human sensibility wanted to divide, the response from heaven showed: 'there's only one [tent] for us'"[26].

Moreover,

> "...the Word of God [is] Christ, the Word of God [is] in the Law, the Word [is] in the Prophets. What do you want to divide, Peter? [It'd be] more worthwhile for you to unite"[27].

Up to here, there's a *second concatenation of ideas:* the difficulty of accepting temporal realities for Peter, once he savors being with Jesus, with Jesus' silence, in whose place the voice speaks of the Son, to Whom the Law and the Prophets has to be united.

Peter, James and John have fallen to the ground[28] because they got to know perfectly weel the fulfillment of the OT promise of the Lord to send the Messiah, and this was the promises sounding at the backround of these queries of Augustine[29]. Moreover (this is the second reason), the three Apostles have read between the lines that that message from the cloud implied an important distinction of *filiation*, "...since one thing is the Only-Begotten [Son], another thing are the adopted [children]"[30].

Augustine enriches the focus of *the relationship Jesus-Moses and Jesus-Elijah*, upon employing (instead of the names *Iesus* and *Verbum*) the title *Dominus*, related with Moses and Elijah (called *serui, ministri*)[31].

---

[26] "Ille quaerebat tria tabernacula: nobis unum esse, quod humanus sensus dividere cupiebat, responsum caeleste monstravit" (AU s 78, 3, cit., 568).

[27] "Verbum Dei Christus, Verbum Dei in Lege, Verbum in Prophetis. Quid, Petre, quaeris dividere? Magis te oportet adjungere" (ibid.).

[28] Cfr. Mt 17,6.

[29] "Quia et in Prophetis ipsum audistis, et in Lege ipsum audistis. Et ubi ipsum non audistis?" (AU s 78, 4, cit., 568).

[30] "Aliud est enim Unicus, aliud adoptati" (ibid.).

[31] Moreover, Augustine applies to the three the pair fons-uasa in order to illustrate the distinction. Thus, Jesus gives meaning to what Moses and Elijah represent.

Up to here, there's a *third concatenation of ideas:* the Apostles' falling to the ground upon recognizing the arrival of the fullness of times, at the same time that they realize the Son's natural divine filiation. Moreover, the three see that in relation to Jesus the Lord, Moses and Elijah are servants.

Augustine again speaks of *the three Apostles' physical reaction to the voice*, but this time, Augustine introduces the allegory of *death*[32]. Related to this mortal meaning –like the other side of the coin– is the *resurrection* allegory which Augustine to Jesus' touching the three Apostles[33].

Aside from the meaning of 'resurrection of the flesh' given to this seeing Jesus alone, Augustine relates seeing Jesus[34] to God's *reward*: that's to say, an anticipation of how the Son shall love he who –loving Him– is also loved by the Father[35].

> "A great gift, a great promise. God doesn't reserve for you just any prize of his: rather, [he reserves for you] Himself"[36].

A fourth concatenation of ideas: the double allegory death-resurrection, the absolute sufficiency of Jesus, Gift and Promise.

---

[32] To support this allegory, Augustine quotes Gn 3,19, which speaks of our material identity, origin and destiny: *"Eres tierra, y a la tierra te irás"* (Gn 3,19). (Porque polvo eres y al polvo volverás) (SagBi 1, 64).

[33] Cfr. Mt 17,6. In the same scene, the Apostles' seeing Jesus alone means, for Augustine, seeing God face to face (cfr. 1 Co 13,12), since in the resurrection of the flesh, God –nobody but Him– shall be everything to everyone (cfr. 1 Co 15,28).

[34] *"...no vieron a nadie, sólo a Jesús"* (Mt 17,8; SagBi 5, 162).

[35] For this, Augustine quotes Jn 14,21: *"Y me mostraré a mí mismo a él (Jn 14,21: Yo mismo me manifestaré a él* – SagBi 5, 665).

[36] *"Et ostendam me ipsum illi.* Magnum donum, magna promissio. Non tibi servat Deus praemium aliquod suum: sed se ipsum" (AU s 78, 5, cit., 570). Augustine doesn't only see in Mt 17,8 seeing Jesus alone, but that he is seen as the *magnum Donum* et magna *Promissio*.

Augustine speaks of *an attitude opposed to God's generosity,* when he questions the listener (and the reader), and in particular, the old man (greedy person) in every listener and reader, and when Augustine asks why it isn't enough for the old man the *magnum Donum et magna Promissio*[37].

Moreover, Augustine speaks of what must be done by each Christian –personified by Peter– to whom Augustine suggests the following:

> "...go down, preach the word, insist on it in and out of time, reprimand, encourage, reproach with much patience and doctrine[38]. Work, sweat off, suffer some torments; in order for you to posses what is made to understand by the Lord's white vestments, through the candor and the elegance of right-minded action in charity"[39].

In order for the teaching on unselfishness (or generosity) may become clearer, Augustine quotes Saint Paul thrice:

> *"Let no one seek his own good, but the good of his neighbor* (1 Co 10,2440)"[41].

When Augustine repeats the quote, he insists:

---

[37] In order to illustrate how paradoxical this attitude is, Augustine emphasizes that God alone suffices for man: "Tu dive tibi videris; et si Deum non habes, quid habes? alter pauper; et si Deum habet, quid non habet?" (AU s 78, 5, cit., 570).

[38] Cfr. 2 Tm 4,2. Unlike the text used by Augustine, the Neovulgate exposes 2 Tm 4,2 thus: *praedica verbum, insata opportune, importune, argue, increpa, obsecra (exhorta)* in *(no cum) longanimitate et doctrina* (SagBi 5, 1288).

[39] "...descende, praedica verbum, insta opportune, importune, argue, hortare, increpa, cum omni longanimitate et doctrina. Labora, desuda, patere aliqua tormenta; ut quod in candidis vestimentis Domini intelligitur, per candorem et pulchritudinem rectae operationis in caritate possideas" (AU s 78, 6, cit., 570). In the final analysis, Augustine speaks of humility. In order to justify this exhortation to humility in the Scriptures, Augustine remins the Paul explains the hymn to charity which doesn't *"no busca lo suyo"* (1 Co 13,5; SagBi 5, 1019).

[40] *"Que nadie busque su provecho, sino el de los demás"* (SagBi, 5, 1010).

[41] *"Nemo quod suum est quaerat, sed quod alterius est"* (AU s 78, 6, cit., 572).

> "But since [I myself] know you, you want to posses not only what is yours but what is the neighbor's. You commit fraud, in order to give yourself what is another's: suffer robbery [yourself], in order to lose what is yours. You don't ask for what's yours, but you snatch what is another's. If you do this, you're not doing [any] good"[42].

Still, Augustine relates 1 Co 10,24 with another quote, in order to dispel any doubt and possible tricks as to its interpretation: *"Not seeking my own advantage, but that of many, that they may be saved"*[43].

Augustine returns to the *verba Petri*, saying that Peter didn't understand the meaning of 1 Co 10,24 because he wanted to stay on the mountain with Jesus. Thus: "He [Jesus] was reserving this for you, Peter, for [your] afterlife"[44].

Augustine repeats the exhortation to *humility* in facing the present-day realities "and to go down the mountain", and informs Peter that it's not he (the author) who tells him to go down and work and suffer martyrdom on earth, but rather, it's Jesus himself, because Jesus himself has given the example[45] of humility[46].

Here, there's a *fifth concatenation of ideas:* the contrast between Jesus' generosity and the avarice of man (with Peter's attitude),

---

[42] "Sed quomodo te novi, habere vis et tuum et alienum. Fraudem facis, ut habeas alienum: furtum patere, ut perdas tuum. Non vis quaerere tuum, sed tollis alienum. Quod si facis, non facis bene" (ibid.).

[43] 1 Co 10,24.33: *"Yo, en cambio, no quiero lo que me es útil, sino lo que [lo es] para muchos, para que se salven"* (sin buscar mi conveniencia sino la de todos los demás, para que se salven) (SagBi 5, 1010).

[44] "Servabat tibi hoc, Petre, post mortem" (AU s 78, 6, cit., 572).

[45] Augustine poses Christ's example for his listener's consideration: 1) the Life came to the world in order to die on the Cross; 2) the Bread of Life experienced hunger; 3) the Way experienced tiredness; 4) the Fountain experienced thirst.

[46] "...et tu recusas laborare? Noli tua quaerere. Habe caritatem, praedica veritatem; tunc pervenies ad aeternitatem, ubi invenies securitatem" (AU s 78, 6, cit., 572). Cfr. Flp 2,5.

Peter's descent from the mountain in order to be generous in the love of Christ.

In AU s 78, there are five blocks of ideas:

1. The Kingdom of the heavens that proclaim God's glory through the righteous ones (with a celestial, cosmic, and eschatological dimension) is inchoated through the Church, the purification of which is prefigured by the resplendent clothes of the transfigured Jesus, the *Sol iustitiae* who illuminates man. The Law and the Prophets bear witness to Jesus, the Word, Who, in turn, gives importance to his servants: the Law and the Prophets.

2. Peter found it difficult to gaze once more at the tough realities after being with Jesus, but Jesus' silence was complemented with the Father's voice.

3. The prostration of the three Apostles before the transfigured Jesus, after listening to the Father's voice, reveals their realization of the natural divine filiation of Jesus, who arrived in the fullness of time.

4. Augustine sees in the falling-rising of the three Apostles a death-resurrection allegory. They see only Jesus since Jesus alone suffices, He who is the Gift and the Promise.

5. Man is called to conquer his avarice by following Christ, when man again goes down the mountain with Peter, in order to imitate God's generous love.

AU s 79

Augustine starts AU *s* 79 (Lent, 425; 19-24 June 426-430[47],

[47] According to Luigi Carrozzi, this sermon was written around the year 425, while Othmar Perler dates it between 19 – 24 of June, between the years 426-430; on the other hand, *La Bonnardière* dates it hypothetically during Lent, without an exact year. [cfr. L. Carrozzi, *"Sant'Agostino, Discorsi II,1 (51-85) sul Nuovo Testamento"*, cit., xi].

in Hippo[48]) by describing the Transfiguration as the *uisio magna*[49]. Then, he interprets Jesus' resplendent face like the *claritas Euangelii*[50]. Jesus' clothing, white *sicut nix*, signify for Augustine the Church's purification (*mundatio*)[51]. The conversation among Jesus, Moses and Elijah means the *habitus* (possession, or according to Augustine, *habet*), on the part of the Gospel, of the witness by the Law and the Prophets[52]. Augustine speaks of the possible *psychological background* of the *uerba Petri*: either because Peter might have found solace in the *solitudo montis*[53] (in Jesus); or because Peter might be feeling tired (*taedium*[54]) of the tumult of human matters. Augustine insists on the unity of the Scriptures[55]. The cloud[56] is a means to correct Peter's mistake, like a single tent that covers everybody.

In AU s 79[57], Augustine clarifies further:

---

[48] Id., cit., 575.

[49] Unlike the description *uisio ista*, simply, in AU s 78.

[50] Here, Augustine fixes his attention in the *splendor uultus Iesu*, while in AU s 78, Augustine has sets his eyes on the totus Iesus.

[51] In order to base this affirmation on the Scriptures, Augustine quotes the prophet Isaiah: *Et si fuerit peccata vestra sicut phoenicium, tamquam nivem dealbabo* (AU s 79, *Sant'Agostino. Discorsi II/1 sul Nuovo Testamento,* cit., 574)]. Although the word nix is mentioned here (as in AU s 78), one can observe that the *whiteness* of the *uestimenta Iesu* is dwelt on more (in AU s 78) in relation to the sun's brightness (*fulgor*), while here, AU s 79 simply mentions the allegorical reading of the white garments like the snow and the Church' purification.

[52] Augustine makes a very brief excursus during the sermon, in order to remind the listeners of the recitation of favors granted through St. Stephen (cfr. L. Carrozzi, *"Sant'Agostino. Discorsi II/1 sul Nuovo Testamento",* cit., 575, note 1). Like in AU s 78 –except for the notion of *habitus*– Augustine deals here about the *conloquium* between the Gospel, the Law and the Prophets.

[53] Term also used in AU s 78.

[54] "...weariness, irksomeness, tediousness; loathing, disgust" (ALD, 1834). Augustine also uses *taedium* in AU s 78. While in AU s 78, Augustine refers to the *turba* (focus on oneself), here, on the other hand, Augustine refers to the *tumultus rerum humanum* (focus on the events).

[55] "Sed tria tabernacula quare quaerebat, nisi quia unitatem Legis, Prophetiae et Evangelii nondum sciebat?" (AU s 79, cit. 574).

[56] Like in AU *s 78*.

[57] In AU s 78, Augustine spoke of the connection among Jesus, Moses and Elijah in terms of Word, Law and Prophets.

> "...the Prophets speak, the Law speaks: but listen to him [escuchad a éste], the voice of the Law, the tongue of the Prophets. He himself[58] resounded (sonuit) in them [the Law and the Prophets], [and] when he deemed [the moment] opportune, he appeared before them in his [splendor]"[59].

Augustine reminds the the Son pre-existed. But moreover, [the Son] was in the interior dynamism of the Law and the Prophets, insofar as –employing terms of the vocal-linguistic system[60]– the Son is the *uox Legis* and the *lingua Prophetarum*[61].

Before ending AU s 79, Augustine suggests to the audience to see in the *lectio Euangelii* the *nubes in euentu Transfigurationis Iesu*[62].

In AU s 79, we see the following aspects: Jesus' clothing prefigure the *mundatio Ecclesiae*. The splendor of Jesus' resplendent face in relation to the Law and the Prophets. Aside from the fact that the *gratia Euangelii* receives the Law and the Prophets, the Son is the *Vox Legis* and the *Lingua Prophetarum*. The *uerba Petri* reveal that Peter is tempted to an easy life. The *unitas Scripturarum*

---

[58] That's to say, the Son.

[59] "Loquuntur Prophetae, loquitur Lex: sed *hunc audite*, vocem Legis, in linguam Prophetarum. Ipse in illis sonuit, ipse in se ipso quando est dignatus apparuit" (AU s 79, cit., 574). Here, there's a temporal to and fro, or a type of *flashback*. With the terms *uox* and *lingua*, one looks towards the OT, but at the same time, is focused on the Son. Augustine specifies the coming –awaited ever since the time of Moses and Isaiah– of the Son's *apparitio* as he is (in the words *ipse in se ipso...apparuit*) when the καιρος comes.

[60] *Vox* and *lingua* evoke another name of the Second Person of the Trinity –*Verbum*– a name which Augustine doesn't use in AU s 79.

[61] If the Son speaks through the Law and the Prophets, then there's no dichotomy or contradiction between the Gospel and the pair Law-Prophets. Rather, the Word, unites the OT with the NT.

[62] *"Quando Euangelium loquebatur, putate quia nubes erat: inde nobis uox sonuit"* (AU s 79, *Sant'Agostino. Discorsi II/1 sul Nuovo Testamento,* cit., 574). Augustine invites to live the Gospel with hope in the Son's promise.

is reaffirmed by the Son's *apparitio* as He is (in his visibly glorious aspect) in the presence of the personifications of the Law (for which the Son is *Vox*) and of the Prophets (for whom the Son is *Lingua*). This *apparitio* takes place in the visio magna: the *Transfiguratio Iesu*. Listening to the *lectio Euangelii* becomes the cloud that resounds in the ear of the believer, commanding him to listen only to the Son.

AU s 79/A

In AU s 79/A (?[63]), Augustine speaks of an eschatological sence of the coming Kingdom[64]: *el Juicio final*. Moreover, Augustine speaks of t*he natural death* of all before seeing the *Dominus iudex* who is *"ready to judge the living and the dead*[65]"[66]. Still, Augustine includes the Apostles Peter, James and John among those who wouldn't suffer death.

Augustine sees in Jesus' resplendent face[67] an allusion to the end of time, when the righteous ones reign, since Augustine underlines the *anticipative* aspect of the head in relation to the Body of Christ[68].

Here, Augustine highlights a *Christological aspect*[69]:

[63] The time and the place of the composition and proclamation of AU s 79/A, which Lambot catalogues as s 17 [cfr. L. Carrozzi, *"Sant'Agostino, Discorsi II,1 (51-85) sul Nuovo Testamento",* cit., xi].

[64] Cfr. Mt 16,28.

[65] 1 P 4,5: *"preparado para juzgar a vivos y muertos"* (SagBi 5, 1431).

[66] The theme that in AU s 78 was in Mt 17,6, in AU s 79/A is in Mt 16,28.

[67] Cfr. Mt 17,2.

[68] If in AU s 78, the face in relation to eschatology isn't mentioned explicitly, and if in AU s 79, there's an allegorical explanation of the face as the *claritas Euangelii*, here, in AU s 79/A, the eschatological aspect is combined with the eclesial aspect of the author's consideration regarding the *fulgor uultus Iesu* in Mt 17,2. In order to justify his affirmation, Augustine cites Saint Paul: *"[el Señor] transformará nuestro cuerpo vil en un cuerpo glorioso como el suyo"* (Flp 3,21; SagBi 5, 1170).

[69] Not in *Sermones* 78 and 79.

> "Look, for he himself, on the mountain, *shone like the sun*[70], and he hadn't yet risen from the dead. He hadn't suffered death yet, but [although] in the flesh which had not yet resurrected, [however,] he was God, and [so,] by divine power, he did what he wanted"[71].

The human body of the Word incarnate doesn't impede the freedom[72] and the omnipotence proper to his divine nature, precisely because he was the incarnate Word: in the author's words, *Deus in carne erat*. Hence, Augustine assures that "it's not [out of] pride if we also hope for this; listen to him and do not doubt"[73].

Augustine recalls in detail Jesus' explanation of the parable of the weeds (darnel)[74], and Augustine insinuates that those whom Jesus

---

[70] Mt 17,2. In the Neovulgate, instead of *refulsit*, one reads *resplenduit* (*"resplandeció como el sol":* SagBi 5, 161).

[71] "Ecce ipse in monte *fulsit sicut sol,* et nondum resurrexit. Nondum mortem gustauerat sed in carne Deus erat et de carne nondum resuscitata quod uolebat diuina potestate faciebat" (AU s 79/A,1, cit., 578). The body of Jesus of Nazareth shone (*resplandeció*) in the Transfiguration (pre-Resurrection event), and Augustine insinuates the reason: there's no inconvenience for the divinity of the Son to anticipate the splendor of his glorious body even before his Resurrection.

[72] I mentioned divine freedom together with divine omnipotence. Jesus didn't transfigure himself because he needed to do it for himself (in the sense that he "needed to" transfigure himself in order to be God); rather, he does it *freely* for our sake (*quoad nos*), in order to encourage us to hope (*pro spe nostra*). First, God incarnate (*Deus in carne*) willed it (*uolebat*), then made it happen (*faciebat*). The most holy Flesh of the Incarnate Word doesn't "have to" await the Resurrection in order to show his *splendor diuinitatis* and doesn't have to suffer –in his Humanity– the *dormitio naturalis* before showing that *splendor*.

[73] "...non esse superbum si hoc et nos speremus, audite ipsum et nolite dubitare" (AU s 79/A,1, cit., 578). The fact that Augustine assures, on the one hand, hope in the transfigured Jesus, and on the other hand, the fact that the author echoes the voice' command in Mt 17,5 –with the addendum of clearing every doubt–, shows not only the pedagogical aspect of this detail of revealed truth, but all this also shows the moral implication of obeying (it's fitting to recall here the relationship between the verbs *audire* and *ob-audire*) and of trusting the Son. It's a call to faith.

[74] Cfr. Mt 13,37-42.

alluded to[75] were precisely the righteous ones who shall shine like the sun[76] in the same Kingdom of the Son of Man in the final day[77].

Augustine interprets the *uerba Petri* as a letting oneself be carried away (*dejarse llevar*) by the solace Peter found when he saw Jesus and Moses and Elijah[78]. By virtue of the things *quae Petrus nolebat*[79] and by virtue of the things *quae Petrus quaerebat*[80], Augustine sees that – explicitly (AU s[78]) and implicitly (AU *Sermones* 79,79/A), Peter would've divided the Law, the Prophets and Jesus, because there is in Peter a subjective attraction to an easy life. Hence the warning[81] to anyone who mistakenly judges

> "that thus must the Lord be accepted, [in other words,] like one [more] of the Prophets, He being the Lord of the Prophets"[82].

After calling the Transfiguration *magnum sacramentum*[83] (great

[75] Cfr. Mt 16,28.

[76] Cfr. Mt 13,43.

[77] This point is in harmony with Augustine's allusion to the righteous ones (AU s 78), when he completes the composition of the heavens that proclaim the divine glory, that's to day, the divine glory proclaimed by the entire cosmos. However, this detail on the righteous isn't found in AU s 79.

[78] This point is in harmony with Augustine's explanatio in AU s 78. Augustine, in AU s 79/A, maintaining the gist of the argument, varies the form, that is, the words he places in Peter's mouth while Peter affirms how good it is to be with Jesus, in Mt 17,4: "'Ut quid descendimus de monte perturbari et non eligimus hic laetari?'" (AU *s 79/A,2, Sant'Agostino. Discorsi II/1 sul Nuovo Testamento,* cit., 578). The words *taedium, solitudo* are used in *Sermones* 78 and 79/A.

[79] In *Sermones* 79/A and 79: the latter –as we have taken notice– uses *tumultus rerum humanum*, whereas the former uses *turbulentum genus humanum*.

[80] In *Sermones* 78 and 79/A: in the former, the object of Peter's joy are the *sancti amores et boni mores,* while in the latter, it is the *uita quieta, otiosa, beata.*

[81] Cfr. Mt 17,5.

[82] "...putarent sic esse Dominum accipiendum quasi unum de prophetis cum esset Dominus Prophetarum" (AU *s 79/A,2*, cit., 578). Here, the distinction Dominus – *serui uel ministri* en el *Ser.* 78 is evoked.

[83] AU *s 79/A,3, Sant'Agostino. Discorsi II/1 sul Nuovo Testamento,* cit., 578. Augustine respects the *Mysterium*. Moreover, there's a semantic change in the reference Augustine does to the Transfiguration: in Ser. 78, he used *uisio ista*, while in AU s 79, he used *uisio magna.*

mystery), Augustine adds to the conversation among Jesus, Moses and Elijah[84] an aspect of his exegetical method which can turn out to be orientative and important, since it alludes to the unity of the Scriptures[85]:

> "...when we present some [passage] of the Gospel before [you], we check (probamos) through the Law and the Prophets. Moses and Elijah speak with the Lord, but [they speak as his] ministers on both sides; he who reigns [is] in the middle"[86].

But here, in *Ser. 79/A*, there's a nominal change in order to refer to the dynamism between Jesus and Moses and Elijah: this change consists in the passage from the pair *Dominus – serui uel ministri* to the *pair Regnator – serui*[87].

After supporting himself in Saint Paul[88], Augustine clarifies that Jesus –in the middle of Moses and Elijah– possesses "the testimony

[84] Something which already arose in *Sermones* 78 y 79.

[85] However, it's not only that this detail of AU s 79/A *is in harmony* with the *unitas inter Legem, Prophetas et Euangelium,* affirmed in AU s 78, but that Augustine deepens on this topic of unity, since Augustine's advice on the hermeneutical aspect cited above implies *an expression of the function of the Gospel with respect to the Law and to the Prophets,* in the sense that what the Law and the Prophets start and proclaim is proven when one sees the Gospel as the fulfillment of the ancient promise and of the ancient prophecy.

[86] "Quando aliqua proponimus de Euangelio, probamus illud de Lege et Prophetis. Et loquuntur cum Domino Moyses et Helias, sed ministri a lateribus, in medio regnator" (AU *s 79/A,3,* cit., 578).

[87] The distinction is not so much a substantial chande of sense, as a change of nuance, since now, *Regnator* accentuates the Gospel's superiority above its servants, the Law and the Prophets. In contrast, *Dominus* accentuates more Jesus' divine character, and derived from this, the Gospel's sacred character.

[88] Rm 3,20-21: *"El conocimiento del pecado, dice, existe por medio de la Ley. Ahora, en cambio, la justicia de Dios (...) se ha manifestado con independencia de la Ley"* (SagBi 5, 907-908).

by the Law and the Prophets. In this time, the testimonies of the Law and of the Prophets are necessary"[89].

In summary, we gather the following from AU s *79/A*:

1. The coming Kingdom –to which are called Peter, James and John– is interpreted in the eschatological sense (end, natural death, resurrection).

2. The Transfiguration (*magnum sacramentum*), interpreted in the eschatological sense (*finis saeculi*), becomes an example –if not *the* example– of natural divine filiation, of the omnipotence and of the freedom of the incarnate Son – when the *mostratio* of the fulgency of his divinity takes place through the visible glorious aspect of the *carnis Iesu* before the Resurrection, and in particular, before the Passion. All this brings with it listening (*fides ex auditu*), a listening responded to (*ob-audire*) and the conquest of doubt (that is, *uiuere cum fide*, or listening and response to this listening). Moreover, Jesus' Transfiguration anticipates the *fulgor omnium membrorum (Corporis Christi)* in the *eschatón*.

3. The *uerba Petri* show a preference (*delectatio*) to being alone (*solitudo*) as well as to a life of solace, without worries, and beatific (*uita quieta, otiosa et beata*). The *colloquium* among Jesus, Moses and Elijah has to be seen as the conversation between the *Iesus Dominus et Regnator* and the *ministri – testimonia*. This relationship *Regnator–ministri* serves as the theological basis in reading the Gospel checking (*probando*) it from the Law and the Prophets, in

[89] "...testimonium habens a Lege et Prophetis. Hoc tempore necessaria sunt testimonia Legis et Prophetarum" (AU *s 79/A,3,* cit., 578). Here it harmonizes with the *utilitas et ualor Legis Prophetarumque* precisely in the Transfiguration (in AU s 78). Moreover, Augustine contrasts the need –at that moment– of the Law and the Prophets to give witness to the Lord, with the non-need of such witnessing in the resurrection of the flesh, because when the latter occurs, we shall already see Jesus Christ himself. Here we have the reason why the three Apostles see only Jesus in Mt 17,6.

the sense of seeing the Gospel as the fullness and the fulfillment of what the Law and the Prophets commenced and proclaimed[90].

Principal affirmations

There are three groups of topics which Augustine has pointed out in the *Sermones* 78, 79 y 79/A[91].

Dogmatic topics: Transfiguration, aspects of Christology, ecclesiology and eschatology

Augustine sees the *Transfiguration* as *uisio*[92], as *uisio magna*[93], as *sacramentum magnum*[94], which –for Angelo Corticelli– is the "central point of the idea of 'Mystical Body' in Augustine"[95].

The Christological aspects of Augustine's sermons on the Transfiguration are the axis of those sermons. Indeed, *Jesus Christ* is, for Augustine: 1) the *sol iustitiae* which illumines the soul[96]; 2) the Giver which is his same *Donum et Promissio*[97]; 3) who isn't only the *Verbum* latent in the Law and in the Prophets[98] –by which Moses

[90] In this sense, "Augustinus begriff, dass das ganze Alte Testament ein Weg zu Jesus Christus ist" (Benedikt XVI, *Die Kirchenväter,* cit., 192).

[91] The groupings don't, in any way, insinuate separation but only a distinction, since the entire picture of Augustine's view of the Transfiguration –with its details and repercussions for exegesis, dogma, morals and spirituality–, implies weaving together these aspects, once the distinction is done. There are some angles that can be enriched, in future studies, with other viewpoints (e.g. historical, philological, anthropological, etc.).

[92] Cfr. AU *s* 78,1.

[93] Cfr. AU *s* 79.

[94] Cfr. AU *s* 79/A,3.

[95] "...punto centrale dell'idea di 'Corpo Mistico' in Agostino" A. Corticelli, *Introduzione*, in R. Benedettine di S. Maria di Rosano–Minuti, (tr.), *Sant'Agostino, Esposizioni sui Salmi I*, in A. Trapè, osa (dir.), "Nuova Biblioteca Agostiniana" (Opere di Sant'Agostino, Parte III: Discorsi, Volume XXV), Città Nuova Editrice, 1967, xix.

[96] Cfr. AU s 78,2.

[97] When he gives himself to us as Way, Bread and Life.

[98] Cfr. AU *s* 78,3.

and Elijah appear together with Jesus– rather, Jesus is the *Dominus Regnatorque Legis Prophetarumque*[99]; 4) the *Only-begotten Son of the Father by nature*[100], whom man is to listen to, as commanded by the Father; 5) *God* –and therefore, with the omnipotence and the freedom proper to the divine nature– for whom the resplendent glorification of his Body even before his Resurrection[101] is possible; 6) The Gospel, as the *sensus plenior* and objetive[102] and the fullness[103] of the Law and the Prophets. The glory of the Gospel is Jesus' resplendent face[104].

Biblical topics: the unity of the Scriptures, the Gospel as the clavis lectionis of the OT

Here we find the counter-example of the separation-division between *the Law and the Prophets*, on the one hand, and Christ, on the other[105], as something opposed to the divine will (which is the unity between the Gospel and the Law and the Prophets[106], the reading of the Law and the Prophets in the light of the Gospel[107], and listening to Christ through the Law and the Prophets[108], although the Law and the Prophets aren't needed in the end of time[109]), a divine will Peter did not see[110].

The Church are the clothes that must cling always to Jesus[111],

[99] Cfr. AU s 79/A,2. Therefore, Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of God, shouldn't be considered parallel to Moses and Elijah.
[100] Not by adoption, like that of Moses and Elijah (cfr. AU s 78,4).
[101] Cfr. AU *s* 79/A,1.
[102] Cfr. AU *s* 78,2.
[103] Cfr. AU *s* 79/A,3.
[104] Cfr. AU *s* 79.
[105] Cfr. AU, *Sermones* 78,3; 79/A,2.
[106] Cfr. AU, *Sermones* 78,4; 79.
[107] Cfr. AU *s* 79/A.
[108] Cfr. AU *s* 78,4.
[109] Cfr. AU *s* 79/A,3.
[110] Cfr. AU *s* 79.
[111] Cfr. AU *s* 78,2.

who washes away the sins[112].

In the Παρουσια, the Church shall shine in her members with the fulgency of the face of her Head[113], when the dead all rise, an event prefigured in the prostration of the three Apostles on the ground, and their rising[114].

Moral and spiritual topics: the final reward, detachment, and above all, charity

Although the Father sends a cloud in order to correct Peter[115], the *final reward*, what's beyond the grave is implicitly communicated to Peter[116]. Therefore, Augustine reassures the validity of hope –of him who follow Christ– in the transformation of the risen body[117].

Augustine warns against an underhand easy-loving attitude, like that of Peter, as against the Son's generosity[118], without considering

[112] Cfr. AU *s* 79. The Church –comments Corticelli– "ha il suo fulcro di unità proprio nella Incarnazione, dove si fondono e il *mysterium* della azione salvifica di Dio, e la Chiesa manifestazione, la piú chiara, di questo misterio nella storia" (A. Corticelli, I*ntroduzione,* in R. Benedettine di S. Maria di Rosano–Minuti (tr.), *Sant'Agostino, Esposizioni sui Salmi I*, cit., xviii).

[113] Cfr. AU *s* 79/A,1. Corticelli explains: "Con l'immagine di Capo e Corpo presa pure da S. Paolo, Agostino specifica la superiorità dello Sposo che è origine di vita e di ogni bene per la sua Sposa. Agostino parte da una analogia che ci riallaccia al punto precedente. Nel corpo umano la testa possiede la pienezza di tutti i sensi, è un riassunto di quanto vi è nel corpo; cosí è di Cristo. Egli, il Cristo storico, è il prototipo non solo perché gli altri saranno figli di Dio in lui, ma anche perché ogni bene, ogni sviluppo, ogni attività e sofferenza della Chiesa, suo corpo, è già riassunta nella sua natura umana" [A. Corticelli, *Introduzione*, in Benedettine di S. Maria di Rosano–Minuti, Riccardo (tr.), *Sant'Agostino, Esposizioni sui Salmi I*, cit., xxii].

[114] Cfr. AU *s* 78,5.

[115] Cfr. AU *s* 79/A,2.

[116] Cfr. AU *s* 78,6. The reward not of something, but the Son himself, who shall present himself to the one loved by him and the Father (cfr. Id., *s* 78,5).

[117] Cfr. AU *s* 79/A,1.

[118] Cfr. AU *s* 78,5.

God as the Only One who can enrich[119]. Augustine recommends *detachment*, against avarice[120], and *charity* –the elegance of which are the white clothes of Jesus– as the Paradigm of generosity[121]. In AU s 78, Augustine insists so much on charity in its unselfish aspect, that it can be said that *charitas* is the pattern of the moral reading of the Transfiguration, on the theoretical and the practical levels[122].

Augustine –upon carrying out a magnificent exercise of his unique capacity to interweave rich teaching, -thus reaffirms Charles Kannengiesser statement, that Augustine's contribution to Patristic exegesis is "...a deliberate synthesis of late antique rhetorical culture with the biblical hermeneutics already elaborated over several centuries inside the church community"[123]. Augustine's exegesis "became an original contribution to biblical exegesis not so much by the imposition of a new theoretical frame as by the freshness and intensity of his inner inquiry"[124].

[119] Cfr. ibid.

[120] Cfr. AU s 78,6. Augustine preaches –Corticelli explains– against a "... sufficienza di chi vuole trovare solemente in sé la pienezza della felicità, disprezzo per tutto ció che suppone una obbedienza ad una legge estranea alla propria volontà" [A. Corticelli, *Introduzione*, in R. Benedettine di S. Maria di Rosano–Minuti (tr.), *Sant'Agostino, Esposizioni sui Salmi I*, cit., xvi–xvii].

[121] Cfr. AU *s* 78,6. The vera *charitas* rejects the subtle temptation of despising (=pejorative, not mystical, sense) temporal realities, a rejection signified by the subjective aspect of Peter's proposal (cfr. AU s 78,3), under the guise of liking to stay with Jesus in glory (like what Peter wanted), a temptation insofar as it brings with it a nuance of lack of generosity, and even a hint of avarice, because of the want to possess what which wasn't yet his (cfr. Id., *s* 78,6), and preferring the comfortable life (cfr. Id., *s* 79/A,2).

[122] Through love, we liken ourselves to the transfigured Jesus.

[123] C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1149.

7. Tractatus 54/A in Mt (Chromatius)

Chromatius Aquileiensis[1] (335/340-407[2]) writes CHRO *Mt*[3], among the 41 works attributed to him[4], works that "are partly based on preached homilies. They benefit from earlier commentaries on Matthew, those of Fortunatius, Chromatius's predecessor, and of Hilary of Poitiers, as well as from Ambrose's *Commentary on Luke*. They were written shortly after Jerome had published his own commentary on Matthew. Their purpose is deliberately pastoral"[5].

Chromace explains that Jesus has gone up the mountain with the three Apostles[6] in order to

> "reveal to these three followers of his the glory of his majesty in which he has to come in his Kingdom"[7],

---

1 He was bishop of his native town (Aquileia) and while still a priest, he particpated in a local council (381) [cfr. C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1088].

2 Ibid. Chromace was born probably in Aquileia. A priest from the year 368 to 373, he participated in a local council in 381, when he would've known Ambrose. Chromace succeeds his Bishop, Valerian. The last years of his episcopal ministry were marked by the invasion of Alaric (401-402), although Chromace – already a Bishop – s have always sought peace. Chromace was a friend of Ambrose, of Jerome and of Rufinus (cfr. R. Étaix – J. Lemarié, *Chromatii Aquileiensis Opera*, CCL 9A, 1974, vi).

3 In the Library of the St. Sylvester of Fabrianus monastery, there's an early 12th c. homiliary [Étaix and Lemarié recall that this is the "äge d'or des homiliaires, (...) au XI, XII et XIIIe siècles" (*Chromatii Aquileiensis Opera*, CCL 9A, 1974, xli] in Bologna and Ravenna. In this so-called Fabrianus homiliary, nine already known treatises of Chromace have been found, and other two unpublished treatises on Mt. One of these treatises deals with Jesus' Transfiguration. Étaix and Lemarié catalogue this writing as Tractatus LIV A. This has happened after the publication of volume 9A of CChr.SL, and so the recent findings about Chromace' works are published in a *Supplementum* of volume 9A.

4 Cfr. C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1093.

5 C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1089.

6 Cfr. Mt 17,1.

7 "...tribus istis discipulis suis maiestatis suae gloriam in qua uenturus in regnum est reuelare" (CHRO *Mt, 16,28-17,9, 1*, CChr.SL 9A, Suppl., 1977, 628).

> "according to the ancient custom"[8], that's to say, according to the Lord's apparition to Moses on mount Sinai, but with the novelty that in the event that's going to happen in the presence of the three Apostles, the Lord Jesus aims to show them that He "is the [one and only] author of one and the other testament"[9].

Chromace contrasts the aspect of Moses' *personal initiative* –of wanting to see the Lord's glory (and for whom the Lord's manifestation was exceptional[10])– with the *spontaneous* aspect of Jesus' invitation to the three Apostles to see his glory[11].

Chromace notes that the Lord, upon revealing to them the coming of his glory, does it

> "with the same habit, because he manifested himself back then to the holy Abraham, wanting to see his day (cfr. Jn 8,5612)"[13].

Chromace considers it necessary –because of the [three] Apostles' perfect faith[14]– for Jesus to let them know something

---

8 "...ex antiqua ac ueteri consuetudine fecit" (ibid.).

9 "...utriusque testamenti esse auctorem" (ibid.).

10 The Lord's latter revelation to Moses (in Jesus' Transfiguration) is prefigured by the back referred to by the Lord to Moses in Ex 33,23.

11 "Iamdudum Moyses, ut gloriam Domini uideret, diu multumque precatus est. Nunc autem apostoli sponte assumuntur, ut gloriam Domini speculentur. Et Moysi quidem diu roganti pro magno hoc praestitum est; apostolis autem non petentibus ultro a Domino concessum hoc modo est" (CHRO *Mt 16,28-17,9, 2*, CChr.SL 9A, Suppl., 1977, 628)]

12 "Abrahán, vuestro padre, se llenó de alegría porque iba a ver mi día; lo vio y se alegró" (SagBi 5, 628).

13 "...ipso habitu Dominus reuelaret, quia iamdudum sancto Abrahae cupienti diem suum uidere manifestauit" (CHRO *Mt 16,28-17,9, 2*, CChr.SL 9A, Suppl., 1977, 628).

14 "Post multa diuinae uirtutis signa, discipulis perfecta iam fide credentibus" (ibid.).

more than what the people saw. This "something more" arrives *aspectu diuinae maiestatis*[15].

Chromace repeats the comparison between God's apparition to Moses and his apparition to the three Apostles, in order to introduce the detail[16] of the *amount (cuantía)*[17] of the Lord's glory manifested to Moses and to the Apostles, which is,

> "not [in] as much as how much [glory there is] in that divine and invisible nature, but [in] how much [glory] their mortal eyes could bear"[18],

because if the Son of God weren't to clothe himself with human flesh when he incarnated, the clarity of the divinity of the *Sol iustitiae*[19] wouldn't be bearable. The immutable glory covered with the cloud of the human body –the human flesh which the *Sol iustitiae* accepted– didn't remain blinded (*ofuscada*); rather, the *gloria maiestatis Domini* (visible during the Transfiguration) shows through *vere sed suaviter* –so to speak– "in order to see the potency

---

[15] Ibid. However, neither the peoples (because of their weak and carnal eyes, which evoke the people which didn't wish the Lord to speak to them), nor even the three Apostles chosen by Jesus, could bear *Jesus' aspectus diuinae claritatis*.

[16] In passing, Chromace quotes ex corde: *"Mi espalda la podrás ver, pero mi rostro no se verá; porque ningún hombre verá mi rostro y seguir viviendo"*. The first part of this quote is from Ex 33,23: "Y tú podrás ver mi espalda; pero mi rostro no se puede ver" (SagBi 1, 435). The second part is from Ex 33,20: "pues ningún ser humano puede verlo y seguir viviendo" (ibid.).

[17] Not in the physical-mathematical sense but in the theological sense.

[18] "...non tanta quanta est in diuina illa atque inuisibili natura, sed quantam possent mortales adhuc oculi sustinere" (CHRO *Mt 16,28-17,9, 3*, CChr.SL 9A, Suppl., 1977, 629). That's to say, that when the Lord appeared to Moses, the Lord showed himself to Moses "non quantum Deus erat, sed quantum Moyses capere poterat" (ibid.). Moreover, Chromace gives an example: "...lumen (...) solis uidemus, ipsum autem fulgorem radiorum ferre non possumus" (ibid.).

[19] For those who believe in him, the Lord's voice in the OT is evoked: "Mas para vosotros, los que teméis mi Nombre, se elevará el sol de justicia, que trae la salud en sus alas" (Ml 3,20; SagBi 4, 1311-1312)].

of his divine clarity, by which his clothes, too, became white like the snow"[20].

Chromace speaks of the *uerba Petri* as the fruit of the desire to enjoy the glory seen (*cupiditate uisae gloriae delectatus est*[21]), a

> "pious impatience (*religiosa impatientia*) and an unbridled hurrying (*festinatio nimis*)"[22], and as *tanta ignorantia*[23]. Thus, Peter doesn't receive any response from Jesus.

Chromace observes that in Jesus' Transfiguration, there are five human witnesses, since the Lord established that from all the places[24] there be a witness of Jesus' Transfiguration, *tamquam ad ius publicum*[25]:

> "...from heaven, the Father is the witness in his voice; from earth, the three Apostles have been chosen; from the netherworld, Moses, too, has been called to give testimony, because Moses has suffered death. And so that no place would remain without a witness to the Lord, Elijah, too, is brought as a witness from paradise"[26].

---

[20] "...ut diuinae claritatis eius potentia ostenderetur, per quam etiam uestimenta ipsius candida in similitudine niuis effecta sunt" (CHRO *Mt 16,28-17,9, 3*, CChr.SL 9A, Suppl., 1977, 629-630).

[21] CHRO *Mt 16,28-17,9, 4*, CChr.SL 9A, Suppl., 1977, 630.

[22] "O quam religiosa impatientia et festinatio nimis propera!" (ibid.).

[23] Ibid. Peter didn't realise that he was proposes to pitch a tent there "Filio Dei (...), qui in caelo in throno gloriae cum Patre regnabat" (ibid.). Moreover, Peter didn't know that he couldn't yet reign with the Lord, "...oportebat etenim illum ante pati pro Christo, et sic ad promissam gloriam peruenire" (ibid.).

[24] Heaven, earth, the netherworld, paradise: where the Lord comes and where he'll go to.

[25] CHRO *Mt 16,28-17,9, 5,* CChr.SL 9A, Suppl., 1977, 631.

[26] "De caelo in uoce sua Pater testis est; de terra tres apostoli eliguntur; ab inferis quoque Moyses ad testimonium uocatur, quia Moyses morte functus est. Et ne ullus locus a testimonio Domini uacaret, etiam Helias de paradiso testis adducitur" (ibid.).

Even still,

> "the Lord – who came down from heaven, and [who] had to suffer in the world, and [who] had to descend to the netherworld, and from there [he] had to head to paradise, – necessarily had to have witnesses from all places, on the earth, and in the netherworld, and in paradise. Because the Apostles preached to the world; Moses announced to the netherworld; the Father received in heaven the Son who returned with the triumph of victory"[27].

The five-fold testimony prepares the Father's revelation about the Son: "suitable witnesses presented, who would show as listeners that the Father was going to give testimony about his Son, heir of history"[28].

Chromace says that the Father's message[29] implies more than what might seem at first glance, because it's

[27] "Dominus qui de caelo descendit, et in mundo passurus erat et ad inferna descensurus et inde ad paradisum missurus, necessario ubique et in terra et in inferno et in paradiso testes habere debuit. Apostoli enim mundo praedicauerunt; Moyses inferis nuntiauit; Pater in caelo Filium cum triumpho uictoriae redeuntem recepit" (ibid.). In order to guarantee the truth of the Transfiguration-event, the Lord didn't make use of only one witness, nor even only of three, but of five human witnesses.

[28] "...testes (...) ea quae Pater de Filio suo herede totius saeculi testabatur, idonei testes adhibiti audientes signarent" (CHRO *Mt 16,28-17,9, 5*, CChr.SL 9A, Suppl., 1977, 631). It's as if Chromace were to say that the Father's words shouldn't be understood "as one more testimony among many", but that the other testimonies would proclaim about and would culminate in the Father's testimony.

[29] Cfr. *Mt 17,5.*

> "as if [the Father] were to say [about the Son]: 'This is who I have begotten'"[30].

Seeing side by side two pericopes (one from the NT and another from the OT), Mt 17,5 points out that, when calling only "son", it means that the person referred to is a son of God by choice or by adoption:

> "In contrast, in bearing witness that [he] is *his*[31] Son, [the Father] bears witness to the propriety and the truth of [his divine] nature"[32].

Towards Israel, the Lord hasn't affirmed any *natural* paternity; rather, it was a paternity by choice[33]. Chromace concludes that the Son should be listened to because *only the Son has been begotten by the Father*[34].

Chromace speaks about what the Son admits about himself[35], and explains that Jesus says that he has come from the Father "in

---

[30] "...tamquam dixisset: 'Hic est quem ego genui'" (CHRO Mt 16,28-17,9, 6, CChr. SL 9A, Suppl., 1977, 631). The Father has willed to communicate that Jesus of Nazareth "et uerum et proprium Filium suum esse testatus est, non adoptione, non gratia, non creatione, sed proprietate, sed ueritate, sed natura" (ibid.). In order to illustrate *the uniqueness of Jesus' divine filiation*, because it is a divine filiation *vera simul naturalis,* Chromace contrasts the expression grammatically in singular (*filiación divina natural*) in Mt 17,5 against the expression in plural – which designates the children by adoption (*adoptive divine filiation*) in two OT passages: Is 1,2 (referred to the children) and Ex 4,22 (referred to Israel).

[31] Translator's note: emphasis mine.

[32] "In hoc autem quod Filium suum esse testatur, proprietatem et ueritatem naturae profitetur" (CHRO *Mt 16,28-17,9, 6*, CChr.SL 9A, Suppl., 1977, 632).

[33] "Porque Yo soy padre para Israel, y Efraím es mi primogénito" (Jr 17,5; SagBi 4, 462).

[34] Before the testimony of the Father himself in the presence of five other witnesses about the uniqueness of his Son's filiation, Chromace shoots the question to the heretics: "Quis hic haereticis locus est? Quae occasio blasphemiae derelicta?" (CHRO *Mt 16,28-17,9, 6*, CChr.SL 9A, Suppl., 1977, 632).

[35] For this, Chromace cites: "Yo salí de Dios. Salí del Padre y vine al mundo" (cfr. Jn 16,27-28; SagBi 5, 674).

order to show us the mystery of his divine nativity"[36]. A bit further on, Chromace exclaims:

> "But, why has he [the Son] testified that He 'has come' (*ha salido*) rather than 'has been born' (*ha nacido*), but to show that his bodily and passible nativity was from the Father?"[37].

Chromace himself replies:

> "[It's] because the Father hasn't begotten the Son due to some detriment of his nature, though he has begotten him [the Son] of himself [of the Father], but that the incorporeal Father begot an incorporeal Son"[38].

Chromace observes that God's voice[39] "...has been feared not only [by] the Apostles, but also [by] the Angels"[40]. The fear of the three Apostles[41] is explicable considering that

> "...the Lord commands the disciples to recognize on their own that [it was] the Father [who] had spoken, and their fear revived by the saving presence of his dignity"[42].

---

[36] "...ut diuinae natiuitatis suae nobis sacramentum ostenderet" (CHRO *Mt 16,28-17,9, 7,* CChr.SL 9A, Suppl., 1977, 632).

[37] "Sed cur exisse se potius quam natum esse testatus est, nisi ut corporalem et passibilem natiuitatem suam de Patre fuisse monstraret?" (ibid.).

[38] "Non enim aliquo detrimento naturae suae Pater filium genuit, licet de se genuerit, sed impassibili generatione incorporeus Pater incorporeum Filium protulit" (ibid.). Hence, Chromace uses another word to designate the second Person of the Most Blessed Trinity (*Verbum*), which implies not having any other origin but God, and that of being begotten impassible from the Father.

[39] Cfr. Mt 17,5.

[40] "...uocem ad quam non solum apostolos, sed et angelos temuisse non dubium est" (CHRO *Mt 16,28-17,9, 8,* CChr.SL 9A, Suppl., 1977, 632-633).

[41] Cfr. Mt 17,6.

[42] "Dominus discipulos iubet, ut ex se de quo Pater fuerat locutus agnoscerent, et timorem ipsorum dignationis suae salutari praesentia confoueret" (CHRO *Mt 16,28-17,9, 8*, CChr.SL 9A, Suppl., 1977, 632-633). Moreover, "...surgere Dominus discipulos iubet, ut ex se de quo Pater fuerat locutus agnoscerent, et timorem ipsorum dignationis suae salutari praesentia confoueret" (Id., cit., 633). If the Lord were not to comfort them (cfr. Mt 17,6), the three Apostles would die of shock. Meanwhile, Chromace points out the contrast between the fear experienced by the three Apostles, and the temerity of the heretics who don't believe in the Father's testimony about the Son, and that "non contremescunt litteras religionis" (CHRO *Mt, 16,28-17,9, 8*, CChr.SL 9A, Suppl., 1977, 633).

Chromace interprets Jesus' prohibition[43] by the inconvenience of announing the Transfiguration-event before Jesus' Passion comes to be.

Reading the Transfiguration narrative *spiritaliter*, Chromace widens the scope of those implied, and he includes Christians, Jews, and heretics[44], explaining that

"no one could see the Son of God who comes in his Kingdom but those whom the Lord chose for the Kingdom, through the merit of their faith"[45].

Chromace sees the six ages in the six days[46]. The mountain of the Transfiguration

"is the [proto]type of the celestial Kingdom, in which all the saints and righteous will reign with Christ"[47].

---

[43] Mt 17,9.

[44] Cfr. Mt 16,28.

[45] "Filium Dei uenientem in regno suo uidere non poterant, nisi quos fidei suae merito elegerit Dominus ad regnum" (CHRO *Mt, 16,28-17,9, 9*, CChr.SL 9A, Suppl., 1977, 633).

[46] Cfr. Mt 17,1; "...quia completis sex milibus annis Filius Dei uenturus in gloria est; iam non in humilitate carnis ut iamdudum ad passionem, sed in gloria maiestatis ad regnum" (CHRO *Mt, 16,28-17,9, 9*, CChr.SL 9A, Suppl., 1977, 633). Then, Chromace again glosses the number six, when he says that the three Apostles prefigure the saints "...quos Filius Dei, completis, ut diximus, sex milibus annis, assumpturus ad regnum est in monte excelso, id est in summitate caelorum" (Id., cit., 634). Chromace mentions that the OT Law "iamdudum lex pridie sabbati, id est die sexto, escas populum praeparare praeceperat, ut possint securi in sabbato requiescere" (ibid.). Cromacio hace una consideración espiritual de que "in hac praesenti vita, in qua sex milia anni putantur, opera fidei, pietatis et misericordiae, tamquam escas necessarias nobis praeparemus, ut in die sabbati, id est in regno futuro, in quo uera, aeterna sabbati requies est, securitatem et requiem uitae perpetuae habere possimus" (ibid.).

[47] "...habet typum regni caelestis, in quo omnes sancti et iusti cum Christo regnabunt"(CHRO *Mt 16,28-17,9, 9,* CChr.SL 9A, Suppl., 1977, 633). Peter, James and John prefigure all the saints among Noah's children.

The Jewish *Shabbat* becomes –for Chromace– a figure of the eternal, eschatological rest in the Kingdom[48].

For Chromace, Jesus' Transfiguration is

> "the similarity of that unspeakable and unheard of glory, in which the Son of God reigns with the Father in the heavens"[49].

For Chromace, the clothes of the transfigured Jesus are "the figure of the Lord's flesh, which transformed into the glory of his divinity through the resurrection"[50]. That's to say, that "this snow-like shine pertains to the glory of the divinity"[51].

Chromace sees that

> "the one and only and same glory of the divinity of the Father and of the Son is openly declared to us, since what has been said of the Father, that itself has been also said of the Son"[52].

---

[48] Cfr. ibid.

[49] "...similitudinem gloriae illius inenarrabilis et inauditae, in qua Filius Dei regnat cum Patre in caelis" (CHRO *Mt, 16,28-17,9, 10*, CChr.SL 9A, Suppl., 1977, 634).

[50] "...figuram dominicae carnis, quam per resurrectionem in diuinitatis suae gloriam transformauit" (ibid.).

[51] "...hanc niuis candorem ad diuinitatis gloriam pertinere" (ibid.). In order to base his affirmation on the Scriptures, Chromace mentions the vision in Dn 7,9-10 (where the Ancient of days appears) with the clothing white as snow and with the hair white as wool. Chromace links this vision of Daniel to the similar vision of John in Ap 1,14.

[52] "...manifeste nobis una et indifferens Patris et Filii diuinitatis gloria declaratur, dum quae de Patre dicta sunt, eadem et de Filio relata esse cognoscimus" (ibid.).

Chromace considers that the *colloquium* between Jesus, Moses and Elijah, (the latter two=the Law and the Prophets) on the topic of Jesus' death (*excessus*) in Jerusalem[53].

Chromace interprets the tents which Peter proposed to pitch[54] by recurring to the *maiores*[55], which is a "unique case in the *Tractatus*"[56]. Chromace connects the *mansiones*[57] with the said tradition: "...when [the Lord] speaks of "many", [he refers to] the diversity of the merits"[58] of those who, "when the cosmos is renewed– will reign on earth"[59].

---

[53] Chromace explains that Moses and Elijah "accusatores erunt populi illius increduli Israhel, qui neque Moysi, neque prophetis de Filio Dei credere uoluerunt" (ibid.). Chromace relates the accusation on the part of the Law and of the Prophets with Jesus' words to the Jews: *"Si creyeseis a Moisés, tal vez me creeríais a mí, pues él escribió de mí. Pero si no creéis en sus escritos, ¿cómo vais a creer en mis palabras?" (Jn 5,46-47; SagBi 5, 601). And: "Examinad las Escrituras, ya que vosotros pensáis tener en ellas la vida eterna: ellas son las que dan testimonio de mí"* (Jn 5,39; SagBi 5, 600).

[54] Cfr. Mt 17,4.

[55] "...tres mansiones, id est caeli, paradisi et terrae significatas maiores intellexerunt, quae uniuersis credentibus tam per Moysen, id est per legem, tam etiam per Heliam, id est per prophetas, quam etiam per ipsum Dominum, id est per euangelicam praedicationem, pro qualitate meritorum a Domino repromissae sunt" (CHRO *Mt, 16,28-17,9, 10,* CChr.SL 9A, Suppl., 1977, 635).

[56] "...cas unique dans les *Tractatus*" J. Lemarié – R. Étaix (cura et studio), *Spicilegium ad Chromatii Aquileiensis opera,* CChr.SL 9A Suppl., 1977, 635, note to lines 285-301). Afterwards, Lemarié and Étaix add that "... sans se référer a des *maiores*, Grégoire d'Elvire donne exactement la même interprétation de l'arche *tricamerata*. Il cite également Jean 14,2, Isaïe 40,31 et Matthieu 13,8, donnant à ce dernier texte un assez long développement (*De arca Noe*, 15-20; CCL 69, 151-152). Chromace, comme Grégoire d'Elvire, dépend donc certainement d'une source qui avait constitué ce petit dossier scripturaire" (ibid.).

[57] Cfr. Jn 14,2.

[58] "Cum dicit multas, ostendit diuersitatem meritorum" (CHRO *Mt, 16,28-17,9, 10,* CChr.SL 9A, Suppl., 1977, 635). Chromace alludes to the condition of those who will reign with the Son of Man when Chromace quotes the prophet: *"...caminarán y no tendrán hambre"* (Is 40,31) (caminan y no se cansan) (SagBi 4, 197).

[59] "...in terra, renouato mundo, regnabunt" (CHRO *Mt, 16,28-17,9, 10,* CChr. SL 9A, Suppl., 1977, 635).

Jesus doesn't respond to the *uerba Petri* since –Chromace observes– Peter was in a hurry, wanting to reign with Jesus before the Passion, before the time of the Kingdom[60].

Chromace sees the Church and the Second Coming behind the column of *cloud*[61], "because all the believers in Christ had to be covered with this celestial cloud and spiritual grace"[62].

For Chromace, the voice[63] confirms "the NT, by which the Father manifests his Son to the human race, and declares that He, already ceasing the Law and the Prophets, must be listened to"[64].

Chromace established a circularity between the Father–Son revelation[65].

Chromace says

> "that not only the Law and the Prophecy[66], but also the Gospel preaching, agree in union one and the other in a single matter [one testimony alone] and they aren't separated for anything from the promise of celestial grace"[67].

---

60 "...quia necdum regni tempus aduenerat" (CHRO *Mt, 16,28-17,9, 11*, CChr. SL 9A, Suppl., 1977, 635); cfr. Mt 16,28.

61 Cfr. Mt 17,5.

62 "...quia omnes credentes in Christo essent hac nube caelesti et spiritali gratia obumbrandi" (CHRO *Mt, 16,28-17,9, 11,* CChr.SL 9A, Suppl., 1977, 635). The cloud also signifies the *praedicatio euangelica* (cfr. ibid.).

63 Cfr. Mt 17,5.

64 "...per quod Pater Filium suum humano generi manifestat, et eum, cessante iam lege ac prophetis, audiendum esse declarat" (CHRO *Mt, 16,28-17,9, 11*, CChr.SL 9A, Suppl., 1977, 635-636).

65 "Dominus legis ac prophetarum est, quem Pater humano generi uoluit manifestare, quia et Filius Patrem omnibus manifestauit" (Id., cit., 636). Afterwards, Chromace cites Jesus' words of having shown the Father to men (cfr. Jn 17,6).

66 Mt 17,4-5.

67 "...quia non solum lex et prophetia, sed et euangelica praedicatio in unum sibi coniuncta cohaerent, nec in aliquo a promissione caelestis gratiae separantur" (CHRO *Mt, 16,28-17,9, 11*, CChr.SL 9A, Suppl., 1977, 635-636).

An allusion to the *unitas* between the OT and the NT concludes the treatise. This unity

> "agrees with and fits within it the preaching of the OT and of the NT in everything so much so, that it [the unity] cannot be separated in any way; since the author of one and another Testament is the Only-begotten Son of God, who is God blessed for ever"[68].

Principal affirmations

Literal reading:

Jesus' ascent together with the three Apostles to the mountain of the Transfiguration evokes the ancient custom (even with the same habit) of the theophany on mount Sinai, with the novelty that in the Transfiguration, Jesus shows himself as the author of the OT and of the NT. It's a "plus" participated in by the three Apostoles, not by everybody, it's seeing an aspect of Jesus' divinity, not all his glory, but the glory insofar as the physical eyes can bear [the glory]. Thanks to Jesus' body, not all his glory is manifested.

Peter's proposal is a fruit of his joy, a pious impatience with a bit of ignorance. Hence, Jesus' silence. Witnesses from heaven and earth shall give testimony of the historical event of the Transfiguration.

The voice' message implies that the *natural* Son is the Begotten of the Father, with the proper and true divine nature. One must

[68] "Ita (...) sibi tam ueteris quam noui testamenti praedicatio in omnibus concordat et conuenit, ut separari omnino non possit; cuius tamen utriusque testamenti auctor unigenitus Dei Filius est, qui est benedictus Deus in saecula" (ibid.).

listen to the Son because only the Son came from the Father. The Son himself bears witness to his divine coming from. The Apostles' prostration was for realizing of being in the presence of God himself.

Spiritual reading:

Although everybody's invited to the Kingdom, only the chosen ones see the Son of Man. The mountain of the Transfiguration prefigures the Kingdom. The six days tipify the ages of creation. The Transfiguration anticipates the inexplicable glory. The resplendent clothing of Jesus transfigured evoke the glory of his Body. The tents proposed by Peter correspond to heaven, paradise and earth. Peter was hurrying to be with Jesus in the Kingdom, and so he offered to pitch tents. The Church has to be covered by the cloud of grace. The unity of the Scriptures is rooted in that they have the one and the same author: the Son.

8. Homilia 51 (Leo Magnus)

The sermons and letters of **Leo I** (Leo Magnus) (+461[1]) are the treasures he bequeaths us[2], where he "shows little consciousness of specific hermeneutical concerns. He mentions scripture only for the purpose of quoting it, (…) but his use of the Bible exemplifies a highly significant emergence of the Roman pontiff's self-awareness"[3], such that, "tacitly, Leo embodies the *auctoritas* of Scripture as he quotes it by affirming himself as Peter *redivivus*"[4].

1 Kannengiesser, C. (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1287. León "occupied an important position inside the papal administration for at least a decade before entering the pontifical office. A man of strong affirmation, he identified himself with his ecclesial mission (…). He established the supremacy of the Roman See in the West at a crucial time when the Empire was collapsing. His interventions in the East (*Tomus ad Flavianum*; Council of Chalcedon 451, his letters concerning the monks of Palestine, 452-454, the ecclesiastical peace in Egypt 457-458), as well as his negotiation with Attila, 452, and his world-wide epistolary activity gave his ministry a universal dimension" (ibid.).

2 "Sermons and letters are Leo's literary legacy" (ibid.), because –according to the illustrious Benedictine Basil Studer – "by their refined style, rhythmic prose, purity of language, conscience of expression and clarity of thought. Few writers of that time excelled like Leo in his domination of Latin rhetoric and his achievement of such a perfect concordance between content and form. This ability to express in a Roman fashion the Christian themes dearest to him is a characteristic of Leo. In Leo, Roman genius was united with the Christian spirit in a truly singular manner (Studer, 595)" (ibid.).

3 C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1288.

4 W. Ullmann, E. Quiter (ibid.).

While composing LEO s 51[5] (Lent, 445[6]), the author thinks of defending the faith against the heretics[7], and starts the *Sermo* 51 by tracing the *iter nuntii*[8].

Jesus Christ, the *Saluator humani generis*, resurrects the righteous (to everlasting life) and the wicked (to judgment)[9], and teaches that he is –at the same time– the *Unigenitus Dei* and the

[5] Antoine Chavasse says that LEO s 51 about the Transfiguration "contiene un assez long développement consacré à la confession de Pierre et aux privilèges que en one découlé, développement qui a fourni au Tome de 449 une partie de son texte" [A. Chavasse (recensuit), *Sancti Leonis Magni, Romani Pontificis Tractatus septem et nonaginta*, CChr.SL 138, 1973, clxxxi]. Thus, Sermo 51 elongs to the first collection, during the five years of Leo's pontificate. Moreover, Leo "l'a utilisée [LEO s 51] quand il rédigeait le Tome à Flavien (449) et il en a reproduit textuellement cinq lignes" [Id. (recensuit), *Sancti Leonis Magni, Romani Pontificis Tractatus septem et nonaginta,* CChr.SL 138A, 1973, 295].

[6] Elena Cavalcanti dates this sermon in "la seconda domenica di quaresima, nella messa che concludeva la veglia notturna nella notte del sabato; ed è datato, con qualche margine di incertezza, all'anno 445" [*Il Sermone di Leone Magno sulla Trasfigurazione*, en Chialà–Cremaschi–Mainardi (eds.), "Il Cristo Trasfigurato nella tradizione spirituale ortodossa (Atti del XV Convegno ecumenico internazionale di spiritualità ortodossa; Bose 16-19 settembre 2007)", Edizioni Qiqajon (collana Spiritualità Orientale), 2008, 185].

[7] Dom Réne Dolle, a monk from Clairvaux, describes Leo's three doctrinal foes: "Pour les Manichéens, en effet, la matière étant intrinsèquement mauvaise, Dieu n'avait pu s'unir à elle: le corps du Christ n'était qu'une apparence et sa Passion qu'une feinte. Pour les Apollinaristes, l'homme en Jésus était incomplet, sans âme, la divinité du Verbe en tenant lieu: on pouvait donc soutenir que celle-ci avait souffert dans la Passion. Enfin les Eutychiens, renouvelant, selon l'expression de l'évêque Flavien, l'erreur d'Apollinaire, n'admettaient plus qu'une nature dans le Christ après l'Incarnation, nature sur laquelle Eutychès lui-même, se couvran, sans le comprendre, de saint Cyrille d'Alexandrie, ne s'est pas expliqué clairement: ici encore, cette nature divino-humaine aurait souffert dans la Passion. A cette anarche doctrinale de l'Orient, saint Léon opposait la fermeté de la foi romaine, dont il serait le témoin et l'interprète. En face des tentatives d'explication humaine, il affirmait la rigueur et la transcendance du mystère" (R. Dolle, Léon le Grand, Sermons, tome III, SC 74, 9).

[8] From the ears (*aures*), through the *auditus interior*, up to the *intellegentia* of the *magnum sacramentum* (cfr. LEO s 51,1, CChr.SL 138A, 296).

[9] Cfr. 1 S 2,6.

Filius hominis, through the *doctrina* and the *miracula*[10]. Believing in Jesus Christ as the (natural) Only-Begotten Son of the Father and, *at the same time*, as the Son of Man, gains more importance[11], "because just as in God there was true human [nature], so too there was true divinity in man"[12].

The heart of Leonine Christology affirms two natures in Christ and his character as Mediator, with a soteriological function; the importance of the passage from LEO s 51 is even testified to by the fact that it is retaken in the document *Tomus ad Flauianum*"[13]. Thus, –on the level of the *corpus leonianum*– LEO s 51, "with its character as a unique liturgical piece in the body of Leo's sermons, is placed among the most important of the pre-Chalcedonian period"[14].

[10] Cfr. LEO *s 51, 1,* CChr.SL 138 A, 296.

[11] "Nam unum horum sine alio non proderat ad salutem" (LEO *s 51, 1,* CChr. SL 138 A, 296).

[12] "...quia sicut Deo uera humanitas, ita homini inerat uera diuinitas" (Id., cit., 297). Here, Cavalcanti observes "...la stringata formula cristologia è resa sonante dai parallelismi contrastanti in posizione chiastica *(aut Deum sine homine / aut sine Deo hominem; sicut Deo uera humanitas / ita homini uera diuinitas),* dall'allitterazione dei termini opposti *(humanitas / diuinitas)* e dal ritmo solenne della clausola lenta che scandisce la conclusione del periodo *(sicut Deo uera humanitas / ita homini inerat uera diuinitas)"* (E. Cavalcanti, *Il Sermone di Leone Magno sulla Trasfigurazione,* cit., 187).

[13] "...ci porta al cuore della cristologia leonina, con l'affermazione delle due nature in Cristo, in funzione soteriologica; l'importanza del passo inoltre è testimoniata dal fatto che viene ripreso alla lettera del *Tomus ad Flavianum*" (ibid.). In the *Tomus ad Flauianum*, Leo indicates: "Quia unum horum sine alio receptum non proderat ad salutem, et aequalis erat periculi Dominum Iesum Christum aut Deum tantummodo sine homine aut sine Deo solum hominem credidisse" [(*Tomus ad Flauianum*, by C. Silva–Tarouca, Pontificia università gregoriana, Roma 1932,20–33; cfr. vv. 141-142); cfr. E. Cavalcanti, I*l Sermone di Leone Magno sulla Trasfigurazione,* cit., 187-188, note 9].

[14] "...con il suo carattere di pezzo unico liturgico nel corpus dei sermoni di Leone, si colloca tra i più importanti del periodo precalcedoniano di esso" (Id., cit., 188).

In order to inculcate in Jesus' followers the importance of affirming his humanity as well as his divinity, Leo goes back to the scene of Peter's confession of faith[15], by which the faith of who would be the Head of the Apostles was rewarded by God.

Leo says that the sublimity of Peter's intelligence (*celsitudo intellegentiae*[16]) is guided –by Jesus transfigured– with regards to Jesus' *inferioris substantiae sacramentum*[17] –that's to say, his *Humanitas*– lest Peter's faith errs after having been "elevated to the glory of confessing the Deity, [and thus mistakenly] judge unfitting and unworthy of the impassible God our weakness that he had assumed, nor to believe that human nature is already glorified in him, that at this point [human nature] can't be affected by torture, nor be dissolved by death"[18]. Jesus will never lose the glory of his power (*gloria potestatis*[19]), whatever happens, even though they crucify him, even though Jesus dies on the Cross[20].

There's a danger of Peter's underestimating Jesus' humanity, upon being revealed to him Jesus' divinity[21]. Leo refreshes the

---

[15] Cfr. Mt 16,16, where Peter, "corporea superans et humana trascendens, uidit mentis oculis Filium Dei uiui et confessus est gloriam Deitatis, quia non ad solam respexit substantiam carnis et sanguinis" (LEO s *51, 1*, CChr.SL 138 A, 297).

[16] LEO *s 51, 2*, CChr.SL 138A, 297.

[17] Ibid.

[18] "...ne apostolica fides ad gloriam confitendae in Christo Deitatis euecta, infirmitatis nostrae receptionem indignam inpassibili Deo atque incongruam iudicaret, et ita iam in ipso humanam crederet glorificatam esse naturam, ut nec supplicio posset adfici, nec morti dissolui" (LEO *s 51, 2*, CChr.SL 138A, 297).

[19] Id., cit., 298.

[20] From our present time, the events of Jesus' Passion, Death and Resurrection can seem like a given, but it wasn't so fast and humanly assumable for the Apostles themselves –especially for Peter– because Jesus was speaking of his imminent Passion just after Peter's confession of faith, after Peter experienced euphoria because of the revelation received from the Father about the Son.

[21] Mt 16,17.

scenes after the Peter's confession of faith, when Jesus predicts his Passion[22], something which disturbs Peter, who addresses Jesus who, in turn, rebukes Peter. Peter's confusion, for Leo, serves as the *starting point* in order to speak of the divine pedagogy to the Apostles in the Transfiguration narrative[23].

Let's remember that Jesus' Transfiguration is, in turn, only "a few steps away" –so to speak– from his Passion; however, it's not a mere temporal or chronological juxtaposition of events; rather, the proximity of the two events is intentional. And so, the Lord invites the three Apostles to go up the mountain with him[24],

> "...since the Apostles still have to conceived wholeheartedly this strong and blessed constancy, and so they might not tremble [even] a bit, even at the sight of the roughness of having to carry the Cross; [it's because] they [still] lack shamelessness even in the face of Christ's torture; not being ashamed of him [Christ], this patience with which he had to give himself to the rigor of the Passion without losing the glory of [his] lordship"[25].

On the mountain, Jesus shows the *claritas gloriae suae*[26]. This detail acquires more importance when Leo says:

---

[22] Cfr. Mt 16,21.

[23] It's as if Leo were to say: Peter has already confessed Jesus' divine filiation, okay; but now he has to be instructed by Jesus in affirming at the same time his Divinity and his Humanity –through the voice and the vision of the Transfiguration, respectively– in view of Jesus' imminent Passion. He needs more teaching from God, "una luce ancor più vigorosa per accettare la realtà della natura umana passibile" (E. Cavalcanti, *Il Sermone di Leone Magno sulla Trasfigurazione*, cit., 188).

[24] Cfr. Mt 17,1.

[25] "Vt ergo istam felicis constantiae fortitudinem, toto apostoli corde conciperent, et nihil de suscipiendae crucis asperitate trepidarent, ut de supplicio Christi non erubescerent, nec pudendam sibi eam patientiam crederent, quae sic subitura erat saeuitiam passionis, ut non amitteret gloriam potestatis" (LEO *s 51, 2*, CChr.SL 138A, 298).

[26] Cfr. Mt 17,2.

> "because, although they had an intuition of God's majesty in him, however, they didn't know the power of the body with which the Divinity was covered"[27].

Here, there are at least three elements that deserve to be mentioned: the Apostles' intuition of the *maiestas Dei*; the Apostles' ignorance of the *potentia corporis Iesu*, and the Apostles' ignorance of the Divinity covered by Jesus' human body.

Hence the importance[28] of the *regia claritas* of the Son of Man,

> "who pertained in a special way to the human nature assumed [by the Word], [and that he] wanted to be visible to these three men"[29].

Nonetheless, that *regia claritas* has been seen, something not so easy for the mortal eye,

> "...since the ineffable and inaccessible *vision* of the divintiy itself, [a vision] reserved for *the clean of heart* for everlasting life, the [beings] still wrapped by mortal flesh couldn't know it by intuition, nor see it"[30],

unless God wills the vision to be seen. Leo clarifies that this *glory* is shown to the Apostles when Jesus

---

[27] "...quia licet intellexissent in eo maiestatem Dei, ipsius tamen corporis, quo Diuinitas tegebatur, potentiam nesciebant" (LEO *s 51, 2*, CChr.SL 138A, 298).

[28] La misma Cavalcanti explica: "...l'elemento principale, che caratterizza questo ricco intreccio esegetico, è l'identificazione del regno del Figlio dell'uomo con 'il regale splendore dell'umanità assunta'" (E. Cavalcanti, *Il Sermone di Leone Magno sulla Trasfigurazione*, cit., 189).

[29] "...quam specialiter ad naturam suscepti hominis pertinentem, his tribus uiris uoluit esse conspicuam" (LEO *s 51, 2*, CChr.SL 138A, 298).

[30] "Nam illam ipsius Deitatis ineffabilem et inaccessibilem uisionem, quae in aeternam uitam *mundis corde* seruatur, nullo modo mortali adhuc carne circumdati intueri poterant et uidere" (ibid.).

> "glorifies that bodily form common to other [human beings] with so much splendor"[31],

that Jesus' face becomes resplendent like the sun itself, and his clothing are as white as the snow[32].

Jesus' Transfiguration happens for the good of the three Apostles (in order to prevent scandal and to protect the faith of those who follow Jesus[33]) and for the good of the Church (as it serves as a reason for eschatological hope[34]).

In order to show the three Apostles faith and knowledge[35], Moses and Elijah

> "appeared speaking with the Lord[36], in order that [the Transfiguration] might be fulfilled very truly in that presence of five men"[37],

---

[31] "...communem illam cum caeteris corporis formam tanto splendore clarificat" (LEO s 51, 3, CChr.SL 138A, 298).

[32] Cfr. Mt 17,2.

[33] "...principaliter agebatur, ut de cordibus apostolorum crucis scandalum tolleretur, nec conturbaret eorum fidem uoluntariae humilitas passionis, quibus reuelata esset absconditae excellentia dignitatis" (LEO *s 51, 3,* CChr. SL 138A, 298-299).

[34] "...ut totum Christi corpus agnosceret quali esset commutatione donandum, et eius sibi honoris consortium membra promitterent, qui in capite praefulsisset" (LEO *s 51, 3,* CChr.SL 138A, 299). Then, Leo quotes Our Lord *["Entonces los justos resplandecerán como el sol en el Reino de su Padre"* (Mt 13,43; SagBi 5, 143)] and Saint Paul [1) *"Porque estoy convencido de que los padeciminetos del tiempo presente no son comparables con la gloria futura que se va a manifestar en nosotros"* (Rm 8,18; SagBi 5, 927); 2) *"Pues habéis muerto, y vuestra vida está escondida con Cristo en Dios. Cuando Cristo, vuestra vida, se manifieste, entonces también vosotros apareceréis gloriosos con él."* (Col 3,3-4; SagBi 5, 1193-1194)].

[35] Cfr. LEO *s 51, 4*, CChr.SL 138A, 299.

[36] Cfr. Mt 17,3.

[37] "...apparuerunt cum Domino loquentes, ut uerissime in illa quinque uirorum praesentia compleretur" (LEO *s 51, 4*, CChr.SL 138A, 299). In order to confirm the testimonial meaning of the presence of Moses and Elijah, Leo quotes the Law: *"Por dos o tres testigos quedará en pie toda palabra"* (cfr. Dt 19,15; Mt 18,16).

aside from signifying the unity of the Scriptures[38]. Moses and Elijah are with the transfigured Jesus

> "...since they mutually support the pages of both Covenants, and the preceding signs had promised he who under the veil of the mysteries, has shown the manifest and luminous splendor of the present glory"[39].

How's the interaction between Jesus Christ and the OT? Jesus Christ fulfills "the promise of the prophetic figures and the reason [of being] of the legal precepts"[40]. How?

> "...by his presence, [Jesus] also teaches true prophecy[41], and by his grace, [Jesus] makes the commandments viable"[42].

Leo reflects on the *uerba Petri*[43] under seven *aspects: factum*[44], *responsium negatiuum Petri*[45], *motiuum Petri*[46], *responsium positivum*

---

[38] Leo illustrates the OT–NT *harmony* in *musical language*, since "ueteris ac noui Testamenti concinit tuba et cum euangelica doctrina antiquarum protestationum instrumenta concurrunt" (LEO *s 51, 4,* CChr.SL 138 A, 299).

[39] "Adstipulantur enim sibi inuicem utriusque foederis paginae, et quem sub uelamine mysteriorum praecedentia signa promiserant, manifestum atque perspicuum praesentis gloriae splendor ostendit" (ibid.). Leo bases himself in Jn 1,17: *"la Ley fue dada por Moisés; la gracia y la verdad vinieron por Jesucristo"* (SagBi 5, 573).

[40] "...propheticarum impleta est promissio figurarum et legalium ratio praeceptorum" (LEO *s 51, 4,* CChr.SL 138A, 300).

[41] Of course, *uera prophetia* here doesn't have the meaning given by Montanists, centuries back.

[42] "...et ueram docet prophetiam per sui praesentiam, et possibilia facit mandata per gratiam" (LEO *s 51, 4*, CCL 138A, 300).

[43] Cfr. Mt 17,4.

[44] What can be called fact (insofar as it happens to Peter from without) established by the author –a *factum* that encourages Peter to say what he'd said– are the revelations of the mysteries (*sacramentorum reuelationes*) (cfr. LEO *s 51, 5,* CChr.SL 138A, 300).

Petri (gaudium)[47]*, desiderium Petri*[48]*, silentium Iesu*[49], and *consideratio moralis-ascetica*[50].

Leo is aware of the multiple levels of reading of the theme *Pater/Genitor–Filius/Genitus* behind the voice[51].

Regarding the *essentia diuina communis,* of Father and Son, Leo observes that "the Father is present in the Son"[52]; that's to say, that

> "the essence of the One who Begets wasn't separated from that of the Only-Begotten"[53].

---

[45] Peter, encouraged by the *reuelationes sacramentorum*, develops an *attitude* of disdain towards what is mundane (*spernere mundana*), in other words, a feeling of disgust towards temporal matters (*fastidiare terrena*) (cfr. ibid.).

[46] Peter, for Leo, "in aeternorum desiderium quodam mentis rapiebatur excessu" (ibid.). This can be called Peter's subjective, personal, *underlying motive*.

[47] Peter discovers –according to Leo– another angle of the *sacramentorum reuelationes* (=like a uisio, but not only of this scene, but with all probability, from the climb to the mountain of Transfiguration up to this moment). I deduce this from what Leo says, that Peter was filled with joy of the entire vision (*totius uisionis*). It's as if Leo were to allude that Peter was realizing the totality of the uisio of the s*acramentorum reuelationes* (=the Transfiguration). Thus, in view of that *flashback in situ* while Peter is seeing Jesus with Moses and Elijah, Peter corresponds with the *gaudium* before the transfigured Jesus.

[48] Because of all this, Peter goes from having a *desiderium* for *what's eternal* (impersonal, incomplete aspect) to desiring *cum Iesu habitare* (Christocentric, concrete aspect) (LEO *s 51, 5*, CChr.SL 138 A, 300).

[49] As a *result* of the *uerba Petri* –according to Leo– "huic suggestioni Dominus non respondit, significans non quidem inprobum, sed inordinatum esse quod cuperet, cum salueri mundus nisi Christi morte non posset" (ibid.).

[50] "...exemplo Domini in hoc uocaretur credentium fides, ut licet non oporteret de beatitudinis promissione dubitari" (ibid.). So, it's important to realize the *mysterium paschale* being reproduced in the believer (referring to the order *passio postea gloria*, not vice-versa) which the pair *uerba Petri–silentium Domini* implies: "...prius nobis tolerantiam postulandam esse quam gloriam" (ibid.), precisamente "quia tempora patiendi non potest felicitas praeuenire regnandi" (ibid.).

[51] "Latum ergo illud et multiplex testimonium fuit, et plus in uirtute uerborum quam in sono uocis auditum est" (LEO *s 51, 6*, CChr.SL 138A, 301).

[52] "Praesens quidem erat in Filio Pater" (ibid.).

[53] "...non separabatur ab Vnigenito Genitoris essentia" (ibid.).

Regarding the *proprietas utriusque personae (diuinae),* Leo comments about the Father ("the voice coming from the cloud announces the Father to the ears"[54]) and about the Son ("the splendor emanated from the body reveals the Son to the eyes"[55]).

Leo makes the listener see the allusion of the *uox Patris to the begetting of the Son before time:*

> "doesn't one hear clearly: *This is my Son*[56], who proceeds from me and is with me before time?"[57].

The *Filius* is begotten before and outside time (=without "before" and "after") because there's an essential *extra-temporal simultaneity* of the *Genitor* and the *Genitus*:

> "...because neither the *Genitor* is before the Genitus, nor is the *Genitus* is after the *Genitor*"[58].

Leo illustrates this *simultaneitas extratemporalis* when he enumerates the common *diuitas, potestas y aeternitas* of *Genitor* and *Genitus*:

> *"This is my Son*[59], whom deity doesn't separate from me, [whom] power doesn't divide [from me], [whom] eternity doesn't distinguish [from me]"[60].

---

[54] "...uisui significacuit Filium splendor ex corpore" (LEO *s 51, 6,* CChr.SL 138A, 300-301).

[55] "...uisui significacuit Filium splendor ex corpore" (LEO *s 51, 6,* CChr.SL 138A, 300-301).

[56] Lc 9,35.

[57] "...nonne euidenter auditum est: *Hic est Filius meus*, cui ex me et mecum esse sine tempore est?" (LEO *s 51, 6,* CChr.SL 138A, 301).

[58] "Quia nec Genitor Genito prior, nec Genitus est Genitore posterior" (LEO *s 51, 6,* CChr.SL 138A, 301).

[59] Lc 9,35.

[60] *"Hic est Filius meus,* quem a me non separat deitas, non diuidit potestas, non discernit aeternitas" (LEO *s 51, 6,* CChr.SL 138A, 301).

Leo focuses on the *Genitus* with three pairs of negative and positive terms, that's to say, of "is not...; is...":

> "This is my Son[61], not an adoptive [son], but the [Son in the] proper [sense of the word], not created in another place, but he who is [the one] begotten by me; not of another nature made comparable with me, but that he came from my essence"[62].

When Leo relates the *Hic est Filius meus*[63] with the phrase from the Johannine Prologue[64], this fragment turns out to be the *clavis lectionis* about the *Father–Son relationship*, since[65]

> "the [fact] that all the things I do [he does them] *likewise*66, and anything *I do, [he] does* [them] inseparably with me and not in a different way"[67].

The inseparability and the identity of the work of the Son and of the Father is rooted in that "the Son *is in the Father, and the Father [is] in* the Son[68], our unite is not divided ever"[69]. Leo, through the Father speaking, explains that the *distinction Genitor-Genitus* doesn't have to separate them:

> "And although I myself am he who have begotten, another the one I have begotten, however, you're not

---

61 Lc 9, 35.

62 *"Hic est Filius meus,* non adoptiuus, sed proprius, non aliunde creatus, sed ex me genitus, nec de alia natura mihi factus conparabilis, sed de mea essentia natus aequalis" (LEO *s 51, 6,* CChr.SL 138A, 301).

63 Mt 17,5 (SagBi 5, 161).

64 "Todo se hizo por él, y sin él no se hizo nada de cuanto ha sido hecho" (Jn 1,3; SagBi 5, 570).

65 Here, we retake Leo's commentary on Mt 17,5.

66 Jn 5,19: *"del mismo modo"* (SagBi 5, 598).

67 "...qui omnia quae facio *similiter facit,* et quidquid *operor*, inseparabiliter mecum atque indifferenter *operatur*" (LEO *s 51, 6,* CChr.SL 138A, 301).

68 Cfr. Jn 10,38.

> permitted to think about him another opinion different from that which you can think about me"[70].

In order to settle any doubt arising from the confusion sown by the heretics, Leo says:

> *"This is my Son*[71], who didn't will to take away the equality he possesses with me, nor became presumptuous by usurpation; rather, remaining in the condition[72] of my glory, in order to carry out till the end [our] common decision to redeem the human race, [he] inclined the incommutable Deity up to *the form of a servant*[73]"[74].

Having reflected on the *Pater/Genitor–Filius/Genitus* relationship, Leo now considers the command: "*audite*"[75]. The Father reveals that the Son is he "in whom I am pleased with everything, and by whose preaching I am shown, by whose humility I am glorified"[76]. There's a clear indication of *urgency* when Leo explains: "listen to him without delay"[77], *quoad nos*,

---

69 *"In Patre* enim *est* Filius, *et in* Filio *Pater*, nec umquam unitas nostra diuiditur" (LEO *s 51, 6,* CChr.SL 138A, 301).

70 "Et cum alius ego sim qui genui, alius ille quem genui, non aliud tamen de illo uobis cogitare fas est, quam de me sentire possibile est" (ibid.).

71 Lc 9,35

72 Flp 2,6 (SagBi 5, 1163).

73 Cfr. Flp 2,7.

74 *"Hic est Filius meus*, qui eam quam mecum habet *aequalitatem non rapina* adpetiit, nec usurpatione praesumpsit, sed manens in *forma* gloriae meae, ut ad reparandum genus humanum exequeretur commune consilium, usque ad *formam seruilem* inclinauit incommutabilem Deitatem" (LEO *s 51, 6,* CChr. SL 138A, 301-302).

75 Mt 17,5.

76 "...in quo mihi per omnia bene complaceo, et cuius praedicatione manifestor, cuius humilitate clarificor" (LEO s 51, 7, CChr.SL 138A, 302).

77 "...[hunc] incunctanter audite" (ibid.).

> "since he himself is *the Truth and the Life*[78], he himself [is] *my virtue and wisdom*[79]"[80].

Heeding the Son implies accepting the unity of the Scriptures:

> *"Listen to him*[81], of whom the mysteries of the Law foretold, about whom the mouths of the Prophets sang"[82].

Moreover, listening to the Son implies accepting the salvation effected by Him:

> *"Listen to him*[83], who *ransoms* the world *by* his *blood*[84], who *overcomes* the devil *and divides his spoil*[85], who *breaks* the *author* of sin and the pacts of complicity"[86].

Heeding the Son makes one accept the way of the Cross in order to arrive at the Kingdom:

> *"Listen to him*[87], who opens the way to heaven, and [who] prepares for you [all] the step [of the staircase] of the ascent to the Kingdom through the torture of the Cross"[88].

---

78 Jn 14,6 (SagBi 5, 662).
79 Cfr. 2 Cro 9,5; Jb 12,16; Dn 2,20; Mt 13,54.
80 "...quia ipse est *ueritas et uita*, ipse *uirtus mea atque sapientia"* (LEO *s 51, 7,* CChr.SL 138A, 302).
81 Mt 17,5: "*Escuchadle*" (SagBi 5, 161).
82 *"Ipsum audite,* quem legis mysteria praenuntiauerunt, quem prophetarum ora cecinerunt" (LEO *s 51, 7,* CChr.SL 138A, 302).
83 Mt 17,5: "*Escuchadle*" (SagBi 5, 161).
84 Cfr. Ap 5,9.
85 Cfr. Lc 11,22.
86 *"Ipsum audite, qui mundum sanguine suo redimit,* qui diabolum *ligat et uasa eius rapit,* qui peccati *chirographum* et praeuaricationis pacta disrumpit" (LEO *s 51, 7,* CChr.SL 138A, 302). Here, Leo connects the *auditus Filii* to the *missio Filii* as *castigator diaboli* and *destructor peccati.*
87 Mt 17,5: "*Escuchadle*" (SagBi 5, 161).
88 *"Ipsum audite*, qui uiam aperit ad caelum, et per crucis supplicium gradus uobis ascensionis parat ad regnum" (LEO *s 51, 7,* CChr.SL 138A, 302).

In connection with the soteriological aspect of the listening to the Son, Leo challenges the faithful: "Why are you all weighed down, having been redeemed? Why do you tremble, tied down, having been freed [from sin]? Christ will that to be done, [since] I will it"[89].

Leo sees the prostration of the three Apostles as a consequence of the *fear*[90],

> "not only in the presence of the Father's majesty, but also [regarding the majesty] of the Son, because [the Apostles] have grasped, in a more penetrating level, the one and only Deity of the one and of the other, and since there was no indecision in the faith [as far as the Apostles are concerned], they didn't distinguish in their fear"[91].

The *Church* also

> "sees what [the three Apostles] saw and receives what they listened to"[92].

---

89 "Quid trepidatis redimi? Quid pauetis uincti * liberari? Fiat quod me uolente uult Christus" (ibid.). Christ wants to save us, because that's what the Father wills. Here, it seems that Leo refers to those who –realizing how demanding the *sequela Christi* is– don't what to get out of the easy life. Moreover, Leo exhorts: "Abicite carnalem formidinem, et fideli uos armate constantia, indignum est ut in Saluatoris passione timeatis, quod ipsius munere nec in uestro fine metuetis" (ibid.).

90 Cfr. Mt 17,6.

91 "...non de Patris tantum sed et de Filii maiestate tremuerunt, altiore enim sensu unam utriusque intellexere Deitatem, et quia in fide non erat haesitatio, non fuit in timore discretio" (LEO *s 51, 6,* CChr.SL 138A, 301).

90 "...in illis tribus apostolis uniuersa Ecclesia didicit quidquid eorum et aspectus uidit et auditus accepit" (Id., cit., 302).

91 "Confirmetur ergo secundum praedicationem sacratissimi euangelii omnium fides" (LEO *s 51, 8,* CChr.SL 138 A, 302).

92 "...in illis tribus apostolis uniuersa Ecclesia didicit quidquid eorum et aspectus uidit et auditus accepit" (Id., cit., 302).

Thus, Leo exhorts to *faith*[93], and insists on witnessing[94] because, God-willing, "if *we remain in* [his] confession and [in] his *love*, we will also conquer [in] what he conquers, and we receive what he promised"[95]. Once more, Leo suggests always to be attentive to listen to God[96].

Principal affirmations

After recalling that the intelligence of the great mystery passes through the hearing, Leo affirms a central truth in his theology, that the Savior of humankind –who foretells his second coming– teaches that he's the Son of God and the Son of Man (in the Word there was true human nature, and Jesus –as– was true God) by words and miracles.

After Peter's confession of faith, in which Jesus' divinity became very clear, Jesus' Transfiguration serves as a teaching on Jesus' humanity, in its visibly glorious aspect, its *gloria potestatis*, the power of Jesus' Body, a power which will not be dissolved, although Jesus dies on the Cross.

The Transfiguration prevents the possible scandal of those who follow Jesus, and serves to infuse hope to the entire Church throughout the ages. The presence of Moses and of Elijah bear witness to the unity of the Scriptures. The falling of the three

---

93 "Confirmetur ergo secundum praedicationem sacratissimi euangelii omnium fides" (LEO *s 51, 8,* CChr.SL 138 A, 302).

94 "...nemo de Christi cruce, per quam mundus redemptus est, erubescat" (ibid.). Why does Leo insist so much on courage in the presence of the Cross? The Cross asks the one who beholds it to take a stand before Christ (either he's loved or he's hated). Moreover, there are many trials that can be risky to –or can purify– the disciple's stand before the Mystery.

95 "...si in confessione et *dilectione* ipsius *permaneamus*, et quod uicit uincimus, et quod promisit accipimus" (LEO *s 51, 8,* CChr.SL 138A, 303).

96 "...siue ad facienda mandata, siue ad aduersa toleranda, praemissa semper uox Patris debet nostris auribus insonare" (ibid.).

Apostles to the ground remind that one is in the presence of the Mystery.

Leo sees that Peter's proposal points to Peter who explicitly affirmed his desire to be with Jesus, while he implicitly refused everything mundane. And so, Jesus keeps silent.

The message of the Father's voice lets us know the common essence and work of the *Genitor* and of the *Genitus* (who is neither created, nor adopted, nor presumptuous, nor usurps, but rather, is the Begotten), the extratemporal simultaneity of the divine essence –Father and Son– and the common deity, power and eternity, which carries out the salvific plan. One must listen to the Son, the Savior of the human race.

9. Homilia I/24Q (Beda)

Fides discipulorum
ne crucifixo Domino titubet solidatur
dum inminente crucis articulo
et humanitas eius qualiter
per resurrectionem sit sublimanda
caelesti luce monstratur

(h I/24Q , Mt 17,5)

The homilies of *Beda Venerabilis* (672-735[1]), according to Daniel Hurst, osb, were written perhaps between 730–735, at the end of Bede's life[2].

In Bede's homily, he interweaves OT explanations with NT explanations[3]. Bede draws inspiration from Ambrose, Jerome,

[1] C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1478. Bede, "at the age of seven (…) entered a Northumbrian community of monks, established in the region of Durham, at Wearmouth and Jarrow, hardly two miles away from Hadrian's Wall. Until his death at the age of 63, he never left that remote spot but he developed within its comparative isolation, the universal vision of a great scholar and the fervent enthusiasm of a spiritual teacher" (ibid.). Moreover, the spiritual heritage "provided an important foundation for the interpretation of the Bible in the Latin Middle Ages by transmitting the riches of spiritual exegesis as taught by the third century Alexandrian Origen and by Pope Gregory the Great, just a few generations before the time of Bede" (ibid.).

[2] "Hae homeliae uersus finem uitae eius compositae uidentur, i.e. inter annos 730–735 A.D." (D. Hurst, *Bedae Venerabilis Opera*, CChr.SL 122, 1955, vii). Giuseppina Simonetti affirms that "Beda stesso raccolse, ordinò in modo organico e pubblicò una parte delle omelie che aveva predicato ai monaci del suo monastero durante la celebrazione della messa. Il critero ordinatore è quello di seguire l'anno liturgico" [G. Simonetti, *Venerabile Beda, Omelie sul Vangelo*, in A. Quacquarelli (dir.), "Collana di Testi Patristici, 90", Città Nuova Editrice, 1990, Roma, 5].

[3] There are two possible *levels of reading*, the historical reality –presupposed by Bede, and the allegorical reading that leads to the spiritual sense. That's to say, that "al di là della realtà storica dei fatti, mai negata ma piú spesso presupposta che non specificamente rilevata, egli [Beda] preferisce scorgere un significato spirituale, che viene messo in evidenza attraverso l'esegesi di tipo allegorico" (G. Simonetti, *Venerabile Beda, Omelie sul Vangelo*, cit., 7). For G. Simonetti, *spiritual sense* signifies "non solo e non tanto un insegnamento morale di carattere attualizzante, ricavato dal testo, ma anche e sopratutto un significato superiore, di senso spirituale, dei gesti materiali di Cristo" (ibid.).

Augustine, Gregory the Great and Isidore, among other exegetes of the West[4]. Bede has been influenced by the numerical and allegorical symbolisms[5]. Nonetheless, Bede hasn't been a mere compiler, since there are so many passages that have the look of being original[6]. For Bede's preaching, the double focus is important[7].

Bede's exegesis "is always fundamentally Christological, and therefore, ecclesiological, even his works dedicated to interpreting OT texts"[8].

---

4 "...tradizione esegetica dominante in Occidente da Ambrogio, Girolamo, Agostino (....). In effetti egli si serve ampiamente delle opere di questi e anche di altri, sopratutto si Gregorio Magno e Isidoro" [G. Simonetti, *Venerabile Beda, Omelie sul Vangelo*, cit., 9]. D. Hurst explains that "...si quis homelias cum expositionibus in euangelia Marci et Lucae conferet, has locis excerptis ex operibus SS: Ambrosi, Augustini, Gregorii Magni et Hieronymi congestas inueniet" (*Bedae Venerabilis Opera*, CChr.SL 122, 1960, vii).

5 It means that "...tra i vari procedimenti caratteristici dell'esegesi di tipo allegorico Beda ha prediletto, come Agostino, Gregorio Magno e altri, il simbolismo numerico e il simbolismo allegorico" [G. Simonetti, *Venerabile Beda, Omelie sul Vangelo,* cit., 9]. "...il simbolismo etimologico consiste nell'impostare l'interpretazione allegorica sull'etimologia dei nomi propri sia di persone sia di luoghi" [Id., cit., 10]. Madame Simonetti adds that "...per queste etimologie Beda si serve del libro di Girolamo: *Liber interpretationum hebraicorum nominum*, sia di repertori anonimi dello stesso genere, che correvano all'epoca sua" (Id., loc. cit., note 6).

6 Cfr. Simonetti, G., *Venerabile Beda, Omelie sul Vangelo*, cit., 9. Besides, "Beda è pieno di ammirazione per i suoi illustri predecessori, sopratutto Girolamo, Agostino, Gregorio Magno, e di fronte a loro si sente nettamente inferiore" (ibid.).

7 Madame Simonetti explains that "è qui evidente la preoccupazione di fare in modo che la convinzione dell'assoluta gratuità della grazia non ingeneri nei monaci l'idea che le buone opere non servano a niente e quindi li inviti all'inerzia e alla neghittosità. Il richiamo di Beda su questo punto è molto insistente, perché la vita del monastero facilmente invitava il monaco all'ozio, nella convinzione che, di fronte alla superiorità della vita contemplativa, quella attiva risultava praticamente inutile" (*Venerabile Beda, Omelie sul Vangelo*, cit., 13).

8 "...è sempre fondamentalmente cristologica, e di conseguenza ecclesiologica, anche quella delle sue opere dedicate a interpretare testi dell'Antico Testamento" (G. *Simonetti*, *Venerabile Beda, Omelie sul Vangelo*, cit., 15). If Bede quotes heretics, it's not because the latter exists in his time; rather, they served as counter-examples (cfr. ibid.)

BED *h I/24Q* (Saturday after the I Sunday in Lent, in Rome during Bede's time[9]) starts with Jesus' *dispositio* to introduce his chosen ones to the topic of the *retributio*[10]. The recalling of the future reward[11] give a chance to describe the final day[12]: the prize[13], which in principle

[9] D. Hurst notes: "In serie lectionum quae Romae antiquitus recitari solebant sabbato post dominicam primam quadragesimae assignata est" (*Bedae Venerabilis Opera*, CChr.SL 122, 1955, 170). Further on, at the end of the *editio critica* of BED h I/24Q, Bede mentions: "Exposita lectione dominicae transfigurationis ad nostram, fratres carissimi, conscientiam reuertamur" (BED *h I/24Q, Mt 17,9*, CChr.SL 122, 1955, 177). On the one hand, the *usus romanus* frames the lectio of the Transfiguration narrative (Mt 17,1–9) in the *feria VII [post dominicam primam in Quadrag.] in XII lect.* [of the lectionary of Herbipolen (Würzburg) Mp. th. fol. 62. S. VIII: cfr. C. Morin, Rev. Bénéd. XXVIII (1911), 296-330: cfr. D. Hurst, *Bedae Venerabilis Opera*, CCL 122, 1955, xii]. On the other hand, the *usus romano-neapolitanus* situates the reading of the Transfiguration event (Mt 17,1) in the *LXXgisima ebd. II feria VII. ad Sanctum Petrum et cottidiana* [accodring to the lectionary of Herbipolen (Würzburg) Mp. th. fol. 68. S. VIII. (Euangeliarium Burchardi, eius urbis episcopi), cfr. G. Morin, *Rev. Bénéd. X* (1893), 113–126: cfr. D. Hurst, *Bedae Venerabilis Opera*, CChr.SL 122, 1955, xii].

[10] It turns out to be noteworthy the fact that in *BED h I/24Q,* the author –unlike other liturgical uses– tackles the Transfiguration by going back not to Mt 16,28, but to the verse before that. The topic of retribution, in order to give hope to the average Christian amidst daily challenges, justifies this beginning with Mt 16,27. Bede makes one see –on the one hand, the harshness of the *certamina temporalium*, and on the other hand, the truth of the *retributio* in the life to come– for the listeners "[ut] leuius ferant mala transeuntia quae bonis sperauerint remuneranda perpetuis" (*BED h I/24Q, Mt 16,27*, CChr.SL 122, 1955, 170). It isn't about an idle, false sense of tranquility that forgets the necessary tension between the struggle to be Jesus Christ's in the present life and the life to come. Rather, it's about a true *tranquilitas ex spe* amidst the trial or the struggle in present life, or in other words, in the daily struggle, which Bede has described under the name of the public fights of old: the *agon*.

[11] Cfr. Mt 16,27.

[12] Bede then contrasts this second coming against the first, in which Jesus Christ was the *Humilis*, and was the one who had been judged by the world (cfr. Jn 19,5 – the so-called *Ecce Homo* episode). If in the first coming, the *depositum* has been entrusted to man, this depositum, shall be demanded of man in the second coming [Cfr. BED *h I/24Q, Mt 16,27*, CChr.SL 122, 1955, 170-171].

[13] "...electos in regnum Patris sui perducet" (*BED h I/24Q, Mt 16,27*, CChr.SL 122, 1955, 170). In the light of the reward of the righteous, Bede exclaims: *"Cantaré la misericordia y la justicia para Tí, Señor"* [Sal 101(100),1 (SagBi 3, 466)]

is two-fold[14], and the punishment[15], especially of those who repent very late[16] and have been surprised by death and judgment[17].

Bede sees behind the *gloria*[18] the *Christological* consideration that "the Son of Man will come in the glory of God the Father because he who in the human nature is less than the Father, in the divinity is of one and the same glory as the Father, true man in all he who is true God"[19].

Because of the uncertainty and the delay of the eternal repose[20], the merciful Master (*pius Magister*) disposed

> "to show beforehand to some of his disciples, while they still live on earth, the joys of the eternal promise, in order that they, too, who have seen, and all who may have listened to it [the Transfiguration narrative] may bear with more serenity the evils at present, thanks to the frequent reminder of the future recompense"[21].

---

[14] "...non solum ab iniustorum liberentur iniuriis sed et iustitiae ac patientiae suae mercedem percipiant" (*BED h I/24Q, Mt 16,27,* CChr.SL 122, 1955, 171).

[15] "...reprobos autem cum diabolo in ignem reiciet sempiternum" (Id., cit., 170-171).

[16] "...male uiuentes patientiam iudicis negligentiam putant iusta sero paenitentes" (*BED h I/24Q, Mt 16,27,* CChr.SL 122, 1955, 171).

[17] "Verum quia incertum est omnibus tempus uniuersalis iudicii incerta singulis sui exitus hora" (ibid.).

[18] Cfr. Mt 16,27,

[19] "Filius (...) hominis in gloria Dei Patris uenturus est quia qui in hominis natura minor est Patre ipse in diuinitate unius eiusdemque est gloriae cum Padre uerus homo per omnia uerus existens et Deus" (*BED h I/24Q, Mt 16,27,* CChr.

[20] "...poterat longa uideri praesens adflictio nescientibus quando requies promissa ueniret" (ibid.).

[21] "...uoluit pius magister aliquibus discipulorum suorum adhuc in terra degentibus aeternae repromissionis gaudia praemonstrare quatenus et ipsi qui uidissent et omnes qui audire possent leuius aduersa praesentia tolerarent reducto saepius ad mentem futurae retributionis munere quod expectarent" (BED *h I/24Q, Mt 16,27,* CChr.SL 122, 1955, 171). Here, Bede situates the exegesis of Jesus' Transfiguration.

Bede notes that the three Apostles

> "saw [Jesus] arriving in his Kingdom, because they saw him resplendent on the mountain"[22].

While in the Transfiguration, the three Apostles had weak eyes, in the resurrection of the flesh, the entire *Ecclesia sanctorum* will contemplate the Lord[23].

Bede unravels a moral parallelism in the inequality of the foot and the top of the mountain[24]. Then, the *imminent display* of Jesus' *gloria maiestatis*[25] teaches the three Apostles,

> "so that they themselves may learn, [in order that] those who thirst for seeing it [the glory] may learn, that it shouldn't be sought in this world, but in the Kingdom of sublime beatitude"[26].

Bede looks back to the *righteous ones*,

> "because although the righteous now stand pressured by the proximity of the wicked, however, they are of tough

---

[22] "Venientem quippe in regno suo uiderunt discipuli quia in ea claritate uiderunt fulgentem in monte" (*BED h I/24Q, Mt 16,28,* CChr.SL 122, 1955, 171). Bede contrasts the incapacity of seeing of the Apostles' mortales oculi during the Transfiguration, with the habilitation of those who shall, in the resurrectio carnis, awake to everlasting life.

[23] Cfr. Is 33,17.

[24] Cfr. Mt 17,1. "...ut doceat omnes qui hanc uidere desiderant non in infimis iacere uoluptatibus non inlecebris seruire carnalibus non cupiditatibus adhaerescere terrenis sed aeternorum amore ad superna semper erigi angelicae munditiae pietatis pacis dilectionis et iustitiae uitam quantum mortalibus possibile est semper imitari debere" (BED *h I/24Q, Mt 17,1,* CChr.SL 122, 1955, 172). In order to support his affirmation –that man is invited *seorsum* and not *deorsum*–, Bede goes to Paul in Flp 3,20: "Pero nosotros somos ciudadanos del cielo, de donde también esperamos al Salvador, al Señor Jesucristo" (SagBi 5, 1170).

[25] Cfr. Mt 17,1.

[26] "...ut discant ipsi discant omnes qui hanc uidere sitiunt non eam sibi in huius saeculi profundo sed in regno supernae beatitudinis esse quaerendam" (BED *h I/24Q, Mt 17,1,* CChr.SL 122, 1955, 172).

> spirit and by the intention of the faith [the righteous] are separated from them [the wicked] also in the future [life], they [the righeous] will completely be made to stand out, because [the Lord] hides them –in the mystery of his face– from the enmity of men and protects them –in his tent– from the hostility of the tongues"[27].

Jesus has promised those *saints* –according to Bede– a show of his glory after six days (*dies iudicii*)[28], since they are those "who have to contemplate the Kingdom which to them *God, who never lies, promised ages ago*[29]"[30]. Bede interprets the "after six days" as the six ages of the world[31], aside from the fact that

> "they can designate the perfection of the good works"[32] toward the repose[33], the seventh day[34].

---

[27] "...quia iusti etsi nunc cum prauorum uicinia premuntur animo tamen sunt toto atque intentione fidei separati ab illis et in futuro funditus seorsum abducuntur ab eis cum abscondit eos in abditu uultus sui a conturbatione hominum protegit eos in tabernaculo suo a contradictione linguarum" (ibid.).

[28] Cfr. Mt 17,1.

[29] Tt 1,2: *"ha prometido desde toda la eternidad el que no miente, Dios"* (SagBi 5, 1298).

[30] "...quod eis *promisit qui non mentitur Deus ante tempora saecularia"* (BED *h I/24Q, Mt 17,1,* CChr.SL 122, 1955, 172).

[31] Bede wants to highlight the vision of salvation of the world from creation to eschatology, and Bede uses the allegory of the six days: "Tempora quippe saecularia sex aetatibus constant quibus conpletis audient ipso dicente: *Venite benedicti Patris mei possidete paratum uobis Regnum a constitutione mundi"* (ibid.).

[32] "...bonorum perfectionem operum designare" (ibid.).

[33] "...ad requiem peruenire debeamus" (ibid.).

[34] "...dall'inizio fino alla consumazione finale, l'autore ama soffermarsi sul tema delle varie età del mondo" (G. Simonetti, *Venerabile Beda, Omelie sul Vangelo*, cit., 19-20). Madame Simonetti describes the ages of Creation, a favorite theme of Bede: "...da Adamo a Noè, da Noè ad Abramo, da Abramo a Davide, da Davide all'esilio babilonese, dall'esilio babilonese a Giovanni Battista, da Gesù alla fine del mondo. A queste sei età tradizionali Beda aggiunge come settima la vita di ogni anima nel periodo intercorrente tra la morte del corpo e la risurrezione finale; e come ottava l'età senza fine, che comincerà con la risurrezione dei corpi e non avrà mai fine" (ibid.).

Bede sees in Jesus' *gloria corporis*[35] a *significatio* of the glory of his Body after his own Resurrection, and also a preliminary *manifestatio –quoad nos–* of the *claritas corporum* of the electi in the resurrectio carnis[36].

Bede clarifies that it's like that

> "...not because the Lord's clarity and glory and the saints' [clarity and glory] can be equal"[37].

The *exemplum solis*[38] doesn't exhaust all the reality of what's signified by the *gloria* or *claritas* of Jesus' risen Body – prefigured in the Transfiguration– as well as of the *iusti*:

> "since there's nothing we can see clearer than the sun, the glory –not only of the Lord but of the saints in the resurrection– is compared to the solar body, because hardly an example was found to give men which may be clearar than the sun"[39].

---

[35] Cfr. Mt 17,2.

[36] Cfr. BED *h I/24Q, Mt 17,2,* CChr.SL 122, 1955, 173. Cfr. Mt 13,43.

[37] "Non quia Domini et sanctorum eius aequalis possit esse claritas et gloria" (BED *h I/24Q, Mt 17,2,* CChr.SL 122, 1955, 173). Saint Paul explains: *"Una estrella se diferencia de otra en el resplandor. Así será en la resurrección de los muertos"* (1 Co 15,41-42; SagBi 5, 1029-1030).

[38] Rather, the *exemplum solis* is the maximum point to which human understanding can arrive at in order to glance at the mystery.

[39] "...quia nihil sole clarius uidere nouimus non solum Domini sed et sanctorum in resurrectione gloria solis aspectui conparatur quia clarius sole aliquid unde exemplum daretur hominibus minime potuit inueniri" (BED *h I/24Q, Mt 17,2,* CChr.SL 122, 1955, 173). But, the damned –who will only see the repercussions of their sins in the Passion of Christ: "...*mirarán al que traspasaron* (Jn 19,37; SagBi 5, 693), *y se lamentarán por él todas las tribus de la tierra* (Ap 1,7; SagBi 5, 1526)" – they will never see the glory neither of the Lord nor of the righteous (cfr. *BED h I/24Q, Mt 17,2*, CChr.SL 122, 1955, 173).

In the final judgment, the righteous –entering in the *gloria Regni*– "...will be transfigured by the light of incorruption"[40].

Bede interprets the Lord's white clothing[41] as figures of the *Ecclesia sanctorum*[42]. Aside from this ecclesiological dimension, Bede adds an *anthropological*[43] dimension, a *Christological*[44] dimension and an *eschatological*[45] dimension.

Bede clarifies that the scope of the *conloquium* among Moses, Elijah and Jesus[46] is like the *oracula*[47] messianica of the Law and of the Prophets. These *oracula*, –already obvious for Moses and Elijah– in *Domino conpleta*[48], "will also be openly seen for all the elect in the future"[49].

---

[40] "...incorruptionis luce transfigurati intrabunt" (BED *h I/24Q, Mt 17,2,* CChr.SL 122, 1955, 173). Again, the words of Saint Paul echo: *"El cual transformará nuestro cuerpo vil en un cuerpo glorioso como el suyo"* (Flp 3,21; SagBi 5, 1170).

[41] Cfr. Mc 9,3.

[42] BED *h I/24Q, Mt 17,2,* CChr.SL 122, 1955, 173. Bede depends on Is 49,18: *"Que te revestirás de todos ellos como ornamento"* (SagBi 4, 238); y en Ga 3,27: *"Porque todos los que fuisteis bautizados en Cristo os habéis revestido de Cristo"* (SagBi 5, 1102).

[43] Bede reminds that every man is *pronus ad peccatum:* "...nemo est qui sine corruptione ac dolore uiuere possit super terram, quod omnibus sapientibus patet licet heretici contradicant nemo est qui sine adtactu alicuius peccati uiuere possit super terram" (BED *h I/24Q, Mt 17,2,* CChr.SL 122, 1955, 173).

[44] Bede situates the explanation of the incapacity of the clothing of Jesus transfigured to be like any fuller (*fullo*) not in what, *prima facie,* could be thought of (=it's the best there can be); rather, Bede introduces a rather new explanation, making Christ the personification of the *fullo, doctor et mundator animarum:* thus, that no fuller can match the whiteness of Jesus' clothes is interpreted in the light of the purification Christ shall do to the Church not in this world but in heaven (cfr. BED *h I/24Q, Mt 17,2*). Bede justifies this view in Saint Paul, when the latter speaks of a purification "de toda mancha de carne y de espíritu" (2 Co 7,1; SagBi 5, 1062).

[45] How shall this purification be? The Lord, when purifying the Church, "insuper et aeterna carnis ac spiritus beatitudine ac luce reficiens" (BED *h I/24Q, Mt 17,2,* CChr.SL 122, 1955, 174).

[46] Cfr. Lc 9,30-31.

[47] BED *h I/24Q, Mt 17,3,* CChr.SL 122, 1955, 174.

[48] Ibid.

[49] "...et electis omnibus in futuro manifestius patebunt" (ibid.).

Moses and Elijah "appeared in [their] majesty"[50], since

> "then, it will be seen with how much dignity of truth the divine discourses have been uttered, not only in the matter of sense, but also in the matter of form"[51].

So, Moses and Elijah are, for Bede, aside from being personifications of the Law and of the Prophets, personifications of the *regnaturi cum Domino*[52].

Bede retakes the retribution theme, clarifying that those who were found faithful, dead or alive, when Jesus arrives,

> "at the same instant they shall be taken up *in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air*[53]; shortly after the judgment, they are introduced to everlasting life"[54].

This idea of Bede acquires more *eschatological relevance* because the *background* of this idea is the convenience of Moses' and Elijah's *glorious* presence together with Jesus Christ:

> "the majesty's excellence indicates the identity of the prize of which they'll be crowned"[55], with its following

---

[50] "...uisi in maiestate" (ibid.).

[51] "...tunc apertius uidebitur quanta ueritatis dignitate omnis diuinorum eloquiorum non solum sensus sed et sermo fuerit prolatus" (BED *h I/24Q, Mt 17,3,* CChr.SL 122, 1955, 174).

[52] They're those who die before the Lord returns: "[Possint intellegi] in Moyse quidem qui mortuus ac sepultus est hi qui in iudicio resuscitandi a morte" (ibid.), y los que aún viven al llegar el Señor: "[Possint intellegi] in Helia uero qui necdum mortis debitum soluit hi qui in aduentu iudicis uiui inueniendi sunt in carne" (ibid.).

[53] 1 Ts 4,17: *"a las nubes [junto con ellos] al encuentro del Señor en los aires"* (SagBi 5, 1221).

[54] "Qui utrique pariter in uno eodemque momento rapti *in nubibus obuiam Domino in aera* mox peracto iudicio ad uitam inducuntur aeternam" (BED *h I/24Q, Mt 17,3,* CChr.SL 122, 1955, 174).

[55] "...per excellentiam namque maiestatis insigne muneris quo sunt coronandi monstratur" (BED *h I/24Q, Mt 17,3,* CChr.SL 122, 1955, 174).

moral and spiritual teaching for the listeners[56].

Bede sees in the *uerba Petri*[57] an *inverse proportion* of the *uitae caelestis dulcedo* to the pleasurable earthly pleasures[58]: Peter's words point to Peter's *adhaesio* to Jesus, when he contemplates Jesus', Moses' and Elijah's *maiestas*, Peter

> "suddenly forgets –only because of these things he sees– all the other earthly matters he had known, and enjoys remaining with the only reality he sees"[59].

Bede *seems* to agree with the Evangelist who reasons that *Peter* said what he said since *no sabía qué decía*[60]. But I say "seems", since Bede adds:

> "[Peter] knew well what he was saying when he affirms, *Lord, it is well that we are here*[61], because the truth is that man's only good is to enter into the joy of his Lord and to contemplate him closely forever"[62].

---

[56] "...quia nimirum unica laudis materia fidelibus sui fit passio redemptoris qui quanto magis meminerint absque gratia illius se saluari nequiuisse tanto maiorem eiusdem gratiae memoriam deuoto semper in pectore uersant deuota confessione testantur" (ibid.).

[57] Cfr. Mt 17,4.

[58] "...quo amplius quisque uitae caelestis dulcedinem degustat eo amplius fastidit omnia quae placebant in infimis" (BED *h I/24Q, Mt 17,4*, CChr.SL 122, 1955, 174).

[59] "...repente cuncta quae nouerat terrena obliuiscitur solis his quae uidet perpetuo delectatur adhaerere" (ibid.).

[60] Moreover, Bede offers an eschatological explanation: "In illa namque caelestis uitae gloria domus necessaria non erit ubi diuinae contemplationis luce omnia pacificante aura aduersitatis alicuius timenda nulla remanebit" (BED *h I/24Q, Mt 17,4,* CChr.SL 122, 1955, 175). Saint John says, "*Pero no vi templo alguno en ella, pues su templo es el Señor Dios omnipotente y el Cordero"* (Ap 21,22; SagBi 5, 1590).

[61] Mt 17,4.

[62] "Sed bene nouerat quid diceret cum ait, *Domine bonum nos hic esse*, quia re uera solum hominis bonum est intrare in gaudium Domini sui et huic contemplando in aeternum adsistere" (BED *h I/24Q, Mt 17,4,* CChr.SL 122, 1955, 175). Peter – contemplating the *glorificata Christi humanitas!* (cfr. ibid.).

Bede relates eschatology to the joy of the righteous, much greater than Peter's joy during the anticipated vision of the arrival of the Son of Man[63].

Bede teaches that "in that dwelling-place of celestial life, houses –where God protects [everything] with his eternal shadow of his life– won't be necessary"[64].

Bede reasons out that the Father spoke[65] so that the three Apostles might know that they were seeing *Jesus' humanitatis eius gloria*[66], and so,

> "they might learn to aspire to contemplate the presence of the divinity, which is equal to [that of] him [of the Father]"[67].

---

[63] "...qui sermo explicare qui sensus ualet conprehendere quanta sint gaudia iustorum cum accesserint *ad Sion montem et ciuitatem Dei uiuentis. Hierusalem et multorum milium angelorum frequentiam* ipsumque ciuitatis eiusdem artificem et conditorem Deum non *per speculum et in enigmate* sicut nunc sed *facie ad faciem* conspexerint?" (BED *h I/24Q, Mt 17,4,* CChr.SL 122, 1955, 175). Then, Bede echoes Peter's words when the latter reminisces the Transfiguration years after, when speaking about the Lord, *"...en quien, sin verlo todavía, creéis y os alegráis con un gozo inefable y glorioso"* (1 P 1,8; SagBi 5, 1419).

[64] "...in illa uitae caelestis habitatione domos non esse necessarias ubi omnia Dominus aeterna suae lucis obumbratione protegit" (BED *h I/24Q, Mt 17,5,* CChr.SL 122, 1955, 175). Moreover, Bede recalls how God, in the OT, *"extendió una nube como protección"* [Sal 105(104),39; SagBi 3, 484] upon what would be the chosen people, affirming that greater would be God's protection in the NT and after, "quanto magis inhabitantes in tabernaculo regni caelestis in saecula suarum uelamento protegit alarum" (Id., cit., 175-176). Bede refers to Saint Paul in order to justify his affirmation about the veracity of the divine protection: *"Porque sabemos que, si la tienda de nuestra mansión terrena se deshace, tenemos un edificio que es de Dios, una casa no hecha por mano de hombre, sino eterna, en los cielos"* (2 Co 5,1; SagBi 5, 1056).

[65] Cfr. Mt 17,5. The Father spoke, knowing that Peter, James and John were at home in front of the transfigured Jesus.

[66] Cfr. BED *h I/24Q, Mt 17,5,* CChr.SL 122, 1955, 176.

[67] "...ut discerent (...) ad diuinitatis quae aequalis est illi contemplandam suspirare praesentiam" (ibid.).

The Son's *testatio*[68] corroborates the *uox paterna*[69].

The Father spoke[70], too, because of his *pia dispositio*[71], in view of Jesus' imminent Passion: in order to strengthen the faith of those who follow Jesus[72] and to teach them that

> "[the Son] is coeternal in divinity to the heavenly Father, the Son is approved by his Father's voice, in order that when the hour of the Passion comes, His death might be less painful [to them], recalling that he –who, immediately after dying, had always been glorified in his humanity– had always been glorified by God the Father in the divinity"[73].

The three Apostles prostrated[74] because they were weak[75]. Jesus orders them to be silent[76] about the *uisio maiestatis* in order not to delay the salvific plan[77] and to avoid scandal[78].

---

[68] *"Y el que me ha enviado está conmigo; no me ha dejado solo, porque yo hago siempre lo que le agrada"* (Jn 8,29; SagBi 5, 624).

[69] Moreover, in the voice (cfr. Mt 17,5), Bede sees a fulfillment of an OT prophecy because, commanding, "recordó [el Padre] que [el Hijo] es de quien el mismo Moisés predecía al dar la Ley al pueblo, [al vaticinar] que *el Señor Dios vuestro os suscitará de entre vuestros hermanos un profeta como yo; le escucharéis en todo lo que os diga* [Hch 3,22 (SagBi 5, 734); cfr. Dt 18,15 (cfr. SagBi 1, 836)]. The Law and the Prophets, important as they are, are secondary to the Son, and the *auditio Filii.*

[70] Cfr. Mt 17,5.

[71] Cfr. BED *h I/24Q, Mt 17,5,* CChr.SL 122, 1955, 176.

[72] "...fides discipulorum ne crucifixo Domino titubet solidatur dum inminente crucis articulo et humanitas eius qualiter per resurrectionem sit sublimanda caelesti luce monstratur" (ibid.).

[73] "...coaeternus sit in diuinitate Patri Filius caelesti eiusdem Patris uoce probatur quatenus adueniente hora passionis minus morientem dolerent quem post mortem mox glorificandum in homine in diuinitate autem semper a Deo Patre glorificatum meminissent" (ibid.).

[74] Cfr. Mt 17,6.

[75] "[Discipuli] quasi carnales adhuc substantiae fragilis audita Dei uoce timentes" (BED *h I/24Q, Mt 17,6,* CChr.SL 122, 1955, 176).

[76] Cfr. Mt 17,7.

[77] "...aut dispensationem passionis illius idem populi principibus repugnando impedirent et sic humanae salutis effectus qui per sanguinem eius erat futurus retardaretur" (BED *h I/24Q, Mt 17,9,* CChr.SL 122, 1955, 176).

[78] "...aut certe hi qui eandem uisionem audientes credidissent uiso crucis obprobrio scandalizarentur" (Id., cit., 176-177).

Bede speaks of the post-Resurrection promulgation of the Transfiguration-event: in the mystagogy (in order to speak of the *resurrectio carnis*[79]) and in the general catechesis[80].

Bede ends the homily by exhorting the audience to climb the mountain of virtues[81], to wash away their sins[82], to listen to the Son of the same substance as the Father[83], and to contemplate the glory awaiting the faithful one[84].

Principal affirmations

Bede interprets the pre-Transfiguration prediction of Jesus (the merciful Master) as a reminder about the final retribution after the six ages of creation, especially in view of the righteous ones persecuted in this life. If in the Transfiguration, the three Apostles couldn't bear the fulgence, on the last day, all will gaze at God.

Jesus' transfigured Body foretells the glory of his risen Body. This, in turn, prefigures the glory of the bodies of the righteous. The whiteness of Jesus' clothing prefigure the resplendent Church and man's purification by the Fuller, the Doctor and the Cleaner of souls. The salvific plan, about which Moses, Elijah and Jesus spoke, will be manifest to all at the end of time. Moses and Elijah, glorious

---

79 "...quatenus omnes qui sacramentis eius initiari uoluissent non solum effectum resurrectionis credere, sed etiam modum eiusdem resurrectionis ab his qui uidebant potuissent ediscere" (Id., cit., 177).

80 "...et aeternitatem diuinae natiuitatis quam a Patre audierant cunctis pariter credendam amandamque praedicarent" (ibid.).

81 "...si Domini gloriam uidere delectat [nobis], transitis carnalibus desideriis subeamus in montem uirtutum" (ibid.).

82 Ibid.

83 "Si uocem Dei Patris audire, si consubstantialis eius Filii maiestatem desideramus intueri, studeamus solliciti peruersa et inutilia mortalium declinare studeamus a superuacuis saeculi fallentis oculos auertere spectaculis" (BED *h I/24Q,* CChr.SL 122, 1955, 177).

84 "...quatenus resurrectionis nostrae gloria coruscante et ipsi quidem quae modo nequimus magnalia nostri Conditoris uidere simul" (ibid.).

too, prefigure the righteous, since they all receive the same prize.

Peter's proposal is due to his attachment to Jesus, which makes him forget what's earthly, because he knows well Who he has in front of him. If Peter already enjoyed the transfigured Jesus, how much more would the joy of the righteous be.

The voice's message aims to help the three Apostles to come to realize that they're in front of the visible glory of the humanity of the Son, the divinity of whom is equal to that of the Father who, by virtue of his pious disposition, wanted to transmit clearly that he who will suffer the Passion is his natural Son.

The three Apostles fall to the ground because they were weak in the presence of the Mystery. Jesus forbids them to publicize the news in order not to delay the salvific plan, and to avoid scandals.

Bede recalls the value of the Transfiguration-event in the mystagogy and in the general catechesis.

Section II

Having seen in Section I how some Latin-speaking Church Fathers –among them, one who then became Montanist, and another who was an Arrian bishop– have expressed their thought on the Transfiguration, now let's see more authors who refer to one or more scenes of the Transfiguration narrative, in the form of allusions, quotes and reflections. As in Section I, I shall try to gather the principal theological affirmations of each author. I follow the chronological order of the authors.

1. Tertullianus

TE mart

Gloriam denique suam discipulis in solitudine demonstrauit
(2,8)

Tertullian tells the imprisoned Christians that *maiores tenebras habet mundus*[1], that's to say, the *saeculum*[2]–: the prison offers the Christian "the same thing as what the wilderness [is] to the prophets"[3], like the Lord who was doing prayer[4],

> "showed his glory to the disciples precisely while being with them alone"[5].

Thus, Tertullian invites the persecuted Christians to think of the prison as *a place of prayer*[6], because the *spirit*[7] of every man is

---

1 TE *mart*, 2, 2. Tertullian's rejection of *mundus* can seem a bit cutting, but it has to be taken into account that "il cristianesimo di Tertulliano già nel 197 è integrale novità di vita. Il secolo è in opposizione radicale alla vita del cristiano e alle sue attese escatologiche" [F. Sciuto, *"Tertulliano. Tre opere parenetiche* (Ad martyras, De patientia, De paenitentia)", Catania, 1961, xxi].

2 The "world" is, for Tertullian, all that is non-Christian; thus, the *saeculum* has no value for him, because the things of this world are nothing, compared to everlasting life.

3 "...quod eremus prophetis [praestat]" (TE *mart*, 2, 8, CChr.SL 1, 1954, 4).

4 Cfr. Lc 9,28-29.

5 "Gloriam denique suam discipulis in solitudine demonstrauit" (TE *mart*, 2, 8, CChr.SL 1, 1954, 4-5).

6 The prison *"habet tenebras, sed lumen estis ipsi; habet vincula, sed vos soluti deo estis"* (TE *mart*, 2, 4). Just like the three Apostles who've been with Jesus in climbing the mountain, the imprisoned Christians –the addressees of *Mart.*– can also convert their prison experience (= retreat) into an *encounter* with Jesus in glory.

7 "Vagare spiritu, spatiare spiritu, et non stadia opaca aut porticus longas proponent tibi, sed illam uiam, quae ad Deum ducit. Quotiens eam spiritu deambularis, totiens in carcere non eris" (TE *mart*, 2, 8, CChr.SL 1, 1954, 4-5). "Obscur, ténébreux, sombre: Publius Vergilius Maro, *Aeneid*, 4, 123" (Gaffiot, 1095). *Vagare* and *spatiare* indicate spatial movement, and Tertullian gives them a metaphorical and spiritual sense: the uagare and spatiare of someone who lets himself be guided by the *spiritus*, or *spiritus Dei.* Tertullian doesn't address only the Christians then, but the Christians here and now.

free[8]. The Christian, in prison or not, is called to seek God[9] because, *alone* with Jesus, He shows himself as glorious[10].

TE hae

> Quid eos ignorasse uoluit quibus etiam gloriam suam exhibuit,
> et Moysen et Helian et insuper de caelo patris uocem?
> *(22, 4-5)*

Here[11], against the Gnostics[12], the "*dementes*[13]" for Tertullian, Tertullian defends himself from the accusations to Peter[14] and John[15]:

> "What did the Lord want them [Peter, James, John] –to whom He also showed his glory, and Moses and Elijah,

---

8 "Etsi corpus includitur, etsi caro detinetur, omnia spiritui patent" (TE *mart*, 2, 9, CChr.SL 1, 1954, 4). Also, "...nihil cus sentit in neruo, cum animus in caelo est. Totum hominem animus circumfert" (ibid.).

9 Cfr. TE *mart*, 2, 8.

10 Ibid.

11 For Johannes Quasten, *Praescr*. (203) is "...the most finished, the most characteristic, and the most valuable of Tertullian's writings" [Quasten, II, 272; cfr. C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 600].

12 "Solent dicere non omnia apostolos scisse, eadem agitati dementia qua susum rursus conuertunt, omnia quidem apostolos scisse sed non omnia omnibus tradidisse" (TE *hae* 22, 2, CChr.SL 1, 1954, 203). What's worse is that, "in utroque Christum reprehensioni inicientes qui ate minus instructos at parum simplices apostolos miserit" (ibid.).

13 "Quis igitur integrae mentis credere potest aliquid eos ignorasse quos magistros Dominus dedit, indiuiduos habens in comitatu in discipulatu in conuictu, quibus obscura quaeque seorsum disserebat, illis dicens datum esse cognoscere arcana quae populo intellegere non liceret?" (TE *hae*, 22, 3, CChr.SL 1, 1954, 203).

14 "Latuit aliquid Petrum, aedificandae ecclesiae petram dictum, claues regni caelorum consecutum et soluendi et alligandi in caelis et in terris potestatem?" (TE *hae*, 22, 4-5, CChr.SL 1, 1954, 203).

15 "Latuit et Iohannem aliquid, dilectissimum Domino, pectori eius incubantem cui soli Dominus Iudam traditorem praemonstrauit quem loco suo filium Mariae demandauit?" (ibid.).

and moreover, the Father's voice coming from heaven– to ignore?"[16].

TE car

Alium in secessu montis in ambitu nubis
sub tribus arbitris clarum
alium ceteris passiuum ignobilem
(24,3)

Tertullian mentions the Transfiguration when defending the truth of the Incarnation[17]:

> "when [the Apostle] defines Christ as one and only, [this definition] destroys those who defend a multiform Christ, those who think in a Christ different from Jesus; one disappearing amidst the mob, another who detains the mob; one in the solitude of the mountain in the sphere (*ámbito*)18 of the cloud with three witnesses, another a clear experimenter of the neighbors' sufferings"[19].

Tertulliano reminds the reader of the Jesus–Christ unity. If those who err don't rectify themselves, in the παρουσια, everybody will know Whom they crucified[20].

---

[16] "Quid eos ignorasse uoluit quibus etiam gloriam suam exhibuit, et Moysen et Helian et insuper de caelo patris uocem?" (ibid.). Jesus willed that there be *three* witnesses of Jesus' Transfiguration, so that then the veracity might be proven (cfr. Dt 19,15; Mt 18,16).

[17] Cfr. Jn 1,14. Tertullian bases his argument on Scripture: "Certe <cum dicit> qui negat Christum in carne uenisse, hic antichristus est, nudam et absolutam et simplici nomine naturae suae pronuntians carnem, omnes disceptatores eius ferit" (TE *ca*, 24, 3, CChr.SL 2, 1954, 916).

[18] *Ambitus* suggests a "mouvement circulaire: M. Tullius Cicero, *Timaeus*, 26; 31; (...)" (Gaffiot, 113).

[19] "...definiens ipsum quoque Christum unum multiformis Christi argumentatores quatit, qui alium faciunt Christum alium Iesum, alium dilapsum de mediis turbis alium detentum, alium in secessu montis in ambitu nubis subtribus arbitris clarum alium ceteris passiuum ignobilem" (TE *ca*, 24, 3, CChr.SL 2, 1954, 916).

[20] Cfr. TE ca, 24, 4, CChr.SL 2, 1954, 916.

TE Marc

Satis iam audierant Moysen et prophetas,
qui secuti erant Christum
credendo Moysi et prophetis
(Marc. IV, 34,15)

Tertullian reminds Marcion that Moses and Elijah aren't those whom the voice commands to be listened to, but the *Filius*[21]. In order to dispel any suspicion (that smacks of Marcion's doctrine) when distinguishing Moses-Elijah and Jesus, Tertullian establishes the *OT–NT continuity*[22] linked to Peter's *confessio fidei*[23]. The faith of Peter, James, and John

> "merited confirmation by the celestial voice, upon commanding that He [Christ] – whom they had known – be listened to"[24].

[21] "'Immo', inquit, 'nostri dei monella de caelo non Moysen et prophetas iussit audiri, sed Christum: hunc audite'" (TE *Marc IV*, 34, 15, CChr.SL 1, 1954, 638).

[22] "...satis iam audierant Moysen et prophetas, qui secuti erant Christum credendo Moysi et prophetis" (Id., cit., 638–639). Following Christ is not to disobey Moses and the prophets; on the contrary, it's to bey them, because Moses and the prophets point to Christ.

[23] Cfr. Mc 16,16s. "Nec enim accepisset Petrus dicere: tu es Christus, antequam audisset et credidisset Moysi et prophetis, a quibus solis adhuc Christus adnuntiabatur" (TE *Marc* IV, 34, 16, CChr.SL 1, 1954, 639).

[24] "Haec igitur fides eorum meruerat, ut etiam uoce caelesti confirmaretur, iubente illum audiri, quem agnouerant" (ibid.). But, something awaits those who didn't want to believe the Son: "...qui non credebant omnino uel qui nec sic credebant, esse post mortem superbiae diuitiarum et gloriae deliciarum supplicia adnuntiata a Moyse et prophetis, decreta autem ab eo deo, qui de thronis deponit dynastas et de sterculinis eleuat inopes" (TE *Marc IV*, 34, 17, CChr.SL 1, 1954, 639).

TE an

Fidelis fuit et uisus et auditus in monte
(17,14)

In *An.*[25] (207), Tertullian affirms the veracity of Jesus' Transfiguration:

> "Marcion opted to believe that [Christ] was a phantasm, denying the truth of all his body. No. The Apostles perceived him with their [external] senses. He [Christ] was faithful and [was] seen and heard on the mountain [where he transfigured][26]; faithful, too, was the taste of that wine, which was water before, in the wedding in Galilee[27]; faithful, too, the touch of the credulous Thomas[28]"[29].

Moreover, Tertullian defends Jesus' true corporality with the Scripture and by the *testimonium Apostolorum*[30].

---

[25] For Kannengiesser, *An*. is, in the *opera tertullianea*, "Tertullian's longest, presents indirect references to scripture in the author's own exposition" [*HOPE*, cit., 605.]

[26] Cfr. Mt 17,3.

[27] Cfr. Jn 2,1.

[28] Cfr. Jn 20,27.

[29] "Marcion phantasma eum maluit credere, totius corporis in illo dedignatus ueritatem. Atquin ne in apostolis quidem eius ludificata natura est; fidelis fuit et uisus et auditus in monte, fidelis et gustus uini illius, licet aquae ante, in nuptiis Galilaeae, fidelis et tactus exinde creduli Thomae" (TE *an*, 17, 14, CChr.SL 2, 1954, 806). Tertullian gives examples of events in Jesus' life because Marcion affirmed that Christ was a *phantasm*. The examples of the external senses are *collateral proofs* that Jesus Christ is true man. Tertullian affirms that Jesus was transfigured *truly and visibly* before Peter, James and John.

[30] *"...lo que vimos lo que hemos oído, lo que hemos visto con nuestros ojos, ... lo que ... han palpado nuestras manos a propósito del Verbo de la vida"* (1 Jn 1,1; SagBi 5, 1466). If the external senses were lying, then John would be a liar, too.

TE je

> Merito igitur etiam in carne
> se dominus ei ostendit
> collegae ieiuniorum suorum,
> non minus et Heliae
> *(6,5)*

Tertullian, speaking about the *advantages of fasting*, says that God teaches even then –through experience– that man doesn't live on bread alone, but on the Word of God. As a counter-example, Tertullian recalls how the people at the foot of the mountain, even when more robust than Moses, couldn't fix their gaze intently even at Moses himself, who has been alimentado por Dios a la vez que ha ayunado, habiendo sido saciado, however –explains Tertullian– de la gloria de Dios[31], alluding to the Transfiguration.

TE Pra

> Quot personae tibi uidentur, peruersissime Praxeas, nisi quot et voces?
> *(23, 4)*

Tertullian states that "Scripture defends the difference by distinction between the visible and the invisible"[32], against

[31] "Ceterum cui cor erectum potius inueniebatur quam impinguatum, qui quadraginta diebus totidemque noctibus supra humanae naturae facultatem ieiunium perennauit spiritali fide uirtutem subministrante, et uidit oculis dei gloriam et audiuit auribus dei uocem et corde coniecit dei legem iam tunc docentis non in solo pane uiuere hominem, sed in omni uerbo dei, cum quidem nec ipsum Moysen deo pastum inediamque eius nomine saginatam constanter contemplari ualeret pinguior populus. Merito igitur etiam in carne se dominus ei ostendit collegae ieiuniorum suorum, non minus et Heliae" (TE *je*, 6, 5, CChr.SL 2, 1954, 1262).

[32] "...scripturam differentiar patrocinari per uisibilis et inuisibilis distinctionem" (TE *Pra*, 14, 5, CChr.SL 2, 1954, 1177). Here, Tertullian affirms that the Scripture defends the difference between the (invisible) Father and the (visible) Son, against the Praxeas' partisans, who insist in the *identitas* of the *uisibilis* and of the *inuisibilis*.

Praxeas[33]:

> "we say that the Son is, in himself and by himself, invisible, insofar as God's Word and Spirit, invisible already by himself, by virtue of the condition of his substance, and also because he is God, as God's Word and Spirit, but was visible before the Incarnation"[34].

Tertullian speaks of the perennial *invisibilitas* of the Father who grants Moses' request centuries after,

> "in the solitude of the mountain, as we read in the Gospel, where Moses was seen speaking with Him– it's clear that in the past, God –it's to say, the Son– was always seen as in a mirror, in an enigma, in a vision and in dreams, by the prophets as well as by the patriarchs, as by Moses himself"[35].

Upon affirming that God fulfilled his promise of reserving

---

[33] Cfr. TE *Pra*, 14, 5-6: "...et illud adicient ad argumentationem quod, si Filius tunc ad Moysen loquebatur, ipse faciem suam nemini uisibilem pronuntiarit quia scilicet ipse inuisibilis Pater fuerit in Filii nomine" (ibid.). Further on, Tertullian alludes to Praxeas' partisans, for whom "...ergo uisibilis et inuisibilis idem, et quia idem utrumque, ideo et ipse Pater inuisibilis, qua et Filius, uisibilis" (TE *Pra*, 14, 6, CChr.SL 2, 1954, 1177).

[34] "Dicimus enim et Filium suo nomine eatenus inuisibilem, qua sermo et Spiritus Dei, ex substantiae condicione iam nunc, et quia Deus, ut sermo et spiritus Dei, uisibilem autem fuisse ante carnem" (ibid.). In order to illustrate this point about the *Filius*, Tertullian cites the OT and the NT. Nm 12,6-8 says: *""Cuando hay entre vosotros un profeta del Señor, mediante visiones yo me doy a conocer, en el sueño yo le hablo. Esto no lo hago con mi siervo Moisés. Conversamos cara a cara. Mediante visión"* (SagBi 1, 650). And Saint Paul: *ahora vemos como en un espejo, borrosamente; entonces, veremos cara a cara* (1 Co 13,12; SagBi 5, 1020).

[35] "...in montis secessu, sicut legimus in euangelio uisum cum illo Moysen colloquentem– apparet retro semper in speculo et aenigmate et uisione et somnio Deum, id est Filium Dei, uisum tam prophetis et patriarchis quam et ipsi adhuc Moysi" (TE *Pra*, 14, 7, CChr.SL 2, 1954, 1177). That wait and that fulfillment of the Lord's promise to Moses justify the antitheses quoted by Tertullian.

for Moses the vision and the dialogue *facie ad faciem*[36] in the Transfiguration, it's implied that, however close the relationship between the Lord and Moses may be, the vision Moses had of the Lord was fuzzy, as compared to the clarity of the presence of the transfigured Jesus, centuries after[37].

Tertullian relates the Father –"*...a quien ningún hombre ha visto ni puede ver*[38], explaining further[39]: *El único que es inmortal, el que habita en una luz inaccesible* (1 Tm 6,16[40])"[41]– *with the Filius, "... al rey de los siglos, al inmortal, invisible y único Dios*[42]" and to the incarnate Son, contrary things can be assigned:

> "mortality, accessibility, of whom [the Apostle] bears witness of having died [Jesus] according to the Scriptures[43], and of having seen him, in the end, through a light, indeed accessible, even if he himself [Pablo] didn't experience it[44] without danger [to the eyes] due to the luminosity (cfr. Hch 9,8)"[45].

---

[36] Cfr. 1 Co 13,12.

[37] It was a friendly conversation, but Moses didn't see the Lord's face. Moses would've to wait until the Transfiguration for the Lord's promise to be fulfilled.

[38] 1 Tm 6,16; SagBi 5, 1268.

[39] *"Exaggerans amplius".* The verb *exaggerare* "ha il senso di 'colmare con un terrapieno' (*agger*), poi 'ingrandire, aumentare' (r*em familiarem*), 'colmare' (*aliquem honoribus*); (...) ha anche il significato di 'insistire, inculcare', che deriva probabilmente dal termine retorico exaggeratio ('amplificazione')" [G. Scarpat (ed.), *Q.S.F. Tertulliano, Adversus Praxean,* Loescher Editore, Torino, 1959, 234].

[40] SagBi 5, 1267.

[41] "Quem nemo uidit hominum, sed nec uidere potest, exaggerans amplius: Qui solus habet immortalitatem et lucem habitat inaccesibilem" (TE *Pra*, 15, 8, CChr.SL 2, 1954, 1180).

[42] Tm 1,17; SagBi 5, 1253.

[43] Cfr. 1 Co 15,3.8.

[44] *Expertus est* could be translated as "(he) experienced", although the word "*experientia*" didn't exist in Tertullian's time.

[45] "...mortalitatem, accessibilitatem, quem mortuum contestatur secundum scripturas et a se nouissime uisum per accessibilem utique lucem, quanquam et illam neque et ipse sine periculo luminis expertus est" (TE *Pra*, 15, 8, CChr.SL 2, 1954, 1180). While φως (*luz*) is associated with seeing God, ιο [A]απροσιτον (inaccessible) emphasizes the infinite distance between God and creatures [cfr. L. Johnson, *The First and Second Letters to Timothy,* in W. Albright – D. Freedman (eds.), AncB, Doubleday, New York, 2001, 309].

Then, Tertullian connects Paul's experience with that of the three Apostles, since

> "neither Peter, nor John, nor James [had the experience] without losing their mind. But, had they seen not the glory of the Son who's about to suffer [the Passion], but [the glory of] the Father, I believe they wouldv'e died instantly[46]. *For man shall not see me and live* (Ex 33,20[47])"[48].

Against Praxeas' partisans' possible obejction on this topic[49], Tertullian says that Peter, John and James have experienced a phenomenon Tertullian calls *amentia*[50]. Moreover, if the three Apostles, in Jesus' Transfiguration, were to behold the Father as he is (as what Praxeas holds) instead of the Son, then Peter, James and John would die at once[51].

For that reason[52],

> "He who was seen in the end was always seen, and that He wasn't seen in the end, He who hasn't been seen from

---

[46] *Morituri ibidem*. Here, *ibidem* doesn't mean "the same", but "immediate", a synonym of *statim, illico*, already with a space-time nuance: "in that very place".

[47] *"...ningún ser humano puede verlo y seguir vivendo"* (SagBi 1, 435).

[48] "...neque Petrus et Iohannes et Iacobus sine rationis et amentia, qui, si non passuri Filii gloriam sed Patrem uidissent, credo, morituri ibidem. Deum enim nemo videbit et uiuet" (TE *Pra*, 15, 8, CChr.SL 2, 1954, 1180).

[49] It's as if Praxeas' partisans were to pose the query: *¿Y si los tres Apóstoles que Jesús tomó consigo al evento de la Transfiguración sólo hubieran visto al Padre, y no al Hijo?* It's because Praxeas' partisans only admit that one and only one Person was seen in the Transfiguration event.

[50] The word ἔκστασις, dear to Tertullian the montanist, reappears. But, Scarpat observes, "sembra che Tertulliano abbia sentito nei termini greci del racconto evangelico qualcosa di più di quanto in realtà vogliano significare, interpretandoli secondo la concepzione montanistica delle condizioni in cui avveniva la 'profezia' (stato di estasi)" (*Q.S.F. Tertulliano, Adversus Praxean,* cit., 236).

[51] Cfr. Ex 33,20.

[52] Here, Tertullian retakes the argumental thread regarding i*nuisibilis/uisibilis.*

the beginning: therefore, it deals with two [Persons]– the visible and the invisible. Therefore, the Son was always seen; the Son has always conversed; the Son has always worked by the Father's authority and will, because *the Son can do nothing of his own accord, but only what he sees the Father doing*[53], or in other words, the Son works by thinking. Because the Father works by thinking, the Son –since he truly sees into the Father's mind– carries out what he sees [in the Father]"[54].

Tertullian explains this *cooperatio*:

"...if [the Father] has created everything through the Son, he must've also extended the heavens through the Son, not [in the sense that Father[55]], does it alone, but [in the sense that] He was the only one, without other [gods]"[56].

Moreover,

"...hence, associating the Son, he is the interpreter of

[53] Jn 5,19.

[54] "...constat eum semper uisum ab initio qui uisus fuerit in fine et eum nec in fine uisum qui nec ab initio fuit uisus et ita duos esse, uisum et inuisum. Filius ergo uisus est semper et Filius conuersatus est semper et Filius operatus est semper ex auctoritate Patris et uoluntate quia Filius nihil a semetipso potest facere, nisi uiderit Patrem facientem, in sensu scilicet facientem. Pater enim sensu agit, Filius uero quod in Patris sensu est uidens perficit. Sic omnia per Filium facta sunt et sine illo factum est nihil" (TE *Pra*, 15, 9, CChr.SL 2, 1954, 1180). All that the Son does, he does it thinking of the Father's work, that is, the Father's will. So much so, that by quoting Jn 1,3, Tertullian reaffirms the Son's presence, preexistence and mediation in Creation.

[55] This monopersonalist creation –which Tertullian mentions– is Praxeas' thesis.

[56] "...si per Filium omnia, caelum quoque per Filium extendens, non solus extendit nisi illa ratione qua a ceteris solus" (TE *Pra*, 19, 4, CChr.SL 2, 1954, 1185). By the Son's *cooperatio* with the Father, Tertullian recalls the Father's words, in praise of the Son, granting victory to his hands: "Anulo los presagios de los agoreros, y vuelvo necios a los hechiceros; echo atrás a los sabios y convierto su sabiduría en necedad" (Is 44,25; SagBi 4, 217)].

> how he [the Father] has extended the heavens by himself –that is, only he with the Son– as he is one with the Son. So too will the voice be the Son's: I [am the Lord,] who stretched out the heavens alone[57], because thanks to the word (sermo), the heavens were confirmed, because with the help of the wisdom in the word, heaven was prepared, and all was created by the word. It's also logical, that the Son alone has extended heaven, because only He has been to the service of the Father's work"[58].

If with the help of the *sophia* in the *sermo*, heaven was prepared, and everything was created by the *sermo*, that is, the *Filius*, then the same Son has administered in the creation worked by the Father[59].

Tertullian clarifies: although "the Son's voice would've sufficed to the Father"[60], however, given the intimate union *Pater–Filius,* the Father responds from heaven, glorifying the Son"[61].

Tertullian asks:

"How many Persons do you think there are, oh very

---

[57] Is 44,24: *"Yo solo desplegué los cielos"* (SagBi 4, 216).

[58] "Ita Filium subiungens ipse interpretator est quomodo caelum solus extenderit, scilicet cum Filio solus sicut cum Filio unum. Proinde et Filii erit uox: *Extendi caelum solus*, quia sermone caeli confirmati sunt, quia sophia in sermone adsistente paratum est caelum et omnia per sermonem sunt facta, competit et Filium solum extendisse caelum quia solus operationi Patris ministrauit" (TE Pra, 19, 5, CChr.SL 2, 1954, 1185). With the background theme of the *cooperatio Filii cum Patre in creatione*, Tertullian explains that the voice is the Son's (cfr. Is 44,24), because thanks to the Son, the skies were put into place (cfr. Sal 32,6).

[59] Cfr. Is 55,11. After recalling the fecundity made by the rain, Isaiah places in God's mouth that "así será la palabra que sale de mi boca: no volverá a mí de vacío, sino que hará lo que Yo quiero y realizará la misión que le haya confiado" (Is 55,11; SB 4, 260).

[60] "...suffecerat Filii ad Patrem uox" (TE *Pra*, 23, 3, CChr.SL 2, 1954, 1192).

[61] "...ecce ex abundanti respondet de caelo Pater, Filio contestatus: *Hic est Filius meus dilectus, in quo bene sensi, audite illum; ita et esto; Glorificaui et glorificabo rursus"* (ibid.).

> mistaken[62] Praxeas, if not how many the voices [are]? There you have the Son on earth, and the Father in the heavens. This is no separation [of the Persons], but the divine disposition. Apart from that, we know that God is also in the abyss[63], and that he dwells everywhere. We know that the Son is inseparable from the Father. Still, in the same economy[64], the Father decided that the Son might be found on earth, and He [the Father] in heaven, to where the Son himself fixed his gaze, praying[65] and begging the Father"[66].

From the *oratio Filii ad Patrem*, Tertullian sees an *exemplum*, because the incarnate Son prayed "teaching us to elevate ourselves in prayer: *Our Father, who art in heaven* (Mt 6,9[67])"[68].

Going further with the Pater–Filius theme, Tertullian says:

---

[62] Here, *peruersitas* pertain to doctrinal errors, in short: heresies (cfr. G. Scarpat, *Q.S.F. Tertulliano, Adversus Praxean*, cit., 166). Peruersitas can mean "erreur: Tert. *Prax*. 1, 4" (cfr. Gaffiot, 1180).

[63] Cfr. Sal 138,8.

[64] According to J. Moingt, sj, "l'Économie est la dispensation du Plan de Dieu en plusiers activités, successives et coordonnées, et la distribution de ces activités entre plusieurs Personnes, qui se montrent ainsi distinctes et unies" (*Théologie Trinitaire de Tertullien*, Aubier-Montaigne, Paris, III, 1966, 909).

[65] Cfr. Jn 11,41.

[66] "Quot personae tibi uidentur, peruersissime Praxeas, nisi quot et voces? Habes Filium in terris, habes Patrem in caelis. Non est separatio ista, sed dispositio diuina. Ceterum scimus Deum etiam intra abyssos esse et ubique consistere, sed ui et potestate, Filiumque et indiuiduum cum ipso ubique. Tamen in ipsa oikonomia Pater uoluit Filium in terris haberi, se uero in caelis, quo et ipse Filius suscipiens et orabat et postulabat a Patre quo" (TE Pra, 23, 4, CChr. SL 2, 1954, 1192). The Father and the Son are very, very much united, but without ever being one and only one Person. If there are two voices, it's because there are two Persons. Moreover, if the Son is on earth, and the Father is in heaven, there are two Persons differentiated solely in their *being relational*: paternity and filiation. Tertullian explains the inseparability of the Father and the Son as a *non separatio*, an expression that complements the *dispositio diuina*.

[67] SagBi 5, 96.

[68] "...nos erectos docebat orare: *Pater noster, qui es in caelis"* (TE *Pra*, 23, 4, CChr.SL 2, 1954, 1192).

"[the Father] has placed the Son a little less than the angels[69] in order to send him here[70]. However, [the Father] would also crown [the Son] with glory and honor, when he receives him in the heavens. [The Father] already guaranteed this when he [the Father says: L*o he glorificado y de nuevo lo glorificaré* (Jn 12,28[71])"[72].

Tertullian poses another question to Praxeas:

"Why do you make of the Father and the Son liars? If the Father –from the heavens– was speaking to the Son while he himself was the Son on earth, or if the Son was asking the Father while He himself was the Father in heaven, [then] how would it be possible for the Son to ask his very Self while asking the Father, if the Son was the Father? How would it be possible for the Father to promise his Self, when he was promising to the Son, if the Son turned out to be the Father?"[73]. Tertullian defends

[69] Cfr. Sal 8,5.

[70] It's what will be later called the *exitus*.

[71] SagBi 5, 651.

[72] "Minorauit Filium modico citra angelos ad terram dimittendo, gloria tamen et honore coronaturus illum in caelos resumendo. Haec iam praestabat illi dicens: Et glorificaui et glorificabo" (TE *Pra*, 23, 5, CChr.SL 2, 1954, 1192).

[73] "Quid mendacem facis et Patrem et Filium? si aut Pater de caelis loquebatur ad Filium cum ipse esset Filius apud terras, aut Filius ad Patrem precabatur cum ipse esset Pater apud caelos, quale est ut Filius item postularet a semetipso postulando a Patre si Filius erat Pater, aut iterum Pater sibi ipse promitteret promittendo Filio si Pater erat?" (TE *Pra*, 23, 6, CChr.SL 2, 1954, 1192). Tertullian exclaims to Praxeas' partisans: "Vt sic duos diuisos diceremus, quomodo iactitatis, tolerabilius erat duos diuisos quam unum Deum uersipellem praedicare" (TE *Pra*, 23, 7, CChr.SL 2, 1954, 1192). *Versipellem* comes from popular terminology. Tertullian recalls Jesus' words: "...ad istos tunc Dominus pronuntiauit: *Non propter me ista uox uenit, sed propter uos*, ut credant et hi et Patrem et Filium in suis quemque nominibus et personis et locis" (ibid.). What John puts in Jesus' mouth in Jn 12,30 is applied by Tertullian to Praxeas and company, so that they may realize the distinction *Pater–Filius* in terms of the name, the person and the position (Father and Son).

> the faith of the Apostles: "...for us, all the Scriptures, the Old and the New, define God's Anointed One as the Son of God. This was preached before, this was preached by Christ himself; still, [it was] even [taught] by the Father who, from heaven, openly proclaimed and glorified the Son: *This is my Son*[74]*; and: I have glorified it, and I will glorify it again*[75], the disciples also believed this, but not the Jews. Because He [the Son] wanted them to believe him, so in every moment he named the Father, invoked the Father and honored the Father"[76].

Praxeas and his partisans insult not the Father but the Son, whom they didn't recognize[77]. Tertullian reasons out[78] that what the Son says (that he who sees him, sees the Father[79]) is in harmony with that of the Son and the Father are one[80], since: the Son came from the Father and came to the world[81]; the Son is the Way... No one goes to the Father, if not through the Son[82]; and: No one can come to the Son if the Father who sent him doesn't attract him[83];

---

[74] Lc 9,35.

[75] Jn 12,28.

[76] "Nobis omnes scripturae et ueteres Christum Dei et nouae Filium Dei praefiniunt. Hoc et retro praedicabatur, hoc et ab ipso Christo pronuntiabatur, immo iam et ab ipso Patre coram de caelis Filium profitente et Filium glorificante: *Hic est Filius meus; et: Glorificavi et glorificabo*, hoc et a discipulis credebatur, hoc et a Iudaeis non credebatur. Hoc se uolens credi ab illis omni hora Patrem nominabat et Patrem praeferebat et Patrem honorabat" (TE *Pra*, 24, 3, CChr.SL 2, 1954, 1194).

[77] "Dominus eum se ignorari exprobrans quem ignorauerant, eum utique agnosci uolebat quem tanto tempore non agnosci exprobrauerat, id est Filium" (TE *Pra*, 24, 4, CChr.SL 2, 1954, 1194).

[78] Cfr. TE *Pra*, 24, 5, CChr.SL 2, 1954, 1194. Tertullian only *enumerates* the passages as argument of the *Pater-Filius* relationship.

[79] Cfr. Jn 14,9.

[80] Cfr. Jn 10,30. The Son wills to be believed because his followers hadn't yet believed him, and because the Father bears witness (cfr. Mt 17,5). If one believes in the Son, when he sees Him, then, it's as if he had seen the Father (cfr. Jn 10,30).

[81] Cfr. Jn 16,28 (cfr. SagBi 5, 674).

[82] Cfr. Jn 14,6 (cfr. SagBi 5, 662).

[83] Cfr. Jn 6,44 (cfr. SagBi 5, 608).

and: to the Son, his Father has given everything[84]; and: Well just as the Father gives life, so too the Son[85] and: Had the Son been known, the Father would've been known, too[86]. Tertullian recapitulates the sense of these *six key-quotes*:

> "He [the Son] had shown himself as the Father's vicar[87], through whom the Father would be seen in his actions, heard in his words, and known in the Son, who administered the Father's acts and words, because the Father is invisible, just as Philip had learned in the Law, and should've recalled: *for man shall not see me and live*[88]. Well, thus, he [Philip] is reproached by having wanted to see the Father as if [the latter] were already visible, and have been taught that He is visible in the Son, in his actions, not by the representation of the [Father's] person"[89].

TE res

Dominus quoque in seccesu montis
etiam uestimenta luce mutauerat,
sed liniamenta Petro agnoscibilia seruauerat
(55,10)

Against the Docetae[90] who denied Jesus' resurrection, Tertullian

---

[84] Cfr. Mt 11,27 (cfr. SagBi 5, 129).
[85] Cfr. Jn 5,21.
[86] Cfr. Jn 14,7.
[87] *Vicarium* signifies that upon seeing the Son, the Father will be seen (cfr. Jn 14,9); when one listens to the Son, the Father will be heard.
[88] Ex 33,20.
[89] "...uicarium se Patris ostenderat, per quem Pater et uideretur in factis et audiretur in uerbis et cognosceretur in Filio facta et uerba Patris administrante, quia inuisibilis pater quod et Philippus didicerat in lege et meminisse debuerat: Deum nemo uidebit et uiuet. Et ideo suggillatur Patrem uidere desiderans quasi uisibilem et instruitur uisibilem eum in Filio fieri ex uirtutibus, non ex personae re praesentatione" (TE *Pra*, 24, 6, CChr.SL 2, 1954, 1194).
[90] Marcion, Apelles, Valentinus, and Alexander.

mentions the *visible change* in Scripture characters[91], just as

> "...the Lord, too, in the solitude of the mountain, changed his clothes through the light, but with the characteristics still recognizable for Peter; there also [are] Moses and Elijah, one in the image of the flesh not [yet] received [by him], another in the truth which hasn't yet been relinquished; notwithstanding they teach that the same bodily condition also survive in glory"[92].

Jean Doignon observes that "the Transfiguration and the visible presence of Moses and of Elijah in this scene are the proofs of the survival of the glorified bodies according to *Res*. 55,10"[93]. For Tertullian, the Transfiguration teaches that in glory, the same bodily condition survives.

Tertullian addresses the heretics[94]. Thus, there could be changes, conversions, reforms to carry out the resurrection, but

---

[91] "Hanc formam demutationis diuina etiam documenta testantur. Mutatur Mosei manus et quidem ad instar emortuae exsanguis et exalbida et frigida, sed et recepto calora et refuso colore eadem caro et sanguis est. Mutatur postea et facies eiusdem incontemplabili claritate, sed Moyses erat proinde qui non uidebatur. Sic et Stephanus angelicum iam fastigium induerat, sed non alia genua in lapidatione succidetant" (TE *res*, 55, 8-9, CChr.SL 2, 1954, 1002).

[92] "Dominus quoque in seccesu montis etiam uestimenta luce mutauerat, sed liniamenta Petro agnoscibilia seruauerat; ubi etiam Moyses et Helias, alter in imagine carnis nondum receptae, alter in ueritate nondum defunctae, eandem tamen habitudinem corporis etiam in gloria perseuerare docuerant" (TE *res*, 55, 10, CChr.SL 2, 1954, 1002).

[93] "La Transfiguration et la présence visible de Moïse et d'Élie à cette scène sont des preuves de la survie des corps glorifiés selon Tert., *resurr.*, 55,10" [J. Doignon (ed.), *Hilaire de Poitiers, Sur Matthieu, tome II,* SC 258, 1979, 65, note 8].

[94] "Quodsi et transfigurationem et conuersionem in transitu substantiae cuiusque defendis, ergo et Saul in alium uirum conuersus de corpore suo excessit?" (TE *res*, 55, 11, CChr.SL 2, 1954, 1003).

always safeguarding the substance of the flesh[95].

Tertulllian gives the example of Moses and Elijah[96] with the transfigured Jesus in order to make all see –according to Paolo Siniscalco– that "being changed (...) doesn't imply in fact perishing (...), to perish means not being more what one has been"[97]. Jesus, upon transfiguring himself, is the same Jesus. Yes, he was transfigured, but didn't perish because of that, nor did he change who he is.

TE sco

Cui potius figuram uocis suae declarasset,
quam cui effigiem gloriae suae reuelauit,
Petro Iohanni Iacobo?
(12,1)

TE *sco*[98] connects the *schola Christi* with the *scientia Scripturarum*[99] of Jesus closest witnesses:

> "[To] who [else] did he reveal the meaning of his word better, but to whom he revealed the image of his glory

[95] Tertullian adds: "Et ipse satanas, cum in angelum lucis transfiguratur, qualitatem suam amittit? Non opinor. Ita et in resurrectionis euentu mutari conuerti reformari licebit cum salute substantiae" (TE *res*, 55, 12, CChr.SL 2, 1954, 1003). However much the devil disguises himself as an angel of light, he'll forever continue to be the father of lies.

[96] Cfr. Mt 17,3s.

[97] "...l'essere mutati (...) non implica affatto il perire (...), perire significa non essere più ciò che si è stati" (Paolo Siniscalco, "*Ricerche sul 'De Resurrectione' di Tertuliano", Editrice Studium, Roma*, 1966, 73).

[98] *Scorpiace* (σκορπιακηντιδοτος) cures the scorpion sting, that's to say, heresy.

[99] "Quis nunc medullam scripturarum, magis nosset, quam ipsa Christi schola? Quos et sibi discipulos dominus adoptauit omnia utique edocendos et nobis magistros adordinauit omnia utique docturos" (TE *sco*, 12, 1, CChr.SL 2, 1954, 1092).

–to Peter, John and James?"[100].

Tertullian quotes Peter in order to encourage the persecuted Christians:

> "Beloved: don't be surprised –as if it was something unusual– of the fire that has been kindled among you in order to test you; rather, be happy, because just as you participate in Christ's sufferings, so too may you be happy in order for you to be filled with joy in the revelation of his glory. Blessed are you if they insult you because of Christ's name; you're blessed because the glory, which is God's Spirit, dwells upon you"[101].

TE mon

Cum in reuelatione gloriae suae
de tot sanctis et prophetis
Moysen et Heliam secum mauult,
alterum monogamum,
alterum spadonem
(8,7)

Tertullian mentions Moses and Elijah in the context of the Transfiguration,

[100] "Cui potius figuram uocis suae declarasset, quam cui effigiem gloriae suae reuelauit, Petro Iohanni Iacobo?" (ibid.). After giving Paul's example, Tertullian asks: "An et illi aliter, quam sentiunt, scribunt, fallaciae magistri, non veritatis?" (ibid.).

[101] "Dilecti, ne epauescatis ustionem, quae agitur in uobis in temptationem, quasi nouum accidat uobis. Et enim secundum quod communicatis passionibus Christi, gaudete, uti et in reuelatione gloriae eius gaudeatis exultantes. Si dedecoramini in nomine Christi, beati estis, quod gloria et dei spiritus requiescit in uobis" (TE *sco*, 12, 3, CChr.SL 2, 1954, 1092. Cfr. 1 P 4,12-16; SagBi 5, 1432–1433). One glimpses at the perplexity of the addressees of 1 P by virtue of intense and prolonged suffering. "...by any ordinary assessment their exultation should belong to the future (...) but for the writer the joy of the end overflows into the present, irradiating the wretched plight of those to whom he writes" [J.N.D. Kelly (1969, 57), cfr. J. Elliott, *1 Peter,* from W. Albright – D. Freedman (eds.), AncB, Doubleday, New York, 2000, 777.

> "when, in the revelation of his glory, from among so many saints and prophets, he chooses Moses and Elijah, the one a monogamous [man], the other a eunuch"[102],

thus highlighting that Moses and Elijah have been chosen to represent the prophets and patriarchs, by their exemplary life.

Principal affirmations

TE *mart, 2* consoles the imprisoned Christians who are reminded that although the body is tied, the spirit is free. They can take advantage of the solitude in order to unite themselves to Jesus Christ, who, alone with them, transfigures himself in order to rekindle their hope.

TE *hae, 22* defends the faith from the Gnostic accusation –that the Apostles haven't transmitted all that they knew, or that they didn't possess all that they should've known– when referring to the Transfiguration: it isn't possible for the Apostles to ignore anything, if Jesus himself made the three Apostles see his glory in the Transfiguration.

TE *car, 24* defends the unity of Christ Jesus and the truth of the Incarnation, saying that Jesus who transfigures is the same Jesus who gives himself to the Passion.

TE *Marc IV* establishes that listening to the Son more than the Law and the Prophets, while it, at the same time, establishes the unity and continuity of the Scriptures. Peter's, James', and John's faith was confirmed by the Father's voice.

TE *an, 17* defends the truth of the Incarnation and of the Transfiguration: Jesus (not a ghost) was seen and heard by the external senses.

---

[102] "...cum in reuelatione gloriae suae de tot sanctis et prophetis Moysen et Heliam secum mauult, alterum monogamum, alterum spadonem" (TE *mon*, 8, 7, CChr.SL 2, 1954, 1240).

TE *je, 6*, observes that Moses, after fasting, merited to see the Lord's glory, which prefigures his presence in the Transfiguration.

TE *Pra* speaks of the distinction and the cooperation, the union (not the monopersonality) of the Invisible Father and the Visible Son, visible even before the Incarnation as the Father's vicar, but who makes himself visible in a clear, luminous way in the Transfiguration, an event in which three Apostles didn't see a mono-personal god (as those of Praxeas think); rather, the three Apostles saw the Son (whom Praxeas' partisans insult since they don't recognize him) and listened to the Father, without them seeing the Father (otherwise, they would've died).

TE *res, 55* defends the truth of the resurrection of the flesh when it says that Jesus transfigured, but was recognized as Jesus. Moses and Elijah confirm that in the resurrection, change doesn't mean erradication of who one was in life.

TE *sco, 12* encourages the persecuted Christians by the hope for the future glory.

TE *mo, 8* highlights Moses' and Elijah's example; so, they got chosen to bear witness to the transfigured Jesus.

2. Cyprianus Carthaginiensis

Thasius Caecilius Cyprianus Carthaginiensis episcopus (martyr in Carthage, 14 September 258[1]), quotes three Scripture passages in order to justify the New Law.

First, he quotes the prophet Micah:

> *"For out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. He shall judge between many peoples, and shall decide for strong nations afar off".*

Then, Cyprian quotes the prophet Isaiah:

> *"For out of Zion shall go forth the law, of the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. He shall judge between the nations[3]".*

In the end, Cyprian quotes the Father in Jesus' Transfiguration:

> *"And a voice from the cloud said, 'This is my beloved Son, with whom I am well pleased; listen to him[4]".*

All in all, it was fitting that the New Law be given not only that there might be justice, but also because the Son himself –the New Law– would've to be listened, as the Father's voice commanded.

---

1 Bévenot, SJ, M, *Introductio Generalis, Sancti Cypriani Episcopi Opera,* CChr. SL 3, 1972, v. He was a *rhetor* who converted to Christianity. As a Bishop (248-249) (ibid.), he witnesses the horrible persecution of the emperors Decius (250-251) and of Valerian (257-258).

2 [Mi 4,2-3: *"Porque de Sión saldrá la Ley, y de Jerusalén la palabra del Señor. Él juzgará entre la multitud de los pueblos, y reprenderá a naciones poderosas y lejanas"* (SagBi 4, 1133); CY te, I, x, CChr.SL 3, 1972, 13].

3 [Is 2, 3.4: *"Porque de Sión saldrá la Ley, y de Jerusalén la palabra del Señor (...) Él juzgará entre las naciones"* (SagBi 4, 65); CY *te*, I, x, CChr.SL 3, 1972, 13].

4 Mt 17,5; CY te, I, x, CChr.SL 3, 1972, 13.

3. Pseudo – Cyprianus Carthaginiensis

Contumeliam fecerunt Patri in Filio
(Adu. Iud., III, 1)

PS-CY Jud speaks of those who repudiated the Son with a foretold repudiation[1]. What's worse is that

> "the Father has suffered insults in the Son"[2],

because the Father himself –during Jesus' Transfiguration– has given testimony that Jesus is his beloved Son[3]. In Jesus' Transfiguration, together with the Father's (greater) testimony, Jesus' Person is also confirmed

> "by the testimony of Moses and Elijah on the mountain, where [Jesus] said before that the mystery of the Scripture not be made public, unless the Son of man rises from the dead"[4].

---

1 "Hijos crié y eduqué, pero ellos se rebelaron contra Mí" (Is 1,2; SagBi 4, 57).

2 "...contumeliam fecerunt Patri in Filio" (PS–CY, Jud, III, 1, CChr.SL 4, 1972, 268).

3 Cfr. Mt 17,5.

4 "...teste Moyse et Helia in montem, ubi praecepit ne patefieret scripturae sacramentum, nisi Filius hominis resurrexisset de mortuis [PS–CY, *Jud*, V, 4, CChr.SL 4, 1972, 271)]. Aside from being a possible exegesis of Mt 17,9, to allude –negatively– that in the mountain of Transfiguration, Jesus anticipated that the *sacramentum Scripturarum* would only be known after the Resurrection, it's possible that this revelation to them who'd know of the Transfiguration (in the Apostolic preaching after the Resurrection) to form part of the conloquium among Jesus, Moses and Elijah, when speaking of Jesus' excessus in Jerusalem (cfr. Lc 9,31)

4. C. M. V. Commodianus

Claudius Marius Victorius Commodianus (3rd c.), who had lived in many places[1], – in COM *in*, Book I of which contains 43 verses[2], in the part *De Antecristi*[3] *Tempore* – speaks of Elijah's arrival, already mentioned by Jesus after the Transfiguration event:

"Elijah will arrive first[4] to seal the lovers"[5].

So, Commodianus mentions Elijah's arrival to reconcile the lovers.

[1] "Possibly from Syria, but settled in the West, most probably in Africa, Commodian belongs to a Jewish-Christian group in conflict with rabbinic authorities" [C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 623].
[2] Cfr. ibid.
[3] N.b. sic.
[4] Cfr. Mt 17,10; Mc 9,10.
[5] "Helias ueniet prius signare dilectos" (COM *in*, I, xli, CChr.SL 128, 1960, 34).

5. Anonymus (Eusebius Vercellensis?)

Mutauit uirtutem deitatis
(II transfigurauit se coram illis)
(L. 8/10, 11)

An author, perhaps Eusebius Vercellensis (4th c.[1]), interprets the Transfiguration as the event where Jesus

> "changed the force of the deity (*II* transfigured in their midst)"[2].

[1] Cfr. KVS4.

[2] "...mutauit uirtutem deitatis (*II* transfigurauit se coram illis)" (AN fi, 11, CSEL 9, 1962, 117). Besides, this author interprets the event in Mt 17,5 thus: "nubis uero splendida uirtutem Patris in eum (eo) ostendit" (ibid.).

6. Hilarius Pictauiensis

HIL Mt

Hilary says that "Moses and Elijah shall sit in the Kingdom of the heavens"[1], an event exemplified in Jesus' Transfiguration. In fact, for Hilary, not only can the three Apostles be included among those alluded to in Mt 16,28, but that Jesus' words there are addressed to those Apostles[2].

When Moses and Elijah appear in the comitatio during Jesus' Transfiguration, Hilary expresses that "we understand that these are the two Prophets who go before his [the Messiah's] arrival"[3].

Hilary describes the company made to Jesus by the three Apostles,

> "to whom the Son of man showed himself just how he would come in his Kingdom, afterwards when, in the presence of Moses and Elijah on the mountain, [the Lord] was surrounded by the [visible] honor of his perennial glory. But, the motive by which he has taken them has been He himself, then and now"[4]:

that of bearing witness[5] to the historical manifestation of the eternal glory (=the Transfiguration) and the manifestion of the Son's obedience to the Father's will (=in the Garden of Olives).

---

1 "...in regno caelorum Moyses et Elias adsidebunt" (HIL *Mt*, 20, 10, SC 258, 1979, 112.114).

2 "...spopondisset Dominus uisuros quosdam de Apostolis, antequam mortem gustarent, Filium hominis uenientem in regno suo" (ibid.).

3 "...hos (...) eosdem prophetas duos praeuenientes aduentum eius esse intelligimus" (ibid.).

4 "...quibus uenturus in Regno suo Filius hominis ostentus est, tum cum, adsistentibus in monte Moyse et Helia, toto aeternae gloriae suae honore circumdatus est. Sed quae tunc adsumendorum eorum, eadem et nunc fuit causa" (*HIL Mt*, 31, 4, SC 258, 1979, 230)

5 Cfr. ibid. This testimony is not for the three Apostles to keep to themselves, but is for them to let the others know everywhere, after Jesus rises from the dead.

HIL tri

In the treatise HIL tri (books I-XII)[6] maybe started in the West and ended in Frigia[7], one sees Hilary's theory, that Christ's body, being a true human body, isn't exactly as weak as ours[8].

After describing the difficulty of speaking about the Genitor/Pater–Genitus/Filius relationship, Hilary admits that he treads on the realm of mystery, and his mind genuflects before the Father and the Son[9]. Hilary reminds that the Genitus is the imago inuisibilis Dei[10], forma Patris ingeniti[11], and recalls his relationship with the Genitor[12].

---

[6] It's "...la sua opera dottrinale piú importante" (L. Longobardo, *Ilario di Poitiers, Commentario a Matteo,* cit., 7).

[7] Cfr. ibid. HIL *tri* seeks the Scriptures' *absoluta significatio* and *inexplicabilis intelligentia* (I), leading to a *confessio Dei*, which denounces the heresies against the command to baptize all peoples (cfr. Mt 23,19-20) (II,1-5), and then there's catechesis on the Trinity (III,6-35). The Christological exposition (III) refutes Arrianism (which threatens the Christian faith in the West) and is based on 1 Cor 1,17-19 when speaking of the experiential spiritual ascent [cfr. C. Kannengiesser (ed.)., *HOPE*, cit., 1000]. Thus, HIL tri I-III are called books *De fide*. In HIL tri -VI, "...as a newcomer facing the mighty rhetoric of Greek Arianism (...), Hilary starts by working out an argument borrowed from Irenaeus, first in calling on OT *exempla* (...); secondly, in resting his case on the Gospels (VI,23-31) and on apostolic testimonies" (ibid.).

[8] It's a theory "sviluppata a fondo nel De Trinitate, secondo la quale il corpo di Cristo non era come il nostro, bensí un corpo celeste, capace di subire la pena ma non il dolore. In polemica con gli ariani che, a causa della debolezza della carne, sostenevano l'inferiorità del Figlio rispetto al Padre, egli chiarische che Cristo ha sofferto in quanto uomo, poiché come Dio è perfetto de eterno, sottratto ad ogni possibilità di alterazione e di mutamento, e che il suo dolore e il suo timore non sono provocati dalla consapevolezza di ciò che avrebbe dovuto subire ma dalla coscienza della debolezza dei suoi discepoli (cfr. HIL *Mt*, 31,2s.)" (L. Longobardo, *Ilario di Poitiers, Commentario a Matteo*, cit., 26).

[9] "Est Pater ut est, et ut est esse credendus est. Filium mens consternatur adtingere, et trepidat omnis sermo se prodere" (Hilarius Pictauiensis, *Tri.*, II, 8, CCL 62, 1979, 45).

[10] Col 1,15.

[11] Hilarius Pictauiensis, *Tri.*, II, 8, CCL 62, 1979, 45.

[12] "Est enim Progenies Ingeniti, unus ex uno, uerus a uero, uiuus a uiuo, perfectus a perfecto, uirtutis uirtus, sapientiae sapientia, gloria gloriae" (ibid.).

How must one conceive the Unigenitus insofar as it is begotten by the Ingenitus? The response to this question is the Father's voice during Jesus' Transfiguration[13].

Hilary explains five aspects of the Pater/Genitor–Filius/Genitus relationship: there's no separation (abscisio), nor division (diuisio)[14], nor adoption (adsumptio)[15]; the Genitus

> "doesn't exist [after] having been commanded [to exist], as [what happens to] all [created beings]"[16];

it mustn't be thought as if one "pars" Patris were to be in the Filius[17]; nor it should be thought as if the Son were to lack something[18].

Sabelius[19] –for whom "the two [Father and Son] are unus [one and only one Person], not unum [in the sense of united]"[20]– is told

---

[13] "Clamat enim saepenumero de caelis Pater: *Hic est Filius meus dilectus, in quo bene conplacui"* (ibid.).

[14] "Inpassibilis est enim ille qui genuit, et *imago inuisibilis Dei* est ille qui natus est; et testatur: *Quia Pater in me et ego in Patre"* (ibid.).

[15] "Verus enim Dei Filius est: clamat: *Qui me uidit, uidit et Patrem*" (HIL tri, II, 8, CChr.SL 62, 1979, 45).

[16] "...neque esse ut cetera iussus est" (ibid.). It's because, "...namque unigenitus ex uno est, et in se habet uitam, ut habet in se uitam ille qui genuit: ait enim: *Sicut habet Pater uitam in semetipso, ita dedit Filio uitam habere in semetipso"* (ibid.).

[17] "Testatur enim Filius: *Omnia quae Patris sunt mea sunt et rursum: Et mea omnia tua sunt et tua mea.* Testatur et Apostolus: *Quia in ipso inhabitat omnis plenitudo diuinitatis corporaliter"* (HIL tri, II, 8, CChr.SL 62, 1979, 45-46)]. Moreover, Hilary reminds that "...nec natura habet omnia esse quod portio est" (Id., cit., 46)].

[18] "...quia qui habet omnia dedit omnia" (ibid.), así que "...perfectus autem a perfecto est" (ibid.).

[19] "Sabellius eundem praedicet, et ipsum illum esse qui utrumque sit nuncupatus" (HIL *tri*, II, 23, CChr.SL 62, 1979, 58-59)].

[20] "...unus sit ambo, non unum" (Id., cit.

be Hilary to obey the Father's voice[21]. Hilary tells Ebion[22] the same thing[23]. Hilary faces the praedicatores ab Antechristo[24] –who, with their fantastic apostolates (nouelli apostolatus[25]), go about "ridiculizing the Son of God with so much insult"[26]– and Hilary points out to them the NT[27]. Hilary addresses the Jews who, like those of the Antichrist, "are angry that Christ publicly declares that God [is his] Father, making himself equal to God"[28]. Hilary declares:

> "...therefore, [our one and only one] unwavering foundation[29] is this – the one and only blessed rock of the faith confessed by Peter's mouth: You are (...) the son of the living God[30], since in itself, [the foundation]

---

[21] "Audiet statim de Euangeliis non semel neque iterum sed frequenter: *Hic est Filius meus dilectus, in quo bene conplacuit"* (HIL *tri*, II, 23, CChr.SL 62, 1979, 59). As if it were insufficient, Hilary adds more passages for Sabelius: *"El Padre es mayor que yo* (Jn 14,28; SagBi 5, 666); *Yo voy al Padre* (Jn 14,12; SagBi 5, 664); *Padre, te doy gracias* (Jn 11,14; SagBi 5, 644); *Padre, glorificame* (Jn 17,5; SagBi 5, 675); *Tú eres el Hijo del Dios vivo* (cfr. Mt 16,16)"

[22] "Subrepat Hebion, initium Filio Dei ex Maria concedens et Verbum a diebus carnis intellegens" (HIL *tri*, II, 23, CChr.SL 62, 1979, 59).

[23] *"Padre, glorificame Tú a tu lado con la gloria que tuve junto a Ti antes de que el mundo existiera* (Jn 17,5; SagBi 5, 675); and: *En el principio existía el Verbo, y el Verbo estaba junto a Dios, y el Verbo era Dios* (Jn 1,1; SagBi 5, 570); and: *Todo se hizo por él* (Jn 1,3; SagBi 5, 570); and: *En el mundo estaba, y el mundo no le conoció* (cfr. Jn 1,10; SagBi 5, 571)" (HIL *tri*, II, 23, CChr.SL 62, 1979, 59).

[24] Cfr. ibid.

[25] Ibid.

[26] "...omni contumelia Dei Filium inludentes" (ibid.).

[27] *"Salí del Padre* (Jn 16,28; SagBi 5,674); and: el Hijo *en el seno del Padre* (Jn 1,18; SagBi 5,573); and: *Yo y el Padre somos uno* (Jn 10,30; SagBi 5, 638); and: *yo estoy en el Padre y el Padre en mí* (Jn 14,11; SagBi 5, 663)" (ibid.).

[27] "...irascantur, quod Christus proprium sibi Patrem Deum confitens, aequalem se Deo fecerit" (ibid.). Hilary reminds them of Jesus' words: "Creed en las obras...que el Padre está en mí y yo en el Padre" (Jn 10,38; SagBi 5, 639-640).

[28] "...irascantur, quod Christus proprium sibi Patrem Deum confitens, aequalem se Deo fecerit" (ibid.). Hilary reminds them of Jesus' words: "Creed en las obras...que el Padre está en mí y yo en el Padre" (Jn 10,38; SagBi 5, 639-640).

[29] Cfr. Mt 16,18.

[30] Mt 16,16.

> supports so many arguments of the truth [that] so many disputed questions of refutations and unjust accusations of infidelity will be dispelled"[31].

Hilary asks himself: "What is the glory which [the Son] expects from the Father?"[32]. It is "this [topic of glory] he [the Son] had before the world came to be. [The Son] possessed the fullness of divinity, and he also possesses [that divinity], since [he is] the Son of God"[33]. But, the Son

> "...asks that [the human flesh] he assumed [in the Incarnation] receive [visibly] in anticipation the glory which [He] didn't abandon"[34].

It means that the Word made flesh has prayed

> "in order for this flesh might start to be for the Father what the Word [was and is]: in order that [the flesh], in time, might receive its glory without end"[35].

Lastly,

> "in order that, by the power of God and of the Spirit, the corruption from the transformed flesh might be absorbed"[36].

---

[31] "Vnum igitur hoc est inmobile fundamentum, una haec felix fidei petra Petri ore confessa: *Tu es Filius Dei uiui,* tanta in se argumenta sustinens ueritatis, quantae peruersitatum quaestiones et infidelitatis calumniae mouebuntur (HIL *tri*, II, 23, CChr.SL 62, 1979, 60).

[32] "...quid est quod apud Patrem clarificationis expectet?" (HIL *tri*, III, 16, CChr.SL 62, 1979, 87).

[33] "...hoc quod habuit apud eum priusquam mundus esset. Habuit plenitudinem diuinitatis adque habet namque Dei Filius" (ibid.).

[34] "Profectum ei quod accepit eius claritatis expostulat unde non destitit" (HIL *tri*, III, 16, CChr.SL 62, 1979, 88).

[35] "...ut hoc Patri caro inciperet esse quod Verbum: ut id quod de tempore erat gloriam eius quae sine tempore est claritatis acciperet" (ibid.).

[36] "...ut in Dei uirtutem et Spiritus incorruptione transformata carnis corruptio absorberetur" (ibid.).

Indeed, the Transfiguration becomes the manifestation of the glorificatio asked for by the Son.

Hilary insists that, knowing that the heretics deny the Son's divinity, the Son is Son non ex adoptione, sed ex natura[37]. Next, Hilary recalls –discreetly alluding to the Transfiguration– that "... many ways have been known, by which we are taught that our Lord Jesus Christ is truly the Son of God: even the Father bears witness to him (cfr. Mt 17,5)"[38]. Hilary clarifies that

> "what is said by faith [that he is the true Son of God, says that] it's about the property [of the Son], it's not [about] a proclamation that grants [the said title of sonship]"[39].

After affirming that "there's no other way towards eternity than Christ Jesus, God Only-Begotten, whom we know to be the Son of God"[40], Hilary says that the voice heard[41] affirms what it affirms "in order for one to believe more firmly for life, since if one were not to believe it, death it would be"[42]. Hilary comments that the Apostles have witnessed the Transfiguration event "in order to testify about the vision and the voice"[43], having seen Jesus "with the habit of his majesty"[44], and upon hearing the Father's message[45]. Why Peter, James and John? Because they're the columnae ecclesiarum[46].

---

37 HIL *tri*, VI, 22, CChr.SL 62, 1979, 221.

38 "...multis modis cognitum est: dum de eo testatur Pater" (ibid.). Continúa el autor: "...dum de se ipse profitetur, dum Apostoli praedicant, dum religiosi credunt, dum daemones confitentur, dum Iudaei negant, dum gentes in passione cognoscunt" (ibid.).

39 "Neque enim ex communione nuncupationis est quod de proprietatis fide dicitur" (ibid,).

40 "...non enim alia aeternitatis uia est, nisi Christum Iesum unigenitum Deum sciamus esse Dei Filium" (HIL *tri*, VI, 24, CChr.SL 62, 1979, 223).

41 Cfr. Mt 17,5.

42 "...ut id firmius crederetur ad uitam, quod non credidisse mors esset" (HIL *tri*, VI, 24, CChr.SL 62, 1979, 223).

43 "...ad uisionis ac uocis fidem " (Id., cit., 224).

44 "...maiestatis suae habitu constitisset" (ibid.).

45 Cfr. Mt 17,5.

46 Cfr. HIL *tri*, VI, 24, CChr.SL 62, 1979, 224.

Hilary clarifies the importance of what was heard in relation to what was seen:

> "...the clarity seen had not sufficed for the confirmation of the honor. [That confirmation] is declared by the voice: This is my Son (Mt 17,5[47])"[48].

The Father wanted to state very clearly –quoad nos– the why of the Transfiguration, since, were Jesus transfigured only to be seen, it could be interpreted in many ways. Then, listening to the uox Patris, everything "falls into place" and is clarified[49]. But, despite that,

> "...the Apostles [were] not [able] to attain the glory of God and the bodily eyes remain blinded from [gazing at] what is seen, moved by fear, the faith of Peter and of James and of John got weaker"[50].

Hilary clarifies[51] that "...the truth about the Son makes itself known not only through [the words] this and my, but adds: Listen to him[52]. Indeed, there's the Father's testimony from heaven, but the Son's testimony is confirmed on earth: because he is shown in order to be listened to"[53].

---

[47] "*z*" (SagBi 5, 161).

[48] "Non ad confirmationem honoris claritas conspecta satis fuerat. Voce designatur: *Hic Filius meus est"* (HIL tri, VI, 24, CChr.SL 62, 1979, 224).

[49] Besides, it seems that the use of the senses of sight and hearing (by not only one, but of three Apostles) are added to the reference to the three witnesses, which by itself will point (for a reader versed in the Scriptures) to the fact that the Transfiguration complies with the condition for something to be worthy of being a *testimonium* (cfr. Dt 19,15; Mt 18,16). With this, God –in his saving teaching– has included many witness-sources (*fuentes testimoniales*) (*the three Apostles, vision, hearing*) in the Transfiguration. Thus, it doesn't seem that the vision has been only subjective (=fruit of the imagination), when it's corroborated by the message heard.

[50] "Apostoli gloriam Dei non ferunt et mortales oculi hacbetantur ad uisum et consternata ad metum Petri et Iacobi et Iohannis fides concidit" (HIL *tri*, VI, 24, CChr.SL 62, 1979, 224).

[51] Cfr. Mt 17,5.

[52] "...audiendi a nobis postulet obsequellam" (HIL *tri*, VI, 24, CChr.SL 62, 1979, 224).

[53] "Neque solum ueritas Fili per hoc quod et hic et meus est intimatur, sed additur: *Hunc audite*. Testimonium quidem Patris e caelo est, sed testimonium Fili confirmatur in terra: nam audiendus ostenditur" (ibid.).

Hilary clarifies the sense of the public recognition (professio[54]) which the Son makes of himself: it's not because of the Son's arrogance[55], nor [is it] because of [his] temerity[56]. Thus, Hilary presents a hypothesis, if Jesus' reference to his filiation were to be accepted as if it were by arrogance or by temerity: "...what do we do, when we give Jesus Christ only the name of adoption, by which –when we accuse him of daring when he proclaims God [as] his Father; do [we] even [accuse him of proclaiming] things without [any] basis?"[57]. In that case, Hilary recalls the Father's voice[58] and the Son's words[59]. Then, Hilary declares:

> "...if I don't believe in names, if I don't understand the nature of the words, I ask myself: What have I to believe and understand? There's no other idea left for me[60]"[61].

Moreover, "...the paternal authority is there from heaven: This is my Son[62]. There's the profession of the Son about himself: My Father's house[63] y My Father[64]"[65]. Hilary recalls that "...the

---

[54] Cfr. HIL *tri*, VI, 25, CChr.SL 62, 1979, 224.

[55] "Humilitatis igitur professio frequens non habet hoc insolentiae uitium, ut sibi aliena uindicet et non sua defendat et propria Deo coaequanda praesumat" (HIL *tri*, VI, 25, CChr.SL 62, 1979, 225).

[56] "...nec pari temeritate" (ibid.).

[57] "Quid nunc agimus concedentes tantum Iesu Christo nomen adoptionis, per quod et in Patre sibi Deo nuncupando temerariae cum arguimus praesumptionis?" (ibid.).

[58] Cfr. Mt 17,5.

[59] "...le escucho [decir]: *Padre, te doy gracias* (Jn 11,41; SagBi 5, 644). [Le] escucho [decir]: *Decís que blasfemé, porque dije: soy Hijo de Dios* (Jn 10,36; SagBi 5, 639)" (HIL *tri*, VI, 25, CChr.SL 62, 1979, 225).

[60] Jesus of Nazareth's divine filiation is true, without usurpation, nor arrogance, nor temerity.

[61] "Si non credo nominibus, si naturam uocabulis non intellego, quid credendum et intellegendum sit quaero. Non mihi relinquitur alia suspicio" (HIL *tri*, VI, 25, CChr.SL 62, 1979, 225).

[62] Lc 9,35.

[63] Jn 2,16.

[64] Cfr. Mt 7,21; Mt 12,50; Mt 18,10; Mt 25,34; Mt 26,29; Lc 2,49; Lc 24,49; Jn 2,16.

[65] "Auctoritas paterna de caelo est: *Hic est Filius meus*. Professio Fili de se est: *Domus Patris mei et Pater meus"* (HIL tri, VI, 25, CChr.SL 62, 1979, 225).

profession of [that] name is salvation, when the question requires the faith saying: Do you believe in the Son of God[66]?"[67]. Thus, Hilary addresses the heretic:

> "I beseech you, oh heretic! [Tell] from where come another presumption! You take away the Father's credibility, [you take away] the Son's profession, [you take away] the nature of the names. You do violence to the words of God, so that they might not be what they enuntiate. What only exists [is] is the shamelessness of your impiety, as you accuse God of having lied about himself"[68].

Hilary reflects on Jesus' divinity through his power.

> "God Only-Begotten teaches that He himself is the Son, not only through the testimony of the name but also [through the testimony] of the virtue. Because his works, those which he does, bear witness that he has been sent by the Father"[69].

Hilary knows that –even then– "works don't suffice in order to testify, for those who don't believe that the same Father had sent [the Son]"[70]. Hilary mentions Jesus' words[71] in order to pose the question of what about Jesus did the Father give testimony.

---

[66] Cfr. Jn 9,35.

[67] "Professio nominis salus est, cum interrogatio fidem postulat dicens: *Tu credis in Filium Dei?"* (Id., cit., 226).

[68] "Tibi quaero, heretice, unde alia praesumptio sit. Adimis Patri fidem, Filio professionem, nominibus naturam. Vim uerbis Dei adfers, ne sint quod enuntiant. Inpietatis tuae sola inpudentia est, ut mentitum de se Deum arguas" (HIL *tri*, VI, 25, CChr.SL 62, 1979, 226).

[69] "Vnigenitus Deus non nominis tantum testimonio sed etiam uirtutis docet esse se Filium. Opera enim eius, quae facit, testantur a Patre se missum" (HIL *tri*, VI, 27, CChr.SL 62, 1979, 227).

[70] "...opera non sufficiunt incredibilibus ad testimonium, quod se Pater miserit" (Id., cit., 228).

[71] *"Y el Padre que me ha enviado, Él mismo ha dado testimonio de mí"* (Jn 5,37; SagBi 5, 600).

In passing, Hilary advises a heretic[72]. The Father's testimony is condensed in these two sentences: This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased[73]; and: Thout are my beloved Son[74]. Hilary gives much testimonial value to the Father's witnessing in the Transfiguration:

> "If there's no other testimony of the Father about the Son in the [sacred] books [anymore], more than [the testimony] that this is his Son, there exists the truth of this testimony, that the very works which [the Son] carries out affirm the truth of this testimony"[75].

To conclude this section, Hilary clarifies Jesus' divine filiation:

> "in these [questions on Christ's filiation], there's no signification [whatsoever] of 'right of possession': and in fact, [the meaning] of the name is only a respect of favor, [by which the Son] was honored by God [his Father]. One thing is this is and [the same thing, with a nuance:] this is my and [the same thing, with another nuance:] listen to him. This [filiation] is in truth, by nature, and worthy of faith"[76].

---

[72] "Euolue euangelica uolumina et totum eorum opus recense" (HIL *tri*, VI, 27, CChr. SL 62, 1979, 228). Further on, Hilary exclaims: "Quid infertur hodie calumniae, ut adoptio nominis sit, ut mendax Deus sit, ut nomina inania sint?" (ibid.).

[73] Mt 17,5.

[74] Mc 1,11. For the Apostles, the Father's testimony in the Transfiguration is more emphasized than the testimony during Jesus' Baptism, since "...eadem de caelo ad eos uox adest, sed accipiunt plus Iohanne" (HIL *tri*, VI, 27, CChr. SL 62, 1979, 228).

[75] "Si nullum aliud Patris de Filio testimonium extat in libris, quam quod hic Filius suus sit, testimonii huius haec ueritas est, ut opera ipsa quae gerit ueritatem testimonii huius adfirment" (ibid.).

[76] "Non est per Deum Patrem Fili nomen in Christo ex adoptione bonitatis neque sanctitate meruit hoc nomen, sicut plures post confessionem fidei Dei filii sunt. Proprietatis enim in his significatio nulla est: nominis namque tantum, ut Deo dignum est, indulta dignatio est. Aliud est *hic est et hic meus est et hunc audite*. In hoc ueritas est, natura est, fides est" (HIL tri, VI, 27, CChr.SL 62, 1979, 229).

Hilary speaks of the uniqueness of the human body of the Word Incarnate, that body which –and now he alludes to the Transfiguration event–

> "it is of a unique nature, that is in conformity to the celestial glory on the amount(cfr. Mt 17,1-2)"[77].

That's to say, that Hilary describes the unity of the two natures in the Second Person of the Most Holy Trinity: "And thus, the man Christ Jesus, the Only-Begotten, God, in flesh and the Word, is Son of man and Son of God"[78].

Hilary reminds us of the immutability of the Divinity when the Word becomes flesh, the Word who

> "...assumed the true man according to tour human likeness, without losing nothing in relation to [his being] God"[79].

Jesus was exposed to the Passion and to pain and, however, he also enjoys the prerrogatives in the flesh, since Christ is true God and true man at the same time. Hence, though

> "some blow should befall Him, or some wound, or should [he] be completely tied, or suspended from on high [on the Cross], these things would certainly bring with them the violence of the Passion, but they wouldn't inflict the pain of the Passion, in the same way as a dart that were to pass through water, or were [it] to prick fire, or were [it] to wound the air; (the dart) carries with it these sufferings proper to its nature: to perforate, to

[77] "Naturae enim propriae ac suae corpus illud est, quod in caelestem gloriam conformatur in monte" (HIL *tri*, X, 23, CChr.SL 62A, 1980, 478).

[78] "Homo itaque Christus Iesus unigenitus Deus, per carnem et verbum et hominis filius ita et Dei Filius" (Id., cit., 477).

[79] "...hominem uerum secundum similitudinem nostri hominis, non deficiens a se Deo, sumpsit" (ibid.).

> prick, to wound, but the damage caused against these things don't hold their own nature, since [the dart] has no power to perforate water, to prick the fire, to wound the air, although wounding, pricking and perforating pertain to the nature of the dart"[80].

Why is that so? Isn't Jesus, as man, equal to us, except in sin[81]? Hilary –aware of this possible objection– reminds us of the inequality between Jesus' Body and ours[82]. Hilary asks:

> "if [Jesus'] bodily nature alone would let itself be carried away, as it were, by its power –by its soul– to walk over the waters and the waves, and to pass through [the walls of] buildings, how is it that we judge the flesh conceived by the Spirit through the nature of the human body?"[83]. Thus, Jesus, "possessing the body in order to endure truly, yes he endured, but he didn't possess a nature to suffer pain"[84], precisely because "...that flesh, meaning, that Bread come down from the heavens; and that man – comes from God"[85].

---

[80] "...ut telum aliquod aut aquam perforans aut ignem compungens aut aera uulnerans, omnes quidem has passiones naturae suae infert, ut foret, ut conpungat, ut uulneret, sed naturam suam in haec passio inlata non retinet, dum in natura non est, uel aquam forari, uel pungi ignem, uel aerem uulnerari, quamuis naturae teli sit et uulnerare et conpungere et forare" (HIL *tri*, X, 23, CChr.SL 62A, 1980, 477).

[81] Cfr. Hb 4,15.

[82] "Habuerit sane illud Domini corpus doloris nostri naturam, si corpus nostrum id naturae habet, ut calcet undas, et super fluctus eat, et non degrauetur ingressu, neque aquae insistentis uestigiis cedant, penetret etiam solida, nec clausae domus obstaculis arceatur" (HIL *tri*, X, 23, CChr.SL 62A, 1980, 478).

[83] "Aduero si dominici corporis sola ista natura sit, ut sua uirtute, sua anima feratur in humidis, et insistat in liquidis, et extructa transcurrat, quid per naturam humani corporis conceptam ex Spiritu carnem iudicamus?" (ibid.).

[84] "...caro illa, habens ad patiendum quidem corpus, et passus est, sed naturam non habens ad dolendum" (ibid.).

[85] "Caro illa, id est panis ille, de caelis est, et homo ille de Deo est" (ibid.).

Hilary says that "now, the Gospels don't fall silent [regarding] the glory of the body of he who reigns"[86], "the bodily glory of he who comes in the Kingdom"[87] shown to Peter, to James and to John –privileged witnesses– while "the Lord was in the habit of his glorious transformation, made visible by the glory of his body which reigns"[88].

Hilary speaks of Jesus promising the Apostles the participation (consortium) in his glory[89], projecting such a promise to eschatology[90], when, "in the end of the world, the scandals will be eliminated from his Kingdom. Therefore, we have the Lord who governs according to the glory of [his] body, until the scandals have been taken away"[91]. Moreover, –Hilary concludes this section– in the παρουσια,

> "we shall see ourselves in corformity to the glory of his body in the Father's Kingdom, resplendent as in the glory of the sun, in which the transformed [Jesus] has shown the habit of his Kingdom to the Apostles on the mount"[92].

---

[86] "...gloriam regnantis nunc corporis sui Euangelia non tacent" (HIL *tri*, XI, 37, CChr.SL 62A, 1980, 565).

[87] "Gloria (...) uenientis in regnum corporis" (ibid.).

[88] "...in habitu Dominus gloriosae transformationis suae constitit, regnantis corporis sui claritate patefacta" (ibid.).

[89] Cfr. HIL *tri*, XI, 38, CChr.SL 62A, 1980, 565.

[90] *"Así será al fin del mundo. El Hijo del Hombre enviará a sus ángeles y apartarán de su Reino a todos los que causan escándalo y obran la maldad, y los arrojarán en el horno del fuego. Allí habrá llanto y rechinar de dientes. Entonces los justos brillarán como el sol en el Reino de su Padre. Quien tenga oídos, que oiga"* (Mt 13,40-43; SagBi 5, 143). Here, Hilary interprets the *qui habet aures, audiat* as: "Dominus insinuans [mysterii cognitionem], auditionem doctrinae fidelis exegit" (HIL *tri*, XI, 38, CChr.SL 62A, 1980, 566).

[91] "In consummatione itaque saeculi de regno eius scandala auferuntur. Habemus ergo regnantem Dominum secundum corporis claritatem, quousque scandala auferantur" (ibid.).

[92] "Habemus rursum conformes nos gloriae corporis sui in Regno Patris tamquam in solis claritate fulgentes, in qua habitum Regni sui Apostolis in monte transformatus ostendit" (ibid.).

HIL syn

HIL syn (early 359[93]) illustrates "Hilary's full inderstanding of the complex political-religious situation in the East; [this work] represents the attempt to reconcile the stands of the anti-Arrians in the West and of the Homeousians in the East, showing that the respective professions of faith, beyond the divergences, are orthodox"[94].

HIL syn, 48, entitled "The divinity didn't suffer corruption in the Son of God crucified"[95], starts by affirming that the dignitas diuinitatis[96] is kept intact because when the Word became flesh[97],

> "[the Word] hasn't lost by the flesh what the Word was, nor has the Word been converted into flesh, as if the Word were to cease to be"[98].

The Incarnation took place "with the aim that the flesh might start, rather, to be what the Word [was already]"[99].

And, if it weren't so?, some might object. Hilary's aware of that and –introducing the Transfiguration pericope– asks:

> "Otherwise, from where [would it come] to the flesh the powers in the works, the glory on the mountain[100], the

[93] "All'inizio del 359, in preparazione ai concili di Rimini e di Seleucia" (L. Longobardo, *Ilario di Poitiers, Commentario a Matteo,* cit., 7).
[94] "...la piena comprensione di Ilario della complessa situazione politico-religiosa d'Oriente, rappresenta il tentativo di conciliare le posizioni degli antiariani d'Occidente e degli omeousiani d'Oriente, dimostrando che le rispettive professioni di fede, al di là delle divergenze, sono ortodosse" (ibid.).
[95] "*Filio Dei crucifixo non est perpessa deitas"* (HIL syn, 48, PL 10, 1845, 516 A12).
[96] Ibid.
[97] Cfr. Jn 1,14.
[98] "...non amiserit per carnem quod erat Verbum, neque translatum in carnem sit, ut Verbum esse desineret" (HIL *syn*, 48, PL 10, 1845, 516 A12).
[99] "...ut caro potius hoc inciperet esse quod Verbum" (ibid.).
[100] Cfr. Mt 16,28–17,6.

science in the knowledge of the thoughts of the human hearts, the security in the Passion, life in death?"[101]

Hilary affirms the divine immutability:

"God, [who] doesn't know change, made flesh, hasn't lost any of the goods of his substance"[102].

HIL hy

The HIL hy possess great poetic and doctrinal value, although they've been eclipsed by the prose of Ambrose of Milan[103]. In an excerpt from the Hymns, Hilary refers to the Transfiguration[104]:

"...among the mob, who used to meet often[105], he receives / the voice which proclaims from heaven: mine is this Son; / listen to him! this beloved, in whom I am pleased"[106].

[101] "Alioquin unde carni in operibus uirtutes, in monte gloriam, in cogitationibus humanorum cordium scientiam, in passione securitatem, in morte uitam?" (HIL *syn*, 48, PL 10, 1845, 516 A12).

[102] "...demutationem Deus nesciens, nihil ex substantiae suae bonis caro factus amisit" (ibid.).

[103] His poetry "is weighed down under the burden of his doctrinal motivation. As a poet, he never achieved popularity and soon was overshadowed by Ambrose of Milan's lyrical performance. Nevertheless his *Hymns* him as a Christian thinker deeply rooted in scripture. They [the *Hymni*] were composed (...) in a poetic meter assimilated during Hilary's exile" [C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1002].

[104] Cfr. Mt 17,5.

[105] When referring to the crowd, the author could be referring not only to the message heard during the Transfiguration, but also to the similar message in Jesus' Baptism.

[106] "Inter turbas, quae frequentes mergebantur, accipit / uocem e caelo praedicantem: meus est hic filius; / hunc audite! hic dilectus, in quo mihi complacet (HIL *hy*, III, 22-24, CSEL 65, 1916, 215).

HIL Ps

Regarding the exegetical source of HIL Ps[107] (364-367[108]), Hilary doesn't leave any clue[109]. After an orientative introduction[110], Hilary makes a realist allegory[111] when he reads some passages of the Gospel according to Matthew[112].

---

[107] Hilary of Poitiers was convinced that it was "his pastoral duty to convey the doctrinal and exegetical riches of the Greek-speaking churches over to his own church community in Gaul" [C. Kannengiesser (ed.)., *HOPE*, cit., 1000]. However, for Descourtieux, "...apparemment, Hilaire n'a jamais justifié son choix en disant pourquoi il avait commmenté les psaumes plutôt qu'un autre livre" [P. Descourtieux (tr.), *Commentaires sur les Psaumes I (Psaumes 1–14)*, cit., 22]. In Frigia, Asia Minor, "...i quattro anni di esilio risultarono decisivi per la sua formazione culturale e dottrinale: egli riuscí a comprendere la complessità della situazione orientale, a valutare le differenze dottrinali fra le varie sette e a rielaborare profondamente la sua teologia. Entra in contatto (...) in particolare con gli omeousiani, e inizia la sua opera di mediazione fra Oriente e Occidente per l'unità della fede. Intanto in Occidente, Ursacio e Valente esercitavano pressioni su Costanzo per trascinarlo alle loro dottrine e il sopravvento dei filoariani fu determinato dall'azione subdola svolta nei concili di Rimini e di Seleucia (359). Nel 360, per insistenza degli ariani, che giudicavano importuna la sua presenza in Oriente, Ilario fu rimandato in Gallia" (L. Longobardo, *Ilario di Poitiers, Commentario a Matteo*, cit., 6).

[108] They're the last years of Hilary's life, "as a homiletic expression of the whole Psalter, closely dependent on Origen's lost *Commentary on the Psalms* (...)" [C. Kannengiesser (ed.)., *HOPE*, cit., 1000]. Longobardo affirms that the date can't be determined with precision, although it seems sure that it's from the first two years of his episcopate and is before his exile to the East in 356 a.D. (cfr. Id., cit., 9-10).

[109] "Hilary remains silent about this source, apparently his only critical paradigm for the exegetical task he undertook" [C. Kannengiesser (ed.)., *HOPE*, cit., 1000-1001], that is to say, "the first literary productive encounter between an exegesis based on the Septuagint and a Western mind which had been shaped in Christian traditions by the *Vetus Latina*" [Id., cit., 1001].

[110] "Hilary considers first the literal context of psalmic verses; he mentions a variety of Greek versions from the Hebrew original (he himself knew no Hebrew); he includes numerous comments on biblical history and geography, on chronologies and etymologies, before engaging into allegorical interpretation" (ibid.).

[111] "His use of allegory was tempered by sound realism" [C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1003].

[112] "...gli episodi piú significativi riportati nel Vangelo di Matteo" [L. Longobardo, *Ilario di Poitiers, Commentario a Matteo,* cit., 10]. Ahora bien, "...if there were any traces of systematic Origenism in his source, he obliterated them all together" [C. Kannengiesser (ed.)., *HOPE*, cit., 1001].

Who are the addressee/s of Hilary of Poitiers in this work? For Descourtieux, they're the faithful attending the Mass of the Bishop of Poitiers[113], or maybe they are sermons for monks[114].

Although Saint Augustine's commentaries on the Psalms are better known than those of Hilary of Poitiers[115], that doesn't take away the value of the treatise of the Bishop of Poitiers because Jerome copied it by hand when he chose to live a monk's life[116].

Hilary of Poitiers says that the always good God[117] sometimes showed himself to be understanding towards human weakness[118], having more patience than wrath towards man[119].

Hilary enters the scene of Peter's denial–

[113] "...ce pourra être le peuple chrétien de Poitiers, assemblé pour écouter son évêque" [P. Descourtieux (tr.), *Hilaire de Poitiers, Commentaires sur les Psaumes I (Psaumes 1–14),* cit., 19].

[114] "...non en peut exclure que les Tractatus aient été prononcés à l'intention des moines réunis par Hilaire autour de Martin à Poitiers, mais il est bien difficile de l'affirmer avec certitude" [Id., cit., 20].

[115] "Les *Enarrationes in Psalmos* de saint Augustin ont sans doute (…) contribué à faire oublier l'oeuvre hilariene" [Id., cit., 16].

[116] Cfr. P. Jay, "Jerome", in C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1094. Moreover, "...une génération seulement après sa rédaction, Jérôme recommande la lecture des Traités" [P. Descourtieux (tr.), *Hilaire de Poitiers, Commentaires sur les Psaumes I (Psaumes 1–14),* cit., 17].

[117] "Bonus (...) solus per naturam indemutabilem suam" (HIL Ps, 52, 12, CSEL 22, 1891, 124).

[118] "...semper Deus non praedurus huius demutationis nostrae arbiter fuit, indulgentiam infirmitati nostrae, qua non semper boni permanemus" (ibid.).

[119] "...magisque his, quae uellemus, propitiatus est, quam his, quae non possemus, iratus est" (ibid.). For example, Moses and Peter. After recalling that God chastises Moses for not having glorifying him (cfr. Dt 32,49.51), Hilary explains that –despite it all–, God kept for his colleague and friend Moses "una cum Helia ab Apostolis in monte conspectum beati et aeterni regni sui" (HIL *Ps 52,* 12, CSEL 22, 1891, 125), that's to say, of the Transfiguration. Then, Hilary makes us see that Jesus –having corrected Peter after denying having seen him– didn't take from Peter the keys of the Kingdom, since "ob fidei tamen meritum adfuit uenia procliuis" (ibid.).

> "because while the denial has caught [Peter] by surprise due of anxiety, however, Peter didn't lack the firm loyalty of the will to confess [Jesus as the Lord] until death"[120].

Peter wanted to be faithful, but his weakness got the better of him[121].

Hilary explains the distribution (dispositio) of the kings on the earth[122], the snowfall on mount Zalmon[123], and combining these two aspects, the distribution of kings whitened with snow[124]. After quoting the Psalmist and Isaiah[125], Hilary insists that the kings go beyond the snowy characteristic (being whiter than snow)[126], –and,

---

[120] "...quia cum per trepidationem obrepsisset negatio, uoluntatis tamen usque ad matryrium confitendi fides firma non deerat" (HIL *Ps,* 52, 12, CSEL 22, 1891, 125).

[121] "...aliud est nolle, aliud non posse" (ibid.). Hilary explains: "Territus enim Petrus, etsi per carnis sensum responsionis non potuit tenere constantiam, per fidem tamen animi statim fleuit. Et cum decussum se ab eo, quod uolebat, agnouit, lacrimarum dolore fidei suae effudit adfectum. Et ipsum illud fuit demutationis tempus et fletus, scilicet secundum trepidationis demutationem uoluntatis firmitate potiore. Nam mox inconstantiam trepidationis constans fides fleuit, probatissimam deinceps apostolicae constantiae firmitatem martyrii confessione confirmans" (ibid.).

[122] "Dum itaque hos caelestis super eam reges discernit, id est, dum Dominus de caelis descendens eos, qui spolia fuerint, constituit in reges et super eam domum, quae per eos pulcherrima est, unumquemque disponit" (HIL *Ps, 67*, 14, CSEL 22, 1891, 289). Cfr. Sal 68(67),15-16: "Mientras el Omnipotente dispersaba a los reyes la nieve caía en el Salmón. Monte de Dios es el monte de Basán. Monte de altas cimas es el monte de Basán" (SagBi 3, 370).

[123] Thus interprets Hilary Sal 68(67),14: "...in pace scilicet, quia Selmon interpretatio pacis est, gloriam aeternitatis accipient. Hic enim Dei mons, in quo pax Dei nominis ipsius est significata uirtute, et uber et consecratus et pinguis est" (HIL *Ps, 67*, 14, CSEL 22, 1891, 289).

[124] "Dominus ergo caelestis –quia qualis caelestis, tales et caelestes– hos in Selmon reges super domum suam, per quos diuisis spoliis ornabitur, exalbatos niue disponet in reges" (HIL *Ps, 67*, 14, CSEL 22, 1891, 289-290).

[125] *"Porque llegó su lugar a la paz* [Sal 76(75),3], and *la grana será blanca como la nieve* (Is 1,18)". On the one hand, Sal 76(75),3 (En Salem está su tienda, en Sión su morada) (SagBi 3, 396). On the other hand, Is 1,18 (Aunque vuestros pecados fuesen como la grana, quedarán blancos como la nieve) (SagBi 4, 63).

[126] "...reges necesse est, penes quos sit domus pulchritudo, ultra candorem niuis esse praestari" (HIL *Ps*, 67, 14, CSEL 22, 1891, 290).

linking this point to the Transfiguration– Hilary says that the kings

> "are the light of the world; and anyone who may be worthy of climbing with the Lord the mount of the celestial Kingdom shall be whiter than snow: because when [the Lord] showed himself to the Apostles in the habit, with which he would reign with the saints, his clothes were seen to be whiter than snow. Therefore, this mount and this Kingdom is for the God of peace"[127].

Hilary applies the recognition–trial–recognition cycle to the events in the lives of Jesus[128] and of Peter[129]. Indeed, "...as soon as [Jesus] has been recognized [as the Son of God[130]], Peter has detested the Passion [of Christ], the scandal of the Cross [implied] therein (cfr. Mt 16,22)"[131]. For Hilary, it turns out that Peter "doesn't admit it[132], before the love and [faith] confessed regarding his knowledge of [Jesus'] divinity"[133]: meaning, that the love and the faith confessed by Peter –who has recognized Jesus' divinity– all that makes it inconceivable (for Peter) to think that Jesus would suffer later on. After making it clear that such a situation shouldn't lead Peter to reject Christ's Passion –and "because [Jesus] had called him 'Satan'"[134]– "not long after, when [Jesus] was on the mountain [with the] habit of his glory, the great[135] [Peter] is recognized by

---

[127] "Lux enim mundi sunt; et quisque dignus erit cum Domino montem regni caelestis inscendere, super niuem dealbabitur: quia cum se Apostolis in habitu, quo cum sanctis conregnaturus esset, ostendit, uestimenta eius super niuem alba sunt uisa. Hic ergo mons et hoc Regnum Deo pacis est" (ibid.).

[128] Baptism (recognition) – temptation (trial) – administration of angels (recognition).

[129] The confession about Jesus as the Son of God (recognition)–rejection of Jesus' suffering the Passion (trial)–the Transfiguration (recognition).

[130] With Jesus' recognition, cfr. Mt 16,16-17.

[131] "Totiens et cognitus est, Petrus passionem eius detestatus est, crucis in eo scandalum" (HIL *Ps*, 138, 6, CSEL 22, 1891, 750).

[132] That is, the Passion foretold by Jesus.

[133] "...prae amore et confessae iam a se diuinitatis cognitione non sustinens" (HIL *Ps*, 138, 6, CSEL 22, 1891, 750).

[134] "...quia eum ob infidelitatem crucis satanam nuncupasset" (ibid.).

[135] This is the nuance which the word *talis* seems to indicate.

the Father's voice (Mt 17,5[136])"[137]. That's to say, that it's "...the trial, whice was converted into a temptation for the Apostle; the recognition by the paternal voice has followed"[138].

Principal affirmations

HIL Mt says that Moses and Elijah, present in Jesus' Transfiguration, are the Prophets who have already taken a seat in the Kingdom. The three Apostles witness the Transfiguration in order for them to bear witness to it later.

HIL tri speaks of the Incarnate Word's special human body. Regarding the Begotter-Begotten relationship, Hilary insists on the absence of separation, of division, of adoption. Against Sabelius and Ebion, Hilary clarifies the union (not the personal oneness) Father–Son. To the Hilary recommends to the Antichrist's partisans the reading of the NT. Although those of the Antichrist and the Jews don't want to listen to Jesus' self-proclamation as the Son of God, Hilary affirms the touchstone of the Christian proclamation: Peter's Christocentric confession of faith.

Moreover, the Son asks the Father that his Body may visible show –through the Transfiguration– the glory which the Word always possesses. The Son is Son of the Father by nature, not by adoption, and the natural divine filiation is property of the Son, not an honor granted afterwards. Peter, James and John, as the columns of the Church, witness the Transfiguration in order to

[136] *"Éste es mi Hijo, el Amado, en quien me he complacido; escuchadle"* (SagBi 5, 161).

[137] "...non multo post, cum in monte gloriae suae habitu constitisset, tali a Patre uoce cognoscitur" (HIL *Ps*, 138, 6, CSEL 22, 1891, 750).

[138] "Probationem, quam temptatio Apostoli effecerat, paternae uocis agnitio est consecuta" (ibid.).

bear witness to that later. The Father's voice confirms what was seen by the three Apostles. On the other hand, the Son bears witness to his filiation not by arrogance nor by temerity.

To affirm the contrary would mean to discredit the credibility of the Father and of the Son. The works of the Son bear witness that he is the one sent by the Father. The Father's testimony is found in the theophanies of Jesus' Baptism and Transfiguration. Jesus' divine filiation is true, natural and worthy of faith. Jesus' body is the body of the Word made flesh, and so, it isn't exactly just another human body, since it is a true human flesh assumed by the Word.

HIL sy, 48 reminds that the Word, in the Incarnation, doesn't lose the divine dignity and immutability, glimpsed at in Jesus' Transfiguration.

One of HIL hy mentions Mt 17,5.

HIL Ps speaks of the always good God who shows mercy, say, to Peter (in the context of his confession about the Son, his trial, and his being implicitly recognized by the Father), the Son who didn't get the keys of the Kingdom from Peter, despite his weakness: Jesus even made Pete winess the Transfiguration. He who climbs the Kingdom will be whiter then snow, the same habit with which the Lord will reign, the snowy characteristic of which the OT alludes to.

7. Gregorius Iliberritani Episcopus

GR-I fi

Gregorius Iliberritani episcopus (+ ± 392[1]) explains that the three Apostles fall on the ground during the Transfiguration[2]

> "due to the fulgence of his light, they almost por el fulgor
> de su luz casi se quedan ciegos"[3];

had it not been so, the three would've died[4]. The incapacity to gaze into the fulgence is due to our weakness (*infirmitas*)[5]. In the Incarnation, God

> "has hidden [the sight] of his own fulgence"[6],
> without ceasing to be immutable[7].

---

1 Cfr. BBKLo (http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/g/gregor_v_e.shtml, visited 9 May 2009).
2 Cfr. Mt 17,6.
3 "...fulgore luminis eius paene obcaecati (occ.)" (GR-I *fi*, 90, CChr.SL 69, 1967, 244).
4 "...pues ningún ser humano puede verlo y seguir viviendo" (Ex 33,20; SagBi 1, 435).
5 Cfr. GR-I *fi*, 90.
6 "...proprii latuisse fulgoris" (GR-I *fi*, 90, CChr.
7 Gregory sais God made it "non suo detrimento" (ibid.).

GR-I tr

After identifying Moses[8] and Elijah[9] as Jesus' escorts[10], Gregory of Elvira thinks –in the GR-I *tr*[11]– that the three Apostles, during Jesus' Transfiguration, recognize[12] that the persons on both sides of Jesus are: Moses,

> "with the tablets of the Covenant, which he received from the Lord on mount Sinai[13]"[14];

and Elijah,

> "with the same chariot in which he had been taken away[15]"[16].

Principal affirmations

GR-I *tr* postulates that the three Apostles recognize to be with the transfigured Jesus: Moses (with the tablets of the Law) and Elijah (with the chariot which took him away). GR-I *fi* sees appropriate the postration of the three Apostles during the Transfiguration, because if not, they would've died. GR-I *fi* mentions the permanence of the divinity in the Incarnation.

---

[8] "...Priscae Legis latur (-or), qui per eandem Legem aduentum Domini praedicauit" (Gregorianus Iliberritani Episcopus, *Tr. Orig.*, II, 11, CChr. SL 69, 1967, 15).

[9] "...qui in clausula mundi uenturus est Euangelium Χριστι [n.b. sic] Iudaeis praedicaturus et facturus nobiles Χριστιανοσ [n.b. sic], metator scilicet secundi aduentus Domini" (ibid.).

[10] "Duo itaque isti uel uiri uei angeli, qui cum Domino comitabantur, si me intentio mea non fallit aut decepit, Moyses et Elias (Helyas) sunt" (GR-I *tr*, II, 11, CChr.

[11] A. C. Vega found these writings attributed to Álvaro of Córdoba (s. IX) [V. Bulhart (ed.), *Gregoriani Iliberritani episcopi quae super sunt,* CChr.SL 69, 1967, liii].

[12] Hence Peter's proposal (cfr. Lc 9,33).

[13] Cfr. 1 R 8,9.

[14] "...cum eas tabulas foederis, quas in monte Sina(-y-) acceperat a Domino" (GR-I *tr*, II, 12, CChr.SL 69, 1967, 15).

[15] Cfr. 2 R 2,11.

[16] "...cum eodem curru in quo leuatus fuerat" (GR-I *tr*, II, 12, CChr.SL 69, 1967, 15).

8. Filastrius Episcopus Brixiensis

In *Diu hae* (±380/390[1]), the Bishop of Brescia, **Filastrius** (+ before 396[2]), mentions

> "like two animals[3], two accept these testaments of the Law and of the Prophets, being with the Lord, like the Apostles saw on the mountain[4]"[5].

Philastrius refers to Moses and Elijah as two animals on both sides of the transfigured Jesus.

---

1 H. Koch, *Philastrius*, in Pauly-Wissowa, RECA, XXXVIII, Stuttgart, 1938, col. 2125-2131: cfr. F. Heylen (cura et studio), *Filastrii Episcopi Brixiensis Diuersarum hereseon liber*, CChr.SL 9, 1962, 210.

2 Cfr. KVS4, 475.

3 Although the application of the figure of the two animals to Moses and Elijah is clear, Philastrius doesn't mention his source, which may be Ha 3,2.

4 Cfr. Mt 17,3.

5 "...sicut duo animalia duo haec testamenta accipiuntur legis et prophetarum, adstantia Domino, sicut uiderunt in monte Apostoli" (FIL *Diu hae*, 156, 14, CChr.SL 9, 1957, 323).

9. Ambrosius

Quia 'in Filio conplacet Pater',
crede quia dignus Patre Filius,
crede quia 'a Deo exiuit' Filius
(fi, I, 16, 107)

AM vg

Ambrose reminds us that God the Son is good1, and that he has to be loved[2]. The Son, "whom the Father begot from eternity, before dawn[3], was begotten from the womb as Son, from the heart as Word (cfr. Jn 1,1)"[4], and is

"in whom the Father is pleased (cfr. Mt 17,5)"[5].

AM Ca

The treatise AM *Ca* (375-378[6]) is composed of two books,

---

1 "Nadie es bueno sino uno solo: Dios" (Mc 10,18; SagBi 5, 312). También aparece en Lc 18,19 (SagBi 5, 508).

2 Cfr. O. Faller, SJ, "S. Ambrosii *De virginibus III, 1, 3*", en B. Geyer –J. Zellinger (eds.), "Florilegium Patristicum tam veteris quam medii aevi auctores complectens" Fasciculus XXXI, Bonnae Sumptibus Petri Hanstein, MCMXXXIII, 65.

3 Cfr. Sal 110(109),3.

4 "...quem pater ante luciferum genuit ut aeternum, ex utero generavit ut filium, ex corde eructavit ut verbum" (O. Faller, sj, "S. Ambrosii *Virg. III, 1, 3"*, cit., 65).

5 "Ipse est in quo complacuit pater" (ibid.).

6 C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1047. For Siniscalco, the composition of AM *Ca* would've been "al periodo iniziale dell'episcopato di Ambrogio" (P. Siniscalco, *"Sant'Ambrogio, Caino e Abele"*, in "Tutte le Opere di Sant'Ambrogio, Opere esegetiche II/I", Biblioteca Ambrosiana-Milano Città Nuova Editrice-Roma, 1984, 10), although, there's no unanimity among the experts regarding the exact year (cfr. ibid.). Finally, Siniscalco, while admitting there's no sufficient proof, dates the work between 375-376 (cfr. Id., cit., 11).

scarcely read up to now[7], which have a common source: Philo of Alexandria's *De sacrificio*. Book I contains many Biblical quotations that deal systematically with the sacrifices in Israel[8].

AM *Ca* might have been, in its origin[9], not exactly a treatise[10] but a sermon[11]. Ambrose could've been influenced –at least in substance[12]– by the Alexandrians: Origen[13] and Philo[14], although

[7] For Paolo Siniscalco, in 1984, "...la critica finora ha prestato poca attenzione (…) al *De Cain et Abel* (…) di Ambrogio" (Id., cit., 9), except for a few informations in books about Patrology and History of Ancient Christian Literature. This sad state is –regarding AM Ca– because, "per lungo tempo la *communis opinio* vi ha scotro un'imitazione servile di pagine di Filone Alessandrino, in special modo del *De sacrificiis Caini et Abelis*. Fu lo Schenkl a proporre un'opinione siffatta, osservando che lo scrittore latino non avrebbe fatto che mettere le parole, desumendo le idee interamente dall'Alessandrino" (Id., cit., 10). Siniscalco continues: "L'autorità e il prestigio dello studioso valsero probabilmente a diffondere e a tramandare lungo molti decenni quest'opinione che solo di recente è stata riproporzionata, se non contradetta" (ibid.)".

[8] Cfr. C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1047.

[9] There's no consensus among the experts on this topic. According to existing theories, AM *Ca* could've taken one of these paths, in the *opera ambrosiana:* like "a) opuscoli scaturiti dalla predicazione, ma fortemente rimaneggiati prima d'essere resi pubblici per iscritto; b) nati per cosí dire, a tavolino, esclusivamente per la lettura, cadono per lasciar posto ad una terza possibilità che pare piú probabile anche tenendo conto delle esigenze della cura pastorale e della necessità per Ambrogio, chiamato d'improvviso e contro la sua volontà a rivestire il ministero episcopale, di prepararsi adeguatamente innanzitutto in campo esegetico" (Siniscalco, P., *"Sant'Ambrogio, Il Paradiso Terrestre, Caino e Abele"*, cit., 21).

[10] Siniscalco says: "sono convinto infatti que *par*. [De paradiso] e *Cain et Ab*. hanno un'origine prevalentemente scritta, pur non essendo, a mio giudizio, da considerare alla stregua di veri e propri tratti esegetici" (Id., cit., 12).

[11] "In *Cain et Ab*. si è riconosciuta la presenza piú evidente del tono di un'omelia, di un 'discorso parlato'" (Id., cit., 19).

[12] The influence is –for Karl Schenkl– in the content, not in the presentation. It means that "solo le parole sono del Vescovo: le idee, specialmente in *Cain et Ab*., provengono a lui dall'Alessandrino, con qualche eccezione relativa ad aggiunte suggerite dai testi scritturali o da digressioni moralizzanti" (P. Siniscalco, *"Sant'Ambrogio, Il Paradiso Terrestre, Caino e Abele"*, cit., 17).

[13] However, how much and where Origen influenced Ambrose isn't calibrated (cfr. Id., cit., 16).

[14] It's in Philo of Alexandria's works *De sacrificiis Caini et Abelis y Quaestiones in Genesim* (cfr. Id., cit., 17). However, "...i primi editori dell'opera ambrosiana sembrano infatti ignorare il largo uso che Ambrogio fa dell'Alessandrino; così accade ad Erasmo (1527), a Giovanni de Coster (1555) e a Giovanni Gillot (1569)" (Id., cit., 16). A bit further on, Siniscalco explains such dependence of the author on the Alexandrian: "...e non a caso egli scoprí una tale dipendenza: nato da genitori ebrei ed educato nel giudaismo, prima di farsi cristiano, doveva aver studiato la letteratura giudaica e quindi anche Filone" (ibid.). However, –opines H. Savon– "...al contrario, numerose e documentabili sono le prove della sua indipendenza rispetto a Filone" (Id., cit., 17).

in the philological level, it could look like a servile following[15]. Anyway, in AM Ca, there are "many passages difficult to understand and to translate"[16].

In AM *Ca*, Ambrose thinks that Moses

> "has been transferred [to heaven] rather than abandoned, [and] about whose sepulchre nobody knows"[17],
> and this arises from two pericopes:

1º. Dt 34,5[18]. Although "one reads that Moses [had] died, but he did by God's word"[19]. But,

> "by God's Word [there's] no devastation of the work [of creation]; rather, [his Word's] their support. Therefore, [Moses] isn't [discovered] as [somebody] fallen into the earth by the dissolution of the body"[20].

2º. According to Dt 34,6[21], Moses didn't perish[22] since, if nobody knows where he's buried, it's because Moses lives in the

---

[15] Cfr. Id., cit., 17. Siniscalco affirms that "...complessa e dibatutta è dunque la questione delle fonti, come d'altronde lo è la questione relativa all'origine e alla natura delle opere [*par. e Cain et Ab.*]" (Id., cit., 19).

[16] "...molti passi difficili da comprendere e da tradurre" (Id., cit., 20).

[17] "...translatus magis quam derelictus est, cuius nemo nouit sepulturam" (AM Ca, I, 2, 8, CSEL, 32/1, 1897, 344).

[18] *"...por la palabra de Dios, [Moisés] se ha muerto"* (SagBi 1, 902). But in the Neovulgate, Dt 34,5 reads: *Mortuusque est ibi Moyses servus Domini in terra Moab, iubente Domino* (Allí murió Moisés, siervo del Señor, en el país de Moab, como había dispuesto el Señor) (ibid.).

[19] "Moyses autem mortuus quidem legitur, sed per uerbum Dei mortuus" (AM *Ca*, I, 2, 8, CSEL, 32/1, 1897, 344).

[20] "...per Verbum igitur Dei non lapsus operis, sed firmamentum est. Non ergo tamquam relapsus in terram deprehenditur corporis solutione" (ibid.). Thus, Moses "tamquam Verbi caelestis operatione donatus et munere, ut quietem magis caro eius quam bustum acceperit" (ibid.).

[21] *"...nadie sabe [dónde está] su sepultura hasta el día de hoy":* "sin que nadie haya conocido el lugar de su sepultura hasta hoy" (SagBi 1, 902).

[22] "...ut translationem magis quam interitum eius intellegas" (AM *Ca*, I, 2, 8, CSEL, 32/1, 1897, 344).

presence of the Son of God, and Moses is shown beside Him in Jesus' Transfiguration[23], beside Elijah[24].

AM Sat

In AM *Sat* (378[25]), *II*, [26], Ambrose speaks of the *resurrectio carnis* as the non-knowledge of (eternal) death:

"your life knows death not"[27].

The fact that Elijah, in his life, was taken to heaven[28], prefigures the selection of the three Apostles in order to witness Jesus' Transfiguration[29].

AM fi

According to Claudio Moreschini, the dogmatic treatise AM *fi*[30] (377-380[31]) –of five books[32]– is Ambrose' most precious

[23] "Quis enim in terris reliquias eius potuit deprehendere quem secum esse Dei Filius in Euangelio demonstrauit?" (ibid.).
[24] "...et Helias simul est uisus" (ibid.).
[25] C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1053.
[26] After a sermon preached in Saturius' funeral, another sermon speaks of the resurrection of the flesh, with examples from the Scripture and from the dualist concept of body-soul. "Ambrose draws on the cycles of nature which witness resurrection, as does the Phoenix (c. 59), then turning to the scriptural teaching on the general resurrection (Trumpets, c. 107-114)" (ibid.).
[27] "...tua uita mori nescit" (AM *Sat*, II, 94, CSEL 73, 1955, 300).
[28] "Ecce currus Heliae, ecce ignes, etsi non uidentur, parantur, ut iustus ascendat, innocens transferatur" (ibid.); cfr. 2 R 2,1-11.
[29] Cfr. Mt 16,28.
[30] "Nell'epoca in cui Ambrogio iniziava a comporre il De fide, quindi Graziano era l'augusto piú anziano e piú autorevole dell'Impero" (C. Moreschini, *"Sant'Ambrogio, La Fede"*, cit., 53, nota 1).
[31] Kannengiesser, C. (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1049.
[32] "I primi due libri furono composti quando Graziano era unico Augusto dell'Impero, e quindi probabilmente (…) dopo la morte di Valente nella disfatta di Adrianopoli (378), ma prima della nomina di Teodosio ad Augusto dell'Oriente (gennaio-febbraio del 379). (…) Invece I libro III-V sono stati scritti a qualche mese di distanza dai primi due (…)" (C. Moreschini, *"Sant'Ambrogio, La Fede"*, cit., 25-26).

contribution in giving the *coup de grâce* to neo-Arrianism in the West[33].

The Apologists teach that the subsistent Λόγος is derived from and dependent on God[34]. It was found out that υπόστασις[35] could express the *Filius–Pater* relationship, but with the danger of establishing too much *Pater–Filius*[36] distinction.

The principal source of AM *fi* are the *Scriptures*[37]. It's interesting to note that "although Christology doesn't constitute *ex professo* the

[33] In fact, it's "il contributo piú valido di Ambrogio alla soluzione della crisi prodotta da quella eresia e alla vittoria della fede nicena" (C. Moreschini, *"Sant'Ambrogio, La Fede"*, in "Tutte le Opere di Sant'Ambrogio, Opere dogmatiche I", Biblioteca Ambrosiana-Milano Città Nuova Editrice-Roma, 1984, 9). Moreover, the books *De fide ad Gratianum* can be considered, altogether, "come l'ultima delle opere antiariane composte in Occidente; anche se non è la piú importante sul piano speculativo (ché tale prerogativa spetta senza dubbio al De Trinitate di Ilario di Poitiers), è però la piú significativa delle opere teologiche di Ambrogio. Sul piano storico é un'opera emblematica, perché, strettamente connessa alla persona del dedicatario, l'imperatore Graziano, istruito e sorretto nella fede nicena proprio da Ambrogio, segna il trionfo della ortodossia non solo negli ambienti di cultura cristiana e nelle ristrette cerchie dei teologi, ma addirittura nella politica dell'Impero d'Occidente. Un anno dopo il completamento del *De fide*, nel 381 il concilio ecumenico di Costantinopoli avrebbe portato il suggello definitivo alla ortodossia della fede nicena e, contemporaneamente, gli imperatori Graziano in Occidente e Teodosio in Oriente avrebbero garantito alla ortodossia il sostegno del braccio secolare. Da allora in poi la partita fu definitivamente perduta per gli Ariani" (Id., cit., 27).

[34] Id., cit., 10.

[35] It's a word "usato raramente dagli stoici, divenne importante con Plotino, con il significato di 'realtà che giunge alla sua manifestazione'" (C. Moreschini, *"Sant'Ambrogio, La Fede"*, cit., 9).

[36] It is "distinguere a tal punto il Figlio dal Padre da dividerlo addirittura da lui facendone un secondo dio, un dio minore, tanto piú che non mancano nei passi degli apologisti... tratti che rilevano chiaramente l'inferiorità del Figlio Logos rispetto al Padre, una inferiorità implicitamente presupposta giá dalla collocazione del Logos como essere intermedio il sommo Dio e il mondo" (M. Simonetti, "*La crisi ariana nel IV secolo"*, Roma, 1975, 7)" (Cfr. C. Moreschini, "*Sant'Ambrogio, La Fede"*, cit., 10-11).

[37] "Occasionally (...) quoted and translated by Ambrose himself from the Greek text (not necessarily from the LXX)" [C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1049]. Besides, maybe "...some quotations (...) may rely on older Latin versions" (Id., cit., 1049-1050). Ambrose of Milan "borrows allegorical insights or polemical quotations from his sources (...) mixing them with his own references, images, and considerations" [Id., cit., 1050].

main argument of Fide, [Christology] is, however, extensively dealt with in this work"[38]. Ambrose hardly uses the word *persona*, because of the possible danger it entails[39]. He insists in the unbreakable *Pater-Filius*[40] unity. Ambrose' response to the two crucial doctrinal questions[41] reveal how well informed he is regarding the controversies back then[42]. To the objection that Ambrose of Milan hasn't been an original thinker[43], it's that, whatever may it be, he influenced much on the theological thought of his time[44].

After warning the heretic who didn't speak well of the *generatio Filii*[45] –by the insufficiency of any human word to adequately describe the mysterium *generationis Filii*[46], and because the heretic applies the rules of human generation to the *divine generation* (which isn't fitting, because [the Son] is God[47])– Ambrose speaks of the Son-Mediator[48], justifying the use of the verb "is"[49] in the

[38] "Nonostante che la cristologia non costituisca *ex professo* l'argomento principale del De fide, essa è però in quest'opera ampiamente trattata" (C. Moreschini, *"Sant'Ambrogio, La Fede",* cit., 43).

[39] Cfr. Id., cit., 41.

[40] This is "secondo un criterio didattico che riprenderà nell'opera inmediatamente successiva, il *De Spir. Sanct.*, che é animata dai medesimi intenti dottrinali" (Id., cit., 40-41).

[41] The two natures of Christ and the union of the properties in the Incarnate Son.

[42] Cfr. C. Moreschini, *"Sant'Ambrogio, La Fede",* cit., 46.

[43] "...se per originalità si intende sopratutto la creatività teologica e il rigore filosofico che caratterizza un Origene o un Agostino: Ambrogio deriva per la massima parte delle sue dottrine del *De fide* da Atanasio" (ibid.).

[44] "...la mancanza di originalità non osta a che l'influsso della risposta stessa sia profondo e durevole. Questo è stato il caso di Ambrogio" (ibid.).

[45] "Non ergo ex usu generationis humanae calumniam, heretice, struas neque ex nostro sermone conponas" (AM *fi*, I, 10, 63, CSEL 78, 1962, 27).

[46] "Neque enim angustis sermonibus nostris inmensae magnitudinem possumus diuinitatis includere, cuius *magnitudinis non est finis"* (ibid.). Sal 145(144),3, in the Neovulgate, reads: *et magnitudinis eius non est investigatio* (su grandeza es insondable) (SagBi 3, 591).

[47] "Namque hominis generationem si definire contendas, tempus ostendis; generatio autem diuina supra omnia est, late patet, supra omnes cogitationes ascendit et sensus" (AM *fi*, I, 10, 63, CSEL 78, 1962, 27).

[48] *"Nadie va al Padre si no es a través de mí"* (Jn 14,6; SagBi 5, 662).

[49] *"Éste es mi Hijo amadísimo"* (Mt 17,5; SagBi 5, 161).

Transefirmature en la Transfiguración (since the Son always is[50], –he remains the same), in order to conclude that

> "that which remains isn't lacking neither [in] substance nor [in] eternity"[51].

After recalling that "...in God, these matters mustn't be thought of in a corporeal way"[52], Ambrose points to where the mystery is, without "solving" it:

> "the Son is begotten in an incomprehensible way, the Father begets in an impassible way, and however, he begets from himself and begets first of all intellect as true God *true God*"[53].

Ambrose thinks that Peter[54] "has neither erred in nature, nor erred in glory"[55], since

> "[Peter] has asked what he must do, not to them [Moses and Elijah], but to Christ; since, although he was offering a gift to the three, he awaited – however – the order of only one"[56].

---

[50] "Quod est, semper est" (AM *fi*, I, 10, 63, CSEL 78, 1962, 27).

[51] "Quod enim manet, nec substantia nec aeternitate deficitur" (AM *fi*, I, 10, 63, CSEL 78, 1962, 28).

[52] "Non haec sunt in Deo corporalibus aestimanda" (AM *fi*, I, 10, 67, CSEL 78, 1962, 29). What things? Ambrose addresses the heretic: "Audis 'Dei Filium': aut dele nomen aut agnosce naturam; audis 'uterum': agnosce generationis perspicuae veritatem; audis 'cor': uerbum intellege; audis 'dexteram': agnosce uirtutem; audis 'os': agnosce sapientiam" (ibid.).

[53] "...inconpraehensibiliter generatur Filius, inpassibiliter generat Pater, et tamen ex se generat et ante omnem intellectum generat ut Deus uerus *Deum uerum*" (AM fi, I, 10, 67, CSEL 78, 1962, 29). Moreover, quoting the Father (cfr. Mt 17,5), he exclaims: "[Pater 'conplacet'] ...et tu cum Iudaeis inuides?" (AM *fi*, I, 10, 67, CSEL 78, 1962, 29).

[54] Cfr. Mt 17,4.

[55] "...nec errauit in natura nec errauit in gloria" (AM *fi*, I, 13, 81, CSEL 78, 1962, 35).

[56] "Denique quod facere deberet, non illos, sed Christum interrogauit; nam etsi tribus parabat obsequium, unius tamen expectabat imperium" (ibid.).

Peter is corrected by the Father: "'Why do you associate your fellow servants with your Lord?"[57]. Afterwards, Peter fell down, "fearful of the Father's voice and of the Son's glory"[58]. Peter sees Jesus, alone[59], in order for it to be clear that the voice refers clearly to Jesus as the beloved Son[60].

Ambrose sees the Transfiguration as *mysterium*:

> "...what does that vision mean, [a vision] that doesn't point out Christ's equality with the servants, but rather [points out] the mystery, until it appears [before] us that the Law and the Prophets reveal the eternal Son of God, whom [the servants] announce in line with the Gospel[61]?"[62].

Here's the mystery: the *Genitus Ingeniti, Genitus non factus manu hominum, sed ab Genitore*[63].

Ambrose speaks of the mystery of the *Son's divinity (Genitus ab Ingenito)*, starting from the Father's message in the Transfiguration:

> "since 'the Father is well pleased with the Son'[64], [then] believe that the Son [is] worthy of the Father, believe that the Son 'has come from God', as He himself bears

---

57 "'Quid conseruos tuos cum Domino socias tuo?'" (ibid.).
58 "[Consternatus] Patris uoce et Filii claritate" (ibid.).
59 Cfr. Mt 17,8.
60 Cfr. AM *fi*, I, 13, 81, CSEL 78, 1962, 35-36.
61 Cf. Mt 17,3-4.
62 "Quid igitur sibi uoluit illa uisio (...) sed mysterium signans, nisi ut appareret nobis quod Lex et Profetae cum Euangelio congruentes sempiternum Dei Filium, quem adnuntiauerant, reuelarent?" (AM *fi*, I, 13, 82, CSEL 78, 1962, 36).
63 "...cum audimus *'ex utero* Filium', 'ex corde Verbum', credamus quia non plasmatus manibus, sed ex Patre natus, non artificis opus, sed progenies est parentis (ibid.).
64 Cfr. Mt 17,5.

> witness [thereof] saying: I proceeded and came forth from God[65], and in another passage: I came from the Father[66]. He who has proceeded from God and has come from God, can't have anything more than what is God's"[67].

After suggesting a careful reading of the Scriptures, Ambrose deepens on the mystery of the Son of God *distinguishing two natures in Jesus Christ:* "thus you will find out that [Jesus] has shown that he's [the Christ], so that God might be distinguished from man"[68], against a possible mistaken interpretation:

> "You shall not think maliciously in the Son boasting of the Father, when you listen to the Father well pleased in the Son[69]"[70].

Ambrose recalls Paul's teaching on Christ, the *Filius dilectissimus*[71]: "Paul advises that this is useful to us, if [we consider] Christ not from the Law or from grace, but as 'the the most beloved

---

65 Jn 8,42: *"Yo he salido de Dios y he venido"* (SagBi 5, 626).

66 Jn 16,27: *"Yo salí de Dios"* (SagBi 5, 674).

67 "...quia 'in Filio conplacet Pater', crede quia dignus Patre Filius, crede quia 'a Deo exiuit' Filius, ut ipse testatur dicens: *Ex Deo processi et ueni*, et alibi: *A Deo exiui.* Qui ex Deo processit et a Deo exiuit, nihil aliud potest habere, nisi quod Dei est" (AM *fi*, I, 16, 107, CSEL 78, 1962, 46).

68 "...inuenies sic demonstrasse se Christum, ut Deus in homine cerneretur" (AM *fi*, II, 11, 99, CSEL 78, 1962, 93).

69 Cfr. Mt 17,5.

70 "Nec malitiose accipias de Patre Filium gloriantem, cum audias Patrem in Filio conplacentem (AM *fi*, II, 11, 99, CSEL 78, 1962, 93). It is remembered that, "...ai tempi di Ambrogio, del resto, si era generalizzato il criterio di interpretare i fatti della vita del Figlio incarnato riferendo alla carne umana da lui assunta tutte quelle azioni o quei particolari che sembravano indegni della natura divina (…). Accanto a questa attribuzione alle due nature, Ambrogio resta saldo sulla dottrina dell'unità personale del Cristo. Allo schema Logos-carne degli Ariani Ambrogio replica avendo di mira una soluzione che conservasse sia l'aspetto personale sia le due nature" (C. Moreschini, *"Sant'Ambrogio, La Fede"*, cit., 45).

71 Mt 17,5.

Son' seated at *at God's right hand*[72]"[73]. Ambrose interprets the phrase *superiora sapere*[74] as a free, loving honor towards Christ, the *Filius dilectissimus*[75]:

> "this is "perceiving" the loftier things: believing because Christ, when he is seated [at the Father's right hand], he is not tributed obedience as if [he himself had] commanded it; rather, he is honored as the *beloved Son* (Mt 17,5)"[76].

Ambrose explains that one must listen to the Son[77] because all that is of the Father is his[78]. Addressing now the heretics, Ambrose says that if the public declaration of the faith (*confessio*) already made the three Apostles prostrate[79], "what would those who denied [the Son do]?"[80].

Ambrose states that the *Regnum coelorum* –where belongingness means not knowing eternal death[81]– is the Regnum Filii Dei[82], and

---

[72] Cfr. Mt 26,64.

[73] "Paulus monet hoc esse nobis utile, si Christum non ex praecepto neque ex gratia, sed quasi 'dilectissimum Filium' *ad dexteram Dei* sedere credamus" (AM *fi*, II, 12, 103, CSEL 78, 1962, 95).

[74] *"Buscad las cosas de arriba, donde Cristo está sentado a la derecha de Dios; sentid las cosas de arriba"* (Col 3,1-2; SagBi 5, 1193). In the Neovulgate, Col 3,1-2, reads *sursum* instead of *susum* (ibid.).

[75] Mt 17,5.

[76] "Hoc est enim superiora sapere: credere quia Christo, ut sedeat, non quasi iussus obsequitur, sed quasi *Filius dilectissimus* honoratur" (AM *fi*, II, 12, 103, CSEL 78, 1962, 95).

[77] Mt 17,5 (SagBi 5, 161).

[78] Cfr. Jn 16,15 (SagBi 5, 672); cfr. AM *fi*, II, 14, 127, CSEL 78, 1962, 101.

[79] Cfr. Mt 17,6.

[80] "...si ceciderunt, qui confessi sunt ...quid facient, qui negarunt?" (AM *fi*, II, 14, 127, CSEL 78, 1962, 101). Ambrose adds with irony: "...illos Iesus *tetigit* et leuauit, uos iacere patietur, ne uideatis gloriam, quam negastis (ibid.).

[81] "...quid est esse in Dei Regno nisi aeternam nescire mortem?" (AM *fi*, III, 12, 99, CSEL 78, 1962, 143; cfr. Mt 16,28).

[82] Cfr. ibid.

because it's the *Regnum Filii,* it is the *Regnum Patris*[83] (since all of the Father is of the Son). Hence

> "...so there, there's even a one [and only] Kingdom, as one shall be the prize, the same men, the same merits, the same guarantee"[84].

Ambrose speaks of the *uirtus aeterna et diuinitas*[85] of the Son, underestimated (by the Arrians):

> "We [ourselves] give honor to the Son, 'in whom the Father is well pleased' (cfr. Mt 17,5); for it pleases the Father that the Son is praised, [the Son] 'in whom he himself was pleased' (cfr. ibid.)"[86].

Against the Arians[87], Ambrose gives four reasons in defense of the *unitas uitae* of the Father and of the Son[88]: the *unitas Pater-Filius[89], the clarificatio Patris a Filio*"[90], the *conplacitio Patris a Filio*[91], and the *possessio uitae a Filio*[92].

After mentioning the command to keep silent regarding Jesus'

---

[83] Cfr. AM *fi*, III, 12, 97, CSEL 78, 1962, 142.

[84] "Eo usque enim unum Regnum est, ut unum sit praemium, idem homines, eadem merita, idem sponsor" (Id., cit., 143).

[85] Rm 1,20, which reads, in the Neovulgate: *sempiterna eius et virtus et divinitas* (su eterno poder y su divinidad) (SagBi 5, 899).

[86] "Nos honorificemus Filium, 'in quo Pater conplacet'; placet enim Patri, ut laudetur Filius, 'in quo ipse conplacuit' (AM *fi*, IV, 8, 80, CSEL 78, 1962, 184).

[87] "...si illis placet hunc locum ad diuinae perpetuitatem referre substantiae, accipiant etiam tertiam expositionem" (AM *fi*, IV, 10, 131, CSEL 78, 1962, 203)].

[88] *"Pues como el Padre tiene vida en sí mismo, así ha dado al Hijo tener vida en sí mismo"* (Jn 5,26; SagBi 5, 599).

[89] "*Dedit* per unitatem" (AM *fi*, IV, 10, 131, CSEL 78, 1962, 203; cfr. Jn 5,26).

[90] "...*dedit*, ut 'conplaceat'" (AM *fi*, IV, 10, 131, CSEL 78, 1962, 203; cfr. Jn 5,26).

[91] "...*dedit*, non ut Pater custodiret, sed ut Filius possideret" (ibid.).

[92] "...noluit dicere quod homines secum sedere non possent, siquidem diuinam suam gloriam celare, priusquam resurgeret, non diuulgare cupiebat" (AM *fi*, V, 6, 72, CSEL 78, 1962, 243-244); cfr. Mt 17,9.

transfiguration[93], Ambrose distinguishes the *amor sempiternus naturae (filiatio divina)* from the *amor gratiae (filiatio nostra in Filio):* "how can the Son, 'in whom the Father is well pleased'[94], [be loved by God]? He pleases by himself, we [on the other hand, please the Father] through Him [the Son]"[95], and then Ambrose compares our filiation (our being *imagines Dei*) to that of the Son, as *Imago Patris*[96]. Ambrose reveals that Arrius pretends to know something that even Catholics –or even Moses (witness of Jesus' divinity in the Transfiguration[97])!– know (something which can't be):

> "Moses is prohibited from seeing God's face. –¿[Is it possible for] Arrius to have merited seeing what is hidden?"[98].

AM sp

In AM *sp*[99] (381, *before Easter*[100]), II, after recalling the prophecy

[93] "...noluit dicere quod homines secum sedere non possent, siquidem diuinam suam gloriam celare, priusquam resurgeret, non diuulgare cupiebat" (AM *fi*, V, 6, 72, CSEL 78, 1962, 243-244); cfr. Mt 17,9.

[94] Cfr. Mt 3,17; 17,5.

[95] "...quemadmodum Filius 'in quo conplacuit Pater'? Ille per se conplacet, nos per ipsum" (AM *fi*, V, 7, 90, CSEL 78, 1962, 249).

[96] Cfr. ibid.

[97] "Moyses, qui cum domino adparet in gloria, Moyses ergo ille posteriora tantummodo Dei in typo uidit. –Arrius totum deum *facie ad faciem* conpraehendit?" (AM *fi*, V, 19, 236, CSEL 78, 1962, 306).

[98] "Moyses uultum Dei uidere prohibetur. – Arrius meruit uidere secretum?" (ibid.).

[99] "La pubblicazione del trattato su *Lo Spirito Santo* di Sant'Ambrogio si colloca in un periodo della vita culturale del cristianesimo antico che vede un acceso dibattito sul problema della natura e delle funzioni della terza Persona della Trinità. Ci riferiamo al ventennio compreso tra il 360 e il 381 d.C.: sono gli anni che vedono il lento esaurirsi della controversia ariana e il sorgere in pari tempo, come diretta derivazione da quella, della controversia sullo Spirito Santo. La polemica antiariana a proposito della natura divina del Figlio produce (...) anche il sorgere della discussione sulla natura dello Spirito, de entrambe giungeranno, se non ad una conclusione, certo ad un ridimensionamento, perdendo buona parte della loro virulenza, grazie alla autorità del secondo Concilio ecumenico, quello di Costantinopoli (…), che nel 381 ribadisce su base dogmatica non solo la divinità del Figlio, ma anche quella dello Spirito. I decenni successivi non vedranno tanto una ripresa dei motivi della controversia ariana quanto il prorompere della discussione sul problema della natura divina e umana di Cristo" (C. Moreschini, *"Sant'Ambrogio, Lo Spirito Santo"*, cit., 9). Moreschini recalls that "il cristianesimo introduce una concezione estranea alla cultura greco-latina e di derivazione ebraica" (Id., cit., 1979, 10). The foreignness of the concept *spiritus as sanctus* lies in the fact that "...la filosofia greca conosceva, sí (...), ma lo intendeva come qualcosa di assolutamente materiale e corporeo" (ibid.).

[100] C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1055.

of the Lord's revelation "*a los hombres a su Ungido*"[101], Ambrose recalls the Father proclaiming his Son in the river Jordan[102], on mount Thabor –*"This is my beloved Son, with whom I am well pleased; listen to him* (Mt 17,5[103])"[104]– and in the Passion[105]. In AM *sp, III*, Ambrose speaks of the *claritas* seen by the three Apostles, "when the Lord Jesus shone with the light of his divinity on the mountain"[106].

AM inc

AM inc (early 382[107]) widens the argument of *Fide*, on the *Pater–Filius*[108] relationship. Against those who believe that the Word is different from the true Son of God[109], Ambrose says that the Johannine Prologue "bears witness that the [Son] himself, who *in the beginning, the Word was* with the Father[110], had come *to his own*

[101] Am 4,13: "Él descubre al hombre lo que piensa" (SagBi 4, 1059).
[102] "Adnuntiauit enim in baptismate dicens: *Tu es Filius meus dilectus, in quo bene conplacui* (Lc 3,22; SB 5, 400)" (AM *sp*, II, 6, 57, CSEL 79, 1964, 109)]. In the Neovulgate, Lc 3,22 reads: *Tu es Filius meus dilectus; in te complacui mihi* (ibid.).
[103] *"Éste es mi Hijo, el Amado, en quien me he complacido; escuchadle"* (SagBi 5, 161).
[104] *"Hic est Filius meus dilectus, ipsum audite"* (AM *sp*, II, 6, 57, CSEL 79, 1964, 109).
[105] "...adnuntiauit in passione, cum sol recessit, maria terraque tremuerunt, adnuntiauit in centurione, qui ait: *Vere filius Dei erat iste* (AM *sp*, II, 6, 57, CSEL 79, 1964, 109)].
[106] "...cum Dominus Iesus diuinitatis suae luce in monte fulgeret" (AM *sp*, III, 12, 87, CSEL 79, 1964, 186).
[107] Kannengiesser, C. (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1056.
[108] In fact, this short work is about "un discorso che prende spunto da un testo biblico (cfr. F. Dudden, *The life and time of St. Ambrose,* II, Oxford 1935, 699–700). Ma al discorso, assai probabilmente rielaborato e avente come argomento il mistero della Incarnazione, è aggiunta una specie di appendice (parr. 79–118) che riprende l'argomento già ampiamente trattato nel *De fide*, il modo di concepire il rapporto tra il Padre e il Figlio" [E. Bellini (tr.), *Sant'Ambrogio, Il Misterio dell'Incarnazione del Signore,* in "Tutte le Opere di Sant'Ambrogio" 16, Milano, Bibliotheca Ambrosiana – Roma, Città Nuova Editrice, 1979, 360].
[109] Cfr. AM *inc*, 6, 48, CSEL 79, 1964, 248.
[110] Cfr. Jn 1,1.

home (Jn 1,11111)"[112]. Against those who –(aside from denying the Christ is the divine Word)– consider Christ equal to the Prophets, Ambrose argues that no prophet has been called incarnate Word[113], nor he who takes away the sins of the world[114]. Still,

> "of no one else has [this] been said: *This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased*"[115].

Ambrose tries to make Arius realize his obstinacy in not believing the divinity of Jesus of Nazareth, even after the Transfiguration:

> "John says [it], Peter [too] says [it], Jesus has shown [it], and aren't you satisfied, Arius, nor do you consider that John and Peter must be believed, they to whom – alone – our Lord Jesus Christ has entrusted the abundance of the faith of everybody by the testimony of his glory[116]? For this reason, it's as if for the testimony of the OT and of the NT, Moses is, with Elijah, received [by Jesus] (cfr. Mt 17,4)"[117].

[111] The Neovulgate reads: i*n propria venit* (vino a los suyos) (*"a los suyos"*: SagBi 5, 571).
[112] "...qui *in principio erat Verbum apud* Patrem, *in sua propria* venisse euangelista testetur" (AM *inc*, 6, 48, CSEL 79, 1964, 248).
[113] Cfr. Jn 1,14.
[114] "...de nullo alio dictum est: *Hic est Filius meus dilectus, in quo conplacui"* (AM *inc*, 6, 48, CSEL 79, 1964, 248).
[115] "...de nullo alio dictum est: *Hic est Filius meus dilectus, in quo conplacui"* (AM inc, 6, 48, CSEL 79, 1964, 248).
[116] Cfr. Mt 17,1-9.
[117] "Iohannes dicit, Petrus dicit, Iesus probauit, et tu non probas, Arriane, nec Iohanni et Petro putas esse credendum, quos uel solos pro testimonio gloriae suae Dominus noster Iesus Christus ad omnium fidem credidit abundare? Denique quasi ad testimonium ueteris et noui testamenti Moyses cum Helia adsciscitur" (AM *inc*, 4, 28, CSEL 79, 1964, 237).

AM Abr

AM *Abr* (382-388[118]) consists of two books[119]. According to Gori, Book I is more Ambrosian[120], while Book II "is clearly Philonian"[121]. Ambrose interprets Genesis and the NT[122].

In AM *Abr*, I, Ambrose, seeing in the Father's words[123] that "certainly, the Father is always well pleased in the Son"[124], applies *amantissimus*[125]

[118] C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1057. For Franco Gori, however, "il problema della datazione rimane insoluto" (*Sant'Ambrogio, Abramo,* cit., 9).

[119] Book I summarizes Abraham's history for the Baptismal catechesis. For Gori, "...in *Abr*. I le citazioni dal NT trovano una piú facile integrazione nel commento. Ciò è dovuto principalmente alla interpretazione tipologica che nel primo libro è largamente preferita a quella allegorica" (Gori, F., *Sant'Ambrogio, Abramo,* cit., 19). Book II, "on a more erudite level (...), offers allegorical, philonian insights on Abraham's life up to the covenant in Gn 17,21" [C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1057]. Gori recalls that in Patristic times, there's no intellectual distinction between *allegoria* and *typologia* (cfr. F. Gori, *Sant'Ambrogio, Abramo,* cit., 19).

[120] "Il primo libro del *De Abraham*, dovendosi adeguare alle esigenze della catechesi *moralis et simplex* (I, 1, 1), è certamente il piú ambrosiano dei due" (F. Gori, *Sant'Ambrogio, Abramo*, cit., 11). However, it isn't clear up to what point Philo of Alexandria may have influenced in the making of Book I of De Abraham; it isn't known either how many works of this Alexandrian might have served the author to compose Book I of *De Abraham* (cfr. Id., cit., 15–17.).

[121] "Il secondo libro del *De Abraham* è chiaramente filoniano" (Id., cit., 17).

[122] "Uno dei caratteri comuni ai due libri è (...) l'incessante ricerca di sintesi fra l'esegesi dei versetti della Genesi e il Nuovo Testamento" (F. Gori, *Sant'Ambrogio, Abramo,* cit., 19).

[123] *"Éste es mi Hijo, el Amado, en quien me he complacido"* (Mt 17,5; SagBi 5, 161).

[124] "...utique semper in Filio placeat Pater" (AM *Abr*, I, 8, 67, CSEL 32/1, 1897, 546).

to Isaac, as the "beloved son"[126] of Abraham[127]: Ambrose of Milan highlights the finesse of the Lord's dealing with Abraham[128], since "[the Lord] didn't consider it sufficient to say 'son', [but, moreover,] added *your only son Isaac, whom you love* (Gn 22,2) [*amadísimo, a quien amaste*]"[129]. Ambrose reflects a bit more on *dilexisti*:

> "we can also accept *amantissimum* in [the temporal sense of] the present, and *whom you loved* [*dilexisti*] in the [sense] that [the beloved] wasn't loved as [if only] with a recent impetus of love, but [rather] with a love of predilection, rooted in and strengthened a long time ago or always. It's because that which grows in a short time, is left behind shortly after; but what has been loved for

[125] It's about the use of the adjective *amantissimus* (or of its synonyms) with a past tense verb (in Mt 17,5: *dilectissimus–conplacui,* according to the text he might have had in front of him –or he might have written *ex corde*– Ambrose) but not with the nuance of time past (=which is only remembered), but rather, of the *present* time (=to be loved ever since, in the case of the Father and of the Son; cfr. Mt 17,5).

[126] Gn 22,2: "Éste respondió: - Aquí estoy. Entonces le dijo: - Toma a tu hijo, a tu único hijo, al que tú amas, a Isaac, y vete a la región de Moria. Allí lo ofrecerás en sacrificio, sobre un monte que yo te indicaré" (SagBi 1, 131). In the Biblical text Ambrose had in front of him –or that he had known by heart– the word used was *amantissimus*, but in the Neovulgate, the word used is *quem diligis*.

[127] The depth of Ambrose' delving into Abraham's psyche can be glimpsed here: "...*uade in terram excelsam*. Interponitur spatium, ne praecipitari subito uideatur adfectus, ut illa dilatione oprepat pietatis gratia desiderium patris. Adiecit: *in uno montium, quem tibi dixero.* Et hic similiter, ut, dum ascendit senex, infringeretur impetus, lassaret dextera, deficeret intentio, dum quaereret montem discere, dedisceret adparatum" (AM *Abr*, I, 8, 67, CSEL 32/1, 1897, 547). Ambrose discerns Abraham's heart, while the latter accepts the divine command, while he walks with his only child in order to sacrifice him to the Lord.

[128] "...a principio eum stimulat et pungit pietatis aculeis et fili nomen addit ad nomen necessitudinis et uim amoris" (Id., cit., 546).

[129] "Non satis putauit dixisse filium, adiuncxit *amantissimum quem dilexisti Isaac"* (AM Abr, I, 8, 67, CSEL 32/1, 1897, 546).

much time or always, can't be suddenly left behind"[130].

AM Dav

AM *Dav* (383-394[131]/388[132]) speaks of David's sin. Though it may seem –seen from the outside– a mere pro-David write-up[133], it is, however –in essence– a homily[134]. However, it's difficult to determine when the homily ends and where the text published

[130] "Possumus tamen et *amantissimum* ad praesens accipere, *et quem dilexisti* ad id, ut non recenti quodam impulsu amoris, sed inolito diu et probato amore significaret dilectum. Quod enim ad tempus augetur ad tempus resoluitur, quod autem diu aut semper placuit cito aboleri non potest" (Id., cit., 546-547). This description applied by Ambrose to Abaraham can also be applied –*mutatis mutandis*– to the Father's words in the Transfiguration.

[131] C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1057. According to Hadot, this work was finished in 390 (SC 239, 42; quoted in Kannengiesser, ibid.). I'm not going to go into the details here of the rhetorical procedure employed by the author. Hadot already dealt with this topic (cfr. *Ambroise de Milan, Apologie de David,* SC 239, 7–12; 17–24).

[132] Here Hadot delimits the author's preaching about Psalm 50, and then, the written reelaboration of the homily [P. Hadot – M. Cordier (tr.), *Ambroise de Milan, Apologie de David,* SC 239, 1977, 40]. It's a historic moment for the composition of the AM *Dav* since it's "une période de rédaction durant laquelle se sont produits les événements de l'automne 300, c'est-à-dire la défaite de Maxime et l'affire de Kallinikon" (ibid.). Here, I won't tackle the historical events during Ambrose' time; rather, the reader may want to refer to Hadot's theory that this AM *Dav* is dedicated to King Theodosius (cfr. P. Hadot – M. Cordier (tr.), *Ambroise de Milan, Apologie de David,* SC 239, 1977, 35–43).

[133] That's to say, "comme une plaidoirie (...). Tout d'abord Ambroise lui-même plaide pour David en faisant valoir ce qui justifie ou excuse son péché (§§ 1-40). Puis David lui-même entre en scène. Commenté par Ambroise, le psaume 50, dans lequel David confessa sa faute et implora son pardon, devient le plaidoyer de David lui-même (§§41-85). Les deux plaidoyers, celui d'Ambroise et celui de David, se conforment zus règles traditionnelles de la rhétorique" (P. Hadot – M. Cordier (tr.), *Ambroise de Milan, Apologie de David*, SC 239, 1977, 7].

[134] "...ne doit pourtant pas être considérée comme un commentaire purement livresque. C'est une homélie, un sermon qui a été prononcé devant le peuple chrétien" [Id. cit., 12].

[135] Cfr. Id., cit., 15.

later starts[135]. Ambrose deals with the adultery[136] and the penance of David[137], and with the universality of sin[138].

The Transfiguration appears in AM *Dav* II, at the start of the second part of Psalm 50, when, "brought about by this gradual realization of the depths of the abyss of sin, David suddenly glimpses at the light"139. Hence the topic of David's joy, "recognizing the signs of forgiveness God has granted him: (...) the spiritual whiteness of the soul"[140]. AM *Dav* may be read at different levels, and can be considered –as what Hadot affirms – "an elegant Latin rendition of Didymus' and Origen's commentaries on Psalm 51(50). Thus, it has contributed (...) in transmitting Origen's theological topic anonymously to the Church in the West"[141].

Ambrose interprets purification[142] in the OT-NT key:

> "[The OT] asks to be purified with the hyssop according to the Law, and [the NT] wishes to wash itself according to the Gospel, and when it is washed, it's considered whiter than snow"[143],

---

[136] Cfr. Id., cit., 24.

[137] This topic is "à la fois la cause et l'effet de la vision prophétique dans laquelle il a entrevu le mystère du baptême et de l'infusion de l'Esprit Saint" (Id., cit., 31).

[138] Ibid.

[139] "Arrivé par cette prise de conscience progressive au plus profond de l'abîme du péché, brusquement David entrevoit la lumière" [P. Hadot – M. Cordier (tr.), *Ambroise de Milan, Apologie de David,* SC 239, 1977, 22].

[140] "...reconnaissant les signes du pardon que Dieu lui a accordé: (...) la blancheur spirituelle de l'âme (§ 59)" (Id., cit., 23).

[141] "...une élégante adaptation latine des commentaires de Didyme et d'Origène sur le psaume 50. A ce point de vue, elle a contribué (...) à transmettre à l'Église d'Occident, sous une forme anonyme, des thèmes théologiques origéniens" (Id., cit., 42–43).

[142] *"Rocíame con el hisopo y quedaré limpio, lávame y quedaré más blanco que la nieve"* [Sal 51(50),9; SagBi 3, 326].

[143] "Hysopo mundari secundum legem postulat, lauari secundum Euangelium concupiscit, et supra niuem se extimat, si lotus fuerit, dealbandum" (AM Dav, I, 12, 59, CSEL 32/2, 1897, 340).

or in other words, that "he who is forgiven of [his] fault is whiter than snow"[144], in such a way that the soul which was before blackened[145], after being purified and forgiven[146], "has gone up white to Christ"[147]. Ambrose connects this reading to a paraphrase from Isaiah[148]: "even though [the sins were] bloody, even though [the sins were] abominable, I will clean [them]"[149], and then, Ambrose dwells on the topic of the nix intellegibilis[150], "about which it was said in the Gospel that the clothes of the Lord Jesus have shone like snow (cfr. Mt 17,2)"[151], because –Ambrose highlights *the impeccability of the human nature of the Incarnate Word*–

> "sin hasn't known his [the Word's] flesh when [the Word] has assumed it [human nature] when coming to this world, [the clothes] clean of every crime"[152].

AM Jac

The essay AM *Jac* (386-388[153]), based on 2 M, consists of two

[144] Cfr. ibid.
[145] "Erat enim nigra, tenebroso peccatorum horrore deformis" (ibid).
[146] That's to say, that "posteaquam abluta per Baptismum remissionem meruit delictorum, dealbata" (ibid.).
[147] "...dealbata ascendit ad Christum" (ibid.).
[148] *"Aunque vuestros pecados fuesen como la grana, quedarán blancos como la nieve"* (Is 1,18; SagBi 4, 63).
[149] "...si cruenta, si tetra, mundabo" (AM *Dav*, I, 12, 59, CSEL 32/2, 1897, 340).
[150] Ibid.
[151] "...de qua ait in Euangelio quod Domini Iesu refulserint uestimenta sicut nix" (AM *Dav*, I, 12, 59, CSEL 32/2, 1897, 340).
[152] "...peccatum non cognouerit, caro eius, quando se induit ueniens in hunc mundum, ab omni fuerit munda delicto" (AM *Dav*, I, 12, 59, CSEL 32/2, 1897, 340).
[153] C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1059, where there are other dates: 386 (Palanque), 387 (Tillemont, Schenkl, Bardenhewer, Schanz), and 388 (Rauschen), although Roberto Palla affirms that "...nessun elemento, interno o esterno, sembra offrire, rigorosamente parlando, delle garanzie ineccepibili per una datazione del tutto sicura e precisa del De Iacob et uita beata" [R. Palla, *Sant'Ambrogio, Giacobbe e la Vita Beata, Giuseppe,* en "Tutte le Opere di Sant'Ambrogio" 3 (Opere esegetiche III), Biblioteca Ambrosiana, Milano – Città Nuova Editrice, Roma, 1982, 215].

books: Book I (about beatific life[154]) states why the Gospel has to complement the Law; Book II gives a mystical sense to Jacob's story[155], and the example of the Maccabean martyrs[156].

Ambrose encourages the reader amidst "the uncertain nooks of life[157] and the snares of the enemy"[158], because he is helped by God. Ambrose reminds the reader of *the Father's ineffable love for man and of man's grandeur*[159], in particular, the sending of the Son: hence, Ambrose invites to consider the affection of parents, which reflect the love of the Father, who loved man so much so that "*gave him* [his Son] *up for us all*"[160]. Ambrose clarifies: God gave –alluding to the Father's voice in the Transfiguration– his *dilectissimus Filius*[161]:

[154] Cfr. Palla, *R., Sant'Ambrogio, Giacobbe e la Vita Beata, Giuseppe,* cit., 216.

[155] "...is essentially based on 2 Maccabees. (...) Ambrose demonstrates in Book I why the Gospel needed to supplement the Law, as only charity secures true happiness. In Book II the mystic significance of the history of Jacob (Genesis 27-36) serves as a convenient *exemplum*" [C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1059]. In Book II, "Ambrose adds the heroic case of the priest Eleazar, the seven Maccabean brothers and their mother (2 Macc 6-7)" (ibid.).

[156] Cfr. Palla, *R., Sant'Ambrogio, Giacobbe e la Vita Beata, Giuseppe*, cit., 216.

[157] Palla explains that the expression *dubii uitae anfractus*, "che Ambrogio usa anche in Exam., III, 5, 23 (*uitae huius declinare dubios anfractus*) si ricollega con ogni probabilità alla metafora del mare saeculi" [Id., cit., 255, nota 33]. This "immagine, comunissima presso autori classici e cristiani (...), del mare (con flutti, tempeste, scogli e naufragi) per rendere l'idea dei pericoli della vita terrena torna molto spesso anche nelle opere ambrosiane (...). Da qui la metafora del porto per indicare la tranquillitpa, la sicurezza da questi travagli" [Id., cit., 299, nota 88].

[158] "...uereris dubios uitae anfractus et aduersarii insidias" (AM *Jac*, I, 6, 25, CSEL 32,2, 1897, 20).

[159] "Habeas tantam eius dignationem, ut filio proprio pro te non pepercerit?" (ibid.). Cfr. Jn 3,16; Rm 8,32. Palla explains that this referes to the passage "della lettera ai Romani dove si afferma che Dio 'non ha risparmiato' il Figlio aveva colpito gli scrittori cristiani (...) (E. Dassmann, *Die Frömmigkeit des Kirchenvaters Ambrosius von Mailand*, Münster, 1965, 131-132 and note 343)" [R. Palla, *Sant'Ambrogio, Giacobbe e la Vita Beata, Giuseppe*, cit., 255, nota 34].

[160] Rm 8,32: *"lo entregó por todos nosotros"* (SagBi 5, 929).

[161] Cfr. Mt 17,5; cfr. AM *Jac*, I, 6, 25, CSEL 32,2, 1897, 20.

> "Even though [it's] proper [to the natural fatherly sense] of piety, so to speak, to take away the [deadly] danger from the dying son, [however, it's] as if [the Father] '*assumed*' ('*se atragara*') the pain of loss, in order that you might not waste the fruit of redemption. Such was the Lord's effort to save you, that he almost [so to speak] placed his [only-begotten Son] in danger, [the Lord even does it] up to [that point] in order to win you[162]. For your sake, he took upon himself our debts, in order to insert you in the divine, [in order] to consecrate [you] among the saints"[163].

Ambrose advises that the heart of the righteous has to be always attentive neither to riches nor to social status, but to the moral good, following the example of Moses and Elijah, since after living two different lives[164], both were beside the transfigured Jesus – they received the same reward:

> "[Elijah isn't inferior to Moses] because [God] is seen to have given the same payment to both witnesses of his glory"[165].

---

[162] Regarding the phrase *dum te lucraretu*r, Palla narrates the conclusion of J. Rivière in his article, Le sacrifice du Père dans la rédemption d'après Saint Ambroise (in "Revue des sciences religieuses", XIX, 1939, 9-16): "Ambrogio sarebbe in questo caso piú letterato che teologo, è stata giustamente criticata da Szabó (Le Christ créateur chez Saint Ambroise, Roma 1968, 85, nota 19)" [R. Palla, Sant'Ambrogio, Giacobbe e la Vita Beata, Giuseppe, cit., 257, nota 36].

[163] "Quod pietatis est quasi morituri filii suscepit periculum, quasi orbitatis hausit dolorem, ne, tibi periret fructus redemptionis. Tantum fuit Domino studium tuae salutis, ut propemodum de suo periclitaretur, dum te lucraretur. Ille propter te dispendia nostra suscepit, ut te diuinis insereret, caelestibus consecraret" (AM *Jac*, I, 6, 25, CSEL 32,2, 1897, 20).

[164] "...cum alter cibi indignus melotide uili sine filiis, sine sumptu, sine comite, alter populorum doctor, laetus subole, succinctos potentia, diuerso genere meritum aequale fundauerint, sicut in euangelio declaratum est, quando cum domino Iesu in resurrectionis gloria refulserunt" (AM *Jac*, I, 8, 38, CSEL 32,2, 1897, 29)].

[165] "...uidetur enim parem his quasi paribus gloriae suae testibus dedisse mercedem" (Id., cit., 29-30).

AM mort

The AM *mort* (390[166]/396[167]) are two sermons (1-29,30-57) which present "three forms of death: spiritual, mystical and physical with a wealth of scriptural citations"[168].

After comparing the Greek philosophers' wisdom to Christian doctrine, Ambrose says that

> "our [matters] are better than [those] other matters of philosophers. And that [illustrious] has posed [the question regarding] things about which he didn't have [their] own testimony; [but] we have the authority of the divine precept. Moses and Elijah have appeared with Christ"[169].

AM Is

In AM *Is*[170] (*De Isaac vel anima* in CSEL) (Lent, 396[171]/387-

[166] C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1062; here, Kannengiesser follows Palanque's date.

[167] L. Pizzolato (tr.), *Sant'Ambrogio, Commento al Salmo CXVIII (Lettere I–XI)*, cit., 14. For Pizzolato, the *De bono mortis* "esplicitamente si presenta come la continuazione del *De Isaac* (cfr. J. Palanque, *Saint Ambrose et l'Empire romain,* Paris, 1933, 540s)" [L. Pizzolato (tr.), *Sant'Ambrogio, Commento al Salmo CXVIII (Lettere I–XI),* cit., 14].

[168] C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1064. It's a catechesis (X-XII) based on IV Esd, considered a part of the canon (X,46; XI,51), "evokes the Day of Judgement [sic] in the presence of the glorious Christ. In its reworked editing, the essay is strikingly close to Plotinus, *Ennead* I, III and IV and to Plato's *Phaedros* and *Phaedon* (Courcelle, Hadot)" (ibid.).

[169] "Nostra sunt itaque quae in philosophorum heteris praestant. Et ille posuit ea quorum proprium testimonium non habebat, nos diuini praecepti habemus auctoritatem. Moyses et Helias cum Christo apparuerunt" (AM *mort*, 11,51, CSEL 32/1, 1897, 747).

[170] This treatise is "...impregnated with Origen's spirituality, and quoting from the Canticle from the first chapter on, the essay identifies Isaac with Christ, and Rebecca with the human soul. A continuous commentary on the Canticle, from chapter 4 to the final chapter 8, introduces Platonic recollections into the homily. The essay is well written and representative of the depth of Ambrose's cultural investment on behalf of his pastoral concerns" [C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, 1062].

391[172]), after affirming that the soul has to be praised by the groom, Ambrose concludes that "therefore, he doesn't call her 'sister' only anymore, but also *well accepted [bien aceptada]* like [the one] accepted [by the Son,] who has pleased the Father well (cfr. Mt 17,5)"[173], beautiful[174]. Ambrose explains that the Word commands that the soul turn her gaze away[175] "since [the soul] cannot bear the fullness of the divinity, nor the splendor of the true light"[176] "because she elevates him"[177]. That's to say, that "the holy man exalts the Lord; [but] the sinner humiliates [the Lord]. And so, [the Word] wants her [the soul] to set her eyes away [from him], lest he considers that she already follows [him] on high, he may be elevated, and leave [behind] all the other souls"[178]. To support his statement, Ambrose goes to the Transfiguration pericope: "Therefore, in the Gospel too, he showed his glory not to all the disciples, but to the most perfect (cfr. Mt 17,1-2)"[179].

Ambrose contextualizes the question

"if someone merited to see that pur and highest

---

[171] L. Pizzolato (tr.), *Sant'Ambrogio, Commento al Salmo CXVIII (Lettere I–XI)*, cit., 14.

[172] C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1062.

[173] "Ideoque iam non solum soror dicitur, sed etiam *bene placita* nominatur quasi ei complacita qui conplacuit Patri" (AM *Is*, 7, 57, CSEL 32/1, 1897, 681).

[174] "*…bella como Jerusalén, la admiración como ordenada"* (cfr. Ct 6,4).

[175] *"…aparte de mí tus ojos"* (Ct 6,5; SagBi 3, 796).

[176] "…eo quod plenitudinem diuinitatis eius et splendorem ueri luminis sustinere non possit" (AM *Is*, 7, 57, CSEL 32/1, 1897, 681). Moreover, "etsi tu perfecta es, aliae mihi adhuc redimendae sunt animae, aliae fulciendae, eleuas enim me uidendo, ego autem ideo descendi, ut omnes eleuem" (ibid.).

[177] "Auerte ergo oculos a me, quia me eleuas" (ibid.).

[178] "…sanctus [enim] exaltat Dominum, peccator humiliat. Vult ergo illam auertere oculos, ne eam considerans quod iam ad superiora sequi possit eleuetur et ceteras animas derelinquat" (AM *Is*, 7, 57, CSEL 32/1, 1897, 682).

[179] "Ideo et in euangelio non omnibus discipulis, sed perfectioribus suam gloriam demonstrauit" (AM *Is*, 7, 57, CSEL 32/1, 1897, 682).

> incorporeal [good], ¿why will he have another [good] to wish for?"[180]

within Peter's proposal[181], when the latter saw "the glory of Christ's resurrection and didn't want to go back down"[182], since he had in front of him the only thing that mattered[183].

AM pae

AM *pae*[184] (384-394[185]/387-390[186]) goes against the Novatians[187]. Gryson observes that "in his great Christological works, Ambrose insists often on the *ueritas* of Christ's body"[188]: "Christ possessed our flesh, but not its vices"[189]. Ambrose speaks

[180] "Si quis igitur purum illud et incorporeum summum illud uidere meruerit, quid habeat aliud quod desideret?" (*AM Is,* 8, 78, CSEL 32/1, 1897, 697).
[181] *"Señor, qué bien estamos aquí"* (Mt 17,4; SagBi 5, 161).
[182] "...gloriam resurrectionis Christi uidit et nolebat descendere" (*AM* Is, 8, 78, CSEL 32/1, 1897, 697).
[183] That's to say, that "quanto incomparabilior est illa diuinitatis gloria et lux inaccessibilis, quam si quis uiderit quid aliud concupiscat?" (Id., cit., 698).
[184] For the description of this work, cfr. C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1058.
[185] Ibid.
[186] R. Gryson, *Ambroise de Milan, La Pénitence,* SC 179, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1971, 17.
[187] They're those who denied the forgiveness of the penitents except for those who commited venial sins. "Parmi les nombreux auteurs qui polémiquèrent contre les Novatiens, figure saint Ambrose de Milan" (R. Gryson, *Ambroise de Milan, La Pénitence,* SC 179, cit., 17). Gryson explains how Ambrose understands and refutes Novatianism, and also, how public penance is practiced in Milan in the 4th c. (cfr. cit., 18–50), topics which I won't tackle in this work. Here, "Ambrose stresses [on] the biblical notion of God's radical forgiveness. He explains the public and private penance in the Church on a biblical basis. His vibrant exposition emphasizes the harmony between both Testaments on that issue and ends with a call to personal penance" [C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1058].
[188] "Ambroise insiste fréquemment, dans ses grandes oeuvres christologiques (...), sur la réalités (veritas) du corps du Christ" (R. Gryson, *Ambroise de Milan, La Pénitence,* SC 179, 1971, 64).
[189] "Le Christ avait notre chair, mais non les vices de celle-ci" (Id., cit., 64-65).

of Elijah's coming: "he took Elijah to heaven, from where he shall return to earth at the appointed time[190]"[191].

AM ex

AM *ex* (*Exameron*[192] in the CCL) (Holy Week, 386-390[193]) are nine homilies on Gn 1,1-26 in six books1[94], the argument of which lets one see the vast cultural baggage of Ambrose[195], who aludes to the Father's message (cfr. Mt 17,5) when he addresses the Eunomian: "you also deny [that the Son is] equal [to the Father, the Son] in whom the Father is well pleased (cfr. ibid.)"[196]. Ambrose says *et tu* since earlier, he had addressed a Manichaean[197],

[190] Cfr. Mt 17,11.

[191] "Heliam ad caelum leuauit, inde eum terris conplacito redditurus tempore" (AM *Pae*, 1, 8, 34, CSEL 73, 1955, 136).

[192] Banterle explains that the spelling of the title, "derivando dal greco'ξαημερον, dovrebbe essere regolarmente *Hexaëmeron*. In realtà, presso i vari autori, questo nome viene scritto in forme diverse (...). Lo Schenkl ci avverte che tutti i codici ambrosiani usano la forma *Exameron*" [G. Banterle (tr.), *Sant'Ambrogio, I sei giorni della Creazione,* cit., 19– 20].

[193] C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1060.

[194] "On the first, and third and fifth day Ambrose must have preached twice. Hence Book I, II, V contain two homilies. He used Basil's *Hexaemeron* directly and, according to Jerome (*Epistola* 84,7), commentaries of Origen and Hippolytus of Rome. He worked with a vivid memory of Cicero, Philo, Virgil and other classical sources in his mind. His written text maintains the simplicity of the spoken style" [C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1060]. Although Gabriele Banterle has said that the concept of "intellectual property", as how we understand it today, didn't exist in Ambrose' time, because pastoral concern was more emphasized than the details of erudition, Banterle admits that "*l'Exameron* costituisce un caso limite" [G. Banterle (tr.), *Sant'Ambrogio, I sei giorni della Creazione*, cit., 16]. Even supposing that Ambrose has made much use of Basil's work, Ambrose hasn't been a mere hand-copier, since "anche se lo spunto è offerto da S. Basilio, questo è ampliato e svolto vivacemente con ricchezza di apporti personali [di Ambrogio]" (Id., cit., 18).

[195] Cfr. Id., cit., 16–17.

[196] "...et tu aequalem negas, in quo conplacuit Pater" (AM *ex*, III, 7, 32, CSEL 32/1, 1897, 80).

[197] "...non agnoscis opus esse te Christi? Manibus suis ut legimus te ille formauit: et tu, Manichee, alterum tibi asciscis auctorem" (ibid.).

Photinianus[198], and then, the Eunomian[199].

AM ep

In AM *ep* XI, 11 [387? (Dudden)/ 393 (Palanque)[200]] addressed to Irenaeus[201], although it's unknown who he might have been[202], the sender poses a question to introduce the topic: "what does the soul want more, than to taste once and for all the gentleness of the Word, than to see once and for all his glory?"[203]. Then, Ambrose gives two examples: Moses[204], Elijah[205], and –alluding to the Transfiguration–, "Peter himself, also contemplating on the mountain the glory of the Lord of the resurrection, by saying: *Lord, it is well that we are here*[206], didn't want to go down. Therefore, how

[198] "...et tu, Photiniane, dicis quia in constitutione mundi adhuc, non erat Christus" (*AM* ex, III, 7, 32, CSEL 32/1, 1897, 80). Photinus was a "disceplo di Marcello di Ancira in Galazia e suo copatriota, divenne vescovo di Sirmio tra la fine del 343 e il principio del 344. Piú volte condannato come eretico, fu deposto nel 351. Dopo un breve ritorno di fortuna dovuto alla protezione di Giuliano l'Apostata, dal 364 visse in esilio e morí nel 376. Per Fotino Cristo non è che un uomo uguale agli altri, salvo che per la sua nascita miracolosa e per le sue virtú. Nega che il Verbo abbia una sussistenza personale prima di discendere nel Cristo (DTC, XII, 2, 1532-1536)" [G. Banterle (tr.), *Sant'Ambrogio, I sei giorni della Creazione,* cit., 143, nota 12].

[199] "Et tu, Eunomiane dicis quia dissimilis est Patri Filius. Nam si imago, non dissimilis utique, sed totum exprimens Patrem, quem Pater substantiae suae unitate signauit. Pater dicit faciamus: et tu cooperatorem negas" (*AM ex*, III, 7, 32, CSEL 32/1, 1897, 80).

[200] G. Banterle, *Sant'Ambrogio, Lettere (1–35),* in "Tutte le Opere di Sant'Ambrogio" 19 (Discorsi e Lettere II/1), Biblioteca Ambrosiana, Milano – Città Nuova Editrice, Roma, 1988, 18.

[201] Cfr. Id., cit., 115.

[202] "...sarebbe stato un sacerdote della Chiesa milanese; secondo J.-R. Palanque *(Deux correspondants de saint Ambrose, Orontien et Irénée,* "Revue des Études Latines", XI, 1933, 158), doveva certamente essere un orientale, forse un greco di Egitto (…) Giustamente il Faller (…) osserva che nessuna delle due ipotesi è certa (*neutrum liquet*)" (Id., cit., 51, nota 1).

[203] "Quid enim aliud desideret anima, quia semel suauitatem Verbi gustauerit, quae semel claritatem eius uiderit?" (AM *ep* XI, 11, CSEL 82/1, 1968, 84).

[204] "Moyses in monte positus quadraginta diebus legem accipiens cibum corporis non requirebat" (ibid.).

[205] "Helias ad illam festinans requiem rogabat ut acciperetur a se anima sua" (ibid.).

[206] Mt 17,5.

much glory of the divine substance, how many goods of the Word, *in which angels long to look*[207]!"[208].

In AM *ep* LXVII (?[209]), addressed to Bellitius[210], Ambrose interlocks two antitheses: *lux-tenebrae, visio-caecitas.* After making Judas' treason an example of *nox–caecitas*[211], the author makes two Apostles examples of *lux–uisio*: John[212] and Peter:

> "For Peter, too, it was day, when he say the light of Christ on the mountain[213]; for the rest, it was night, but for Peter, it was day"[214].

But when Peter thrice denied having known Jesus, it became night for him[215]. However, the cock crowed[216] "in order to correct [his] error; for already *the day is at hand*[217]"[218].

---

[207] 1 P 1,12.

[208] "Petrus aspiciens et ipse in monte dominicae resurrectionis gloriam, nolebat descendere dicens: *Domine, bonum est nos hic esse.* Quanta igitur illa diuinae substantiae gloria, quanta verbi bona, *in quae concupiscunt et angeli prospicere!* (AM *ep*, XI, 11, CSEL 82/1, 1968, 84-85).

[209] Since the date of composition of this letter doesn't appear in the chronological table, this letter pertains to those letters of Ambrose "che mancano indizi sufficienti per una datazione che abbia qualche garanzia di fondamento" (G. Banterle, *Sant'Ambrogio, Lettere (36–69),* in "Tutte le Opere di Sant'Ambrogio" 20 (Discorsi e Lettere II/II), Biblioteca Ambrosiana, Milano – Città Nuova Editrice, Roma, 1988, 17).

[210] Cfr. Id., *Sant'Ambrogio, Lettere (36–69)*, cit., 191. Bellicius was a"... catecumeno che differiva il battesimo"" [Id., *Sant'Ambrogio, Lettere (1–35)*, cit., 105, nota 1]. Ambrose also dedicates Letter IX (cfr. ibid.) to Bellitius.

[211] Cfr. Jn 13,27.30; cfr. AM *ep LXVII (Maur. 80),* 7, CSEL 82/2, 1990, 168.

[212] "Iohanni dies erat qui in Christi pectore recumbebat" (AM ep LXVII *(Maur. 80)*, 7, CSEL 82/2, 1990, 168).

[213] Cfr. Mt 17,1-4.

[214] "Petro quoque dies erat cum lumen Christi uideret in monte; nox erat aliis sed Petro dies erat" [AM *ep LXVII (Maur. 80),* 7, CSEL 82/2, 1990, 168].

[215] "At uero ipsi Petro nox erat quando Christum negabat" [AM *ep LXVII (Maur. 80)*, 7, CSEL 82/2, 1990, 168)].

[216] Cfr. Mc 14,72.

[217] Rom 13,12, which reads, in the Neovulgate: *dies autem appropiavit* (el día está cerca) ("el día estaba cerca": SagBi 5, 950).

[218] "...ut emendaret errorem; iam enim *dies appropinquabat"* (AM *ep LXVII (Maur. 80),* 7, CSEL 82/2, 1990, 168).

AM Ps

AM Ps (between 390 – 397[219]), according to Pizzolato, is a compilation of doctrinal reflections[220] preached, then written[221]. It's not known exactly who the addressees of these explanations on twelve Psalms[222] were: maybe a small, very intellectual group would listen to Ambrose[223]. It's also unknown why AM Ps[224] was written. It's known that Ambrose considers that the literary genre of the Psalms is the highest[225], where the *historia salutis*[226] is synthesized in an *Explanatio* that demonstrates the typically Ambrosian

[219] C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1066.

[220] That's to say, that "non è lavoro unitario quanto a composizione né organico quanto a tematiche" [L. Pizzolato (tr.), *Sant'Ambrogio, Commento a Dodici Salmi (1)*, in "Tutte le Opere di Sant'Ambrosio" 7 (Opere esegetiche VII/1), Biblioteca Ambrosiana,Milano – Città Nuova Editrice, Roma, 1980, 9]. AM Ps consists of sermons on Psalms 1, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 45, 47, 48, 61 and 43 (the composition of the last Sermon was interrupted by Ambrose' death [cfr. C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1066]. The commentary to Psalm 36 is extensive, and explains the senses of Scripture and its links with certain books of the Scripture [cfr. Id., *HOPE*, cit., 1067].

[221] Cfr. L. Pizzolato (tr.), *Sant'Ambrogio, Commento a Dodici Salmi (1)*, cit., 9–11.

[222] Cfr. Id., cit., 10.

[223] It's because "Milano è ai suoi tempi città imperiale e centro di vivaci interessi culturali, tanto che si è potuto parlare di un *circolo* milanese, che tenta di conciliare cristianesimo e neoplatonismo" (Id., cit., 19). Besides, "...a questo circolo è vicino Ambrogio, che fu preparato all'episcopato proprio da Simpliciano, generalmente considerato caposcuola milanese di tale movimento. Ambrogio allora ha di fronte sia un pubblico umile e poco colto, di cui sa sempre farsi interprete e patrono, sia una presenza di intellettuali esigenti e spesso critici, di fronte ai quali non può rinunciare al suo *habitus* di retore, alla sua cultura, al peso della sua fama" (ibid.). And so, "Ambrogio sceglie la strada di un chiarimento sí, ma poetico: cioè di un chiarimento del testo che soddisfi la fame del semplice, ma che, essendo ottenuto per via di voli intuitivi, sappia evitare la noia ed affascinare gli intelletti piú vivaci" [L. Pizzolato (tr.), *Sant'Ambrogio, Commento a Dodici Salmi (1),* cit., 20].

[224] As what Pizzolato said, "ci sfugge il motivo della scelta di questi dodici" (Id., cit., 16).

[225] Id., cit., 21. I'm not going to tackle here the literary genre of *psalmus*; Pizzolato describes it well in his introduction to *Sant'Ambrogio, Commento a Dodici Salmi (1)*, cit., 21–31.

[226] This "spiega la complessa rete di riferimenti, che Ambrogio getta all'interno della sua interpretazione" [L. Pizzolato (tr.), *Sant'Ambrogio, Commento a Dodici Salmi (1)*, cit., 23].

exegesis, which compares the Scripture text with others, forming an impressive network of references from the OT and the NT, from which he draws out a spiritual reading[227]. Ambrose makes a more pastoral-analytical exegesis rather than a synthetical one, then aht becomes a spiritual discourse[228]. So much so, that it isn't an exegesis on the Psalms themselves, but rather, one word or another from the Psalm is made a springboard in order to speak of other themes[229]. Here is seen "the multiplicity of the discourse and the varied style"[230]. Such that Pizzolato affirms that Ambrose' mentality is very literary, with more expressivity but with less interpretative precision[231].

The thematic background is the OT-NT unity "in a typological interpretation (which Ambrose likes to call *mystic*)"[232]. The Psalms follow a linear doctrinal trajectory: from the call to penance[233], to the Christological kernel of the NT[234], to Baptism and the

[227] That's to say, "che è quello di trascorrere dal testo-base ad altri testi scritturistici, seguendo il richiamo della presenza di uno stesso termine. En deriva un virtuosistico e teso interccio di riferimenti, che stringe in una morsa unificante le varie zone della Scrittura, ma anche una perdita di spessore storico dei testi stessi, che vengono tutti posti sullo stesso piano, mattoni indifferenziati per la costruzione del discorso spirituale" (Id., cit., 17).

[228] Cfr. G. Lazzati, *Il valore letterario della esegesi ambrosiana*, in "Archivio ambrosiano" 11, Milano, 1960, 61, 102, passim (ibid.).

[229] That is, "...l'opera va quindi letta non tanto per trovarvi un'esegesi dei salmi in questione, ma tanti spunti su altrettanti discorsi spirituali, che si dipartono, a volte in maniera esegeticamente forzata, dalle parole del salmo sottostante. Non debe quindi meravigliare se, invece delle tematiche insite nei testi del salterio, prendono sviluppo altri problemi" [L. Pizzolato (tr.), *Sant'Ambrogio, Commento a Dodici Salmi (1),* cit., 17].

[230] "La poliedricità del discorso e il variare stilistico" (Id., cit., 18).

[231] Cfr. L. Pizzolato, *Ambrogio e Agostino: due modi di accostare il testo sacro,* in "Atti della Settimana pavese" del 1975 (ibid.).

[232] "...in una interpretazione tipologica (che Ambrogio ama chiamare *mistica*)" [L. Pizzolato, (tr.), *Sant'Ambrogio, Commento a Dodici Salmi (1),* cit., 18]. For example, Ambrose quotes Ct, an eminently mystical book [cfr. C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1067].

[233] Cfr. Sal 38(37).

[234] Cfr. Sal 39-40(38-39).

Eucharist[235], in view of the last things[236]. Such is Ambrose' capacity to reelaborate what he draws from his sources[237] for the *Expl. Ps. 12*, that he manages to give it an original touch[238].

In AM Ps 36, 58, (396[239]), Ambrose said, following the Greek version of the Psalm quote[240], that it seems that there wasn't any injustice in David's time. However, Ambrose introduces the uneasy presence of the forsaken righteous people[241]. Still, Ambrose narrates that David "[was] not only abandoned, but that he even shouts, [having been] hurt by friends and relatives: he says –*my friends and companions stand aloof* [Sal 38(37),11]"[242]. Therefore, "if in

[235] Cfr. Sal 41-44(40-43).

[236] Cfr. Sal 49(48); cfr. C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1067.

[237] Basically, Origen and Basil.

[238] Pizzolato tells that there are so many instances when, even when the originality of the author's explanations might be doubted, the experts "sono comunque costretti a riconoscere la grande capacità sua [Ambrogio] nel rielaborare le sue fonti, nel costruire tramite esse un quadro di sapore nuevo de originale nel suo complesso" [*Sant'Ambrogio, Commento a Dodici Salmi (1)*, cit., 15].

[239] Cfr. ibid. Pizzolato thus places the explanation of Psalm 36 because "essa descrive la vittoria di Teodosio contro Eugenio 394" (L. Pizzolato (tr.), *Sant'Ambrogio, Commento a Dodici Salmi (1)*, cit., 13).

[240] "Aliqui autem iuxta Graecos habent: *iuuenis fui; etenim senui et non uidi iustum derelictum nec semen eius quaerens panem"* (AM *Ps*, 36, 58, CSEL 64, 1919, 114). And Ambrose interprets it thus: "Simpliciter, qui uult intellegere, patet sensus, quod uitae suae tempore Dauid non uiderit iustum derelictum" (ibid.).

[241] "...hoc et brevis temporis est et incredibile; siquidem multos uidemus in saeculo iustos ab hominibus relinqui, quando eos aliqui potentium persecuntur, et nullus ad eos audet accedere, cum in timore aut iniuria uiderit constitutos" (AM *Ps*, 36, 58, CSEL 64, 1919, 114-115). Regarding how incredible *tempus breue* is, Pizzolato echoes Pépin when saying that "...l'irrazionale (*álogon*) e l'assurdo (*átopon*) nella lettera della Scrittura indicano che il senso letterale va superato nell'interpretazione spirituale [cfr. J. Pépin, A *propos de l'histoire de l'exégèse allégorique: l'absurdité, signe de l'allégorie,* en *Studia Patristica* I (TU 63), Berlin, 1957, 395-413]" [in L. Pizzolato, (tr.), *Sant'Ambrogio, Commento a Dodici Salmi (1),* cit., 219, nota 80].

[242] "...non solum destitutum, sed etiam impugnatum se ab amicis et proximis clamat: amici –inquit– mei et proximi mei aduersum me appropinquauerunt" (AM *Ps*, 36, 58, CSEL 64, 1919, 115).

this world there are forsaken righteous men, why did David say contradictory things about himself, unless you don't understand that the righteous man, though forsaken in the world, is not, however, forsaken by the Lord?"[243]. Thus, David, inspite of it all, wasn't forsaken in the end[244]. Among the examples Ambrose gives is this: "What will I say of Elijah and of Elisha who, walking on the desert, meet a chariot of fire and horses from heaven? How is Elijah abandoned, he who is invited by Christ (cfr. Mt 17,2-4)?"[245], alluding to Elijah's presence in the Transfiguration.

In AM *Ps 12* (388–390[246]), Ambrose observes that in *when he goes out*[247], "...Moses [is] inside the cloud, with Jesus[248], outside [are] the Jews", then, "*God judges those outside*[249], because Christ

[243] "...si in hoc saeculo repperiuntur iusti derelicti, quomodo sibi contraria dixit Dauid, nisi intellegas quod iustus, etsi in saeculo derelinquitur, a Domino tamen non derelinquitur?" (AM *Ps*, 36, 58, CSEL 64, 1919, 115).

[244] Ambrose observes that "...nec derelictus Dauid, cui regnum dedit, ut populo imperaret electo, quem parricidalibus proeliis appetitum, regni sui depulsum finibus, uictoriae iure restituit" (ibid.).

[245] "Quid de Helia et Heliseo dicam, quibus per deserta gradientibus, equi de caelo et igneus currus occurrit? Quomodo derelictus Helias, qui est inuitatus a Christo?" (AM *Ps*, 36, 58, CSEL 64, 1919, 115).

[246] Cfr. L. Pizzolato (tr.), *Sant'Ambrogio, Commento a Dodici Salmi (1)*, cit., 14. Pizzolato thus dates this *Explanatio* –after the composition of the *Expositio* of the Gospel according to Luke– by "analogie con opere del periodo 388–390" (ibid.).

[247] Sal 41(40),6. Pizzolato observes that this phrase serves as the "...sviluppo del discorso per isolamento dal testo del Salmo della parola *foras/is,* attorno alla quale si addensano altri riferimenti scritturistici" [L. Pizzolato (tr.), *Sant'Ambrogio, Commento a Dodici Salmi, (2)*, in "Tutte le Opere di Sant'Ambrogio" 8 (Opere esegetiche VII/II), Biblioteca Ambrosiana, Milano–Città Nuova Editrice, Roma, 1980, 53, nota 20].

[248] Cfr. Mt 17,4-5.

[249] 1 Co 5,13: "a los de fuera los juzgará Dios" (SagBi 5, 993). As an example of those who had gone out – who have been judged by God – there's Judas Iscariot: "Egrediebatur igitur Iudas et loquebatur. Egrediebatur de fide, egrediebatur de consilio et numero Apostolorum, egrediebatur de conuiuio Christi ad latrocinium diaboli, egrediebatur de gratia sanctificationis ad laqueum mortis, qui uana ad perfidos loquebatur, egrediebatur foras, qui uitae interna mysteria relinquebat, egrediebatur, qui Scripturae interiora non nouerat" (AM Ps, 40, 17, CSEL 64, 1919, 240)].

absolves those who are inside[250]"[251].

For Ambrose, having chosen only three from among the twelve Apostles shows that God "has willed his mystery to be hidden"[252]. Besides, keeping silence on the Transfiguration[253] is apt,

> "lest one weaker receive [it] as a sort of scandal, he who can't accept, due to [his] shaky nature, the power of the sacraments"[254].

The cloud itself impeded the three Apostles from standing –they who "entered the cloud, in order to know the secret and hidden things"[255], listening to the *vox Dei*[256]– it was a relief when Jesus touched them and told them not to fear[257]. Ambrose clarifies that, being Moses and Elijah men already gifted with superhuman powers, *the beloved Son, in whom God is pleased*[258] *well is infinitely greater than them*[259]. Thus, Moses and Elijah are *servuli Filii Dei* –little servants of Him who is

---

[250] Cfr. Mt 17,5.

[251] *"...eos qui foris sunt Deus iudicabit,* eos autem qui intus sunt Christus absoluet" (AM *Ps*, 40, 17, CSEL 64, 1919, 240).

[251] "...occultum suum uoluit esse mysterium" (AM *Ps*, 45, 2, CSEL 64, 1919, 330).

[252] "...occultum suum uoluit esse mysterium" (AM *Ps*, 45, 2, CSEL 64, 1919, 330).

[253] "...occultum suum uoluit esse mysterium" (AM *Ps*, 45, 2, CSEL 64, 1919, 330).

[254] "...ne offendiculum quisquam subiret infirmior, qui uim sacramentorum fluctuanti ingenio haurire non posset" (AM *Ps*, 45, 2, CSEL 64, 1919, 330). Such weakness is seen –according to Ambrose– in the prostration of the three Apostles during the Transfiguration (cfr. Mt 17,6).

[255] "Introierunt (...) in nubem, ut abdita et occulta cognoscerent" (AM *Ps*, 45, 2, CSEL 64, 1919, 330).

[256] Cfr. Mt 17,5.

[257] Cfr. Mt 17,7.

[258] Cfr. Mt 17,5.

[259] "Ubi testimonium resurrectionis adsciscitur, adstipulentur ministeria seruulorum; ubi gloria Domini resurgentis ostenditur, seruulis splendor absconditur" (AM *Ps*, 45, 2, CSEL 64, 1919, 330).

> "the Only One who is the true and everlasting[260], in whom the Father is well pleased"[261]–

and never equal to Him, since

> "...where the testimony of the resurrection is admitted, [there] the ministries of servants are needed; where the glory of the risen Lord is shown, [there] the splendor is hidden to the servants"[262].

Lastly, Ambrose links Jn 10,30[263] to Mt 17,5, placing words in the mouth of the Father, who "...hasn't said: 'Moses and I are one', nor has he said that between [he and Elijah] there was some participation in the divine glory. Why do you prepare three booths? There are no booths of this kind on earth, but in heaven"[264].

---

[260] Thus, "...tenebrae sunt uniuersa comparatione lucis aeternae" (Id., cit., 331). Cfr. Jn 1,9.

[261] "...hic solus est uerum lumen et aeternum, in quo Pater complacet" (AM *Ps*, 45, 2, CSEL 64, 1919, 331).

[262] "Ubi testimonium resurrectionis adsciscitur, adstipulentur ministeria seruulorum; ubi gloria Domini resurgentis ostenditur, seruulis splendor absconditur" (AM *Ps*, 45, 2, CSEL 64, 1919, 330). This sentence seems to contain much theological content, since Pizzolato observes that it's an "... definizione antiariana, letterariamente efficace, della divinità di Cristo, che non va posto sullo stesso piano dei grandi personaggi biblici, che gli sono seruuli e ministri. La prova decisiva della differenza consiste nel fatto della resurrezione, che rivela la gloria del Signore e la subordinazione a lui degli altri, come sui servi" [L. Pizzolato (tr.), *Sant'Ambrogio, Commento a Dodici Salmi (2)*, 199, nota 2].

[263] "Yo y el Padre somos uno" (SagBi 5, 638).

[264] "Non dixit: 'Ego et Moyses unum sumus', non dixit sibi et Helias illum diuinae gloriae esse consortium. Quid tria tabernacula praeparatis? Non in terris habet iste tabernaculum, sed in caelo" (AM *Ps*, 45, 2, CSEL 64, 1919, 331).

AM 118 Ps

AM *118 Ps* (386-390[265]/13 May 295–3 February 396[266]), was preached (for nine months except during Lent[267], perhaps before a mixed crowd[268]) and later put into writing[269]. Ambrose isn't the first commentator of Psalm 118. Hilary has already commented on Psalm 118, but in the context of his Treatise on the Psalter[270]. The commentators from the East were the first to comment on Psalm 118 apart from the Psalter[271]. Why has Ambrose commented

[265] C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1060.

[266] L. Pizzolato (tr.), *Sant'Ambrogio, Commento al Salmo CXVIII (Lettere I–XI),* in "Tutte le Opere di Sant'Ambrogio" 9 (Opere esegetiche VIII, 1), Biblioteca Ambrosiana, Milano–Città Nuova Editrice, Roma, 1987, 14. The Commentary is made of "twenty-two homilies, commenting on the twenty-two stanzas of Psalm 118: 'The exegesis which is of a moral type is concerned with the conversion of the soul. Images of a military, athletic, judicial, and a medical nature follow one upon the other throughout this protreptic on the *sequela Christi*. A typological exegesis applied to the church is also to be found' (G. M. Mara: Quasten IV, 163)" [C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1060].

[267] And so, it's "il commento della lectio del Salmo CXVIII, condotto nel corso di nove mesi e al di fuori del tempo della Quaresima" [L. Pizzolato (tr.), *Sant'Ambrogio, Commento al Salmo CXVIII (Lettere I–XI),* cit., 14–15].

[268] Cfr. H. J. auf der Maur, *Das Psalmenverständnis des Ambrosius von Mailand. Ein Beitrag zum Deutungshintergrund der Psalmenverwendung im Gottesdienst der Alten Kirche*, Leiden, 1977, 15; in L. Pizzolato (tr.), *Sant'Ambrogio, Commento al Salmo CXVIII (Lettere I–XI)*, cit., 15.

[269] Cfr. L. Pizzolato (tr.), *Sant'Ambrogio, Commento al Salmo CXVIII (Lettere I–XI),* cit., 9–12. Here, I don't deal in detail with the characteristics of the aformentioned two phases.

[270] Cfr. Id., cit., 17.

[271] "Orígenes, Eusebio de Cesarea, Dídimo de Alejandría, Apolinario de Laodicea" [P. Devréesse, Les anciens commentateurs grecs des Psaumes, en "Studi e Testi" 264, Città del Vaticano, 1970, 19-85, 132-134, 197-201, 217-219]" [cfr. L. Pizzolato (tr.), *Sant'Ambrogio, Commento al Salmo CXVIII (Lettere I–XI)*, cit., 17]. Pizzolato compares Origen's and Ambrose' exegesis of Psalm 119(118): "Se è quindi vero che l'interpretazione che del Salmo CXVII dà Origene è di tipo intelletivo –a partire dalla particolare struttura del Salmo che lo qualifica come morale proprio perché esprime un progresso di avvicinamento alla perfezione– non è però giusto continuare a chiamare, in modo riduttivo, 'morale' l'interpretazione ambrosiana, la quale, sotto il carattere progressivo (e perciò didattico-morale) indicato dalla struttura del Salmo CXVIII, scorge invece la forma dell'economia della salvezza" [Id., cit., 19].

on Psalm 118 apart from the Psalter? Maybe it was to encourage monastic spirituality[272].

Ambrose' *exegesis* on Psalm 118 is "moral and mystic: a Christian tropology"[273]. The very *location* of Psalm 118 –after Psalm 117 (which prefigures the *Passio Christi*)– opens Psalm 118 to soteriology, celebrated through praise[274]. Ambrose connects the scene of the realization of the disciples in Emmaus[275] to the sleep of the three Apostles during the Transfiguration[276]:

> "if Jesus were not to take away the veil, the grace of the Gospel wouldn't shine for anybody. Peter, too, had his eyes closed; John, too had [them] closed; James, too had [them] closed. Hence, on the mountain [the eyes of the three] were heavy with slumber, but woken by

[272] "Molto probabilmente (…) il Salmo CXVIII da Salmo per tutto il popolo diventerà testo adatto ad esprimere la spiritualità monastica, alla quale quante cure abbia dedicato Ambrogio" [Id., cit., 21]. Moreover, "...l'eccezionale presenza del tema della Legge e la ricercata struttura abecedaria, scandita lungo strofe ottonarie" (ibid.).

[273] "...una interpretazione morale-mistica congiunta: diremmo di tropologia cristiana" [L. Pizzolato (tr.), *Sant'Ambrogio, Commento al Salmo CXVIII (Lettere I–XI)*, cit., 23]. It means that Ambrose purifies Origen's reading from the "strettoie dell'intellettività e vedendola come un cammino morale che sfocia nella mistica dell'incontro: cammino ripercorso lungo le tappe della storia della salvezza di popoli e di uomini, lungo motivi storicamente determinati oltre che archetipalmente perenni" [Id., cit., 22]. Moreover, for Ambrose –according to Pizzolato– "...il testo del Salmo CXVIII permette addirittura di superare la mistica nel suo aspetto di redenzione e di arrivare alla mistica quale riposo celeste" (ibid.).

[274] "Salmo CXVII –che secondo Ambrogio canta la Passione del Signore– indica l'apertura del nostro Salmo al mondo della redenzione, che viene celebrato giustamente nelle movenze della lode" [L. Pizzolato (tr.), *Sant'Ambrogio, Commento al Salmo CXVIII (Lettere I–XI)*, cit., 27].

[275] Lc 24,31: *"Entonces se les abrieron los ojos y le reconocieron"* (SagBi 5, 552).

[276] Cfr. Lc 9,32.

> the fulgence of the divine majesty, the eyes of their heart opened"[277].

A cloud covered the Apostles[278], "so that the fulgence of the celestial glory won't leave the bodily eyes weakened"[279].

Ambrose observes[280] that "well, there are those who live, [but] are dead, and [there are those who,] dead, are alive"[281], and "...for this reason, some go alive to the netherworld; others, since they're dead in the body, live because of their merits"[282]. For Ambrose, the fact that the proclamation of salvation[283] points to Jesus Christ[284] poses a question: "What is glory, if not the Lord Jesus?"[285]. Alluding to the Transfiguration, Ambrose explains that

---

[277] "...nisi Iesus aperuisset nobis oculos, nemo uidisset; nisi Iesus sustulisset uelamen, nulli Euangelli gratia refulsisset. Et Petrus clausos habebat oculos et Iohannes clausos habebat et Iacobus clausos habebat. Denique in monte grauati erant somno, sed excitati maiestatis fulgore diuinae oculos cordis sui aperuerunt" (AM *118 Ps*, 3, 23, CSEL 62, 1913, 54).

[278] Cfr. Mt 17,5.

[279] "...ne corporis oculos gloriae caelestis fulgor hebetaret" (AM *118 Ps*, 3, 23, CSEL 62, 1913, 54).

[280] *"Haz que viva en tu justicia"* [Sal 119(118),40; SagBi 3, 529].

[281] "...sunt enim qui uiuentes mortui sunt et qui mortui uiuunt" (AM *118 Ps*, 5, 47, CSEL 62, 1913, 108).

[282] "Denique alii descendunt in infernum uiuentes, alii, cum sint corpore mortui, meritis suis uiuunt" (ibid.). Next, Ambrose paraphrases Mt 16,28 with eschatological echoes: "Sunt enim qui non gustabunt mortem, donec uideant Filium hominis die iudicii reuertentem, quando cum gloria sancti resurgent" (ibid.).

[283] "¿No volverás a darnos la vida, para que se alegre en Tí tu pueblo? Señor, muéstranos tu misericordia y danos tu salvación. Escucharé lo que dice Dios: el Señor anuncia la paz a su pueblo y a sus fieles, con tal de que no retornen a la necedad. En verdad, ya está cerca la salvación para los que le temen, para que en nuestra tierra habite la Gloria" [Sal 85(84),7–10; SagBi 3, 427].

[284] "...totus hic locus Iesum Dominum sonat" (AM *118 Ps,* 6, 3, CSEL 62, 1913, 109-110).

[285] "Quis est gloria nisi Dominus Iesus?" (ibid.).

"the Father is well pleased in Him [the Son][286], because the glory is the Father's"[287],

thus speaking of the *Father-Son inseparability and equality and of Christ, the highest praise of the Father*[288].

Ambrose establishes a parallelism between the frost[289] and the righteoes who is dead to sin, meaning, the *iustus mortificatus (corpus mortuum facere)–uter* parallelism, and Ambrose explains the parallelism with the process of making wine-skins[290], in order to be –by the Spirit– "spiritually 'peeled' (*exuviae spiritales; despellejados*)"[291], detached from sin, alive in God[292].

Ambrose refers to Jesus' Transfiguration, and connects its visual and snowy aspect to the humid aspect of dew and snow[293]. Thus, the clothes of Jesus transfigured are seen to be as white as snow[294],

---

[286] Cfr. Mt 17,5.

[287] Cfr. Ef 1,17: *"[E]l Dios de nuestro Señor Jesucristo, el Padre de la gloria"* (SagBi 5, 1129).

[288] "Hunc qui a Patre separat maiorem Patri iniuriam facit, quem uult esse sine gloria. Hunc quisque aequalem Patri non putat, inferiorem et Patrem iudicat, cum alio uerbo Patrem plus laudare non possit, quia summa laus gloriae Christus est (AM *118 Ps*, 6, 3, CSEL 62, 1913, 109-110).

[289] "Soy como odre a la helada blanca, pero no olvido tus decretos" [Sal 119(118),83; SagBi 3, 533]. In the Neovulgate, instead of gelicidio, we read fumo (smoke). [*"Quoniam factus sum sicut uter in gelicidio; iustificationes tuas non sum oblitus"* (AM *118 Ps*, 11, 13, CSEL 62, 1913, 241)].

[290] "Recte enim uter dicitur iustus, qui expeliatus, non nudus inueniatur; uter namque de exuuiis fit animantia mortui" (ibid.).

[291] Ibid

[292] The context of this iter follows: "Igitur et nos peccato moriamur, ut uiuamus Deo. Repleti Spiritus iucunditate et suauitate laetitiae erimus exuuiae spiritales, infirmitate corporea et integro mentis sinu infusam nobis diuinorum mysteriorum gratiam reseruantes" (ibid.).

[293] The context of this iter follows: "Igitur et nos peccato moriamur, ut uiuamus Deo. Repleti Spiritus iucunditate et suauitate laetitiae erimus exuuiae spiritales, infirmitate corporea et integro mentis sinu infusam nobis diuinorum mysteriorum gratiam reseruantes" (ibid.).

[294] Cfr. Mt 17,2-3.

"not only that he himself might be considered alien to contact with sin"[295], but also,

> "[that,] he who is risen may rise refreshed, with the spousal passional attractions frozen"[296].

Thus, *nix* –according to Ambrose– offers three levels of reading, according to the visual-textile[297], temperature-meteorological (humid)[298] (*continentia*[299]), and tactile[300] (contact with the divine Word[301]) aspects.

Ambrose says that the death of those who've followed the Lord implies the non-death mentioned by Jesus[302], and so the Cross shouldn't be feared.

---

[295] "...ut non solum ipse alienus aestimaretur contagione peccati" (AM 118 *Ps*, 11, 13, CSEL 62, 1913, 242). It's about Jesus' impeccability.

[296] "...quicumque resuscitatur congelatis coniugii cupiditatibus resurgere, frigidus uideretur" (ibid.). It referes to the ceasing of the physical dimension of conjugal union in eschatology. Ambrose quotes Mt 22,30: *"...porque en la resurrección no se casarán ni ellas ni ellos, sino que serán en el cielo como los ángeles"* (SagBi 5, 191). In the Neovulgate, instead of nubunt, we read *nubent*; instead of *uxores ducunt*, we read *nubentur*; and instead of *erunt*, we read *sunt* (ibid.).

[297] The dimension of the clothes of the transfigured Jesus, on the Christological level: *impeccabilitas Iesu* (cfr. AM *118 Ps,* 11, 13, CSEL 62, 1913, 241).

[298] This is, on the moral-spiritual level (as *nix, frigor niualis, gelicidium, pruina*): "Boni ergo utres frigidi, hoc est in gelicidio constricti pruinis, non libidinis calore resoluti" (ibid.).

[299] In this dimension, without any connection to the *solar* aspect of the fulgence of the clothes of the transfigured Jesus, Ambrose interprets the sun as *iniquitas*, related –in turn– to the *feruentium uiscerum cupiditates diuersae* (cfr. ibid.). Ambrose thus inverts the meaning of the parallelisms generally known as warmth–love for God, coldness–lack of love, when Ambrose gives a rather unusual but interesting meaning to the snow. One must be cold (with the snow of continence and of the divine word) in order to combat the warmth (in this case, hotness seems more appropriate) (of sin, and in particular, of the sin of lust).

[300] This is, on a theological level (as ros). Although the physical condition changes, because stricto sensu, the dew is not snow. However, sensu lato, dew and snow can be considered proximate realities because, besides, in Ambrose' mind –I think– the spiritual reading of dew and snow relate them both.

[301] Cfr. AM *118 Ps*, 11, 13, CSEL 62, 1913, 241.

[302] Cfr. Mt 16,28; cfr. AM *118 Ps*, 15, 40.

Ambrose rejoices in the loot[303] because "without any effort of mine, I've found a loot I didn't use to have"[304]. Ambrose compares the loot of the Jews and the loot of the Christian[s][305], then he speaks of a certain "transfer", placing words in Jesus' mouth:

> "Therefore, with Moses and Elijah, [he] has appeared before me[306], because he has distanced himself from them [the Jews]"[307].

AM my

AM my (389-391[308]) is a series of sermons[309] wherein, after stating: "washing away of the sins is manifested in the white garments of the neophytes. Even the angels and the Groom himself, Jesus, have marvelled at the purity of the Church"[310], Ambrose reminds the neophyte: "You've accepted these clothes afterwards

[303] *"...estoy gozoso, como el que encuentra un rico botín"* [Sal 119(118),162; SagBi 3, 539].

[304] "...sine labore meo inueni spolia quae non habebam" (AM *118 Ps*, 21, 12, CSEL 62, 1913, 480).

[305] "Habent illi libros, sed sensum librorum non habent; habent Prophetas, sed non habent quem illi prophetauerunt" (ibid.)]. Meanwhile, he asks himself: "Quomodo enim habent quem non receperunt?" (ibid.).

[306] Cfr. Mt 17,4.

[307] "Ideo cum Moyse et Helia mihi apparuit, quia ab eis recessit" (AM *118 Ps*, 21, 12, CSEL 62, 1913, 480). Ambrose concludes by saying that "...multa habet spolia qui habet Dei Verbum" (ibid.).

[308] C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1065.

[309] Here, "...the different events of biblical salvation history (...) are applied to the baptismal and eucharistic newness of life, experienced by the neophytes, as symbols rich in significance. The Canticle helps to celebrate the intimacy of the relationship between Christ, the church, and the human soul in that newness of life (7, 35-41)" (ibid.).

[310] "Vestimentis albis neophytorum ablutio peccatorum manifestatur. Etiam angeli et ipse Iesus sponsus nitorem ecclesiae mirati sunt" [J. Quasten, S. *Ambrosii de mysteriis,* 7, in "Monumenta eucharistica et liturgica vetustissima" pars III, in B. Geyer – J. Zelliger (eds.) "Florilegium Patristicum tam veteris quam medii aevi auctores complectens" Fasciculus VII, Bonnae Sumptibus Petri Hanstein, MCMCCCVI, 129].

in order to indicate that you take off the cover of sins, [and that] you clothe yourself with the chaste cape of innocence"[311]. Then, Ambrose affirms that the baptized is clean according to the Law[312] and according to the Gospel. He's clean according to the Gospel

> "because Christ's clothes were white as snow, when in the Gospel he showed the glory of his resurrection"[313].

AM Lc

Ambrose distinguishes[314] between *uerbum* in common usage[315]–, and *Verbum*[316], "whom the Apostles have served"[317]. The Apostles "haven't only seen the Lord *secundum corpus*, but also *secundum Verbum*[318], like in the Transfiguration, too, "since those who've seen the glory of the Word with Moses and Elijah have seen the Word. Since these have seen Jesus, those who've seen him have seen [him] in his glory"[319].

---

[311] "Accepisti post haec uestimenta candida, ut esset indicio, quod exueris inuolucrum peccatorum, indueris innocentiae casta uelamina" (AM *my*, 7, 34, CSEL 73, 1955, 102-103). Ambrose bases his affirmation in the words of the Psalmist: *"Rocíame con el hisopo y quedaré limpio, lávame y quedaré más blanco que la nieve"* [Sal 51(50),9; SagBi 3, 326].

[312] "...secundum legem, quia hysopi fasciculo Moyses agni aspergebat sanguinem" (*AM my,* 7, 34, CSEL 73, 1955, 103)]. Cfr. Ex 12,22.

[313] "...quia Christi erant candida uestimenta sicut nix, cum resurrectionis suae gloriam in Euangelio demonstraret" (*AM my,* 7, 34, CSEL 73, 1955, 103).

[314] *"Conforme nos las transmitieron quienes desde el principio fueron testigos oculares y ministros de la palabra"* (Lc 1,2; SagBi 5, 376).

[315] "Todo el pueblo percibía los truenos" (Ex 20,18; SagBi 1, 372-373). Ambrose notes how, beyond the audio-visual meaning of *uox*, "altissimo ingenio uoluit declarare Moyses quia uox uidetur Dei; interioris enim mentis uidetur obtutu" (AM *Lc*, I, 5, SC 45, 1956, 48-49).

[316] "...quia non prolatiuum Verbum, sed substantiale signatur Verbum illud, quod *caro factum est et habitauit in nobis,* non uulgare Verbum, sed illud caeleste intellegamus" (ibid.).

[317] "...cui Apostoli ministrarunt" (ibid.).

[318] Ibid

[319] "...uiderunt enim Verbum qui cum Moyse et Helia uiderunt gloriam Verbi. Isti enim uiderunt Iesum, qui in sua uiderunt gloria" (AM *Lc*, I, 5, SC 45, 1956, 48-49). Cfr. 1 Jn 1,1-2.

Ambrose establishes an Elijah-John the Baptist[320] parallelism: "this [John] dwells with the Lord on earth, that [Elijah] will appear with the Lord in glory (cfr. Lk 9,30321)"[322].

Against the Arians[323], Ambrose highlights the fact that God the Father himself bears witness to having been well pleased by Jesus of Nazareth, his beloved Son[324]. "Therefore, he who doesn't believe in the Son won't either believe in the Father. The latter is the witness on the Son"[325]. For Ambrose, the Father's *in quo complacui* means that "all the things the Son has are mine"[326]: the Son has the *indifferentis diuinitatis potentia* like the Father, and so has to be heeded[327].

After interpreting as Peter's weaknesses the fact that "...he fell on the mountain[328], and was helped by Christ to get up (cfr. Mt

[320] "[Juan] *marchará antes en la presencia del Señor con el espíritu y el poder de Elías"* (Lc 1,17; SagBi 5, 378); E irá delante de Él con el espíritu y el poder de Elías (ibid.).

[321] Moreover, "ille coruis pascebatur, hic dumis, et calcata omni uoluptatis inlecebra parsimoniam praetulit luxumque contemsit. Ille Achab regis gratiam non quaesiuit, hic spreuit Herodes, ille Iordanen diuisit, hic ad lauacrum salutare conuertit" (AM *Lc*, I, 36, SC 45, 1956, 64-65).

[322] "...hic cum Domino uersatur in terris, ille cum Domino apparet in gloria" (ibid).

[323] "Vbi sunt Arriani, quibus non placet Filius, in quo conplacuit Pater?" (AM *Lc*, II, 95, CChr.SL 14, 1957, 75).

[324] "Hoc non ego dico neque hominum quisquam loquutus est neque per hominem Deus neque per angelos neque per archangelos, sed ab ipso Patre uox de caelo missa signauit" (ibid.).

[325] "Qui ergo Filio non credit non credit Patri. Testis est ille de Filio" (AM *Lc*, II, 95, CChr.SL 14, 1957, 75).

[326] "Quid est enim dicere: *in quo conplacui* nisi quia omnia quae habet Filius mea sunt" (AM *Lc*, II, 95, CChr.SL 14, 1957, 75). Next, Ambrose quotes Jn 16,15: *"Yo y el Padre somos uno"* (SagBi 5, 672).

[327] "Credamus Patri, cuius uocem elementa sonuerunt, credamus Filio, cuius uoci elementa obsequium praestiterunt" (AM *Lc*, II, 95, CChr.SL 14, 1957, 75)].

[328] Cfr. Mt 17,6.

17,7)"[329], Ambrose reminds that

> "there [Peter] falls, where nobody climbs"[330], "...and if he has fallen, though he has fallen on the mountain, but he has fallen more fortunately than others who have been on their feet, he whom Christ help to get up had fallen more fortunately"[331].

AM ptr

AM *ptr* (after 390[332]) comments on Gen 48-49, where Ambrose follows the *ordo narrationis*, while he adds "Christological insights. There is no trace of a homiletic style"[333]. Why is AM *ptr* written? According to Banterle, "Ambrose wants to show that the sacred texts[334], by virtue of prophecy, refer integrally to Christ's coming"[335], basing this on Hippolytus' and Philo's writings[336].

[329] "...in monte cadit, sed leuatur a Christo" (AM *Lc*, X, 84, SC 52, 1958, 184-185).

[330] "Ibi cadit, quo nullus ascendit" (ibid.).

[331] "Et si cecidit, in monte tamen cecidit, sed felicius ille cecidit quam alii steterunt, felicius cecidit, quem Christus leuauit" (ibid.).

[332] C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1066. Banterle dates the composition in 391 [cfr. Banterle, Gabriele (tr.), *I Patriarchi*, in "Tutte le Opere di Sant'Ambrogio" 4 (Opere esegetiche IV), Biblioteca Ambrosiana, Milano – Città Nuova Editrice, Roma, 1980, 10].

[333] C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1066. Maybe "il De Patriarchis non sia un sermone successivamente rielaborato, ma un breve trattato nel senso moderno del termine, e alcuni elementi contribuiscono ad avvalotate tale opinione. Si veda, per esempio, la chiusa senza la consueta dossologia finale" [G. Banterle (tr.), *I Patriarchi*, cit., 1980, 10].

[334] Cfr. Gn 49,3–27 (Jacob's blessing to his descendants), Dt 33,6–25 (Moses' blessing to the tribe of Israel) [in G. Banterle (tr.), *I Patriarchi*, cit., 9]

[335] "Ambrogio si propone di dimostrare che i due testi sacri, per virtú profetica, si refiscono integralmente alla venuta di Cristo" [G. Banterle (tr.), *I Patriarchi,* cit., 9].

[336] "Hippolytus's Commentary on the Blessing of Jacob provides much of the allegorical commentary on Genesis 48. Philo's De sobrietate, Leg. alleg., De somnis, De ebrietate, and other treatises surface repeateadly in the commentary on Genesis 49 (Schenkel)" [C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1066].

Ambrose interprets Issachar[337], a mercenary, as Christ (our *merces*) who, upon redeeming us by faith and devotion[338], "...rested amidst the lots (suertes) of the OT and NT or amidst the Prophets"[339]. Referring to Jesus' Transfiguration,

> "[Christ] appeared in the middle, between Moses and Elijah, to show us that [He] rested on [their] sermons"[340].

Principal affirmations

In AM *vg*, Ambrose refers to the Father who begot the Son, in whom he is well pleased.

AM *Ca* states that Moses was taken to heaven, and did not remain buried, nor was he even annihilated, because in fact, he was in Jesus' Transfiguration.

In AM *Sat*, resurrection is the non-knowledge of eternal death, as in the case of Elijah and of the three Apostles.

In AM *fi, I,* after warning that one mustn't speak of begetting of the *Genitus* in human terms, Ambrose insists that the "is" of the message of the voice during Jesus' Transfiguration (*mysterium*) indicates the Son's perfection and eternity. The mystery lies in that the Father begets, but without being passible. Although Peter didn't err either in nature nor in glory, because Peter was focused on Jesus, the Father corrected him. Peter prostrated due to fear in the presence of divine glory. In the Transfiguration, the Law and the Prophets reveal the mystery, the Son of God. Ambrose reminds

[337] "Isacar es un asno robusto echado entre las aguaderas; ve que el descanso es bueno y la tierra agradable; ofrece el lomo a la carga llega a hacerse esclavo a sueldo" (Gn 49,14-15; SB 1, 256). Banterle observes that Gn 49,14 and 15 (partly) "non corrisponde al testo dei *Settanta*, qui riprodotto da S. Ambrogio" [G. Banterle (tr.), *I Patriarchi,* cit., 43, nota 1].

[338] Cfr. AM *ptr*, 6, 30, CSEL 32/2, 1897, 141.

[339] "Requieuit inter sortes Veteris et Noui Testamenti uel in medio Prophetarum" (Id., cit. 142).

[340] "...inter Moysen et Heliam medius apparuit, ut ostenderet nobis quod eorum sermonibus requiem habeat" (ibid.).

that the Son, who proceeds and comes from God, is God.

In AM *fi, II*, when the Father proclaims who the Son is, there's no reason why the Son should be bragging, because the Father affirms the eternal, natural divine filiation of the Son, who is respected not because the Son commands it, but simply because the Son is the beloved Son of the Father. If those who accepted Jesus as Son of God fell to the ground, it makes one think what would those who denied the Son's divinity would do.

AM *fi, III* states that he who doesn't know eternal death pertains to the heavenly Kingdom, to the Kingdom of the Son, and the Kingdom of the Father, where everyone belonging to it receive the same prize.

AM *fi, IV* affirms –against Arians– the Son's eternal power and divinity. Moreover, there is vital unity Father-Son because the Father granted life in itself to the Son, so the Father may be glorified in the Son, who pleases the Father well.

AM *fi, V* distinguishes between the eternal love of nature (of the Son) from the love which is fruit of grace. There's also a reference to Arius' presumption as if he knew more than Moses, who was a witness of the Transfiguration.

AM *sp* mentions that the Anointed One promised by God is his beloved Son, in whom he is well pleased, in the clarity seen by the three Apostles.

AM *inc* defends the divinity of the Word, the use of which isn't made outside the context of the second Person of the Trinity: only the Word is the Father's beloved Son. It's what Ambrose says against those who reject the faith of the witnesses of the Transfiguration, when Moses and Elijah are received by Jesus, to serve as testimony of the unity of Scriptures.

AM *Abr* attempts to look into, as it were, the depths of the heart of the Father who, in turn, speaks "father to father" to Abraham,

asking him to sacrifice his beloved only child, then Ambrose talks about the perenniality of true love, which in this case is fatherly.

In AM *Dav*, within the context of David's sin and repentance, Ambrose speaks of the spark of light David sees while he was being contrite, which gives place to the purificaiton of his soul. Then, Ambrose speaks of purification in the OT and the NT, with echoes of the Transfiguration in the latter case: Christ himself shone brightly because He is the One Without Sin.

AM *Iac* reminds the Father's great love for everybody, who gives his only begotten Son, although it meant giving him to a most cruel death, for our sake. Ambrose advises focusing one's attention not to the social level but on the moral level, since in the end, like Moses and Elijah, all those who merit heaven shall receive the same prize.

AM *mort* says that the testimony Moses and Elijah give of Jesus' Transfiguration has no comparison, even with the most sublime human science or wisdom.

AM *Is* says that although the Groom praises the soul, he nevertheless tells her to distance her glance from him since, just as after Jesus' Transfiguration, the three Apostles have to bear witness to it, the Groom has to seek other souls. Peter didn't want to go down because Peter knew that in front of the transfigured Jesus, he already had what he desired for.

AM *pae* mentions Elijah who will come to earth once more.

AM *ex* defends –against a Eunomian– the Father-Son equality, since the Father is well pleased with the Son.

In AM *ep*, Ambrose speaks of how good it is in the presence of the glory of the divine substance, as what Peter experienced in Jesus' Transfiguration. Moreover, Ambrose says that, unlike Judas

Iscariot (for whom it was night), for Peter it was like day when he was before the transfigured Jesus.

AM *Ps* explains that, although there seems an appearance of being left out, Elijah (like Elisha and David) weren't abandoned by God. Moreover, it's better to be inside, in God's presence (like Moses), than outside. It's a means of divine prudence Jesus commanding not to divulge, for the time being, the three Apostles' witnessing of His Transfiguration. The special powers of Moses and Elijah were nothing compared to the power of Jesus – God!– seen in His Transfiguration. The tent, which has to be one and only one, mustn't be built on earth, but in heaven.

AM *118 Ps* compares the Emmaus experienc with the slumber of the three Apostles who witnessed the Transfiguration. Christ is the Glory. Like ice, the righteous person has to die to the hotness of sin, and has to remain humid –like a spiritual wine-skin– through divine grace. Jesus transfigured appears with snow-like clothes in order to indicate his impeccability. Thus, the snow signifies death to sin, Jesus' impeccability, and contact with the Word of God. The Cross shouldn't be feared, because it contains the very, very precious loot inherited by those who follow Jesus Christ.

AM *my* compares the white garment of the neophyte to the purification from sin, similar to the clothes of Jesus transfigured, which indicate the absence of sin in Him.

AM *Lc* shows the hearing (and the sight) of the Word through the word, in Jesus' Transfiguration. The Father himself bears witness to the Son, who possesses the very same divine power. He who doesn't believe in the Son won't believe the Father either. Indeed, Peter fell and was raised up, but where he fell, nodoby could be, except for the three Apostles.

AM *ptr* portrays Jesus as Issachar, a mercenary who rests between the testimonies of the Law and of the Prophets.

10. Rufinus Tyrannius

"Est ergo Deus Pater uerus,
tamquam ueritatis Pater,
non extrinsecus creans,
sed eo quod ipse est,
Filium generans"

(sy 4)

Rufinus[1] **Tyrannius**[2] (±345 – 410[3]) writes RUF sy (±404[4]), which contains many probable, original passages from Rufinus, even though, *prima facie*, he could seem to have copied and compiled[5].

A bishop, by the name Lawrence –the seat of whom is

---

1 Born in Concordia, near Aquileia, Rufinus studied in Rome, where he met Jerome, against whom he fought because of the teaching of Origen. Rufinus, instead of refuting Jerome's writings against him, chose to go to Aquileia, and when the Goths attacked that place, Rufinus returned to Rome, and thereafter, to Sicily, where he died (cfr. M. Simonetti, *"Rufino, Spiegazione del Credo"*, in A. Quacquarelli (dir.) "Collana di Testi Patristici" 11, Città Nuova Editrice, Roma, 31993, 24-25).

2 M. Simonetti explains that, "...usualmente egli viene ricordato come Tirannio Rufino; ma il nome *Tyrannius* è riportato soltanto da Girolamo in un paso polemico nei confronti nel nostro autore, sí che non è da escludere una malevola alterazione, da parte sua, di un originario Turanio, Turranio, Torano o qualcosa di simile: infatti tutte queste forme sono bene attestate dalla documentazione epigrafica relativa all'Aquileia del IV-V secolo" (*"Rufino, Spiegazione del Credo",* cit., 24, nota 26).

3 Cfr. M. Simonetti, *"Rufino, Spiegazione del Credo"*, cit, 24-25.

4 Id., cit., 26.

5 Rufinus "occupa un posto non di secondo piano nella grande fioritura delle lettere cristiane in lingua latina che si ebbe fra la fine del IV e i primi decenni del V secolo. La sua fama allora no fu offuscata dalla polemica, perché il cattivo carattere di Girolamo era ben conosciuto. Solo a partire dal Rinascimento la grande ammirazione degli Umanisti per Girolamo ha nuociuto alla valutazione di Rufino. Ma oggi una serie di studi di vari autori ha collocato in luce piú precisa i contorni della polemica origeniana, rilevando sia gli eccessi di Girolamo sia la fondamentale moderazione di Rufino" (M. Simonetti, *"Rufino, Spiegazione del Credo"*, cit., 26).

unknown–, asks that the *RUF sy*[6] be written because he was being considered a bishop gifted with eloquence and clarity when teaching the *central truths of the Catholic faith*[7] (on the Trinity[8] and

[6] Cfr. Id., cit., 27-28. "Per capire le esigenze che motivarono la richiesta, si tenga presenta che, durante l'istruzione dei catecumeni per prepararli al battesimo, proprio dell'ultima e piú intensa fase durante la Quaresima, era costume compendiare l'insegnamento di contenuto piú specificamente dottrinale sotto forma di spiegazione delle varie proposizioni del Simbolo, (…). Tale insegnamento, già complesso agl'inizio del IV secolo, si era di molto amplificato e soprattutto tecnicizzato durante questo secolo, che aveva visto lo svolgimento della grande controversia ariana coll'appendice, anch'essa di primaria importanza, della controversia apollinarista, per la quale la divinità di Cristo faceva risultare incompleta (...) la sua umanità. Perciò, se da una parte era avvertita l'esigenza di ragguagliare i catecumeni su tutta questa problemática, dall'altra era comprensibile che non ogni vescovo e prete fosse in grado di impartire l'insegnamento con sufficiente competenzza e padronanza della materia. Di qui la richiesta di testi che in forma compendiosa esponessero i punti fondamentali intorno ai quali doveva essere articolata la spiegazione del Simbolo" (ibid.). Sin embargo, "[t]utta l'esposizione di Rufino vuole essere non esercizio di originalità ma aderenza fedele all'insegnamento tradizionale della Chiesa" (Id., cit., 32).

[7] M. Simonetti explains that "Rufino torna sulla problematica trinitaria nel c. 33, in cui spiega l'espressione del Simbolo relativa allo Spirito Santo. É un cenno molto sommario, nonostante l'importanza che questo argomento aveva avuto nell'ultima parte della controversia ariana, proprio perché Rufino riteneva di aver esaurientemente trattato questa tematica nella parte iniziale del suo scritto" (*"Rufino, Spiegazione del Credo"*, cit., 29, nota 30).

[8] This intention is seen in the fact that, "adattandosi abilmente al testo del Simbolo, egli en utilizza le prime espressioni, relative al Padre e a Gesú Cristo Figlio unigenito di Dio, per introdurre la problemática fondamentale d'argomento trinitario, un punto sul quale si era allora particolarmente sensibili perché l'annosa controversia ariana era terminata solo da qualche decennio. E la sua trattazione tiene conto ovviamente dei risultati cui quella controversia aveva dato luogo da parte cattolica" (M. Simonetti, *"Rufino, Spiegazione del Credo",* cit., 29).

Christology[9]) to the catechumens –geting support from a Latin version of the Scriptures before Jerome's Vulgata[10]– especially in the face of doctrinal threat[11] of Arrianism and Apollinarism.

RUF sy 4 starts with the parallelism between the proclamation of faith in God the Father according to the Latin (*Credo in Deo Patre omnipotente*[12]) and Oriental (*Credo in uno Deo Patre omnipotente*[13]) formulae of faith. Afterwards, Rufinus enuntiated the faith-formula in God the Son in the West (*et in Iesu Christo, unico Filio eius Domino nostro*[14]) and in the East (*et in uno Domino*

[9] "...la spiegazione della sezione cristologica del Simbolo, imperniata sulla vicenda del Cristo incarnato, permette a Rufino di chiarire il punto intorno al quale si era accentrata la controversia apollinarista, insistendo sull'assunzione, da parte del Figlio di Dio, di una umanità completa di anima e di corpo, e non soltanto di un corpo privo di anima, come aveva sostenuto Apollinare. Ma in questa parte dell'opera il discorso di Rufino si fa meno tecnico nel presentare brevemente il significato della vicenda humana Cristo, dall'incarnazione fino all'ascensione, a cominciare dal significato dei nomi Gesú (=Salvatore) e Cristo (=unto, in quanto re e sacerdote). In questa parte dell'opea, a partire del c.17, Rufino fa uso amplissimo di testimonianze scritturistiche, per dimostrare che già il VT aveva anticipato tutta la vicenda umana del Redentore. Soprattutto là dove adduce passi relativi alla passione egli fa certamente uso di antiche raccolte di testimonia" (Id., cit., 30).

[10] M. Simonetti recalls that "Rufino introduce queste testimonianze scritturistiche veterotestamentarie servendosi della antica traduzione latina (…) in uso prima della traduzione di Girolamo (…). Al tempo della polemica con Girolamo, Rufino aveva avuto parole di biasimo per tale traduzione" (*"Rufino, Spiegazione del Credo"*, cit., 30, nota 31).

[11] M. Simonetti explains that "...la complicazione era diretta conseguenza delle controversie provocate dalle varie eresie che si erano succedute nel II e nel III secolo (gnosticismo, montanismo, marcionismo, monachiahismo, ecc.); esse infatti imponevano una presentazione molto detagliata della regola di fe, tale da escludere senza equivoco le tesi sostenute dagli eretici. E tale esigenza evidentemente non era a vantaggio della demplicità e della brevità" (*"Rufino, Spiegazione del Credo"*, cit., 26, nota 27).

[12] RUF *sy*, 4, CChr.SL 20, 1961, 137.

[13] Ibid.

[14] Ibid.

nostro Iesu Christo unico Filio eius[15]), with scarce elucidation[16]. After speaking about the words Deus[17] (in an apophatic manner[18]) and *Pater*[19], Rufinus concludes with an affirmation of the Son's consubstantiality with the Father: "By this, with the same name with which God is called –"Father"– it's shown that the Son eqully subsists [with the Father]"[20].

Rufinus marks the central theme –the truth of the Father and of the Son, based on their mutual reference– within the caution of treading the realm of mystery[21]:

"Well, how God the Father had begotten the Son, I don't wish you to debate about [it] nor for you to delve by curiosity into the mystery of this depth, lest you –while scrutinizing with pertinancy the fulgence of the inaccessible light– lose that very expertness of seeing that it was conceded to mortals by divine plan"[22].

---

[15] Ibid. Further on, we shall see how the formula of Christological faith in the East makes one see more the reference of the *Filius* to the *Pater*, not because it's denied by the formula in the West, but in the light of Arrian nationalist which breaks away the *Filius*, so to speak, from the *Pater*.

[16] "...unum scilicet Deum et unum Dominum secundum auctoritatem Pauli apostoli profitentes" (RUF *sy*, 4, CChr.SL 20, 1961, 137).

[17] "Deus, secundum quod opinari potest humana mens, naturae ipsius uel substantiae, quae est super omnia, appellatio est" (ibid.).

[18] "Deum cum audis, substantiam intellege sine initio sine fine simplicem sine ulla admixtione inuisibilem incorpoream ineffabilem inaestimabilem, in qua nihil adiunctum nihil creatum sit. Sine auctore est enim ille qui auctor est omnium" (RUF *sy*, 4, CChr.SL 20, 1961, 137-138).

[19] "Pater archani et ineffabilis sacramenti uocabulum est" (Id., cit., 137).

[20] "Hoc ergo ipso nomine quod Deus Pater appellatur, cum Patre pariter subsistere etiam Filius demonstratur" (RUF *sy*, 4, CChr.SL 20, 1961, 138).

[21] Rufinus suggests *reverence and humility* before the mystery: "Aut si putas in hoc omni genere nitendum, prius tibi propone quae nostra sunt; quae si consequenter ualueris expedire, tunc a terrestribus ad caelestia et a uisibilibus ad inuisibilia properato" (ibid.).

[22] "Quomodo sane Deus Pater genuerit Filium, nolo discutias nec te curiosius inseras in profundi huius archanum, ne forte dum inaccessae lucis fulgorem pertinacius perscrutaris, exiguum ipsum, qui mortalibus diuino munere concessus est, perdas adspectum" (ibid.).

After enunciating *key-questions*:

"how are these [faculties] –diverse as they are– one by substance or nature? And how shall they come from the mind, if they never separate from the mind?"[23],

Rufinus begs for humility[24], prudence[25] and faith[26] when thinking about the Father and the Son, because –even while having grasped what the three examples (the human mind[27], the flow of a source from river to river[28], the visible light[29]) say– it is a realm of mystery[30].

[23] "Quomodo haec cum diuersa sint rebus et actibus, unum tamen sunt substantia uel natura? Et cum e mente procedant, numquam tamen ab ipsa separantur?" (ibid.).

[24] "Exerce te prius in horum explanatione et discute, si potes, quae habentur in manibus: et tunc ad horum sublimiora ueniemus" (ibid.).

[25] "Nec putes quod te statim de terra ascendere suadeam super caelos; sed prius te, si placet, ad istud firmamentum quod oculis uidetur, educam" (RUF *sy*, 4, CChr.SL 20, 1961, 138-139).

[26] "Credendus est ergo Deus esse Pater unici Filii sui Domini nostri; non discutiendus [est]" (Id., cit., 139). Rufino añade: "Neque enim fas est seruo de natalibus Domini disputare" (ibid.)].

[27] "Expedi primo si potes et explana quomodo mens, quae intra te est, generet uerbum, et qui sit in ea memoriae spiritus" (RUF *sy*, 4, CCL 20, 1961, 138).

[28] "Fons quomodo ex se generat fluuium? Quo autem spiritu rapidum fertur fluentum? Quid est quod, cum unum et inseparabile sit fluuius et fons, tamen nec fons fluuius nec fluuius fons intellegi aut appellari potest? Et tamen qui uiderit fluuium, uidet et fontem" (ibid.).

[29] "...quomodo ignis iste caelestis generat ex semetipso splendorem lucis; quomodo etiam producit uaporem; et cum sint tria in rebus, unum tamen sunt in substantia" (RUF *sy*, 4, CCL 20, 1961, 139).

[30] "...si haec singula inuestigare potueris, scito adhuc diuinae generationis mysterium tanto esse differentius et eminentius, quanto Creator creaturis potentior, quanto artifex opere suo praestantior, quanto ille qui semper est eo qui ex nihilo coepit esse, nobilior" (RUF *sy*, 4, CCL 20, 1961, 139). It's as if Rufinus were to exclaim: Watch out!, because although you may have been able to reach this level of understanding, it's not because you've "solved" the mystery of the *Genitus as Genitus of the Genitor.*

Rufinus illustrates the Father-Son mystery with the Transfiguration narrative[31], when "...the Father answered from the heavens"[32]. As a counter-example, Rufinus shows the gist of the Arian heresy[33]. For M. Simonetti, the pair Pater–Filius doesn't only underline the Son's co-eternity –which is exactly what the Arians deny[34]– but it makes the Father's paternity and the Son's filiation important, by their mutual reference. Finally, "...therefore, God the Father is true [Father] as the Father of truth, not creating anything extrinsic, but by what he himself is, begetting the Son"[35], precisely

> "insofar as [the Father] is wise, [he begets] Wisdom; insofar as he is just, [he begets] Justice; insofar as [the Father is] eternal, [he begets] the Eternal; insofar as [the

[31] Cfr. Mt 17,5.

[32] "Contestatus est Pater de caelis" (RUF sy, 4, CChr.SL 20, 1961, 139). Moreover, Rufinus quotes the IV Gospel: *"El que me ha visto a mí ha visto al Padre"* (Jn 14,9; SB 5, 663); *"Yo y el Padre somos uno"* (Jn 10,30; SagBi 5, 662); *"Yo salí de Dios y vine al mundo"* (Jn 16,27-28; SagBi 5, 674). For M. Simonetti, "...i passi che qui adduce Rufino erano tutti fondamentali nella dottrina cattolica al fine di affermare la reale divinità del Figlio e la sua unità col Padre, che lo aveva generato" (*"Rufino, Spiegazione del Credo",* cit., 45, nota 17).

[33] "Quis est qui inter has Patris et Filii uoces medius se discussor interserat, et deitatem diuidat, affectum separet, substantiam rumpat, spiritum secet, neget esse uerum quod ueritas dicit?" (RUF *sy*, 4, CChr.SL 20, 1961, 139). M. Simonetti thinks that "...l'ammonimento a non scrutate troppo a fondo la natura divina era ormai tradizionale, di fronte agli eccessi di razionalismo cui si erano spinti gli Ariani" (*"Rufino, Spiegazione del Credo"*, cit., 43, nota 15).

[34] "Nell'espressione *Dio Padre onnipotente* in origine Padre non stava a significare la relazione col Figlio, bensí il rapporto col mondo: Dio è Padre di tutto ció che crea. Successivamente le controversie trinitarie avevano fatto spostare il significato nel senso qui riportato da Rufino. La reciprocità dei nomi padre/figlio era stata proposta fin dal III secolo e poi valorizzata durante la controversia ariana per dimostrare la coeternità del Figlio insieme col Padre: infatti ammettere che in principio Dio fosse stato senza Figlio, como affermavano gli Ariani, significava ammettere che allora egli non era stato Padre, coll'assurdo risultato di postulare un mutamento in Dio, per definizione immutabile" (M. Simonetti, *"Rufino, Spiegazione del Credo",* cit., 42-43, nota 14).

[35] "Est ergo Deus Pater uerus, tamquam ueritatis Pater, non extrinsecus creans, sed eo quod ipse est, Filium generans" (RUF *sy*, 4, CChr.SL 20, 1961, 139).

Father is] immortal, [he begets] the Immortal; insofar as [the Father is] invisible, [he begets] the Invisible; through light, [he begets] Splendor; through the mind, the Word"[36].

Principal affirmations

RUF sy points to the mystery of the *Genitor and Genitus*, and in particular, their mutual reference, the Son's cosubstantiality with the Father, the example of which is the message heard during Jesus' Transfiguration.

[36] "...qua sapiens sapientiam, qua iustus iustitiam, qua sempiternus sempiternum, qua immortalis immortalem, qua inuisibilis inuisibilem, qua lux splendorem, qua mens uerbum" (ibid.). M. Simonetti observes that "...sapienza, giustizia, parola, splendore sono tutti appellativi scritturistici tradizionalmente riferiti a Cristo: essi qui sottolineano la sua generazione proprio dall'intimo della sostanza di Dio" (*"Rufino, Spiegazione del Credo"*, cit., 45, nota 19).

11. Eusebius Hieronymus

Jerome's exegesis is indirectly influenced, on the one hand, by the "Hellenistic grammarians who come to him across the works of his Greek forebears"[1]; on the other hand, Jerome is influenced by the school of Donatus, from which he quotes many interpreters but without quoting them *nominatim*, leaving this task to the wisdom of the *prudens lector*[2]. Jerome's position in the history of Latin Patristic exegesis is original[3].

HI ep

In HI *ep 46*, Jerome thus mentions one of the places in the Holy Land which he'd visit together with Marcella: "...let's go [mount] Thabor[4] and to the tents of the Savior[5], not like Peter

---

1 P. Jay, "Jerome", in C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1102.

2 Cfr. Id., cit., 1103.

3 Since according to Jay, the accent of Jerome's exegetical labor on the Prophets was so much that he's "the first and even the only one of the Latins to have commented on all of them, and this privileged accent placed on prophecy does not seem to be unrelated to his preference for the figurative exegesis and the Christocentric character of his exegesis" [P. Jay, "Jerome", in C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1113].

4 "Forma „Itabyrium" apud Latinos extra textus biblicos rarissima fuisse videtur. ...Hodie hic mons Gebel-et-Tôr appellatur. ... Hunc montem describit Hieronymus in com. in. Os. Prophet. 5,1s. his verbis: est autem Thabor mons in Galilaea, situs in campestribus, rotundus atque sublimis et ex omni parte finitur aequaliter" (PL XXV [1865] 898) (...) [F. Stummer, *Ad Marcellam epistula*, 13]", in Id., "Monumenta historiam et geographiam Terrae Sanctae illustrantia, series prima", in B. Geyer – J. Zellinger (eds.), "Florilegium Patristicum tam veteris quam medii aevi auctores complectens" Fasciculus XLI, Bonnae Sumptibus Petri Hanstein, MCMXXXV, 19, nota 6.

5 "...tempore Hieronymi iam oratorium (vel oratoria) in monte Thabor fuisse colligi potest ex vocabulo "tabernacula Salvatoris", quo hic autores nostrae utuntur. Hieronymum enim vocem "tabernaculum", quod occurrit (...) ex his, quae dicit ad ps. 14, 1 (quis habitabit in tabernaculo tuo): 'tabernaculum non est firma domus, tabernaculum non habet fundamentum, sed huc illucque mutatur et cum transmigrante migrat … tabernaculum mihi videtur istius mundi ecclesia. (…) nunc ecclesias, quas videtis, tabernacula sunt: non enim hic permanemus habitantes, sed alio migraturi sumus (...)" (F. Stummer, *Ad Marcellam epistula*, 13, cit., 19-20, nota 6).

wished it in the past, (to be) with Moses and Elijah[6]"[7].

In HI ep 65, Jerome offers two readings of 1 Co 15,51[8]: the eschatological reading[9] and the present-day reading[10], "when we leave behind the old man and we clothe ourselves with the new[11], which is renewed in knowledge according to the Creator's image[12], and contemplating the Lord's glory in the same image[13], we're transformed like from glory to glory[14]"[15].

In HI *ep 108*, Jerome mentions that "...he went up mount Thabor, upon which the Lord transfigured himself[16]"[17].

HI Ps

Stemming from the expression "in octave" from Ps 6,1[18], Jerome thinks that the number has something to do with the

6 Cfr. Mt 17,4.

7 "Pergemus ad Itabyrium et ad tabernacula Saluatoris, non, ut Petrus quondam uoluit, (eum) cum Moysi et Helia" (HI *ep* 46, 13, CSEL 54/1, 1996, 344).

8 *"...todos dormiremos, pero no todos seremos cambiados"* (SagBi 5, 1030), which in the Neovulgate, however, is thus expressed: *"...non omnes quidem dormiemus, sed omnes immutabimur"* (ibid.).

9 "...referuntur ad finem" (HI *ep* 65, 4, CSEL 54/1, 1996, 620).

10 Where it discreetly alludes to the Transfiguration.

11 Cfr. Ef 4,22-24; Col 3,9-10.

12 Cfr. Gn 1,26-27.

13 Cfr. Mt 17,2-3.

14 Cfr. 2 Co 3,18.

15 "...quando exuimur ueteri homine et induimur nouo, qui renouatur in cognitionem secundum imaginem Creatoris, et gloriam Domini contemplantes in eandem imaginem transformamur quasi a gloria in gloriam" (HI *ep* 65, 4, CSEL 54/1, 1996, 620). The glory of the *Carissimus* is contemplated, referring to Is 5,1: "Voy a cantar a mi amado la canción de mi amigo a su viña" (SagBi 4,73); cfr. Mt 17,5.

16 Cfr. Mt 17,1-9.

17 "Scandebat montem Thabor, in quo transfiguratus est Dominus" (HI *ep* 108, 13, CSEL 55, 1996, 323).

18 *"En fin, en octava"* (SagBi 3, 198). This passage, in the Neovulgate, reads: *Super octavam* (ibid.).

salvific plan[19], since –for example– a Gospel-writer says that after day *eight*[20], Jesus transfigured[21].

HI Is

Here[22], Jerome personifies the *duae aut tres oliuae*[23]: "...the two olives [are] Paul and Barnabas. And the three olives [are] Peter and James and John, who also contemplated the Lord transfigured on the mountain"[24].

HI Za

Jerome shares[25] two readings of *duae oliuae*[26]: either as Moses and Elijah, "...since all the Law and the Prophets preach about

[19] "'...pro octaua' inscriptionem habent, resurrectionis et paenitentiae ac per hoc salutis nostrae mysterium continentes" (HI *Ps*, VI, 1, CChr.SL 72, 1959, 186).

[20] Cfr. Lc 9,28.

[21] "Et post dies octo, siue sex (utrumque enim in diuersis Euangelistis legitur) Dominus transformatur in monte" (HI *Ps*, VI, 1, CChr.SL 72, 1959, 187).

[22] "Of his eighteen books which had occupied him for more than two years, the Commentary on Isaiah, finished in 410, is at once the fullest and the finest of all Jerome's exegetical works" [P. Jay, "Jerome", in C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1098].

[23] Is 17,4-6: *"Aquel día se debilitará la gloria de Jacob, enflaquecerá la obesidad de su carne, será como la paja cuando el segador ha recogido la mies y su brazo ha segado las espigas, como el que rebusca espigas en el valle de Refaím; sólo quedará el desecho, como después de varear el olivo: dos o tres aceitunas en la cima de la copa, cuatro o cinco en las ramas del frutal –oráculo del Señor, Dios de Israel"* (SagBi 4, 119).

24 "Duas oliuas Paulum et Barnabam et tres oliuas Petrum et Iacobum et Ioannem, qui et in monte transfiguratum Dominum conspexerunt" (HI *Is*, VII, xvii, 4/6, CChr.SL 73, 1963, 269).

[25] "...access to works which without him would remain closed to them at a time when the linguistic cut-off of the Empire went in tandem with its definitive political division, he played a role in connecting link between East and West" [P. Jay, "Jerome", in C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1114].

[26] "También dos olivos junto a él, uno a la derecha del cuenco y otro a su izquierda" (Za 4,3; SagBi 4, 1256).

Christ's Passion"[27], or as the Law and the Gospel, "as the Gospel is at the right side, and the Law at the left"[28].

HI Phlm

Jerome distinguishes between 'beloved' (*dilectus*) and 'to the lovable' (*diligibili*)[29], and hereby justifies such a distinction: "one can also call 'beloved' he who doesn't deserve love, but in fact, the 'lovable' [is] only the one loved by merit"[30]. He gives an example on the Christian's dealing with the enemy[31]. Then, Jerome interprets in a Christological key the title from Psalm 45(44)[32]. Jerome contrasts the Jewish reading[33] from the Christian reading:

> "¿...who else can declare himself 'God's beloved', but that of whom the Father speaks in the Gospel: T*his is my beloved Son, with whom I am well pleased; listen to him* (Mt 17,5)?"[34].

---

[27] "Omnis enim Lex et Prophetae de Christi praedicant passione" (HI *Za*, IV, 3, CChr.SL 76A, 1970, 780).

[28] "...ut in dextra Euangelium sit, in sinistra Lex" (ibid.). Es más, Jerónimo cita Ct 2,6: *"Su izquierda sostiene mi cabeza, su derecha me abrazará"* (SagBi 3, 780, except the last word, which in SagBi is *abraza*). In the Neovulgate, instead of *sinistra*, it reads: *laeva* (SagBi 3, 780).

[29] "Non habet in Graeco ηαπημενω, quod 'dilectus' dicitur, sed ηαπημενω, id est, 'diligibili'" (HI *Phlm*, 1, CChr.SL 77C, 2003, 87). "*A Filemón [nuestro] querido"* (cfr. Flm 1; SagBi 5, 1314).

[30] "...dilectus appellari potest et ille qui dilectionem non meretur, diligibilis uero is tantum qui merito diligitur" (HI *Phlm*, 1, CChr.SL 77C, 2003, 87).

[31] "Denique et inimicos nostros diligere praecipimur, qui sunt dilecti, sed non diligibiles. Amamus quippe illos, non quia amari merentur, sed quia praecipitur eos odio non habendos" (ibid.).

[32] "Illud quoque quod in quadragesimi quarti Psalmi titulo praenotatur: *Pro dilecto*, melius habet in Graeco: 'Pro diligibili'; qui locus manifestissime de Christo intellegitur" (HI *Phlm*, 1, CChr.SL 77C, 2003, 87).

[33] "Licet enim Iudaei IDIDIA, hoc est 'amatum Dei', Salomonem dici putent, quod ei a Deo sit ob sapientiam nomen impositum" (ibid.).

[34] "'...amatus Dei' quis magis dici potest, nisi is de quo in Euangelio Pater loquitur: *Hic est Filius meus dilectus, in quo mihi complacui, hunc audite?"* (HI *Phlm*, 1, CChr.SL 77C, 2003, 87).

HI Ps h

Jerome interprets the King, the virtues and the Beloved[35]: "The King [is] the Father; of the virtues, that is, of the saints; of the beloved, of the Son. 'Behold my Son, the Beloved, listen to him[36]"[37].

Jerome interprets the voice of the thunder[38] as a great voice, and "it is said [to be a] 'great voice', because great is the preaching"[39]. Jerome gives the example of the Transfiguration,

> "when God said, *This is my beloved Son, with whom I am well pleased*[40], there was a voice similar to the thunder of the whirlwind"[41].

Jerome relates the cloud mentioned by the Psalmist[42] with light: "I think that this cloud is that, of which it's said in the Gospel: 'And a cloud of light, it says, overshadowed them', at that time when the Lord transformed himself, and the Apostles fell, and a cloud

---

35 *"El Rey de las virtudes al amado"*, according to Jerome. This verse, in the Neovulgate, reads: *Reges exercituum fugiunt, fugiunt* (Los reyes de los ejércitos huyen y huyen) [Sal 68(67),13; SagBi 4, 369].

36 Cfr. Mt 17,5.

37 "Rex, Pater; uirtutum, hoc est sanctorum; dilecti, Filii. 'Ecce Filius meus, ipsum audite'" [HI *Ps 67,13 h 7* (cfr. KVS4, 529), CChr.SL 78, 1958, 42].

38 *"Rugió en el torbellino el fragor de tus truenos"* [Sal 77(76),19; SagBi 3, 400].

39 "...grandis uox dicitur, quia grandis est praedicatio" [*HI Ps 76,19 h 6* (cfr. KVS4, 529), CChr.SL 78, 1958, 61].

40 Although in the text, they are words pronounced during Jesus' Baptism (Mt 3,17) and during his Transfiguration (Mt 17,5), however, by the relationship there is between the voice and the thunder, it seems that Jerome associates these words with the thunder (Jn 12,29) where *la multitud que estaba presente y la oyó decía que había sido un trueno* (SagBi 5, 651).

41 "...eo tempore, quando Deus loquutus est 'Hic est Filius meus dilectus, in hoc mihi conplacui', facta est uox tonitrui rotae similis" [*HI Ps 76,19 h 10* (cfr. KVS4, 529), CCL 78, 1958, 60-61].

42 *"Nubes y tinieblas lo rodean"* [Sal 97(96),2; SagBi 3, 459].

of light overshadowed them"[43]. Then, Jerome speaks of darkness, clarifying that "...the Lord is in the light and in the darkness. [The Lord] is in the light for those who begin; well, 'for those who begin' he spoke more simply; to those who, in fact, are perfect, he speaks to them mystically"[44].

HI Gal

Jerome confirms that God shows no partiality[45], and after insinuating that Jesus seemed to favor the three Apostles when he chose them to witness his Transfiguration[46], he clarifies that "it doesn't matter to me, since I don't speak against those who were following the Lord at that time"[47], and that he only wanted to insist that God doesn't show partiality[48].

Jerome comments on the role of Peter and James[49] in the Church: "*Columns*, therefore, of the Church are the Apostles and especially Peter, James and John, two of whom deserve to climb the mountain with the Lord"[50].

---

[43] "Ego puto nubem istam esse, de qua dicitur in Euangelio: 'Et operuit, inquit, eos nubs lucida': eo tempore quando transformatus est Dominus, et Apostoli ceciderunt, et operuit eos nubs lucida" (HI *Ps 96,2 h 73* (cfr. KVS4, 529), CCL 78, 1958, 158).

[44] "Dominus aut in lumine est, aut in caligine est. In lumine incipientibus est: incipientibus enim simplicius loquitur; qui uero perfecti sunt, illis mystice loquitur" (Id., cit., 159).

[45] "*En cuanto a los que se consideraba que eran autoridad –nada me importa lo que hayan sido en otro tiempo: Dios no hace acepción de personas"* (Ga 2,6; SagBi 5, 1096).

[46] "Petrum et Iohannem Dominus secum Apostolos habuerit et transfiguratum eum in monte uiderint et super ipsos Ecclesiae sit positum fundamentum" (HI *Gal* I, 2, 6a, CChr.SL 77A, 2006, 46).

[47] "...mihi tamen nihil refert, quia non aduersum eos loquor qui eo tempore Dominum sequebantur" (ibid.).

[48] Cfr. Ga 6,2.

[49] "Santiago, Cefas y Juan –que eran considerados como columnas–" (Ga 2,9; SagBi 5, 1096).

[50] "*Columnae* igitur sunt Ecclesiae Apostoli et maxime Petrus, Iacobus et Iohannes, e quibus duo cum Domino ascendere merentur in montem" (HI *Gal* I, 2, 9, CChr.SL 77A, 2006, 50).

Principal affirmations

Mount Thabor, mentioned in two HI ep, is considered the mountain where Jesus transfigured. In another Letter, Jerome establishes an analogy between Jesus' Transfiguration and the transformation of the human body on the last day.

In the HI *Ps*, we see that the number eight is used in the Transfiguration narrative.

In HI *Is*, Peter, James and John are like the three olives.

In HI *Za*, Moses and Elijah, and also the Law and the Gospel, are like two olive trees.

HI *Phlm* insists on the convenience of calling the Son the Father's "Beloved".

HI *Ps h* mentions the Father and the Son, with whom the Father is well pleased. The voice in the Transfiguration is described as a great voice. We see that the cloud referred to by the Psalmist refers to the bright cloud of the Transfiguration.

HI *Gal* considers the choice of the three Apostles (columns of the Church) by Jesus before his Transfiguration not as a show of partiality.

12. Aurelius Augustinus

AU cf

According to Pamela Bright, Book XI of AU cf deals with what she calls "tension or distraction (*distentio animi*), this near fracturing of self"[1], a them that continues an earlier theme of the human condition's innate indigence –an indigence that invites one to reach to the Messiah– in order to reflect, in Book XI, on the "I" in time, "'distended' between past, present, and future"[2]. In AU cf XI, there's a change in focus, from a *distentio* to an *extensio* towards Christ, Mediator[3].

Augustine, in asking for the meaning of the message of God the Father[4]– speaks of the prudent soul (mens prudens) who discerns between the uerba temporaliter *sonantia*[5] and the *Verbum aeternum*[6]. After situating the dynamics of the listening to the uerba–Verbum[7], Augustine deals with the topic of the procedence of the *uerba* in question, and asks himself from where they may come from[8].

---

1 P. Bright, *"Augustine: The Hermeneutics of Conversion"*, in C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1224.

2 Ibid

3 Cfr. ibid.

4 Cfr. Mt 17,5.

5 AU *cf*, XI, vi, 8, CChr.SL 27, 1981, 198. Augustine describes the *phenomenon* of the production of this kind of words: "Illa enim uox acta atque transacta est, coepta et finita. Sonuerunt syllabae atque transierunt, secunda post primam, tertia post secundam atque inde ex ordine, donec ultima post ceteras silentiumque post ultimam" (ibid.).

6 Ibid.

7 "...claret atque eminet, quod creaturae motus expressit eam seruiens aeternae uoluntati tuae ipse temporalis. Et haec ad tempus facta uerba tua nuntiauit auris exterior menti prudenti, cuius auris interior posita est ad aeternum uerbum tuum" (ibid.).

8 Here, I don't deal with this topic, which – though interesting – could be a topic of another study.

AU Ps

The AU Ps9 (392–415[10]) started, for Corticelli, being written and preached[11]. There's a distinction between the *enarrationes dictatae*[12] and the *Enarrationes praedicatae*[13]. There's no consensus

[9] Angelo Corticelli recalls: "Quale nome abbia egli [S. Agostino] imposto a questa sua opera, una delle maggiori, non sappiamo. (...) Il nome *Enarrationes* appare per la prima volta nella edizione di Erasmo [*S. Aurelii Augustini Hipp. Episc. opus, continens Enarrationes in Psalmos*, Basilea 1529]" [A. Corticelli, *Introduzione*, in R. Benedettine di S. Maria di Rosano–Minuti (tr.), *Sant'Agostino, Esposizioni sui Salmi I*, cit., vi]. However, Corticelli specifies: "Erasmo stesso non ci dà alcuna ragione del suo modo di chiamare l'opera (cit., vi, nota 1)". Más adelante el mismo Corticelli afirma que las En. in Ps. son "l'opera piú voluminosa di Agostino" (cit., xii).

[10] "Alle *Enarrationes* non si può attribuire un tempo ben delimitato: esse infatti furono l'opera di quasi tutta la vita di Agostino. Di certo abbiamo questi estremi limiti: le *Enarrationes* sui Salmi 1–32 all'inizio del 392; quelle catalogate nella seconda classe delle *Enarrationes* dettate, fra il 415–416; i sermoni sul salmo 118 dopo il 415. Per tutte le altre predicate il tempo è tra il 392 e il 415" [A. Corticelli, *Introduzione*, in R. Benedettine di S. Maria di Rosano–Minuti (tr.), *Sant'Agostino, Esposizioni sui Salmi I*, cit., ix].

[11] "Un po' scrivendo un po' predicando, S. Agostino si trovò tra le mani il commento a tutto il Salterio" [Id., cit., vi].

[12] The *Enarrationes dictatae* are –for Corticelli– the *Enarrationes* about Sal 1–31, the Enarrationes about other Sal mentioned by Augustine in his letter to Evodius, and those Possidius enumerates (although Corticelli expresses a certain reservation as far as Possidius' classification), and the 32 *Enarrationes* on Sal 118 [A. Corticelli, *Introduzione*, in R. *Benedettine di S. Maria di Rosano–Minuti* (tr.), *Sant'Agostino, Esposizioni sui Salmi I*, cit., viii, also footnotes 8 and 9].

[13] These shall be the rest of the *Enarrationes* not included among the Enarrationes dictatae. The *Enarrationes praedicatae* are popular, improvised sermons, hence "l'impressione di una costruzione senza legame, disordinata, composta di passaggi ex abrupto. Questo perché l'oratore nei suoi sermoni abbandona i procedimenti abituali della retorica per utilizzare mezzi piú semplici e popolari" [Id., cit., xi]. The audience of the *Enarrationes praedicatae* are "di una sensibilità e di una emotività estrema, che deve manifestare la propria impressionabilità in gesti (...). Gli ascoltatori rispondono, acclamano, sussurrano, disapprovano. Ci sono anche quelli che piangono o si battono il petto con grandi colpi (cfr. In Ps. 36, s. 2,11; 85,24; 136,10; 80,8; 127,9; 72,31)" [cfr. A. Corticelli, *Introduzione*, in R. Benedettine di S. Maria di Rosano–Minuti (tr.), *Sant'Agostino, Esposizioni sui Salmi I*, cit., x]. Moreover, "...la cultura era ancor piú disuguale: analfabeti e colti stavano gomito a gomito" (cfr. In Ps. 121,8)" (cfr. ibid.).

as to what type of *Psalmody* text Augustine might have used[14]. Behind the themes[15] in the AU Ps there is the Augustinian idea of the Christocentric history[16].

In AU Ps 50 (411-413[17], Carthage), Augustine describes the hyssop[18] as a plant which grows humbly[19] and can cure pulmonary ailments[20]. From this similitude to humility and purity of the hyssop, Augustine interprets Jesus' Transfiguration in an ecclesiological-eschatological key[21]:

[14] Here, I shall not deal with this aspect. Cfr. A. Corticelli, *Introduzione*, en R. Benedettine di S. Maria di Rosano–Minuti (tr.), *Sant'Agostino, Esposizioni sui Salmi I*, cit., ix-x.

[15] These themes reveal Augustine's vast culture: natural sciences, theology (grace, predestination, Mariology, eschatology, moral life and ascesis), and philosophy (nature, substance, anthropology). Here, I shall not delve into the themes just mentioned. Cfr. A. Corticelli in Introduzione, in R. Benedettine di S. Maria di Rosano–Minuti (tr.), *Sant'Agostino, Esposizioni sui Salmi I,* cit., xii–xiii.

[16] Cfr. Id., cit., xiii. The themes are: the dispersion because of sin, God's action and manifestation in history, the *sacramentum magnum*, Christ-Head and Church-Body, the heavenly Church, the Holy Spirit and his action in the Mystical Body, the members of the Body of Christ. For the development of these themes, which I shall not tackle in this work: cfr. A. Corticelli, *Introduzione*, in R. Benedettine di S. Maria di Rosano–Minuti (tr.), *Sant'Agostino, Esposizioni sui Salmi I,* cit., xv–xxxix.

[17] Cfr. S. Zarb, S., *Chronologia Enarrationum S. Augustini in Psalmos,* Malta, 1948, 253-256, in A. Corticelli, *Introduzione*, in R. Benedettine di S. Maria di Rosano–Minuti (tr.), S*ant'Agostino, Esposizioni sui Salmi I*, cit., xliv.

[18] *"Rocíame y quedaré limpio; lávame, y quedaré más blanco que la nieve"* [Sal 51(50),9; SagBi 3, 326].

[19] "Hyssopum herbam nouimus humilem, sed medicinalem; saxo haerere radicibus dicitur. Inde in mysterio mundandi cordis similitudo assumpta est. Adprehende et tu radicem dilectionis petram tuam: esto humilis in humili Deo tuo, ut sis excelsus in glorificato Deo tuo" (AU *Ps* L, 12, CChr.SL 38, 1956, 608).

[20] "Aliquid etiam dicam quod a medicis solemus audire, uel experiri in aegrotis. Hyssopum dicunt purgantis pulmonibus aptum esse. In pulmone solet notari superbia: illic enim inflatio, illic anhelitus" (ibid.).

[21] *"Aunque vuestros pecados fuesen como la grana, los haré blancos como la nieve"* [(Is 1,18; cfr. SagBi 4, 63, *aunque...grana*).

> "his garments on the mountain, which shone as white snow[22], meant the Church clean from all stain of sin"[23].

In the AU Ps 110 (Eastertime, 414, Hippo[24]/ maybe 400 or 408[25]), Augustine, after commenting on the word *Alleluia*, speaks of the forty days in terms of penance[26], like the fasting of Jesus, of Moses and of Elijah, the three always united, also in the Transfiguration: "because [the Gospel] has the testimony of the Law and of the Prophets; hence, too, on the mountain, the Savior shone amidst one and another person (cfr. Mt 17,2-3)"[27]. Then, Augustine affirms –already looking back from the fifty days of Easter joy[28]– that "in this Psalm is personified someone exulting with a happy exultation; [this Psalm] also prefigures the people

[22] Cfr. Mt 17,2-3.

[23] "...uestis eius in monte, quae tamquam nix dealbata effulsit, significavit Ecclesiam omni macula peccati mundatam (AU *Ps* L, 12, CChr.SL 38, 1956, 608).

[24] Cfr. S. Zarb, *Chronologia Enarrationum S. Augustini in Psalmos,* Malta, 1948, 253-256, in A. Corticelli, *Introduzione*, in R. Benedettine di S. Maria di Rosano–Minuti (tr.), *Sant'Agostino, Esposizioni sui Salmi I*, cit., xliv.

[25] Cfr. A. La Bonnardière, *Note de chronologie augustinienne. Notice sur le psaume 25*, in "Recherches de Science religieuse" 45 (1957), 91-93: quoted in A. Corticelli, *Introduzione*, in R. Benedettine di S. Maria di Rosano–Minuti (tr.), *Sant'Agostino, Esposizioni sui Salmi I*, cit., xlv.

[26] "...quamdiu perfectio decalogi legis, tamquam psalterium decem chordarum, per quattuor eiusdem mundi partes, id est, toto orbe praedicatur, ut decem quater ducta quadragenarium numerum signent" (AU *Ps* CX, 1, CChr.SL 40, 1956, 1621).

[27] "...quod [Euangelium] testimonium habet a Lege et Prophetis; unde etiam in monte inter utramque personam medius Saluator effulsit" (ibid.).

[28] "Sicut enim dies isti praeteritis diebus Quadragesimae, quibus ante resurrectionem Dominici corporis uitae huius significatur maeror, sollemniter grata hilaritate succedunt, sic dies ille qui post resurrectionem dabitur plenario corpori Domini, hoc est sanctae Ecclesiae, cunctis uitae huius aerumnis atque doloribus exclusis, perpetua beatitate succedet" (ibid.).

wholeheartedly effusive for the love of God, that is, the body of Christ, freed from all evil[29]"[30].

In AU Ps 147 (December 412, Carthage[31]), after comparing the nix[32] with the *praedestinati filii Dei*[33], Augustine considers the wool as the anticipation of the giving of the garment[34]. Then, Augustine establishes an *iter (filiorum praestinatorum Dei) nix-lana-uestis*[35],

[29] Mariucci comments that "...la beata illa aeternitas, cioè l'ille dies, trova espressione in un altro simbolo numerico (*quinquagenarius numerus*) per cui si puó dire: il 40 della Quaresima corrisponde al 50 della Pasqua; prima il *tempo della vita terrena* (dovere della ontinenza e dell'osservanza del Decalogo) e poi l'*eternità dell'altra vita* (beatitudine come mercede per il lavoro compiuto)" [T. Mariucci (tr.), *Sant'Agostino, Esposizioni sui Salmi III/2 [Salmi 101-110],* 997].

[30] "Ecce personat in hoc salmo quemdam exsultantem felici exsultatione, praefigurat et scaturientem corde in amore Dei populum, scilicet corpus Christi, ab omni malo liberatum" (AU Ps CX, 1, CChr.SL 40, 1956, 1621). Moreover, as far as the eschatological paschal joy is concerned, "hoc erit otiosorum negotium, hoc opus uacantium, haec actio quietorum, haec cura saecurorum" (ibid.). On this description, Mariucci comments that "...la serie di questi quattro sostantivi [negotio, opus, actio, cura], seguiti dai genitivi di significato contrario, serve a precisare la caratteristica del dies ille che s'identifica con l'eternità beata (...): l'uomo sarà nel riposo e nella pace e non avrà altra occupazione che quella di lodare eternamente Dio" [T. Mariucci (tr.), *Sant'Agostino, Esposizioni sui Salmi III/2 (Salmi 101-110),* cit., 995].

[31] Cfr. S. Zarb, *Chronologia Enarrationum S. Augustini in Psalmos,* Malta, 1948, 253-256: cfr. A. Corticelli, *Introduzione*, en R. Benedettine di S. Maria di Rosano–Minuti (tr.), *Sant'Agostino, Esposizioni sui Salmi I*, cit., xlvi.

[32] *"...la nieve como lana"* [Sal 147,16 (147,5); SagBi 5, 598].

[33] "Qui ergo praedestinauit nos, dedit terrae niuem, ipsos nos. Iam enim ueniamus ad illos psalmi uersus subobscuros; incipiant illa inuolucra euolui; quoniam uos uerbum Dei, quanto magis per nos dicitur, tanto auidiores inuenit. Ecce nos pigri in hac terra quasi congelauimus hic. Et quomodo contingit niuibus; sursum enim gelant, et in ima decidunt: sic frigescente caritate decidit humana natura in has terras, et pigro corpore inuoluta uelut nix facta est. Sed in ista niue sunt praedestinati filii Dei" (AU *Ps* CXLVII, 23, CChr.SL 40, 1956, 2159).

[34] "Id est, de niue quam dedit, de istis pigris adhuc spiritu et frigidis quos praedestinauit, facturus est aliquid. Lana enim materies uestis est: lana cum uidetur, ueluti praeparatio est aliqua ad uestem. Ergo quia praedestinauit hos qui ad tempus frigidi repunt in terra, et nondum feruent spiritu caritatis (de praedestinatione enim adhuc loquitur), ueluti lanam dedit hos Deus; facturus est inde uestem" (ibid.).

[35] Cfr. Sal 147,16 [147,5].

relating it with Jesus' Transfiguration:

> "Reasonably, on the mountain, Christ's garment shone like the snow[36]. Christ's garment was shining like the snow, as from that wool a wollen tunic had already been made, that is, [like a tunic] of snow like wool, the predestined had been lazy (holgazanes) up to now; but wait, look at what follows; because as they were given wool, hence the tunic's made"[37].

Moreover,

> "...since it's said that the Church [is] Christ's Body, it's also said that Christ's garment [is] the Church herself"[38],

read in the light of three coordinates: 1) the unity and the continuity of God's salvific plan (from the words of the Psalmist, to the Transfiguration, and up to eschatology), 2) the call to all mankind to participate in God's salvific plan by means of the Church, and 3) the *mysterium paschale*[39].

---

[36] Cfr. Mt 17,2.

[37] "Merito in monte uestis Christi fulsit, sicut nix. Fulgebat uestis Christi, sicut nix, tamquam de illa lana iam facta erat tunica; de qua lana, id est de niue quam dedit sicut lanam, adhuc praedestinati, pigri erant; sed exspecta, uide quid sequatur; quia sicut lanam dedit eos, fit inde tunica" (AU *Ps* CXLVII, 23, CChr.SL 40, 1956, 2159).

[38] "Quomodo enim dicitur Ecclesia corpus Christi, dicitur et uestimentum Christi ipsa Ecclesia" (ibid.). This affirmation is corroborated by Ef 5,27: *"[P]ara mostrar ante sí mismo a la Iglesia resplandeciente, sin mancha, arruga"* (SagBi 5, 1144).

[39] "Ergo exhibeat sibi gloriosam Ecclesiam, non habentem maculam aut rugam; faciat sibi uestem de illa lana quam praedestinauit in niue. Adhuc in hominibus incredulis, et frigidis, et pigris, faciat uestem de hac lana. Vt abluatur a maculis, mundetur fide; ut rugam non habeat, tendatur in cruce" (AU *Ps* CXLVII, 23, CChr.SL 40, 1956, 2159).

AU do

Augustine speaks of the meaning of the number forty (10 x 4)[40], in order to illustrate the spiritual meaning behind the forty–day fasting[41], after mentioning that "Moses[42] and Elijah[43] and the Lord himself[44] fasted for forty days"[45]. Jesus, the Lord, who "has the testimony of the Law and of the Prophets, shone in their midst on the mountain, before the three disciples who see[46] and are filled with awe[47]"[48].

Augustine gives en example of the synecdoche[49]: the discrepancy between the number of days (six, eight) before the Transfiguration-event:

> *"eight days after*[50], it means the last part of the day when Christ foretold what would happen, and first part of the day when [Christ] showed [his prophecy] completed – taken as two whole and complete days; but, he who has said: *after six days*[51], has computed all as complete and

[40] "In hoc ergo denario dum temporaliter nobis insinuatur, id est quater ducitur caste et continenter a temporum delectatione uiuere, hoc est quadraginta diebus ieiunare" (AU *do*, II, xvi, 25, CChr.SL 32, 1962, 51).
[41] As Augustine shall say, "quaedam (...) in sanctis libris secreta ponuntur, quae propter numerorum imperitiam legentibus clausa sunt (ibid.).
[42] Cfr. Ex 24,18.
[43] Cfr. 1 R 19,8.
[44] Cfr. Mt 4,2.
[45] "...et Moyses et Helias et ipse Dominus quadraginta diebus ieiunauerunt" (AU *do*, II, xvi, 25, CChr.SL 32, 1962, 50).
[46] Cfr. Mt 17,1-3.
[47] Cfr. Mt 17,6.
[48] "...tamquam testimonium habens ex lege et prophetis medius inter illos in monte tribus discipulis uidentibus atque stupentibus claruit" (AU *do*, II, xvi, 25, CChr.SL 32, 1962, 51).
[49] "...aut a parte totum aut a toto partem facit intellegi" (Id., cit., 110).
[50] Lc 9,28: *"ocho días después"* (SagBi 5, 448).
[51] Mt 17,1: *"seis días después"* (SagBi 5, 161); Mc 9,2 (SagBi 5, 303).

> whole [days], but only [has counted the days] in between [the first and last days]"[52].

A second example is the computation of the three days of the *mysterium paschale*, from the viewpoint of Jesus' Resurrection[53].

There's an interesting detail, at least for me, which can be observed from Augustine's computation. Although his intention has been precisely to dissipate all suspicion of incongruence among the Synoptic narratives on the Transfiguration because of the six and eight days, when commenting that what would be the eighth day must've been

> "the first part of the day when [Christ] mostró showed [his prophecy] fulfilled"[54],

Augustine implicitly agreed –at least, he didn't show reservation– in situating the Transfiguration in the morning[55].

AU tr brev

Here, Augustine speaks of the unity of the Person of the Son of God and of the Son of Man "either in glory or in humility"[56].

---

[52] *"[P]ost dies octo,* intellegatur partem nouissimam diei, ex quo id Christus praedixit futurum, et partem primam diei, quo id ostendit impletum, pro totis diebus duobus atque integris posuisse, eum uero qui dixit: post dies sex, integros omnes et totos, sed solos medios computasse" (*AU do*, III, xxxv, 50, CChr.SL 32, 1962, 110-111).

[53] "Pars enim nouissima diei, quo passus est, nisi pro toto die accipiatur, id est, adiuncta etiam nocte praeterita, et nox, in cuius parte ultima resurrexit, nisi totus dies accipiatur adiuncto scilicet die inlucescente dominico, non possunt esse *tres dies et tres noctes*, quibus se in *corde terrae* praedixit futurum" (Id., cit., 111).

[54] "...partem primam diei, quo id ostendit impletum" (Id., cit., 110).

[55] However, Augustine doesn't specify his opinion, of whether that first part of the day is the time of Jesus' mountain climb with the Apostles, or Jesus' Transfiguration itself on top of the mountain.

[56] "De *unitate personae* filii dei et filii *hominis* siue *in gloria* siue in humilitate" (AU *ci tri*, I, xiii, CChr.SL 50, 1968, 4; cf Mt 16,28).

AU tr

Augustine mentions that God is the Lord of glory, but that,

> "however, the Lord of glory was crucified because it is rightly said that God [was] cricified, not by virtue of the divinity, but by the weakness of the flesh [assumed by the Word]; just as we say that by being God, he judges, that is, by divine [and] not by human power, and however, man himself would be judged, just as the Lord of glory was crucified"[57].

Moreover, Augustine says that

> "there we know that it [can] only be accepted that it is from the Father where it said: *This is my beloved Son*[58], pues ni puede creerse ni entenderse que Jesús también sea Hijo del Espíritu Santo o también su propio hijo"[59].

AU ep

In AU *ep* 55, Augustine applies Rm 3,21[60] to Jesus' Transfiguration, when "in between them [Moses and Elijah], [Jesus] appeared on the mountain[61], that it might be clearer what

[57] "[Nam ecce diximus quia secundum id quod deus est glorificar suos, secundum hoc utique quod dominus gloriae est; et] tamen dominus gloriae crucifixus est, quia recte dicitur et deus crucifixus, non ex virtute divinitatis sed ex infirmitate carnis; sicut dicimus quia secundum id quod deus est iudicat, hoc est ex potestate divina non ex humana, et tamen ipse homo iudicaturus est sicut dominus gloriae crucifixus est" (AU *tri*, I, xiii, 28, CChr.SL 50, 1968, 69; cf Mc 16,28; Mc 9,8; Lc 9,26, etc.).

[58] Mt 17,5.

[59] "Ibi enim cogimus nonnisi patris accipere ubi dictum est: Hic est filius meus dilectus; neque enim Iesus etiam spiritus sancti filius aut etiam suus filius credi aut intellegi potest" (AU *tri*, II, x, 18, CC 50, 1968, 104).

[60] "[...la justicia de Dios,] atestiguada por la Ley y los Profetas" (SagBi 5, 908). Augustine writes: *Testimonium habens a Lege et Prophetis* (AU ep LV, 28, CChr. SL 31, 2004, 256), but in the Neovulgate, Rm 3,21, instead of *testimonium*, reads: *testificata* (SagBi 5, 908).

[61] Cfr. Mt 17,2-3.

the Apostle says of him"[62]. Thus,

> "the Gospel shows that [the Lord] doesn't set himself apart from the Law and from the Prophets"[63].

AU Jo

In AU Jo 17 (19 July 413, Saturday[64]/up to 10 August 415[65]/ after 418[66]), a very pastorally-oriented work[67], Augustine speaks of the number '40'[68], since "...fasting is consecrated by this number"[69]. Then he gives three examples: "Moses also fasted for forty days[70], and Elijah, another forty[71], and He himself, our Lord

---

[62] "...inter quos in monte gloriosus apparuit, ut euidentius emineret quod de illo dicit Apostolus" (AU *ep* LV, 28, CChr.SL 31, 2004, 256).

[63] "...demonstrans Euangelium non dissentire a Lege et Prophetis" (ibid.). Here, Augustine also speakes of the fasting of Moses and of Elijah, and Jesus' fasting, aside from the main theme – the meaning of the Lenten season, through the number 40, up to the meaning of the fifty days of Easter. It's an interesting numerological exegesis, but I'm not going to tackle this here. Perhaps it can be a theme of some future work.

[64] S. Zarb, *Chronologia tractatuum S. Augustini in evang. primamque epist. Io. apostoli,* in *Angelicum* 10 (1933), 50–110; in A. Vita, A. - Gandolfo, E. (tr.) - Tarulli, V. (ed.), *Sant'Agostino, Commento al Vangelio di San Giovanni,* in Trapè, OSA, Agostino (dir.), "Nuova Biblioteca Agostiniana (Opere di Sant'Agostino, Parte III, Volume XXIV)", Città Nuova Editrice, Roma, 1968, lxv.

[65] M. Le Landais, *Deux années de prédication de saint Augustin*. Introduction à la lecture de l'In Ioannem, Études Augustiniennes, Paris, 1953: in A. Vita – E. Gandolfo (tr.) - V. Tarulli (ed.), *Sant'Agostino, Commento al Vangelio di San Giovanni,* cit., lxv.

[66] A. La Bonnardière, *Recherches de chronologie augustinienne,* Études Augustiniennes, Paris, 1965 (cfr. ibid).

[67] A. Vita, *Introduzione*, in A. Vita – E. Gandolfo (tr.) - V. Tarulli (ed.), *Sant'Agostino, Commento al Vangelio di San Giovanni,* in Trapè, osa (dir.), "Nuova Biblioteca Agostiniana (Opere di Sant'Agostino, Parte III, Volume XXIV)", Città Nuova Editrice, Roma, 1968, xi.

[68] "Quadragenarius numerus sacratus nobis in quadam perfectione commendatur" (Aurelius Augustinus, *Tr. in Ioh.*, XVII, 4, CCL 36, 1954, 171).

[69] "Ieiunium hoc numero consecratum est" (ibid.).

[70] Cfr. Ex 24,18.

[71] Cfr. 1 R 19,8.

and Savior Jesus Christ, perfected this method of fasting[72]"[73]. These three characters are important. "The Law is signified by Moses, the Prophets are signified by Elijah, the Gospel is signified by the Lord"[74]. The Transfiguration, for its part, confirms such designation and importance:

> "the three appeared on the mountain, where [Jesus] manifested himself to the disciples in the glory of his face and garment. Well, he appeared in the middle, between Moses and Elijah, as the Gospel is borne witness to by the Law and [by] the Prophets"[75].

In AU Jo 99 (a homily dictated after 418[76]/preached up to the summer of 416[77]/preached from 422[78]), Augustine deals with one

---

[72] Cfr. Mt 4,2.

[73] "...et Moyses quadraginta diebus ieiunauit, et Elias totidem, et ipse Dominus noster et saluator Iesus Christus hunc ieiunii medium impleuit" (AU *Jo*, XVII, 4, CChr.SL 36, 1954, 171). Later on, Augustine describes the *perfectum ieiunium*: "Ieiunium autem magnum et generale est, abstinere ab iniquitatibus et illicitis uoluptatibus saeculi quod est perfectum ieiunium" (ibid.). [Augustine also speaks of the fasting of Moses, of Elijah, and of Jesus in: AU *do*, II, xvi, 25.] The sense of the fasting is projected by Augustine to eschatology, by establishing a double parallelism *Lent–Easter* and *fasting (40 days)–recompense plus ten (40+10):* "cum fuerit de spe facta res, accepturi sumus mercedem denarium. Ipsa enim merces redditur operariis in uinea laborantibus secundum Euangelium, quod uos credo reminisci; neque enim omnia commemoranda sunt, tamquam rudibus et imperitis. Denarius ergo qui accepit nomen a numero decem, redditur, et coniunctus quadragenario fit quinquagenarius; unde cum labore celebramus quadragesimam ante pascha" (AU *Jo*, XVII, 4, CChr.SL 36, 1954, 171-172).

[74] "Per Moyses significatur Lex, per Eliam significantur Prophetae, per Dominum significatur Euangelium" (Id., cit., 171).

[75] "...in illo monte tres apparuerunt, ubi se discipulis ostendit in claritate uultus et uestis suae. Apparuit enim medius inter Moysen et Eliam, tamquam Euangelium testimonium haberet a Lege et Prophetis" (AU AU *Jo*, XVII, 4, CChr.SL 36, 1954, 171).

[76] S. Zarb, *Chronologia tractatuum S. Augustini in evang. primamque epist. Io. apostoli,* in A. Vita – E. Gandolfo (tr.) –V. Tarulli (ed.), *Sant'Agostino, Commento al Vangelio di San Giovanni,* cit., lxv.

[77] M. Le Landais, *Deux années de prédication de saint Augustin*, en A. Vita, *Introduzione*, (cfr. ibid.)

[78] A. La Bonnardière, *Recherches de chronologie augustinienne* (cfr. ibid.).

question he himself admits as tough, very tough[79]: how God makes use of a temporal reality when, "making use of the creature, [without ever being] dominated by its very nature, that, remaining the same thing as it is, [God] moves what he wants, and [remaining] unchanging, he changes what he wants"[80]. Say, in the Transfiguration,

> "that voice from the cloud made itself perceiveable, indeed, in order to reach the bodily ears and, to be listened to by the bodily sense called 'hearing'"[81].

But, "it shouldn't be in any way be believed that the Word of God, who is the Only-Begotten Son –because it says 'Word'– is limited by syllables and sounds"[82].

The inequality in the pair verba–Verbum is as infinite as in this other pair, *homo–Deus*, "because not even all [the sounds] can sound at the same time when one word is enunciated, but rather as if, by order, [the sounds] were being born and dying. Each sound comes after [another], so that all that we speak is completed with the last syllable. It shall not be so when the Father speaks to the Son, that is, God to his Word God"[83].

Augustine notes that this question can be posed by a soul mature in the faith:

---

[79] "Ardua quaestio, nimis ardua" (AU *Jo*, XCIX, 2, CChr.SL 36, 1954, 583).

[80] "De creatura seruiente, non de ipsa dominante natura, quae in se manens quod uult monet, et quod uult immutabilis mutat" (ibid.).

[81] "...uox illa de nube aures utique adtigit corporales, eumque sensum corporis qui uocatur auditus" (AU *Jo*, XCIX, 2, CChr.SL 36, 1954, 583).

[82] "...nec tamen ullo modo credendum est Verbum Dei, quod est unigenitus Filius, quoniam uerbum dicitur, syllabis sonisque finiri" (ibid.).

[83] "...quia nec omnes simul sonare possunt cum sermo fit, sed tamquam nascentes morientibus ordine suo soni quicumque succedunt, ut totum quod loquimur nouissima syllaba compleatur. Absit ut sic loquatur Pater ad Filium, hoc est, Deus ad Verbum suum Deum" (ibid.). Here, aside from the inequality described above, one sees how the loving dialogue between Father and Son doesn't end, unlike human words. This can point to the Holy Spirit, the *Amor Patris et Filii* (cfr. ibid.).

> "...but it is proper for this to be grasped grasped by all those for whom milk is not fit anymore, but solid food[84]"[85].

AU q Ev

The AU *q Ev*[86] (around 400[87]) belongs to the group of *quaestiones*[88] –in Christian terms[89]– a literary style dear to Augustine[90]. Origen may have influenced him much[91]. In the West, Ambrose shall influence Augustine[92] in this work[93].

The *writing style* of the *AU q Ev*[94] is the colloquial and familiar tone of the *sermo humilis*[95], since the *AU q Ev* are addressed not to an audience of the faithful, but to a disciple of Augustine[96].

Augustine gives an example of synecdoche: "when the Lord showed himself on the mountain, it happened after six days, says an Evangelist, but the second [Evangelist] says after eight days: the last part of the first day, in which the Lord promised this, counting

---

[84] Cfr. Hb 5,14.

[85] "Sed hoc eorum est capere, quantum ab homine capi potest, ad quos non lac pertinet, sed solidus cibus" (AU *Jo*, 1954, 583).

[86] In the *Quaestiones* in general, and in those of the Gospels in particular, Augustine deals with the importance of each fragment of the Scripture; and of the OT–NT unity; the "interpretare i passi oscuti della Bibbia (...) alla *luce* dei passi chiari" [B. Fenati, *Introduzione*, in V. Tarulli (tr.), *Sant'Agostino, Questioni sui Vangeli*, in R. Piccolomini, osa (dir.), "Nuova Biblioteca Agostiniana (Opere di Sant'Agostino, Parte I, Volume X/2)", Città Nuova Editrice, Roma, 1997, 295]; the Church as a community of believers; and Jesus Christ (cfr. Id., cit., 293–296). The AU *q Ev* are divided into the questions about Mt 11,27–26,75, and the questions about Lc 1,8–24,28 (Id., cit., 290).

[87] B. Fenati, *Introduzione*, in V. Tarulli (tr.), *Sant'Agostino, Questioni sui Vangeli,* cit., 289.

[88] Not exactly like the Scholastic *questio*.

[89] As L. Perrone says, this literary genre "nasce infatti molti secoli prima nella letteratura profana classica greca con gli ζετηματακαιλυσεις (ricerche e soluzioni) (L. Perrone, *Domande e risposte. La letteratura delle "Quaestiones" nel cristianesimo antico*, Pisa, Anno accademico 1989)" [cfr. B. Fenati, *Introduzione*, in V. Tarulli (tr.), *Sant'Agostino, Questioni sui Vangeli,* cit., 289].

all the days [as] entire [days], so that you may understand that he who has said 'after six days' has only remembered the days between the first and the last [days], [that is, the days] which have passed totally and wholly"[97].

Augustine offers an easchatological and soteriologial reading of Elijah's arrival[98]: "those whom the persecution of the Antichrist

[90] Augustine like this "perché la frammentarietà che lo caratterizza gli offriva la possibilità di una composizione protratta nel tempo. (...) Le Quaestiones sono risposte o a dubbi e problemi che l'autore si è posto durante lo studio e la meditazione di un testo biblico, o a domande che gli sono state poste da suoi interlocutori e discepoli riguardo le sacre Scritture" [B. Fenati, Introduzione, in V. Tarulli (tr.), *Sant'Agostino, Questioni sui Vangeli,* cit., 289].

[91] Especially when commenting on the Gospel according to Mt [cfr. B. Fenati, *Introduzione*, in V. Tarulli (tr.), *Sant'Agostino, Questioni sui Vangeli*, cit., 291–292].

[92] It's because "Ambrogio non solo fu maestro di Agostino nello studio dei testi sacri, ma, principalmente, fu il suo padre spirituale. Giunto a Milano come professore di Ambrogio, si staccò definitivamente dal manicheismo e superò il dubbio scettico. Il contatto con l'esegesi allegorica di Ambrogio gli permise di intuire la ricchezza del testo sacro celata sotto forma anche modesta. (...) [s]i comprende come questi [Ambrogio] non è solo una fonte a cui Agostino ricorre, ma un vero modello della sua esegesi" [Id., cit., 292].

[93] So much so that "le *Quaestiones Evangeliorum* sono l'opera di Agostino che piú di tutte le altre subisce l'influsso di Ambrogio; non solo in alcune questioni ed in particolari interpretazioni, ma in generale l'autorità ambrosiana determina un larghissimo uso dell'esegesi allegorica e delle ricerche mistico-dogmatiche sui testi evangelici, di cui sono meno frecuenti le spiegazioni letterali" [B. Fenati, *Introduzione*, in V. Tarulli (tr.), *Sant'Agostino, Questioni sui Vangeli*, cit., 293].

[94] "...una testimonianza preziosa del linguaggio familiare e quotidiano con cui Agostino se esprimeva naturalmente nei rapporti con i suoi confratelli, con gli amici e i familiari" [Id., cit., 296].

[95] Cfr. Id., cit., 298.

[96] "...ad un discepolo: le *Quaestiones Evangeliorum* nascono dunque da un dialogo avvenuto in una certa intimità tra un discepolo [histórico] e il suo padre spirituale, in presenza forse di qualche altro fedele e, senza dubbio, dei *notarii*" [Id., cit., 297].

[97] "...quod se Dominus ostendit in monte, post sex dies factum dicit unus Euangelista, alter uero post octo dies dicit, partem posteriorem primi diei, in quo futurum hoc Dominus promisit, pro totis atque integris diebus adnumerans, ut intellegas eum qui dixit post sex dies solos medios commemorasse, qui uere toti atque integri completi sunt" (AU *q Ev,* I, vii, CChr.SL 44B, 1980, 11).

[98] Cfr. Mt 17,11.

bothers, or like he himself –dying– shall settle what [man] is in debt of"[99].

AU s 43

After highlighting that Peter remembers the message of the voice[100] in 2 P 1,18[101], Augustine interprets2 P 1,19[102] in the light of the truth of the *verba Prophetarum* and the *vox Patris*: "Rightly, he said 'more' [confirmed], 'more', not 'better', nor 'truer'. Since that word from heaven [is] as true, as good, as useful as the prophetic word. Therefore, what is [the word] 'more' [confirmed], if the hearer isn't confirmed more in that [which he hears]?"[103]. So that the *infideles* may not disfigure the original sense of the *uox Patris*, Augustine roots this word of the Father in the *uerba Prophetarum*, of the Prophets who have spoken before the Incarnation of Christ[104]. Augustine refers to the Word's pre-existence in order to terminate once and for all any attempt of the unfaithful at denying the divinity of Jesus, whom they reduce to a magician. Therefore, "Christ [was] not yet man when he sent the Prophets[105]", although "someone says that He [Jesus] was a magician; well, if by the magical arts he made them worship him and [then] he died, was he perhaps a magician

[99] "...uel eos quos persecutio antichristi conturbauerit, uel ut ipse restituat moriendo quae debet (AU *q Ev,* I, xxi, CChr.SL 44B, 1980, 19).

[100] Cfr. Mt 17,5.

[101] *"Esta voz venida del cielo la oímos nosotros estando con él en el monte santo"* (SagBi 5, 1447). Peter bears living witness to what the three of them witnessed on the mountain where the Lord transfigured himself, thus affirming that the Transfiguration guarantees the παρουσια (cfr. 2 P 1,16-18).

[102] *"Y tenemos así más confirmada la palabra de los profetas"* (cfr. SagBi 5, 1447).

[103] "Certiorem sane dixit, certiorem, non meliorem, non ueriorem. Tam enim uerus ille sermo de caelo, quam sermo propheticus, tam bonus, tam utilis. Quid est ergo, certiorem, nisi in quo magis confirmetur auditor?" (AU *s 43,* 5, CChr.SL 41, 1961, 510).

[104] "Sed prophetae antea fuerunt, non dico ante istam uocem, sed ante Christi carnem" (ibid.).

[105] "Nondum erat homo Christus, quando misit Prophetas" (AU *s 43*, 5, CChr. SL 41, 1961, 510).

before being born?"[106]. In the final analysis, 2 P 1,19 confirms the *sermo propheticus–vox de caelo*[107] link.

Principal affirmations

The AU *cf* invite one to discern between words (which sound and go) and the eternal Word.

In the AU *Ps*, it's seen that the hyssop teaches humility and purity. The garments of Jesus transfigured are the figure of the Church purified from all sin. On another occasion, Augustine speaks of the forty days before Easter in the key of penance and fasting, like what Jesus, Moses and Elijah did: hence, the three were together also in Jesus' Transfiguration.

On another occasion, Augustine compares the snow with the God's predestined children, in order to speak of the snow–wool–garment trio: the garment of Jesus transfigured is the Church, insofar as she is the continuity of God's salvific plan, insofar as all are called to participate in this divine salvific plan, and as a paschal mysteryl.

In AU *do*, the number forty is interpreted as penance that may bring about the vision of Jesus' glory. As an example of synecdoche, Augustine places as en example the discrepancy of days in the narratives on Jesus' Transfiguration.

In a AU *ep*, Jesus is considered God's justice witnessed by the Law and the Prophets, in the Transfiguration.

[106] "Quisquis eum dicit magum fuisse, si ergo magicis artibus fecit ut coleretur et mortuus, numquid magus erat antequam natus?" (ibid.).

[107] "Vox de caelo, qua fideles admoneantur; propheticus sermo, quo infideles conuincantur" (ibid.).

In AU *Jo*, it is seen that the number forty alludes to the fasting of Moses, of Elijah and of Jesus, the three together in Jesus' Transfiguration, since the Gospel is witnessed by the Law and the Prophets.

On another occasion, Augustine deals with one question he himself finds tough: that of the voice heard in the Transfiguration. It's [tough] because the inequality between [human] words and the Word is like the [discrepancy] there is between man and God.

In the AU *q Ev*, the disciple is taught an example of the synecdoche: the discrepancy of days in the narratives of Jesus' Transfiguration. Augustine links the Father's voice in the Transfiguration to the voice of the Prophets.

13. Chromatius

CHRO s 8

Here, in the Lord's Ascension, Chromatius *Christologically* interprets the pair *[frater] rubeus–[frater] candidus*[1], the pair that points to Christ's Divinity (Christ risen, glorious) and the Humanity (=human Blood)[2]. Thus, in Jesus' Transfiguration,

> "his clothing became snow-like, because they were shining with the glory of his clarity"[3].

CHRO s 22

Here, Chromatius points to the *mysterium* in the Transfiguration:

---

1 *"Mi hermano es blanco y rojo"* (Ct 5,10; SagBi 5, 794), "quia qui abiectus et humilis uisus est in passione, clarus et gloriosus apparuit in resurrectione" (CHRO *s 8, 2*, CChr.SL 9A, 1974, 34).

2 The Christological reading of Ct 5,10 is complemented by the Soteriological reading (Transfiguration–Passion) of Jr 18,14: *"Desaparecen de las altas rocas la nieve del Líbano"* (cfr. SagBi 4, 407). Chromatius justifies the citation of Ct 5,10, "ut in mamilla petrae incarnationem eius ex uirgine demonstraret, in niue uero Libani candorem diuinae claritatis eius ostenderet" (CHRO *s 8, 2,* CChr.SL 9A, 1974, 34).

3 "...uestimenta eius sicut nix facta sunt, quia claritatis eius gloria resplendebant" (CHRO s. 8, 2, CChr.SL 9A, 1974, 34). After seeing Jesus' human nature, prefigured in the *rubor uestimentorum* of Is 63,1: "¿Quién es ese que viene de Edom, desde Bosrá vestido de rojo? ¿Ese con ropaje tan distinguido que avanza con fuerza imponente?" (SagBi 4, 285), Chromatius sees a *uestimentorum* (cfr. Is 63,1)–*uestimenta* (cfr. Mt 17,2) parallelism because "Princeps enim martyrum est Christus (...); quia corona martyrum, uelut uestimentis rubentibus circumdatur" (CHRO s 8, 2, CChr.SL 9A, 1974, 34). The very snowlike clothing of Jesus transfigured shall be that which shall be stained by his Blood.

"how the Son of God shows himself to be God of heaven and of the earth and of what's under the earth"[4] through the witnesses of the transfigured Jesus[5].

Principal affirmations

CHRO s *8* interprets in the light of Christ the red (Incarnation) and white (Transfiguration) brother[6]. The clothes of the transfigured Jesus shall be colored by his Blood in the Passion.

CHRO s 22 sees in the witness of Jesus' Transfiguration an indication that they bear witness to the Son, the Lord of the cosmos.

---

4 "...quomodo Filius Dei Deus caeli et terrae et infernorum ostenditur" (CHRO *s 22, 2*, CChr.SL 9A, 1974, 101).

5 "De caelo Pater Filio testimonium perhibuit; de terra tres Apostoli eliguntur; Moyses ab inferis testis uocatur, quia Moyses mortem gustauit. Et ne ullus locus a testimonio Christi uacaret, etiam Helias, qui necdum mortem gustauit, de paradiso testis ductus est, ut Deus caeli et terrae et paradisi et inferorum undique et de omni loco testes haberet" (ibid.).

6 Cfr. Ct 5,10; cfr. Jr 18,14.

14. Faustinus

In FAUn Ar, **Faustinus** (a Roman Luciferian priest[1], perhaps from the 4th c.[2]) speaks of the Son's divinity:

> "since it's enough for me if only the Father, for the meantime, shows the faith of Christ's divinity saying: *This is my beloved Son, with whom I am well pleased* (Mt 3,17)"[3].

Such is the force of the *testimonium Patris*, which Faustinus poses as a challenge to a heretic: "What do you think of the Father? Is he not by chance truthful to you, when he bears witness that Christ is his Son?"[4]. If the heretic answers that the Father isn't truthful, then Faustinus makes him realize that if he thinks the Father tells a lie, then he's not greater than the Son, which contradicts the heretical statement[5].

Aside from the *testimonium Patris* in Jesus' Baptism, Faustinus –presenting the second *testimonium Patris* in Jesus' Transfiguration[6]– speaks of Moses' and Elijah's *adoptive filiation*: "you can't deny that

---

1 Cfr. KVS4, 469.

2 Cfr. H. Leclercq, "Lucifer of Cagliari", The Catholic Encyclopedia, vol. 9, New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1910, online version (http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/09410b.htm), visited 9 May 2009.

3 "...sufficit enim mihi si fidem in Christo diuinitatis solus interim Pater ostendat dicens: *Hic est Filius meus dilectus, in quo bene conplacui"* (FAUn *Ar, 18*, CChr.SL 69, 1967, 313).

4 "Quid censes de Patre? Estne ueridicus apud te, cum Christum Filium suum esse testatur?" (ibid.).

5 "Et quomodo Patrem maiorem Deum uindicas, cuius uocem quasi minimi depretias?" (ibid.). Faustinus makes one realize –like the other side of the coin– that if the Father were to be considered less truthful than the Son, then the Son would be more truthful than the Father, which would contradict the Arrian thesis that the Son is inferior to the Father.

6 Cfr. Mt 17,5.

they're made sons of God by adoption"[7]. The Father has indeed said *exactly* what he has said in Mt 17,5 –thus making explicit a *separatio* between Jesus' filiation and that of Moses and Elijah–,

> "for if Christ were also a son by adoption, when he was between the two adoptive children, [the voice] would've at least said: This, too, is my Son, lest they think that Christ is the only son"[8].

Faustinus makes three clarifications on Mt 17,5:

1ª. When saying that Jesus is his beloved Son, "[the Father] separated the adoptive sons, so that the propriety of the true sonship only in Christ, the Son, may be believed"[9];

2ª. Here's the connecting affirmation. "But it doesn't suffice that [the Father] recognize in public that Christ alone is his Son; for he added what truly was due to the Son, [by] saying: *Listen to him*[10]"[11];

3ª. "[The Father] showed in the Son great, in other words, and equal authority as to himself, when indeed, the Son must be listened to, as the Father, too, must be listened to: Listen to him[12], he says"[13].

---

[7] "...de adoptione factos esse filios Dei negare non potes" (FAUn *Ar*, 18, CChr. SL 69, 1967, 314).

[8] "Si enim et Christus de adoptione Filius est, cum staret inter duos filios adoptiuos, dixisset utique: Et hic Filius meus est, ne Christus solus filius esse crederetur" (ibid.).

[9] "...adoptionis filios separauit, ut proprietas uerae natiuitatis in Christo solo Filio crederetur" (ibid.).

[10] Mt 17,5 (SagBi 5, 161).

[11] "Sed non sufficit ut Christum tantummodo suum Filium esse profiteretur; addidit enim quod uero Filio debebatur, dicens: *Ipsum audite*" (FAUn *Ar*, 18, CChr.SL 69, 1967, 314).

[12] Mt 17,5 (SagBi 5, 161).

[13] "Magnam, immo et parem sibi auctoritatem ostendit in Filio, cum ita audiendus est Filius, ut audiendus et Pater est: *Ipsum* –inquit– *audite*" (FAUn *Ar*, 18, CChr.SL 69, 1967, 314).

After corroborating Jesus' awareness of being the Son of God –and thus, of having God as Father– with Jesus' words[14], Faustinus offers an even more descriptive explanation:

> "[Jesus of Nazareth] wouldn't ever dare to say: *My Father*, nor: *Of my Father*; nor: *Do you believe in the Son of God?*, if he had no confidence from [his] nature, which revindicates the word of the truth in the Father, regarding the awareness of his own sonship (*engendramiento*)"[15].

Faustinus sees that the if the Son weren't God, it would turn out that the Christological hymn wouldn't only be out of context but would become absurd[16].

Principal affirmations

FAUn *Ar* gives much importance to the Father's witnessing of the Son's divinity. When referring to the Son's natural divine filiation, Moses' and Elijah's adoptive filiation is implied. But, it doesn't suffice to recognize who the Son is; one must listen to him, since the authority of the Son (who has the connatural confidence with the Father) is the very authority of the Father. If the Son weren't God, the hymn to Christ[17] would lose its meaning.

---

[14] *"Toda planta que no plantó mi Padre celestial será arrancada"* (Mt 15,13; SagBi 5, 152); "...no hagáis de la casa de mi Padre un mercado" (Jn 2,16; SagBi 5, 581-582); *"¿Crees tú también en el Hijo?"* (Jn 9,35; SagBi 5, 633).

[15] "Numquam praesumeret dicere: *Pater meus*, et: *Patris mei,* et: *Tu credis in Filio Dei?*, nisi esset confidentia naturae, quae uindicat uocabulum ueritatis in Patre, de conscientia propriae natiuitatis" (FAUn Ar, 18, CChr.SL 69, 1967, 314). The term *confidentia naturae [diuinae]* applied to Jesus of Nazareth –Son of God– seems to have a Christological weight, as a term correlative to the term *conscientia propriae natiuitatis [a Patre]*. Moreover, uindicare can point to the mutual corroboration of the Son's natural divine filiation with regards to the Father, and of the Father's natural divine paternity with regards to the Son – without falling into tautology – precisely because *uindicare* places the mutual witnessing in the realm of the *truth* and of the *authority*.

[16] *"...se humilló a sí mismo haciéndose obediente hasta la muerte, y muerte de cruz"* (Flp 2,8; SagBi 5, 1163).

[17] Cfr. Flp 2,8.

15. Ambrosiaster

The so-called Ambrosiaster[1], (2nd half of the 4th c. A.D.[2]), anonymously wrote a commentary on the Pauline letters (except for Hb), and the AMst q[3]. Jerome knew some of these q, but he didn't want to mention "Ambrosiaster"[4]. His *exegetical method* ignores Alexandria's allegorical method[5].

Commentarius in epistolas paulinas

The Ambrosiaster's *Commentarius* (June/363– December/384)[6]

---

[1] He's "the first exegete to render εφ' ω in Rom 5:12 with *in quo*, meaning Adam and humanity, by which the way was opened for Augustine's doctrine of original sin. He created the phrase ius *ecclesiasticum* (*quaest*. 93,2f.; 102,24 and 31; *Ad. Tim.* 4:12), when stressing clerical orders. Ambrosiaster is the only patristic author admitting remarriage under certain conditions (Stuiber, Crouzel)" [C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1081]. He might've been a "juridically trained Roman, possible of Spanish extraction, converted from paganism, and apparently a member of the local clergy under Pope Damasus (366-384) (…)" (ibid.). In this work, neither do I go into details nor do I enter into the debate on who might've been the so-called Ambrosiaster.

[2] C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1081.

[3] Cfr. ibid.

[4] "...did not want to mention him (H.J. Vogels, xvi)", cfr. ibid.

[5] C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1082. After presenting the reason and the context of the writing of the commentary, the author follows the *ordo narrationis*, commenting each verse briefly, in order to present what Paul said. And so, "he acts more like a historian of Pauline thought than as a theologian concerned by the church's thought of his own day" (ibid.). Thus, "with Ambrosiaster, the task of interpreting scripture shifts from the pastoral level to the level of individual scholarship, the private commposition [sic] of the commentary seeming to replace homiletic delivery" (ibid.). The Ambrosiaster quotes the Scripture, but doesn't depend on it, as what an Ambrose would do. He's more interested in the *substance* of Paul's message, rather than on the *style* of transmitting it. Here lies the originality of the Ambrosiaster's interpretation. Although the Ambrosiaster ignores the Alexandrian allegorical method, or perhaps, because he might've been "allergic to it" [C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1083], he "expresses a strong sense for the spiritual and figurative meaning of what scripture describes in bodily terms" (ibid.).

[6] C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1081.

is theologically situated in the "desire for salvation"[7] and the "Paulinism"[8] of the 4th century.

AMst Rm

AMst *Rm* (363-384[9]) analyzes the debate between Paul and the *judaizantes*[10]. He who breaks (*praevaricator*) the Law[11] rejects the

[7] "...sul finire del sec. IV l'interrogativo sulla salvezza si poneva non solo in forma indifferenziara – 'essere cristiano' = 'essere romano' – ma acquisiva una sua maggiore specificità e urgenza: come e chi si salva? Quali le opere da compiere? Quali i modelli da seguire? A questa serie di interrogativi si era data una duplica serie di risposte: all'esterno della Grande Chiesa con le varie sette ereticali; all'interno della Grande Chiesa su tre ordini diversi reciprocamente influenti: *ordine teologico* (concili–sinodi–simboli); *ordine ideologico* (diritto ecclesiastico–storiografia); *ordine spirituale* (monachesimo). E tuttavia la risposta rimaneva in qualche modo carente" (L. Fatica, *"Ambrosiaster, Commento alla Lettera ai Galati"*)", in A. Quacquarelli (dir.) "Collana di Testi Patristici" 61, Città Nuova Editrice, Roma, 1986, 13.

[8] "...quel fenomeno costituito dall'interesse 'improvviso' acquisito dall'Occidente e dall'Oriente cristiani per il *Corpus Paulinum* nella sua interezza" (L. Fatica, "*Ambrosiaster, Commento alla Lettera ai Galati",* cit., 16). Since "Paolo è l'apostolo che, pur avendo fatto l'esperienza non del Gesú storico ma del Cristo glorificat, propone se stesse como imitatore di Cristo, anzi imitatore da imitare" (Id., cit., 17), he becomes "un esempio vicino alla sensibilità del credente e, parimenti, sviluppare un discorso teologico diversificato e completo che non si impantanava nella polemica contro questa o quella eresia. Proporre Paolo equivaleva ad offrire, in un certo senso, un universo esemplare teologicamente e antropologicamente 'completo'" (ibid.).

[9] Although there are no textual clues which let us know Rm's date of composition, it seems that it was written during a period of peace (cfr. A. Pollastri, *"Ambrosiaster, Commento alla Lettera ai Romani"*, cit., 8), and when quoting 1 Tm 3,14-15, the Ambrosiaster would've written it "durante el pontificado del Papa Dámaso (366-384), quien intentó combatir el arrianismo de Occidente" (Id., cit., 8), "entre 363 (muerte del emperador Juliano) y 384 (muerte del Papa Dámaso)" (Id., cit., 9). The AMst *Rm* could've been written in Rome (cfr. ibid.), the environment of which –in the Ambrosiaster's time– is scarcely known (Id., cit., 11). However, "...non molto prima dell'Ambrosiaster, Caio Mario Vittorino si è dedicato all'esegesi di Paolo" (Id., cit., 14).

[10] Augustine, in 405, had admitted in AU ep 82,24, that the author of the commentary to the letter to the Romans was Ambrose, and it'd be Erasmus who would declare, in 1527, the authorship not of Ambrose, but of whom he called the Ambrosiaster [cfr. C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1082].

[11] *"Tú, que te glorías en la Ley, deshonras a Dios al quebrantar la Ley"* (Rm 2,23; SagBi 5, 904).

sensum Legis, "which is that of Christ's Incarnation (and divinity)"[12]. He who dishonors God is he who doesn't accept

> "the witnessing he bore about his Son. He himself has said: *This is my Son, the Beloved*"[13].

Its tone is very Roman[14].

AMst Gal

AMst *Gal*[15]*'s exegetical style* is "particularly elliptical, in synthesis: barely does the Ambrosiaster concede to a harmonious treatment of discourse"[16]. The Ambrosiaster's consideration on the Law and Christ revolves around Paul[17], such that the author makes his own the life of the Apostle of the Gentiles[18].

---

[12] "...qui de incarnatione (et diuinitate) Christi est, praeteris" (AMst *Rm*, II, 23, CSEL 81/1, 1966, 86).

[13] "...dum testimonium eius, quod dedit de Filio suo, non recipis" (ibid.).

[14] AMst *Rm* is "Roman and practical in tone. Common-sense explanations are the rule. The tone is that of the calm dispassionate searcher for truth than of the mystic visionary who seeks to soar to the heights of the Apostle's thought. We have here none of the spiritual insights of an Augustine...but the work of a conscientious writer who seeks in scripture for plain useful lessons which may serve elevate the daily lives of his Roman fellow citizens... The commentary seems to be for the most part, if not entirely, original" [C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1082-1083].

[15] For Fatica, it's "come un'analisi attenta e puntigliosa dell'epistola considerata oggi generalmente come l'abbozzo, la 'prova generale' della successiva grande Lettera ai Romani" (cfr. S. Cipriani, *"Le lettere di S. Paolo"*, Assisi, 1974, 374-351: cfr. L. Fatica, *"Commento alla Lettera ai Galati"*, cit., 18). Fatica recalls that the authors themselves of ancient Biblical commentaries don't think in what would now be called the *evolutio historica* of the thought of the hagiographers within a set of writings, since for the ancient commentators, "...la verità divina era rivelata non progressivamente ma *tota simul"* (ibid.).

[16] "...particolarmente ellittico, sintetico: l'Ambrosiaster poco concede al procedere armonioso del discorso" (cfr. A. Souter, *"A Study of Ambrosiaster"*, TS 74 (1905), 161-189, especially 178s.: L. Fatica, *"Commento alla Lettera ai Galati"*, cit., 19.

[17] "Paolo costituisce –in un certo senso– il punto il sintesi delle considerazioni fatte da Ambrosiaster sulla Legge e su Cristo" (L. Fatica, *"Commento alla Lettera ai Galati"*, cit., 26).

[18] Cfr. ibid.

The AMst *Gal* alludes to Peter, to James and to John, the three Apostles "worthy of seeing his glory on the mountain[19]"[20]. Then, attention is paid to the *ministerium Apostolorum*, with Peter's leadership, because the Apostles "stretch out the right hand to show concordance [between] the Apostles of the Gentiles and the society of the Jews"[21].

AMst Phil

AMst *Phil* says that Jesus emptied himself[22] since "he teaches us to be imitated in this patience and humility, not only in order that we may not put ourselves before those who [are] equal to us, but also [in order that] we may lower ourselves, following the true example of our Author"[23]. If by serui one means those enslaved by sin, then this is not the meaning of the self-emptying of the Word[24]. But, one of Jesus' works, through which one glimpses at his divine condition, his *forma Dei*[25], is precisely the Transfiguration,

[19] Cfr. Mt 17,1-9.

[20] "...gloriam eius digni in monte respicere" (AMst *Gal*, II, 10; CSEL 81/3, 1969, 24).

[21] "...ut Apostoli circumcisionis dexteras (dextras) porrigerent Apostolis gentium ad concordiam societatis demonstrandam" (Id., cit., 24-25).

[22] Cfr. Flp 2,8.

[23] "Hanc patientiam et humilitatem imitari nos docet, ut non solum coaequalibus non nos anteponamus, uerum etiam inclinemus nos auctoris nostri secuti exemplum" (AMst *Phil*, II, 8; CSEL 81/3, 1969, 140).

[24] "Formam tamen Dei non accepisse dicitur, sed esse in Dei forma, serui autem formam accepisse" (ibid.). A bit further, the Ambrosiaster insists: "Non enim mihi sicut quibusdam uidetur sic formam serui accepisse, dum homo natus est" (AMst *Phil*, II, 8; CSEL 81/3, 1969, 141). The Ambrosiaster depends on Flp 2,5 to affirm that Jesus Christ is not only God and man, but also, that "...ubi ergo aut Deum aut hominem uult significare Scriptura, unum e duobus ponit, aut Iesum aut Christum" (Id., cit., 140). The examples the Ambrosiaster poses are: *Y la roca era Cristo* (1 Co 10,4; SagBi 5, 1008), y: *Ni tentemos al Señor, como lo tentaron algunos de ellos* (1 Co 10,9; SagBi 5, 1008).

[25] "Opera enim formam significauit (significabant), ut quia opera eius non utique hominis opera sunt, hic qui in opera (opere) uel forma Dei erat, Deus intellegeretur" (AMst *Phil*, II, 8; CSEL 81/3, 1969, 140-141).

"since on the mountain[26], certainly, he has appeared as God"[27].

AMst 1 Cor

Regarding the *themes*, "the bottomline is the presence of ecclesial and moral situations not in consonance with the proclamation carried out by Paul"[28], aside from what Fatica calls "Paul's human or psycho-pedagogical"[29] datum. The tone of the text is doctrinal (the Trinity and Christ) and polemical[30]. AMst *1 Cor* contrasts the prudence of the world (in the sense of worldliness) with the apparent lack of wisdom in God[31], aside from speaking of man (body and soul) and of law (ecclesiastical and civil law)[32].

The Ambrosiaster applies the distinction of nearness –in order to avoid scandal33 (deviating from the teaching)– in the case of the Twelve[34]:

---

[26] Cfr. Mt 17,2-3.

[27] "Nam in monte utique quasi Deus apparuit" (AMst *Phil*, II, 8; CSEL 81/3, 1969, 141).

[28] "Il dato di fondo è quello della presenza di situazioni ecclesiali e morali non in sintonia con l'annuncio portato da Paolo" [L. Fatica, *"Commento alla prima Lettera ai Corinti",* in A. Quacquarelli (dir.), "Collana di Testi Patristici" 78, Città Nuova Editrice, Roma, 1989, 8].

[29] *"...umano o psicopedagogico* di Paolo" (Id., cit., 9).

[30] That is to say, "l'opposizione alle tendenze unitariste (sabelliane) che, preoccupate di salvaguardare il monoteismo, finivano per confondere e, anzi, identificare il Padre de il Figlio; l'opposizione ricorrente al marcionismo e ai Manichei, entrambi accusati di docetismo (...). L'oggetto inmediato della polemica sono i Novaziani ma, in realtà, il discorso si fa piú generale" (L. Fatica, *"Commento alla prima Lettera ai Corinti",* cit., 10-11).

[31] Cfr. Id., cit., 14.

[32] Cfr. Id., cit., 16-19.

[33] *"Como a niños en Cristo, os di a beber leche, no alimento sólido"* (1 Co 3,1-2; SagBi 5, 984). In the Neovulgate, instead of *quasi parvolis*, it reads: *tamquam parvulis* (ibid.).

[34] By the way, the Ambrosiaster recalls the treachery of the fake Apostles: "Pseudoapostoli enim promiscue omnibus uno atque eodem genere tradebant, nullius personam discernentes, ut acceptabiles fierent per hypocrisin commendati" (AMst *1 Cor,* III, 2; CSEL 81/2, 1968, 32).

> "[the Lord is righ in that] there shall be a difference among the Apostles themselves; because, in fact, [Christ] shows his glory on the mountain to three disciples[35], telling them to keep silent [about] what was seen, until [he] rises from the dead (cfr. Mt 17,9)"[36].

AMst 2 Cor

Among the qualities of the Apostle Paul which the Ambrosiaster has put to the fore, according to Fatica, are: the Apostle's concern for the salvation of his addressees, and his wisdom[37].

AMst 2 *Cor* interprets *spem habere*[38] as *gloriam uidere*, not the glory on Moses' face, "but the very [glory] the Apostles have seen on the mountain, the Lord having revealed himself to them[39]"[40]. Moreover, there's a soteriological-eschatological dimension in the *gloriam videre*[41]. The Ambrosiaster encourages a life of living faith –a reflection of the *benevolentia Dei*– in order to see God[42].

The Ambrosiaster pays attention to the Law of Moses and to the law of grace[43], "since [the Law of Moses] hasn't been able to

---

35 Cfr. Mt 17,1-2.

36 "...inter ipsos apostolos fuisse distantiam; tribus etenim discipulis gloriam suam in monte ostendit dicens illis, ut tacerent uisum, quamdiu a mortuis resurgeret (AMst *1 Cor,* III, 2; CSEL 81/2, 1968, 32-33).

37 Cfr. L. Fatica, *"Commento alla seconda Lettera ai Corinti",* cit., 17.

38 *"Teniendo, pues, esta esperanza, procedemos completamente confiados"* (2 Co 3,12; SagBi 5, 1052). In the Neovulgate, instead of *utamur*, it reads: *utimur* (ibid.).

39 Cfr. Mt 17,1-3.

40 "...sed eam quam uiderunt tres Apostoli in monte reuelante se Domino" (AMst *2 Cor*, III, 12; CSEL 81/2, 1968, 217).

41 "...excellentem saluatoris gloriam uisuros nos credimus" (ibid.).

42 "...et nos uicem reddere, in quantum possumus, debemus beniuolentiae Dei, ut propensiores simus in eius amore, qui nobis fiduciam dedit, abluens nos a peccatis, uidendi gloriam Dei" (ibid.).

43 "Pues si el ministerio de muerte, grabado con letras sobre piedras, resultó glorioso, hasta el punto de que los hijos de Israel no podían fijar su vista en el rostro de Moisés a causa de la gloria de su rostro, que era perecedera, ¿con cuánta mayor razón será más glorioso el ministerio del Espíritu?" (2 Co 3,7; SagBi 5, 1052)].

provide (*proveer*) for the sinners, the law of the faith arrives, to save them, not only by forgiving them but also by sanctifying them"[44]. Before, sinners haven't been freed from death. In contrast,

> "...now, through grace, [death is] taken away by the law of the Spirit, when [it's] accepted by the remission of sins, the righteous are made worthy to contemplate and they can [contemplate] God's glory, as Peter and John and James have seen Christ's glory on the mountain"[45].

AMst q

The AMst q are pamphlets[46] of 47 questions on the OT[47] and 80 on the NT[48]. There, the Ambrosiaster places as an example of the *dies–nox* calculation Luke's calculation of the interval between Jesus' words and the Transfiguration[49]: "Aren't the nights perhaps contained in this number?"[50].

---

[44] "...quia peccatoribus prouidere non potuit, uenit lex fidei, quae hos saluaret, non solum ignoscens, sed et iustificans eos" (AMst *2 Cor*, III, 7-8; CSEL 81/2, 1968, 215).

[45] "Quae nunc gloria [mors] euacuatur per legem Spiritus, cum accepta remissione peccatorum facti iusti digni sunt adspicere et possunt gloriam Dei, sicut uiderunt in monte Petrus et Iohannes et Iacobus gloriam Christi" (AMst *2 Cor*, III, 7-8; CSEL 81/2, 1968, 215).

[46] These are 151 pamphlets in the *editio princeps*, then reduced to 109 in a second edition. A third version of the AMst *q* dates from the 8th and 12th centuries, according to Couter (CSEL 50, 1908, xi-xiii); cfr. C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 10.

[47] Questions 1-6 (on Gn), 7-28 (Mosaic law), 19-29 (body and soul), 30-43 (sin and death), 44-47 (index, plus the *Adversum Iudaeos*).

[48] "The biblical text employed by Ambrosiaster...is at least coeval with our oldest complete manuscripts of the Greek Bible, and thus presupposes a Greek text anterior to them...the text employed by him was presumably that commonly employed in Rome at the time...the only Latin text of the NT to which Jerome paid any regard at all...the value of Ambrosiaster's text of the Pauline Epistles could not be exaggerated (Souter, 195f.)" [cfr. C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1084]. The Ambrosiaster's *exegetical objective* is "to overcome all apparent contradictions in scripture, and to verify God's consistent acting in view of the fulfillment of biblical salvation-history in Christ" (ibid.).

[49] Lc 9,27-28.

[50] "Numquid non in hoc numero continentur et noctes?" (AMst *q, numero CXXVII,* CVII, 5; CSEL 50, 1908, 248).

A characteristic of the God who doesn't suffer any defect is that he "is so bright, that nobody sees him, unless he wants to accommodate himself"[51]. Jesus is God, "who on the mountain has transfigured himself, has also appeared with great clarity[52], this was hidden in the body and he showed it in the body when he willed it"[53].

Principal affirmations

He who breaks the Law doesn't accept the Father's testimony regarding the Son. Peter, James and John have been privileged to have been invited to witness Jesus' Transfiguration. In Jesus' self-emptying, he didn't cease to be God, as is seen in the Transfiguration. Jesus chooses three of his Apostles to witness the Transfiguration. To foster hope is to see the glory. If Moses' Law didn't free one from death, the Law of the Spirit let one wtiness the glory of Jesus, who showed himself glorious but not his entire glory, but insofar as it was bearable for mortal eyes.

[51] "...tam praeclarus est ut a nullo uideatur, nisi se uoluerit temperare" (Id., cit., 251).

[52] Cfr. Mt 17,1-3.

[53] "...quod in monte transfiguratus est et in claritate magna apparuit, hoc ueluti latebat in corpore, quod, cum uoluit, manifestauit" (*AMst q, numero CXXVII,* CVII, 8; CSEL 50, 1908, 251).

16. Pseudo – Vigilius Thapsensis

According to Patrizia Guidi, "...this work [PS-VIG *Var.*] was identified by Chifflet with that –in reality, a lost work– to which the Pseudo-Vigilius himself refers to in the *Dialogue*, where it reads: 'In the book we had published against Maribadus, deacon of you sacrilegous heresy'[1]. Chifflet maintains his identification on the basis of conjectures and texts, which go very unsatisfactorily together, as has been already shown long ago by Ficker[2]. It is, thus, about a spurious work"[3].

In the *Var*, the **Pseudo-Vigilius Thapsensis** (5th c.[4]) teaches that when presenting the possible erroneous doctrinal affirmation on the Father and the Son, that is to say, "...if they were to tell you: The Son isn't the Father's will"[5], a response must make mention of the Transfiguration-event. It should be considered that

> "...if the Son were not the will of God the Father, how could the Father been able to to be pleased in him [the Son]?"[6].

---

1 *Dialogus* II, 45 (PL 62, 226D-227B), cfr. P. Guidi, *"Vigilio di Tapso, Contro gli ariani"*, in C. Moreschini (dir.), "Collana di Testi Patristici" 184, Città Nuova Editrice, 2005, 14.

2 Cfr. Picker, *Studien zu Vigilius von Tapsus,* Leipzig, 1897, 42ss. (cited by Guidi).

3 "Quest'opera fu identificata da Chifflet con quella –in realtà andata perduta– cui l'autore medesimo fa riferimento nel *Dialogo*, laddove si legge: 'Nel libro che abbiamo pubblicato contro Maribado, diacono della vostra empia eresia'". Chifflet sostiene la sua identificazione sulla base di congetture e di presunti rimandi testuali, che appaiono del tutto insoddisfacenti, come è stato già da tempo dimostrato da Ficker. Si tratta dunque di un'opera spuria" [P. Guidi, *"Vigilio di Tapso, Contro gli ariani"*, cit., 14].

4 Cfr. B. Schwank (ed.), *Florilegia Biblia Africana saec. V: contra Varimadum,* CChr.SL 90, 1961, viii.

5 "Si tibi dixerint: Non est uoluntas Patris Filius" (PS-VIG, *Var*, lib. I, vii, CChr.SL 90, 1961, 21).

6 "Si uoluntas Dei Patris Filius non fuisset, quomodo Patri in illo potuit *complacere*?" (Id., cit., 22).

If the heretics present a second thesis[7]– the response, again, mentions the Transfiguration:

> "on the mountain, to the three disciples: *This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased [Amadísimo], listen to him*[8]. Listen to the Father bearing witness to having begotten [the Son], listen [to the Father] showing the Son the origin of his birth, of whom or from whom he was unspeakably begotten"[9].

And so, if the heretics were to say that the Son wasn't the Father's will, or that the Father created the Son, one should answer with the voice's message during the Transfiguration.

---

[7] "Pater Filium fecit, Filius uero omnia" (PS-VIG, *Var*, lib. I, lxiv, CChr.SL 90, 1961, 7).

[8] Mt 17,5 (cfr. SagBi 5, 161: ""). En la Neovulgata, en lugar de *dilectissimus*, se lee *dilectus* (ibid.).

[9] "Et in monte tribus discipulis: *Hic est Filius meus dilectissimus, ipsum audite*. Audi Patrem de se genuisse propria uoce testantem, audi Filium natiuitatis suae originem, unde uel ex quo inenarrabiliter ortus sit, demonstrantem, et desine facturam dicere caelorum ac mundi creaturarum omnium Conditorem" (*PS-VIG, Var,* lib. I, lxiv, CChr.SL 90, 1961, 75).

17. Apponius

To **Apponius**1 (+4152) is attributed the composition of a commentary on Ct in twelve books, a commentary representative of the symbolical theology of the start of the apogee of the Middle Ages[3]. In order to cite Ct, Apponius used the *Vg* of Jerome (398), and his exegesis is spiritual[4]. Ct is a nuptial canticle "sung by the Spirit in order to celebrate the marriage of Christ and of the Church"[5], a text that prefigures the Incarnation, and with different senses of the Scripture – the *history*, the *intelligentia mysteriorum*, the *sensus moralis*, although "there is no direct influence of Origen perceptible in Apponius"[6].

Apponius interprets the word *uberum*[7] of the Patriarchs and the Prophets, amidst of whom is Christ:

> "it shall not be incongruent that the Patriarchs and the Prophets mean the breasts of the Church, in the middle

---

1 Apponius is "merely a name, possibly a Roman author with a Jewish or Oriental background" [C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1278].

2 Ibid.

3 Ibid. Moreover, he "expounds a christological and ecclesiological interpretation of the Canticle, deeply rooted in the tradition of Origenian exegesis" (ibid.).

4 Ibid.

5 "...sung by the Spirit to celebrate the wedding of Christ and the Church (V, 458; VIII, 3)" [C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1279].

6 Ibid.

7 The text worked on by APO carries the word *uberum*. However, in the Neovulgate, Song 1,4[1,3] reads *amorum*: "Trahe me post te. Curramus! / Introducat me rex in cellaria sua; / exsultemus et latemur in te / memores amorum tuorum super vinum; / recte diligunt te" (Llévame contigo. ¡Corramos! Condúzcame el rey a sus alcobas. Alegrémonos y deleitémonos contigo, celebremos tus amores más que el vino. ¡Con razón se enamoran de tí!) (SagBi 3, 776).

> of which Jesus transfigured himself, on the mountain, the Church's beloved, showing the Church's future glory"[8].

Apponius explains the ecclesiological reading of Ct 1,4[1,3]: "the Church is known as the *breasts*, in the middle of which Christ is shown *dwelling*"[9].

Afterwards, Apponius interprets the chosen like the sun[10] as the soul, upon whom it has been foretold –according to Apponius– "the most perfect glory of the resurrection, always full of paternal clarity"[11]. Precisely in the Transfiguration-event,

> "[Christ] made the Apostles see a particle of that clarity when he transfigured atop the mountain (cfr. Mt 17,2-3)"[12].

Moreover, Jesus' divinity (terrible aspect)[13] and humanity (choice)[14] are seen in the Transfiguration. Apponius dwells on three aspects of the eschatological reading of the Transfiguration[15].

---

[8] "...non erit incongruum Patriarchas et Prophetas Ecclesiae ubera nuncupari, in quorum medio transfiguratus in monte Iesus, dilectus Ecclesiae, inter Moysen patriarcham et Heliam prophetam in medio in futuram gloriam se Ecclesiae manifestasse probatur" (APO *Ct*, liber III, 14, CChr.SL 19, 1986, 68).

[9] "Ecclesia *ubera* cognoscuntur, quorum medio Christus commorari probatur (ibid.).

[10] *"Elegida [la luna] como el sol"*. In the Neovulgate, it reads: *pulchra ut luna* (hermosa como la luna) (Ct 6,10; SagBi 3, 798).

[11] "...post resurrectionis gloriam plenissimam, paternae claritatis plena semper consistens praedicta est" (APO *Ct*, liber IX, 35, CChr.SL 19, 1986, 228).

[12] "De qua claritate particulam, in uertice montis, Apostolis transfiguratus in gloriam demonstrauit" (APO *Ct*, liber IX, 35, CChr.SL 19, 1986, 228).

[13] "...in conturbationem Apostolorum et *terribilitas* simul maiestatis ostenditur" (ibid.).

[14] "...ubi cum electione humanitatis" (ibid.).

[15] Thus, the reading og Song 6,10 is enriched. Not because there are three Transfigurations, but it deals with what the Transfiguration would suppose to the soul, according to what it may deserve in the παρουσΓα.

> "...these three full levels that deserve praise can be understood, that is, *the fairness, the choice and the terribleness,* in the order according to which he shall appear, on the coming judgment, to the three [types of] persons, according to their merits"[16]: "to the righteous with the *fairness of the moon* (cfr. Ct 6,10)"[17]; "to the heavenly virtues, [he shall appear as] bright in his majesty, *as the sun* (Ct 6,10[18])"[19]; "but, to the wicked sent to eternal fire, [he] shows himself *terrible as an army with banners* (Ct 6,10[20])"[21].

Principal affirmations

APO Ct applies *uberum*[22] to Moses and Elijah, who proclaim the Church's future glory, and amidst of whom Jesus rests. Also, the chosen one like the sun[23] is the soul oriented to the glorious resurrection, of which a particle was shown to the Apostles who witnessed the Transfiguration.

---

[16] "Possunt siquidem tres gradus isti laudibus pleni, id est pulchritudo, electio et terribilitas, eo ordine intellegi quo singulis tribus personis, pro meritis, in futuro iudicio apparebit" (APO *Ct*, liber IX, 35, CChr.SL 19, 1986, 228).

[17] "...iustis hominibus in pulchritudine lunae" (APO *Ct*, liber IX, 35, CChr.SL 19, 1986, 228).

[18] SagBi 3, 798.

[19] "...caelorum uirtutibus in maiestate refulgens ut sol apparere praedicitur" (APO *Ct*, liber IX, 35, CChr.SL 19, 1986, 228).

[20] "...caelorum uirtutibus in maiestate refulgens ut sol apparere praedicitur" (APO *Ct*, liber IX, 35, CChr.SL 19, 1986, 228).

[21] "...impiis autem deputandis aeterno igni, *terribilis ut acies ordinata* ostenditur" (APO *Ct*, liber IX, 35, CChr.SL 19, 1986, 228). Apponius poses an example from war in order to illustrate these three aspects: "Vbi uere, ut rex post patratam uictoriam, fortiter dimicantibus uictoribus et fugacibus seu rebellibus reddendo pro meritis, agnorum uel haedorum ante tribunal suum acies ordinabit" (ibid.). Afterwards, he again speaks of what the wicked shall receive, referring to the confusion of the Lord's vineyard, Israel (cfr. Is 5,7).

[22] Cfr. Ct 1,4(1,3).

[23] Ct 6,10.

Transfiguration and eschatology are linked because the soul shall see Jesus in the end according to his state during judgment[24]: as the fair moon for the righteous, as the bright sun for the celestial virtues, but terrible as war for the damned.

[24] Cfr. ibid.

18. Maximus Taurinensis

Maximus Taurinensis (+408/423[1]), bishop of Turin[2], might have written the *Sermones* (between 451 and 465)[3], sermons with a *historical context*[4] characterized by the invasion of the "barbarians" and by the sack of Rome (410) by Alaric's Visigoths. This historical factor, which carries with it a climate of uncertainty in Turin and in all the West[5] is glanced at by the consoling and encouraging tone in these *Sermones*[6]. Maximus had –in his surroundings[7]– different kinds of people as audience[8], and basically three types of

---

1 Cfr. S. Petri – G. Banterle (tr.), *Massimo di Torino, Sermoni*, in Moreschini, C. (dir.) "Collana di Testi Patristici" 168, Città Nuova Editrice, Roma, 2003, 5.

2 The author, Maximus, shouldn't be confused with the other Maximus (also Bishop of Turin) who, according to Petri, would be the one who signed in the Proceedings of the Councils of Milan (451) and of Rome (465) [cfr. Id., cit., 6].

3 Cfr. ibid.

4 Cfr. S. Petri – G. Banterle (tr.), *Massimo di Torino, Sermoni*, cit., 7.

5 Cfr. Id., cit., 10.

6 Id., cit., 11. However, "...la stessa energia che caratterizza la predicazione di Massimo in tempi di guerra si avverte anche quando la situazione è più tranquilla e il vescovo si pu` dedicare alle tensioni ordinarie che lacerano la società del suo tempo" (Id., cit., 12). Here, I won't go into details of the historical factors about Maximus and his *Sermones*. A succint and interesting commentary is that of Petri in *Massimo di Torino, Sermoni*, cit., 7- 9.

7 Given the location of the Christians predominantly in Turin, and the pagans (with their places of worship) in the outskirts, it could've been that Christianity was a religion of the wealthy, and paganism, that of the poor [cfr. S. Petri – G. Banterle (tr.), *Massimo di Torino, Sermoni,* cit., 17].

8 "Dai suoi sermoni emerge un mondo nettamente diviso fra la categoria dei poveri, (...) fra clienti, stranieri e schiavi, e quella dei ricchi. La predicazione di Massimo si rivolge prevalentemente a questi ultimi, per esortare e rimproverare, talora molto aspramente" [Id., cit., 12].

non-faithful[9], especially the Arians[10]. This Bishop of Turin made an effort to present to the faithful the richness of the liturgical celebrations in the light of Christ[11].

MAX s 44

Maximus applies Jn's typical pair (*lux–tenebrae*) when interpreting the splendid (*splendida*) and luminous (*praeclara*)[12] cloud of the Ascension[13], the cloud that "couldn't be either obscure or horrible or dark"[14], "...since the darkness couldn't carry the light"[15]. Then, Maximus of Turin links the cloud of the Ascension to the cloud of the Transfiguration: "[that cloud was] that which bore witness to Christ on the mountain"[16].

[9] "...tre categorie contro le quali il vescovo polemizza e dalle quali mette in guardia i suoi fedeli: si tratta dei pagani, ancora numerosi soprattutto nelle campagne, degli ebrei e degli eretici" [Id., cit., 16].

[10] "...un rilievo particolare è dedicato agli ariani. (…) Nei suoi sermoni, il vescovo di Torino non cerca una confutazione di questa eresia in base ad argomenti teologici, ma si limita ad accennare rapidamente ai punti fondamentali di questa dottrina, riducendola generalmente ad una sintetica formula. Nella lotta contro le eresie, Massimo indubbiamente preferisce muoversi, come di consueto, sul terreno della morale" [Id., cit., 22-23]. Maximus's *exegetical style* in the *Sermones* is "semplice e chiaro, ma questo non significa che l'autore rinunci ad un'accurata elaborazione formale. All'epoca, infatti, alla base della formazione di un uomo di buona cultura, quale Massimo doveva essere, c'era appunto la retorica e il vescovo mette questa sua competenza al servizio del suo ministero, servendosi degli strumenti più adatti per colpire e quindi persuadere i suoi ascoltatori. Nel suo stile sono particolarmente frequenti i parallelismi, sui quali spesso è costruito l'intero sermone" (Id., cit., 27).

[11] "Lo stesso intento di costruire una forte identità cristiana è forse, per certi aspetti, alla base di una delle caratteristiche più peculiari della predicazione di Massimo, cioè l'accento posto sugli aspetii gloriosi e solenni delle celebrazioni liturgiche e della figura stessa di Cristo" [S. Petri – G. Banterle (tr.), *Massimo di Torino, Sermoni*, cit., 24-25].

[12] Cfr. MAX *s 44*, 3, CChr.SL 23, 1962, 179.

[13] Cfr. Hch 1,9.

[14] "Neque [enim] poterat obscura esse ac tetra uel tenebrosa" (MAX *s 44*, 3, CChr.SL 23, 1962, 179).

[15] "Tenebrae enim lucem gestare non poterant" (ibid.); cfr. Jn 1,5.

[16] "...quae et testimonium Christo etiam in monte perhibuit" (MAX *s 44*, 3, CCL 23, 1962, 179); cfr. Lc 9,35. *Mutatis mutandis*, one can think of the cloud of the Transfiguration in the light of the cloud of the Ascension.

Maximus details his reflection on the cloud of the Ascension in four points[17]: the non-utilitarian but rather loving meaning of Father-Son[18]; the Father-Son love, described because of the cloud and with human words[19]; the encouraging post-Resurrection meaning of the cloud of the Ascension[20]; the parallelism between the protecting cloud[21] (for Mary) and the cloud that draws the Son to the Father[22].

MAX s 61/A

MAX s 61/A (*Dictum ante Natale Domini*) invites the audience to clothe their souls with *indumenta pura et nitida*[23] for the birth

[17] I shall relate these points with the cloud of the Transfiguration.

[18] "Non igitur nubes suscepit Christum, sed Deus Pater recepit Filium" (MAX *s 44*, 3, CChr.SL 23, 1962, 179). In the Transfiguration, too, one can think of the non-instrumentalization of the meaning of the cloud, because it invites to dwell in not only the Son before his very Father (although they're always one: cfr. Jn 10,30), but he also invites the other characters to interiorize themselves in order to get a glimpse at the Mystery.

[19] "...et occursu quodam pietatis ascendentem illum gremio molliore conplectitur" (MAX *s 44*, 3, CCL 23, 1962, 179). In the Transfiguration, the Father shows his love for the Son verbally, although in the Transfiguration as well as in the Ascension, there's an "embrace", the cloud covering them.

[20] "Nam ideo Pater dicitur suscipere Filium nubis umbraculo, ut ostendatur refrigerio quodam fouere eius uulnera passionis. Post crucem enim post iniurias post inferos non est maius Christi refrigerium, nisi uirtute diuinitatis obumbraretur" (Id., cit., 179-180). Here, if the cloud of the Ascension serves as a post-Resurrection encouragement, the cloud of the Transfiguration can be considered an example of the pre-Resurrection encouragement of the Father about his Son in his humanity, in the face of the imminent arrival of the mortal, bloody, but salvific, Passion.

[21] Maximus also mentions the cloud that protected what would be the chosen people in the OT: *"Extendió una nube para protegerlos"* [Sal 105(104),39]. The Neovulgate reads: *Expandit nubem in protectionem* (Extendió una nube como protección) (SagBi 3, 484).

[22] "Altissimus ergo Pater, qui nascente Christo obumbrauit in uirtute Mariae, ascendentem eum suscepit in nube" (MAX *s 44*, 3, CChr.SL 23, 1962, 180). In fact, the author refers to the Archangel's words in order to establish this parallelism: *"Y el poder del Altísimo te cubrirá con su sombra"* (Lc 1,35; SagBi 5, 381).

[23] Cfr. MAX s *61/A,* 2, CChr.SL 23, 1962, 249.

of Jesus[24]. Maximus describes these *animae uestimenta praetiosa*[25] in the light of the *indumentum Christi transfigurati*. Moreover, Maximus praises the clothing of Jesus transfigured[26]– in four steps: the *indumentum Iesu–gratia*:[27] comparison; the link *indumentum Iesu* made attractive – *caro immaculatum Verbi:*

> "...may the clothing be praised not because it has been made dense by the fineness of the threads, but because [it was] conceived in the integrity of the body"[28];

the *indumentum Iesu transfigurati as caro Verbi incarnati formatum ex Maria:*

> "...may the clothing be praised not because women's hands weave [it], but because [it] brought about Mary's virginity"[29];

the *indumentum Iesu* as the *opus splendens et diuinum*, with Mary's cooperation with the divine plan:

> "And therefore, in it the fairness of the resplendence is magnified, because that immaculate [color] hadn't been carried out by any human hands"[30].

---

[24] Puede complementar esta pureza y limpieza del alma con el *odor sanctitatis animae*, si el alma está unida a Jesús. Este *bonus odor Christi* lo relaciona Máximo con el Sal 45(44),9: "Mirra, áloe y casia exhalan tus vestidos" (SagBi 3, 309).

[25] MAX *s 61A*, 2, CChr.SL 23, 1962, 249.

[26] Cfr. Mc 9,6.

[27] "Laudatur igitur Christi indumentum, quia nitebat non textura sed gratia" (MAX *s 61A*, 2, CChr.SL 23, 1962, 250).

[28] "...laudatur indumentum non quod staminum subtilitate densetum est, sed quod corporis integritate conceptum" (ibid.).

[29] "...laudatur uestimentum non quod mulierum manus texuit, sed quod Mariae uirginitas procreauit" (ibid.).

[30] "Et ideo in eo magnificatur candoris gratia, quia inmaculatum illud non artificis cura praestiterat" (ibid.).

Maximus is convinced of the fuller's (*fullo*[31]) incapability to reproduce the *splendor indumenti Iesu transfigurati*,

> "...since 'fuller' can offer brillance, cleanliness, purity, but cannot present virginity, justice, goodness"[32].

Principal affirmations

MAX *s 44* sees the cloud of the Transfiguration as luminous, with Johannine nuances of the contrast between light and darkness. The cloud of the Ascension evokes that of the Transfiguration, which expresses the love of the Father and the Son.

[31] Mc 9,6.

[32] "Fullo enim praestare potest nitorem munditiam puritatem, praestare autem non potest uirginitatem iustitiam bonitatem" (MAX *s 61/A*, 2, CChr.SL 23, 1962, 250). Es decir, que el batanero sólo puede lavar las manchas físicas, pero no las manchas espirituales.

MAX s *61/A* sees in the resplendent clothes of the transfigured Jesus a comparison with grace, with the most pure flesh of the Word incarnate, formed in the most pure womb of Mary, a splendid and divine work. The earthly fuller can't make such clothing of the transfigured Jesus because it can't reproduce purity, among other virtues.

19. Petrus Chrysologus

Many writings of **Petrus Chrysologus**[1] (archbishop of Ravenna and Doctor of the Church[2], ± 380 – 450[3]) that exist up to now are exegetical homilies[4].

In a non-exegetical homily, Peter Chrysologus refers to the Transfiguration[5], and says[6]:

> "If Moses and Elijah appear on the mountain, in order to contemplate the promised one, Christ, how come Abraham doesn't contemplate the giving birth of the Virgin, as the promised blessing for the peoples, this is because he contemplated whom he expects with so much patience?"[7].

In summary, Peter Chrysologus compares the contemplation which Moses and Elijah due to the awaiting for the Abraham.

---

1 According to Basil Studer, Peter Chrysologus was "Metropolitan of Ravenna sometime before 431 (when Theodoret wrote a letter to him) until his death between 449 and 458, (…) became famous for his 168 sermons of the *Collectio Feliciana (saec. VIII)* and 15 *extravagantes* (Studer, 576)" [C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1261].

2 Cfr. BBKLo (http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/c/chrysologus_p.shtml, visited 9 May 2009).

3 C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1261.

4 Cfr. ibid. The lack of writings of Peter Chrysologus at present on the Lord's Passion and Resurrection can be due to the fact that many of his exegetical sermons "perished in the troubled circumstances following his death" (ibid.).

5 Cfr. Kannengiesser, C. (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1266.

6 "Abrahán, vuestro padre, se llenó de alegría porque iba a ver mi día; lo vio y se alegró. Los judíos le dijeron: ¿Aún no tienes cincuenta años y has visto a Abrahán?" (Jn 8,56-57; SagBi 5, 628).

7 "Si Moyses et Helias in monte occurrunt, ut promissum conspicerent Christum, quomodo nec Abraham occurrit ad partum Virginis, ut promissam benedictionem in gentibus, id est, in semine suo, patientissimus expectator intenderet?" (PET-C s 131, 11, CChr.SL 24b, 1992, 809). In the sense that if Moses and Elijah have merited to be beside, and to contemplate, Jesus transfigured (cfr. Mt 17,2-3), he who is God, how much more reason abraham has of meriting the contemplation of God.

20. Eucherius Lugdunensis

Eucherius Lugdunensis (± 380 – 450/455[1]), "highly esteemed in mediaeval monasteries"[2], writes his *Salon*.[3], which "explains in Book I passages from the OT and NT"[4]. Eucherius writes in a question–and–answer format, and his exegesis "follows closely models provided by Ambrose and Augustine"[5].

EUCH inst explains in brief the *discrepancy* regarding the days before the Transfiguration:

> "Luke, who by disposition towards the disciples by the Lord's conversation, wrote this vision shown to the disciples and the same day when the Lord spoke[6], he also understood to whom the glorified Jesus spoke. Indeed, they[7] judged that there must be indicated only six half-

---

1 C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1283. "The son of a senatorial family of Lyon, well educated and knowledgable in Greek, (…) separated from his wife and four children (among them two sons who became bishops in his lifetime), and retired into the eremitic solitude of one of the Lérins islands from which he was elected to the see of his hometown in 453" (ibid.).

2 Ibid

3 Salonius, one of Eucharius's children, "was educated at Lérins where his father had spent a few years with his wife and their two children. Between 428 and 434, Salonius received there the two volums of Institutiones, which Eucherius dedicated to him (…). Before 439, he became bishop of Geneva, his brother, Veranus, occupying the see of Vence" [C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1298].

4 Id., cit., 1283. Kannengiesser continues: "...in Book II, it comments on some Hebrew and Greek words like *Halleluiah* or *Zabaoth*, according to Jerome" (ibid.).

5 Ibid.

6 Cfr. Lc 9,28.

7 It refers to the other SYnoptic Gospels: cfr. Mt 17,1; Mc 9,1.

> days and they kept silent [regarding] the entire days, the first and the last day enumerated as a quasi-whole day"[8].

Thus, Eucherius explains the discrepancy of days on the Transfiguration narratives.

[8] "Lucas qui habito Domini apud discipulos sermone post octo dies scribit uisionem hanc discipulis ostensam et eum diem quo Dominus locutus est conprehendit et eum quo Iesus glorificatus apparuit. Hi uero qui sex dies indicandos putauerunt mediis tantum atque integris diebus adnumeratis quasi semiplenum primum illum diem postremumque tacuerunt" (EUCH, *inst*, I, v, CChr.SL 66, 2004, 150).

21. Quodvultdeus

Quodvultdeus Carthaginensis (+ ± 454[1]) hails from the Church in Carthage[2], and has a spiritual or typological *exegetical style*[3]. Moreover, the "allegorical numerology, learned from Augustine, contributes to Quodvultdeus's exegesis"[4].

QU Jud

Quoduultdeus interprets Ha 3,2[5] in a Christological key in three ways: "either [Christ Jesus] amidst the two testaments"[6]; "or, [Christ Jesus] amidst two thieves[7]"[8]; "or, [Christ Jesus] amidst

---

1 C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1251.

2 Quodvultdeus "asked Augustine in 428 to write a compendium of heresies for him (Augustine, *Letters* 221,223; De *haeresibus*). He was expelled by the Arian warlord Gaiseric and found refuge in Naples where he died ca. 454. Entirely dedicated to pastoral work, he left behind him a collection of sermons, a few letters and the *Liber promissionum et praedictorum dei*" (ibid.).

3 "In his view biblical salvation-history is a texture of closely linked signa, mysteria, sacramenta, announcing the Christian fulfillment" (ibid.). Moreover, "...the author's originality consists in adding to traditional typology a detailed illustration by which small or hitherto neglected elements of figurative data are systematically interpreted as significant" (ibid.). Más aún, "Scripture is usually quoted from memory, with occasional inaccuracy, or paraphrased and accommodated to the author's symbolic interpretations. His free quoting of scripture is paired with a similarly free use of various textual traditions: he rests on Jerome's translation from the Hebrew, (…) but more frequently on Old Latin versions, circulating in Africa (Braun, SC 101,33-53)" (ibid.).

4 Ibid.

5 *"En medio de dos animales das a conocer"*, according to the text known by Quoduultdeus: *"In medio duorum animalium innotesces"* (QU *Jud*, XIII, 8, CChr.SL 60, 1976, 244). In the Neovulgate, it reads: *in medio annorum notum facies* (en nuestros años dalas a conocer) (SagBi 4, 1191). In this work, I don't deal with the question of the difference between the Latin versions nor between the translations of Ha 3,2.

6 "...aut in medio duorum testamentorum" (QU *Jud*, XIII, 8, CChr.SL 60, 1976, 244).

7 Cfr. Mt 27,38.

8 "...aut in medio duorum latronum" (ibid.).

Moses and Elijah conversing with Him on the mountain[9]"[10].

QU hae

Quoduultdeus deems reasonable the *conloquium* of Moses and Elijah with Jesus transfigured

> "because they had spoken about him; they showed whom they foresaw, the manifested about whom they prophesized"[11].

Quoduultdeus especulates on five themes of the conversation among Jesus, Moses and Elijah, who would talk

> "about the Jews being convinced, of the Manicheans being confused, of the pagans being converted, of the heretics being suppressed, of the Catholics being confirmed"[12].

Quoduultdeus speaks –in figurative and literary terms– of the conloquium between the OT and the NT[13].

---

[9] Cfr. Mt 17,2-3.

[10] "...aut in medio Moysi et Heliae cum eo in monte sermocinantium" (QU *Jud*, XIII, 8, CChr.SL 60, 1976, 244).

[11] "...quia locuti erant de illo; ostendebant quem praeuiderant, manifestabant quem prophetauerant" (QU *hae*, VII, 20, CChr.SL 60, 1976, 296). Here, there's a double parallelism, each of which is related to Moses and Elijah, respectively. This double parallelism can be completed with a third pair (OT) in order to obtain the following *ordo unitatis Scripturarum*: ostendere (NT) – praeuidere (OT) and manifestare (NT) – prophetare (OT). The Transfiguration event will be the *locus manifestationis* of this *ordo unitatis Scripturarum*.

[12] "Vt Iudaei conuincerentur, Manichaei confunderentur, pagani conuerterentur, haeretici comprimerentur, catholici confirmarentur" (QU *hae*, VII, 20, CChr. SL 60, 1976, 296).

[13] For Quoduultdeus: "Loquebantur Lex et gratia, asperitas et lenitas, terror et mansuetudo, praeceptum et adiutorium, ferramenta et medicus, umbra et lux, praeco et iudex, sententia et misericordia" (*QU hae*, VII, 21, CChr.SL 60, 1976, 296).

Quoduultdeus reproaches Peter[14]:

> "The world perishes, and you [Peter] ask for solitude? You see many people gathering, and you seek to rest? You see the darkness of the world, and you hide the Light?"[15].

Peter's proposal seems to try to hide the Light, against the words of Jesus[16], which Quoduultdeus interprets in two ways: the Light –which Peter mustn't hide– shines precisely on the Cross[17]; the Light of the Truth –Jesus transfigured– protects us from the darkness of doctrinal error[18]. Moreover, Quoduultdeus sees in the vox Patris[19] the correction to Peter: "God's precept sounded and Peter's suggestion was removed"[20].

Quoduultdeus invites everybody to listen to the Son[21], especially those who err in the doctrine: "May the feigning pagans listen, may the persecuting Jews listen, may the Manicheans who dream of ghosts listen, may the heretics bound to the errors listen; let them listen, and listen especially, including the faithful Catholics who worship God. May the latter listen in order to be instructed,

---

14 Cfr. Mt 17,4.

15 "Mundus perit, et tu secretum petis? Vides tot gentes in unum conuenire, et tu requiem quaeris? Vides tenebras mundi, et tu lumen abscondis?" (QU *hae*, VII, 22, CChr.SL 60, 1976, 296).

16 In Mt 5,15: *"Nadie enciende una luz y la pone debajo de un celemín, sino sobre un candelero para que alumbre a todos los de la casa"* (SagBi 5, 90, except for the first word, *nadie*).

17 "Ista domus totus est mundus; lucernae accensio Verbi est incarnatio; candelabrum crucis est lignum; lucerna in candelabro lucens Christus est in cruce pendens (QU *hae*, VII, 23, CChr.SL 60, 1976, 296).

18 "Tenebrae sunt, non offendamus in paganis, non erremus cum haereticis. Luceat nobis lucerna, doceat nos Verbum in carne (QU *hae*, VII, 24, CChr. SL 60, 1976, 296).

19 Cfr. Mt 17,5.

20 "Intonuit praeceptum Dei et remotum est consilium Petri" (QU *hae*, VII, 34, CChr.SL 60, 1976, 298).

21 Cfr. Mt 17,5.

may the former listen to be corrected; o that the latter may listen in order not to be enticed, and the latter, to be chastised"[22].

Here there are two addressees of the message: the Catholics, for whom the message is an exhortation to orthodoxy, as a prevention against the prevalent error of that time; the heretics, for their conversion and warning – the pagans[23], the Jews[24]. After all, Quoduultdeus states his intention clearly –behind the strong tone of controversy– of helping and inviting the Jews to recognize Jesus as the Son of God[25]. Quoduultdeus offers a way to those who have killed Jesus.

> "What do you have to do now, but to get yourselves baptized as believers, and to drink the Blood which you shed? There's nothing to fear: the doctor's blood was shed, and was made medicine of the frenzied. Why do you doubt? *Taste and see that the Lord* is good [Sal 34(33),9[26]]"[27].

---

[22] "Audiant pagani irrisores, audiant Iudaei persecutores, audiant Manichaei phantasmatum somniatores, audiant haeretici errorum ligatores; audiant, et maxime audiant etiam catholici fideles Dei cultores. Isti audiant ut instruantur, illi ut corrigantur; aut isti audiant ne seducantur, illi ut puniantur" (QU *hae*, VII, 26, CChr.SL 60, 1976, 297).

[23] "Vbi estis qui aduersamini Filio Dei? Pater dicit: *Hic est Filius* meus, et tu dicis: Non habet filium Deus. Tu, pagane, quid foras stas et murmuras? Intra huc in scholam Dei et aperi aures cordis tui, audi uocem Domini tui, et disce Filium Dei" (QU *hae*, VII, 27, CChr.SL 60, 1976, 297).

[24] "Quid agitis, Iudaei, qui occidistis Filium Dei? Quo fugietis, ubi uos abscondetis? Qui montes, quae petrae super uos casurae sunt? *Et si in cauernis petrarum uos absconderetis, inde extraham uos, dicit Dominus"* (QU *hae*, VII, 28, CChr.SL 60, 1976, 297).

[25] "Sed et uos uenite, intrate, consilium meum audite, desperare nolite: *quoniam sunt reliquiae homini pacifico*. Saeuistis, occidistis, sanguinem Christi fudistis, Filio Dei increduli fuistis, in periculo positi estis" (QU *hae*, VII, 29, CChr.SL 60, 1976, 297).

[26] SagBi 3, 273: *"Gustad y ved qué bueno es el Señor".*

[27] "Quid facere nunc habetis, nisi ut credentes baptizemini, et bibatis sanguinem quem fudistis? Non est quod horreatis: fusus est sanguis medici, et factus est medicamentum phrenetici. Quid dubitatis? *Gustate et uidete quoniam suauis est Dominus"* (QU *hae*, VII, 30, CChr.SL 60, 1976, 297).

Principal affirmations

QU *Jud* sees Moses and Elijah as two animals[28], amidst of which is Jesus.

QU *hae*, aside from seeing that the Law and the Prophets proclaimed Jesus, observes that Moses, Elijah and Jesus shall speak of the Jews, of the Manicheans, of the pagans, of the heretics, and of the Catholics. Moreover, Peter's proposal seems to imply his desire to hide the Light, for which he is corrected by the Father. Finally, everybody –Catholics and heretics– have to listen to the Son.

[28] Cfr. Ha 3,2.

22. Vincentius Lerinensis

In the com, **Vincentius Lerinensis** (+ ± 455[1]) makes a very, very slight reference to Jesus' Transfiguration when, speaking of the unity in the Trinity, he specifies that it's not the Trinity which spoke from the cloud when Jesus transfigured, "when the three disciples were with him on the mountain"[2],

> "but that it was only the Father's voice made to the Son – although the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, as they are inseparables, so they too work inseparably. Ths is my faith insofar as it's the Catholic faith"[3].

In summary, Vincent makes it clear that the voice which spoke during the Transfiguration wasn't the Trinity's, but of the Father.

---

1 Cfr. KVS4pdf, 10.

2 "...in monte quando cum illo erant tres discipuli" (VIN com I, CChr.SL 64, 1985, 203).

3 "...sed tantummodo Patris uocem fuisse ad Filium factam – quamuis Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus sicut inseparabiles sunt, ita inseparabiliter operentur. Haec est mea fides quando haec est catholica fides" (ibid.). Vincent recalls the events when the *uox Patris* was heard: in Jesus' Baptism (heard by John the Baptist; cfr. Mc 1,11), in Jesus' Transfiguration (cfr. Mt 17,5), and in the voice which sounded like thunder to the believers (cfr. Jn 12,28).

23. Arnobius Iunior

Si in unum sint Christus et Lex et Prophetae,
tunc et Christus Dei Filius conprobatur

(exp Lc 4)

Arnobius Iunior[1] (+ after 451[2]), in exp *Lc 4,* offers two readings[3] of the Transfiguration, about: the ascent to the mountain of the Transfiguration[4], Jesus transfigured[5], the trio of Jesus, Moses

---

[1] "African monk, having fled the Vandals, while in Rome ca. 432, (…) opposed Augustine's doctrine of grace. In particular, he wrote an allegorical Commentarii on the Psalms in which he opposes Augustinianism, and the Expositiunculae in evangelium which offer scholia on passages from Matthew, Luke and John" [C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1286]. He was a semi-Pelagian [cfr. BBKLo (http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/a/arnobius_d_jue.shtml, visited 9 May 2009)], although it seems that this detail about Arnobius the Younger doesn't affect what he says about Jesus' Transfiguration. On the other hand, this Arnobius is called "Younger" in order to distinguish him from Arnobius the Greater, an apologete of the 3rd c. [cfr. BBKLo (http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/a/arnobius_d_ae.shtml, visited 9 May 2009)].

[2] Ibid.

[3] Readings which I shall call L1 and L2, respectively.

[4] In the L1, the reflection of the *sublimitas Patris* is seen in the *mons altus* (cfr. ARN exp Lc 4, CChr.SL 25a, 1992, 296). In the L2, the attentions goes from the *mons altus* to Christ who is atop the high mountain: "Christus in monte excelso sapientiae, per exercitationem uerborum spiritalium, Deus Verbum intellegitur et creditur et colitur, secundum Dei formam" (ibid.). Arnobius has spoken of the Father and of Jesus, both atop the mountain: the Father, insofar as the mountain is on high; Christ, insofar as he shows the Father.

[5] The L1 sees a confirmation of the faith of the Apostles in the *inmutatio* of Jesus in a *splendor luminis:* "...ne forte Apostoli adhuc aliquid dubitarent" (ARN *exp Lc 4*, CChr.SL 25a, 1992, 296). After recalling Jesus' reproach to Peter who was about to go down (cfr. Mt 14,31), Arnobius jumps to eschatology when he says that the *splendor* of Jesus' clothes "inmutationem sanctorum futuram demonstrat" (ibid.). The L2 sees the brillance of the NT in the snow-like aspect of the clothes of Jesus transfigured, which are "sermones et litterae Euangeliorum, quibus Iesus est indutus" (ibid.). Arnobius has spoken of the Transfiguration as a confirmation in the faith of the Apostles regarding his divinity, although one glimpses at Arnobius' effort to make one see the importance of the Gospel, when he sees it behind Jesus' resplendent clothes.

and Elijah[6], the mutual testimony of the two Testaments[7], and the testimony of the Scriptures *quoad nos*[8].

Principal affirmations

ARN *exp Lc 4* pays attention to the ascent to the mount of the Transfiguration (in reference to the Father's majesty and the Son's divinity), Jesus transfigured (firstfruits of the future glory and spiritual intelligence of the Scriptures), the trio of Moses, Elijah and Jesus (triple room and unity of those in Jesus, who is God), the testimony of the two Testaments (testimony-prophecy of the OT about Christ, the testimony-fulfillment of Christ over the OT), the testimony of the Scriptures by us (reading the Scriptures as a unified whole).

---

[6] In the L1, the numerical allegory points to the mysterium paschale, since Arnobius sees that the number '3' "triduanam habitationem passionis demonstrat" (ARN exp Lc 4, CChr.SL 25a, 1992, 296). However, here, Arnobius doesn't explain what that signifies. In the L2, Arnobius sees the colloquium of Moses and Elijah with Jesus, the Son of God, as united components: "Si quis autem intellegit spiritalem legem conuenientem sermonibus Iesu, et in prophetis absconditam in mysterio sapientiam, ille uidet Moysen et Heliam in gloria, quando uiderit eos unum cum Iesu" (Id., cit., 296-297). This union doesn't diminish the fact that Jesus Christ is God. Rather, it confirms it, since "si in unum sint Christus et Lex et Prophetae, tunc et Christus Dei Filius conprobatur" (Id., cit., 297). This union has been yearned for since the OT oracles about the Christ.

[7] The L2, Arnobius speaks of the OT and Christ first as *testimonium mutuum*. On the one hand, the OT's Testimonium-prophetia about Christ: "et Lex et Prophetae uera prophetasse inueniuntur, quoniam Lex et Prophetae testimonium dederunt de Christo praedicantes ea quae futura erant de Christo" (ARN *exp Lc 4*, CChr.SL 25a, 1992, 297). On the other hand, Christ's *Testimonium-plenitudo* upon the OT: "et Christus testimonium dedit Legi et Prophetis, quoniam uera prophetauerunt, prophetiam eorum ipsis rebus adimplens" (ibid.). The importance Arnobius gives the Scriptures is seen in this (the OT prophesying about the NT; the NT fulfilling the OT).

[8] From Peter's proposal, Arnobius intuits the need to adhere to the *testimonium scripturarum* –to Jesus, to Moses and to Elijah– since "adhaereamus his tribus coniunctis, uidelicet Christo Moysi et Prophetis. Nam in ore horum trium stat omne iudicium. Quos qui separare studebunt, erunt nescientes quid dicerent" (ibid.). In this Scriptural testimony *quoad nos*, Arnobius has used the allegory of the number three to speak of the importance of reading the Scripture as a whole, especially in order to shed light on the mystery of the Passion of Christ, to which points the triple room of Christ, the Law and the Prophets.

24. Prosperus Aquitanus

Prosperus Aquitanus (+ after 455[1]), among Augustine's most fervent disciples[2], interprets the snow[3] in two levels: on the literal level, the Psalmist speaks of fecundity,

> "...because the clouds that fall have a sort of wool, and the dew of the clouds is no other than scattered ash and with that makes the earth fertile"[4];

on the spiritual level, the Psalmist speaks of the *opera hominum* carried out with God's grace, works "prefigured by the wools of snow"[5].

Prosperus gives Christological-ecclesiological meaning to the clothing:

> "...works that –in order to carry out Christ' clothing, which is the entire Church– gather and merge together into one in the same [garment] that is woven *without spot or wrinkle*[6]; rather, [let it be woven] in that damp covering of purity, which shines through the eternal glorification, and [let the clothing] be linked with it [purity]"[7].

---

1 Cfr. KVS4, 8.

2 P. Callens (cura et studio), *Prosperi Aquitani Opera,* CCL 68A, 1972, vii.

3 *"Él dispensa la nieve como lana, esparce la nube como ceniza"* [Sal 147,16(147,5);]. "Él dispensa la nieve como lana, esparce la escarcha como ceniza" (SB 3, 598).

4 "Quia et nubes decidentes habent uellerum speciem, et nebularum ros non aliter quam cinis spargitur atque ex eo terra pinguescit" (Prosperus Aquitanus, Expo. *Psa*., CXLVII, 16, CCL 68A, 1972, 204).

5 "...per niuium uellera uocatione gentium figurata" (ibid.).

6 Ef 5,27: *"sin mancha, arruga"* (SB 5, 1144).

7 "...quae ad conficiendum uestimentum Christi, quod est Ecclesia, in unum confluit et in idipsum tota contexitur *non habens maculam aut rugam*, sed in illa puritate mansura, quae aeterna glorificatione resplendeat sitque in ea compage" (PROS Ps CXLVII, 16, CChr.SL 68A, 1972, 204). Ef 5,27 reinforces the point which Prosperus of Aquileia makes: the Church' purity or holiness is the characteristic which makes her the *uestimentum Christi*.

In the clothing of light[8], Prosperus sees a confirmation of the Scripture of the *puritas/sanctitas Ecclesiae – vestimentum Christi* parallelism which he presents. Prosperus deems it fitting to link the words of the Psalmist[9] to the *uestis Christi transfigurati*[10]. Then, Prosperus specifies that, having interpreted the *uestis Christi transfigurati sicut* nix in a Christological-ecclesiological sense, it doesn't follow that the cloud in the Transfiguration-event[11] is to be interpreted the same way, since the *nebula*[12] is like "the faint cloud of ignorance, which takes refuge in the ashes of penance"[13].

Principal affirmations

Prosperus interprets the snow as fecundity and as works of man made through the divine grace. The white and luminous clothing of Jesus transfigured is the pre-figuration of the holiness and the purity of the Church.

---

[8] *"Señor, te envuelves de luz como de un manto"* (Sal 104[103],2; SagBi 3, 475, salvo la palabra Señor). The Neovulgate reads: *amictus lumine sicut vestimento* (ibid.).

[9] Cfr. Sal 147,16[147,5].

[10] Cfr. Mt 17,2. "Ad quod significandum pertinuit quod uestis Christi transfigurati in monte, sicut nix legitur refulsisse" (PROS *Ps* CXLVII, 16, CCL 68A, 1972, 204).

[11] Cfr. Mt 17,5.

[12] *"...esparce la nube como ceniza"* Sal 147,16[147,5] (SagBi 3, 598, partim). In the Neovulgate, instead of "cloud" (*nebula*, according to the text known by Prosperus), it is "frost" (*pruina*; cfr. ibid.).

[13] "...caligo ignorantiae, quae ad paenitentiae cinerem confugit, indicatur" (PROS *Ps* CXLVII, 16, CChr.SL 68A, 1972, 204). Prosperus adds: "Non enim quisquam ante uocationem dici iustus potest, quia Filius hominis non uenit iustos eligere, sed peccatores et impios saluos facere" (ibid.).

25. Epiphanius Latinus

EP-L h 29

Semper adnuntiaverunt Christum venturum,
apparuerunt in monte conloquentes ei,
ut apostoli crederent novo testamento,
quia ipse esset,
quem vetus testamentum adnuntiabat

For Epiphanius Latinus, bishop of Seville, Spain (411-461)[1], the Transfiguration takes place "in order to confirm the faith of the disciples and to show them his [Jesus'] majesty"[2]. Moses and Elijah –personifications of the OT, for Epiphanius–

> "always announced that Christ had to arrive, [they] appeared on the mountain speaking with him, so that the Apostles might believe in the NT, because he was the One whom the OT was announcing"[3].

Then, Epiphanius exhorts the audience[4]: "let's not have any part, dearly beloved, with the incredulous Jews or with the pérfidos herejes"[5], but rather, one has to have *plena fides* here and now in Jesus, the *Filius Dei*, thereby strengthening the eschatological hope of the listeners[6].

---

1 R. Gryson, *Répertoire Général des Auteurs Ecclésiastiques Latins de l'Antiquité et du haut Moyen Âge,* tome I, Verlag Herder, Freiburg, 52007, 458.

2 "...ut confirmaret fidem eorum et ostenderet eis maiestatem suam" (EP-L h 29, PLS 3, col. 870-871).

3 "...semper adnuntiaverunt Christum venturum, apparuerunt in monte conloquentes ei, ut apostoli crederent novo testamento, quia ipse esset, quem vetus testamentum adnuntiabat" (ibid.).

4 Cfr. Mt 17,5.

5 "Nulla ergo nobis sit portio, dilectissimi, cum incredulis Iudaeis vel cum perfidis haereticis" (EP-L *h 29*, PLS 3, col. 870-871).

6 "...quem sancti apostoli praedicaverunt, ipsum iudicem expectamus" (EP-L *h 29*, PLS 3, col. 870-871).

EP-L h 47

Tres testes habemus de caelo et tres de terra,
patrem de caelis loquentem et Moyses et Elias cum eo confabulantes
et tres apostolos, qui omnia cognoverunt.
Septimus vero in medio eorum erat filius dei

After asking himself about the sense of the *post haec uerba*[7], going back to Lk 9,23[8], Epiphanius Latinus says that the *mortem non gustare* until one sees the *Regnum Dei*[9] is not the natural death[10]. Afterwards, Epiphanius gives four explanations of why Peter, James and John were chosen by Jesus to climb the mountain with him:

1ª. *The visual anticipation of the second coming of the Son of Man,* when Jesus "se les mostró en qué gloria ha de venir el Señor"[11];

2ª. *The manifestation of the glory of the Word Incarnate in the human flesh assumed by the Word,* that is to say, "what was hidden behind the flesh, that God was hidden in the man"[12];

3ª. *The Pater/paternitas–Filius/filiatio relationship* through the testimonium Patris: "the Father's voice from heaven bearing witness to his Son"[13].

---

7 Lc 9,28.

8 Epiphanius makes the Apostles the *exempla* of those who –having known to follow Jesus through the Cross– have deserved the reward alluded to in Lk 9,27.

9 Cfr. Lc 9,27.

10 "...sciamus omnes apostolos vel discipulos domini curso evangelico completo mortem omnes gustasse et in caelos esse eos, cum domino resurrecturi in gloria" (EP-L *h 47*, PLS 3, 919-921).

11 "...ostendit se eis, in qua gloria venturus est dominus" (EP-L *h 47*, PLS 3, 919-921).

12 "...quid intra carnem latebat, quia deus in homine erat absconsus" (ibid.).

13 "...uocem patris de caelis testimonium reddentem de filio suo" (ibid.).

4ª. *Jesus' divinity, an invitation to faith:* It's "so that through three fit witnesses, everybody might believe that he himself is the Son of God"[14].

Epiphanius insists that Jesus' Transfiguration serves against doctrinal errors:

1º. "Where are all the superfluous and useless heresies, or those too, whose *throat is an open sepulchre*[15], those who deny that Christ [is] God and confess [that he is] man or even dare to make themselves equal to the Son of God?"[16]

2º. The *sententia antiqua* prophesied through David[17] shall be fulfilled in those who deny Jesus' divinity. Epiphanius justifies the *sententia antiqua*: "...because they always err from the heart"[18], in the sense that "such a generation always has always harbored hatred"[19].

Epiphanius insists on the *particular importance* of the narrative of the Transfiguration-event against the heresies:

"Behold that in this chapter or for the holy Church, within which we stand firmly, founded on the rock of

[14] "...ut tribus idoneis testibus totus mundus crederet ipsum esse filium dei" (ibid.).

[15] Sal 6[5],9. In the Neovulgate, this passage is in Ps 5,10 ("*garganta es sepulcro abierto*": SagBi 3, 197).

[16] "Ubi sunt omnes superfluae et inanes haereses vel etiam illi, quorum *sepulchrum patens est guttur eorum*, qui Christum deum negant et hominem confitentur vel etiam audent se filio dei coaequare?" (EP-L *h 47*, PLS 3, 919-921).

[17] Regarding some Jews, Psalm 95(94),11: "Por ello juré en mi enojo: "No entrarán en mi descanso" (SagBi 3, 456).

[18] "Quia semper errant corde" (EP-L *h 47*, PLS 3, 919-921). Cfr. Sal 95(94),10.

[19] "...odio semper habuit generationem talem" (EP-L *h 47*, PLS 3, 919-921).

Christ, with the help of his grace, we overcome all the harmful heresies"[20].

This importance is explained by two *testimonia*: the *testimonium–conloquium* between the Law (Moses) and the Prophet (Isaiah) with Jesus[21]; and the *testimonium maius Patris*[22].

Epiphanius allegorically interprets the number *septem* (plenitude)[23] and *septimus* (Jesus, the Fullness)[24].

Epiphanius concludes h 47 by mentioning the trinitarian theophany in Jesus' Baptism, as *testimony of the Father and of the Holy Spirit –Testimonium testimoniorum– on Jesus' identity*[25].

---

[20] "Ecce hoc solo capitulo vel sanctae ecclesiae, in qua firmiter stamus fundati supra petram Christi, adiuvante gratia ipsius omnes ruinosas haereses superamus" (EP-L *h 47*, PLS 3, 919-921).

[21] Because "de ipso ante prophetaverant" (ibid.) and because the theme was "et excessum, id est passionem, quam conpleturus erat Hierosolymam" (ibid.). Cfr. Lc 9,31.

[22] "...habemus ipsum deum testem de caelo loquentem, qui solus sufficit nobis ad omnes haereses evertendas" (EP-L *h 47*, PLS 3, 919-921).

[23] That the witnesses are seven means that the minimum number of witnesses required by the Law (cfr. Dt 19,15; Mt 18,16) is not only followed, but surpassed. I think that Epiphanius especially thinks of the Jews, for whom his reference to the prescription of Dt 19,15 must've served as an indication to them that Jesus is God and that they were in error when they denied Jesus' divinity. Epiphanius tries to convince the heretics of their error, before the παρουσια arrives: "Erubescant tandem ad haec omnia confusae haereses ante diem iudicii. Omnis eorum perfidia cordis et ruinosa eorum subvertatur expectantibus nobis mala constructa fabrica" (EP-L h 47, PLS 3, 919-921).

[24] "Septimus vero in medio eorum erat filius dei" (ibid.). Jesus' divine filiation is witnessed to three times: by the Son of God himself, by the witnessed from the heavens, by the witnesses from the earth: Peter, James and John.

[25] "Similiter quando ad baptismum venit dominus, vox patris intonuit hunc esse unicum filium ipsumque dilectum audiente praecursore suo Iohanne baptista et vidente spiritu(m) sanctu(m) in specie columbae de caelo descendentem et manentem super eum, quod nobis ad catholicam fidem et ad trinitatis baptismum sufficiat in aeternum. Habemus ergo patrem de caelis loquentem, habemus et filium dei stantem in aqua, habemus et spiritum sanctum descendentem in specie columbae et manentem in eum" (ibid.).

Principal affirmations

EP-L *h 29* sees the Transfiguration as an invitation to faith and to the divine glory. The Law and the Prophets always have announced Jesus, with whom Moses and Elijah are on the mountain.

EP-L *h 47* says that Jesus brought along with him three Apostles to climb the mountain where he would transfigure himself, in order that they may see beforehand the Son of Man in his Kingdom, with the glory of the Word manifes in the human flesh assumed by him, and to teach them the Father-Son relationship, with the consequent confirmation of the Son's natural divine filiation, and divinity. The witnesses, with the transfigured Jesus, are seven, and Epiphanius sees in this number the fullness.

Moreover, the Son's divinity is testified to thrice: by the Son, by the three Apostles –with Moses and Elijah–, and by the Father. Epiphanius gives much importance to the Transfiguration narrative against the heresies, by the double testimony: the testimony–colloquy OT–NT, and the greater testimony of the Father.

26. Eusebius 'Gallicanus'

The so-called **Eusebius 'Gallicanus'** (end of the 5th c. - beginning of the 6th c.)[1] mentions that the *Filius hominis*[2] entered the see of death[3], and "there he untied through death the chains tied by death, and from where anyone –alone– would hardly be able to ever return, from there he returned with the loot upward"[4]. "Therefore, the Lord returning after the third day, he returned bringing along with him the fruit of the three-day pilgrimage to the living"[5]. In summary, the Son of Man, whom Jesus foretold to be coming in his Kingdom, went down to the kingdom of death, and freed those who were there.

---

1 Here, "Eusebius" refers to, more than to a historical man, to the compilation of homilies, and in particular, to the "Latin translation of a Greek collection of homilies, dating from the end of the fifth or from the sixth century (J. Leroy – F. Glorie, 46-47)" [cfr. C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1314]. This collection has been called "Eusebius" because "in the original collection, Caesarius of Arles borrowed his sermons *de pascha* mainly from expositions transmitted under that name (F. Glorie, CChr.SL 101, XXI)" (cfr. ibid.).

2 Cfr. Mt 16,28.

3 That is to say, "imas atque abditas tartari sedes" (EUS-G *h 7*, 2, CChr.SL 101, 1970, 214).

4 "...ibi uincula mortuorum ligata morte laxauit, et, unde difficile ullus umquam uel solus redierat, inde ille cum spoliis ad superna remeauit" (ibid.).

5 "Regrediens ergo Dominus post diem tertium, fructus secum triduanae peregrinationis uiuentibus reportauit" (ibid.).

27. Caesarius Arelatensis

Caesarius Arelatensis[1] (469/470–542[2]) "made it his custom to interpret Scripture in an unpretentious style"[3], thus popularizing the Christian values for his flock. However, "...It was an essential part of his pedagogy as a biblical commentator to let his congregation hear the voices of the 'Fathers' from the pulpit. Thus in a time of severely reducd literacy, his congregation at Arles benefited from Caesarius's own 'patristic' culture, which he drew upon with the sole purpose of commenting on scripture"[4].

CAE s 9

Caesar of Arles describes the words "God" and "Father"[5], and passes on to the theme of the Son's consubstantiality with the

---

1 "...after a short-lived eremitic experiment at Lérins, (…) settled in Arles where he became a priest, then the abbot of a monastic community. Consecrated bishop of Arles shortly before Christmas 502, he managed, under the Gothic rulers, to maintain close relations with the bishops of Rome, in particular Pope Symmachus. His pastoral activity embodied the reforming ideals of Lérins, while his theology was strictly Augustinian" [C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1310]. Caesar of Arles' oratory "communicated a vision of society based on a christianized Stoicism inherited from Chrysostom and other patristic authorities" (ibid.).

2 Ibid.

3 Ibid. Kannengiesser quotes Klingshirn when describing Caesar's method as "'ordinary, everyday, rustic speech' (*sermo* 1,20; 86,1; 114,2) to the 'elegant and luxuriant worldly eloquence' (*sermo* 1,20) that bishops like Sidonius and Avitus employed becaused he believed that it could be understood by the whole congregation whereas the latter could be appreciated by only a few cultivated persons (*sermo* 1,20)' (Klingshirn, 148)" (ibid.).

4 C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1311. Kannengiesser echoes the warning given by Delage in 1971, that is, "a *caveat* still accurate since 1971: 'The working method of Caesarius, his way of choosing and integrating his borrowings deserved a more extensive study' (Delage, [Caesarius's] Patristic Sources and Biblical Quotations, in "Sermons au Peuple", SC 175, 110)" [cfr. Id., cit., 1312].

5 "Deum cum audis, substantiam intellege, sine initio, sine fine. Patrem cum audis, Filii intellege Patrem" (CAE *s 9*, 48, CChr.SL 103, 1953, 48).

Father[6], recalling that it is on the terrain of mystery, when one speaks of the *Genitor* and of the Genitus[7]. Caesar of Arles corroborates his description of the mystery with the Father's testimony in Jesus' Transfiguration:

> "The Father answered from heaven saying: *This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased: listen to him*[8]. The Father says that he [Jesus] is his very Son, and he ordered [us] to listen to him: who denies that what the Truth tells is true?"[9].

CAE s 115

Caesar of Arles says that Moses "[is] not only an [arche]type of Christ, but it's also understood that he possesses the figure of the Law"[10]. In fact, "on the mountain, where the Lord transfigured himself, Moses and Elijah were speaking with him, and the Law and the Prophecy were meant in both of them"[11].

---

[6] "Hoc ergo ipso nomine, quod Deus Pater appellatur, cum Patre pariter subsistere etiam Filius demonstratur" (ibid.).

[7] "Quomodo sane Deus Pater genuerit Filium, nolo discutias. Quomodo sane Deus Pater genuerit Filium, nolo discutias. Credendus est ergo Deus esse Pater unici Filii sui Domini nostri, non discutiendus: neque enim fas est seruo de natalibus Domini disputare" (ibid.).

[8] Mt 17,5.

[9] "Contestatus est Pater de caelis dicens: *Hic est Filius meus dilectus, in quo mihi bene complacuit: ipsum audite.* Pater ipsum esse dicit Filium suum, et ipsum audire iubet: quis est qui neget esse uerum, quod Veritas dicit? (CAE *s* 9, 48, CChr.SL 103, 1953, 48).

[10] "...non solum typum Christi, sed etiam figuram legis intellegitur habuisse" (CAE *s* 115, 1, CChr.SL 103, 1953, 478).

[11] "...in monte, ubi Dominus transfiguratus est, Moyses et Helias loquebantur cum eo, et in illis duobus lex et prophetia significatae sunt" (ibid.).

Principal affirmations

CAE *s 9* speaks of the Father-Son consubstantiality, leaning on the message of the the Transfiguration.

CAE *s 115* affirms that Moses is the [pre]figuration of the Law, not only is he the type of Christ.

28. Primasius episcopus Hadrumetini

Primasius[1] (+550-560[2]), in PRIM *Ap, V,* says that Jesus Christ is "to whom all Lay and prophecy serve with fervor"[3]. In fact,

> "on the mountain, showing himself between Moses and Elijah, his face shone with the luminosity of his clothing, and declared that he truly possessed the testimony of the Law and of the Prophets"[4].

Primasius thereby affirms that Jesus Christ is to whom the Law and the Prophets serve and bear witness to.

---

1 "Bishop of Hadrumentum (modern Sousse in Tunisia) in the fertile Province of Byzcena in the mid-sixth century. Primasius wrote a commentary on the Apocalypse, which borrowed from the lost Commentary of Tyconius and was influenced by Augustine" [C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1325].

2 Ibid.

3 "...cui omnis lex et prophetia deseruit" (PRIM *Ap*, V, xix, 10, CChr.SL 92, 1985, 263).

4 "...in monte se manifestans inter Moysen et Heliam, uultus uestisque suae claritate resplenduit, seque testimonium a Lege et Prophetis habere ueraciter declarauit" (ibid.).

29. Verecundus Iuncensis

VER cant-Mn

The parts of the Commentary of **Verecundus Iuncensis**[1] (+552[2]) *super cantica* that mentions the Transfiguration are the prayer of Manasses and the canticle of Deborah (Jc 5)[3]. His style combines the literal and the allegorical senses[4].

The VER *cant-Mn VIII* interprets the OrMan 1,7[5] as the supplication of one who knew how to address the *Deus altissimus*, whose description in the OrMan Verecundus of Junca corroborates with other *loci* in Scripture[6], including the pericope of the Transfiguration–event of Jesus: "But also the Lord, transfigured on

---

1 He was Bishop "in the African Province of Byzcena (the southern part of modern Tunisia)" [C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1316].

2 Ibid

3 The parts of the VER *cant* are: "the Canticle of Moses in Exodus 11; his farewell Canticle, Deuteronomy 33; the Lamentation of Jeremiah over the destruction of Jerusalem, Lamentations 5; the Canticle of Habakkuk, Habakkuk 3; the prayer of Manasseh; the prayer of Jonah from the belly of the whale, Jonah 3; the song of Deborah, Judges 5" (ibid.).

4 "The pervasive allegorism in the work of Verecundus does not exclude a full recognition of the literal sense. He is mainly concerned to find useful applications for the spiritual progress of his readers" (ibid.).

5 *"Porque Tú eres el Señor, el Altísimo sobre toda la tierra* [Sal 97(96),9; SagBi 3, 460], *lento a la ira y rico en misericordia* [Sal 102(102),8; SagBi 3, 474], *y te arrepientas de las maldades de los hombres"* ["For thou art the Lord Most High, of great compassion, long-suffering and abundant in mercy, and repentest thee for the evils of men" (The Prayer of Manasses, 1, 7, in R. Charles, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English,* Vol. I, Apocrypha, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1965, 621)].

6 Is 57,15: *"Esto dice el Señor Altísimo y Sublime, el que habita eternamente"* (cfr. SB 4, 267, except for the word Señor); Ex 16,10: "[Y] he aquí que la gloria del Señor se manifestó en la nube" (SagBi 1, 352); Sal 97(96),9: *"Porque Tú eres el Señor, el Altísimo sobre toda la tierra"* (SagBi 3, 460); 1 Tm 6,16: *"El que habita en una luz inaccesible"* (SagBi 5, 1267); Dn 7,9: *"Un anciano en días se sentó. Su vestido era blanco como nieve, el cabello de su cabeza como lana pura"* (SagBi 4, 908).

the mountain, appeared in the glory of the sun: *His face,* it says, *shone like the sun*[7], *shining in its power*"[8].

It's interesting to see –and I focus on this aspect[9]– the interpretation Verecundus makes of the first part of the quote from the OrMan, since Verecundus of Junca makes obvious that he doesn't refer to the altitude of the sky, or to its distance from the earth[10]. Here, Verecundus presents his Christological reading on the quote from the OrMan:

> "Therefore, what did he mean in the glory on high that is common to the creatures? Unless we pay attention to the mystery of Christ, he who preached marvelously, that when he incarnated – because t*he Word became flesh and dwelt among us*[11],– he was made the highest above all flesh, which is called with the name 'earth'"[12].

The mystery of Christ's Incarnation[13] fulfills the OrMan, and the glorious aspect of the *human* body –the glory on high common to the creatures[14]– of the Word incarnate is made obvious in Jesus' Transfiguration.

---

7 Cfr. Mt 17,2.

8 "Sed et Dominus transfiguratus in monte, in solis apparuit claritatem: *Facta est,* inquit, *facies eius sicut sol, fulgens in uirtute sua"* (VER *cant-Mn,* VIII, CChr.SL 93, 1976, 153).

9 I'm not going to deal with the exegesis Verecundus makes of other parts of the quotation from Manasses' prayer. Such can be done in other, latter works.

10 "Nihil ergo mirum est in laudibus Dei quod dictum est: *Tu es Dominus altissimus super omnem terram*, quasi caelum uel angelus non sit altissimus super terram" (VER *cant-Mn,* VIII, CChr.SL 93, 1976, 153).

11 Jn 1,14: *"el Verbo se hizo carne, y habitó entre nosotros"* (SagBi 5, 572).

12 "Quid ergo uoluit in excellenti gloria dicere quod commune sit creaturis? Nisi illud mirabiliter intendimus mysterio Christi praedictum, quod cum fuisset caro, quia *Verbum factum est et habitauit in nobis*, altissimus factus est super omnem carnem, quae terrae nomine nuncupatur" (VER *cant-Mn,* VIII, CChr.SL 93, 1976, 153).

13 Cfr. Jn 1,14.

14 Cfr. VER *cant-Mn* VIII.

VER cant-Db

Verecundus interprets Jc 5,4-5[15], and in particular, the reference to the mountains agitated before the face of the Lord, in the light of the Transfiguration, and afterwards, Verecundus explains that

> "leaving aside the lesson of the history, we have to consider things beyond the sacrament – of which spoke Moses and Elijah with the Lord, and in which is shown that the Gospel, the Law and the Prophesies coincide"[16].

Thus, Verecundus denominates Jesus' Transfiguration as a mystery (*sacramentum*), where the *ostensio* of the *conloquium* of the personification of the Law and of the Prophets with the Gospel – who is Jesus –, takes place.

Principal affirmations

For Verecundus, the Incarnation of the Word is the fulfillment of the prayer of Manasses, and the glory of the human body shines in the Transfiguration. Moreover, Verecundus sees the Transfiguration as mystery, that makes obvious the conversation of the Law and the Prophets, both in person, with Jesus.

[15] "Señor, cuando salías de Seír, cuando venías de los campos de Edom, se estremecía la tierra y los cielos destilaban, los nubarrones descargaban aguaceros; los montes se derretían delante el Señor, el Sinaí temblaba delante del Señor, Dios de Israel" (Jc 5,4-5; SagBi 4, 156).

[16] "Relinquentes historicam lectionem altiora nobis sunt sacramenti oculo contuenda, in quibus Moyses et Helias in monte cum Domino loquebantur, et Euangelio, Legi ac Prophetiae ostenditur conuenire" (VER *cant-Db*, V, CChr.SL 93, 1976, 176).

30. Flauius Magnus Aurelius Cassiodorus

For **Flauius Magnus Aurelius Cassiodorus**[1] (485/490 – ±580[2]) "the whole message of the Psalter was Messianic"[3]. In the CAr *Ps*[4], Cassiodorus interprets the *Dominus regnauit*[5] Christologically, "because the eternal King made himself known to humankind

---

1 "...born of high nobility from a family of Syrian ancestry, his father being a *praefectus praetorio*, (...) Cassiodorus was nominated *quaester sacri palatii* by the Ostrogothic King Theodoric the Great (474–526) as early as 506–507. (...) In 533 he became *praefectus praetorio* under the ruling of Athalaric; but in 537 the Byzantine takeover by Justinian and his commander-in-chief Belisarius brought him back to private life. He left Ravenna at the latest in 540. (...) In modern Calabria, next to his birthplace in Scyllaceum, today's Squillace, he founded a double monastery in a place called Vivarium Castellum, to which he added a well furnished library, all costs being covered by his private funds. (...) Most probably unmarried, he devoted his ascetical idealism to the preservation of the cultural heritage of the church" [C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1327].

2 Ibid.

3 Ibid. "Soon after his return to private life in 537, when still in Ravenna, Cassiodorus had started to write an *Expositio Psalmorum*, or *Commenta Psalterii*, on which he continued working for a full decade. Using Augustine's *Enarrationes* as a main source, and basing it on his own rhetorical and stylistic ideas, Cassiodorus commented on the Psalms line by line in stressing their literary form" (ibid.).

4 "The *Expositio Psalmorum* is properly a single commentary (…), addressed to Pope Virgilius (537–555). According to Cassiodorus, there are seventeen basic notions (...) to keep in mind when reading the Psalms" [C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1328-1330]. The basic notions are: "1) Prophecy, 2) Davidic Psalms, 3) In finem, 4) Psalter, 5) Psalm, 6) Canticum, 7) Psalmocanticum, 8) Canticum psalmus, 9) Five Books, 10) Titles of Psalms Interpreted, 11) Diapsalma, 12) The unity of the Book of Psalms, 13) Christology of Psalms, 14) Steps in interpretation, 15) Scripture's diction *(De eloquentia totius legis divinae)*, 16) The diction proper to the Psalter, 17) *Laus Ecclesiae*" (ibid.). Moreover, "the style and the disposition of Cassiodorus's text remain unchanged from beginning to end of what became the unique Commentary on all the psalms, handed down in its integrity from Late Antiquity" [Id., cit., 1330].

5 *"Exposición del Salmo. El Señor reina. Vestido está de majestad"* [Sal 93(92),1; SagBi 3, 450).

through the manifestation of the holy incarnation"[6]. Then, he interprets the *decorem induit* as the *ostensio* of the *pulchritudo maiestatis Dei* in Jesus' Transfiguration, "when he transfigured himself on mount Thabor in the presence of his disciples: and *his face shone like the sun, and his garments became white*[7] *[as snow]*, so much so, that no fuller on earth can leave [clothing like that]"[8].

Cassiodorus places Sal 139(138),1-2[9] on the lips of Jesus, who says that the Father

> "...*knew* him, that is to say, showed him, when he said: *This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased: listen to him*[10]"[11].

So, Cassiodorus interprets *the Lord reigns*[12] as the manifestation of the Incarnation, the majesty of which is seen in the Transfiguration.

---

6 "...quia humano generi Rex aeternus manifestatione sanctae incarnationis innotuit" (CAr *Ps*, 92, 1, expositio Psalmi, CChr.SL 98, 1958, 843).

7 Mc 9,2-3.

8 "...quando transfiguratus est in monte Thabor coram discipulis suis: *et resplenduit facies eius ut sol, uestimenta autem eius facta sunt alba sicut nix,* qualia fullo non potest facere super terram (CAr Ps, 92, 1, expositio Psalmi, CChr.SL 98, 1958, 843).

9 *"Señor, Tú me pruebas y me conoces. Tú sabes cuándo me siento y me levanto"* (cfr. SagBi 3, 576). The word pruebas, which the Neovulgate expresses as escrutatus es, reads, in SagBi, examinas (ibid.).

10 Mt 17,5.

11 "*Cognouit* eum, id est ostendit, quando dixit: *Hic est Filius meus dilectus, in quo mihi complacui: ipsum audite"* (CAr *Ps*, 92, 1, expositio Psalmi, CChr.SL 98, 1958, 843).

12 Sal 93(92),1.

31. Gregorius Magnus

Gregorius Magnus[1] (±540 – 604[2]), according to Kessler, SJ, "was not a systematic theologian. His aim was the interpretation of the Bible in the sight of a committed Christian life"[3]. Moreover, "despite the undeniably great influence of Augustine's thought on his writings, Gregory modifies the exegetical practice of Late Antiquity by going back to the Origenist tradition"[4], since "Origen's triad of a fleshly, moral, and spiritual understanding of scripture is transformed in Gregory into an explanation which is literal-historical, allegorical-typological, and finally, moral-contemplative"[5]. Even still, "though familiar with the Augustinian legacy, Gregory ignored its analytical and systematic stance"[6]. Thus, "the first pope from a monastic background became the founder of a new and independent Bible-theology on the eve of the Middle Ages. By his exegetical work Gregory developed an independent

---

1 "...le premier pape exégète de l'histoire" [Margerie, *Introduction á l'histoire de l'exégèse* vol. 4: L'occident latin de Léon le Grand à Bernard de Clairvaux, Paris: Cerf, 1990, 142; cfr. S. Kessler, sj, *Gregory the Great*, en C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1339]. Kannengiesser thinks that, "...as distinguished from the times of his inspiring models [Origen, Augustine, Cassiodorus] for expounding the Holy Scriptures Gregory's world had definitly [sic] changed. At the end of the 6th century it had become a Christian world: Gregory could take Christianity for granted. (...) Therefore his culture was essentially a biblical culture and interpreting the scriptures of the Bible by commentaries and homilies meant for Gregory to address an audience already well established in the Christian faith. (...) [H]ow to live the perfect Christian life was Gregory's central preoccupation in all his exegetical writings" [S. Kessler, sj, *Gregory the Great*, in C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1336].

2 Ibid.

3 Ibid.

4 V. Recchia, "La memoria di Agostino nella esegesi biblica di Gregorio Magno", Aug 25 (1985) 405-434; Kessler, *Gregor der Große als Exeget* (1995): 175-190", (S. Kessler, sj, *Gregory the Great*, in C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1337).

5 Id., cit., 1354.

6 Ibid.

theological and most of all pastoral access to the world of the Bible"[7].

In his *exegesis*, Gregory follows the pair *littera–allegoria*[8], and goes from the *allegoria* to the *moral action*[9]: the triple exegesis of the senses: 1) literal (or historical), 2) allegorical (or spiritual) which can be 3) typical, or moral, or mystical[10], with the primacy of the literal or historical sense, especially in the *Moralia*[11]. However, " Gregory considers it as the first requirement of an exegete to communicate to them [the listeners] the *rectus loquendi ordo*. Therefore the interpreter has the licence and the power to modify the *ordo expositionis*"[12] of the Scripture, which for Gregory, enjoys unity[13].

---

[7] S. Kessler, sj, *Gregory the Great,* in C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1337.

[8] Cfr. 2 Co 3,6.

[9] Cfr. S. Kessler, sj, *Gregory the Great*, in C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1351s.

[10] Cfr. ibid.

[11] Cfr. ibid. However, on the practical level it's another thing: an example is that, "...despite his emphasis on the literal understanding as basis in his exegesis Gregory normally passes rather quickly over the literal-historical sense and goes immediately to the allegorical and mystical interpretation. Exegesis for Gregory in practice turns out to be merely twofold, despite his strong emphasis of three senses" [S. Kessler, sj, *Gregory the Grea*t, in C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1352]. Because "...allegorical interpretation of the biblical texts for Gregory becomes a synonym for spiritual exegesis under a dual aspect: biblical respectively christological typology and moral tropology for the active and contemplative life. It is impossible to discern these two stages of Gregory's spiritual interpretation. In his sight they melt into the one spiritual sense that should lead towards the morality of a Christian life and the heights of contemplation. Allegory in the view of Gregory as a pastorally minded churchman implicitly means a moral interpretation aiming at the practice of faith" (ibid.).

[12] S. Kessler, sj, *Gregory the Great*, in C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1353.

[13] "In the view of Gregory there is an inseparable unity between the two Testaments of the Bible" [Id., cit., 1356].

GR-M Jb

In the GR-M *Jb*, the *vox Patris*[14] is interpreted as a correction (*reprehensio*) by the Law "because even without having been fortified by the perfection of the mind, grasped by the clarity of the truth, [Peter] makes an effort on earth to pitch a tent[15]"[16]. Having been present at the Transfiguration helps Peter at the time of repenting from having denied knowing Jesus before the maid, in order that, "sobbing and loving, he might go to him whom he had seen[17]"[18].

GR-M Rg

Kessler, sj tells that "the last exegetical work after long discussions handed down under the name of Gregory is a commentary on 16 chapters of I Samuel under the traditional LXX title On I Kings (*in Primum Regum*). Recent research led to the assumption that this work by internal and external reasons seems to be Pseudo-Gregorian[19] (...). Yet, it seems that authentic material from Gregory was used because there are unmistakably authentic Gregorian traits[20]"[21].

---

[14] Cfr. Mt 17,5.

[15] Cfr. Mt 17,4.

[16] "...quia necdum mentis perfectione roboratus, ueritatis claritate cognita, in terra figere tabernaculum conatur" (GR-M *Jb*, VIII, liv, 92, CChr.SL 143, 1979, 454).

[17] Cfr. Mt 17,2-4.

[18] "...ad illud flendo et amando recurret quod uidisset" (GR-M *Jb*, XXIV, xi, 29, CChr.SL 143B, 1985, 1208).

[19] A. De Vogüé, "L'auteur du Commentaire des Rois attribué à Grégoire: un moine de Cava?", Rben 106 (1996), 319-331; Idem (ed.), Grégoir le Grand – (Pierre de Cava), *Commentaire sur le Premier Livre des Rois* (SC 432), Paris: Cerf, 1998, 9f. (cfr. Kessler,sj).

[20] Clark, F, "Authorship of the commentary 'In 1 Regum': Implications of A. de Vogüé's discovery", RBen 108 (1998), 69f.; cfr. review article of A. de Vogüé's edition of In I Rg (SC 432): S. C. Kessler, ZKG 111 (2000): 252-54 (cfr. Kessler,sj; vid. infra).

[21] S. Kessler, sj, Gregory the Great, in C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1346-1347.

Gregory compares the representatives of the Law and of the Prophets to the wooden jambs of the Temple[22]: "the poses of the Temple portico are the Law and the Prophecy. Hence, on the mountain too, the Lord appeared transfigured amidst Moses and Elijah; in order for the splendor of his divinity to be seen"[23]. Moreover, inviting to the *intellegentia Scripturarum* from the consideration of the personificationes of the said wooden jambs, Gregory teaches that "one must seek their mysteries not in the letter that kills, but in the spiritual meaning of the Law and of the Prophet"[24].

If in the GR-M *Jb*, Peter receives a *reprehensio* during Jesus' Transfiguration-event, in the GR-M *Rg*, Gregory delves into the root of Peter's proposal[25]:

> "[Peter] admits, by the favor of God almighty, that he takes part in this sublime event, [he] ineffably loves the incomparable good [found therein] makes him consider [as] ugly the other things that go by"[26].

In fact, the *verba Petri*[27] lets one glimpse at the Apostle's *care (afecto)* towards Jesus: "Peter insinuates caring well [to us] when he was before the Lord transformed on the mountain[28]"[29], in the sense that, "had he been able to, he would never want to get his eyes off

---

[22] *"De igual modo, hizo para la entrada al Santuario jambas de madera de olivo con cuatro molduras"* (1 R 6,33; SagBi 2, 523).

[23] "Postes autem templi sunt Lex et Prophetia. Vnde et in monte Dominus in medio Moysi et Heliae transfiguratus apparuit: quia tunc diuinitatis eius splendor adspicitur" (GR-M *Rg*, I, 23, CChr.SL 144, 1963, 67).

[24] "...cum non in occidente littera sed in spiritali Legis et Prophetiae significatione eius sacramenta requiruntur" (Id., cit., 67-68).

[25] Cfr. Mt 17,4.

[26] "Nam, quia iam Dei omnipotentis munere meretur interesse sublimibus, inconparabile illic bonum ineffabiliter diligit, ex cuius pulchritudine cuncta, quae transeunt, uelut foeda reprehendit" (GR-M *Rg*, I, 65, CChr.SL 144, 1963, 91).

[27] Cfr. Mt 17,4.

[28] Cfr. ibid.

[29] "Quem profecto affectum bene Petrus insinuat, qui, cum transformato Domino in monte adsisteret" (GR-M *Rg*, II, 139, CChr.SL 144, 1963, 193).

that vision of so much glory"[30].

Gregory sees the prostration of Peter, James and John as a caution to keep on being humble,

> "lest they be dragged [by pride], wasting what they merited to see with humility [upon having been] taken [by Jesus] with him [to the mountain]"[31].

Gregory thinks that the testimony of the Father[32] shows the power of the Son's love towards the Father, and shows the superiority of the quality of the Son's works, as compared to the wonders done by Moses and Elijah:

> "there's no one [so] strong as the Lord, because any prodigious thing Moses could show [is, truly,] the Lord, not [Moses] himself [who] did them. But, with Jesus, all things that he marvelously did, he presented [them] by his own power"[33].

Moreover, the *vox Patris* bears witness to how Jesus "introduced the Father [as] witness to his divinity"[34].

From the consideration that "Peter is brought to the mountain, so he may deserve to see the glory of the Redeemer transformed.

---

[30] "...si posset, ab illa uisione tantae gloriae numquam deponi uoluisset" (ibid.). This loving care (*cariño*) is seen in Peter's readiness, as well as in Samuel's attitude: *"Habla, Señor, que tu siervo escucha"* (1 S 3,9; SagBi 2, 273).

[31] "...ne elati perderent, quod humiliter adsumpti uidere meruissent" (GR-M *Rg*, I, 68, CChr.SL 144, 1963, 93).

[32] Cfr. Mt 17,5.

[33] "Non est ergo fortis, ut Dominus; quia, quidquid uirtutis Moyses ostendere potuit, Dominus, non ipse, fecit; Iesus autem omnia, quae mire gessit, propria uirtute exhibuit" (GR-M *Rg*, I, 93, CChr.SL 144, 1963, 109).

[34] "Patrem suae diuinitatis testem produxit" (GR-M *Rg*, V, 145, CChr.SL 144, 1963, 508).

Since on that mountain climb, the mind's sublime preparation is explained"[35], Gregory draws out a lesson in ascesis:

> "he who doesn't replenish the spirit through the meditation on sublime things won't be able to see the things on high"[36].

Gregory relates the calling of Samuel[37] to the Father's call on the witnesses –especially Peter– on Jesus' Transfiguration: "The Apostle Peter, too –not only the prophet, but also the great patriarch– saw the brilliant, ineffable light from above, the cloud that covers, the Father who speaks: *This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased* (Mt 17,5[38])"[39].

Gregory compares the pronouns referring to David (*ipse*) and to Jesus (*hic*): "There, it says: He is; here, it says: *This is my beloved Son.* There, because it was being shown in figure, as if one were to distinguish that something was amiss, while it says: He is[40]; but here, since his glory had already been revealed, it's distinguished with more presence, because it says: *This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased*"[41]. Therefore, the latter (*this*) has to be anointed,

---

[35] "Petrus in monte adsumitur, ut gloriam transformati Redemptoris uidere mereatur. In illo enim ascensu montis sublimis praeparatio mentis exprimitur" (GR-M *Rg*, IV, 121, CChr.SL 144, 1963, 357).

[36] "...alta uidere non poterit, qui per intentionem in sublimibus animum non reponit" (ibid.).

[37] *"Levántate y úngelo. Él es"* (1 S 16,12; SagBi 2, 321). It refers to the choise and unction of David, son of Jesse.

[38] SagBi 5, 161.

[39] "Petrus quoque Apostolus non solum propheta, sed etiam summus patriarcha uidit inenarrabilem lucem fusam desuper, nubem obumbrantem, clamantem Patrem: *Hic est Filius meus dilectus, in quo mihi complacui"* (Gregorius Magnus, *Exp. I Reg.,* VI, 113, CCL 144, 1963, 612).

[40] 1 S 16,12 (SagBi 2, 321).

[41] Mt 17,5.

has to be praised and helped"[42], drawing from there the question as to who shall be worthy, or at least capable, of praising the Son. Meanwhile, Gregory recalls that no one could say wholeheartedly "Lord Jesus" if the Paraclete doesn't inspire him[43].

Of course, Peter isn't worthy to praise the Son: "since Peter hadn't yet received that fullness of the Spirit, he wasn't able to preach about Jesus as if [Peter were] a boy"[44], in the sense that he was still immature in the faith, when he hadn't yet received the divine Spirit. A proof of Peter's indignity, at that moment, was when he prostrated:

> "...that [Peter] was seeing and that, seeing, he fell, means that he couldn't pay attention to that which he deserved to see"[45].

Hence, too, the *mandatum tacendi*[46] till the descent of the Holy Spirit[47] when the Apostles shall have received the gift (and the gifts) of the Holy Spirit, which will equip them to be mature in the faith.

---

[42] "Ibi dicitur: *Ipse est enim*; hic dicitur: *Hic est Filius meus dilectus*. Ibi, quia in typis ostendebatur, quasi absentior cernitur, dum dicitur: *Ipse est*; hic autem, quia iam reuelata claritas eius erat, praesentior cernitur, quia dicit: *Hic est Filius meus dilectus, in quo mihi conplacui.* Hic ergo ungendus est, hic laudandus et perpetuis fauoribus demulcendus" (Gregorius Magnus, *Exp. I Reg.,* VI, 113, CCL 144, 1963, 612-613).

[43] Cfr. 1 Co 12,3.

[44] "Quia ergo Petrus illam plenitudinem Spiritus nondum acceperat, praedicare Iesum quasi paruulus non ualebat" (Gregorius Magnus, *Exp. I Reg.,* VI, 113, CCL 144, 1963, 613).

[45] "Videbat et, quia uidendo cadebat, significat, quod ad id non poterat adtingere, quod merebatur uidere" (ibid.). What does Peter deserve to see? It's precisely the centrality of listening and teaching of Jesus, the Son of God (cfr. Mt 17,5), insinuates Gregory.

[46] Cfr. Mt 17,9.

[47] Cfr. Gregorius Magnus, *Exp. I Reg.*, VI, 113, CCL 144, 1963, 613.

Principal affirmations

In the GR-M *Jb*, the paternal voice in Jesus' Transfiguration is understood as a correction to Peter, who shall be helped –Gregory thinks– by the memory of Jesus' Transfiguration-event when he repents from having denied knowing Jesus thrice.

In the GR-M *Rg*, it is thought that Moses and Elijah are like the two jambs of the Temple[48], interpreted spiritually. Peter shows care towards Jesus transfigured, and so he didn't want to go down the mountain, although by having fallen to the ground, Peter showed immaturity of faith, since he wasn't able to pay attention to what was important: the Son. The prostration of the three Apostles during Jesus' Transfiguration recalles the need for humility. The Father's message in Jesus' Transfiguration (who almost points with his fingers his message about his most beloved Son) reveals the Son's great love for the Father. The climb itself to the mountain of Transfiguration is like how the soul has to seek what is sublime, in order to find the Redeemer transfigured.

[48] Cfr. 1 R 6,33.

32. Iulianus Toletanae sedis Episcopus

In the *aet II*, **Iulianus Toletanae** (644 – 6 March 690[1]) mentions the Father's testimony in Jesus' Transfiguration:

> "Therefore, oh Judah, if you don't want to believe Christ through [the witness of] the angels, believe the demons[2], believe the heavens who announce [him], the opened sepulchres[3], those who –among the dead– come to life[4]. Since the angel taught that he was the Son of God[5] and the star showed[6] and went before the adoration by the Magi[7] and a voice from the cloud, loudly, made [it] obvious[8] and the dove showed[9] and John recognized [it][10]"[11].

In short, Julian mentions the Father's testimony about the Son in the Transfiguration.

---

1 J. Hillgarth (ed.), *Sancti Iuliani Toletanae sedis episcopi opera, pars I*, CChr. SL 115, 1976, viii.
2 Cfr. Mc 1,24; Lc 4,34.
3 Cfr. Jn 11,44-45.
4 Cfr. ibid.; cfr. Mc 5,41-42.
5 Cfr. Lc 1,31ss.
6 Cfr. Mt 2,2.
7 Cfr. Mt 2,11.
8 Cfr. Mt 3,17; 17,5.
9 Cfr. Mt 3,16.
10 Cfr. Jn 1,29.
11 "Si ergo non uis, O Iudeae, de Christo angelis credere, crede daemonibus, crede nuntiantibus coelis, patefactis sepulchris, resurgentibus mortuis. Filium enim eum Dei esse angelus docuit et stella ostendit et magorum adoratio prodidit et uox de nube intonans patefecit et columba monstrauit et Ioannes agnouit" (JUL-T *aet*, II, 4, CChr.SL 115, 1976, 182). Julian of Toledo considers that the *vox Patris* echoes Is 42,1: *"Mi elegido, en quien se complace mi alma"* (SagBi 4, 202).

33. Scottus Anonymus

Siue sanctificatus mons fuit in quo Dominus erat
(AN scot, 2 P 1, 17)

An anonymous author from Scotland (650 – 690[1]) glosses on the mountain[2]: "that is, the mountain had been made holy, where the Lord had been"[3] in the Transfiguration[4].

---

1 R. McNally, sj (ed.), *Scriptores Hiberniae Minores, pars I,* CChr.SL 108B, 1973, x.

2 *"Con él en el monte santo"* (2 P 1,18; SagBi 5, 1447). One sees the link with Jesus' Transfiguration when one considers 2 P 1,17: "En efecto, él fue honrado y glorificado por Dios Padre, cuando la suprema gloria le dirigió esta voz: 'Éste es mi Hijo, el Amado, en quien tengo mis complacencias'" (ibid.).

3 "...siue sanctificatus mons fuit in quo Dominus erat (AN scot 2 P, I, 17, CChr.SL 108B, 1973, 36).

4 Cfr. Mt 17,1-9.

34. Beda Venerabilis

BED Act

Cuius aeterna gloria diuinaque
quondam in monte tribus discipulis apparuit
(I, 11)

BED *Act* (around 709[1]) sees the *sic vidistis eum*[2] in the light of the Transfiguration of Jesus, "...whose eternal and divine glory one appeared to the three disciples on the mountain[3]"[4], since Jesus Christ, the Word *incarnate*, will always be the Word incarnate, once the Word becomes flesh: "...he who has to come to judge shall come in the same form of flesh and substance in which he had come"[5].

BED cath

Qui si hunc uersiculum sollertius adtenderent et hoc quod sequitur,
cum essemus cum ipso in monte sancto,
nequaquam de epistolae huius auctore dubitarent
(2 P, I,18)

BED cath (709-715[6]) sees that Peter's self-reference as a *communicator gloriae Christi*[7] refers to the Transfiguration-event,

---

1 C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1478.

2 *"Este mismo Jesús, que de entre vosotros ha sido elevado al cielo, vendrá de igual manera a como le habéis visto subir al cielo"* (Hch 1,11; SagBi 5, 720).

3 Cfr. Mt 17,2.

4 "Cuius aeterna gloria diuinaque quondam in monte tribus discipulis apparuit" (BED *Act*, I,11, CChr.SL 121, 1983, 9).

5 "...in eadem forma carnis et substantia ueniet iudicaturus in qua uenerat iudicandus" (ibid.).

6 C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1479.

7 *"A los presbíteros que hay entre vosotros, yo – presbítero como ellos y, además, testigo de los padecimientos de Cristo, y partícipe de la gloria que va a manifestarse"* (1 P 5,1; SagBi 5, 1433).

"when [Peter], with James and John, contemplated the celestial glory of his [Jesus'] face on the holy mountain"[8].

In order to defend the authenticity of the Petrine authorship, Bede glosses 2 P 1,18[9], where Peter looks back through the years, to the moment of Jesus' Transfiguration: "Some deny that this letter has been composed by the blessed Apostle Peter. Those who correctly paid attention to this verse and the one that follows, *we were with him on the holy mountain*[10], wouldn't in any way doubt the author of this letter. Well it's official along the faith of the Gospels that Peter himself, with James and John, Apostles like him, heard the aforementioned voice about the Lord on the mountain"[11].

Bede sees 1 Jn 1[12] in the light of the vision of the Apostles (of the three Apostles, from John's viewpoint): "not only did they see the Lord with bodily eyes, like the others; rather, they also have touched Him –whose divine power the spiritual eyes also distinguished– especially those who saw him glorified on the mountain, among whom was John himself"[13].

---

[8] "...cum in monte sancto gloriam uultus eius caelestem cum Iacobo et Iohanne conspexit" (BED *cath*, 1 P, V, 1, CChr.SL 121, 1983, 256).

[9] *"Y esta voz venida del cielo la oímos nosotros estando con él [nosotros] en el monte santo"* (SagBi 5, 1447). In the Neovulgate, instead of *allatam*, it reads: *prolatam* (ibid.).

[10] 2 P 1,18.

[11] "Quidam hanc epistolam negant a beato apostolo Petro esse conscriptam. Qui si hunc uersiculum sollertius adtenderent et hoc quod sequitur, *cum essemus cum ipso in monte sancto*, nequaquam de epistolae huius auctore dubitarent. Constat enim iuxta fidem Euangeliorum quia praefatam uocem super Dominum in monte clarificatum idem Petrus cum Iacobo et Iohanne coapostolis suis audiuit (BED *cath*, 2 P, I,18, CChr.SL 121, 1983, 266).

[12] *"Lo que hemos visto con nuestros ojos, lo que hemos contemplado y han palpado nuestras manos a propósito del Verbo de la vida"* (SagBi 5, 1466). The Neovulgate, instead of *temptauerunt*, reads: *contrectaverunt* (ibid.).

[13] "Non solum quippe corporalibus oculis sicut ceteri Dominum uiderunt, sed et perspexerunt illum cuius diuinam quoque uirtutem spiritalibus oculis cernebant, maxime illi qui eum in monte clarificatum uiderunt, e quibus unus erat ipse Iohannes" (BED *cath*, 1 Jn, I,1, CChr.SL 121, 1983, 284).

BED Apc

Totus autem hic filii hominis habitus etiam Ecclesiae conuenit (III)

BED Apc (710–716[14]) interprets the resplendent face[15] as an eschatological Christophany, with two readings: on the one hand, that the saints shall see Jesus Christ himself similar to the moment when he had transfigured himself; on the other hand, that the unrepentant sinners shall see him whom they crucified with their sin: "Just as the disciples on the mountain, so too after the judgment, the Lord shall appear to all the saints; since on judgment, the wicked *shall look on him whom they have pierced*[16]"[17].

Moreover, Bede compares the Church at the end of time with the resplendent habit of the transfigured Christ:

> "But all this habit of the Son of man also befits the Church, with which Christ himself made a nature, granting it with a priestly and judicial power, also in order that [the Chuch] may shine like the sun in the Kingdom of his Father"[18].

[14] C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1479.

[15] *"Y su rostro era como el sol cuando brilla en todo su esplendor"* (Ap 1,16; SagBi 5, 1527).

[16] Jn 19,37: *"mirarán al que traspasaron"* (SagBi 5, 693). The Neovulgate, instead of using *pupunxerunt*, uses *transfixerunt* (cfr. ibid.).

[17] "Qualis in monte discipulis, talis post iudicium Dominus omnibus sanctis apparebit; impii enim in iudicio *uidebunt in quem pupunxerunt"* (BED *Apc*, III, CChr.SL 121A, 2001, 247, 249).

[18] "Totus autem hic filii hominis habitus etiam Ecclesiae conuenit, cum qua una natura ipse factus est Christus, honorem illi sacerdotalem et iudiciariam tribuens potestatem, et ut fulgeat sicut sol in Regno Patris sui" (ibid.).

BED Sam

BED *Sam* (around 716[19]) interprets the *triplex vocatio Samuelis*[20] from Jesus Christ: Samuel's three calls, are two in Jesus' case –Jesus' first call when he wanted to stay in Jerusalem without notifying Mary and Joseph[21]. The second call was during Jesus' Baptism: this calling has the characteristics of the call during the Transfiguration, *mutatis mutandis*[22]. Bede wishes to underline the Word's pre-existence, when indicating that "he who had been sought, expected and wanted is present from the beginning"[23].

BED Gn

> Respicit Dominus ad Abel, dicens, Hic est filius meus dilectus
> (II, iv, 4)

BED Gn (720[24]) interprets the Lord's look of contentment towards Abel[25] from the NT, with the Father's words about the Son[26], although Bede doesn't say that Abel is Jesus[27]. But, God rejects Cain's offering[28].

---

[19] C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1479.

[20] 1 S 3,8: *"Y el Señor llegó y llamó de nuevo a Samuel por tercera vez"* (SagBi 2, 273).

[21] It is when Jesus said that *"es necesario que yo esté en las cosas de mi Padre"* (Lc 2,49; SagBi 5, 395).

[22] Cfr. Mt 3,17; cfr. Mt 17,5.

[23] "...qui diu quaesitus expectatus et desideratus fuerit indicat" (BED *Sam*, iii, 8, CChr.SL 119, 1962, 3).

[24] C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1479.

[25] *"[M]iró complacido"* (Gn 4,4; SagBi 1, 66).

[26] Cfr. Mt 17,5. "Respicit Dominus ad Abel, dicens, *Hic est filius meus dilectus in quo mihi bene complacui*" (BED *Gn*, II, iv, 4, CChr.SL 118A, 1967, 74)].

[27] Bede explains that the Lord hasn't only been pleased with Abel, but that "... respicit et ad munera eius, quia uitam electorum quam offert illi gratanter, Deus Pater accipit, et quasi per ignem de caelo hostiam eius incendit, quia eos que se pro Domino mortificare curauerint, ipse uirtute sui spiritus, quo amplius in celestibus ignescant, immo toti celestes efficiantur, inflammat" (ibid.).

[28] Bede explains it: "quia redarguens carnalia Iudaeorum opera dicit per prophetam: *Quo mihi multitudinem uictimarum uestrarum? Dicit Dominus, Plenus sum; holocausta arietum et adipem pinguium et sanguinem taurorum et hircorum et uitulorum nolui"* (ibid.).

BED tab

Dominum in sancto monte uiderunt ut magister gentium
(I)

BED *tab* (720-725[29]) interprets the measure *cubitum et dimidium* of the Ark[30] thus: "the one and a half complementary cubits symbolize the beginning of the contemplative life by which many of the saints, also in life, up to now, deserved to enjoy"[31]. That is to say, it's not only an awaited retribution, so to speak, but something more –or better still– it's not some thing, but Somebody else, God himself! (as one shall see next): "To those who has been granted not only the expectation of heavenly prizes, but even to partly have a taste in the manner of a vision". Among the witnesses Bede presents are Isaiah, Micah and

> "Peter, James and John, who had seen the Lord glorified between Moses and Elijah on the holy mountain[32] like the Master of the peoples"[33].

BED Prv

Ne gloriam eius quam in monte conspexerant cuiquam dicerent
(I, i, 20/21)

BED Prv (720-730[34]) says that, even when the praedicatio

[29] C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1479.
[30] "Fabricarás un arca de madera de acacia de dos codos y medio de largo, un codo y medio de ancho y uno y medio de alto" (Ex 25,10; SagBi 1, 395).
[31] "...semis uero qui superest initium uitae contemplatiuae quo non nulli sanctorum etiam in carne adhuc positi frui meruerunt" (BED *tab*, I, CChr. SL 119A, 1969, 22).
[32] Cfr. Mt 17,1-3.
[33] "Petrus Iacobus et Iohannes qui clarificatum inter Moysen et Heliam Dominum in sancto monte uiderunt ut magister gentium" (BED, *tab*, I, CChr.SL 119A, 1969, 22).
[34] C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1479.

sapientiae foris[35] is true, it is also true that at times the *silentium sapiens*[36] is fulfilled, as in the *mandatum tacendi* after the Transfiguration[37]. Bede explains:

> "Undoubtedly, God's wisdom is Christ who, having lived in the world, revealed to some the mysteries of his divinity and ordered them not to preach before his Passion and Resurrection that he himself is Jesus Christ[38], lest they just say to anyone about his glory which they contemplated on the mountain"[39].

After the silence before the Resurrection, the *praedicatio* shall make itself heard again: "after the resurrection, the wisdom preaches in public because – having been sent from above by the Holy Spirit, he declared himself openly to the world through the Apostles"[40].

---

35 *"La sabiduría pregona en público, alza su voz en las plazas; llama en lo alto de los sitios bulliciosos"* (Pr 1,20-21; SagBi 3, 621).

36 *"No hará oír su voz en la calle"* (Is 42,2; SagBi 4, 202).

37 Cfr. Mt 17,9.

38 Cfr. ibid.

39 "Sapientia quippe Dei Christus est qui in mundo conuersatus paucis suae mysteria diuinitatis patefecit ipsisque praecepit ne ante passionem et resurrectionem suam quia ipse esset Iesus Christus praedicarent, ne gloriam eius quam in monte conspexerant cuiquam dicerent" (BED *Prv*, I, i, 20/21, CChr.SL 119B, 1983, 29). The reason Bede gives for such *mandatum* is so that there may be no imprudence when informing anyone about the crucial events of the *historia salutis*. Making the Transfiguration known is after the Resurrection, not before it, because it is the revelation *ad uisum* and *ad auditum* of Jesus' divinity, a revelation more apt to know after Jesus' rises from the dead. If it were to be made known before the Passion, it's not that the truth of the event depended on that, but that, *quoad hominem*, given the human weakness (*infirmitas*), one could see Jesus' Passion not as a stage of the *mysterium paschale* –which shouldn't shake one's faith in Jesus' natural divine filiation in his Transfiguration– but exactly the opposite: as an event that might make one think that Jesus was only a man... a frustrated man.

40 "At post resurrectionem sapientia foris praedicabat quia misso desuper spiritu per Apostolos aperte se ipsam mundo declarabat" (BED *Prv*, I, i, 20/21, CChr.SL 119B, 1983, 29).

BED Ct

> Desiderabilis in monte Petro cum dicit: Domine bonum est nos hic esse (VI, v)

BED *Ct* (720-730[41]) interprets the *desiderabilis*[42] in the light of Christ[43] "because not only should be accepted [as] true [the things] about the unchanging majesty of the perpetual divinity"[44],

> "[but] also about the glorified substance of the humanity assumed"[45].

Bede continues: "I'll say something of a broader scope. [He] entirely had been the delight even before the glorification of the humanity"[46], that is to say, that the Word incarnate has been *desiderabilis* from the Incarnation: "all that [he] is was the delight from the very start of the conception until the triumph of the Passion"[47]. From the Incarnation, Bede marks an *iter exemplorum* about Jesus as *Desiderabilis*[48]. Jesus transfigured was "delight for

41 C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1479.

42 *"Y todo él [el amado] las delicias"* (Ct 5,16; SagBi 3, 795).

43 "Totus Christus Deus est et homo, id est uerbum anima et caro" (BED *Ct*, VI, v, 16, CChr.SL 119B, 1983, 296).

44 "Quia non solum de incommutabili maiestate perpetuae diuinitatis" (ibid.). It means man accepting the revelation God makes of Himself.

45 "...uerum etiam de clarificata substantia assumptae humanitatis accipiendum est" (ibid.). Bede doesn't refer to the Incarnation of the Word, but refers to the *manifestation* of the Word's divinity through the human flesh he assumes, through the *claritas*, which takes places in Jesus' Transfiguration.

46 "Amplius aliquid dicam, totus erat desiderabilis etiam ante clarificationem humanitatis" (ibid.).

47 "...totus erat desiderabilis ab ipso mox initio conceptionis usque ad triumphum passionis" (ibid.).

48 Bede says that Jesus Christ was "desiderabilis beato uentri qui portauit, desiderabilis uberibus quae eum lactauerunt, desiderabilis angelis qui hymnum mox nato dicebant, desiderabilis pastoribus qui uiso eo glorificabant et laudabant Deum, desiderabilis magis qui ad quaerendum eum ab oriente uenientes ubi inuenire meruerunt oblatis munerius adorauerunt, desiderabilis Symeoni seni qui promissam sibi uisionem natiuitatis eius ad ultimam usque praestolans aetatem ubi accepit eum in ulnas suas benedixit Deum mortemque laetus aspexit, desiderabilis Annae prophetissae quae et ipsa uisa eius natiuitate debitas confessionis suae laudes Domino reddebat, desiderabilis omnibus qui eum in templo duodennem inter seniores ac magistros caelesti sapientia mirandum cernebant, desiderabilis discipulis cum uocantem eum citissime relictis quae habebant omnibus sequebantur" (BED *Ct*, VI, v, 16, CChr.SL 119B, 1983, 296).

Peter when he says on the mountain: *Lord, it is well that we are here*[49]"[50].

BED Esr

> Apostoli qui clarificatum in monte sancto Dominum uidere gaudebant
> (III)

The commentary BED Esr (725-731[51]) interprets the *laetitia*[52] not as the facile laughter, but as the joy coming from on high, fruit of the *benedictio*[53]. Bede gives an example: "like the Apostles who enjoyed seeing the Lord glorified on the holy mountain[54]"[55].

BED aed

> Cuius praesagii ammonuit discipulos uox Patris de caelo
> cum apparente illis Domine in gloria
> (II)

BED *aed* (729-731[56]) insists that the *vox Patris* from the cloud –"while the Lord in glory between Moses and Elijah appeared before them on the holy mountain– it [the voice] indeed thundered

[49] Mt 17,4: *"Señor, qué bien estamos aquí"* (SagBi 5, 161).
[50] "...desiderabilis in monte Petro cum dicit: *Domine bonum est nos hic esse"* (BED *Ct*, VI, v, 16, CChr.SL 119B, 1983, 296-297).
[51] C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1479.
[52] "Dios los alegró con un gozo extraordinario" (Ne 12,42; SagBi 2, 1059).
[53] According to the Psalmist: "Bendice a los que temen al Señor, pequeños y grandes" [Sal 116(115),13; SagBi 3, 515].
[54] Cfr. Mt 17,2.
[55] "...ut Apostoli qui clarificatum in monte sancto Dominum uidere gaudebant" (BED *Esr*, III, CChr.SL 119A, 1969, 385). Here, it's interesting to see how Bede accentuates the *gaudium* –and not fear– of Peter, James and John when they witness Jesus' Transfiguration (cfr. Mt 17,6).
[56] C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1479.

saying: *This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased: listen to him*[57]"[58].

Bede explains that the sacraments of the NT have been predesignated (*praesignata*) in the five books of the Law or in the five ages; hence, Bende links the *five* cubits[59] with the theme of fulfillment (in the NT) of the OT/*five* books of the Law/*five* ages[60]. Deepening on the theme of the *unitas Testamentorum vel Scripturarum*, Bede says that

> "not only do the Testaments harmonize each other by the relationship of the divine sacraments, but that all the writings, too, contained in the books of each Testament are chosen, granted by one and the same faith and these very things are connected to one another through love"[61].

BED Hab

Potest in medio duorum animalium in medio Moysi et Heliae intellegi

BED *Hab* (before 731[62]) sees Ha 3,2[63] in the light of the OT

---

[57] Mt 17,5 (SagBi 5, 161).

[58] "Cuius praesagii ammonuit discipulos uox Patris de caelo cum apparente illis Domine in gloria inter ipsum Moysen y Heliam in monte sancto ita intonuit dicens: *Hic est filius meus dilectus in quo mihi bene complacuit; ipsum audite"* (BED *aed*, II, CChr.SL 119A, 1969, 201).

[59] "La longitud del atrio será de cien codos, la anchura de cincuenta por ambos lados y la altura de cinco codos; todo de lino torzal, y las basas de bronce" (Ex 27,18; SagBi 1, 404-405). It's about the Tabernacle atrium.

[60] Cfr. BED *aed*, II, CChr.SL 119A, 1969, 201.

[61] "Non solum autem testamenta sibi inuicem diuinorum sacramentorum relatione concinunt sed et omnes qui in eorundem testamentorum libris scripti continentur electi una fide praediti eademque sunt ad inuicem caritate conexi" (BED *aed*, II, CChr.SL 119A, 1969, 201).

[62] C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1479.

[63] *"En medio de dos animales das a conocer",* according to the text known to Bede: *"In medio duorum animalium innotesces"* (BED Hab, CChr.SL 119B, 1983, 383). In the Neovulgate, Ha 3,2 reads: *in medio annorum notum facies* (en nuestros años dalas a conocer) (SagBi 4, 1191).

(*Lex et Prophetae*), making known their Christological projection when they situate the context in Jesus' Transfiguration, including a reference to the prefiguration of our future in the face and the clothing of Jesus transfigured, as well as the divinity of the Son and his relationship with the Father:

> "'In the middle of two animals' can be understood [as] 'in between Moses and Elijah'. Well there it is being made known to the three disciples on the holy mountain that [Jesus] was going to die, telling them the things he would suffer in Jerusalem. There it was being made known that he would rise again, and the immortal future because of his face glorified in the likeness of the sun, and his garments woven in the likeness of snow. There it was being made known that he was the Son of God, the paternal voice telling him from the heavens: *This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased: listen to him* (Mt 17,5)"[64].

BED h 21

Vocem Patris super Dominum clarificatum una cum Petro audirent

BED *h* 21 –from the fifty homilies of the *Homeliarum evangelii libri II* (730–735[65])– justifies the name changes of James and John

> "because they had also listened with Peter the Father's voice about the glorified Lord, and they knew many

[64] "Potest in medio duorum animalium in medio Moysi et Heliae intellegi. Ibi enim innotescebat discipulis tribus in monte sancto quia moriturus esset, dicentibus eis quae passurus esset in Hierusalem. Ibi innotescebat quia resurrecturus esset, et inmortalis futurus clarificato uultu eius instar solis, et uestimentis eius nitentibus in similitudinem niuis. Ibi innotescebat quia Filius Dei erat, dicente ad eum de caelis uoce paterna: *Hic est Filius meus dilectus, in quo mihi bene complacui, ipsum audite"* (BED Hab, CChr.SL 119B, 1983, 383).

[65] C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *HOPE*, cit., 1479.

more secrets of the mysteries than the other disciples, and that pertained to the gist, they were aware of attaching themselves wholeheartedly to the Lord and of loving him with a greater loving care"[66].

Principal affirmations

BED *Act* interprets the *as you saw him*[67] within the context of the Transfiguration.

BED *cath* sees that the fact that Peter calls himself the *partaker in the glory*[68] points to his presence in Jesus' Transfiguration. Bede defends the Petrine authorship of the Letters of Peter[69]. Bede includes the uniques experience of the Transfiguration within the Johannine experiential testimony[70].

BED *Apc* interprets Jesus the resplendent face[71] like an eschatological Christophany, for the righteous as well as for the damned.

BED *Sam* interprets the three calls to Samuel in the light of the testimony of the Father to the Son.

BED *Gn* compares God's delight towards Abel to the Father's delight to the Son.

BED *tab* compares the cubit and a half[72] to the contemplation

66 "...quia uidelicet et uocem Patris super Dominum clarificatum una cum Petro audirent et plura aliis discipulis mysteriorum secreta cognoscerent quodque ad rem plurimum pertinebat se integro corde Domino adhaerere et maxima illum dilectione sentiebant amplecti" (BED *h 21*, CChr.SL 122, 1965, 336).
67 Cfr. Hch 1,11.
68 Cfr. 1 P 5,1.
69 Cfr. 2 P 1,18.
70 Cfr. 1 Jn 1.
71 Cfr. Ap 1,16.
72 Cfr. Ex 25,10.

of the Lord's glory, as in Jesus' Transfiguration.

BED *Prv* presents the contrast between the proclamation in the town squares and the command to keep silent, as in the case fo the Transfiguration.

BED *Ct* presents Jesus as the *Desirable*[73], backed up by a litany of instances, from the Incarnation throughout the life of the Lord, including the mention of his Transfiguration, where the glorified substance of the human flesh assumed by the Word shines forth.

BED *Esr* underlines the aspect of blessing of true joy[74].

BED *aed*, after highlighting the intensity of the voice that thundered in the Transfiguration, links the five cubits[75] of the Temple in the OT to the Pentateuch, in order to go on insisting on the unity of the Scriptures in charity.

In the two animals[76] BED *Hab* sees Moses and Elijah, on both sides of Jesus transfigured.

BED *h 21* stresses that the three Apostles who were witnesses of Jesus' Transfiguration knew more about him, and thus, they could love him with more care (*afecto*).

[73] Cfr. Ct 5,16.
[74] Cfr. Ne 12,42.
[75] Cfr. Ex 27,18.
[76] Cfr. Ha 3,2.

35. Anonymus (Liber Questionum in Eu.)

Vbi splendor describitur,
non substantia tollitur,
sed gloria mutatur
(**q Mt, XVII,2)

An anonymous Irish author (start of the 8th c.[1]), considering some Biblical characters as pre-figurations of Jesus Christ, compares Jesus Christ to David, "the desirable, of whom the Evangelist says: *His face shone like the sun*[2]"[3].

The *discrepancy* of days between Jesus' foretelling of the Transfiguration-event and the start itself of the Transfiguration narrative is clarified by saying that the difference lies in the inclusion (or otherwise) –in the computation of days– of the days of the said prophecy and of the start of the Transfiguration[4].

The author links the selection of the three Apostles[5] with Jesus' omniscience:

---

1 J. Rittmueller (ed.), *Liber questionum in Euangeliis,* CChr.SL 108F, 2003, 11* [n.b. sic].

2 Mt 17,2: *"Su rostro se puso resplandeciente como el sol"* (SagBi 5, 161).

3 "...desiderabilis, de quo euangelista dicit: 'Et resplenduit facies eius sicut sol'" (AN ***q Mt,* I, 5, CChr.SL 108F, 2003, 9). The author corroborates his affirmation with the words of the Psalmist: *"Eres el más hermoso de los hijos de Adán"* [Sal 45(44),3 (SagBi 3, 308)].

4 In the author's words: "Post dies VI. 'Marcus dicit: "Post dies VI"; Lucam autem ait: "Die octaua", reliqua; Matheus diem quo dictum est: "Sunt quidam", reliqua, et illum quo transmutatio facta est 'non adnumerat, sed' tantum 'VI medios'. Marcus uero primum adnumerat diem quo dictum est: "Sunt quidam", reliqua. Lucas autem utrosque posuit" (AN ***q Mt,* XVII, 1, CChr.SL 108F, 2003, 281).

5 Cfr. Mt 17,1.

> "He who searches the hearts knows why the three were chosen 'from among the others'"[6]:
>
> in the end, it is, for the invited, an *honor specialis*[7].

The mountain as the place of the Transformation has been thought by God, and the author links to the primordial motive of transfiguration (*transformatio*) an eschatological projection (insofar as it's a place of *iudicium*): "...it is done fittingly in order that there where the transformation is done, there be the judgment"[8]. Now, the author insists on the realism of the Transfiguration:

> "It must not be believed 'that [the Lord] has lost the glorious face not that [he] has assumed a body of air'; rather, [it must be believed] that a 'transformed' condition was made"[9].

The quasi-solar splendor of the transfigured Jesus doesn't change who he is, but only his condition. "'There where the splendor is described, the substance isn't taken away, but that the glory' is changed"[10].

The anonymous author links the snowlike aspect of the transfigured Jesus to the quasi-solar aspect: "It had shown the sun

---

[6] "Cordium scrutator nouit cur hi III 'a ceteris' selecti sunt" (AN **q *Mt*, XVII,1, CChr.SL 108F, 2003, 281). One almost "hears" the author quote Mt 16,18 from the heart when he says: "III autem ducuntur, ut: "In ore duorum uel", reliqua" (ibid.).

[7] "Sicut in monte quondam gloriae testes fuerunt, ita et uerae humanitatis et timoris mortis testes fierent (AN **q *Mt*, XXVI, 37, CChr.SL 108F, 2003, 419).

[8] "Apte agitur ut ibi transformatio fieret ubi iudicium erit (Id., AN **q *Mt*, XVII, 1, CChr.SL 108F, 2003, 281). I think that this *iudicium* has something to do with the belief (or non-belief) in Jesus as the Son of God (cfr. Mt 16,16).

[9] "Non 'pristinam faciem amississe uel aereum corpus adsumpsisse' credendus est, sed formam 'transformatam' fecisse" (AN **q *Mt*, XVII,2, CChr.SL 108F, 2003, 281).

[10] "'Ubi splendor describitur, non substantia tollitur, sed gloria mutatur" (ibid.). That is to say, that this lets one see in a miraculous way the glory of Jesus' divinity through the human nature which the Word had assumed.

in the sky, the snow on earth[11] as two substances"[12]. This reference to the heavens and the earth shall be corroborated by the arrival of two witnesses, one from heaven, another from *sheol*[13]. The very presence of Moses and of Elijah in Jesus' Transfiguration acquires an *eschatological* message, because "...it means that the living and the dead shall be in the judgment"[14]. That is to say,

> "in the Lord, the celestial neighbors [in] Elijah as well as [the neighbors] from *sheol* [in] Moses, as well as the earthly [neighbors] in the Apostles, shall come to the judgment"[15].

[11] That is to say, the snow, as a meteorological phenomenon on this planet, not because snow grows from the earth. Although it's possible too, that the author might have been thinking of the dew as growing from the earth, and not as a condensation of water molecules.

[12] "Sol in caelo, nix in terra ut duas substantias ostenderet" (AN **q *Mt*, XVII,2, CChr.SL 108F, 2003, 281). It's possible that the author has wanted to imply that the sun and the snow, as the hagiographer's descriptive –very elemental– factors regarding the transfigured Jesus, are the peak of what the very limited human knowledge may reach, in the presence of the Mystery of Jesus.

[13] Cfr. ibid. More importantly, the author makes reference to the contrast between Jesus' negative reply to the hypocritical request of some Jews who were asking of him a signum caeleste (cfr. Mt 16,1) and Jesus' affirmative reply, in the context of the Transfiguration: "'...ut' autem 'apostolorum augeatur fides caeleste signum' praetenditur in 'Helia' de supernis 'et Moysi ab inferis' ueniente (AN **q *Mt*, XVII,2, CChr.SL 108F, 2003, 281).

[14] "Significat quod uiui et mortui in iudicio erunt" (Id., AN **q *Mt*, XVII,3, CChr.SL 108F, 2003, 281).

[15] "...in Domino et Helia caelestes accolae et in Moysi infernales et in apostolis terrestres ad iudicium uenient (ibid.).

36. Anonymus (Prebiarum)

Non desimilae Moysi et Eliae
inter quos apparuit Dominus in gloriam monte
(AN Ex, 65)

An anonymous Irish author (765–800[1]) of a book for catechesis, starting from the origin of the forty-day fasting of Moses and Elijah, speaks of Jesus' fasting, of the same duration as of the other two. The three are united not only in fasting but also in the Transfiguration[2], where Peter's proposal[3] "shows itself [as] a prefiguration of the resurrection"[4].

[1] R. McNally, sj (ed.), *Scriptores Hiberniae Minores, pars I,* CChr.SL 108B, 1973, xvii.

[2] In the Transfiguration, "non desimilae Moysi et Eliae inter quos apparuit Dominus in gloriam monte" (An *Ex*, 65, CChr.SL 108B, 1973, 166).

[3] Cfr. Mt 17,4.

[4] "...figura resurrectionis ostenditur" (An *Ex*, 65, CChr.SL 108B, 1973, 166).

37. Hilarius Hiberniae

Hilarius Hiberniae (1st half of the 9th c.[1]), or Pseudo-Hilarius Arelatensis, says that Christ is the *lapis uiuus*[2] who, although he is "rejected by men"[3], is the [rock] chosen by God[4], "as the Lord himself says: *This is my beloved Son*[5]"[6], that is to say, "[rock] honored in the glory of the Kingdom"[7].

PS-HIL-A *cath* interprets the *virtus Domini*[8] as "the glory of the divinity shown on the mountain"[9], shown to the three Apostles, as Peter would recall years later[10]. Moreover, the author draws two observations from 2 P 1,17[11]: the honor and the glory granted by the Father to the Son don't alter the *Pater–Filius* equality *in the divinity*[12]; I said "equality in the divinity" precisely because what the Father grants the Son is addressed to the Son's *human nature*:

---

1 Cfr. R. McNally, sj, *Scriptores Hiberniae Minores, pars I*, CChr.SL 108B, 1973, xi.

2 *"...a la piedra viva"* (1 P 2,4; cfr. SagBi 5, 1423).

3 1 P 2,4 (SagBi 5, 1423).

4 Ibid. The Neovulgate reads: *coram Deo autem electum, pretiosum* [pero (piedra) escogida y preciosa delante de Dios] (1 P 2,4; SagBi 5, 1423).

5 Mt 17,5: *"Éste es mi Hijo, el Amado"* (SagBi 5, 161).

6 "...sicut ipse Dominus dicit: *Hic est Filius meus dilectus"* (PS-HIL-A cath, 1 P II, 4, CChr.SL 108B, 1973, 82).

7 "...honorificatus in gloria regni" (ibid.).

8 *"Os hemos dado a conocer el poder de nuestro Señor Jesucristo"* (2 P 1,16; SagBi 5, 1447). The words y la venida are omitted from the SagBi since these words appear after the Latin version of this pericope as it was known to Hilary of Ireland.

9 "...diuinitatis gloriam in monte ostensam" (PS-HIL-A *cath*, 2 P I, 16, CChr. SL 108B, 1973, 101).

10 *"Porque hemos sido testigos oculares de su majestad"* (2 P 1,16: SagBi 5, 1447).

11 *"En efecto, él fue honrado y glorificado por Dios Padre"* (ibid.).

12 Indeed, "...non minor est qui accipit illo a quo accipit" (PS-HIL-A *cath*, 2 P I, 17, CChr.SL 108B, 1973, 101).

"It says to have received *honor and glory*[13] on the part of the flesh"[14]. The author justifies the use of filius *dilectus*, not filius *electus*, for Jesus[15].

Hilary of Ireland places the message on the Father's lips[16]: that he and the Son are equal – they share it all. Moreover, the author introduces an explicit Trinitarian reading of 2 P 1,17:

> *"In whom I am* well *pleased*[17], this means, all the things that are his are mine, and [all] the things that are mine, are his. He said *pleased [mis complacencias]*, this means, the Father and the Holy Spirit"[18].

Hilary of Ireland sees the *mons sanctus* of Peter's testimony[19] as "'mountain of the spirit' wherein the Trinity had been seen"[20], evoking the first encounter between Moses and the Lord[21]. Thus, Hilary of Ireland introduces a Trinitarian reading of Jesus' Transfiguration, starting from the reading of the mountain. However, Hilary of Ireland shows himself a bit indecisive on whether or not to adhere to the name of the mountain of the Transfiguration[22].

---

[13] Cfr. 2 P 1,17.

[14] "Accepisse dicitur *honorem et gloriam* pro parte carnis" (PS-HIL-A *cath*, 2 P I, 17, CChr.SL 108B, 1973, 101).

[15] "Id: *Hic est Filius meus dilectus,* id est non Moyses et Adam et Helias, licet et ipsi electi erant. Electus enim ex malis eligitur; dilectus de dilectis" (ibid.).

[16] Mt 17,5.

[17] 2 P 1,17: *"En quien tengo bien mis complacencias"* (SagBi 5, 1447).

[18] *"In quo mihi* bene *complacui*, id est omnia quae eius sunt, mea sunt, et quae mea sunt, eius sunt. *Complacui* dixit, id est Pater et Spiritus sanctus" (PS-HIL-A *cath*, 2 P I, 17, CChr.SL 108B, 1973, 101).

[19] *"Y esta voz la oímos nosotros, estando con él en el monte santo"* (2 P 1,18; SagBi 5, 1447) Hilary of Ireland omits the incision *esta voz* and *la oímos nosotros: venida del cielo* (in the Neovulgate: *de caelo*) (SagBi 5, 1447).

[20] "Mons spiritus dicitur in quo Trinitas uisa fuerat" (PS-HIL-A *cath*, 2 P I, 18, CChr.SL 108B, 1973, 101).

[21] *"Porque el lugar que pisas es tierra sagrada"* (Ex 3,5; SagBi 1, 291).

[22] "Mons autem iste secundum historiam Thabor uel quislibet alius mons est" (PS-HIL-A *cath*, 2 P I, 18, CChr.SL 108B, 1973, 101).

Hilary of Ireland considers the Father's testimony[23] about the Son as superior to the testimony of th Law and the Prophets:

> *"The testimony of God is greater*[24] because *[the Father] has borne witness to his Son*[25]. This [is]: *This is my beloved Son*[26]"[27].

Principal affirmations

Hilary of Ireland sees the Lord's power[28] as the glory manifested in Jesus' Transfiguration. The glorificaiton of the beloved (not chosen) Son by the Father[29] doesn't alter their equality in the divinity. Moreover, "my delights" imply the Father and the Holy Spirit. For the Irish author, the Trinity has been seen in the Transfiguration. The Father's testimony about the Son surpasses very much the testimony of the Law and of the Prophets.

[23] *"Si aceptamos el testimonio"* (1 Jn 5,9; SagBi 5, 1481).
[24] 1 Jn 5,9: *"Mayor es el testimonio de Dios"* (SagBi 5, 1481).
[25] Ibid.
[26] Mt 17,5.
[27] *"Testimonium Dei maius est quod testificatus est de Filio suo.* Id, *hic est Filius meus dilectus"* (PS-HIL-A *cath*, I Jn V, 9, CChr.SL 108B, 1973, 117).
[28] Cfr. 2 P 1,16.
[29] Cfr. 2 P 1,17.

38. Anonymus (Ap)

Habens claritatem Dominus habuit in monte,
sicut lapis iaspis,
id est opus Ecclesiae similis Christo
(AN Ap, 99)

An anonymous author, whom we shall call AN *Ap* (around the 9th c.[1]), sees the Church as the *lapis iaspis*[2] like

> "the Lord who possesses the glory he had possessed on the mountain, *like a jasper*[3], that's to say, the work of the Church similar to Christ"[4],

precisely because the Church (insofar as she is the *Corpus Christi*) shall be similar to the glory of Christ, her Head. If the faithful heeds Jesus' command to be perfect[5], he shall shine with Him[6].

---

1 It refers to the manuscripts in Paris, from Saint-Germain-des-Prés, around the 9th c., perhaps of French origin [Cfr. R. Gryson (recognovit), *De Enigmatibus ex Apocalypsi Johannis*, CChr.SL 107, 2003, 234].

2 "Su luz era semejante a una piedra preciosísima, como la piedra de jaspe, transparente como el cristal" (Ap 21,11; SagBi 5, 1589).

3 Ibid.

4 "...habens claritatem Dominus habuit in monte, *sicut lapis iaspis*, id est opus Ecclesiae similis Christo" (AN *Ap*, 99, CChr.SL 107, 2003, 292-293).

5 Cfr. Mt 5,48.

6 Cfr. Mt 5,16: *"Alumbre así vuestra luz"* (SagBi 5, 90).

Section III: Theological synthesis

In the Latin Fathers, the Transfiguration presents itself[1] in order for God to help the weak man[2], because to hope is to see the glory[3] to come[4].

Six authors[5] speak of **Jesus' announcement before transfiguring himself**, and there are *three eschatological themes: death* (in its "degrees": seeing, tasting and throwing oneself to death[6]). Not to die for ever[7] is the condition *sine qua non* to seeing the heavenly and glorious *Kingdom*[8] of the *Son of Man* (the Savior[9] –who also rescued those who were in the shadow of death[10]– shall be seen by three Apostles[11]), the Father's Kingdom, where the chosen ones[12] receive the same reward[13].

---

1 The Latin Fathers thought about the faith in Christ Jesus, be it before the pulpit, be it during a controversy, be it when writing a treatise. Among many other references to the life of Jesus, the Christ, they mentioned (or, as the case may be, they paid more attention) to Jesus' Transfiguration. I shall limit myself to the principal theological affirmations of the extracts of the texts of the Latin Fathers about Jesus' Transfiguration, without distinguishing between the three narratives in the Synoptics. Of all the possible perspectives, I have chosen the ordo narrationis in the Synoptics.

2 Cfr. AM Lc, VII.

3 Cfr. AMst 2 Cor, III.

4 Cfr. TE sco, 12.

5 Jerome, Ambrose, Leo, Chromatius, Epiphanius, Eusebius.

6 Cfr. HI Mc.

7 Cfr. AM Sat, II.

8 Cfr. HI Mc.

9 Cfr. LEO s 51.

10 Cfr. EUS-G h 7.

11 Cfr. EP-L h 47.

12 Cfr. CHRO Mt.

13 Cfr. AM fi, III; cfr. Id., Jac, I: Ambrose suggests focusing on the moral good, not on socual climbing, since in the end, like in Moses' and Elijah's case, the righteous receive the same reward. In this sense, it's about the gift not of something, but of the Son himself, to who is loved by him and by the Father (cfr. AU, s 78,5). Cfr. BED h I/24Q.

Eight authors[14] speak of the **six or eight days.** Here, there are *three readings*. If the days six and eight are considered as a whole[15], the discrepancy is explained not only as the inclusion/exclusion of the days of Jesus' announcement and of the very start of the mountain climb[16], but as an exaple of synecdoche[17]. The eight days gaze at the salvific mystery[18]. The six days are like the creation[19] before arriving at the Kingdom[20], which implies not only the judgment upon Israel[21], but the final retribution to the righteous who had been persecuted in this life[22], when they rest in God's presence[23].

Ten authors[24] speak of **Jesus' invitation to the three Apostles to be with him in climbing the mountain**, and each author sees Jesus' invitation to Peter, to James and to John from various perspectives (even from the etymology[25]): the three Apostles (like three olives[26]) are chosen[27] (without despising the other Apostles[28]), and then invited[29] to faith[30] and to the divine glory[31], and therefore, are honored[32] as the models of following Jesus Christ[33], whom the

[14] Hilary of Poitiers, Jerome, Maximinus the Arian, Augustine, Chromatius, Bede, Eucherius, and an anonymous author.
[15] Cfr. AN **q Mt, XVII.
[16] Cfr. EUCH, inst, I.
[17] Cfr. AU, do, III; cfr. Id., q Ev, I.
[18] Cfr. HI Ps, VI.
[19] Cfr. CHRO Mt.
[20] Cfr. HI Mc.
[21] Cfr. HIL Mt., 17.
[22] Cfr. BED h I/24Q.
[23] Cfr. MAXn h 17, 1.
[24] Tertullian, Hilary of Poitiers, Ambrose, Jerome, Ambrosiaster, Epiphanius, Bede, and three anonymous authors.
[25] Cfr. HI Mc.
[26] Cfr. Id., Is., VII.
[27] Cfr. AMst 2 Cor, III.
[28] Cfr. HI Gal, I, 2.
[29] Cfr. AMst, Gal, II.
[30] Cfr. HI Mt, III.
[31] Cfr. EP-L h 29.
[32] Cfr. AN **q Mt, XXVI.
[33] Cfr. AM Lc, VII.

three Apostles would know more and love better[34]. *Jesus' invitation* –as a sign of divine kindness to Peter (who rejected the idea of Jesus suffering[35]) and as a consolation to the persecuted Christians[36]–, is always *free*, the "cubit and a half"[37] which anticipates the inexplicable glory[38].

Seven authors[39] link **Jesus' mountain climb alone with the three Apostles** (to the holy mountain[40] called Thabor[41], a prefiguration of the Father's majesty as well as of the Son's majesty[42] and divinity[43], and also, of the final judgment[44]) with: the true *intelligence of the Scriptures*[45] (finding oneself with Jesus[46], the Word incarnate[47], Author of the Scriptures[48], one shall take part –in anticipation[49]– in the glory of the Kingdom of the Son of Man[50]). Were one not to read through the Scriptures, one would run the risk of being left at the foot of the mountain, due to mediocrity and to animality[51]. Moreover, the climb prefigures the spiritual ascent of each soul[52].

---

34 Cfr. BED h 21.
35 Cfr. HIL Ps, 52.
36 Cfr. TE mart, 2.
37 Cfr. BED tab, I (cfr. Ex 25,10).
38 Cfr. CHRO Mt.
39 Ambrose, Jerome, Chromatius, Arnobius, Gregory the Great, and two anonymous authors.
40 Cfr. AN scot 2 P.
41 Cfr. HI ep 46 et ep 108.
42 Cfr. CAr Ps, 92.
43 Cfr. ARN exp Lc 4.
44 Cfr. AN, **q Mt, XVII.
45 Cfr. HI Mc.
46 Cfr. AM Lc, VII.
47 Cfr. ibid.
48 Cfr. CHRO Mt.
49 Cfr. ibid.
50 Cfr. HI Mt, III.
51 Cfr. HI Mc.
52 Cfr. GR-M Rg, IV, 121.

Twenty-one authors[53] reflect on **Jesus' transfiguring of himself before the three Apostles**. There's an insistence on *the truth of the Incarnation* (the external senses bear witness to Jesus as not being a ghost[54], having been recognized as Jesus when he transfigured himself[55] gloriously[56]) before Peter, James, and John[57] (as eyewitnesses[58]) before the Passion[59], because Jesus was able to and wanted to do it[60], and because the white garment shall be tainted with blood during the Passion[61]. In Jesus' Transfiguration (*visio*[62], *visio magna*[63], and s*acramentum magnum*[64], *mysterium*[65]), with allusions to the sun and to the snow[66], Jesus' Body –beyond human comprehension– shone with a heavenly light[67], with *glory*[68] *(not all of it, but only insofar as it was bearable*[69] *and thanks to his Body*[70]*) of the divine substance*[71] *of the Word*[72] *(yet still, Christ is the Glory*[73]*)* never lost when he became flesh[74], the *gloria potestatis*[75] *of*

[53] Tertullian, Hilary of Poitiers, Ambrose, Ambrosiaster, Jerome, Augustine, Leo, Epiphanius, Chromatius, Apponius, Maximus, Arnobius, Prosperus, Gregory of Elvira, Verecundus, Cassiodorus, Hilary of Ireland, Bede and three anonymous authors.
[54] Cfr. TE an 17.
[55] Cfr. TE res 55; cfr. AN **q Mt,, XVII; cfr. GR-I fi, 90.
[56] Cfr. HI Mt, III.
[57] Cfr. TE hae 22; cfr. HIL tri., VI.
[58] Cfr. HIL Mt.
[59] Cfr. TE car, 24.
[60] Cfr. AU s 79/A,1.
[61] Cfr. Ct 5,10; cfr. Jr 18,14; cfr. CHRO, s 8.
[62] Cfr. AU, s 78,1.
[63] Cfr. Id., s 79.
[64] Cfr. Id., s 79/A,3.
[65] Cfr. VER, cant-Db, V.
[66] Cfr. HIL Ps, 52.
[67] Cfr. Id., Mt, 17.
[68] Cfr. Id., tri, XI.
[69] Cfr. AMst, **q Mt, numero CXXVII, CVII; cfr. CHRO Mt.
[70] Cfr. CHRO Mt.
[71] Cfr. AM ep XI.
[72] Cfr. HIL tri, III; cfr. EP-L h 47.
[73] Cfr. AM 118 Ps.
[74] Cfr. HIL syn, 48.
[75] Cfr. LEO, h 51.

the Lord[76]*;* however, *Jesus' Body, being human, was not –however– an ordinary body*[77]: in the Passion, it indeed suffered, but without the bodily power being dissolved[78], without the condition in order to suffer pain, because the Son who emptied himself[79] doesn't cease to be God[80]. Through his garments, the transfigured Jesus is Purity[81], the Impeccable[82], the Desireable[83], in whom the glorified substance of the human flesh (from the Virgin Mary[84]), assumed by the Word[85], shines. The *spiritual ice and snow* don't give way to the heat of sin, but to spiritual humidity[86]; the snow, in another context, is like the human action made bountiful by grace[87]. *The spiritual intelligence of the Scriptures* (enfleshed in Jesus[88], more important than the history or then literality) transfigures the divine word like the snow[89], because Jesus' resplendent face –the glory of the Gospel[90], the Fuller[91] and Doctor[92]– purifies[93] and enlightens (like the sun of justice[94]) the repentant sinner[95]. The face of Jesus transfigured, and his clothes[96] (which echo the glory of his Body[97]),

[76] Cfr. PS-HIL-A cath, 2 P I, 16.
[77] Cfr. HIL tri, X.
[78] Cfr. LEO, h 51.
[79] Cfr. AMst, Phil, II.
[80] Cfr. HIL tri, X.
[81] Cfr. AM Dav, I.
[82] Cfr. Id., my; cfr. Id., 118 Ps.
[83] Cfr. Id., my; cfr. Id., 118 Ps.
[84] Cfr. MAX, s 61A.
[85] Cfr. VER cant-Mn, VIII; cfr. BED Ct, VI (cfr. Ct 5,16).
[86] Cfr. AM 118 Ps; cfr. Id., Lc, VII.
[87] Cfr. PROS Ps, CXLVII.
[88] Cfr. ARN exp Lc 4.
[89] Cfr. HI Mc.
[90] Cfr. AU s 79.
[91] Cfr. AM Lc, VII. In another context, the earthly fuller can't make such garments of the transfigured Jesus because it can't reproduce purity, among other virtues (cfr. MAX s 61A).
[92] Cfr. BED, h I/24Q.
[93] Cfr. HI Mc; cfr. AU s 79.
[94] Cfr. AU s 78,2.
[95] Cfr. AM Dav, I; cfr. AU do, II.
[96] Cfr. AU Ps, L.
[97] Cfr. CHRO Mt.

anticipate the hope[98] *–whatever happens*[99]*– of the eschatological transformation*[100] *of the human body*[101] *and of the Church*[102], being the latter [the Church] the clothes (white, without stain[103]) which, attached to Jesus[104], shall shine like jasper[105] in the end, when the souls see Jesus[106]: be it like the beautiful moon for the righteous (who knew how to interweave their lives into the resplendent garments as God's children[107]), be it like the resplendent sun for the heavenly virtues, but terrible as the war for the condemned[108]. A ray of the resurrection (to which the chosen soul is oriented[109]) is seen when Jesus transfigures himself[110].

Twenty authors[111] speak of **Moses' and Elijah's presence together with the transfigured Jesus** (the three united[112] by the forty-day fasting[113]) with different *foci*. First, Moses and Elijah are considered separately: Moses (a witness more credible than Arius[114]) –whose request on mount Sinai to see the Lord was granted on Jesus' Transfiguration[115]– was taken to heaven, and didn't remain buried, much less annihilated, because he was with

98 Cfr. AU s 79/A,1.
99 Cfr. LEO s 51.
100 Cfr. ARN, exp Lc 4.
101 Cfr. HI, ep 65.
102 Cfr. AU s 79/A,1; cfr. BED h I/24Q.
103 Cfr. PROS Ps, CXLVII.
104 Cfr. AU s 78,2.
105 Cfr. Ap 21,11; cfr. AN Ap, 99.
106 Cfr. Ct 6,10.
107 Cfr. AU Ps, CXLVII.
108 Cfr. APO Ct, liber IX; cfr. BED Apc, III (cfr. Ap 1,16).
109 Cfr. Ct 6,10.
110 Cfr. APO Ct, liber IX.
111 Tertullian, Hilary of Poitiers, Ambrose, Maximinus the Arian, Augustine, Jerome, Filastrius, Peter Chrysologus, Arnobius, Quodvultdeus, Gregory of Elvira, Primasius, Leo, Apponius, Verecundus, Caesarius of Arles, Bede, Gregory the Great, and an anonymous author.
112 Cfr. TE *Marc IV,* 22.
113 Cfr. AU *Ps*, CX; cfr. AN *Ex*, 65.
114 Cfr. AM *fide*, V.
115 Cfr. Ex 33,13; cfr. TE *je*, 6.
116 Cfr. AM *Ca*.

the transfigured Jesus[116]; Elijah –apparently a failure in his lifetime, but who wasn't really forsaken by God[117]– shall return to the earth[118] in order to reconcile the beloved[119]. Afterwards, it speaks of Moses (personification of the Law[120]) and of Elijah (personification of the Prophets) together [who, like the Law and the Gospel, are like two olives[121], or two door-jambs of the Temple[122]; Moses and Elijah shall have been recognized by the three Apostles because of the tablets of the Decalogue (Moses) and the chariot (Elijah)[123]]. Moses and Elijah, exemplary chosen ones[124], legates[125] and Prophets already sitting in the Kingdom of the Son[126], confirm that in the resurrection –when the living and the dead[127] are before the Son of Man– the change doesn't dignify eradication of who one was in life[128]. Moses' and Elijah's "powers" pale in comparison to the Son of Man in the Transfiguration[129]. The *unity of the Scriptures[130] in love[131] (decessio and successio[132])* is rooted in Christ, the one and only Author[133]. *Jesus transfigured* rests[134] *(as between two animals[135]) between the Law (the five cubits of the Temple[136]) and the Prophets:* the

[117] Cfr. Id., Ps.
[118] Cfr. Id., *pae*, I.
[119] Cfr. COM *in*, I.
[120] Cfr. CAE *s* 115.
[121] Cfr. HI *Za*, IV.
[122] Cfr. 1 R 6,33; cfr. GR-M *Rg*, I, 23.
[123] Cfr. GR-I *tr*, II.
[124] Cfr. TE *mon*, 8.
[125] Cfr. Id., *Marc IV,* 22.
[126] Cfr. HIL *Mt*, 20.
[127] Cfr. MAXn *h* 17, 2.
[128] Cfr. TE *res*, 55; cfr. HIL *Mt*, 17 (Moses as a prefigure).
[129] Cfr. AM *Ps*.
[130] Cfr. Id., *inc*, 4; cfr. LEO *s 51*.
[131] Cfr. BED *aed*, II.
[132] Cfr. Ha 3,2; Za 4,14.
[133] Cfr. CHRO *Mt*.
[134] Cfr. AM *ptr*. (Issachar, a prefigure of Jesus); cfr. APO, *Ct*, liber III [cfr. Ct 1,4 (1,3): *uberum*].
[135] Cfr. *Ha* 3,2; cfr. FIL *Diu hae*, 156; cfr. QU, *Jud*, XIII; cfr. BED *Hab*.
[136] Cfr. Ex 27,18.

latter have awaited[137] and reveal the mystery (the Son of God[138]), they point to the true sense –unity of the Scriptures– (to which one arrives only through the spiritual intelligence of the Scriptures)[139], they annouce the Son[140], and serve and bear witness to Jesus[141] like who the Gospel[142] *is, the* Judgment of God[143]. In fact, the Law and the Prophets offer a testimony[144] greater than the most sublime of human knowledge[145]; even still, it's not only that the *Verbum* is latent in the Law and in the Prophets[146] (the *Verbum* seen and listened to, through the word, in Jesus' Transfiguration[147]), but that Jesus is the Lord and King[148], the *sensus plenior* and objective[149], and the fullness[150] of the Law and of the Prophets. *The trio "Moses–Elijah and Jesus"* points to a triple dwelling-place[151], the testimony within the Scriptures (OT testimony-prophecy about Christ, Christ's testimony-fullness about the OT)[152], the testimony of the unity of the Scriptures[153]. Moses and Elijah, both glorious, prefigure the righteous who receive the same reward[154], and by the place where they came from [by the mention of the sun from above and of the snow (which stays at the foot of the mountain)], prefigure the living and the dead before the Judge[155]. Moses, Elijah, and Jesus

[137] Cfr. PET-C *s* 131.
[138] Cfr. AM *fi*, I.
[139] Cfr. HI *Mc*.
[140] Cfr. EP-L *h* 29.
[141] Cfr. PRIM *Ap*, V.
[142] Cfr. AU *Jo*, XVII.
[143] Cfr. Id., *ep* LV.
[144] Cfr. MAXn, *h* 17, 3.
[145] Cfr. *AM* mort.
[146] Cfr. AU *s* 78,3.
[147] Cfr. AM *Lc*.
[148] Cfr. AU, *s* 79/A,2. Thus, Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of God, mustn't be made equal neither to Moses nor to Elijah.
[149] Cfr. Id., *s* 78,2.
[150] Cfr. Id., *s* 79/A,3.
[151] Cfr. ARN, *exp Lc* 4.
[152] Cfr. ibid.
[153] Cfr. ibid.
[154] Cfr. BED *h I/24Q*.
[155] Cfr. AN ***q Mt*, XVII.

shall speak –perhaps– of the Jews, of the Manichaeans, of pagans, of heretics, and of Catholics[156]. Having said everything, the salvific plan, theme of the conversation of the three, shall be made manifest in eschatology[157].

Ten authors[158] speak of **Peter's proposal**, which –although he makes known his desire to be with Jesus[159]– implies: an *amentia*[160] (if not, Peter wouldn't have been correct in saying that Jesus was the Son of the living God[161]); the tremendous impression caused in Peter seeing Jesus transfigured[162]; the rejection of the world (hence, Jesus' silence)[163]; a joy, a holy impatience with a bit of ignorance (hence Jesus' silence)[164]; a desire to hide the Light (hence the Father's correction)[165]. Peter proposed to pitch three tents (which perhaps correspond to heaven, to paradise and to the earth[166]) because he was in a hurry to be with Jesus in the Kingdom[167], but Jesus' silence implies that then, it wasn't yet the time to sit in the glory168. Instead of having an attitude of avarice and of seeking comfort, *detachment*[169] and *charity* (the elegance of which is Jesus' white garment) –as the Paradigm of generosity[170], in the example of the Son[171]– is recommended.

---

[156] Cfr. QU *hae*., VII.
[157] Cfr. BED *h I/24Q*.
[158] Tertullian, Hilary of Poitiers, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, Leo, Chromatius, Quodvultdeus, Gregory the Great, Bede.
[159] Cfr. LEO *s* 51.
[160] Cfr. TE *Marc IV, 22*.
[161] Cfr. TE Marc *IV, 22 (*cfr. Mt 16,16).
[162] Cfr. HI *Mc*.
[163] Cfr. LEO *s 51*.
[164] Cfr. CHRO *Mt*.
[165] Cfr. QU *hae*, VII.
[166] Cfr. CHRO *Mt*.
[167] Ibid.
[168] Cfr. HIL *Mt*, 17.
[169] Cfr. AU *s* 78,6.
[170] Cfr. ibid.
[171] Cfr. AU *s* 78,5.

Wanting to stay with Jesus atop the mountain implies *not wanting to go down*, which triggers various readings: that it wasn't due to ill will, but to Peter's youthful devotedness[172]; he already knew that he already had everything he was dreaming of: the transfigured Jesus[173]; once the heavenly is tasted through spiritual reading, it's explicable that one doesn't want to return to the old life[174]; Peter shows care towards the transfigured Jesus[175] as well as towards Moses and Elijah[176] (hence the fatherly voice which corrects him)[177]; an attachment to Jesus, which makes him forget earthly concerns, because Peter knows well Whom he has in front of him[178].

But, the proposal implies a separation–division between *the Law and the Prophets and Christ*[179]: this separation–division goes against the divine will (which is unity between the Gospel and the Law and the Prophets[180], the reading of the Law and of the Prophets in the light of the Gospel[181], and the unity of the universal Church[182]), a divine will which Peter doesn't seem to grasp[183]. Rather, Moses, Elijah and Jesus mustn't be altogether treated equally, since that would do harm to the greater[184]. Thus, the (one and only) tent has to be built not on earth –although the universal Church (like the heavenly Jerusalem) is the one and only tent of the Son of God[185]– but in heaven[186]. Instead of pitching three material tents, one must

[172] Cfr. AM *Luc, VII.*
[173] Cfr. AM *Is.*
[174] Cfr. HI *Mc.*
[175] Cfr. GR-M *Rg*, I, 65; cfr. MAXn *h 17, 4.*
[176] Cfr. MAXn *h* 17, 4.
[177] GR-M *Jb*, VIII.
[178] Cfr. BED *h I/24Q.*
[179] Cfr. AU *sermones* 78,3; 79/A,2.
[180] Cfr. Id., *sermones* 78,4; 79.
[181] Cfr. AU *s* 79/A.
[182] Cfr. MAXn *h* 17, 4.
[183] Cfr. AU *s* 79.
[184] Cfr. HI *Mc.*
[185] Cfr. MAXn *h* 17, 4.
[186] Cfr. AM *Ps.*

pitch one immaterial tent as the dwelling-place of the Trinity in the heart[187].

Although Peter doesn't err neither in nature nor in glory (when he focuses on Jesus), the Father corrects him[188], as the Spouse who tells the soul not to impede him from seeking more souls[189]. Moreover, as this scene from the Transfiguration-event which Peter witnesses, helps him when he later repents from having denied knowing Jesus thrice[190], Peter –when calling himself partaker in the *glory*[191]– evokes his experience of Jesus' Transfiguration[192].

Six authors[193] speak with regards to **the cloud of the Transfiguration**, –analogous to the cloud of the Ascension[194]– as: the cloud of the Spirit (in the context of the Trinitarian theophany in the Transfiguration[195], although only the Father's voice is heard196); the best site (inside the luminous cloud[197] –with God, like Moses– is better than outside198) because the cloud –seen as the Holy Spirit that protects from wild weather– invites man to contemplate the Trinity[199]; the grace the protects the Church[200]; a correction of the Father to Peter[201].

[187] Cfr. HI *Mt*, III.
[188] Cfr. AM *fi*, I.
[189] Cfr. Id., *Is*.
[190] Cfr. GR-M *Jb*, XXIV.
[191] Cfr. 1 P 5,1.
[192] Cfr. BED *cath*, 1 P, V, 1.
[193] Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, Chromatius, Maximus, Hilary of Ireland.
[194] Cfr. MAX *s* 44.
[195] Cfr. PS-HIL-A *cath*, 2 P I, 18.
[196] Cfr. AM *Lc*, VII.
[197] Cfr. HI *Ps h XCVI*; cfr. MAX s 44.
[198] Cfr. AM *Ps*.
[199] HI *Mc*.
[200] Cfr. CHRO *Mt*.
[201] Cfr. AU *s* 79/A,2.

Five authors[202], commenting on **the voice from the cloud**, speak of the great[203], intense[204] voice of the Father (not that of the Trinity[205]) which confirms what is seen by the three Apostles[206], and which says that the Son is of the nature and the substance of the Father, remaining in him, and is everything he is[207]. That voice resounds in the Prophets[208]. Nevertheless, an *arduous question* is that of the voice; it's because the *words–Word* inequality is like the inequality between man and God[209].

Seventeen authors[210] speak of the **Father's testimony about the Son in the Transfiguration. In the Transfiguration,** the Father bears witness on the Son[211] again[212], and implies the distinction and the cooperation, the union (but not monopersonality[213], nor unicity, as what Sabelius and Ebion[214] say) of teh Invisible Father and the Visible Son[215]. The Son is visible even before the Incarnation as the vicar[216] of the Father (and as an enigma in the time of Moses[217]), and to be the (visible) Son is made luminously clear when Jesus transfigures himself. The Apostles didn't see a monopersonal god[218]; rather, they did see –in extasis– the Son,

[202] Hilary of Poitiers, Jerome, Augustine, Vincent, Bede.
[203] Cfr. HI *Ps h LXXVI*.
[204] Cfr. Ex 27,18; cfr. BED *aed*, II.
[205] Cfr. VIN *com*, I.
[206] Cfr. HIL *tri*, VI.
[207] Cfr. HI *Mc*.
[208] Cfr. AU *s* 43 (*spurius*).
[209] Cfr. Id., *Jo*, XCIX.
[210] Tertullian, Hilary of Poitiers, Ambrose, Jerome, Augustine, Epiphanius, Leo, Chromatius, Rufinus, Faustinus, Pseudo–Vigilius, Caesarius, Julian, Hilary of Ireland, Gregory the Great, Bede, and an unknown author.
[211] Cfr. JUL-T *aet*, II.
[212] Cfr. TE *Marc IV,* 22.
[213] Cfr. Id., *Pra*, 14.
[214] Cfr. HIL *tri*, II.
[215] Cfr. TE *Pra*, 14.
[216] Cfr. Te *Pra*, 19.
[217] Cfr. Id., *Pra*, 14.
[218] Cfr. Id., *Pra*, 23.

and they listened to the Father; if they had seen the Father[219], they would've died. In the *Genitor-Genitus relationship* (it's not exactly the father–son relationship in human beings[220]), there's no separation, nor division, nor adoption[221]. Only the Son is the begotten of the Father by nature[222], not by adoption[223] (Moses and Elijah are sons by adoption[224]), nor by choice[225], but that his filiation is true, natural and worthy of trust[226]. This filiation is property of the Son, not by an honor granted[227]. There's a *Genitor–Genitus common essence and work* (the Begotten who is neither created[228] nor adoptive, nor does he presume, nor does he usurp)229, the extratemporal simultaneity of the divine esence –Father and Son–[230] and the common divinity, power and eternity, which carries out the salvific plan[231]. That is to say, that there's the *Father–Son equality*, because the Father is pleased in the Son[232] (although "my delights" point to the Father and the Holy Spirit[233]), the "most beloved"[234] of the Father (thus, he informs of the Son's great love towards the Father[235], an eternal love of nature, not in the love fruit of grace[236]); such glorification of the Father doesn't alter the equlity in the divinity[237]. Thus, he who doesn't believe in the *Son's divinity* not only disbelieves the divinity

[219] Cfr. Id., *Pra*, 15.
[220] Cfr. AM, *fi*, I.
[221] Cfr. HIL *tri*., II.
[222] Not by adoption, like in Moses' and Elijah's case (cfr. AU *s* 78,4).
[223] Cfr. HIL *tri*, VI.
[224] FAUn, *Ar*, 18.
[225] Cfr. 2 P 1,17.
[226] Cfr. HIL, *tri*, VI.
[227] Cfr. ibid.
[228] Cfr. PS-VIG *Var*, lib. I.
[229] LEO *s* 51.
[230] Cfr. ibid.
[231] Cfr. ibid.
[232] Cfr. AM ex.; cfr. Id., *sp*, II-III; cfr. Id., *vg*.
[233] Cfr. PS-HIL-A *cath*, 2 P I, 17.
[234] Cfr. HI, *Phlm*, 1.
[235] Cfr. GR-M, *Rg*, VI, 113.
[236] Cfr. AM, *fi*, V.
[237] Cfr. PS-HIL-A *cath*, 2 P I, 17; cfr. BED *h* I/24Q.

of the Father[238] (who bears witness on the Son's divinity[239]), but worse, he'd be insulting the Father and the Son[240], because one would be taking away the credibility from them both[241]. The "is" of the message of the Transfiguration (*mysterium*) indicates the Son's perfection and eternity[242]. The mystery is that of the Father he is begotten, but without being passible[243]. The Father has a heart of a father (who had spoken "father to father" to Abraham[244]), and for the love of all, he gives his only Son, although it supposed giving him to a very cruel death[245]. When the Father proclaims who the Son is, it's not that afterwards the Son becomes proud, because the Father only *confirms* the natural, eternal divine filiation of the Son, who is respected not because the Son himself commands so, but simply because he is the most beloved Son of the Father[246]. Only the Word is the most beloved Son of the Father[247]. The message of the voice implies that the natural Son is the Begotten of the Father, with its own and true divine nature[248]. There's a *Genitor–Genitus mutual reference,* and the Son is consubstantial[249] with the Father[250]. The voice helps the three Apostles to realize that they're before the glory of the Son's humanity, and that he who shall suffer the Passion is the natural Son of the Father[251]. Bede interprets Samuel's

[238] Cfr. AM *Lc.*
[239] Cfr. FAUn, *Ar*, 18.
[240] Cfr. PS-CY, *Jud*, III.
[241] Cfr. HIL *tri.*, VI.
[242] Cfr. AM, *fide*, I.
[243] Cfr. ibid.
[244] Cfr. AM *Abr*, I.
[245] Cfr. Id., *Jac*, I; cfr. Jn 3,16.
[246] Cfr. Id., fide, II.
[247] Cfr. Id., inc, 6.
[248] Cfr. CHRO *Mt*; cfr. EP-L *h* 47.
[249] Cfr. CAE *s* 9.
[250] Cfr. RUF *sy*, 4.
[251] Cfr. BED, *h I/24Q.*
[252] Cfr. Id., *Sam.*
[253] Cfr. Id., *Gn*, II.
[254] Cfr. AM, *fi*, IV.

triple calling in the light of the Father's testimony regarding the Son[252]. Bede sees God's delight towards Abel in the Father's delight in the Son[253]. There's the vital unity Father–Son because the Father granted life to the Son, so that the Father may be glorified in the Son, who pleases the Father[254].

Eight authors[255] speak of the **command to listen to the Son**, the Savior[256], from various perspectives: the command fulfills the prophecy[257]. One should listen to the Son (who establishes the New Law[258]) through[259], but more than, the Law and the Prophets, affirming the unity and the continuity of the Scriptures[260], because the testimony of the Son about his filiation[261] is not only due to his name (neither out of arrogance nor out of temerity[262]), but out of virtue, such that his works give faith that he's the One Sent by the Father[263]. To listen to the Son leads to perfect faith[264]. Since the Son, proceeding and coming from the Father, is God[265], with eternal power[266]; and so, he must be heeded[267]. It's not enough to recognize who the Son is, but that he should be listened to, since the authority of the Son (who has the connatural confidence with the Father) is the same authority of the Father[268]. Well then, in order to be able to listen to the Son, it's good to discern between fleeting words, and the eternal Word[269].

---

[255] Tertullian, Cyprian of Carthage, Hilary of Poitiers, Ambrose, Augustine, Leo, Chromatius, Faustinus.
[256] Cfr. LEO, *s 51*.
[257] Cfr. Is 50,10.
[258] Cfr. CY *te*, I, x.
[259] Cfr. AU *s* 78,4.
[260] Cfr. TE *Marc IV*, 34.
[261] Cfr. CHRO *Mt.*
[262] Cfr. HIL *tri*, VI.
[263] Cfr. Ibid..
[264] Cfr. AM *Lc*, VII.
[265] Cfr. Id., *fi*, I. If the Son weren't God, the Christological hymn (cfr. Flp 2,8) wouldn't make any sense (cfr. FAUn *Ar.*, 18).
[266] Cfr. AM, *fi*, IV.
[267] Cfr. CHRO *Mt.*
[268] Cfr. FAUn *Ar.*, 18.
[269] Cfr. AU *cf*, XI.

Three authors[270] contemplate the scene of t**he transfigured Jesus and the witnesses**. The *triune* number can refer to the two groups of three witnesses around the transfigured Jesus[271], *heavenly and earthly witnesses*[272] who bear witness to the Son as the Lord of the cosmos[273]. The number seven (which indicates fullness) is formed by the six witnesses plus the transfigured Jesus[274], whose divinity is testified to thrice: by the Son; by the three Apostles, Moses and Elijah; and by the Father[275]. The Transfiguration invalidates heresies through a double testimony: the testimony–colloquium OT–NT, and the greater testimony of the Father[276].

Eight authors[277] speak of **the prostration or the sleep of the three Apostles** upon listening to the Voice during Jesus' Transfiguration, with various interpretations. *The prostration* reminds one of the weakness of him who follows Jesus, and serves as an encouragement before life's trials[278]. Peter, who fell to the ground for fear before the divine glory[279], was imitated by James and John in prostrating, because the three recognized that they were in the presence of the Mystery[280], God[281], and they felt weak before Him[282] (it's what any humble man would do[283] before the Mystery[284]). However, Peter fell –showing immaturity of faith–

[270] Ambrose, Chromatius, Epiphanius.
[271] Cfr. AM *Lc, VII*.
[272] Cfr. CHRO *Mt*.
[273] Cfr. Id., *s 22*.
[274] Cfr. EP-L, *h* 47; cfr. MAXn *h* 17, 3.
[275] Cfr. ibid.
[276] Cfr. ibid.; cfr. PS-HIL-A *cath*, I Jn V, 9.
[277] Hilary of Poitiers, Ambrose, Jerome, Leo. Chromatius, Gregory of Elvira, Gregory the Great, Bede.
[278] Cfr. HIL *Mt*., 17.
[279] Cfr. AM *fi*, I.
[280] Cfr. LEO *s 51*.
[281] Cfr. CHRO
[282] Cfr. BED *h I/24Q*.
[283] Cfr. GR-M, *Rg*, IV, 68.
[284] Cfr. HI *Mt*, III.

when he wasn't able to pay attention to what was important: the Son[285]. The three Apostles did well in falling to the ground; had they not done it, they would've died[286]. In eschatology, all shall gaze upon God[287]. If those who already accept Jesus' divinity prostrate themselves, it makes one think what those who dared to deny the Son's divinity would do[288]. The blindness of the two disciples on the way to Emmaus before the presence of the risen Jesus is like *the sleep* of the three Apostles during the Transfiguration[289].

Three authors[290] speak of **Jesus touching and waking up the three Apostles.** The fall[291] and the sleep and the rising of the three Apostles prefigure death and resurrection[292]. On another level, Jesus, as a good divine Master, dispels fear, and then teaches[293]. Even still, in order to clarify that the Son is Jesus, Moses and Elijah disappear from the scene[294].

Three authors[295] speak of the **command to keep silent, for the meantime, about the Transfiguration-event.** The said command of Jesus illustrates the seriousness of the Transfiguration-event within the divine salvific plan, and in the face of human weakness[296]. A measure of divine prudence is the order not to divulge[297], for the meantime, the Transfiguration-event[298], in order not to delay the salvific plan and to prevent scandal[299]. Already in Pentecost,

[285] Cfr. GR-M, *Rg*, VI, 113.
[286] Cfr. GR-I *fi*, 90.
[287] Cfr. BED *h I/24Q*.
[288] Cfr. AM *fi*, II.
[289] Cfr. Id., *118 Ps*.
[290] Ambrose, Augustine, and Jerome.
[291] Cfr. AU *s* 78,5.
[292] Cfr. AM *Lc, VII*.
[293] Cfr. HI *Mt*, III.
[294] Cfr. Id., *Mc*.
[295] Hilary of Poitiers, Ambrose, and Bede.
[296] Cfr. HIL *Mt*, 17.
[297] Cfr. BED *Prv*, I.
[298] Cfr. AM *Ps*.
[299] Cfr. BED *h I/24Q*.

the Holy Spirit shall make possible the timely announcement of Jesus' Transfiguration, within the general proclamation of about Christ Jesus[300], in the general catechesis and in the Baptismal catechesis[301].

[300] Cfr. HIL *Mt, 17*.
[301] Cfr. BED, *h I/24Q*.

Conclusion

We have seen forty authors in Latin (be they known persons –who wrote or dictated their works–, be they unknown authors, be they collections of writings with nicknames), nine integral works, and extracts from some one hundred works, where the authors have left us a proof of having made reference to a verse (or more) of the Transfiguration, ranging from the slight allusion, up to the mention of a verse (without explaining it further), up to the treatment of one –or two, or of all– of the scenes of the Transfiguration narrative in the Synoptic Gospels.

In the beginning of this work, I've said that the theological theme of Jesus' Transfiguration is nice and at the same time difficult. It's nice because, seen in retrospect, each scene gives way to more than one interpretation among the authors. The theological theme of Transfiguration is difficult precisely because finding a single *Leitmotiv* has been difficult to find, among the interpretations of each scene of the said narrative, and also in between the scenes, especially in Section II.

Now, one may ask: can one speak of a theology of the Transfiguration in the Latin Fathers?

It would be posing the same question of whether the Latin Fathers have proposed to do a theology of the Transfiguration, but in a more direct manner. I would say: yes and no. If by "theology", one means "doing theology" in the present-day sense –of *systematically* analyzing and synthesizing elements of judgment and of reflection with regards to the elements of the Transfiguration narratives, following the hermeneutical patterns of the authors before (or by presenting a new pattern)–, then the answer is no.

But, if for "theology" is meant a reflection on the faith –in this case, about the narrative on Jesus' Transfiguration (I think

not only of the narrative written in the Gospels, but also in the oral transmission of Peter's, James' and John's testimony, first to the other Apostles, and then to the young Church)– beyond the circumstances (polemical, liturgical, for example) thay might have arisen, the thing is that what has come to us are some integral writings and many others, extracts, in which there are aspects of reflection regarding the Transfiguration.

In this sense, from among those aspects, one can indeed do –at present– a Latin Patristic Transfiguration theology. A sample of aspects that could be considered as "steps" to a Latin Patristic Transfiguration theology is the synthesis attempt in Section III of this work.

On the one hand, the majority of writings in toto about Jesus' Transfiguration are situated in a homiletic part of the Eucharistic celebration. This suggests the value which –from the writings which have arrived intact up to our days– the authors have given the narrative (or to the three Synoptic narratives) of Jesus' Transfiguration. However, the specific treatment –from the historico-liturgical perspective– of the homiletic occurrence of the majority of these works can be done in other, future works.

On the other hand, the more than fourfold number of authors studied in Section II makes one think of the many who left an indication of their having referred to an aspect of the Synoptic narratives of Jesus' Transfiguration.

I insist that the writings –instead of being considered on one and the same level– are multi-faceted, each one approaching the Transfiguration narrative, be it in order to allude to it, be it in order to deal with it more. Nevertheless, what is observed is the plurality of references and meanings given to the details of the Transfiguration narratives.

Well then, in the light of this varied content, will not have

been this work a mere compilation, a "copy-and-paste", a repetition of the anthologies mentioned in the Introduction? Even still, the inclusion –for example, of Maximinus the Arian– in the set of quoted authors, does this not invalidate the title of the work, "theology of the Transfiguration *in the* Latin Fathers"?

I don't believe so. Instead of slowing down the internal logic –or any storyline– of the Thesis, I believe that the inclusion of authors not strictly called "Fathers" (think, moreover, of the collection of homilies called Eusebius the 'Gallican', or the anonymous authors) adds richness of content, not in the sense of "filling up pages", but rather, in the sense that they are an eloquent testimony that aside from the Latin Fathers, *stricto sensu*, there are *other voices* from Antiquity –in the Latin language– who refer to Jesus' Transfiguration, though it be, in some cases, a discreet allusion.

Moreover, I haven't seen any doctrinal error –regarding Jesus' Transfiguration– preached by any author (say, Maximinus the Arian) to be imitated. What there is, are doctrinal errors –especially those which refer to the Son, and his relation to the Father–, doctrinal errors which are specifically mentioned (say, by Tertullian) in order to be combatted, and to pre-warn the faithful against the possible deceit the heretics can inculcate in them. The specific treatment of these authors not properly called "Church Fathers" can be done in future works.

Let's go to some aspects of the content of the quoted authors. Without repeating here all the points in the preceding pages, I recall some *perspectives* which can be *of interest* to the reflection of the authors in Latin about Jesus' Transfiguration, in order to show that the extracts in the preceding pages have not been just juxtaposed. The order of exposition I follow shall be the *order of narration* in the narratives of the Transfiguration in the Synoptics.

On the basis of Jesus' announcement, before inviting Peter, James and John to go with him, there has been a mention of the

degrees of death (according to the man–death link).

The days between the announcement and the start of the ascent to the mountain have given place –at least, due to two narratives– to a reflection on the six *ages of creation*, extending the question of days to the history of salvation, in such a way that the seventh day is like the presence before Jesus in eschatology. Here we see how the authors try to see in each detail of the Synoptic narratives of the Transfiguration a channel through which to teach about Christian faith.

Jesus' very invitation to the three Apostles points to the *gratuitousness of the Son's initiative* towards man to be with him during this special moment. It's stated clearly that it's not the three Aposles had "a right" to witness the Transfiguration; rather, it has been a pleasant surprise to the chosen witnesses.

The mountain climb of the four is linked to the not-so-easy act of *reading through (intelegir) the Scriptures,* as well as to the Christian's *spiritual–ascetical life*.

The moment when Jesus transfigures himself (which is *described*, but isn't ever defined, because in the end it's a great mystery) has given place –among other teachings– to what could be called *theology of the snow*. Without trying to solve here the question of why φ ως is translated as *nix*, instead of as lux (a question that can be resolved in future works), it's clear that there has been a taking advantage of the different translation in order to speak of ascesis, among other things.

Moreover, there has been a recourse to Jesus' Transfiguration in order to speak: of *the Word's true Incarnation, of Jesus' true divinity*, of *Christ and Jesus as the same divine Person,* of *God's freedom and omnipotence* –when he presents himself *visibly* glorious before the Resurrection–, with *ecclesiological and eschatological echoes* when referring to the Body and to the clothes, both resplendent – of the transfigured Jesus.

Moses and Elijah on the sides of the transfigured Jesus makes one think not only on the fulfillment of the prophecy (and of a desire related to something intuited by Moses, in his life) in a relation of *circularity*, of *reciprocity*, of *continuity* and of *unity* (but not uniformity) *of the two Testaments of the Scriptures*.

The words Peter addresses to Jesus give rise to interpretations not only about *what Peter wants*, but also of *what he doesn't want*. In any case, the occasion is used to speak about generosity, and to be and to be focused on the divine will of having an over-all view of the Scriptures.

It's interesting to note that for Augustine, the question about the voice –which was heard when the cloud appeared– is very arduous. But more interesting –at least, for me– are the themes drawn out of the message heard, supposing that the voice is the Father's: *the distinction (not the diference),* and at the same time, *the mutual reference, the essential and operacional unity (not monopersonality) between two divine Persons: Paternity-Filiation, Invisible-Visible, Genitor-Genitus, Father-Son.*

Affirming the Filiation of the Son implies affirming *the divinity of the Son* who *has not been created, nor adopted, much less, usurped.* Moreover, this implies that the *Son's filiation is essential* (the Son is Filiation), *natural, true (as the Father is true Paternity), not a latter honor.* The very scene of Jesus and the witnesses who have just listened to the message of obeying the Son has a total of *seven* characters, whose origin from the different parts of the cosmos echoes on the message about Jesus Christ (who transfigured himself), a message which has to be let known everywhere.

The prostration and the rising of the three Apostles give way to an eschatological explanation *(death–resurrection)*.

The mystery of the dynamism between the divine will and human freedom, on which Jesus –the prudent Son– counts, is

glimpsed on the command not to speak –for the meantime– of the Transfiguration. It can also point to the Transfiguration as not an event that can just be considered as one more episode in the life of Jesus of Nazareth, the Word incarnate. However, this point can be studied in future works.

With the aspects underlined above among the commentaries of the Latin Fathers about the Transfiguration, one can see that this work doesn't intend to be a mere data compilation (in which case would just make of it an anthology, nothing more).

After analyzing and synthesizing the data –or in other words, the commentary on the commentaries– behind the texts gathered and translated, there's a need to insist on the unity of the narrative on Jesus' Transfiguration. Moreover, the narratives, upon which the Latin Fathers have reflected, point to the *historical event of the Transfiguration.*

No Latin Father would seem to accept the 20th c. theories that state that the Transfiguration narrative would've just been a textual or literary device to reaffirm the post-Resurrection faith in Christ in a moment just before the Passion. Much less would any of the Latin Fathers deny the historicity of Jesus' Transfiguration. If the Latin Fathers don't say it textually, I think that it's because this has been something obvious to them –beyond discussion– that Jesus himself truly transfigured himself, that the Transfiguration is a historical event, but also a meta-historical, supernatural event. It goes beyond the coordinates of space and time, because –independently of how long it might have lasted in terms of what we call "time"– the plurality of allusions and indications of all the characters and of all the details point not only to that present time –shortly before the Passion of Jesus– but, at the same time, it gazes beyond –to the even longer past of the OT prophecies about He whom the Lord God shall send–, and also, it projects itself towards the future, first to the birth of the Church, and second –through the centuries– up to the present where we find ourselves, in the first year of the third

millennium, and third, up to eschatology.

One last precision. *This work doesn't pretend to exhaust* what can be said about the commentaries of the Latin Fathers regarding the Synoptic narratives on Jesus' Transfiguration.

The *theological focus* employed here has gone from the *principal* themes or aspects. This doesn't hamper, but rather opens perspectives for future works about (for example) the relationship between the Latin Patristic Transfiguration theology and the heresies, or liturgy, etc.

In particular, it would be good to do a Patristic theology (from both the East and the West) of the Transfiguration, or at least, to establish a comparison of similar and dissimilar aspects between the Greek-Oriental Patristic theology and the Latin Patristic theology on the Synoptic narratives on Jesus' Transfiguration.

Other foci (Biblical –say, the possible allusions of the Apocryphal and Intertestamentary literature to Jesus' Transfiguration–, historical-theological, philological, liturgical, moral, espiritual) could be added to the many paths that open up on this topic.

Even more detailed studies could be made on each of the forty authors presented here. Or, a study can be done on the influence of other authors, like Origen, upon the Latin authors on the topic of Jesus' Transfiguration.

Finally, I hope that this work may contribute even a bit, in order to encourage more studies on the very, very vast field –up to now with many areas still without being researched beyond the critical editions– of the writings of the Fathers of the Church.

Appendix I: Mount Thabor

Knowing something more about mount Thabor can help in location in space the Transfiguration–event. Thus, here are presented some extracts –not dealt with in the work– in order to orient the reader on the mountain which tradition has recognized as the place where Jesus transfigured himself.

Aside from the author of the narrative called Egeria[1], the author of IT-*Bu* informs that not far from the mount of Olives, "there's a small mountain, where the Lord climbed to pray and there appeared Moses and Elijah, when [Jesus] took with him Peter and John"[2].

In IT-*Pla* (± 570, in Piacenza[3]) the author describes: "From Nazareth we came to mount Thabor, which is the mountain which has risen amidst the field, of fertile soil, with a circumference of six thousand, [with] an ascent of three thousand, an height of a thousand; there, there are three basilicas, where the disciple said: *Let us make three booths here*[4]; around it there are various cities, which are read in [the book] of Kings"[5].

---

1 It's "la piú antica relazione (nutrita soprattutto di nomenclatura topografica) del viaggio condotto da un anonimo bordolese da Bordeaux a Gerusalemme e viceversa, dopo un soggiorno in quest'ultima città durato qualche mese" [P. Siniscalco – L. Scarampi, *"Egeria, Pellegrinaggio in Terra Santa",* in A. Quacquarelli (dir.), "Collana di Testi Patristici" 48, Città Nuova Editrice, Roma, 31999, 13].

2 "...est monticulus, ubi Dominus ascendit orare et apparuit illic Moyses et Helias, quando Petrum et Iohannem secum duxit" (IT-*Bu*, 595,4 – 596,1, CChr.SL 175, 1965, 18).

3 KVS4, 584.

4 Cfr. Mt 17,4.

5 "De Nazareth uenimus in Tabor monte, qui mons exurgit in medio campestri, terra uiua, tenens circuitum milia sex, ascensum milia tria, susum contra unum miliarium planus; in quo sunt tres basilicas, ubi dictum est a discipulo: *Faciamus hic tria tabernacula;* in circuitu diuersae ciuitates, quae in Regum leguntur" (IT-*Pla* A, 6, CChr.SL 175, 1965, 131. It also apears in IT-Pla B, 6, CChr.SL 175, 1965, 158).

The author of *De locis sanctis libri tres* describes more in detail the place traditionally called mountain of the Transfiguration: mount Thabor: "From the lake of Genesaret, mount Thabor is away by three thousand, wonders around, from each narrow part, considering it from the northern region on the said swamp, with many plants and flora; in the summit of which there's a broad plain surrounded by a big forest, in the midst of which there is found a big monastery of monks and their many quarters"[6].

Then, the author describes the summit of Thabor: "...the summit of that rural mountain isn't compressed in a narrow peak; rather, it broadens in a latitude of twenty-three stadia; but its height flies to thirty stadia"[7]. Next, the author speaks of three Christian temples in that zone, the number corresponding to the tents of the uerba Petri: "Also, in the same upper plains there are three famous churches founded, not small buildings, according to the number of those tents about which –on the same holy mountain– Peter, enjoying the vision and very much afraid, speaking with the Lord, said: *How well it is that we are here; let us make three booths, one for you and one for Moses and one for Elijah*[8]"[9].

---

[6] "Mons Thabor in Galilea tribus milibus a lacu Cinereth distat, mira rotunditate ex omni collectus parte, a plaga boreali respiciens supra dictum stagnum, herbosus ualde et floridus; in cuius amoena summitate ampla planities silua pergrandi circumcincta habetur, cuius in medio campo monachorum inest grande monasterium et plurimae eorundem cellolae" (ADOMN *loc*, XXVII, CChr.SL 175, 1965, 219).

[7] "Nam illius montis campestris uertex non in angustum coartatur cacumen sed in latitudinem dilatatur stadiorum xxiii; altitudo autem eius xxx stadiis sublimatur" (Id., cit., 219-220).

[8] Cfr. Mt 17,4.

[9] "In eadem quoque superiore planitie non parui edificii ternae sunt fundatae celebres eclesiae iuxta illorum tabernaculorum numerum de quibus in eodem sancto monte Petrus caelesti laetificatus uisione et ualde pauefactus ad Dominum locutus ait: *Bonum est nobis hic esse et faciamus tria tabernacula, unum tibi et unum Moysi et unum Heliae"* (ADOMN loc, XXVII, CChr.SL 175, 1965, 220).

The author completes his description by mentioning the wall: "...about the said buildings of the monastery and of the three churches with the monks' quarters, everything is surrounded by a stone wall"[10].

The author leaves a clue on some important characters of his time who are linked to mount Thabor, aside from the characters of the Transfiguration. According to the author, Thabor is the mountain "...where saint Arculfus was received for one night in the summit of the holy mountain; yes, Peter Christian of Burgundy, a guide in those lands, didn't stop [being] in the quarters of both hospices"[11].

BED *loc* summarily describes Thabor and its surroundings: "Mount Thabor in the middle of the field of Galilee, some three thousand to Manasses to the north from the Genesaret lake distances itself in a circular way from all sides, with many plants and flora, of a height of thirty stadia. The rustic and very cozy summit itself broadens to a space of thirty-three stadia, where the big monastery is also surrounded by a big forest, with three churches, according to what Peter said: Let's make three tents here[12]. The place around with a wall has big buildings"[13].

In summary, through these extracts from pilgrims to the Holy Land, one sees how Christian tradition has sought to pass

---

[10] "...supra memorata monasterii et trium eclesiarum edificia cum cellulis monachorum lapideo omnia circumueniuntur muro" (ibid.).

[11] "Vbi sanctus Arculfus una hospitatus est nocte in eiusdem sancti montis celsitudine; nam Petrus Burgunnio Christicola in illis terris semitarum eius ductor non ipsum sinebat in uno eodemque hospitio" (ibid.).

[12] Cfr. Mc 9,4; Lc 9,33.

[13] *"Mons Thabor in medio Galilaeae campo* in *tribus milibus* Manasse ad boream *a mari Ceneret distat ex omni parte* rotundus, *herbosus ualde et floridus altitudinis XXX stadiorum. Vertex* ipse *campestris* et multum amoenus, *XX et trium stadiorum* spatio dilatatur, ubi *grande monasterium grandi quoque silua* circumdatur, tres *ecclesias* habens, iuxta quod *Petrus ait: Faciamus hic tria tabernacula.* Locus muro cinctus magna gestans aedificia" (Bed *loc*, XVI CChr.SL 175, 1965, 276-277).

from generation to generation the tradition that Jesus historically transfigured himself on mount Thabor, in Palestine. Locating mount Thabor and the buildings therein can help in the affirmation of the historicity of Jesus' Transfiguration.

Appendix II: Transfiguration and liturgy

The fourfold content of this Appendix II intends to show –with only *some* examples– how the Church proclaims the transfigured Jesus in liturgical prayers. This theme hasn't been dealt with in the main body of the work. Maybe in some future work, it can deal with this interesting research path.

A. Praefationes

The Eucharistic Prefaces express in many ways the Transfiguration of Jesus, in which He "sprinkled with maximum splendor that bodily form common to others"[1]. "He was man when he took the disciples with him to the mountain, he was God when he transfigured himself before them, and [when] a cloud shone around him, and [when] there was a voice from the cloud saying: *'Éste es mi Hijo, el Amado, en quien me he complacido, escuchadle*'[2]"[3].

The purpose of the Transfiguration: "so that the scandal of the Cross might be taken away from the hearts of the disciples"[4], "...to attract the human souls from weakness, [the souls] wrapped with torpor toward that true pleasure of perpetual light, to contemplate, desire and attain it with all [one's] efforts"[5]. Jesus transfigured himself

---

1 "...et communem illam cum ceteris corporis formam maximo splendore perfudit" (*praef 862 VD*, CChr.SL 161 C, 1980, 265).

2 Mt 17,5 (SagBi 5, 161).

3 "Homo fuit (quan)do discipulos in monte assumpsit, Deus erat quando transfiguratus est ab eis, et nubs circumfulsit illum, et uox de nube facta est, dicens: 'Hic est Filius meus dilectus, in quo mihi bene complacui, ipsum audite'" (*praef 1153 DJ*, CChr.L 161 C, 1980, 355).

4 "...ut de cordibus discipulorum crucis scandalum tolleretur" (*praef 862 VD*, CChr.L 161 C, 1980, 265).

5 "Ut infirmitatis humane mentes, torpore inuolutas, ad ueram illam lucis perpetuae amoenitatem alliceret contemplandam, desiderandam, et totis nixibus consequendam" (*praef 982 VD*, CChr.SL 161 C, 1980, 303).

so that, "having foretold his own death to the disciples, he opened his glory on the holy mountain, so that through the Passion, also through the testimony of the Law and the Prophets, the coming of the glory of the Resurrection might become established"[6]. Jesus wanted to transfigure himself because "he wanted his glory to be marvelously conspicuous"[7]. For the Christians, Jesus let himself be seen transfigured "for the souls of the believers, to fortify desires of glory of the heavenly hosts"[8].

Moses and Elijah: Jesus Christ is "Lord and author of the Law and of the Prophets"[9].

Peter's proposal: not only Peter, but also James and John, share Peter's decision to be there, "...since they had been attracted by the glory so admirable to opt more for the intense desires of glory on high"[10]. To gaze so much on the transfigured Jesus gives the result of "having made [the sense of sight] reddish by the splendor of so much light"[11].

The Father spoke: "so that you may discover the consubstantiality [of the Son] to your Divinity"[12].

---

6 "...propria morte praenuntiata discipulis, in monte sancto suam eis aperuit claritatem, ut per passionem, etiam lege prophetisque testantibus, ad gloriam resurrectionis perveniri constaret" (*praef 1184 VD,* CChr.SL 161 C, 1980, 365).

7 "...diuinitatis suae gloriam uoluit mirabiliter esse conspicuam" (*praef 1265 VD,* CChr.SL 161 C, 1980, 390).

8 "Ob mentes namque credentium, ad desideria claritatis agminum erigenda caelestium" (*praef 1265 VD,* CChr.SL 161 C, 1980, 390).

9 "...legis ac prophetarum auctor et Dominus" (*praef 1006 VD,* CChr.SL 161 C, 1980, 310).

10 "Allecti enim fuerant ex tam mirabili claritate amplius supernam gloriam intensis desideriis peroptare" (*praef 982 VD,* CChr.SL 161 C, 1980, 303).

11 "...tantae lucis splendore rutilasse" (ibid.).

12 "...ut tuae Deitatis consubstantialem panderes" (*praef 1265 VD,* CChr.SL 161 C, 1980, 390).

Moral lesson: "So that, freed from the servile house of the present life, we may be transferred to you, true light and unfading glory for ever. And raising our eyes, may we not see anyone, but only Jesus the Redeemer"[13].

B. Benedictiones

On Mt 17,1: "he who was worthy to go to the mountain, having taken with him the disciples"[14]; "[May God] grant you [all] to climb the mountain of righteousness with the Lord and with the Apostles, full of the glory of the heavenly light, with the bodily clothes [made] white"[15];

On Mt 17,2: "he wanted to show himself to them in the glory of the sun and the whiteness of the snow"[16], "And he who showed glory to the same [James] on the mountain"[17]; "God, who deigned to reveal to the three disciples the glory of the divine clarity, may he himself open your interior eyes in order to gaze intently on the light of the holy and indivisible Trinity"[18]

---

[13] "Vt praesentis uitae ergastulo liberati, ad te uerum lumen et indeficientem claritatem in perpetuum transferamur. Leuantesque oculos nostros neminem uideamus, nisi solum Iesum Redemptorem" (*praef 982 VD,* CChr.SL 161 C, 1980, 303).

[14] "...qui assumptis discipulis montana cum eis dignatus est petere" *(bened 293,a [Cant. 20, I: bened sabbato in hebdomada Iª Quadragesimae],* CChr.SL 162, 1971, 125).

[15] "Concedat uobis montem iustitiae cum Domino et apostolis conscendere, et candidatis corporum uestimentis perfundi caelestis luminis claritate" *(bened 1966,b [Long. 25b: bened in sabbato Iº Quadragesimae],* CChr.SL 162A, 1971, 803).

[16] "[Qui] illis in solis claritate et niuis candore uoluit demonstrare" *(bened 293,a [Cant. 20, I: bened sabbato in hebdomada Iª Quadragesimae],* CChr.SL 162, 1971, 125).

[17] "Quique ipsi transfigurationis ostendit gloriam in monte" *(bened 834b,b [bened in die sancti Iacobi apostoli, b (25 Iul.)],* CChr.SL 162, 1971, 334).

[18] "Deus, qui tribus discipulis reuelare dignatus est gloriam diuinae claritatis, ipse uobis interiores oculos aperiat ad contuendam lucem sanctae et indiuiduae Trinitatis" *(Item alia (bened in sabbato hebdomadae Iae Quadragesimae)* 1158b,a, CChr.SL 162A, 1971, 475).

On Mt 17,3: "like Moses and Elijah, may you deserve to see and to speak with God on the heavenly mansion without the faint shadow of blindness"[19].

On Mt 17,4: "May insofar as adhering by faith, hope and love to the triune majesty in the tent of pilgrimage, you may be partakers, in the end, of the Lord's Transfiguration through the configuration of the bodies and through the enlightenment of the minds"[20].

On Mt 17,5: "he who was called by the paternal voice from the cloud"[21].

C. Missale Ambrosianum

Within the liturgical formulae, there are:

1º *Trinitarian themes:* "The Father's voice has been heard: This is my Beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; listen to him"[22], "Oh God, You who have strengthened the mysteries of the fathers in faith through the glorious Transfiguration of your Only-Begotten"[23],

---

[19] "...cum Moyse et Elia Deum uidere et colloqui in caelesti habitaculo sine caecitatis obumbraculo mereamini" *(bened 1928c,c [W.144: bened in sabbato IIIº Quadragesimae],* CChr.SL 162A, 1971, 789).

[20] "Quatenus trinae maiestati fide, spe et caritate in peregrinationis tabernaculo adhaerentes, transfigurationis dominicae configuratione corporum et illustratione mentium tandem possitis esse participes" *(bened 1966,c [Long. 25b: bened in sabbato Iº Quadragesimae],* CChr.SL 162A, 1971, 803).

[21] "...qui paterna uoce de nube est uocatus" *(bened 293,c [Cant. 20, I: bened sabbato in hebdomada Iª Quadragesimae]*, CChr.SL 162, 1971, 125).

[22] "...paterna uox audita est: Hic est Filius meus dilectus, in quo mihi bene complacui: ipsum audite" *(Ingressa, in festo Transfigurationis Domini,* M-AM, Milano, 1981, 694); cfr. Mt 17,5.

[23] "Deus, qui fidei sacramenta in Unigeniti tui gloriosa transfiguratione patrum testimonio roborasti" *(Oratio super populum, in festo Transfigurationis Domini,* M-AM, Milano, 1981, 694); cfr. Mt 17,2.5.

2º. *Christological themes:* "[He who] sprinkled with maximum splendor that bodily form common to all"[24], "so that the scandal of the Cross may be taken away from the hearts of the disciples"[25], "We beseech you, Lord, that the heavenly nourishment we have eaten may transform us constantly into the image of him, whose clarity you willed to show through the glorious Transfiguration"[26], "Lord, because you illumine my lamp: my God, illumine my darkness. Because in you I shall be drawn out of temptation: my God, illumine my darkness. Lord, because you illumine my lamp: my God, illumine my darkness"[27].

3º. *Pneumatological themes:* "In the resplendent cloud the Holy Spirit has been seen"[28]

---

[24] "...communem illam cum ceteris corporis formam maximo splendore perfudit" *(praef, in festo Transfigurationis Domini,* M-AM, Milano, 1981, 695). Es prácticamente la misma fórmula empleada en la *praef 862 VD* (CChr.SL 161 C, 1980, 265).

[25] "...ut de cordibus discipulorum crucis scandalum tolleretur" *(praef, in festo Transfigurationis Domini,* M-AM, Milano, 1981, 695). Es prácticamente la misma fórmula empleada en la *praef 862 VD* (CChr.SL 161 C, 1980, 265).

[26] "Caelestia, quaesumus, Domine, alimenta quae sumpsimus, in eius nos transforment constanter imaginem, cuius claritatem gloriosa transfiguratione manifestare uoluisti" (*Post Communionem, in festo Transfigurationis Domini,* M-AM, Milano, 1981, 695).

[27] "Quoniam tu illuminas lucernam meam, Domine: Deus meus, illumina tenebras meas. / Quoniam in te eripiar a tentatione: Deus meus, illumina tenebras meas. / Quoniam tu illuminas lucernam meam, Domine: Deus meus, illumina tenebras meas" *(Lucernarium, Ps 17, 29-30a, Missa inter Vesperas in Cena Domini; Initium Vesperarum celebrationis Passionis Domini,* M-AM, cit., 223, 231). La rúbrica para este rito litúrgico reza así: *"Dum responsorium lucernarii cantatur, celebrans accendit candelabra quae ministri ei praesentant atque deinde disponunt prope uel super altare; interim alia candelabra uel lampades ecclesiae accenduntur. Postea celebrans, incenso in turibulo infuso, altare incensat"* (ibid.).

[28] "In splendenti nube Spiritus sanctus uisus est" *(Ingressa, in festo Transfigurationis Domini,* M-AM, cit., 694); cfr. Mt 17,5.

4º. *Ecclesiological themes:* "We beseech you, Lord, to illumine your people, and to enkindle their heart with the splendor of your grace"[29].

5º. *Eschatological themes:* "raising our eyes, may we not see anybody but Jesus, the Redeemer"[30], "when Christ manifests himself, we shall be like him, for we shall see him as he is"[31].

6º. *Anthropological (moral and spiritual) themes:* "[Oh God, you] who have prodigiously predestined the perfect adoption of your children, deign it, so that by listening to the voice of your beloved Son, we may deserve to become co-heirs"[32], "...freed from the prison of slaves of the present life, may we be transferred for ever to you, Lord, true Light and unfading Glory"[33], "so that the manifest celebration of the Savior of the world, eternal Light, may reveal himself alwas and grow in our hearts with a generous glory"[34], "We beseech you, Lord, sanctify the sacrifices offered, through the glorious Transfiguration of your Only-Begotten, and cleanse us from the stains of the sins through the splendor of his

---

[29] "Illumina, quaesumus, Pater, populum tuum, et splendore gratiae tuae cor eorum semper accende" *(Ad complendam liturgiam Verbi, in festo Transfigurationis Domini,* M-AM, cit., 694); cfr. Mt 17,2.

[30] "...leuantesque oculos nostros neminem uideamus, nisi solum Iesum redemptorem" *(Post Euangelium, in festo Transfigurationis Domini,* M-AM, cit., 694); cfr. Mt 17,8.

[31] 1 Jn 3,2 (cfr. SagBi 5, 1474, salvo "Cristo", que en la Neovulgata es ipse); *Transitorium, in festo Transfigurationis Domini,* M-AM, cit., 695.

[32] "...adoptionem filiorum perfectam mirabiliter praesignasti, concede ut, ipsius dilecti Filii tui uocem audientes, eiusdem mereamur effici coheredes" *(Oratio super populum, in festo Transfigurationis Domini,* M-AM, cit., 694); cfr. Mt 17,5.

[33] "Praesentis uitae ergastulo liberati, ad te, Domine, uerum lumen et indeficientem claritatem in perpetuum transferamur" *(Post Euangelium, in festo Transfigurationis Domini,* M-AM, cit., 694); cfr. Mt 17,2.4.

[34] "...ut Saluatoris mundi, aeterni luminis gloria famulante, manifestata celebritas mentibus nostris reueletur semper et crescat" *(Ad complendam liturgiam Verbi, in festo Transfigurationis Domini,* M-AM, cit., 694); cfr. Mt 17,2.

manifestation"[35], *"Porque en Ti está la fuente de la vida, en tu luz vemos la luz"*[36].

D. Missale Hispano-Mozarabicum

"Hear us, Lord our God, undying Light, Light from the One and Only Light, Source of light, Light-Author of the lights you have created and illumined; Light of your angels (...) Light of your saints. (...) Bless this light, oh Light, because you created and gave this which we hold in our hands. And just as we light the lights with this –sending away the night from this place–, so too send away the darkness from our hearts"[37].

"From the created tree the night of the crime / but from the wood was born the Light of salvation"[38].

---

[35] "Oblata munera, quaesumus, Domine, gloriosa Unigeniti tui transfiguratione sanctifica, nosque a peccatorum maculis splendoribus ipsius illustrationis emunda" *(Super Oblata, in festo Transfigurationis Domini,* M-AM, cit., 695); cfr. Mt 17,2.

[36] Sal 36(35),10 (SagBi 3, 281); *Confractorium, in festo Transfigurationis Domini,* M-AM, cit., 695.

[37] "Exaudi nos, lumen indeficiens, Domine Deus noster, /unici luminis lumen, fons luminis, / lumen auctor luminum quae creasti et illuminasti; / lumen angelorum tuorum (...) / lumen sanctorum tuorum. (...) / Benedic hoc lumen, o lumen, quia et hoc quod portamus in manibus, / tu creasti, tu donasti. / Et sicut nos per haec lumina quae accendimus / de hoc loco expellimus noctem, / sic et tu expelle tenebras de cordibus nostris (Ex *Benedictione lucernae in sacrario: sollemne initium Vigiliae seu Lucernarium, in nocte sancta Vigiliae Paschalis,* Missale Hispano-Mozarabicum, 1991, 369).

[38] "De arbore creata nox criminis, / sed de ligno genita lux salutis" (Ex *Benedictione lucernae ante altare, in nocte sancta Vigiliae Paschalis,* Missale Hispano-Mozarabicum, 1991, 373).

Appendix III: Chronology

I present the following chronology according to the authors studied, be they historical persons, pseudonyms, and as the case may be, of dubious authorship. Moreover, the works of each author that mention (or as the case may be, explain) something or a part of the narrative of Jesus' Transfiguration. However, I don't enter into the debate about the date regarding each author, nor do I enter into the topic of authenticity, or the probability, or the falsehood of the authorship. Where the page numbers before the dates aren't seen, they are taken from KVS4.

The works in boldface type correspond to the works dealt with in Section I of this work.

+ after 212	Quintus Septimius Florens Tertullianus
197	TE mart
203	TE hae
206	TE car
209/10 ?	TE Marc IV
210/3	TE an
210/1	TE je, TE Pra
± 211	TE res
± 211/2	TE sco
214/5	TE mon
+258	Cyprianus Carthaginensis
248/250	CY te
3rd c.	Pseudo-Cyprianus
3rd c.	PS-CY Jud

half of 3rd c.	Commodianus
[?]	COM in
4th c. ?	Anonymus (Eusebius Vercellensis?)
± 315 – 367 ?	Hilarius Pictauiensis
353/5	HIL Mt
356/9	HIL tri
end of 358	HIL syn
360/7	HIL hy
± 365	HIL Ps
333	IT-Bu (cfr. Appendix I)
381 – 384	IT-Ae (cfr. Appendix I)
+ ± 392	Gregorius Iliberritani Episcopus
360 – 364	GR-I fi
[?]	GR-I tr. Orig.
+ before 396	Filastrius
383/91	FIL Div. hae.
+397	Ambrosius Mediolanensis
377	AM vg
± 378	AM Ca
378	AM Sat
378 – 380	AM fi
381	AM sp
382	AM inc
382/3	AM Abr
383-394	AM Dav
early 386	AM Jac
Easter 386 / 390 / 396	AM mort
Lent 396/387-391	AM Is

384 – 390	AM pae
Holy Week 386–390/386/387	AM ex
387 ? / 393	AM ep
387/97	AM Ps
± 389/90	AM 118 Ps
389/391	AM my
± 390	AM Lc
± 391	AM ptr
+450	Maximinus Arrianus
[?]	MAXn h 17
±345 – 410	Rufinus Tyrannius
404	RUF sy
±347 – 419/420	Eusebius Hieronymus
[?]	HI Mc
398	HI Mt
[?, Bethlehem]	HI e 46
386	HI Gal, HI Phlm
392 – 401	HI Ps
398	HI e 65
404	HI e 108
406	HI Za
408/9	HI Is
[?]	HI Ps h
13 Nov 354 – 430	Aurelius Augustinus
397	AU cf
397 – 426/427	AU do
399/400	AU q Ev
399 – 422/6	AU tr brev, AU tr
401	AU ep 55
411 – 413	AU Ps 50
412	AU Ps 147

413 – 418	AU Jo 17
414	AU Ps 110
418 -422	AU Jo 99
425 or after	AU s 79
[?]	AU s 78
[?]	AU s 79/A
[?]	AU [?] s 43 [spurius]
335/340 – 407	Chromatius Aquileiensis
397 – 407	CHRO Mt
[?]	CHRO s 8
[?]	CHRO s 22
2nd half of the 4th c.	Faustinus presbyter
before 386	FAUn Ar
+366/384	Ambrosiaster
370/5	AMst q
June 363 – Dec 384	AMst [Rm, Gal, Phil, 1-2 Cor]
5th c.	Pseudo-Vigilius Thapsensis
445 – 480	PS-VIG Var
+415	Apponius
+408/423	Maximus Taurinensis
[?]	MAX s 44, MAX s 61/A
± 380 – 450	Petrus Chrysologus
[?]	PET-C s 131
± 380 – 450/455	Eucherius Lugdunensis

428 – 434	EUCH inst
+ ± 454	Quoduultdeus
[?]	QU hae, QU Jud
+ ± 455	Vincentius Lerinensis
434	VIN com
+ after 451	Arnobius Iunior
[?]	AR exp Lc
+ after 455	Prosperus
440	PROS Ps
411 – 461	Epiphanius Latinus
[?]	EP-L h 29, EP-L h 47
+ 461	Leo Magnus
[?]	LEO s 51
5th c. (– 7th c.?)	Eusebius ‘Gallicanus’
[?]	EUS-G h 8
469/470 – 542	Caesarius Arelatensis
[?]	CAE s 9, CAE s 115
+550/560	Primasius
[?]	PRIM Ap
+552	Verecundus

±534	VER cant
±570	IT-Pla (cfr. Appendix I)
485/490 – ±580	Cassiodorus
537 – 570	CAr Ps
±540 – 604	Gregorius Magnus
579 – 585/6	GR-M Jb
594/8	GR-M Rg
644 – 6 Mar. 690	Iulianus Toletanae archiepiscopus
686	JUL-T aet
650 – 690	Scottus Anonymus
672 – 735	Beda Venerabilis
≠≠	
maybe ±702/3	BED loc (cfr. Appendix I)
703/9	BED Apc
after 709	BED Act
± 710	BED cath
± 716	BED Sam
720/25	BED tab
720-730	BED Ct, BED Prv
before 731	BED Hab
725/31	BED Esr, BED Gn
729-731	BED aed
730-735	BED h 21, BED h I,24
8th c.	Anonymus (Liber questionum in Euangeliis)
+704	Adamnanus/Adomnanus (cfr. Apéndice I)

775 – 800	Anon. Ex. (Preb.)
8th c. (1st half of the 9th c.?)	Hilarius Hiberniae (Pseudo Hilarius Arelatensis)
690/708	PS-HIL-A (Liber 8/9 seu De fidei unitate)
± 9th c.	Anon. (De Enigmatibus ex Apocalypsi Johannis)

Bibliography
Sources, critical editions and translations

Adamnanus, *Adamnani de locis sanctis libri tres*, L. Bieler (cura et studio), CCL 175, Turnholti, Brepols, 1965

Ambrosiaster, *Ambrosiaster, Commento alla Lettera ai Galati,* L. Fatica (tr.), en A. Quacquarelli (dir.) "Collana di Testi Patristici nº 61", Città Nuova Editrice, Roma, 1986

_____, *Ambrosiaster, Commento alla Lettera ai Romani,* A. Pollastri (tr.), en A. Quacquarelli (dir.) "Collana di Testi Patristici nº 43", Città Nuova Editrice, Roma, 1984

_____, *Ambrosiaster, Commento alla Prima Lettera ai Corinzi,* L. Fatica (tr.), en A. Quacquarelli (dir.) "Collana di Testi Patristici 78", Città Nuova Editrice, Roma, 1989

_____, *Ambrosiaster, Commento alla Seconda Lettera ai Corinzi,* L. Fatica (tr.), en A. Quacquarelli (dir.) "Collana di Testi Patristici 79", Città Nuova Editrice, Roma, 1989

_____, *Ambrosiastri qui dicitur Commentarius in Epistulas Paulinas, Pars prima, in Epistulam ad Romanos,* H. Vogels (recensuit), CSEL 81/1, Hoelder–Pichler–Tempsky, Vindobonae, 1966

_____, *Ambrosiastri qui dicitur Commentarius in Epistulas Paulinas, Pars secunda, in Epistulas ad Corinthios,* H. Vogels (recensuit), CSEL 81/2, Hoelder–Pichler–Tempsky, Vindobonae, 1968

_____, *Ambrosiastri qui dicitur Commentarius in Epistulas Paulinas, Pars tertia, in Epistulas ad Galatas, ad Filippenses,* H. Vogels (recensuit), CSEL 81/3, Hoelder–Pichler–Tempsky, Vindobonae, 1969

_____, *Pseudo–Augustinus [Ambrosiaster], Quaestiones Veteris et Novi Testamenti CXXVII,* A. Souter (recensuit), CSEL 50, Tempsky (Vindobonae) – Freytag (Lipsiae), 1908 (reprint, 1963)

Ambrosius Mediolanensis, *Ambroise de Milan Le Pénitence*, R. Gryson (tr.), SC 179, Les Éditions du Cerf, Paris, 1971

_____, *Ambroise de Milan, Apologie de David,* P. Hador (ed.) - M. Cordier (tr.), SC 239, Les Éditions du Cerf, Paris, 1977

_____, *Ambroise de Milan, Des sacrements, Des Mystères,* B. Botte (ed.), SC 25bis, Les Éditions du Cerf, Paris, 1961

_____, *Ambroise de Milan, Traité dur l'Évangile de S. Luc,* I (livres I–VI), G. Tissot, OSB (tr.), SC 45, Les Éditions du Cerf, Paris, 1956

_____, *Ambroise de Milan, Traité dur l'Évangile de S. Luc, II (livres VII–X),* G. Tissot, OSB (tr.), SC 52, Les Éditions du Cerf, Paris, 1958

_____, *Ambroise de Milan, Traité dur l'Évangile de S. Luc, II,* G. Tissot, OSB (tr.), SC 52, Les Éditions du Cerf, Paris, 1958

_____, *Ambrosii Mediolanensis Opera (Ex. eu. sec. Lc.)*, M. Adriaen (cura et studio), CCL 14, Turnholti, Brepols, 1957

_____, *Ambrosii Mediolanensis Opera,* P. Ballerini (ed.), CCL 14, Turnholti, Brepols, 1957

_____, *Sancti Ambrosi* [sic] *Opera, Pars decima, Epistulae et Acta (tom. II: Epistularum libri VII–VIIII),* M. Zelzer (post O. Faller SJ recensuit), CSEL 82/2, Hoelder–Pichler–Tempsky, Vindobonae, 1990

_____, *Sancti Ambrosii Opera, De Pars septima Mysteriis,* O. Faller, SJ (recensuit), CSEL 73, Hoelder–Pichler–Tempsky, Vindobonae, 1955

_____, *Sancti Ambrosii Opera, Pars altera, De Jacob,* C. Schenkl (recensuit), CSEL 32/2, Hoelder–Pichler–Tempsky, Vindobonae, 1962

_____, *Sancti Ambrosii Opera, Pars altera, De Patriarchis,* C. Schenkl (recensuit), CSEL 32/2, Hoelder–Pichler–Tempsky, Vindobonae, 1962

_____, *Sancti Ambrosii Opera, Pars decima, Epistulae et Acta (tom. I: Epistularum libri I–VI),* O. Faller, SJ (recensuit), CSEL 82/1, Hoelder–Pichler–Tempsky, Vindobonae, 1968

_____, *Sancti Ambrosii Opera, Pars nona, De Incarnationis Dominicae Sacramento,* O. Faller, SJ (recensuit), CSEL 79, Hoelder–Pichler–Tempsky, Vindobonae, 1964

_____, *Sancti Ambrosii Opera, Pars nona, De Spiritu Sancto,* O. Faller, SJ (recensuit), CSEL 79, Hoelder–Pichler–Tempsky, Vindobonae, 1964

_____, *Sancti Ambrosii Opera, Pars octava, De Fide [ad Gratianum Augustum],* O. Faller, SJ (recensuit), CSEL 78, Hoelder–Pichler–Tempsky, Vindobonae, 1962

_____, *Sancti Ambrosii Opera, Pars prima, De Abraham,* C. Schenkl (recensuit), CSEL 32/1, Hoelder–Pichler–Tempsky, Vindobonae, 1962

_____, *Sancti Ambrosii Opera, Pars prima, De bono mortis,* C. Schenkl (recensuit), CSEL 32/1, Hoelder–Pichler–Tempsky, Vindobonae, 1962

_____, *Sancti Ambrosii Opera, Pars prima, De Cain et Abel,* C. Schenkl (recensuit), CSEL 32/1, Hoelder–Pichler–Tempsky, Vindobonae, 1962

_____, *Sancti Ambrosii Opera, Pars prima, De Isaac vel anima,* C. Schenkl (recensuit), CSEL 32/1, Hoelder–Pichler–Tempsky, Vindobonae, 1962

_____, *Sancti Ambrosii Opera, Pars altera, De Apologia David,* C. Schenkl (recensuit), CSEL 32/2, Tempsky–Tempsky–Freytag, Vindobonae, 1962

_____, *Sancti Ambrosii Opera, Pars prima, Exameron,* C. Schenkl (recensuit), CSEL 32/1, Hoelder–Pichler–Tempsky, Vindobonae, 1962

_____, *Sancti Ambrosii Opera, Pars quinta, Expositio Ps. CXVIII,* M. Petschenig (recensuit), CSEL 62, Hoelder–Pichler–Tempsky, Vindobonae, 1962

_____, *Sancti Ambrosii Opera, Pars septima, De excessu fratris, O. Faller, SJ (recensuit),* CSEL 73, Hoelder–Pichler–Tempsky, Vindobonae, 1955

_____, *Sancti Ambrosii Opera, Pars septima, De Sacramentis, O. Faller, SJ (recensuit),* CSEL 73, Hoelder–Pichler–Tempsky, Vindobonae, 1955

_____, *Sancti Ambrosii Opera, Pars sexta, Explanatio Psalmorum XII,* M. Petschenig (recensuit), CSEL 64, Hoelder–Pichler–Tempsky, Vindobonae, 1962

_____, *Sant'Ambrogio, Discorsi e Lettere II/I, Lettere (1–35),* G. Banterle (tr.), SAEMO nº 19, Milano–Roma, 1988

_____, *Sant'Ambrogio, Discorsi e Lettere II/II, Lettere (36–69),* G. Banterle (tr.), SAEMO, nº 20, Milano–Roma, 1988

_____, *Sant'Ambrogio, Il Misterio dell'Incarnazione del Signore,* E. Bellini (tr.), en "Tutte le Opere di Sant'Ambrogio" 16, Milano, Bibliotheca Ambrosiana – Roma, Città Nuova Editrice, 1979

_____, *Sant'Ambrogio, Opere dogmatiche I, La Fede,* C. Moreschini (tr.), SAEMO nº 15, Milano–Roma, 1984

_____, *Sant'Ambrogio, Opere dogmatiche II, Lo Spirito Santo,* C. Moreschini (tr.), SAEMO nº 16, Milano–Roma, 1979

_____, *Sant'Ambrogio, Opere esegetiche I, I sei giorni della creazione,* G. Banterle (tr.) SAEMO, Milano–Roma, 1979

_____, *Sant'Ambrogio, Opere esegetiche II/I, Caino e Abele,* P. Siniscalco (tr.), SAEMO, Milano–Roma, 1984

_____, *Sant'Ambrogio, Opere esegetiche II/II, Abramo,* F. Gori (tr.), SAEMO, 1989

_____, *Sant'Ambrogio, Opere esegetiche III, Giacobbe e la Vita Beata, R.* Palla (tr.), SAEMO nº 3, Milano–Roma, 1982

_____, *Sant'Ambrogio, Opere esegetiche III, Il bene della Morte*, C. Moreschini (tr.), SAEMO, Milano–Roma, 1982

_____, *Sant'Ambrogio, Opere esegetiche III, Isacco o L'anima,* C. Moreschini (tr.), SAEMO nº 3, Milano–Roma, 1982

_____, *Sant'Ambrogio, Opere esegetiche IV, I Patriarchi,* G. Banterle (tr.), SAEMO nº 4, Milano–Roma, 1980

_____, *Sant'Ambrogio, Opere esegetiche VII/I, Commento a Dodici Salmi,* L. Pizzolato (tr.), SAEMO nº 7, Milano–Roma, 1980

_____, *Sant'Ambrogio, Opere esegetiche VII/II, Commento a Dodici Salmi*, L. Pizzolato (tr.), SAEMO nº 8, Milano– Roma, 1980

_____, *Sant'Ambrogio, Opere esegetiche VIII/I, Commento al Salmo CXVIII (Lettere I–XI), L.* Pizzolato (tr.), SAEMO nº 9, Milano–Roma, 1987

_____, *Sant'Ambrogio, Opere esegetiche VIII/II, Commento al Salmo CXVIII (Lettere XII–XXII),* L. Pizzolato (tr.), SAEMO nº 10, Milano–Roma, 1987

Anonymi, *Corpus benedictionum pontificalium,* E. Moeller, OSB (ed.), CCL 162 A, Turnholti, Brepols, 1971

_____, *Corpus Praefationum, Textus (Q–V),* E. Moeller, OSB (cura et studio), CCL 161 C, Turnholti, Brepols, 1980

_____, *Scriptores Hiberniae Minores, pars I (Commentarius in epistolas catholicas scotti anonymi, Tractatus Hilarii in septem epistolas catholicas, Prebiarum de multorum exemplaribus),* R. McNally, SJ (ed.), CCL 108B, Turnholti, Brepols, 1973

Anonymus, *De Enigmatibus ex Apocalypsi Johannis, en Variorum Auctorum Commentaria Minora in Apocalypsin Johannis,* R. Gryson (recognovit), CCL 107, Turnholti, Brepols, 2003

_____, *Itinerarium Burdigalense,* P. Geyer – O. Cuntz (ad fidem editionem), CCL 175, Turnholti, Brepols, 1965

_____, *Liber questionum in Evangeliis,* J. Rittmueller (ed.), CCL 108F, Turnholti, Brepols, 2003

Antoninus Placentinus, *Antonini Placentini Itinerarium,* P. Geyer (cura et studio), CCL 175, Turnholti, Brepols, 1965

Apponius, *Apponii in Canticum Canticorum expositionem,* B. De Vregille – L. Neyrand (edd.), CCL 19, Turnholti, Brepols, 1986

_____, *Apponius, Commentaire sur Cantique des Cantiques (I),* SC 420, B. De Vregille – L. Neyrand (edd.), Les Éditions du Cerf, Paris, 1997

_____, *Apponius, Commentaire sur Cantique des Cantiques (III),* SC 430, B. De Vregille – L. Neyrand (edd.), Les Éditions du Cerf, Paris, 1998

Arnobius Iunior, *Arnobii Iunioris Commentarii in Psalmos,* K. Daur (ed.), CCL 25, Turnholti, Brepols, 1990

_____, Arnobii Iunioris *Commentarii in Psalmos,* K. Daur (ed.), CCL 25a, Turnholti, Brepols, 1992

Aurelius Augustinus, (ed.), *De doctrina christiana libri IV,* J. Martin (ed.), CCL 32, Turnholti, Brepols, 1962

_____, *S. Augustini Confessionum libri XIII,* L. Verheijen, OSA (ed.), CCL 27, Turnholti, Brepols, 1981

_____, *S. Aurelii Augustini De diversis Quaestionibus octoginta tribus,* A. Mutzenbecher (ed.), CCL 44A, Turnholti, Brepols, 1975

_____, *S. Aurelii Augustini Enarrationes in Psalmos CI – CL,* E. Dekkers – I. Fraipont (edd.), CCL 40, Turnholti, Brepols, 1956

_____, *S. Aurelii Augustini Enarrationes in Psalmos I – L,* E. Dekkers – I. Fraipont (edd.), CCL 38, Turnholti, Brepols, 1956

_____, *S. Aurelii Augustini epistulae I–LV,* K. Daur (ed.), CCL 31, Turnholti, Brepols, 2004

_____, *S. Aurelii Augustini in Iohannis Evangelium tractatus CXXIV,* R. Willems, OSB (ed.), CCL 36, Turnholti, Brepols, 1954

_____, *S. Aurelii Augustini quaestiones Evangeliorum cum appendice quaestionum XVI in Matthaeum,* A. Mutzenbecher (ed.), CCL 44B, Turnholti, Brepols, 1980

_____, *S. Aurelii Augustini Sermones de Vetere Testamento,* C. Lambot, OSB (ed.), CCL 41, Turnholti, Brepols, 1961

_____, *Sancti Aurelii Augustini De Trinitate libri XV (libri I–XII)*, W. Mountain (cura et studio), CCL 50, Turnholti, Brepols, 1968

_____, *Sancti Aurelii Augustini De Trinitate libri XV (libri XIII-XV),* W. Mountain (cura et studio), CCL 50A, Turnholti, Brepols, 1968

_____, *Sant'Agostino, Commento al Vangelio di San Giovanni,* A. Vita – E. Gandolfo (tr.) – V. Tarulli (ed.), en A. Trapè, OSA (dir.), "Nuova Biblioteca Agostiniana (Opere di Sant'Agostino, Parte III, Volume XXIV)", Città Nuova Editrice, Roma, 1968

_____, *Sant'Agostino, Commento al Vangelo di San Giovanni,* E. Gandolfo (tr.), en "Nuova Biblioteca Agostiniana" vol. XXIV, Città Nuova Editrice, Roma, 1968

_____, *Sant'Agostino, Discorsi II/1 (51-85) sul Nuovo Testamento,* L. Carrozzi (tr.), en A. Trapè, OSA (dir.), "Nuova Biblioteca Agostiniana" vol. XXX/1, Città Nuova Editrice, Roma, 1982

_____, *Sant'Agostino, Esposizioni sui Salmi III,2 (Salmi 101-110),* T. Mariucci (tr.), en "Nuova Biblioteca Agostiniana" vol. XXVII/2, Città Nuova Editrice, Roma, 21993

_____, *Sant'Agostino, Esposizioni sui Salmi III,2 (Salmi 86–100, 111–120),* V. Tarulli (tr.), en "Nuova Biblioteca Agostiniana" vol. XXVII/2, Città Nuova Editrice, Roma, 21993

_____, *Sant'Agostino, Esposizioni sui Salmi IV,* V. Tarulli (tr.), en "Nuova Biblioteca Agostiniana" vol. XXVII, Città Nuova Editrice, Roma, 1977

_____, *Sant'Agostino, Esposizioni sui Salmi, I,* R. Minuti (tr.), en "Nuova Biblioteca Agostiniana" vol. XXV, Città Nuova Editrice, Roma, 1967

_____, *Sant'Agostino, La Dottrina Cristiana, V.* Tarulli (tr.), en "Nuova Biblioteca Agostiniana" vol. VIII, Città Nuova Editrice, Roma, 1992

_____, *Sant'Agostino, Le Confessioni,* C. Carena (tr.), en "Nuova Biblioteca Agostiniana" vol. I, Città Nuova Editrice, Roma, 31975

_____, *Sant'Agostino, Le Lettere I (1–123),* T. Alimonti – L. Carrozzi (eds.), "Nuova Biblioteca Agostiniana" vol. XXI, Città Nuova Editrice, Roma, 1969

_____, *Sant'Agostino, Questioni su Vangeli,* V. Tarulli (tr.), en "Nuova Biblioteca Agostiniana", opere esegetiche X/2, Città Nuova Editrice, Roma, 1997

_____, *Sant'Ambrogio, Opere esegetiche IX/I, Esposizione del Vangelo decondo Luca,* G. Coppa (tr.), SAEMO nº 11, Milano–Roma, 1978

_____, *Sant'Ambrogio, Opere esegetiche IX/II, Esposizione del Vangelo secondo Luca,* G. Coppa (tr.), SAEMO nº 12, Milano–Roma, 1978

Beda Venerabilis, *Bedae Presbyteri Expositio Apocalypseos*, R. Gryson (ed.), CCL 121A, Turnholti, Brepols, 2001

_____, *Bedae Venerabilis de locis sanctis,* I. Fraipont (cura et studio), CCL 175, Turnholti, Brepols, 1965

_____, *Bedae Venerabilis Opera, pars II*, *opera exegetica 4, Expositio Actuum Apostolorum,* M. Laistner (ed.), CCL 121, Turnholti, Brepols, 1983

_____, *Bedae Venerabilis Opera, pars II, opera exegetica 4, In Epistolas VII catholicas,* D. Hurst, OSB (cura et studio), CCL 121, Turnholti, Brepols, 1983

_____, *Bedae Venerabilis Opera, pars II, opera exegetica, 1. Libri quattuor in principium Genesis usque ad nativitatem Isaac et eiectionem Ismaelis adnotationum,* Ch. Jones (cura et studio), CCL 118A, Turnholti, Brepols, 1967

_____, *Bedae Venerabilis Opera, pars II, opera exegetica, 2. In primam partem Samuhelis libri III, in Regum librum XXX quaestiones,* D. Hurst, OSB (cura et studio), CCL 119, Turnholti, Brepols, 1962

_____, *Bedae Venerabilis Opera, pars II, opera exegetica, 2A. De Tabernaculo, De Templo, In Ezram et Neemiam,* D. Hurst, OSB (cura et studio), CCL 119A, Turnholti, Brepols, 1969

_____, *Bedae Venerabilis Opera, pars II, opera exegetica, 2B. In Habacuc,* J. Hudson (cura et studio), CCL 119B, Turnholti, Brepols, 1983

_____, *Bedae Venerabilis Opera, pars II, opera exegetica, 2B. In Proverbia.* In Cantica Canticorum, D. Hurst, OSB (cura et studio), CCL 119B, Turnholti, Brepols, 1983

_____, *Bedae Venerabilis Opera, pars III, opera ehomiletica, pars IV, opera rhythmica,* D. Hurst, OSB (cura et studio), CCL 122, Turnholti, Brepols, 1965

_____, *Bède le Vénérable,* C. Vuillaume, OSB (tr.), SC 475, Les Éditions du Cerf, Paris, 2003

_____, V*enerabile Beda, Omelie sul Vangelo,* G. Simonetti (tr.), in A. Quacquarelli (dir.) "Collana di Testi Patristici 90", Città Nuova Editrice, Roma, 1990

Caesarius Arelatensis, *Césaire d'Arles, Sermons au Peuple, tome I (sermons 1–20)*, M.-J. Delage (ed.), SC 175, Les Éditions du Cerf, Paris, 1971

_____, *Sancti Caesarii Arelatensis sermones, pars prima,* G. Morin (ed.), CCL 103, Turnholti, Brepols, 21953

Chromatius Aquileiensis, S*picilegium ad Chromatii Aquileiensis Opera,* J. Lemarié – R. Étaix (cura et studio), CCL 9A (Supplementum), Turnholti, Brepols, 1977

Claudius Marius Victorius Commodianus, *Commodianus, Claudius Marius Victorius (Commodiani Carmina),* J. Martin (cura et studio), CCL 128, Turnholti, Brepols, 1960

Cyprianus Episcopus, *Sancti Cypriani Episcopi Opera, Pars I, Ad Quirinum,* R. Weber (ed.), CCL 3, Turnholti, Brepols, 1972

Egeria, *"Egeria, Pellegrinaggio in Terra Santa",* P. Siniscalco – L. Scarampi (tr.), in A. Quacquarelli (dir.), "Collana di Testi Patristici" 48, Città Nuova Editrice, Roma, 31999

Eucherius Lugdunensis, *Eucherii Lugdunensis. Instructionum Libri Duo,* C. Mandolfo (ed.), CCL 66, Turnholti, Brepols, 2004

Eusebius 'Gallicanus', *Eusebius 'Gallicanus' Collectio Homiliarum,* J. Leroy (Dissertatio), F. Glorie (ed.), CCL 101, Turnholti, Brepols, 1970

Eusebius Vercellensis, *Eusebii Vercellensis episcopi quae supersunt,* V. Bulhart (ed.), CCL 9, Turnholti, Brepols, 1957

Filastrius Brixiensis, F*ilastrii Episcopi Brixiensis Diversarum hereseon liber,* F. Heylen (cura et studio), CCL 9, Turnholti, Brepols, 1962

Gregorius Iliberritanus, *Gregoriani Iliberritani episcopi quae super sunt,* V. Bulhart (ed.), CCL 69, Turnholti, Brepols, 1967

Gregorius Magnus, *Grégoire le Grand, Commentaire sur le Premier Livre des Rois, tome I (Préface–II,28),* A. De Vogüé (ed.), SC 351, Les Éditions du Cerf, Paris, 1989

_____, *Grégoire le Grand, Commentaire sur le Premier Livre des Rois, tome II (II,29–III,27),* C. Vuillaume, OSB (tr.), SC 391, Les Éditions du Cerf, Paris, 1993

_____, *S. Gregorii Magni expositiones in Canticum Canticorum, in librum primum Regum,* P. Verbraken, OSB (recensuit), CCL 144, Turnholti, Brepols, 1963

_____, *S. Gregorii Magni Moralia in Job, libri I–X,* M. Adriaen (cura et studio), CCL 143, Turnholti, Brepols, 1979

_____, *S. Gregorii Magni Moralia in Job, libri XXIII–XXXV,* M. Adriaen (cura et studio), CCL 143B, Turnholti, Brepols, 1985

Hieronymus, *Hieronymus, Epistularum indices et addenda,* M. Kamptner (ed.), CSEL 56/2, Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vindobonae, 1996

_____, *Jerôme, Homélies sur Marc,* J. Gourdain (tr.), SC 494, Les Éditions du Cerf, Paris, 2005

_____, *S. Hieronymi presbyteri opera, pars I, opera exegetica 6, Commentarii in epistulam Pauli apostoli ad Galatas,* G. Raspanti (ed.), CCL 77A, Turnholti, Brepols, 2006

_____, *S. Hieronymi presbyteri opera, pars I, opera exegetica 7, Commentatorium in Matheum [sic] libri IV,* D. Hurst – M. Adriaen (edd.), CCL 77, Turnholti, Brepols, 1959

_____, *S. Hieronymi presbyteri opera, pars I, opera exegetica 8, Commentarii in epistulas Pauli apostoli ad Titum et ad Philemonem,* F. Bucchi (ed.), CCL 77C, Turnholti, Brepols, 2003

_____, *S. Hieronymi presbyteri opera, pars I, opera exegetica, 1, Commentarioli in Psalmos,* G. Morin (ed.), CCL 72, Turnholti, Brepols, 1959

_____, *S. Hieronymi presbyteri opera, pars I, opera exegetica, 2, Commentariorum in Esaiam, libri I–XI,* M. Adriaen (cura et studio), CCL 73, Turnholti, Brepols, 1963

_____, *S. Hieronymi presbyteri opera, pars I, opera exegetica, 6, Commentarii in prophetas minores,* D. Vallarsi – M. Adriaen (edd.), CCL 76A, Turnholti, Brepols, 1970

_____, *S. Hieronymi presbyteri opera, pars II, opera homiletica (ed. altera),* G. Morin (ed.), CCL 78, Turnholti, Brepols, 1958

_____, *Saint Jerôme, Commentaire sur S. Matthieu, tome II,* É Bonnard (ed.), SC 259, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1979

_____, *San Girolamo, Le Lettere, Vol. I (I–LII),* S. Cola (tr.), Città Nuova Editrice, Roma, 1961

_____, *San Girolamo, Le Lettere, Vol. II (LIII–LXXIX),* S. Cola (tr.), Città Nuova Editrice, Roma, 1962

_____, *San Girolamo, Le Lettere, Vol. III (LXXX–CXVI),* S. Cola (tr.), Città Nuova Editrice, Roma, 1962

_____, *Sancti Eusebii Hieronymi Epistularum pars I (Epistulae I–LXX)*, I. Hilberg (ed.), CSEL 54, Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vindobonae, 1996 (editio altera supplementis aucta)

_____, *Sancti Eusebii Hieronymi Epistularum pars II (Epistulae LXXI–CXX),* I. Hilberg (ed.), CSEL 55, Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vindobonae, 1996 (editio altera supplementis aucta)

Hilarius Pictauiensis, *Hilaire de Poitiers, Sur Matthieu (tome II),* J. Doignon (ed.), SC 258, Les Éditions du Cerf, Paris, 1979

_____, *Ilario de Poitiers, Sinodi e fede degli orientali,* L. Longobardo (ed.), Città Nuova Editrice, Roma, 1993

_____, *S. Hilarii Episcopi Pictauiensis Opera, Pars quarta, Hymni,* F. Feder, SJ (recensuit), CSEL 65, Hoelder–Pichler–Tempsky, Vindobonae, 1916

_____, *Sancti Hilarii episcopi Pictauiensis, Tractatus super Psalmos*, M. Zingerle (recensuit), CSEL 22, Tempsky (Pragae) – Tempsy (Vindobonae) – Freytag (Lipsiae), 1891

_____, *Sancti Hilarii Pictauiensis episcopi Opera Omnia,* J. Migne, PL 10, Turnholti, Brepols, 1966

_____, *Sancti Hilarii Pictauiensis Episcopi, De Trinitate, Libri VIII–XII*, P. Smulders (cura et studio), CCL 62A, Turnholti, Brepols, 1980

_____, *Sancti Hilarii Pictauiensis Episcopi, De Trinitate, Praefatio, Libri I–VII,* P. Smulders (cura et studio), CCL 62, Turnholti, Brepols, 1979

Iulianus Toletanae sedis episcopus, *Sancti Iuliani Toletanae sedis episcopi opera, pars I,* J. Hillgarth (ed.), CCL 115, Turnholti, Brepols, 1976

Leo Magnus, *Léon le Grand, Sermons (III),* R. Dolle (ed.), SC 74, Les Éditions du Cerf, Paris, 1961

Magnus Aurelius Cassiodorus, *Magni Aurelii Cassiodori Expositio Psalmorum LXXI–CL,* M. Adriaen (cura et studio), CCL 98, Turnholti, Brepols, 1958

Maximinus Arrianus, *Scripta Arriana Latina, Pars I,* R. Gryson (cura et studio), CCL 87, 1982

Maximus Taurinensis Episcopus, *Massimo di Torino, Sermoni*, S. Petri (ed.) - G. Banterle (tr.), en C. Moreschini (dir.), "Collana di Testi Patristici 168", Città Nuova Editrice, Roma, 2003

_____, *Maximi Episcopi Taurinensis Sermones,* A. Mutzenbecher (ed.), CCL 23, Turnholti, Brepols, 1962

Novatianus, *Novatiani Opera,* G: Diercks (ed.), CCL 4, Turnholti, Brepols, 1972

Petrus Chrysologus, *S. Petri Chrysologi Collectio Sermonum pars III,* A. Olivar (ed.), CCL 24b, Turnholti, Brepols, 1992

Primasius episcopus Hadrumetinus, *Primasius episcopus Hadrumetinus, Commentarius in Apocalypsin*, A. Adams (cura et studio), CCL 92, Turnholti, Brepols, 1985

Prosperus Aquitanus, *Prosperi Aquitani Opera. Expositio Psalmorum,* P. Callens (cura et studio), CCL 68A, Turnholti, Brepols, 1972

Pseudo-Vigilius Thapsensis, *Florilegia Biblia Africana saec. V: Contra Varimadum (Pseudo-vigilii Thapsensis opus contra Varimadum),* B. Schwank (ed.), CCL 90, Turnholti, Brepols, 1961

Quintus Septimius Florens Tertullianus, *On the Soul,* E. Quain, SJ (tr.), en R. J. Deferrari (ed.) *"Tertullian, Apologetical Works and Minucius Felix, Octavius",* The Catholic University of America Press, Washington, 1962

_____, *Tertullien, Contre Marcion, tome IV (livre IV),* C. Moreschini – R. Braun (tr.), SC 456, Cerf, Paris, 2001

_____, *"Tertuliano: A los mártires, El escorpión, La huida en la persecución",* (C. Balaguer – J.M. Serrano) de la colección "Biblioteca de Patrística", Ciudad Nueva, Madrid, 2004

_____, *Tertullianus, Opera I, Aduersus Marcionem,* A. Kroymann (ed.), CCL 1, Turnholti, Brepols, 1954

_____, *Tertullianus, Opera I, Opera catholica (Ad martyras),* E. Dekkers (ed.), CCL 1, Turnholti, Brepols, 1954

_____, *Tertullianus, Opera I, Opera catholica (De praescriptione hereticorum),* R. Refoule (ed.), CCL 1, Turnholti, Brepols, 1954

_____, *Tertullianus, Opera II, Opera montanistica (Aduersus Praxean),* A. Kroymann – E. Evans, CCL 2, Turnholti, Brepols, 1954

_____, *Tertullianus, Opera II, Opera montanistica (De anima),* J. Waszink (ed.), CCL 2, Turnholti, Brepols, 1954

_____, *Tertullianus, Opera II, Opera montanistica (De ieiuno contra psychicos),* A. Reifferscheid – G. Wissoa (eds.), CCL 2, Turnholti, Brepols, 1954

_____, *Tertullianus, Opera II, Opera montanistica (De monogamia),* E. Dekkers (ed.), CCL 2, Turnholti, Brepols, 1954

_____, *Tertullianus, Opera II, Opera montanistica (De resurrectione mortuorum),* J. Borleffs (ed.), CCL 2, Turnholti, Brepols, 1954

_____, *Tertullianus, Opera II, Opera montanistica (Scorpiace),* A. Reifferscheid – G. Wissoa (eds.), CCL 2, Turnholti, Brepols, 1954

Quodvultdeus Carthaginiensis, *Opera Quodvultdeo Carthaginiensi episcopo tributa,* R. Braun (ed.), CCL 60, Turnholti, Brepols, 1976

Tyrannius Rufinus, R*ufino, Spiegazione del Credo,* M. Simonetti, en A. Quacquarelli (dir.) "Collana di Testi Patristici 11", Città Nuova Editrice, Roma, 31993

_____, *Tyrannii Rufini Opera,* M. Simonetti (ed.), CCL 20, Turnholti, Brepols, 1961

Verecundus Iuncensis, *Verecundi Iuncensis, Commentarii super Cantica,* R. Demeulenaere (ed.), CCL 93, Turnholti, Brepols, 1976

Vigilius Thapsensis, *Vigilio di Tapso, Contro gli ariani,* P. Guidi (tr.), en C. Moreschini (dir.), "Collana di Testi Patristici nº 184", Città Nuova Editrice, Roma, 2005

Vincentius Lerinensis, *Vincentius Lerinensis Commonitorium excerpta,* R. Demeulenaere (ed.), CCL 64, Turnholti, Brepols, 1985

Reference works

J. Allenbach – A. Benoît – D. Bertrand – A. Hanriot-Coustet – P. Maraval – A. Pautler – P. Prigent – F. Vinel – Th. Ziegler, *Biblia Patristica, [6] Hilaire de Poitiers, Ambroise de Milan, Ambrosiaster,* Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Paris, 1995

J. Allenbach – A. Benoît – D. Bertrand – A. Hanriot-Coustet – P. Maraval – A. Pautler – P. Prigent, *Biblia Patristica, [1] Des origines à Clément d'Alexandrie et Tertullien,* Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Paris, 1975

_____, *BiPa, [2] Le troisième siècle (Origène excepté),* Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Paris, 1977

W. Albright – D. Freedman (eds.), *The Anchor Bible,* Doubleday, New York, 2001

F. W. Bautz – T. Bautz, *Biographisch-Biliographisches Kirchenlexikon,* Hamm, 1975ss, online version: http://www.bautz.de/bbkl (updated: 31 Aug 2008; Webpage visited 9 May 2009)

Benedikt XVI., *Die Kirchenväter,* Editrice Vaticana–St. Benno Verlag, 2008

A. Casamassa, *Scritti patristici, Volume II,* en "Lateranum, Nova Series, an. XXII, n. 1-4", Roma, 1956

J. M. Casciaro (ed.), *Sagrada Biblia, Antiguo Testamento, Libros Históricos*, EUNSA, Pamplona, 2000

_____, *Sagrada Biblia, Antiguo Testamento, Libros Poéticos y Sapienciales,* EUNSA, Pamplona, 2001

_____, *Sagrada Biblia, Antiguo Testamento, Libros Proféticos,* EUNSA, Pamplona, 2002

_____, *Sagrada Biblia, Nuevo Testamento,* EUNSA, Pamplona, 2004

_____, *Sagrada Biblia, Pentateuco*, EUNSA, Pamplona, 1997

R. Charles, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English,* Vol. I, Apocrypha, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1965

S. Chialà – L. Cremaschi – A. Mainardi (eds.), *"Il Cristo Trasfigurato nella tradizione spirituale ortodossa"* (Atti del XV Convegno ecumenico internazionale di spiritualità ortodossa), Ed. Qiqajon Comunità di Bose, Magnano, 2008

M. Coune, osb, *"Grâce de la Transfiguration d'après les Pères d'Occident"*, Abbaye de Bellefontaine, 1990

M. Fiedrowicz, *Theologie der Kirchenväter, Grundlagen frühchristlicher Glaubensreflexion,* Herder, Freiburg im Breisgau, 2007

H. J. Frede, *Kirchenschriftsteller. Verzeichnis und Sigel,* Herder, Freiburg, 41995 [also the compilation of abbreviations for Latin authors in PDF format, from www.vetuslatina.org (http://itsee.bham.ac.uk/vetuslatina/verbumdata/Fredeabbreviations.pdf, downloaded 9 May 2009)]

F. Gaffiot – P. Flobert (eds.), *Le Grand Gaffiot Dictionnaire Latin-Français,* Hachette-Livre, Paris, 2000

R. Gryson, *Répertoire Général des Auteurs Ecclésiastiques Latins de l'Antiquité et du haut Moyen Âge,* tome I, Verlag Herder, Freiburg, 52007

C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *Handbook of Patristic Exegesis, The Bible in Ancient Christianity,* Brill, Leiden-Boston, 2006 (one-volume edition)

C. Lewis – C. Short (eds.), *A Latin Dictionary,* Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1879

Missale Ambrosianum, Milano 1981

Missale Hispano-Mozarabicum, Toledo 1991

H. Sieben, *Kirchenväterhomelien zum neuen Testament, ein Repertorium der Textausgaben und Übersetzungen*, Steenbrugis, in Abbatia S. Petri, 1991

E. Watson – L. Pullman, *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers (vol. 9)*, W. B. Eerdmans Publ. Co., Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1898

Monographies

H. Baltensweiler, *Die Verklärung Jesu, Historisches Ereignis und synoptische Berichte,* Zwingli-Verlag, Zürich, 1959

Benedetto XVI, *Gesù di Nazaret*, Rizzoli, 2007

R. Cantalamessa, *El Misterio de la Transfiguración,* Monte Carmelo, 2003

M. Coune, *Grâce de la Transfiguration d'après des Pères d'Occident,* 41990

_____, *Joie de la transfiguration d'après des Pères d'Orient,* Paris, 91985

É. Divry, *La Lumière du Christ Transfiguré chez les Saints, Nouvelles approches dogmatiques sur la lumière thaborique* (Thèse – 2 tomes), Fribourg, 2000

O. Faller, sj, S. Ambrosii *De virginibus III, 1, 3*, en B. Geyer – J. Zellinger (eds.), "Florilegium Patristicum tam veteris quam medii aevi auctores complectens" Fasciculus XXXI, Bonnae Sumptibus Petri Hanstein, 1933

A. Gundlach, *Verklärung des Herrn, Die Botschaft vom Heiligen Berg,* Verlag J. Pfeiffer, München, 1957

G. Habra, *La Transfiguration selon les Pères grecs,* Fontainebleau, 21983

J. Heil, *The Transfiguration of Jesus: Narrative Meaning and Function of Mark 9:2-8, Matt 17:1-8 and Luke 9:28-36,* Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, Roma, 2000

J. Macphail, *The Bright Cloud. The Bible in the Light of the Transfiguration,* 1956

J. Moingt, sj, *Théologie Trinitaire de Tertullien (vols. I–III),* Aubier, 1966

J. Quasten, *S. Ambrosii de mysteriis, 7,* in "Monumenta eucharistica et liturgica vetustissima" pars III, in B. Geyer –J. Zelliger (eds.) "Florilegium Patristicum tam veteris quam medii aevi auctores complectens" Fasciculus VII, Bonnae Sumptibus Petri Hanstein, 1936

A. Ramsey, *La Gloire de Dieu et la Transfiguration du Christ,* Cerf, 1965. [Original title: *The Glory of God and the Transfiguration of Christ,* Longmans, London, 1949]

H. Riesenfeld, *Jésus transfiguré. L'arrière-plan du récit évangelique de la Transfiguration de Notre-Seigneur,* Ejnar Munksgaard, København, 1947

N. Russell, *The Doctrine of Deification in the Greek Patristic Tradition,* Oxford, 2004

G. Scarpat (ed.), *Q.S.F. Tertulliano, Adversus Praxean,* Loescher Editore, Torino, 1959

P. Schaff – A. Menzies (eds.), *ANF03. Latin Christianity: Its Founder, Tertullian,* Christian Classics Ethereal Library, Grand Rapids, Michigan. URL: http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/anf03.html (created 2006-01-08)

F. Sciuto, *"Tertulliano. Tre opere parenetiche* (Ad martyras, De patientia, De paenitentia)", Catania, 1961

É. Shoufani – C. Pellistrandi, *Célébration de la Lumière*, en É. Gondinet-Wallstein (ed.), "Collection Célébrations", Albin Michel, Paris, 2000

P. Siniscalco, *Ricerche sul 'De Resurrectione' di Tertuliano,* Editrice Studium, Roma, 1966

J.E.L. van der Geest, *Le Christ et l'Ancien Testament chez Tertullien,* Dekker & Van de Vegt – Nijmegen, 1972

S. Vicastillo, "*Tertuliano. 'Prescripciones' contra todas las herejías"*, from the collection "Fuentes Patrísticas", Ciudad Nueva, Madrid, 2001

Articles

J. Badcock, *The Transfiguration,* JThS XXII, Oxford, 1931, 325s

F. W. Bautz, *Arnobius der Ältere,* BBKLo, http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/a/arnobius_d_ae.shtml, actua-lized 21 Dec 2007 [cfr. BBKL, I, Nordhausen, 1990]

_____, *Arnobius der Jüngere,* BBKLo, http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/a/arnobius_d_jue.shtml, actualized 7 Sept 2008 [cfr. BBKL, I, Nordhausen, 1990]

_____, *Chrysologus, Petrus genannt Chrysologus,* BBKLo, http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/c/chrysologus_p.shtml, actua-lized 14 Aug 2007 [cfr. BBKL, I, Nordhausen, 1990]

_____, *Gregor von Elvira,* BBKLo, *http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/g/gregor_v_e.shtml*, actualized 24 Nov 2008 [cfr. BBKL, II, Nordhausen, 1990]

K. Berger, *Die Verklärung Jesu*, in IKaZ, Freiburg, 2008/I, 3 – 9

J. Bernardin, *The Transfiguration,* JBL LII, New York, 1933, 181s

G. Caird, *The Transfiguration,* in A. Hastings – E. Hastings, (eds.), *The Expository Times LXVII,* Edinburgh, 1955-1956, 291s.

E. Cavalcanti, *Il Sermone di Leone Magno sulla Trasfigurazione,* in Chialà–Cremaschi–Mainardi (eds.), "Il Cristo Trasfigurato nella tradizione spirituale ortodossa (Atti del XV Convegno ecumenico internazionale di spiritualità ortodossa; Bose 16-19 settembre 2007)", Edizioni Qiqajon (collana Spiritualità Orientale), Magnano, 2008, 185–197

D. Dombrowski, *Göttliches und Menschliches in Raffaels Transfiguration,* in IKaZ, Freiburg, 2008/I, 20 – 37

M. Figura, *Theologische und mystische Bedeutung der Verklärung Jesu bei den Kirchenvätern,* IKaZ, Freiburg, 2008/I, 10 – 19

P. Jay, *Jerome*, in HOPE (2006), 1094–1113

S. Kessler, sj, *Gregory the Great,* in *HOPE* (2006), 1336-1368

H. Leclercq, "Lucifer of Cagliari", in The Catholic Encyclopedia, vol. 9, New York, 1910, online version (http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/09410b.htm), visited 9 May 2009

A. Louth, *St. Augustine's Interpretation of the Transfiguration of Christ,* in "L'esegesi dei padri latini: dalle origini a Gregorio Magno" (XXVIII incontro di studiosi dell'antichità cristiana ; Roma, 6-8 maggio 1999), SEA 68, 2000, 375–382

J. Madey, *Maximinus*, BBKLo, http://www.bautz.de/bbkl/m/maximinus_b_g.shtml, actualized 3 Dec 1999 [cfr. BBKL, XVI, Nordhausen, 1999]

F. Stummer, *Ad Marcellam epistula, 13,* in Id., "Monumenta historiam et geographiam Terrae Sanctae illustrantia, series prima", in B. Geyer – J. Zellinger (eds.), "Florilegium Patristicum tam veteris quam medii aevi auctores complectens" Fasciculus XLI, Bonnae Sumptibus Petri Hanstein, 1935, 19s.

S. Thelwall, *"On Fasting, in opposition to the Psychics"*, in A. Roberts – J. Donaldson (eds.), *The Ante-Nicene Fathers,* vol. IV WM. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co., Michigan, 1976



Fr. Emmanuel Cuello Marfori (born in 1977), only child of loving parents Fraterno (+) and Gloria (+), was sent to the Universidad de Navarra in Spain to study: Baccalaureate in Philosophy (summa cum laude, 1998), Baccalaurate in Sacred Theology (summa cum laude, 2001), Licentiate in Sacred Theology (magna cum laude, 2008) and Doctorate in Sacred Theology (summa cum laude, 2009).

Ordained for the Diocese of San Pablo in Laguna, Philippines (2003), he is now Assistant Oeconomus, resides in the Bishop's Residence, and a Guest Priest at the Cathedral Parish of St. Paul the First Hermit, San Pablo City. He now teaches, invited as Guest Professor, at St. Peter's College Seminary (San Pablo City), St. Alphonsus Regional School of Theology (Lucena City), Divine Word Seminary (Tagaytay City), and at the Loyola School of Theology (Quezon City).