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Venues

Opening Event, 15 August (18:00 – 20:00):
Aula Schloss
Schlossplatz 2
D-48143 Münster

Panels and Workshops, 16 Tuesday – 19 Friday:
Fürstenberghaus (Rooms F 1, F 2, F 040, F 043)
Domplatz 20–22
D-48143 Münster

Contact Information

Origen Research Centre
Domplatz 23
D-48143 Münster
Tel: +49 251 83-25072
E-Mail: origeniana@uni-muenster.de

During the conference you can reach us at the following phone numbers:

Prof. Dr. Dr. Alfons Fürst: +49 251 83-25053
Dr. Monnica Klöckener: +49 251 83-22633
Felix Arens: +49 251 83-25072
Florine Hund: +49 251 83-22624
Monday, 15 August (18:00 – 20:00)

Opening Event

Welcome Addresses

Prof. Dr. Dr. Alfons Fürst
(Organizer, Director of the Origen Research Center)

Prof. Dr. Johannes Wessels
(Rector of the University)

Prof. Dr. Johannes Schnocks
(Dean of the Faculty of Catholic Theology)

Opening Lecture

Prof. Dr. Samuel Fernández (Santiago de Chile)
The Status and Limits of Christian Knowledge According to Origen

Reception

Venue: Aula Schloss, Schlossplatz 2

The opening lecture and the plenary lectures are sponsored by

Fritz Thyssen Stiftung
für Wissenschaftsförderung
Plenary Lectures, Presentations and Final Panel
(Room F 1)

Tuesday, 16 August

09:00 George KARAMANOLIS (Vienna)
Main Philosophical Themes at the Time of Origen

12:00 Book Presentation (Mohr Siebeck Publisher)
Alfons Fürst, Wege zur Freiheit. Menschliche Selbstbestimmung von Homer bis Origenes, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2022

17:00 Vito LIMONE (Milan)
Origen and Greek Philosophy: The Eclectic Method of a Platonic Christian

Wednesday, 17 August

09:00 Hartmut LEPPIN (Frankfurt a. M.)
Being a Christian in the Early Third Century: Between Fragmentation and Homogenization

14:00 Presentations
Annette von STOCKHAUSEN (Berlin): Origen in the Patristic Text Archive (PTA): An Introduction to Digital Editions and Tools for the Study of Origen
Samuel FERNÁNDEZ (Santiago de Chile) /
Alfons FÜRST (Münster): Clavis Origenis

15:30 Sightseeing Tour

17:30 Reception by the Lady Mayor of Münster (Münster Town Hall)
Thursday, 18 August

09:00  Nikolai KIEL (Münster)
Origen and Gregory of Nyssa about Freewill in Eschatological Perfection

17:00  Anna USACHEVA (Helsinki)
The Origen of Nemesius and the Different Perceptions of Origen in the Fourth and Fifth Centuries

Friday, 19 August

11:30 – Final Panel
13:00  The Future of Origen Research – Trends and Possibilities
Chair: Peter W. MARTENS (Saint Louis)
**Rooms with Panels and Workshops**  
*(and Chairs)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Room</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09:00</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>F1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>F2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:30</td>
<td>F043</td>
<td>F043</td>
<td>F040</td>
<td>F040</td>
<td>F040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **09:00**  
  - Plenary Lecture (V. Limone)

- **10:00 – 12:30**  
  - I.1 Alexandrian Background (P. Martens)
  - II.1 Intellectual Profile (S. Contini)
  - III.1 Biblical Hermeneutics (F. Soler)
  - IV.3 Workshop: Alex. Tradition (D. Voprˇada)

- **14:30 – 17:00**  
  - I.2 Christianity and Philosophy (P.H. Ip)
  - II.4 Journey of the Soul (M. Munkholt)
  - IV.2 The Cappadocians (S. Pomeroy)
  - IV.4 The Cappadocians (S. Pomeroy)
  - IV.6 Workshop: One Origen (W. Tegg)

- **17:00**  
  - Plenary Lecture (V. Limone)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F 1</td>
<td>09:00</td>
<td>Plenary Lecture (H. Leppin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10:00 – 12:30</td>
<td>Plato and Platonism (Th. Gramann)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14:30 – 15:30</td>
<td>Presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 2</td>
<td>10:00 – 12:30</td>
<td>Ontology and Theology (G. Hermanin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14:30 – 15:30</td>
<td>Presentations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 040</td>
<td>09:00</td>
<td>Workshop: Maximus I (S. Mateescu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 043</td>
<td>10:00 – 12:30</td>
<td>Disputed Legacy (A. Villani)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14:30 – 15:30</td>
<td>Presentations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Wednesday, 17 August**

**Rooms with Panels and Workshops (and Chairs)**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Panels and Workshops (and Chairs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09:00</td>
<td>F 40</td>
<td>Plenary Lecture (A. Usacheva)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>F 43</td>
<td>Workshop: Origen in Modern Times (F. Arens)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>F 2</td>
<td>Workshop: Exegetical Works (Ch. Markschies)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30</td>
<td>F 1</td>
<td>Workshop: De Principiis (A.-Ch. Jacobsen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Workshop: Feminine Sociology and Pedagogy (L. Cerioni)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Workshop: Maximus II (P. Blowers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Workshop: Origen After 553 (A. von Stockhausen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:00</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plenary Lecture (A. Usacheva)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thursday, 18 August
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Room</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F₀₄₀</td>
<td>09:00 – 11:00</td>
<td>Workshop: Origen / Jerome (K. Pålsson)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F₀₄₃</td>
<td>11:30 – 13:00</td>
<td>Final Panel (P. Martens)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F₁</td>
<td>09:00 – 11:00</td>
<td>Contra Celsum (E. Dively Lauro)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F₂</td>
<td>11:30 – 13:00</td>
<td>Workshop: Origen PsHom (A. Aliau-Milhaud)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>III.2 Judaism (V. Limone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>III.4 Workshop: Origen / Jerome (K. Pålsson)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>III.5 Workshop: Origen / Jerome (K. Pålsson)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Friday, 19 August**

Rooms with Panels and Workshops (and Chairs)
Panels and Workshops

Schedule

Tuesday, 16 August, Morning 10:00 – 12:30

Room F 1

I.1 The Alexandrian Background  
(Chair: Peter Martens)
10:00 Oskari Juurikkala (Turku)  
Origen and the Origins of the Metaphor of the Book of Nature
10:30 Francisco Bastitta Harriet (Buenos Aires)  
Wisdom Created or Absolute? Philo and Origen on First Principles
11:00 Ilaria Vigorelli (Santa Croce)  
Clement’s and Origen’s Use of κατὰ περιγραφήν and its Philosophical Background
11:30 Paul Hartog (Ankeny)  
Faith, Reason, and Epistemology in the Christian Philosophy of Clement of Alexandria
12:00 Book Presentation (Mohr Siebeck Publisher)  
Alfons Fürst, Wege zur Freiheit. Menschliche Selbستbestimmung von Homer bis Origenes, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2022

Room F 2

II.1 Aspects of Origen’s Intellectual Profile  
(Chair: Sara Contini)
10:00 Christoph Markschies (Berlin)  
The Tentative Element in Origen’s Intellectual Profile
10:30 Paul B. Decock (KwaZulu-Natal)  
Origen: Philosophy and Rhetoric
11:00 Ryan Haecker (Cambridge)  
On the First Principles of Origen’s Logic
11:30  John SOLHEID (Toronto)
Freedom and Constraint: Emergent Properties from Origen’s School in Caesarea Maritima

Room F 043

III.1  Biblical Hermeneutics
(Chair: Fernando Soler)
10:00  Brian BARRETT (Notre Dame)
In the Shadow of Christ the Lord
10:30  Olivier MUNNICH (Paris)
An Origen’s Simile: The Key of a Biblical Text
11:00  Magdalena WDOWIAK (Warsaw)
The Introduction to Origen’s Commentary on the Song of Songs Compared with Introductory Schemata of the Ancient Philosophical Commentaries on Aristotle and Plato
11:30  Augustine M. REISENAUER (Providence)
The Evangelization of Philosophy in Origen’s Commentary on the Gospel of John

Room F 040

IV.3  Workshop: Created and Uncreated in the Alexandrine Tradition
(Chair: David Voprˇada)
10:00  Markéta DUDZIKOVÁ (Prague)
Why Did Souls Turn Away from the Good? Philonic Roots of Origen’s Teaching of koros
10:30  Tomáš JENIŠ (Prague)
Beautiful Worlds: Origen and Ambrose
11:00  David VOPŘADA (Prague)
The Use of λόγος and ἀρχή in the Biblical Exegesis of African ‘Arians’ of the Fifth Century
11:30  Matteo MONFRINOTTI (Rome)
Νοητός and καίσθητος: The Stromateus versus the βάρβαρος φιλοσοφία (strom. V 93,4–5)
Room F 1

I.2 Christianity and Philosophy
(Chair: Pui Him Ip)

14:30 Leszek Misiarczyk (Warsaw)
Christian Faith as a Philosophy according to Origen

15:00 Chris Synodinos (Worcester, MA)
Eidos in Origen’s Doctrine on the Resurrection:
Terminology and Stoicism

15:30 Giulio Maspero (Rom)
The Category of πρὸς τί in Origen’s Thought and
its Philosophical Background

16:00 Daniel Tolan (Cambridge)
Origen and Prepositional Metaphysics

16:30 László Perendy (Budapest)
Ridiculing Astrologers. Origen’s Sources and his Heritage

Room F 2

II.4 The Journey of the Soul
(Chair: Maria Munkholt Christensen)

14:30 Pamela Mullins Reaves (Colorado Springs)
Shifting Souls and Cosmic Landscapes in Origen’s Peri Archon

15:00 Elizabeth A. Dively Lauro (Camarillo)
The Role of Redemption within Origen’s Schema of the Soul’s
Journey to God

15:30 Aashu Alexander Mattackal (Leuven)
Γίνεσθαι ὁμοιωθῆναι εἶναι θεῷ: Plotinus and Origen on ‘Vices’
and ‘Virtues’ as Factors in the Struggle for Deification

16:00 Marcos Ruffa (San Juan)
The Spiritual Authority According to Origen
Room F 043

IV.2  The Cappadocians (Chair: Samuel Pomeroy)
14:30  Franz Xaver RISCH (Berlin)
Der axiomatisierte Glaube: Zur wissenschaftstheoretischen Einschätzung von Glaubenssätzen bei Origenes und Basilius
15:00  Anna GRUENERT (Moscow)
La notion stoïcienne de προαίρεσις dans l’exégèse chrétienne: une étude comparative des Homélies sur les Psaumes d’Origène et de Basile de Césarée
15:30  Antonio Stefano SEMBIANTE (Naples)
Influssi origeniani nel primo Carmen Arcanum (Περὶ ἀρχῶν) di Gregorio Nazianzeno
16:00  Michaela DURST (Vienna)
The Significance of Olfaction in Transforming Man: Origen and Gregory of Nyssa on the Song of Songs
16:30  Giovanni MANABU AKIYAMA (Tsukuba)
“Preesistenza delle anime” secondo Origene e la “Personalità corporativa” secondo Gregorio di Nissa

Room F 040

III.6  Workshop: One Origen – the Exegete and the Philosopher
(Chair: Joseph W. Trigg)
14:30  Joseph W. TRIGG (Louisville)
The anēr ekklesiastikos and “Origen the Neoplatonist” in the Homilies on Psalms
15:00  Robin Darling YOUNG (Washington D.C.)
Origen’s Philosophy in Evagrius Ponticus
15:30  István PÁSZTORI-KUPÁN (Komáro / Budapest)
Plotinus as the Pupil of Origen? An Extraordinary Claim by Theodoret of Cyrus and some of its Potential Reasons

IV.4  Around the First Origenist Controversy
16:00  Santiago VÁSQUEZ (San Juan)
The χάρις / φύσις Relationship in Evagrius Ponticus: Background and Medical Projections
16:30  Tiziano F. OTTOBRINI (Bergamo)
Tra la Bibbia e Aristotele: il retaggio esegetico e speculativo di Origene sull’Esamerone del commentatore aristotelico Giovanni Filopo
Room F 1

I.3  Plato and Platonism  
(Chair: Thomas Graumann)

10:00  Nathan Betz (Leuven)  
Old Athens and the Alexandrian New Jerusalem: Plato’s Influence on Origen’s Understanding of Revelation’s Holy City  
(Rev. 21–22)

10:30  Victor Yudin (Louvain-la-Neuve)  
Plato’s mimesis behind Origen’s imago Dei

11:00  Grant Gasse (Notre Dame)  
Plato’s Gorgias in Origen’s On First Principles

11:30  Eirini Artemi (Patras)  
The Platonism and the Neo-Platonism Influence on Origen’s Exegesis of Bible

Room F 2

II.2  Ontology and Theology  
(Chair: Giovanni Hermanin de Reichenfeld)

10:00  Patricia Ciner (San Juan)  
The Ontological Dynamism of Origen’s Theology: Implications of the Use of the Verb γίγνομαι in the Commentary on the Gospel of John

10:30  Xavier Morales (Santiago de Chile)  
The Distribution of the Divine Operation between the Trinitarian Persons in Origen’s Commentaries on John and on Romans

11:00  Fernando Martin (San Juan)  
Origen and Plotinus on the Absolute Transcendence of the First Principle: Doctrinal Continuity or Rupture?

11:30  Joseph O’Leary (Tokyo)  
Epekeina tēs ousias in Origen

12:00  Ramón Torres Villegas (Seville)  
Cosmología y Tiempo en Orígenes de Alejandría: Principales fuentes y posteriores influencias
Room F 043

IV.1 A Disputed Legacy
(Chair: Andrea Villani)

10:00 Francesco CELIA (Jerusalem)
Aristotelian Background of Gregory of Neocaesarea’s
Theory of “Mixture” in the Ad Theopompum de passibilitate et impassibilitate Dei

10:30 Jon DECHOW (Portola Valley)
Saving Origen of Alexandria: Resurrection Body and Philosophy

11:00 Tommaso INTERI (Turin)
Eusebius and the Legacy of Origen’s Exegesis: Reading the
Commentary on the Psalms

11:30 Pui Him IP (Cambridge)
Ecclesiastes as Solomonic Physics. Shadows of an Origenian
Idea in Later Patristic Exegesis of Eccl 1:9–10

Room F 040

IV.6 Workshop: Maximus the Confessor, Origen and Origenism I: Historiographical Problems
(Chair: Sebastian Mateiescu)

10:00 Paul M. BLOWERS (Elizabethtown)
Resonances of Origen’s Logosmystik in Maximus the Confessor:
A Post-Balthasarian Reassessment

10:30 Christian BOUDIGNON (Aix-Marseille)
Les Commentarii in Psalmos nouvellement découverts de
Maxime et Origène

11:00 Ian GERDON (Notre Dame)
Evagrian Cosmology in Maximus the Confessor’s Early Works

11:30 Adrian PIRTEA (Vienna)
Perception and the Spiritual Senses in Seventh-Century
Byzantine Ascetic Thought: From Origen and Evagrius to
Maximus the Confessor
Wednesday, 17 August, Afternoon

Presentations (Room F 1)

14:00  Annette von STOCKHAUSEN (Berlin)
Origen in the Patristic Text Archive (PTA): An Introduction to
Digital Editions and Tools for the Study of Origen

14:30  Samuel FERNÁNDEZ (Santiago de Chile) /
Alfons FÜRST (Münster)
Clavis Origenis

Sightseeing Tour

15:30  Starting Point: Fürstenberghaus, courtyard

Reception (Münster Town Hall)

17:30  Reception at Münster Town Hall
(Rathaus des Westfälischen Friedens)
Angela STÄHLER, Lady Mayor of the City of Münster
Thursday, 18 August, Morning 10:00 – 12:30

Room F 1

I.4 De principiis
(Chair: Anders-Christian Jacobsen)

10:00 Antonio CASTELLANO (Rome)
The unity of Origen’s De principiis

10:30 Will DILBECK (Temple Terrace)
Origen and God’s Inability to Comprehend the Infinite

11:00 Filip KARFIK (Fribourg)
Where Comes τὸ αὐτεξούσιον from? The Background of a Key Word in Origen’s De principiis III

11:30 Lenka KARFIKOVÁ (Prague)
Matter in Origen’s De principiis IV 4,6(33)–8(35)

Room F 2

II.6 Martyrdom and Death
(Chair: Monnica Klöckener)

10:00 Carl Johan BERGLUND (Åbo)
The Philosopher’s Death in Origen’s Exhortation to Martyrdom

10:30 Jennifer OTTO (Lethbridge)
Origen and the Ethics of Exhorting Martyrdom

11:00 Raffaele TONDINI (Padua)
Origen and the Suicide

11:30 Margaret A. SCHATKIN (Chestnut Hill)
The Three Deaths: From Origen to Ambrose and Chrysostom
Room F 043

III.3 Exegetical Works
(Chair: Christoph Markschies)

10:00 Pavel Dudzik (Prague)
Prov. 8:22–25 LXX in the Exegesis of the Early Church

10:30 Marco Grossi (Prato)
La formation des corpora homilétiques d’Origène:
Réflexions méthodologiques à partir des Homélies sur les Juges

11:00 Samuel B. Johnson (Notre Dame)
“The sign of the Son of Man will appear”: Origen on the
Matthean Logic of Parousia

Room F 040

IV.8 Origen in Early Modern and Modern Times
(Chair: Felix Arens)

10:00 Andrea Villani (Bologna/Göttingen)
Christianus Theologus et Philosophus Platonicus: Giordano Bruno
und Origenes

10:30 Elena Rapetti (Milan)
The Odd Couple: Remarks on Origen and Descartes

11:00 Roberto Spataro (Rome)
Origène un philosophe? L’interprétation de Pierre-Daniel Huet
dans ses Origeniana dans la France du XVIIe siècle

11:30 Gianluca Piscini (Tours)
“Poor Origen!” Origène dans l’œuvre de Samuel Taylor Coleridge

12:00 Samuel Pomeroy (Münster)
Origen pro/contra Eusebius: Paradigms for the Theology of
History in Jean Daniélou, Karl Löwith, and Nicolas Berdyaev
Thursday, 18 August, Afternoon 14:00 – 17:00

Room F 1

II.3 Pedagogy and Soteriology
(Chair: Patricia Ciner)

14:30 Mark SCOTT (Stonehill College)
Origen’s Pedagogy: Education as Spiritual Transformation

15:00 Zurab JASHI (Leipzig)
Christ as Divine Double: Origen’s Exegesis of Gal. 2:20

15:30 Bradley HANSEN (Chicago)
Praying with Others: Addressing Readers and their Problems in De oratione

16:00 Bernadine KENSINGER (Weston MA)
The Spiritual Paradise of Origen in his De oratione

Room F 2

II.5 Workshop: Origen and the Feminine
(Chair: Lavinia Cerioni)

14:00 Anders-Christian JACOBSEN (Aarhus)
Sophia: The Female Aspect of God in Origen of Alexandria

14:30 Maria MUNKHOLT CHRISTENSEN (Bonn)
Teachers of Good Things

15:00 Giovanni HERMANIN DE REICHENFELD (Rome)
Female Voices and God’s Memory in Origen of Alexandria

15:30 Katarina PÅLSSON (Lund)
Regaining Paradise: Jerome’s Reception of Origen in his Defence of Female Spiritual Authority

16:00 Lavinia CERIONI (Aarhus)
The Errant Feminine: A Comparative Study of Plato and Origen

16:30 Miriam J. DECOCK (Aarhus)
The Theological-Pastoral Usefulness of Female Scriptural Speech in Origen of Alexandria
Room F 043

IV.5  Origen’s Reception after his Condemnation in 553  
(Chair: Annette von Stockhausen)

14:30  Dimitrios ZAGANAS (Louvain-la-Neuve)  
A Wise Man? Remarks on the Conflicting Reception of Origen

15:00  Vladimir BARANOV (Novosibirsk)  
Andrew of Crete in Dialogue with Origen: Exegesis of the Transfiguration

15:30  Roy FLECHNER (Dublin)  
A Seventh-Century Irish Origen?

16:00  Domenico PAZZINI (Rome)  
From the Samaritan Woman to the Dialogue with the Disciples (Jn 4): Origen, Eckhart, the Philosophy

Room F 040

IV.7  Workshop: Maximus the Confessor, Origen and Origenism II: Conceptual Problems  
(Chair: Paul Blowers)

14:00  Vladimir Cvetkovic (Belgrade)  
Body and Soul in Origen, Maximus the Confessor and the Seventh-Century Origenism

14:30  Aleksandar Djakovac (Belgrade)  
From Origen’s epinoia to the tropos hyparxeos of Maximus the Confessor

15:00  Daniel Heide (Montreal)  
Creation as Incarnation: Maximos’ Logos-Theology as Immanent Principle of Differentiation

15:30  Sebastian Mateiescu (Leiden)  
Maximus the Confessor on the Non-Simultaneity of Origin and Rest

16:00  Dionisios Skliris (Athens)  
Origen’s Eschatology and Its Legacy
Room F 1

I.5 Contra Celsum
(Chair: Elizabeth Dively Lauro)

09:00 Freerk Jan BERGHUIS (Groningen)
On ‘Incarnation’ and Change in Origen’s Contra Celsum:
Platonism and Beyond

09:30 Riemer ROUKEMA (Amsterdam/Groningen)
Origen’s Justification of the Diversity in Christianity over
against Celsus’ Philosophical Ideal of Unity

10:00 Alexander H. PIERCE (Notre Dame)
Origen and Celsus on μυστήριον: Christianizing a Manifold
Concept

10:30 Fernando SOLER (Santiago de Chile)
Logos’ epidemia in Origen’s Contra Celsum

Room F 2

III.2 Judaism
(Chair: Vito Limone)

09:00 Paul WHEATLEY (Notre Dame)
“Into the Labyrinth of Rabbinic Hermeneutics”:
Origen, the Passion of Abraham and Jesus, and the Exegesis
of Song 1:3, 12–13

09:30 Luca ANGELELLI (Rome)
Origene e i farisei

10:00 Sébastien MORLET (Paris)
The Philosophical Background of Origen’s Spiritual Exegesis
Room F 043

III.4 **Workshop**: Origen’s Homilies on the Psalms: A Place for Dialogue(s)?
*(Chair: Agnès Aliau-Milhaud)*

09:00 Agnès Aliau-Milhaud (Paris)
Asking Questions: A Way of Organising Dialogue in the *Homilies on the Psalms* by Origen

09:30 Claudine Cavalier (Paris)
The Controversy against the Jews in Origen’s *Homilies on Psalm 73*: Literary Devices

10:00 Mark Randall James (Washington D.C.)
Must Origen Understand What He Says?

Room F 040

III.5 **Workshop**: Philosophy before or after Exegesis in Origen and his Reader Jerome?
*(Chair: Katarina Pålsson)*

09:00 Peter W. Martens (Saint Louis)
Philological Moods: A Taxonomy of Origen’s Postures toward the Bible

09:30 Karla Pollmann (Bristol)
Allegorizing the Song of Songs: Origen between Eros and Cognitive Therapy

10:00 Ilaria Scarponi (Bristol)
The Reception of Origen’s Christian Philosophy and Exegesis in Jerome’s *Epistle 120*

10:30 Sara Contini (Tübingen/Bristol)
*Una dignitas militantium*: Dignity and Justice in Jerome’s Polemic against Apocatastasis
Abstracts

Agnès Aliau-Milhaud (Paris)

*Asking Questions: A Way of Organising Dialogue in the Homilies on the Psalms by Origen*

The literary genre of *quaestiones et responsiones* was studied by the Fathers of the Church, and especially in the works of Origen by Lorenzo Perrone. He noticed the importance of the questions by Origen to get deeper in the interpretation, so that the questions are sometimes even more developed than the answers.

From a different point of view, I would like to study the role of direct questions in some of the newly discovered *Homilies on the Psalms*. Indeed, Origen often asks questions in his homilies. What role do these questions play in the rhythm and in the organisation of the exegesis?

Sometimes, questions help him to start the hermeneutical movement and to give his voice an impulse. On the other way round, they may conclude the exegesis of a verse: instead of giving a pace of acceleration, this type of *quaestio sine responsione* may slow down research or even introduce a kind of meditative pause. Besides, the Scripture itself is being transformed into questions by Origen. Through these questions the preacher organises the exegesis, gives a rhythm to the homily, builds a dialogue with the audience. Therefore, these questions allow us to feel the different rhythms of the speech and to hear the voice of Origen himself.

Luca Angelelli (Rome)

*Origene e i farisei*

Nei primi secoli cristiani la rappresentazione dei farisei conosce uno sviluppo verso una dimensione tipologica quale rappresentanti per eccellenza dei protervi ebrei colpevolmente incapaci di riconoscere la novità di Cristo, esplicitamente nemici della fede, rei di condotte riprovevoli, prima fra tutte l’ipocrisia. In tale sviluppo Origene costituisce un punto di svolta, sia per la costruzione della tipologia farisaica che per l’influenza sulle successive generazioni di scrittori cristiani.
La questione è connessa con il dibattito teologico nei primi secoli ed è possibile, allargando lo sguardo, riconoscere diverse linee di sviluppo connesso con le prospettive teologiche degli autori e delle comunità cui essi appartengono: la tipologia farisaica appare come un epifenomeno (marginale) della costruzione dell’identità cristiana in confronto con le comunità giudaiche e con la cultura ellenistica, e come risultato della crescente attenzione all’esegesi dei vangeli canonici.

Questa analisi, svolta nella mia tesi dottorale sui farisei nei Padri della chiesa dei primi tre secoli, mostra lo sviluppo non lineare della tipologia farisaica e il ruolo essenziale di Origene nella traiettoria propria della “grande Chiesa” la quale vorrà porsi come unica rappresentante del cristianesimo, a scapito di altre traiettorie concorrenti proprie di altre comunità, come quelle soggiacenti al romanzo pseudo-clementino.

Eirini ARTEMI (Patras)

The Platonism and the Neo-Platonism Influence on Origen’s Exegesis of Bible

Origen is a Christian writer who knows very well not only the Bible and the Christian tradition until his day, but he has studied Greek philosophy and probably Greek literature. His knowledge of Greek philosophy and literature gives him an absolute privilege to deepen and enrich the meanings of the biblical language and terminology. Origen doesn’t adopt the Greek philosophy without any critical thought. He accepts Platonism and neo-Platonism ideas only if they were consistent with the church’s rule of faith. For him the study of philosophy, understood as an exercise involving moral purification as well as intellectual training, as a necessary preparation for the study of Scripture. In this essay, we will show that Origen was a Christian Platonist, who accepts many things of Platonic philosophy and criticizes many others which doesn’t belong to Plato but they were expressed by some other philosophers as false Platonism ideas. Plotinus and Proclus showed a disliked view against Origen’s Christian writings, but they accepted his ideas concerning God and “the things”, deeming them raised by Greek philosophy. In Origen’s theological system, Neoplatonic features can be underlined. The knowledge of Bible is for Origen the only truth but the Platonism and the Neoplatonism provide a simpler and more natural explanation of the revelation of God.
Vladimir Baranov (Novosibirsk)
Andrew of Crete in Dialogue with Origen: Exegesis of the Transfiguration

The paper intends to demonstrate that even after the condemnation at the Fifth Ecumenical Council, Origen continued to be read by Byzantine authors and remained a powerful source of exegetical inspiration. In his Homily on the Transfiguration of Christ, Andrew of Crete (d. 767) not only borrowed several concepts from Origen’s Commentary on the Gospel of Matthew, such as the vision of the transfigured Christ as passing to the mystical eighth day beyond the six days of creation or “words and deeds” of the Savior and Scripture as garments of Christ, but also polemicized with some of Origen’s solutions, for example, arguing that Peter was inspired by the Holy Spirit when he proposed to set up three tabernacles – the solution which Origen explicitly denied. Some parallels with Ambiguum 10 of Maximus the Confessor may indicate that Andrew of Crete belonged to the same Palestinian tradition of the “corrected” Christian Platonism expressing the reality of Incarnation of the Word and the ascent of the human soul to the divine in the mystical language adopted from Evagrius and pseudo-Dionysius the Areopagite.

Brian Barrett (Notre Dame)
In the Shadow of Christ the Lord

This paper considers the convergence of mysteries Origen finds in Lam 4:20. It will primarily give a contextual analysis of Origen’s discussions of this verse in Peri Archon with his exegesis in Fragment on Lamentations 116. Origen cites this verse twice in Peri Archon: at PA 2.6, when discussing the Word’s incarnation, and at 4.3.13, when discussing the progressive, historical revelation of the mystery of Christ’s person from the law, to the gospel, to the eternal gospel. These passages are joined by an underlying analogy. Just as the incarnation is the revelation of a hiddenness (the Word concealed in a revealable soul), so Scripture is the revealing of hiddenness (the whole Word revealed in the shadow of the law). Frag in Lam 116 specifies the purpose of this analogy, namely that spiritual exegesis is grace by which the saints learn to imitate Christ and so become his shadow in history. As de Lubac notes in Medieval Exegesis, Christ himself is “the Gift” (τὸν δωρησάμενον) whose being given to the Church
is demonstrated in his concealment in the words of the prophets. That is, the incarnation reveals that the hiddenness of the Scripture’s spirit has made the letter possible, and this precisely so that Christ might continue to reveal himself through the saints.

Francisco Bastitita Harriet (Buenos Aires)
*Wisdom Created or Absolute? Philo and Origen on First Principles*

The purpose of this paper is to examine and compare the use of the concept and image of divine *Sophia* in the works of Philo, the great Jewish scholar from Alexandria, and of Origen, who was raised in the same city two centuries later, and certainly read Philo’s texts in detail. Both authors describe two different aspects or phases of Wisdom: one of them, more divine and transcendent, and the other, closely related to creation. Our analysis of this twofold orientation of *Sophia* will be eminently philosophical, since what interests us is to show how both authors apply to divine Wisdom the logical and metaphysical principles of their contemporary Greek schools, and at the same time create an original conception beyond those influences. The main hypothesis is that, when judged against Philo’s thought and the Platonic and Neo-Pythagorean categories of Absolute (τὸ καθ᾽ αὑτό) and Relative (τὸ πρός τι), Origen’s notion of *Sophia* reveals unexplored and fundamental aspects of his Trinitarian doctrine and opens new questions for future research. In particular, the immanent relation between the Father and the Son may be conceived as a full and absolute unity, although not as an identity of essence or consubstantiality, according to later Nicene orthodoxy, but as a unique sort of Absolute-Relative.

Freerk Jan Berghuis (Groningen)
*On ‘Incarnation’ and Change in Origen’s Contra Celsum: Platonism and Beyond*

In *Contra Celsum* Origen is not just focused on the refutation of Celsus’ criticism, but he also wants to edify his readers by explaining elements of his Christian faith. Some of the main issues discussed in this work relate to philosophical theology and the discussions show that in many respects Celsus and Origen defend different notions of God, although on some
points Origen agrees with ideas of his Platonist opponent. A central issue of debate concerns the idea of a divine descent into the world, which is an abhorrent thought for the Platonist. As part of this debate Celsus raises the issue of the immutability, which he considers to be an undeniable divine quality. In this paper I will examine to what extent Origen in his reply endorses a Platonist approach to this issue and I will analyse the interpretation of the ‘incarnation’ that Origen provides to educate his readers. It will appear that Origen in this interpretation alludes to Platonic terminology and even creates a certain room for divine change.

Carl Johan Berglund (Åbo)

*The Philosopher’s Death in Origen’s Exhortation to Martyrdom*

Death by martyrdom constitutes not only the inclusio of Origen’s public life from the martyrdom of his father to his own post-imprisonment death in 254 CE, but also the theme of one of his shorter writings, *Exhortation to Martyrdom*. This paper explores his aims, rhetorical strategies, and basic beliefs in this writing, and compares Origen’s philosophy of death to those of contemporary philosophers, especially Porphyry of Tyre.

Nathan Betz (Leuven)

*Old Athens and the Alexandrian New Jerusalem: Plato’s Influence on Origen’s Understanding of Revelation’s Holy City (Rev. 21–22)*

While Origen is well known for many things, it is perhaps his much debated connection with Platonism and his controversial notions concerning eschatology for which he is most (in)famous. In this paper, I wish to undertake an intertextual exploration that brings these two topics into focus through the lens of Origen’s exposition of the New Jerusalem texts of John’s Revelation. Namely, I will contend that Origen’s understanding of the final major figure of the book of Revelation must be acknowledged as a Christian appropriation of certain Platonic priorities pertaining to the proper end of philosophy in order to draw out the spiritual meaning that lies buried under the letter of Revelation’s text. To support this contention, I will bring three sets of texts into contact with one another. The first set is Plato’s definition of the city (*Rep.* 2.369C) and his articulation of the
end of philosophy as seeing the divine (Rep. 7.517 A–C) and becoming like the God (Theaetetus 176a-177a), and his localization of both of these things in a “supercelestial place” (Phaedrus 247c-248a). The second set is several short extracts from the text of Revelation 21–22 pertaining to the status of the inhabitants of the New Jerusalem. The third set is Origen’s discussion of the heavenly city and the vision of God at Princ. 2.11.7 and of the heavenly city as the city of gods in Cels. 8.74. Other texts may be adduced as they shed light on the matter at hand. In the end, it should be clear that Origen’s use of certain (if perhaps mediated) Platonic priorities in interpreting a mystical Biblical text resulted in a highly philosophical, specifically mystical, and thoroughly Christian view of Revelation’s heavenly city.

Paul M. Blowers (Elizabethtown)
Resonances of Origen’s Logosmystik in Maximus the Confessor: A Post-Balthasarian Reassessment

While much scholarship in the second half of the twentieth century was poured into Maximus the Confessor’s monumental criticism of Origenist cosmology and eschatology, beginning especially with Polycarp Sherwood’s work on the Ambigua ad Johannem, Hans Urs von Balthasar was the principal voice in showcasing Maximus’s debts to Origen, even arguing in a few cases for Maximus’s direct knowledge of some of Origen’s works. Under pressure from Sherwood and others, von Balthasar famously retracted his Vermutung that Maximus at one time underwent a “crisis” of monastic infatuation with Origen’s work—a conjecture more plausible today if we concede to the Syriac Life of Maximus that he was a native of Palestine and originally formed by Origenist monks in the New Lavra. Nevertheless, von Balthasar’s claim still stands that there were elements of Origen’s teaching in Maximus (especially but not exclusively in his Chapters on Gnosis) that were not simply mediated through the Cappadocians or Evagrius. My paper will begin with a concise “inventory” of themes and images from Origen’s Logosmystik (as Aloisius Lieske dubbed it) that scholars like von Balthasar have already identified as positively shaping Maximus’s understanding of the Logos as simultaneously the Revealer and the revelation of the “eternal gospel.” The second part of
my paper will explore additional nuances in these thematic continuities (e.g. in the multivalence of L/logos itself) and suggest other motifs and patterns that have been given insufficient or no attention. My purpose is not to argue for a kind of “innocent” retrieval of Origen by Maximus that is entirely free of intervening influences (esp. the Cappadocians, Evagrius, the Macarian tradition, and Ps-Dionysius), but to signal other paradigms besides “Christian Platonism” for understanding Maximus’s appropriation of Origen’s legacy.

**Christian Boudignon (Aix-Marseille)**

*Les Commentarii in Psalmos nouvellement découverts de Maxime et Origène*

Eugenia Rapa et moi-même (Christian Boudignon) avons découvert en 2018 que l’*Expositio in Psalmo 59* de Maxime le Confesseur était en fait une partie de plus vastes *Commentarii in Psalmos*, œuvre perdue. Quelques fragments ont été édités par José Declerck et Katrien Levrie mais n’ont pas été mis en rapport avec ces *Commentarii in Psalmos*, dont l’hypothèse n’avait pas été faite. Après une présentation des éléments conservés de ce texte, nous les mettrons en rapport avec les *Selecta in Psalmos* d’Origène (ou plutôt attribués à Origène). Certains éléments attribués à Origène pourraient en fait appartenir aux *Commentarii in Psalmos* de Maxime. La méthode d’exégèse de Maxime sur les psaumes sera aussi mise en relation avec celle d’Origène.

**Antonio Castellano (Rome)**

*The unity of Origen’s De principiis*

Starting from the study of B. Steidle (Neue Untersuchungen zu Origenes *Peri Archon*, 1941) and the years that followed, an attempt has been made to identify the structure of the *De Principiis*. Until now, the consent of scholars has not been reached. On one point they do agree: the *De Principiis* seems to be composed of two cycles that take up the same themes (I, 1-II, 3; II, 4-IV, 3). This position has not been questioned since the time Steidle proposed it. However, it is precisely this point that underlies the difference of opinion. A more careful reading of the *De Principiis* in
the light of the rules of rhetorical art, well known and applied by Origen, allows us to discover the unitary plan of this work.

**Claudine Cavalier (Paris)**

*The Controversy against the Jews in Origen’s Homilies on Psalm 73: Literary Devices*

The controversy with the Jews which can be found in the *Monacensis Graecus 314*’s Homilies on the Psalms was studied by A. Fürst (“Judentum, Judenchristentum und Antijudaismus in den neu entdeckten Psalmehomilien des Origenes”, *Adamantius* 20 (2014), p. 275–287). The Author described the tension between dialogue and controversy in the Homilies. The present communication will be focused on the case of the three Homilies dedicated by Origen to the exegesis of Psalm 73. We shall study how rhetorical devices based on a fictional orality are used by Origen to express his ideas. A dozen passages are involved: we propose to list them and provide a detailed literary analysis for four of them: the dramatized rewriting of the crucifixion present in Homily 2, (§ 2) and Homily 3 (§ 7), which assimilates the Jews to devils and leads to an exposition of the theology of substitution; an imaginary debate with a Jewish contradictor about the nature of the elected people (Homily 1, §4); a theatrical apostrophe to a female public supposed to include observants of the Jewish rituals (Homily 2 § 2).

**Francesco Celia (Jerusalem)**

*Aristotelian Background of Gregory of Neocaesarea’s Theory of “Mixture” in the Ad Theopompum de passibilitate et impassibilitate Dei*

Preserved in Syriac translation, the *Ad Theopompum* of Gregory of Neocaesarea is the only ancient treatise entirely dedicated to the issue of God’s impassibility. It is configured as a dialogue between Gregory and a pagan (Theopompus) over the Christian view that God is impassible despite suffering from passion, and consists of a unique apologetic attempt at giving a rational explanation of this belief.

In an effort to remove the theoretical hindrances that prevented Theopompus from accepting the Christian view of God’s impassibility,
Gregory put forward a series of arguments that reveal that he qualifies his answer vis-à-vis the Epicurean view that God is incorruptible and blessed, untouched by weakness, and indifferent to human affairs. In this, as some scholars have already noted (Ryssel, Crouzel), Gregory partially follows in his master’s footsteps as he shares some of the concerns which animated an important section of the *Contra Celsum* (IV,14–23), where Origen discusses Celsus’ assumption that ‘if God comes down to men, he must undergo change’ and ‘alteration’.

Gregory’s answer to this problem shows that his approach is more speculative and less biblically based than Origen’s. Gregory tries to demonstrate the impassibility of God’s nature while undergoing passion by highlighting the concept that the status of impassibility is manifested both in those men who accomplished noble actions, and in some examples taken from the natural world.

In this paper we will draw particular attention to the physical focus of Gregory’s argumentation in order to bring to light the Aristotelian background against which he bases his assertion that God’s nature remains incorruptible while it is in ‘contact’/‘participation’/‘mixture’ with ‘things which cause passions’. It will be argued that Gregory must have been aware, at least to a certain degree, of Aristotle’s account of mixtures in the *De generatione et corruptione*.

**Lavinia Cerioni (Aarhus)**

*The Errant Feminine: A Comparative Study of Plato and Origen*

The degree of influence and interdependence between Platonism and Origen of Alexandria’s theology is a question that has puzzled all major Origenian scholars. In this longstanding debate, the role played by the feminine has never been taken into consideration, whilst it bears great value in both Origen’s theology and Plato’s philosophy. There is, indeed, a significant common element that needs to be further investigated: both authors employ the feminine as an intellectual category, that is, as a rhetorical and literary code for expressing theological and philosophical doctrines. The figure of the Platonic *chora* and Plato’s characterization of the prophetess Diotima reflect an ambiguous, albeit well structured, understanding of the feminine. Similarly, Origen’s characterization of the
Bride in his exegesis of the Song of Songs encompasses well the theological stand that he attributes to the feminine. Hence, this paper proposes a comparative analysis of the use of feminine metaphors and images in the works of these two authors, highlighting similarities and differences in their philosophical and theological use of the feminine.

Patricia Ciner (San Juan)

*The Ontological Dynamism of Origen’s Theology: Implications of the Use of the Verb γίγνομαι in the Commentary on the Gospel of John*

It would not be a novelty to say that Origen’s system is characterized by its dynamism. However, and especially in the *Commentary on the Gospel of John*, little research has been done on the vocabulary that the Alexandrian uses to emphasize this dynamism. This paper will seek to show how, through the repeated use of the verb γίγνομαι, the Alexandrian highlights this dynamism which, because it is constitutive of the Trinity itself, can be called ontological. This primeval dynamism will have direct implications for his Christology, for his cosmology and fundamentally for his anthropology. We therefore will divide this paper into three sections. In the first section, and by way of introduction, we will explain the reasons why, in our translation of the *Clo* into Spanish, on some occasions we translated the verb γίγνομαι as “llegar a ser” or “devenir”, and on others as “convertir” or “venir”. We will also explain why, in the case of some of the Johannine verses in the Prologue, we did not translate the verb γίγνομαι as to do, as has been done in other modern translations of the *Clo*, but rather as to become. We think that with this translation it is possible to fully understand Origen’s conception of the ontological dynamism of divinity itself, as well as the presence of divinity in the cosmos and the mystical possibility of transformation of the human being. With a correct understanding of this verb in the Prologue to the Gospel of John, it will also be possible to clearly differentiate the theological and philosophical positions of Heracleon and Origen. In the second section dedicated to cosmology, we will analyze how, through the repeated use of the verb γίγνομαι, Origen seeks to demonstrate that traces of divinity will always be present both in the intelligible and in the sensitive cosmos. Finally, we will analyze the implications of the verb γίγνομαι in Origen’s anthropology, especially with
regard to the possibility of divinization. Through this analysis, it will be possible to demonstrate that in the verb γίγνομαι, we find the theological and metaphysical bridge between eternity and time, which is undoubtedly the great genius that Origen continues to teach through the centuries.

Sara Contini (Tübingen/Bristol)
Una dignitas militantium: Dignity and Justice in Jerome’s Polemic against Apocatastasis

The paper analyses the way Jerome employs the term dignitas, “dignity”, in his argument against Origen’s views on the end times. The aim of this investigation is to assess the role played by a very Roman understanding of the connection between dignity and justice in Jerome’s polemic against the philosophical notion of apocatastasis, i.e., the belief, presented by Jerome as held by Origen and his supporters, that the end will be the same (or very similar) for all reasonable beings regardless of the merits or faults they accrued during their lives. This will shed further light on the complex interplay in the Latin Christian culture of the late 4th and early 5th centuries of Roman political notions and of Greek Christian views on human-kind and its relationship with God, developed through the interpretation of Scripture and through the hermeneutical instruments and patterns of thought provided by philosophy.

The paper considers passages by Jerome featuring dignitas that reflect on eschatology, such as Comm.Jon. ad 3:9–6 and Comm.Am. 2 ad 5:2, and compares them to passages on the dignitas of the creatures in the Latin translations of Origen’s De Principiis, as well as to passages from classical Latin authors that present an idea of justice based on the connection between a person’s dignitas and their merit, as found for instance in Cicero’s De Officiis. Then, the paper considers passages by other Latin authors from the late 4th century expressing their views on dignitas in the end times, such as Hilary of Poitiers, Ambrosiaster, Philastrius of Brescia, and Augustine of Hippo.

The paper concludes that Jerome and other Latin Christian authors cannot conceive dignity in the end times without hierarchy; for Jerome, as for Cicero, dignity is the opposite of universal equality. In this sense, the paper will argue that Jerome follows the Christian perspective that one
should not pursue dignity as social status in this world; however, he remains very *Ciceronianus* (Ep. 22.30) in his ideas on how we are to achieve (or not achieve) dignity in the afterlife.

**Vladimir Cvetković** (Belgrade)

*Body and Soul in Origen, Maximus the Confessor and the Seventh-Century Origenism*

The paper aims to interpret Maximus the Confessor’s arguments regarding the pre-existence of soul and soul-body compound from *Ambiguum* 7 against the backdrop of both Origen’s position as well as seventh-century Origenism. First, the paper focuses on Origen’s position on the body-soul relationship and the possible sources of its transmission to Maximus’ time. Then, in light of contemporary studies on seventh-century doctrinal debates the paper distinguishes in regard to body-soul relationship between radical, moderate Origenists and anti-Origenists one the one hand and Chalcedonians, Nestorians and Monophysites on the other hand. Finally, the paper presents Maximus’ refutation of the Origenist position of the pre-existence of the soul and of the anti-Origenist position of ‘sleep of the soul’ by his employment of Aristotelian categories of reciprocal relation (ὁ τοῦ πρός τι) and simultaneous becoming (ἀμα... κατὰ τὴν γένεσιν).

**Jon deChow** (Portola Valley)

*Saving Origen of Alexandria: Resurrection Body and Philosophy*

In the history of controversy about Origen’s thought, the issue of the resurrection body of Jesus and believers has perennially been primary. I first began work on this subject years ago with the book, *Dogma and Mysticism in Early Christianity: Epiphanius of Cyprus and the Legacy of Origen* (1975; 1988). Of work since, perhaps most significant, pertaining to late antiquity, are my “From Methodius to Epiphanius in Anti-Origenist Polemic,” *Adamantius: Journal of the Italian Research Group on „Origen and the Alexandriaian Tradition“* 19 (2013), 10–19; and, pertaining to early Christian pluralism, „The Nag Hammadi Milieu: An Assessment in the Light of the Origenist Controversies ([1982] with Appendix 2015),“ in *The Nag Hammadi Codices and Late Antique Egypt*, ed. Hugo Lundhaug and Lance Jenott; STAC 110 (Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2018).
But the most timely work pertaining to the theme of the present colloquium, and on which I shall build, is my „The Conceptual World of Methodius in His Treatise On the Resurrection (De resurrectione),“ in Methodius of Olympus: State of the Art and New Perspectives, ed. Katharina Bracht; TUGAL 178 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2017). My article there, arguing that Methodius disputed Origen’s Pauline/Platonic resurrection view by means of Aristotelian materialism, was shortened by the editor for reasons of space. The longer version, thus far unpublished and including Gregory of Nyssa’s reaction to Methodius, is targeted (if I am able) for inclusion in a book of my essays entitled Saving Origen of Alexandria and subtitled, with kudos to Henri Crouzel, Christianity’s First Great Theologian.

All of this work is pointed toward Christian ecumenism and modern dialogue on the language of faith as expressed in my two articles on “Origen’s Shadow over the Erasmus/Luther Debate,” part I (CO-VI 1993/1995) and Part II (CO-XI 2013/2016).

Miriam J. DeCock (Aarhus)
The Theological-Pastoral Usefulness of Female Scriptual Speech in Origen of Alexandria

In this paper, I will examine Origen’s theological treatment of the speech of several of scripture’s most prominent female characters. To do so, I will make use of the observations of Mark Randall James, who, in his recently published monograph, Learning the Language of Scripture, illustrated that one of Origen’s primary goals in exegeting scripture was to “deify” the speech of his audience via their internalization of the scriptural text, particularly the words of its characters. I will focus, for example, on the words of Elizabeth and Mary in Luke 1 (HomLuke 6–9); the Samaritan Woman of John 4 (CommJn 13.40ff); the mother of the 7 martyrs of the Maccabean literature (ExhortMart 22–23); and the Canaanite woman of Matt 15 (CommMatt 11.16–17). I will investigate the extent to which Origen makes use of women’s speech as theologically and pastorally instructive for his various literary audiences. We will see that Origen tends not to urge his audience to internalize and say the words on the lips of scripture’s female characters, as he often does the male, but rather he draws attention to the women’s accompanying actions and their theological meaning.
Paul B. DeCock (KwaZulu-Natal)  
*Origen: Philosophy and Rhetoric*

Like Socrates in the *Phaedrus*, Origen envisaged and developed a form of rhetoric that was an expression of his particular ‘philosophy’ and at the service of the promotion of that philosophy. For Origen, as for Socrates, the power of the message did not rely on ‘involved verbosity and stylish constructions, and by a logical argument divided into distinct sections and worked out with Greek technical skill’ (*Cels. 3:39*; Chadwick 1980:155). Michael Duncan has argued, that Origen was ‘carving out a distinct Christian rhetoric based on textual authority and an ethos of inspiration (*The New Christian Rhetoric of Origen. Philosophy & Rhetoric*, 2013: 46:89). This paper will explore more fully how Origen’s understanding of the power of the Scriptures together with the place of the preacher or teacher within the divine *oikonomia* shaped his particular rhetoric.

Will Dilbeck (Temple Terrace)  
*Origen and God’s Inability to Comprehend the Infinite*

In a single passage from *De principiis*, Origen simultaneously affirms something that most early interpreters would not, and denies what later thinkers affirm. The text under discussion concerns God’s inability to understand the infinite. Thus, Origen seems to uphold an Aristotlean notion which was quite rare before him among the Greek fathers. But the idea that God could not understand the infinite would have struck later interpreters such as Aquinas as impious.

However, there are problems with this aforementioned text. The text was indeed printed in Koetschau’s edition, but is actually a fragment from Justinian. Another passage in *De principiis* seems to affirm the same idea, but in less explicit terms. As Tzamalikos argues, this text is also problematic because it might reflect the ideas of Rufinus rather than Origen. But is it impossible that Origen would express such ideas?

In this paper, I wish to look more closely at these and other statements of Origen concerning the infinite and its unknowability.


Elizabeth A. Dively Lauro (Camarillo)

*The Role of Redemption within Origen’s Schema of the Soul’s Journey to God*

Origen studies has been equivocal on the significance of Christ’s redemptive act on the Cross to Origen’s explanation of salvation. The major portrait that Origen paints in his collective works showcases the soul’s journey to union with God through growth in virtue both with the guidance of Scripture, which is Christologically infused and anthropologically structured, and against the backdrop of the cosmic battle for possession of the human soul. Yet, how does Christ’s redemptive act on the Cross fit into this schema? Is it a necessary component to starting or completing the soul’s journey to God? Origen provides ample discourse on Christ as both the Paschal Lamb and the Scapegoat on the Day of Atonement. He also discusses in various passages how humans were sold to the devil with the currency of sin but bought back by Christ’s blood, on the one hand, and the offering of his soul, on the other. While Origen provides an explanation of a ransom theory that is accessible, it has remained unclear whether it is fully coherent and, in turn, whether it is necessary to Origen’s understanding of salvation as a journey to God. By examining his atonement language against the backdrop of his explanation of the soul’s journey, this paper explores what role Christ’s act of redemption plays within his portrait of salvation.

Aleksandar Djakovac (Belgrade)

*From Origen’s epinoia to the tropos hyparxeos of Maximus the Confessor*

Epinoia is a term with a wide range of meanings, and Origen deserves credit for its theological use. In this paper, we will try to show that the term epinoia in Origen, when used in a Christological context, means particular properties. The term epinoia among Cappadocians is not equated with the term hypostasis, but it served as a basis for its specific definition. It is on that ground that the Cappadocian Fathers will develop their teaching on hypostatic properties. With the mediation of Leontius of Byzantium, this process will be completed by St. Maximus the Confessor, in his teaching on tropos hyparxeos.
Pavel Dudzik (Prague)
Prov. 8:22–25 LXX in the Exegesis of the Early Church

Prov. 8:22–25 LXX seems to serve as one of the critical protological accounts of the relationship between God the Father and the Son of God in the Scriptures. It contains the account of God’s activity related to his Wisdom before the creation of the world. We encounter there three verbs indicating his activity (κτίζειν, ‘to create’, θεμελιοῦν, ‘to found’, and γεννᾶν, ‘to beget’), the result of his activity (Wisdom as a ‘beginning of his ways’; ἀρχὴ ὁδῶν αὐτοῦ) and reassurance of the premundane character of his activity (it happened πρὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος, ‘before the age’, i.e., before the present age, the age of the sensible world). In the paper, I will attempt to survey the early Christian exegeses of the Biblical passage in question and to (re)examine the ways how the earliest Christian writers until Origen of Alexandria (and including Origen) were dealing with this complex Biblical passage.

Markéta Dudziková (Prague)
Why Did Souls Turn Away from the Good? Philonic Roots of Origen’s Teaching of koros

Origen’s doctrine of the beginning of evil includes the idea that some of the original intelligible beings reached “satiety” (koros) when contemplating the real good and therefore turned away from it. It was shown by some scholars that the idea had already been mentioned by Philo, and that in Origen’s use, the word koros had acquired a specific sense (cf. esp. Marguerite Harl, “Recherches sur l’origénisme d’Origène”). In the paper, I will discuss Philo’s teaching on koros, especially his statement in Her. 240, to show what the reason for the turning away of some souls from the good is and how Philo’s concept of koros differs from that of Origen.

Michaela Durst (Vienna)
The Significance of Olfaction in Transforming Man: Origen and Gregory of Nyssa on the Song of Songs

The Song of Songs, a text richly endowed with olfactory elements (e.g. Cant. 1:1–14), tells of the bride’s being affected by the groom’s fragrance
and their mutual interaction by means of smell or perfuming. Thus, in
the exegesis of the Song of Songs smell is one descriptive context of the
progress of the soul. In Origen’s commentary on the Song of Songs, for
instance, it can represent the reception of the Word of God in the hege-
monikon, accessible by means of the multiplicity of the senses. Gregory of
Nyssa in his homilies on the Song of Songs focuses on physiological details
of olfaction, in order to characterize the infinite progress of the bride. Al-
though both authors of course refer to smell and perfume as virtues of the
bride, olfaction and scent gain slightly different exegetical emphases. The
goal of this paper is to give a nuanced panorama of the olfactory setting,
how it unfolds and how it is given significance in each case.

Roy Flechner (Dublin)
A Seventh-Century Irish Origen?

The recent edition of the early medieval Irish Collectio Hibernensis con-
tains approximately eighty attributions to Origen. Only four of the texts
attributed to Origen have ever been identified: three are quoted from
Orosius’s History and one from the Homilies on Genesis by the Greek
Father Origen. At least some of the remaining quotations may be by an
Irish author who assumed a patristic name, a practice that was not un-
common in early medieval Ireland. An Origen is mentioned also in three
other contemporary Hiberno-Latin texts. In these, as in the Hibernensis,
the ‘Irish Origen’ is quoted as the author of biblical exegesis and various
aphorisms. The present paper will investigate the identity of this figure,
his intellectual debt to the genuine works of Origen, and the familiarity in
early medieval Ireland with these genuine works.

Grant Gasse (Notre Dame)
Plato’s Gorgias in Origen’s On First Principles

In a quote from Eusebius’ Contra Marcellum, Marcellus of Ancyra claims
that Origen prefaced his De principiis with a reference to the Gorgias. Mar-
cellus recognizes in this incipit the residue of Origen’s own beginnings in
the Platonic schools, a point which, for him, impugns Origen’s Christian
credentials. Accordingly, this reference is often mentioned in debates over
Origen’s relationship with the Platonism of his contemporaries. Yet, little attention has been given to the reference itself. From the extant evidence, the 2nd and 3rd centuries saw wide use of the Gorgias, which was largely seen as an “anatreptic” work, in which Socrates takes on and subverts the practices of rival educators. Although most of this commentary material is not preserved, we do possess the later Neoplatonist commentary of Olympiodorus, which reads the Gorgias, somewhat counter-intuitively, in line with the more positive treatments of rhetoric in the Republic and the Phaedrus. Origen’s allusion displays a similarly counter-intuitive, or even subversive reading, insofar as it eschews the neat distinctions Socrates makes between different types of persuasion, knowledge, and belief. In this paper, therefore, I consider the possible reasons for the allusion by comparing thematic elements of the Gorgias, Origen’s stated intentions in De prin., and the evidence of Olympiodorus. Ultimately, I argue that this allusion situates the treatise within contemporary discourses concerning institutionalized education, the art of persuasion, and the construction of Christian forms of academic discipline. In so doing, I open up a broader discussion about Origen’s justifications for and defense of his own educational program, viewed as a part of the historical formation of Christian literary high culture. Much has been written in recent years about the process of this formation and the ample evidence that Christians within elite circles adopted and utilized various forms of cultural and symbolic capital to bring about their own legitimation within their Late Antique context. I attend to the justifications for this strategy internal to De prin. itself in order to complicate and nuance our picture of Origen’s appropriation of the “spoils of Egypt,” in conversation with what evidence we have of the reception of the Gorgias within the Platonism of Origen’s day.

**Ian Gerdon (Notre Dame)**

*Evagrian Cosmology in Maximus the Confessor’s Early Works*

The standard chronologies of Maximus’s writings agree that the linked texts Liber Asceticus (LA) and Capita de Caritate (CC) are among his earliest works, well prior to the Ambigua that constitutes his sympathetic revision of Origenism. So significant is Ambigua’s gravity that the earlier works are drawn into its orbit and frequently interpreted in its light, as
Balthasar proposed: “we must interpret the second group [Capita] in terms of the first [Ambigua, etc.].” Dalmais’s “Doctrine ascetique” on LA offers an example of this interpretive approach. In the process, the distinctive features of Maximus’s early works are lost and any hope of identifying the early progress of his thought vanishes.

In this paper, I will argue that placing the LA and CC in the context of the 5th-6th century Evagrian tradition, especially that of Palestine, allows the unique arguments of LA and CC to emerge more clearly. Consequently, LA can be seen as a representative of the Palestinian approach to Christological asceticism, while CC appears as a radical new departure in the Evagrian tradition that attempts to recover rather than ignore Evagrius’s cosmology. As such, it begins the line of thought that concludes in Maximus’s Ambigua.

Marco Grossi (Prato)
La formation des corpora homilétiques d’Origène: réflexions méthodologiques à partir des Homélies sur les Juges

The paper deals with some methodological considerations about the formation of Origen’s homiletic corpora, and particularly of his Homilies on Judges, translated by Rufinus of Aquileia. Since the texts explain some passages of the biblical book only until chapter 7, this study proposes a new exam in order to understand whether the lack of sermons regarding the remaining chapters is due to a mechanical loss or to a deliberate choice not to comment on it or not to publish it.

Through the comparison between Rufinus’ translation and similar passages in the Origenian works preserved in Greek, the investigation intends to examine the hypothesis that the publication project was not undertaken or completed by the author. Furthermore, the enquiry will try to verify the possibility that the Homiliae in Judices were intended to be an anthology by evaluating the authenticity of some catenary fragments that were recognized as the trace of further homilies.
Anna Gruenert (Moscow)

La notion stoïcienne de προαιρεσις dans l’exégèse chrétienne: une étude comparative des Homélies sur les Psaumes d’Origène et de Basile de Césarée

Cet exposé a pour objectif de présenter une comparaison de l’emploi que font Origène et Basile de Césarée de la notion stoïcienne de προαιρεσις dans leurs Homélies sur les Psaumes respectives. Nous semblons rencontrer cependant quelques difficultés quand nous cherchons à trouver une cohérence dans les propos d’Origène qui se sont constitués notamment dans le contexte de la polémique anti-gnostique. En effet, la προαιρεσις figure dans les Homélies sur les Psaumes d’Origène avec les deux sens suivants : un choix entre le bien et le mal dont nous sommes responsables ; le choix du bien qui est assisté de Dieu. Ainsi, nous tâcherons de formuler plus précisément quelle place occupe la προαιρεσις dans les conceptions sur le libre arbitre d’Origène et de Basile de Césarée. Ce problème est d’autant plus actuel pour la compréhension de nos auteurs que la question du libre arbitre occupe dans le Traité des Principes et dans la Philocalie une place d’importance primordiale.

Ryan Haecker (Cambridge)

On the First Principles of Origen’s Logic

Logic and theology are united in Origen. Origen’s logic has tended to be read anachronistically as little more than a late-Stoic anticipation of modern mathematical logic. In On First Principles, he has cycled the highest hypostases from the end to the beginning in what we can call a ‘theology of logic’. We can observe a salient example of Origen’s theological interpretation of logic in his reading of Saint Paul’s paraphrase of Epimenides’ Liar’s Paradox (Tit. 1:12). He argues that although the Liar’s Paradox can be analysed into a contradiction, it can also be analysed again to distinguish a divine from the human author; to deny any self-reference; and render it, not false but true, and no paradox at all. (ComRm 2.14.20–1.) The paradoxes of ancient as of modern logic can, as I shall argue, be speculatively resolved by analysing the first principles of any system, inference, and consequence of formal logic in and from the revelatory ground of the divine Logos.
Bradley Hansen (Chicago)
Praying with Others: Addressing Readers and their Problems in De oratione

In De oratione, Origen sought to provide a comprehensive account of prayer. In doing so, he introduced various readers, both of his treatise and the biblical text. Among these readers are Ambrose and Tatian, unnamed propagators of various teachings on prayer, and Tatian, the only named opponent in this work. This paper explores the ways Origen presents and engages these readers within De Oratione. As they appear throughout the treatise, one of the most prominent ways Origen addresses the questions from, for, and about these readers is through the ancient strategy of προβλήματα καὶ λύσεις. This strategy allows Origen to construct a dynamic matrix of refutation, practical instruction, and philosophical and theological construction. Through focused attention to a few key passages, I demonstrate that Origen creates multiple readers simultaneously in this work in order to shape and display his pedagogical, polemical, and protreptic purposes.

Paul Hartog (Ankeny)
Faith, Reason, and Epistemology in the Christian Philosophy of Clement of Alexandria

According to Boniface Okafor, “The relationship between reason and faith is a crucial problem in Clement’s whole thought. There is no doubt that the solution he provides sheds a lot of light on the theory of knowledge behind his thought.” Clement’s epistemology maintained that faith and reason (as well as divine revelation and philosophical intellect) exist in a harmonious and complementary relationship. His conceptualization would later be represented by the formula Credo ut intelligam, the “germ” of Christian philosophy developed by Augustine. This essay will examine three specific ways that faith is necessary for philosophy, as maintained by Clement. First, an infinite epistemological regress is not possible – one must inevitably begin with “first principles.” The process of epistemological demonstration ultimately leads to these “first principles,” which (following Aristotle) are essentially incapable of demonstration. Second, an absolute suspension of belief is not possible. As Matthew Baker surmises of this Clementine argumentation, “If nothing is certain, then we can-
not be certain that nothing is certain.” Clement goes further, however, by integrating his views on faith and “sight,” and thereby opposing an epistemology constrained by empiricist limitations. Third, the submission of faith opens up new horizons of knowledge acquisition. As an illustrative example, children must first trust the elementary instruction of their teachers (an act of faith) before advancing to more complex levels of critical reasoning. In this manner, faith does not stand in epistemological contrast to knowledge, but as an epistemological precursor to knowledge (or further knowledge). While Clement’s views of “faith and reason” interacted with the Greek philosophical tradition, this essay will conclude by comparing his insights with the transcendental argumentation (influenced by Immanuel Kant) of the epistemology represented by contemporary Christian “presuppositionalism.”

Daniel Heide (Montreal)

Creation as Incarnation: Maximos’ Logos-Theology as Immanent Principle of Differentiation

In my paper I propose to re-examine Maximos’ retrieval of Origen’s Logos-theology which, perhaps due to its subordinationist overtones joined with the renewed threat of Eunomius’ Neo-Arianism, is largely ignored by subsequent thinkers such as the Cappadocians. While this Logos-theology makes an appearance in the writings of Dionysius, it makes a dramatic comeback in Maximos Confessor who places it at the centre of his cosmological and ontological speculations.

This unexpected retrieval of a controversial doctrine raises many questions. I argue that Maximos’ Logos-theology serves as a necessary principle of differentiation. Given the uncompromising commitment to divine simplicity and the rejection of subordinate hypostases by the Cappadocians, there is no longer any room for the Platonic Forms or the Plotinian Nous. For Maximos, the Logos takes over this function. However, in keeping with the divine simplicity, Maximos does not think of the Logos as a Nous-like unity-in-multiplicity; rather, the Logos is One in His transcendence and many in His immanence. In other words, in Maximos we find a kind of “incarnational ontology”, the embodiment of the One Logos as the many logoi constitutive of beings. Beings do not participate the logoi
in the manner of the Forms, but rather are created according to (κατά) the 
logoi which govern their being and perfection. The seeds of this doctrine 
are already present in Origen.

**Giovanni Hermanin de Reichenfeld (Rome)**

*Female Voices and God’s Memory in Origen of Alexandria*

This paper explores the theological significance of three pivotal evangelical figures in the thought of Origen of Alexandria: Elizabeth, Mary, and the Samaritan woman. The paper analyses the one characteristic that seems to relate these three figures in Origen’s interpretation: their prophetic voice (φωνή). Mary’s voice filled Elisabeth with Holy Spirit; Elisabeth’s voice is prophetic when she blesses Mary’s womb and the Samaritan woman’s conversion makes her a prophetic voice to others. In all three instances, Origen’s interpretation establishes a dichotomy between φωνή and λόγος, voice and word. This is particularly evident in the case of Elisabeth since her son – John the Baptist – is said to be the forerunner of Christ, sent by God from the celestial regions to be the „voice“ (φωνή) who foretells the „word“ (λόγος). In this latter case, Origen establishes also a very interesting Platonic link between voice and memory (μνήμη) of God which, according to him, is the etymology of the name Zachariah (father of John the Baptist). Therefore, this paper’s aim is twofold. On the one hand, it offers an insight on Origen’s use of the feminine by unfolding the complex Christological relation between φωνή and λόγος in Origen’s thought. On the other hand, it evaluates the possibility that Zachariah’s etymology is a reference to the Platonic doctrine of the anamnesis of God.

**Tommaso Interi (Turin)**

*Eusebius and the Legacy of Origen’s Exegesis: Reading the Commentary on the Psalms*

Eusebius of Caesarea is mostly known for his apologetical and historical efforts, rather than for his exegetical ones. Nonetheless, his Commentary on Isaiah and Commentary on the Psalms are fundamental works which help to ascertain to what extent Origen’s exegesis was adopted and repurposed by the Caesarean bishop. Indeed, it is been said that Eusebius, as
an exegete, places himself halfway between the allegorical method of the Alexandrians and the literalist one of the Antiochenes, but such reading does not account for every detail of his approach to the biblical text.

In this occasion, a few samples of Eusebius’ interpretation of the Psalms will be useful to propose a more nuanced consideration of the bishop’s interpretative technique. On the one hand, it will be highlighted that he follows the Alexandrian tradition inasmuch as he recurs to the prosopological interpretation of each Psalm, or resorts to the Greek translations contained in the Hexapla. On the other hand, I will argue that Eusebius’ interpretation differs from Origen’s one because even if he recurs to the Alexandrian exegetical array, he does so with a different consideration of the biblical text, and in particular of the Psalter, and therefore he pursues a different object with its interpretation.

Comparing the bishop’s explanation of some Psalms with the one advanced by Origen in his Homilies on the Psalms (e.g. on Ps 67 and 76) will allow to ascertain the influence of the Alexandrian on Eusebius’ exegetical method, as well as account for both the similarities and differences of the two exegetes.

**Pui Him Ip (Cambridge)**

*Ecclesiastes as Solomonic Physics. Shadows of an Origenian Idea in Later Patristic Exegesis of Eccl 1:9–10*

It is well-known that in ComCC Prol. 3,5–7, Origen maps the Solomonic biblical books (Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs) onto a three-fold division of philosophy (ethics, physics, epoptics). But little is known about his understanding of Ecclesiastes as a book of physics. This is largely because we know very little about Origen’s mostly lost exegesis of Ecclesiastes, despite the best efforts by scholars to retrieve as much as possible from catenae fragments. Building on the recent work by Francesco Celia who has shown that much can be learned about Origen’s ‘Solomonic physics’ from its afterlife in later commentators, this paper proposes to trace possible content of ‘Solomonic physics’ further by studying interpretations of Eccl 1.9–10 in Gregory Thaumaturgus, Didymus the Blind, Jerome, Olympiodorus the deacon and Metrophanes of Smyrna. Unlike passages previously studied by Celia, it is well-attested that Eccl 1.9–10 was
used by Origen explicitly in the context of physics (de Princ. I,4,5, III,5,3; C.Cels IV,12) to set out (a) the ‘pre-existence’ of creation in Wisdom in a pre-figured form, and (b) a theory of world cycles that counter rival natural philosophies. I will show that both ideas can hardly be found in later interpretations of the same passage. Further, later commentaries on Eccl 1.9–10 can be roughly divided into discussions on physics and ethics. This study suggests that a more detailed reconstruction of Ecclesiastes as ‘Solomonic physics’ via its reception-history would need a more complex methodology to handle the discrepancies between various post-Origenian treatments of Ecclesiastes as physics. I argue that these shadows of ‘Solomonic physics’ become more intelligible when one takes seriously the intrinsic connection between the exercise of free will (ethics) and the nature of the visible world (physics) in Origen’s thought (de Princ. II,1,1–3).

Anders-Christian Jacobsen (Aarhus)

Sophia: The Female Aspect of God in Origen of Alexandria

This paper explores the role of the Wisdom – Sofia – in Origen’s theology. The following questions are asked: What are the sources of Origen’s wisdom theology? Why does God according to Origen need a feminine aspect? What is the relation between the female Wisdom and the male Logos? How does the Wisdom connect the divine and the human according to Origen?

Mark Randall James (Washington)

Must Origen Understand What He Says?

The development of Christian thought involves the invention of new language. As scholars like Alain Le Boulluec and Olivier Munnich have shown, one of Origen’s central contributions to the development of Christian thought is his methodological use of the Christian scriptures as a generative source for the invention of language, a so-called “textualization of thought.” Through an analysis of the recently discovered Homilies on the Psalms, my monograph, Learning the Language of Scripture, shows that this process of invention uses inductive reasoning to propose and test new sentences by analogy with sentences of scripture. Origen teaches his con-
Abstractions

Aggregation not only to understand the words of scripture but to speak in imitation of its language—which means, saying and thinking new things that scripture does not explicitly say.

This presentation develops some implications of this model for the use of Origen’s writings in scholarly accounts of the development of Christian thought. That Origen frequently offers speculative proposals as hypotheses in what Prinzivalli calls a “tono zetetico” is well-known. It is less frequently recognized that Origen’s method of inquiry shapes the linguistic form of his discourse. Because Origen’s speculative proposals are generated by analogy with scriptural sentences, his own language tends to display the formal characteristics that he ascribes to scriptural language, such as obscurity, exactness, and logical sequence. For this reason, as I show with reference to the Psalm homilies, Origen slides from interpreting scriptural language to interpreting his own proposed formulations, using the same inductive methods to test the propriety of his invented sentences as he uses to explicate scripture. I conclude with a caution: scholars cannot assume that the meaning of his own words was transparent to himself, but should instead be open to the possibility that Origen might utter sentences that he himself does not claim fully to understand.

Zurab JASHI (Leipzig)

Christ as Divine Double: Origen’s Exegesis of Gal. 2:20

The recent studies on Origen have lucidly demonstrated the primary significance of the notion of freedom in the Alexandrian father’s doctrine of salvation. There can be no place for the contradiction between freedom and divine providence in Origen’s metaphysical vision. On the contrary, it grounds human freedom in the transcendent being of God. Providence is considered to create all the necessary conditions for the restoration and perfection of human freedom. But it has proved difficult to grasp with a certain degree of conceptual clarity how Origen envisages the character of these providentially designed conditions under which human freedom flourishes. This article attempts to make a modest contribution to shedding light upon this question. It analyses the different contexts within which Origen places Gal. 2:20 as he examines the way the human being can attain unity with God. In all of these contexts, one main soteriological
motif becomes evident, which can be designated as the salvation of human rationality. This article argues that this kind of salvation is conceived by Origen according to the schema of exchange of identities between the Logos and the human soul, where the former is present as a “divine double” of the latter.

**Tomáš Jeniš (Prague)**

*Beautiful Worlds: Origen and Ambrose*

The paper investigates reception and transformation of Origenian aesthetics of κόσμος νοητός and κόσμος αἰσθητός present in his *Homiliae in Genesim* and Ambrose’s *Exameron*. Attention will be paid to the idea of beauty and its manifestation both created and uncreated entities. A further focus will reveal the intelligible and sensible beauty of the Image of God in the creation of Man. The last section will inquire into arguments for aesthetic ugliness of the created world, humans and animals due to moral and intellectual corruption caused by acts of free will.

**Samuel B. Johnson (Notre Dame)**

*“The sign of the Son of Man will appear”: Origen on the Matthean Logic of Parousia*

This essay will examine how Origen understood Jesus’s sayings about the “coming of the Son of Man” in his *Commentary on Matthew*. I will argue that his reading of these passages depends much less on *a priori* theological commitments than on rather straightforward critical judgments, derived from collecting plausible literary precedents, establishing a sense of genre, and remaining persistently skeptical that their intent was ever reducible to some flatly historical prediction alone. Origen is well aware “that the church seems to have received a tradition that there will be a second advent of Christ ‘in glory’” (*Comm. ser. Matt.* 50); what is less clear, Origen suggests, is what was ever meant by this tradition. This paper will account for why Origen believes the Son of Man sayings may have been styled as historiae (i.e., as a narrative of events “as (if) they will happen”), but were never meant to be received literally—a position that aligns with a strain of contemporary NT scholarship.
Oskari Juurikkala (Turku)

Origen and the Origins of the Metaphor of the Book of Nature

The early history of the metaphor of the book of nature has received limited attention in scholarship, and various claims have been made concerning its origins. This paper argues that, although one finds hints of the idea in earlier Alexandrian thought, Origen is the definitive early exponent of the idea that the visible creation is another form of divine scripture. The paper explores four texts in which the metaphor appears either implicitly or explicitly, and provides a reflection on both the philosophical underpinnings and the theological implications of the Origenian book of nature. The metaphor is not an isolated idea but concurs with Origen’s broader vision, which unites the Greek philosophy of the *logos* with an appreciation of the Scriptures in the centrality of the divine Word. The paper finishes with a brief overview of the subsequent patristic development of the metaphor with a view to Origen’s role in its dissemination.

Filip Karfik (Fribourg)

Where Comes τὸ αὐτεξούσιον from? The Background of a Key Word in Origen’s De principiis III

Starting with the II\textsuperscript{nd} century CE, the term τὸ αὐτεξούσιον emerges in Christian as well as in pagan authors. It partly replaces, partly goes alongside with the term τὸ ἐφ’ ἡμῖν which has an Aristotelian pedigree. The claim has been made that τὸ αὐτεξούσιον stems from the early Stoics, but there is no inconvertible evidence for this. It has also been suggested that it may have originated in the Judeo-Christian theological context but there is no conclusive evidence for this either. Within the extant literary corpus, the term first occurs in Diodorus Siculus, followed by Philo of Alexandria and Flavius Josephus. None of them, however, uses it in its philosophical meaning. This paper is aimed at shading new light on the emergence and meaning of the term αὐτεξούσιον in early Roman times.
Lenka Karpíková (Prague)
Matter in Origen’s De principiis IV 4,6(33)–8(35)

Origen’s analysis of matter (ὕλη, materia) as provided in De principiis IV,4,6(33)–8(35), considers, besides a short polemic against the concept of “unchangeable elements”, two basic ideas: (i) material nature as qualities without any substrate; (ii) matter as the substrate of qualities. While the second concept, originating in Plato’s Timaeus, comes close to the Stoic doctrine which Origen enriches with some Aristotelian features, the first one is also attested by Plotinus, who, similarly to Origen, rejects it; it was, later on, endorsed by the Cappadocians. In my paper, I try to show the philosophical background of both concepts, as well as to follow Origen’s biblical argumentation.

Bernadine Kensinger (Weston, MA)
The Spiritual Paradise of Origen in his De oratione

The subject of this paper is Origen’s use of his De Oratione to prove the appeal and priority of belief in Christ over and above any philosophy. His compelling opening sets the stage for what he will bring forth in the Lord’s Prayer: what is impossible (αδύνατα) and transcends our human condition is made possible (δυνατά) to us only through Christ and the Spirit.

Origen places himself on the cutting edge of dialogue with his contemporary Alexandrian culture in his De Oratione. The heavy yoke of the sense of mystery and the impenetrability of the truth of things that stymied the ancient Greek mind is forever cast off with Christ the Logos (Λόγος) of God who opens the way for our knowing God and our being known by God. Plotinus’s notion of the complexity of representing or speaking of the One is reconciled in Christ who is the image of the invisible God and source of our reason, the logos (λόγος) in us. Christ is the one who showers his “superabundant” and “immeasurable” graces upon us through the Spirit making our “human epistemological impotence” receptive to what is possible through the Spirit. The words (λόγοι), thoughts (ἐπίνοιαι) and doctrines (θεωρήματα) of Christ made available to us in Scripture, help us to understand him and appeal to us so that we can grasp him and take hold of him with our intellect and give the assent of our free will to believe in him and love him. Christians see that with Jesus, human and
divine nature began to be woven together, so that by fellowship with divinity, human nature might become divine. This intimacy with the divine is beyond all human comprehension, freeing us to go beyond what was inconceivable to the Greek mind to the truth that is made possible because of Christ. Origen is attempting to break through the intellectual barriers that keep God at a distance and in the category of being an impersonal unknown by establishing the preeminence of Christ over everything in creation that extends even to our innermost being. Through the Lord’s Prayer, Origen illuminates his own experience and knowledge of Christ making his dwelling in us as the Word in our minds and hearts. He shows that the reality of the relationship we possess in Christ offers us a foretaste of eternal life even now in this earthly life such that Christ may walk in us as in a spiritual paradise.

Giovanni MANABU AKIYAMA (Tsukuba)
“Preesistenze delle anime” secondo Origene e la “Personalità corporativa” secondo Gregorio di Nissa

Christoph Markschies (Berlin)

*The Tentative Element in Origen’s Intellectual Profile*

Everyone dealing with the texts of Origen will immediately realize the tentative style of his thoughts expressed for example with small Greek particles and verbs of doubt. Wording like “One could think here possibly …” is often used by him to express doubt or possibility. But this “tentative” element is not only a characteristic element of Origen’s literary style but also a line of thought in his intellectual profile. In the paper this element will be analyzed from a viewpoint of literary criticism (compared to other authors of his time), but also compared to the “language” of skepticism in a broader history of ideas-approach. In a third part the question will be asked how this “tentative way of thinking” is realized differently in different genres (sermons, commentaries and tractates) and according to different types of content.

Peter W. Martens (Saint Louis)

*Philological Moods: A Taxonomy of Origen’s Postures toward the Bible*

I intend to present on the “moods” of Origen’s exegesis. I am thinking of a typology that distinguishes between scales of moods: (1) how we see criticism, but also submissiveness to the text; (2) a conservative, curatorial spirit, but also a creative posture; (3) his famously cautious dispositions (hypothetical, speculative, multiple options) but also definitive assertions about meaning; and finally, (4) from more impersonal readings to deeply intimate identifications, even fusions with, biblical narratives.

The backgrounds are these: how customary discussions of late antique philology/early Christian biblical interpretation often fail to grasp the dispositions of the philologist which strongly shaped the inquiry; the often exaggerated importance we give “criticism” for all things reading and thinking in the humanities – “the work of the humanities is frequently descriptive, or appreciative, or imaginative, or provocative, or speculative, more than it is critical” (Helen Small, *Value of Humanities*, 56); how late antique engagements with the Bible can provide an impetus for more dynamic engagements with texts in the humanities today, starting with learning outcomes that don’t just talk about “critical” reading and thinking. Origen’s “moods” or “dispositions” do not distinguish him from
Fernando Martín (San Juan)
Origen and Plotinus on the Absolute Transcendence of the First Principle: Doctrinal Continuity or Rupture?

Despite the chronological distance and the differences between the reflections of the Christian Origen and the pagan Plotinus, both thinkers share the interpretation that the first principle is ineffable. Origen maintains that the divine essence remains hidden from human intelligence. However, God reveals himself through the Word, to the extent that Christ, being the wisdom of the Father, is the archetype of everything created. For his part, Plotinus affirms that the One surpasses all intelligible reality. Consequently, the unitive vision is carried out by the self-renunciation of the intellect, attracted by the beauty of One that neither thinks nor is. Without assuming the alleged thesis of a direct influence due to the controversy—not yet resolved—on the common teachings given by Ammonio Sakkas, the present work will be an attempt to elucidate to what extent both models of thought enrich each other on the basis of a fundamental question: in what sense can intelligence be linked to a presence that transcends it? It is a doctrine which has had a significant historical impact on the composition of later works such as the Liber de causis, whose prop. 5 [6] affirms that “the first cause is superior to discourse” and that “it is only possible to proceed from the second causes, illuminated by the light of the first one” (superior est narratione … et non narratur nisi per causas secundas quae illuminantur a lumine causae primae, 57). Later it is explained that this communication proceeds “through intelligence” (mediante intelligentia, 18 [19], 149). By virtue of this assimilation, the original Neoplatonic understanding of the intellect as a universal mediator is transformed and integrated into a new conceptual scheme, closer to that of a theory of creative causality. For the analysis of the mentioned topics, a hermeneutical and critical reading of both the sources and the specialized bibliography will be applied.
Giulio Maspero (Rom)
The Category of \( \piρ\delta\zeta \tau\iota \) in Origen’s Thought and its Philosophical Background

In the very incipit of John’s Prologue the formula “\( \piρ\delta\zeta \tau\iota \theta\epsilon\omicron\nu \)” challenged the metaphysical understanding of Trinitarian revelation. The key element was the accidental dimension linked to the \( \piρ\delta\zeta \tau\iota \) in Aristotelian thought and its role in the Commentators as macro-category opposed to substance. But in Origen’s approach there is no space for a predication according to more or less in relation to the Trinity. So a tension emerges from exegesis itself. The paper will cover the \( chr\epsilon\omicron\zeta is \) of \( \piρ\delta\zeta \tau\iota \) in the works of Origen, highlighting its relation with \( sch\epsilon\omicron\zeta is \) and the Commentators’ tradition.

Sebastian Mateiescu (Leiden)
Maximus the Confessor on the Non-Simultaneity of Origin and Rest

In Ambiguum 15, Maximus the Confessor shapes one complex argument against the Origenistic henad along the idea that rest is not relative to origin but to motion. However, as motion is for Maximus always relative to origin as there is no motion without a cause, how could it be that rest, being relative to motion, is not also relative to origin? I would like to argue that an answer to this issue could be gathered from Ambiguum 7 in which Maximus works out a double meaning of motion as ‘passion’ and ‘effective activity’. These correspond to the idea of ‘end’ and ‘perfection’ and I shall suggest that for Maximus ‘rest’ gets its relative status if seen as an ‘end’ but not as ‘perfection’. Since for Maximus ‘perfection’ is only an attribute of God, he contends that created beings cannot have it as a potency inherent in their origin which they could eventually later actualize. Rather, they receive it only as a gift ‘from the outside’ and hence they will achieve a ‘rest’ that cannot be simultaneous with their being.

Aashu Alexander Mattackal (Leuven)
\( \Gamma\iota\nu\nu\varsigma\sigma\theta\alpha\iota \ \omicron\rho\omicron\omega\omicron\omega\theta\nu\iota\zeta \ \iota\nu\nu\iota \ \theta\epsilon\omicron\omicron\varsigma\omicron\zeta \): Plotinus and Origen on ‘Vices’ and ‘Virtues’ as Factors in the Struggle for Deification

Prior research on Plotinus and Origen has devoted extensive attention to their understanding of the human soul and its salvation. Nevertheless,
a comparative analysis of their position on the different degrees in the soul’s journey towards deification is lacking. This paper will address that gap, firstly, by exploring the problem of vices in Plotinus’ *Enneads* and Origen’s *Homilies on Ezekiel*. This inquiry will provide a background for the second part: an overview of the role of virtues – namely, wisdom, courage, self-control and justice – in the soul’s journey. Additionally, by building on existing research and through a textual analysis of the forenamed texts, this paper will argue that Plotinus’ and Origen’s account of ‘virtues’ and ‘vices’ in the soul’s journey manifests near identical stages in the process of human deification.

**Leszek Misiarczyk (Warsaw)**

*Christian Faith as a Philosophy according to Origen*

We know that the development of terminology understandable to people of that time which would allowed for a deeper understanding of the truths of the Christian faith was one of the most important doctrinal problems of the Church in post-apostolic times. Greek philosophers were unable to reconcile the world of philosophy with Greek religiosity, hence any attempt to relate philosophy to the Christian religion seems to be an absurd idea at all. Christianity itself was not a philosophy in the strict sense, nevertheless, the truth about the salvation of people by Christ expressed through the techniques of rational understanding of the world developed by Greek philosophy can be considered as philosophy. The key task of Greek philosophy was to teach a life that would allow one to achieve a happy life among the gods. Hence, many philosophers, such as Plato and Plotinus, called for a virtuous life and exercise of the spirit in order to become like God. The motive of becoming like God seems to be crucial, because God was a perfect being and only to him was assigned the attribute of wisdom. The philosopher was a step below God, he could not call himself wise, but he could love wisdom. Becoming like God could take place on the plane of a virtuous life and a love of wisdom, as recorded in Plato (Theatet 176). Pierre Hadot rightly emphasizes that ancient philosophy is not only a set of views and doctrines, but is also a philosopher’s ethos. In addition to the desire to become like a deity, the second key task of philosophy was to fight passions and acquire virtue, especially
to overcome the fear of pain and death. In the first and second centuries, Christians encountered a philosophy that was a combination of Stoicism and Platonism, and as such was recognized by the average educated community. The beginning of the meeting of the ideals of Christianity and Greek ancient culture undoubtedly seems to be in the discourse of St. Paul in the Areopagus. It seems to be a masterful attempt at translating the Good News with the help of the language of the contemporary world. It is not difficult to notice that on the basis of ethics, Christianity was and is comparable to the ideas of Stoicism, especially when it comes to the image of a sage who is in a state of constant apatheia despite the constant misfortunes or temptations. On the level of metaphysics, Christianity can be juxtaposed with Platonism, and especially with its model of a man who, in his essence, belongs to the higher world, although in earthly life he is trapped in a material body.

For many years, research on ancient philosophy has focused on the views of philosophers on the one hand, and on the other hand it has been interpreted from the perspective of a medieval or contemporary definition of philosophy. This perception of ancient philosophy through the prism of later definitions completely obscured its true face and the assessment of its relationship to ancient Christianity. For if philosophy is defined as the famous E. Gilson wanted, as a speculative view of reality or as it is presented today by the so-called the post-Enlightenment tradition as an achievement of reason or rationality independent of the authority of religion, it will be completely incomprehensible to present the Christian faith in the texts of the Church Fathers as philosophy. And this is how the Church Fathers of the first centuries presented Christianity and, interestingly, no one objected to describing it as a philosophy, although, as you know, at that time Christians were accused of many different things. Research on how ancient philosophers perceived themselves and their mission, and the concept of philosophy that Pierre Hadot has been pursuing for years has shown beyond any doubt that ancient philosophy was first and foremost a „way of life“ (ars vitae). As Hadot rightly points out, medieval theology in fact reduced philosophy to a purely theoretical role, and Gilson projects this scholastic way of understanding philosophy upon ancient philosophy with which primitive Christianity came into contact. An even more distorted picture of the relationship between ancient philosophy and Chris-
tianity of the first centuries appears in the case of designing the definition of post-Enlightenment philosophy on ancient philosophy, because then this relationship is perceived as the eternal conflict between faith and reason. Ancient philosophy, especially in the so-called in the third stage of the development of Greek thought, it turned into one that shifted the focus from metaphysical, ontological and epistemological investigations to ethics, often understood as a way of life. In the context of philosophy understood in this way, Christians could and really present their faith as a new philosophy in the sense of a new „way of life“. Even a cursory analysis of the patristic texts clearly shows that no one refused Christians to define their faith in such a way, because faith in all schools, with the exception of skeptics, was an integral component of philosophical life and was the starting point of the path that was to lead to happiness, virtue and full knowledge. If ancient philosophy was a way of life, a tool that is to help man become like God and control his passions (especially the most difficult to control passion, which is the fear of death) and achieve a state of impassibility, there is no doubt that the Christian faith turned out to be in this regard, the most effective tool for such a transformation. For in Christians, as the pagans themselves have noticed, even women and children do not fear death and boldly give their lives, and their faith is the realization of the ideal of the classical definitions of philosophy: preparation for death and likeness to God. If the truthfulness of a doctrine is measured by its effectiveness, then there is no doubt, as was repeatedly emphasized by early Christian authors, that the Christian faith most effectively prepares people for martyrdom and, by mastering the fear of death, makes it the most similar to God. Therefore, it is worth applying such an understanding of ancient philosophy to the understanding of the Christian faith limited only to the works of one of the most eminent Church Fathers, namely Origen. The Alexandrian was perfectly able to combine the traditions of philosophical schools with their characteristic arguments, with faith in Revelation and knowledge of the Scriptures. Hence Origen's arguments based on the Holy Scriptures and the writings of philosophers are intertwined. We have studies by H. Crouzel, *Origène et la philosophie*, Paris 1962 or a three-volume monograph by E. de Faye, *Origène. Sa vie, son œuvre, sa pensée*, vol. I – III, Paris 1923–1928, which is a certain summary of the period of writing philosophy about Origen. However, most
of the publications to date concern the philosophical presentation of the truths of the Christian faith in the writings of the Alexandrian or his Platonism do not develop this aspect sufficiently. Here I would like to present the understanding of Christianity as a philosophy in the sense of a way of life, fighting with passions and becoming like God in the thought of the scholarch from Alexandria. In the first part of my speech, I would like to briefly show that the first Greek apologists, such as Justin Martyr, Tatian, Athenagoras of Athens and Clement of Alexandria, Origen’s direct predecessor, presented the Christian faith as a new philosophy. Origen is therefore not the creator of the understanding of Christianity as a philosophy, but draws from the earlier tradition of the Greek Fathers, especially Justin and Clement. In the next part, I would like to show how Origen understood philosophy in general. What he accused her, why and for what he criticized individual philosophical schools. In this chapter I will also present what, according to the Alexandrian, deserved praise in the search for pagan philosophers. In the third part, I will try to show how Origen understood Christianity as a philosophy and a way of life. How were Christians to implement the postulates of Christianity so that it became a kind of *ars vitae* for them? I will also try to explain why, according to Origen, Christianity fulfills this function of a teacher of the art of living better than Greek philosophy. In the following, I will present the Alexandrian understanding of Christianity – philosophy as being like God. In it, I will try to show how, according to the theologian from Alexandria, a man can become like God and how Christianity is to help him in the implementation of this postulate. In the last paragraph, I will focus on the subject of how Origen transferred to Christianity the understanding of philosophy as a tool to fight the passions. In it I will present what, according to the scholarch of Alexandria, passions are, where they come from and how to fight them on the way of Christian life.

Matteo Monfrinotti (Rome)

*Νοητός and αἰσθητός: The Stromateus versus the βάρβαρος φιλοσοφία (strom. V 93,4–5)*

Many and highly speculative are the protological reflections that Clement formulates in his writings, in particular in *Stromateis* 5,93,4–5 where he
elaborates, in the context of his creationist conception, the relationship between κόσμος νοητός and κόσμος αἰσθητός. Our contribution, based on the text in question, intends to propose an examination of the meaning of the two definitions to verify the fruition, reinterpretation and “conversion” of Platonic and Middle-Platonic thought on created and uncreated reality, as well as the resolution of the concept proper to βάρβαρος φιλοσοφία.

Xavier Morales (Santiago de Chile)

*The Distribution of the Divine Operation between the Trinitarian Persons in Origen’s Commentaries on John and on Romans*

Various witnesses seemingly agree in attributing to Origen a same doctrine about the difference between the powers of the three divine persons, the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. All of them pretend to transmit the very words of Origen, probably extracted from his treatise *Peri Arkhôn*. All of them do it with different words, and neither of them correspond exactly to the Latin translation of *Peri Arkhôn* by Rufinus of Aquileia, which was nevertheless vindicated in 1976 by Henri Crouzel (“Les personnes de la Trinité sont-elles de puissance inégale selon Origène, *Peri Archon* I, 3, 5–8”, *Gregorianum* 57/1 (1976) 109–123.).

The present paper aims at confirming the analysis of Crouzel, and comparing the declarations of *Peri Arkhôn*, already commented in a previous paper (X. Morales, “Las operaciones personales en la teología trinitaria de Orígenes”, *Teología y Vida* 58 (2017) 447–471), with two other works by Origen: the first two books of the *Commentary on John*, in which the Alexandrian asks the question of the participation of the Word to the divine operation of creation; and book VIII of the *Commentary on Romans*, in which he gives an interesting interpretation of the three prepositions of Rom. 11, 36.

These comparisons will allow to measure the unstable equilibrium in which Origen stands, between two possible models of distribution of the divine operation between the Trinitarian persons: what I would call a scalar model and a tri-functional model.
Sébastien Morlet (Paris)
The Philosophical Background of Origen’s Spiritual Exegesis

Origen’s exegesis is generally analysed in the context of Alexandrian Jewish and Christian tradition, in the light of its Christian posterity (cf. De Lubac and “les quatre sens de l’Écriture”), or in the tradition of Greek philology (Neuschäfer). Porphyry’s famous fr. 39 of his treatise against the Christians (Harnack), however, highlights the supposed philosophical sources of Origen’s usage of “allegorical” exegesis, and gives a precise list of stoic, Pythagorean and Platonist philosophers. Though Porphyry’s statement is deeply polemical, and even if he might confuse the Christian Origen and Origen the Platonist, it is interesting to evaluate Porphyry’s thesis. Are there any reasons to connect Origen’s practice of spiritual exegesis with a philosophical background? Are there any reasons to think that he might be dependent on the philosophers whom Porphyry mentions as his sources?

Pamela Mullins Reaves (Colorado Springs)
Shifting Souls and Cosmic Landscapes in Origen’s Peri Archon

In this communication, I consider certain spatial dimensions of Origen’s cosmological landscape, as illustrated in his Peri Archon. With a focus on how such envisioned spaces allow for the descent and ascent of souls, I analyze a series of passages that engage related topics in Origen’s thought, including his eschatological outlook, conceptions of the body, and exegetical strategies. For instance, in Peri Archon IV.3, Origen interprets prophetic accounts of the geopolitical circumstances of Israel, including Jerusalem, as well as its proximate neighbors, like Egypt and Babylon, as illustrative of heavenly locations and corresponding abodes for souls. Dismissive of the historical happenings, Origen posits a spiritual reading that elevates ethnic distinctions into the heavenly realm: captivity in Egypt references a soul’s descent into a lesser realm, indicative of the potential dispersion of souls across “other nations” (Peri Archon IV.3.9). This particular mapping encourages a consideration of how Origen’s emphasis on the progress of individual souls corresponds with such group classifications. To further illuminate Origen’s spatial perspective, I consider other passages, such as Peri Archon III.6, that offer the eschatological prospect
of a distinct earthly realm, another cosmic space that plays a role in the ascent of souls. In addition, I reflect on both the familiar and distinctive features of Origen’s cosmic landscape through brief comparisons with related cosmo-logies and treatments of ascent in contemporary Jewish and Christian traditions, primarily those that similarly draw on Platonic and Stoic philosophical currents.

Maria Munkholt Christensen (Bonn)

Teachers of Good Things

Origen expects elderly women and men to be “teachers of good things” in the congregations (Origen’s Commentary on John 32.132; cf. Titus 2:3). At the same time, he follows Paul in restricting women from teaching in church assemblies. In Origen’s works, we find some of the first existing comments about the (Pseudo-)Pauline prohibitions on women to speak and teach in church (1 Timothy 2:12 and 1 Corinthians 14:34–35). This paper investigates Origen’s argumentation and his emphases when mentioning female teachers and the restrictions on their activities. Obviously, Origen assumes that women can receive divine revelations, and he allows for women to give “spiritual instruction”. However, he interprets this in a very specific way (e.g. Origen’s Homilies on Isaiah 6.3). This paper looks at Origen’s argumentation in order to determine to which degree the argumentation is based on theological principles. Why is it, as Origen writes in his Commentary on 1 Corinthians 14, shameful for a woman to speak in church, “even if she should speak marvelous and holy words”? It will be discussed what words such as “shameful” (ἀίσχρόν), “revelation” (ἀποκάλυψις) and “exercise authority” (αὐθεντεῖν) mean according to Origen’s world view, and how he blends theology and prevailing cultural norms.

Olivier Munnich (Paris)

An Origen’s Simile: The Key of a Biblical Text

Among the four excerpts from the Origen’s Commentary on Psalm 1 that the Philocalists retain, one of them (2, 3) reports a Jewish tradition. We will question its origin and ask whether the comparison between “room
The puzzling claim of Platonists that “God does not even participate in being” (CCêls 6.64) continues to percolate in contemporary talk of “God without Being.” Origen replies that “He is participated in, rather than participates” (6.64). But he does not develop the ontological overtones of this, falling back into the channel of biblical piety instead. When he does ask the question “whether God ‘transcends being in rank and power’ (epekeina ousias esti presbeia kai dunamei; cf. Plato, Rep. 509B) … or whether He is Himself being” (6.64), he leaves the question open, as Philo and Middle Platonists had done. Generally, the philosophical question is drowned in theological ones; the Father’s transcendence of the Son upstages the Good’s transcendence of being; see ComJn 13.152 for example. His use of the words “beyond being and intellect” at the same time as he identifies God as being and intellect is typical of middle Platonism, and it may be that when we siphon out the philosophical element from the theological discourse on the Father’s transcendence we will find only a conventional Platonism, handled in a plodding, desultory manner, and not an anticipation of Plotinus.

Jennifer Otto (Lethbridge)
Origen and the Ethics of Exhorting Martyrdom

The martyrs of the early church have been a perennial source of fascination, and occasionally revulsion, for later scholars. Beginning with the seminal work of Daniel Boyarin and Elizabeth Castelli, recent decades have seen a proliferation of studies that have identified competing discourses of martyrdom articulated by Christians in the ancient and late antique worlds. As scholars such as Candida Moss and Paul Middleton have demonstrated, the criteria for determining when martyrdom—or its
avoidance—was beneficial, advisable, or obligatory remained a matter of contention rather than consensus among Christians throughout the third century CE.

For Origen, questions pertaining to the legitimacy of martyrdom were not merely theoretical. In *Historia Ecclesiastica* 6, Eusebius introduces Origen as the son of a martyr and as one who would himself eventually suffer tortures at the hands of persecutors. Eusebius presents Origen as a man who was willing not only to himself die for God, but as actively encouraging others to do so as well. This presentation is confirmed by Origen’s own writings, in particular his *Exhortation to Martyrdom*. This paper interrogates Origen’s *Exhortation* in order to better understand the ethical considerations that governed Origen’s conception of himself as an exhorter of martyrs. Situating Origen’s *Exhortation* in relation to contemporary arguments about the ethics of noble death and legitimate self-killing, I ask, what principles and assumptions prompted Origen to encourage his friends and fellow Christians to permit themselves to be killed? What responsibilities did he understand himself to have in relation to them? As I will demonstrate, Origen conceives of martyrdom as a benevolent expression of God’s grace that ought to be embraced, if not sought out, rather than an evil to be avoided. Martyrdom is thus is deeply connected to Origen’s anthropology, his eschatology, and his ecclesiology, as well as his ethics.

Tiziano F. OTTOBRINI (Bergamo)

*Tra la Bibbia e Aristotele: il retaggio esegetico e speculativo di Origene sull’Esamerone del commentatore aristotelico Giovanni Filopono*

Del tutto negletta risulta la frequente ripresa di Origene da parte dell’alexandrinio Giovanni Filopono, noto per i commentari aristotelici. Stante la duplice competenza sia esegetica sia filosofica del cristiano Filopono, il suo *De opificio mundi* (c. 560) rappresenta un punto di vista assolutamente privilegiato per valutare la ricezione e le correzioni che l’impianto speculativo origeniano riceueva a brevissima distanza dalla condanna conciliare del Costantinopolitano II (553). L’attenzione si concentrerà su due rispetti:
I. centrale in Filopono è l’ opposizione all’ apotelesmatica; con riferimento a *De op.* IV, 18 si illustrerà la strategia argomentativa filoponiana che, per negare il determinismo astrale sulla vita umana, fa uso esplicito della testimonianza di Origene. Mediante una sinossi con le non poche reliquie origeniane, si evidenzierà che Filopono mutua da Origene le ragioni speculative per ricusare l’apotelesmatica: a) dal punto di vista epistemico, questa non si fonda su una teoria aitiologica; b) eliminando ogni spazio alla libertà dell’uomo, essa sopprime l’ambito della responsabilità morale. Si mostrerà quindi come Filopono rilegga gli argomenti di Origene alla luce della propria *forma mentis* aristotelica, sicché l’originaria opposizione di Origene alla *heimarmenē* stoica viene integrata da Filopono con la dottrina della causazione dello Stagirita, con esplicita ripresa della *Metafisica* e del *De calo*.

II. Commentando la creazione genesiaca dell’uomo, Filopono articola una compiuta embriologia. Con riguardo a *De op.* VI, 23–25 e VII, 3 verrà esibito come, dietro la dottrina dell’animazione all’atto del concepimento, si accampi anche l’intendimento di prendere le distanze dalla preesistenza delle anime origeniane. Attingendo alla psicologia aristotelica della tripartizione dell’anima, Filopono mutua dalla filosofia origeniana l’eternità dell’anima ma la integra a la Aristotele, considerando anima solo quella che sia entelechia di un corpo già formato.

*Katarina Pålsson* (Lund)

*Regaining Paradise: Jerome’s Reception of Origen in his Defence of Female Spiritual Authority*

In the debates over Christian asceticism at the end of the fourth century, arguments tended to centre specifically around *female* asceticism, and there is good reason to understand these conflicts partly in terms of a discourse of female spiritual authority. Jerome of Stridon was an author with several female patrons and disciples, and in many writings, we find him defending not only his practice of writing to women, but also the authority of these women. In his self-presentation as a learned, orthodox teacher, Jerome certainly had an interest in presenting his followers as reliable judges of his exegetical efforts. This paper deals with Jerome’s use of Origen’s theology in his defence of female spiritual authority. It is argued that
Origen provided Jerome with an anthropological understanding that became useful for him in these debates. Origen’s view on the human telos as a return to a spiritual existence, as well as the idea that humans were able to transcend their bodily existence and regain Paradise while still living in the flesh, became important for Jerome’s ascetic theology and particularly for his views on female asceticism. Used by Jerome in an argument for the superiority of asceticism, the idea of transcendence implied that a person, although being a woman in the bodily sense, could transform into an angelic being, a member of the familia Christi who served the Lord in a way that was not possible for non-celibates. Following Origen in seeing the hierarchy of Christians as a spiritual hierarchy, based on a person’s degree of spiritual transformation, Jerome was able to claim that ascetics, men and women alike, stood above other Christians.

István PÁSZTORI-KUPÁN (Komárno/Budapest)

*Plotinus as the Pupil of Origen? An Extraordinary Claim by Theodoret of Cyrus and some of its Potential Reasons*

We know from Porphyry that Plotinus studied under Ammonius and was most likely Origen’s fellow student in Ammonius’ school. It is also generally accepted that Ammonius had been originally a Christian who later renounced his faith and embraced Greek philosophy. Apart from the much later Suda, Theodoret of Cyrus is the only ancient author known to us to have claimed in his *Cure of Greek Maladies* that Ammonius was called Sakkas, presumably being a carrier of bags filled with wheat in the Alexandrian port. In the same work, however, without expressly denying that Plotinus followed Ammonius, Theodoret makes yet another potential and somewhat bizarre *hapax legomenon*, alleging that Plotinus was in fact Origen’s pupil. This might come in handy for his recurring argument that whatever Plotinus and his disciple, Porphyry may have said in consonance with Christian teaching, they had in fact ‘snitched’ from the Gospel and their teachers. Furthermore, the way in which Theodoret refers to Ammonius undertaking ‘philosophical life’ is another subtle allusion that he may not have abandoned Christian faith altogether – at least in the view of the Bishop of Cyrus. By assessing similar turns of phrase and technical terms from Theodoret’s œuvre, a certain pattern emerges, and the
alluded succession of Ammonius → Origen → Plotinus → Porphyry does not only strengthen his rhetorical assertion, but also reveals his attempt to ‘redirect’ these Neo-Platonists towards ‘the divine streams’ of evangelical teaching. It is not necessarily a sequential argument, which is of course historically unprovable and perhaps improbable, yet chronologically plausible. Its rhetorical elegance, however, is worth a look, especially in our modern world gradually devoid of style.

Domenico Pazzini (Rome)
*From the Samaritan Woman to the Dialogue with the Disciples (Jn 4): Origen, Eckhart, the Philosophy*

The longest of the analyses of the *Commentary on the Gospel according to John* of Eckhart on Jn 4 regards the dialogue of Jesus with the disciples, following the encounter with the Samaritan Woman: *Ego misi vos metere quod non laborastis; alii laboraverunt, et vos in labores eorum introitis* (Jn 4,38). On the Jn 4,34 (*ἐμὸν βρῶμα ἐστίν ἵνα ποιήσω τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πέμψαντός με καὶ τελειώσω αὐτοῦ τὸ ἔργον*) Origen founded the Trinitarian discourse (*CIO* 228–249). My contribution proposes that the philosophical stance of Eckhart became both the outcome and the premise of the Trinitarian circuit of Origen.

László Perendy (Budapest)
*Ridiculing Astrologers. Origen’s Sources and his Heritage*

Origen’s *Homiliae in Genesim* exerted a great influence on later authors of Christian antiquity, e.g., they were utilized by Basil of Caesarea in his *In Hexaemeron* extensively. Origen’s *Commentary on Genesis* survived partially in the *Philocalia*. In its ch. 23 astrology is discussed in detail. Gen. 1: 14 says that the task of the luminous bodies is to serve as signs (*ἐστωσαν εἰς σημεῖα*). The astrologers claimed that by “reading” these “signs”, i.e., in their mind the constellation of the heavenly bodies, they can predict the fate of each human being. Origen rejected fatalism, which was taken for granted by most astrologers. Just like the prophecies are not causes of their fulfilment, so the heavenly bodies are not the causes of the fate of human beings, he argues. However, astrology as reading heavenly signs
was not entirely rejected by him, but in his view God’s messages hidden in
the constellation of the stars can be deciphered – almost without excep-
tion – only by angels. Revealing his expertise in astrology, Origen enumer-
ates several arguments that in fact astrologers cannot foretell the fate of
human beings also because they are not trained well enough to find out
exactly what the constellation of the heavenly bodies was in the instant of
the birth of a particular person. What could have been Origen’s sources
in his criticism of astrologers? Similar arguments, ridiculing the efforts of
astrologers, can be found in the work titled *Adversus matematicos* written
by Sextus Empiricus (c. 160 – c. 210 AD), a Greek Pyrrhonist philosopher.
Tatian, a Christian apologist of Syrian origin wrote his *Oratio ad Graecos*
in the 170s. He also rejects fatalism, which he regards as irreconcilable
with Christianity, and he attributes the invention of the chart of the con-
stellations to the demons, i.e., to the gods of the Greeks. He portrays
them as wicked dice-players. Later he says that the seven planets, whose
erratic movements the astrologers try to describe, play at draughts on
the diagram of the Zodiac circle, and the gods (demons) enjoy watching
them. So, both Tatian and Origen cast doubts on the abilities of astrolo-
gers, often making fun of their futile efforts. In my contribution I wish to
demonstrate in some detail what kind of arguments taken from sceptic
philosophers are utilized by them to reject fatalism, which was a decisive
element of Stoic philosophy.

**Alexander H. Pierce** (Notre Dame)

*Origen and Celsus on μυστήριον: Christianizing a Manifold Concept*

Common to early Judaism and its Scriptures, Greco-Roman philosophy
and religion, and Christianity’s earliest witnesses is the use of the word
μυστήριον. Origen’s early third-century Alexandria exposed him to the
full semantic range of this dynamic late antique term (e.g., initiatory rites,
divinely hidden and disclosed truths, pagan religious cults). Building on
earlier studies conducted by Daniélou, Crouzel, Studer, Harl, Edwards,
and Ramelli, among others, this paper contends that Origen’s refutation
of Celsus’s critique of Christian μυστήρια helps him to clarify what dis-
tinguishes Christian from alternative uses of the term. Origen portrays
Celsus as affirming the mystery cults and their initiation rites while reject-
ing Christians’ liturgical mysteries. Origen counters by offering his own countervailing, Christian characterization of the term as encompassing liturgical and scriptural forms of divine disclosure. Origen shows in *Contra Celsum* a high degree of self-awareness concerning the indebtedness and notwithstanding originality of his μυστήριον. He refuses to abandon the term despite its cultural and semantic baggage. Critically appropriating the eclectic background of μυστήριον, he gives it an unprecedented coherence as ingredient to his ἐποπτεία or Christian philosophy. Comparing Celsus and Origen sheds light on how Origen situated his view relative to alternative religio-philosophical uses. The argument involves four steps. First, I present an adumbration of μυστήριον as Origen would have encountered it: its biblical resonances, cultic associations, and active usage in pertinent Alexandrian sources. Second, I sketch a summary of the semantic field of Origen’s μυστήριον. Third, I describe Origen’s portrayal of Celsus’s μυστήριον, showing how his endorsement of selective uses manifests inconsistency regarding what is hidden and revealed and ultimately fails to stand on the side of truth revealed by the Creator, God. Finally, I show how Origen works to salvage the term in a manner that includes resonances it carried in contexts, pagan, Jewish, and Christian.

Adrian Pirtea (Vienna)
*Perception and the Spiritual Senses in Seventh-Century Byzantine Ascetic Thought: From Origen and Evagrius to Maximus the Confessor*

This paper will discuss (a) Origen’s engagement with ancient philosophical theories of perception and his elaboration of a Christian concept of spiritual senses; and (b) the reception and further development of this concept in the writings of Evagrius Ponticus (d. 399) and Maximus Confessor (d. 662). My main goal is to investigate the extent to which the Origenian and Evagrian understanding of perception (both bodily and spiritual) survived in the Greek and Syriac monastic milieux of the Eastern Mediterranean and to determine Maximus’ role in formulating a new theory of spiritual senses following the damnatio memoriae of Origen and Evagrius after the Second Council of Constantinople (553). I will conclude by placing Maximus’ contribution within the broader context of seventh-century monastic and ascetic literature in the Eastern Mediterranean.
Gianluca Piscini (Tours)
“Poor Origen!” Origène dans l’œuvre de Samuel Taylor Coleridge

A central figure in English poetry, Samuel Taylor Coleridge was also a preacher and an influential theologian. My contribution will analyze the allusions to Origen and the citations of his writings in Coleridge. I will start by giving a general overview of the way Coleridge read and quoted Origen: I will pay special attention to the difference between private annotations and published works. Then I will study the way Coleridge defends Origen from his detractors – for Coleridge never hesitates to defend the Alexandrian Father whenever he comes upon a negative remark on him. But Coleridge does not only defend Origen: he explicitly praises “the very best of the old Fathers”. In the final part of my contribution I will show that Origen’s culture is often compared by Coleridge to the flaws of other ancient and modern theologians; more importantly, some mentions of Origen work as argumenta ab auctoritate to support Coleridge’s views.

Karla Pollmann (Bristol)
Allegorizing the Song of Songs: Origen between Eros and Cognitive Therapy

In the Biblical Book of the Song of Songs we find erotically charged descriptions of the human body, with a notable difference in detail regarding the female and the male body. Throughout the history of the Bible readers found this text an exegetical and theological challenge. Origen engages with the Song of Song by emphasizing that its intended meaning was exclusively on the allegorical level. Both in his Commentary and in his Homilies on the Song of Songs he presents allegorical explanations of this text with the intention of spiritualizing erotic desire as the longing of the soul of the individual believer, and of the Church as the community of all believers, for God which were highly influential in Western Mysticism. His approach has often been seen as ignoring the literal sense of this text, leading to a highly abstract, “anaemic” reading which was hostile to the body and sexuality. My contribution aims to challenge this view by analysing the countercultural and provocative elements in Origen’s allegorical efforts, and how they interrelate with competing approaches in pagan philosophy.
In this paper, I examine how Karl Löwith, Jean Daniélou, and Nicolas Berdyaev reference and study Origen in their philosophy or theology of history. I situate their use of Origen as a philosopher of history within their own wider aims of reconceiving in modern terms the agencies and forces behind world events. I highlight where they describe these forces as “national-angels,” sometimes in direct reference to Origen's development of this theme. For Daniélou, Origen could offer a window into a Christian philosophical thinking uncontaminated by Eusebius’s harmony of Christianity and culture (Roman Empire as *praeparatio evangelica*). Löwith, however, collapsed Origen into Eusebius’s harmonization and set these two against Augustine’s detachment from empire. Berdyaev viewed Origen as contrasting with aloof orthodoxy and mainline Protestantism represented by Karl Barth. Key to his view of history and freedom, Origen’s spiritual Gnosticism is a disentanglement from the emanationist cosmic hierarchies of Valentinus and Basilides.

Engaging Erik Peterson’s *Monotheismus* (1936) and Bossuet’s *L’histoire universelle* (1681), Löwith corrected Augustine’s rejection any world-historical principle of history. Instead, with “Origen and Eusebius” (*Meaning in History*, 1949, p. 171), Löwith affirms that divine providence mysteriously directs events of world history involving nations and empires, illustrated by the allegorical interpretation of the nation-angels in Daniel 10. Second, via Peterson and Lucien Cerfau’s *Le Christ selon St Paul* (1933), Daniélou opposes Origen and Eusebius (*Essai sur le mystère de l’histoire*, 1953, p. 52–70), the former representing a « theologie de politique », the latter « caeséropapisme ». For Daniélou, Origen articulates this theology by the providential distribution of the national angels. Similarly, Berdyaev’s *On the Destiny of Russia* (1918, p. 94) and *On Inequality* (1923, p. 74–76) sketches the relevance of the national-angels as a positive collective consciousness (cf. Dennert, *Die Krisis der Gegenwart und die kommende Kultur*, 1928), which aids the liberation of the individual. I parallel these mentions with his reference to Origen’s gnostic liberation from cosmic deities in his *Truth and Revelation* (1947, p. 52), which he views as necessary to discovering the paradox of God-manhood.
Descartes’ relationship to Augustine is well known and has received special attention from researchers. Instead, nothing would seem to link the father of modern philosophy to Origen, whose name does not occur in Descartes’ writings. Nevertheless, from the second half of the seventeenth century to the present day, some scholars have highlighted certain aspects of Origen’s thought that seem to anticipate some Cartesian doctrines, despite the absence of specific textual references. Among the themes underlined by these scholars there are anthropological issues, such as the primacy of the rational soul and the devaluation of the human body, and the account of animal behaviour. The aim of this essay is to provide an overview of these connections that have been established between Origen and Descartes over the centuries, so as to add an unusual chapter to the history of Origen’s reception.

In his Commentary on the Gospel of John, Origen seeks to disclose for Ambrose the vast treasury of goods in Christ, and thus endeavors to translate the literal and sensible Gospel into the spiritual and intelligible Gospel. Unlike Heracleon, Marcion, and other like-minded heretics, Origen’s translation project refuses and refutes the disjunctive bifurcation of the latter from the former. Instead, Origen argues for the conjunctive unity between the sublime doctrines of the Gospel and the common ones of Scripture. Within this unitive framework, Origen sees not only that truth, wisdom, and the Word are all one, but also that the Savior has come and made all things Gospel. Christ’s evangelization concerns not only the law and the prophets, not only the good and bad deeds done to Jesus and his disciples, but also the truths and falsehoods of the philosophers. The attention Origen devotes to the teachings of the Platonic and Stoic philosophers evinces his grasp of their assorted participations in the Word of God, manifests his efforts to discriminate between their truths and falsehoods, and gestures towards his incorporation of both – either for clarification
or for contrast – into his translation of the Gospel. Origen thereby denies human philosophy a status radically independent from divine revelation. Writing during his own persecutions, Origen acknowledges that some philosophers contribute to the Gospel not only by what they taught, but also by how they suffered dishonor and execution for the truth. This paper explores how Origen evangelizes the teachings of the philosophers. Origen incorporates into his translation of the Gospel various philosophical notions of the divine essence, the difference between the incarnation and transmigration of the soul, the two-tiered cosmology of the Platonists, the generative principles of the Stoics, and the Stoic notion of paradox. In this translation project, Origen participates in the Word’s activity of making even philosophy Gospel.

**Franz Xaver Risch (Berlin)**

*Der axiomatisierte Glaube: Zur wissenschaftstheoretischen Einschätzung von Glaubenssätzen bei Origenes und Basilius*


**Riemer Roukema (Amsterdam/Groningen)**

*Origen’s Justification of the Diversity in Christianity over against Celsus’ Philosophical Ideal of Unity*

According to the philosopher Celsus the Christians had deviated from the ancient True Doctrine and thus from the original truth that is one. In this light we may also see his criticism of the diversity of Christian hairesis (‘schools’ or ‘sects’), in Against Celsus III, 12. Basically Origen agrees that unity is better and more original than diversity, as he testifies
e.g. in his work *On First Principles*, but confronted with Celsus’ mockery of the existence of various Christian sects he appeals to Paul’s saying that dissensions (*haireseis*) among the Christians are inevitable (1 Cor. 11:19). This paper discusses Origen’s eclectic and pragmatic use of a philosophical principle, and his justification of the Christian diversity even with reference to philosophers.

**Marcos Ruffa (San Juan)**

*The Spiritual Authority According to Origen*

Origen’s thought, characterized by a deep reflection on the Scriptures and on the philosophy of his time, can also be situated in the context of the theological-political problems of the third century. Although the theological-political problems have been generally circumscribed to one of Origen’s main works, the *Contra Celsum*, in many other Origen works there are important ideas about spiritual authority that directly affect their consideration. This suggests that the concern for the political and spiritual problem of authority was not marginal in Origen, nor can it be reduced to a mere attempt at theological consolidation of the monarchical episcopate. Therefore, it is possible to affirm that Origen presents a very particular way of considering the relationship between spiritual life and concrete historical-political conditions.

**Ilaria Scarponi (Bristol)**

*The Reception of Origen’s Christian Philosophy and Exegesis in Jerome’s Epistle 120*

Written in 407, Jerome’s *Epistle* 120 provides Hedibia, a Christian woman from Gaul, with scriptural guidance on difficult biblical passages, including chapter 9 from Paul’s Epistle to the Romans. This paper analyses Jerome’s comments on Romans 9 in *Epistle* 120 and investigates the reception of Origen’s ideas and biblical interpretations in Jerome’s exegetical solutions.

This paper shows that Jerome engages with Origen’s exegesis of Romans 9.11–13, a biblical verse concerning the divine election of Jacob before birth, as expressed *e.g.* in *Prin* 2.9.7. Here, Origen justifies Jacob’s election with the merits of a preceding life (*ex praecedentis ... uitae meri-*)
tis), namely with the merits acquired by Jacob’s soul in a life preceding its earthly embodiment. Remaining faithful to the anti-Origenist position held during the Origenist crisis, Jerome rejects this Origenian interpretation and the doctrine of the pre-existence of souls informing it, which Jerome sees as coming from the Greek philosophers Pythagoras and Plato.

This paper then shows that, in his own comments on Romans 9, Jerome emphasises that God acts upon human beings according to his sovereign choice; at the same time, Jerome highlights that humans, endowed with freedom of choice (libertas arbitrii), can embrace or reject Christian faith of their volition and will be judged by God on account of their choices and actions as justice requires. The paper assesses that Jerome’s anti-Origenist exegetical solutions are akin to a number of interpretations in previous works, including Origen’s own writings. E.g. Jerome seems to draw on Origen, Comm. Rom. 7.14 when describing the hardening of Pharaoh’s heart (Rom 9.18; Ex 4.21) as a voluntary perseverance in evil, or when arguing that Paul’s statements in Romans 9.14–19 reflects the objections of an interlocutor who denies freedom of choice.

The paper concludes that, while in Epistle 120 Jerome rejects the biblical interpretations reflecting Origen’s Christian philosophy, he is still keen on re-employing Origen’s exegetical solutions focused on human autonomy and responsibility. This paper thus reveals Jerome’s Epistle 120 as a noteworthy example for the reception of Origen in the 5th-century that can approve Origen’s exegesis when rejecting his philosophy.

Margaret A. Schatkin (Chestnut Hill)

The Three Deaths: From Origen to Ambrose and Chrysostom

The subject of this communication is Origen’s teaching of the three deaths and its reception by Ambrose and Chrysostom.

As a scholar of the Bible and one intimately familiar with ecclesiastical tradition, Origen employed philosophy (and philology) to analyze the nature of death in his Dialogue with Heraclides, where he researches the different senses of the word, “death,” in Scripture, in the context of the question of the immortality of the soul.

We shall scrutinize Origen’s teaching on the three deaths and how it relates to tenets of the Greek schools of philosophy. In his Commentary on
Romans, in the Latin translation of Rufinus, the Alexandrian father speaks of two additional meanings of the word, “death,” as another name for hell and the devil.

We shall then trace how Origen’s teaching was a direct source of Ambrose and also received by Chrysostom. In the west, Ambrose adopted Origen’s teaching in his treatise, *De bono mortis*, and strengthened its reliance on philosophy; as a result, Augustine found fault with Ambrose for his overreliance on Neoplatonism (*Civ.* 13). Ambrose’s overreliance on Greek philosophy in his treatise, *De bono mortis*, may reflect the rules of the ancient literary genre of the *consolatio*, when compared to the treatment of death in his treatise, *De Mysteriis*, in connection with baptism. The anti-Manichean thrust of this latter work is of interest.

In the east, John Chrysostom received the teaching of Origen and integrated it into his mystagogy of the sacrament of baptism. Like Epicurus, John is very concerned to eliminate the fear of (biological) death, which gives such death its strength, so he teaches that (biological) death is merely a sleep (similarly to the kinship of Thanatos and Hypnos in Homer and Hesiod), and passage to another life, which is understood as a philosophy of the resurrection.

In the course of this analysis, reference will be made to the cross-cultural motif of three deaths in Indo-European literature, and its possible, though less than likely, relation to Origen.

**Mark Scott (Stonehill College)**

*Origen’s Pedagogy: Education as Spiritual Transformation*

In *Address of Thanksgiving*, Origen’s admiring student Gregory Thumaturgus (ca. 213–270 AD) delineates Origen’s teaching techniques at his school in Caesarea. Gregory’s panegyric demonstrates Origen’s multifaceted pedagogical approach, which seamlessly interweaves theological and philosophical themes within the wider spiritual programmatic of transformation. What do Origen’s teaching methods reveal about his robust vision of theological education? What are the continuities and discontinuities between his pedagogy and his literary scholarship? How might we, the intellectual descendants of Gregory the Wonderworker, incorporate...
Origen’s soul-opening pedagogy into our contemporary contexts of theological education?

Antonio Stefano SEMBIANTE (Naples)
Influssi originiani nel primo Carmen Arcanum (Περὶ ἀρχῶν) di Gregorio Nazianzeno

Dionisios Skliris (Athens)

*Origen’s Eschatology and Its Legacy*

We shall observe the notion of ‘apokatastasis’ in Origen in view of the question of its deterministic or free character. The ontological depth of this question is that evil cannot coexist with goodness, since the former is finite, while the latter is infinite. The ethical side of the same question regards the divine pedagogy through which God achieves in making human persons fit for participating in Him through different ways. We shall inquire whether Origen transcends Platonist deterministic intellectualism toward an authentic Christian eschatology that does justice to historical contingency. We shall also examine Gregory of Nyssa’s critique to the notion of ‘koros’, which led him to the famous notion of ‘epektasis’, which is arguably both a reaction to and an evolution of Origen’s schema. The two thinkers shape an eschatology that is both very dynamic and takes place inside the ontological ‘realm’ of Goodness. In responding to this, Maximus the Confessor has tried to balance the notions of ‘stasis’ and ‘dynamis’ through his famous antinomical expression of ‘ever-moving repose’ and we shall observe how this synthesis responds to the Origenist problematic of koros.

Fernando Soler (Santiago de Chile)

*Logos’ epidemía in Origen’s Contra Celsum*

In Origen’s theological anthropology, rational creatures are characterised by the freedom with which they can *approach* or *distance* themselves from God. This movement depends simultaneously on the Logos’ salvific mediation and its reception by the creatures. Now, how does the encounter between the creature and the Logos take place? On the one hand, each rational being, given his or her uniqueness and state of progress, requires a particular mediation, and on the other hand, the Logos can become all those things. Here there is a classic Origenian topic, which has been
abundantly studied, the epinoia, modulated from the Logos’ quality perspective.

This, being a fundamental aspect, is partial, since it does not consider that the Logos comes in different ways and that also does so an indefinite number of times. In this sense, I propose to complement it from the comings of the Logos. In my communication, I will address the issue of Logos’ ἐπιδημίαι in Contra Celsum, where Origen reacts against the philosophical arguments about the substantial presence of the Logos in the world since this topic allows to complement essential aspects of his mediation and the (dis)continuity of his presence. I will do this from a comprehensive analysis of ἐπιδημία and ἐπιδημέω, confronting it especially with the classic work of Aeby (Les missions divines de Saint Justin a Origène, Fribourg 1958).

**John Solheid (Toronto)**

*Freedom and Constraint: Emergent Properties from Origen’s School in Caesarea Maritima*

The theme of this year’s Origeniana meeting asks us to examine and discuss Origen’s “complex relation” to philosophy. While this has been the subject of a vast scholarly literature. It has been common knowledge in Origenian studies that Origen valued both intellectual freedom and the authority of tradition. The former is perhaps most apparent when Origen ends an exegetical discourse by leaving conclusions up to his students and readers. The latter is perhaps most evident at the beginning of de Principiis, when Origen articulated the fundamental tenets of the faith, which provided the starting points for his theological exposition in what followed. The observance of both intellectual freedom and the constraints of authority is not, however, inconsistent. In this paper, I will explore this issue by situating Origen’s intellectual labours within the backdrop of intellectual institutions. Christoph Markschies has already provided some pioneering work on the need to examine early Christian theology in its institutional context. Furthermore, Peter Martens has identified a number of “exegetical virtues” at work in Origen’s understanding of the work of an exegete. In light of both Markschies and Martens, I will argue that the institutional context of Origen’s scholarship, both a school and the ecclesial institution, illuminate the dialectic of freedom and constraint in
Origen’s exegesis. In light of this institutional context, intellectual freedom and deference to authority can be seen as what John Kloppenborg, in his monograph Christ’s Associations, has called “emergent properties,” or particular values and behaviors that are “products of network dynamics.” Thus, the institutions of church and school provided the guiding force of Origen’s intellectual project, through which he cultivated those same virtues and habits in his students.

Roberto Spataro (Rome)

Origène un philosophe? L’interprétation de Pierre-Daniel Huet dans ses Origeniana dans la France du XVIIe siècle

La biographie de P.D. Huet sur Origène du siècle XVII est un jalon dans l’histoire de la réception d’Origène dans l’histoire moderne. On voudrait donc explorer la vie d’Origène présentée dans les Origeniana d’Huet afin de vérifier les points suivants: 1) si Origène y est considéré comme un philosophe; 2) quel est le poids de la philosophie dans son activité d’enseignement et son expérience personnelle; 3) quelles sont les écoles qu’il a suivies; 4) de quelle façon ses convictions philosophiques ont contribué à la formation des erreurs que lui ont été attribuées.

Chris Synodinos (Worcester, MA)

Eidos in Origen’s Doctrine on the Resurrection: Terminology and Stoicism

This paper contains an analysis primarily of the term eidos and of some concomitant terms, such as schéma and morphé, associated with it in Origen’s doctrine on the Resurrection, which comes down to us mainly through the intermediary Methodius of Olympus’s Peri Anastaseōs and Epiphanius’s Panarion. Using Bonwetsch’s edition of De Resurrectione, I will look carefully at Methodius’s interpretation of Origen’s terminology and critically evaluate Crouzel’s interpretation thereof. Crouzel challenged Methodius’s reading of Origen’s eidos and developed a line of interpretation for this term, as well as for the accessory terms schéma and morphé, which has been nearly universally accepted in Origenian scholarship. This paper considers the notion of eidos from a different perspective, namely, from the angle of its affinity to the Stoic idea idios poion, or “distinctively
qualified object” – an affinity posited and brilliantly defended by Alain Le Boulluec. This line of approach aims to demonstrate how Origen’s *eidōs* is more intimately connected with the Stoic concept of *idiōs poion* than with other philosophical concepts with which it has been variously associated. It is argued that Origen modified and utilized the Stoic model of substance individuated through qualification, a model likely going back to Chrysippus and one used to explain the persistence of the individual through change by positing a composite individual: one consisting of substance – understood as matter – and of quality. Of these two components only the latter persists in the Stoic model, admitting of increase and decrease, while the former does not, being in flux and constantly changing. Origen apparently adapts that model in other ways and in breaking it up by detaching *eidōs* – which now appropriates the function of the Stoic individuating quality, the *idiōs poion* – and by discarding the material substrate, a process impossible in the Stoic system except by an operation of the mind.

**Daniel Tolan (Cambridge)**

*Origen and Prepositional Metaphysics*

Origen is an inheritor and expositor of the “prepositional metaphysics” observable in Philo of Alexandria, the Apostle Paul, and the Evangelist John. This is clear both when he discusses creation and when he makes doxological statements. The present communication begins with a brief note about the origins of prepositional metaphysics. It, then, reviews Philo of Alexandria’s use of this notion. Next, it turns to a discussion of the central role prepositions play in Pauline thought. From the sections on Philo and Paul, it becomes clear that Hellenistic Judaism has absorbed “middle” Platonic uses of prepositional metaphysics; “middle” Platonism’s prepositional metaphysics presents a fusion of what Dörrie delineates as the “Platonic” and “Stoic” series of prepositions. The preposition διά is given particular prominence, in this period, as a way in which to denote mediation. This communication concludes with a discussion of how Origen further develops the prepositional metaphysics he finds in his Scriptural authorities. In particular, he applies the preposition ἐκ or ὑπό to the Father, διά to the Son, and ἐν to the Holy Spirit. When Origen constructs doxological
statements, the direction of these prepositions is inverted, for that which receives its ontological exitus from the Father undergoes an ἐπιστροφή, being offered back to God the Father in a doxological re editus. By reading Origen as part of this intellectual trajectory, we find that his adherence to the prepositional metaphysics of “middle” Platonism is something he has inherited from both Scripture and Hellenistic Judaism.

Raffaele Tondini (Padua)

Origen and the Suicide

In one of the newly discovered homilies on the Psalms, Origen lists three ways of committing suicide: hanging himself as Judah did, throwing himself off a cliff or assuming poison (H81Ps, 7). This threefold pattern mirrors a scheme recognized by E. Fraenkel in Aristophanes' Frogs (vv. 118–135) and widespread in the whole ancient literature – both Greek and Latin – and also in legal sources (Dig. 21,1,23,3). Through a punctual reference to Judah's suicide, Origen gives there a Christian aspect to this neutral pattern. Furthermore, a few significant references to suicide can be recognized within Origen's work. Surprisingly enough, suicide isn't radically condemned: the case of Judah (CMtS. 117) is naturally crucial but much more meaningful is the allusion to a possible «divine suicide» committed by Christ himself (CIo XIX 15, 98). In this communication, I intend to take into consideration Origen’s attitude towards suicide and to place it in its theological and philosophical context. I therefore intend to make a comparison with the suicide-permissive stoic ethic and with the much harder condemnation pronounced by Plotinus (Enn. I, 9 [16]). It should be moreover investigated if Origen’s position is coherent with the ancient Christian tradition, that will find his end point in Augustine’s radical conviction (Civ. Dei 1,17) The study of a limited but crucial ethical question as the suicide is, will allow us investigate Origen main philosophical sources and to locate his individual position in the frame of ancient Christianism.
Ramón Torres Villegas (Seville)
Cosmología y Tiempo en Orígenes de Alejandría: Principales fuentes y posteriores influencias

El presente trabajo guarda como objetivo analizar los principales elementos en torno a la concepción ontológica del tiempo en Orígenes de Alejandría. En primer lugar, analizaremos las principales fuentes filosóficas de las que pudo valerse, a fin de dilucidar sus principales influencias u objeciones para con la tradición filosófica, pasando tras esto a revisar las diversas escuelas y autores de su tiempo, como será el caso del estoicismo, Filón de Alejandría o Aristóteles. A continuación, analizaremos algunos aspectos de su propia concepción del tiempo, tanto desde una perspectiva cuantitativa, centrándonos en su dimensión temporal como cualitativa, focalizando en sus aspectos más dinámicos, escatológicos y morales, analizando desde esta perspectiva conceptos como Preexistencia o Apokatastasis. Por último, expondremos brevemente las posibles recepciones de su teoría en diversos autores, como podría ser el caso de Basilio de Cesarea o Gregorio de Nisa.

Joseph W. Trigg (Louisville)
The aνer ekklēsiastikos and “Origen the Neoplatonist” in the Homilies on Psalms

There is only one Origen, a philosopher as well as an exegete. He and later Christian thinkers inspired by him played a crucial role in the encounter of two traditions foundational to Western thought, Platonism and Second-Temple Judaism (“Platonism” including Aristotle and “Second-Temple Judaism” including Christianity.)

Origen’s recently-discovered Homilies on the Psalms, along with the other homilies on the Greek Old Testament, are a rich and largely untapped source for understanding how Origen the biblical interpreter was also a philosopher. Something similar is true of Evagrius’s works. Both of them fuse the two roles and the two traditions. Their work testifies to the reinvigorated Platonic diadochē in which Christians and non-Christians functioned as philosophers in conversation with each other.

Joseph Trigg proposes a presentation that will examine selected passages from the homilies that give evidence not hitherto noticed of this
encounter and its social setting, including important evidence not hither-to noticed that our *anēr ekklesiastikos* and “Origen the Neoplatonist” were one and the same.

**Santiago VÁSQUEZ (San Juan)**

*The χάρις/φύσις Relationship in Evagrius Ponticus: Background and Medical Projections*

This paper seeks to elucidate Evagrius Ponticus’ model of psycho-spiritual integration through his understanding of the relationship between grace and nature. This doctrine was developed when the practice of monastic spirituality and the doctrine of grace itself began to develop from and around Platonic and Stoic philosophy, and Hippocratic medicine. The study of Evagrius’ spirituality and asceticism allows us to recognize a series of cognitive-emotional dynamics of a psychic nature that need to be corrected, modified, or more properly, healed or cured by the Spirit. In this context, it will be studied the use of the medical metaphor according to Origen.

**Ilaria VIGORELLI (Santa Croce)**

*Clement’s and Origen’s Use of κατὰ περιγραφήν and its Philosophical Background*

The expression κατὰ περιγραφήν is found in both Clement and Origen to identify the Son with respect to the divine essence. The opposition between κατὰ περιγραφήν and κατ’ οὐσίαν appears as a novelty in Clement, who uses it to distinguish the Son from the Father without numerically multiplying the divinity (Excerpta ex Theodotus 1,19,1); and it seems that Origen appropriates this use to highlight the ways of the distinction of the Son from the Father in his commentary on John’s Prologue, pointing out, however, that affirming in this way the difference of the Son should not lead to denying his divinity (Commentarii in evangelium Joannis 2,1,16).

The paper aims at investigating the use of κατὰ περιγραφήν in the Middle Platonic philosophical sources and in Philo, in order to verify the meaning adopted by Clement and transmitted to Origen, as well as the meaning attributed by the adoptionists, which provokes Origen’s reaction.
Andrea VILLANI (Bologna/Göttingen)
Christianus Theologus et Philosophus Platonicus: Giordano Bruno und Origenes


David VOPŘADA (Prague)
*The Use of λόγος and ἀρχή in the Biblical Exegesis of African ‘Arians’ of the Fifth Century*

The discussion of the vital Alexandrine concepts of arche and logos played a pivotal role in the fourth to fifth centuries’ theological controversies. The paper aims to analyse the understanding of these two concepts especially in African Arian authors of the fifth century, to discern whether there are precedents of this Arian exegesis of crucial Scripture verses (i. e., Prov. 8; John 1:1) in the Alexandrine theological tradition, despite the Antiochene background of many earlier’ Arians’ of the fourth century.

Magdalena WDOWIAK (Warsaw)
*The Introduction to Origen’s Commentary on the Song of Songs Compared with Introductory Schemata of the Ancient Philosophical Commentaries on Aristotle and Plato*

This paper discusses the theme of Origen’s introduction to the *Commentary on the Song of Songs* in relation to the schemata of introductions in ancient
philosophical commentaries on Aristotle and Plato. In the Neoplatonic school there was a set order of studies in philosophy and the introduction of each treatise on Aristotle and Plato could comprise a detailed instruction developing a number of standard topics in order to direct the reading of a particular text. Origen’s introduction to the *Commentary on the Song of Songs* fits these introductory schemata. In agreement with them Origen analyses six points or topics in the Prologue to the *Commentary on the Song of Songs*. Firstly, I aim to describe the schemata of introductions within the tradition of teaching curriculum of the Neoplatonic school. Secondly, I ask the question of the emergence of these schemata taking into consideration previous scholarship on the topic. Finally, I investigate Origen’s usage of the schemata in his *Commentary on the Song of Songs* and show how Origen develops a series of points (τόποι) found in a regular form in the aforementioned introductions.

Paul Wheatley (Notre Dame)

“Into the Labyrinth of Rabbinic Hermeneutics”: Origen, the Passion of Abraham and Jesus, and the Exegesis of Song 1:3, 12–13.

Speaking of intercourse between the exegesis of Origen and the Rabbis of Caesarea, Paul M. Blowers offered a general rule of thumb that “Origen admired the rabbis’ sense of the mystical depth of scripture, and sometimes borrowed isolated pieces of Haggadah, but he did not venture, beyond his means, into the labyrinth of rabbinic hermeneutics.”¹ Origen’s exegesis of Song 1:3, 12–13 seems an exception to Blowers’s rule. In a complicated Rabbinic Haggadah in Song of Songs Rabbah, the association between nard (נֵרְדָּם, Song 1:12–13) and the Lover’s perfume (שְׁמוֹר, Song 1:3) incites discussion of an apocryphal story about the deliverance from martyrdom in a fiery furnace of Abraham, who is “like a phial of foliatum” that releases its scent when moved (Song Rab 1.3.3). Origen, on the other hand, speaks of how “every vessel [of myrrh] that … has been loosed is unclean” (*Comm. in Cant.* 2.10). Kimmelman has shown in Origen and Rabbi Yoḥanan’s exegesis of Song 1:3 a mutual awareness that affects the interpretations of each. In this paper, I add to Kimmelman’s observations in Song 1:3 and extend his argument into related material in Song 1:12–13, comparing Origen’s exegesis of Song 1:3, 12–13 with con-
temporary rabbinic exegesis in Song of Songs Rabbah and Genesis Rab-
bah. I argue that Origen engages Abrahamic martyr traditions employed
by the Rabbis in their exegesis of Song 1:3, 12–13, ultimately contradict-
ing these traditions to ascribe similar meaning to Jesus. As such, this paper
shows examples of how Origen, at times, uses Jewish interpretive methods
to very different conclusions than the Rabbis.

Robin Darling Young (Washington, D.C.)
_Origen’s Philosophy in Evagrius Ponticus_

There is only one Origen, a philosopher as well as an exegete. He and
later Christian thinkers inspired by him played a crucial role in the en-
counter of two traditions foundational to Western thought, Platonism
and Second-Temple Judaism (“Platonism” including Aristotle and “Sec-
ond-Temple Judaism” including Christianity.)

Origen’s recently-discovered *Homilies on the Psalms*, along with the
other homilies on the Greek Old Testament, are a rich and largely un-
tapped source for understanding how Origen the biblical interpreter was
also a philosopher. Something similar is true of Evagrius’s works. Both of
them fuse the two roles and the two traditions. Their work testifies to the
reinvigorated Platonic διάδοχη in which Christians and non-Christians
functioned as philosophers in conversation with each other.

Robin Darling proposes a presentation that shows how selected pas-
sages from Evagrius develop Origen’s philosophy and redirects Platonism,
deepening its practice of cryptic sugkatabasis, returning through Clement
to a Parmenidean apophatic stance with respect to the One, and making
possible the work of Dionysius the Areopagite.

Victor Yudin (Louvain-la-Neuve)
_Plato’s mimesis behind Origen’s imago Dei_

According to Mark Edwards, Origen’s relationship to Plato was primarily
antagonistic. However, as it often happens, we learn most from our oppo-
nents. In the case of Origen, this applies even to such fundamental parts
of his teaching as anthropology and Christology. E.g. he borrows the key
ideas for his doctrine of the creation of man from Plato, claiming that man
was created in the image of Christ, who himself, being the Son, in turn, is the image of the Father (De Proncipiis 1,2, 13). In this light, Origen creatively interprets the biblical expression “in image and likeness” (Gen. 1: 26a), arguing that man was created as imitation of Christ, who himself is the image of his Father. Thus, Origen believes that man is an image of an image (Homiliae in Genesim), following Plato’s imitation of imitation. Plato uses this expression in relation to the work of arts, this being an imitation of the world of becoming, which itself is an imitation of the eternal paradigm of the world of ideas (Republic X 596–9). Thus, Plato’s attitude towards the arts is quite disdainful, since imitation not only contradicts creativity, but also appears to be not real. It is even more so concerning the double imitation which seems to be twice unreal. This can hardly be said about Origen’s attitude towards man as an image of an image.

In our paper, we will trace this creative influence of philosophical ideas on Origen’s theology, following the parallel between the Platonic artifact and Origen man. We will also deal with the upcoming Neoplatonism in this context.

Dimitrios Zaganas (Louvain-la-Neuve)
A Wise Man? Remarks on the Conflicting Reception of Origen

Διὰ τί ἀρα Ὡριγένης ὁ αἱρετικὸς ἔπεσεν, τοιαύτῃ γνώσει καὶ σοφίᾳ παρὰ θεοῦ τιμηθεῖς[;] The religious query, reported by Leontius of Cyprus (7th c.), apparently reflects the aporia that Origen’s contradictory reception progressively created: on the one hand, his wisdom attested by his numerous (and useful) works, and his reputation as a wise man among his followers and beyond, and on the other hand, the severe criticism his ideas (and his ardent followers) received, which led to his condemnation. Was he indeed wise (sophos)? The opinions were divided, as this paper will show on the basis of the testimony by some late-antique and early-Byzantine Christian authors.