

**Christian Pedagogy and Christian Community in the Fifth-
and Sixth-Century Mediterranean**

by

Alexandra Talarico McLaughlin

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
(Greek and Roman History)
In the University of Michigan
2017

Doctoral Committee:

Emeritus Professor Raymond Van Dam, Chair
Professor Sara Ahbel-Rappe
Associate Professor Hussein Fancy
Associate Professor Ellen Muehlberger

Alexandra Talarico McLaughlin

aetalari@umich.edu

ORCID iD: 0000-0003-1324-885X

© Alexandra Talarico McLaughlin 2017

DEDICATION

For Terence

nil tam difficilest quin quaerendo investigari possiet, Ter.Hau, 675

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This dissertation would not have been possible without the faith and guidance of my advisor, the unconquerable Ray Van Dam. I would like to thank Ray for having the confidence in me to allow me to write a dissertation on Christianity in both the eastern and western halves of the Mediterranean, and for his help with using case studies as a productive framework for undertaking such an unwieldy topic. Further, the loving care with which Ray read and reread every word of my dissertation made the multiple rewrites he encouraged me to do a pleasure rather than a burden. My work is much better for it.

I also owe thanks to the other members of my committee for introducing me to different approaches and always keeping me on my toes. Sara Ahbel-Rappe helped me get into the minds of my preachers by asking about the theological and rhetorical contexts that lay behind their pedagogy. Hussein Fancy and Ellen Muehlberger asked me difficult questions throughout the dissertation writing process that helped me formulate my analysis in as nuanced a way as possible. I would also like to thank my undergraduate advisor, Jim O'Donnell, who first sent me on the quest for ordinary Christians in 2008 when he asked me to explain to a Martian who visited Earth in the fifth century what a Christian was. I am still not sure I have an answer, but I'm getting closer.

I would further like to thank the numerous friends, colleagues, and professors who provided academic and moral support as I wrote my dissertation. My colleagues in the Medieval and Early Modern Studies dissertation colloquium and the History dissertation

writing seminar gave me important feedback on early drafts of all my chapters. Christian de Pee offered crucial writing and argumentation advice while he led the MEMS colloquium. I have also benefited from the scholarly and professional mentoring and friendship given by other faculty members in History and Classical Studies, including Paolo Squatriti, Val Kivelson, Ian Moyer, Celia Schultz, Bruce Frier, and especially Kit French. My friends in the departments of History and Classical Studies and the Interdepartmental Program in Greek and Roman History, especially Noah Blan, Paula Curtis, Amy Pistone, Ellen Cole Lee, Kate Allen, and my IPGRH cohort-mate Tim Hart, were always there to cheer me on, read a draft, or geek out with me over obscure parts of ancient and medieval history.

I am also grateful to the departments of History and Classical Studies, the Interdepartmental Program in Greek and Roman History, and Rackham Graduate School for the various forms of financial support they provided me in summers and terms that I was not working as a graduate student instructor. To that end, this dissertation would also have been much more difficult to finish without the tireless administrative support of the staff in the History Department, especially Kathleen King and Diana Denney.

Finally, in this honored position at the end, I would like to thank my family. My parents, Tom and Kristin Talarico, have always encouraged me in my incessant questioning and, as I got older, my scholarly pursuits. Their simultaneous support and security, and prodding reminders to never think I've learned it all and to make time for the non-academic parts of life have been invaluable. My husband Jonathan McLaughlin, a gentleman and a scholar, has been a constant source of love, moral support, and advice from the other side of the dissertation process. From challenging my ideas over dinner, to telling me about the things he's read, written, and taught in his own branch of Roman History, to sacrificing time

for his scholarship to have extra “Dad days” and “Dad weekends” as I neared completion, Jonathan has greatly improved the quality of my dissertation. I would like to dedicate this work to our beautiful son Terence. Although he cannot read it yet, Terry is a visible, tangible reminder of the future generations whom historians are doing all this work for.

CONTENTS

DEDICATION	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	viii
ABSTRACT	ix
Chapter 1. Introduction: A Mediterranean-wide Christianity in the Fifth and Sixth Centuries 1	
Traditions of Christian Teaching	8
Defining Faith for Ordinary Christians	13
A Case for Case Studies	21
Hesychius of Jerusalem.....	23
Caesarius of Arles	24
PART I: HESYCHIUS OF JERUSALEM	27
Chapter 2. Orthodoxy without Controversy: The Early-Fifth-Century Homilies of Hesychius of Jerusalem	33
The Council of Ephesus and Hesychius’ Word-Made-Flesh-Christology.....	36
Hesychius Teaches Jerusalem.....	39
Conclusion.....	74
Chapter 3. Learning through the Liturgy: The Experiential Pedagogy of the Jerusalem Liturgy	76
The Multi-Sensory Liturgy.....	78
Theological Lessons.....	83
Communities of Christians	95
Leaders of the Church	101
Encountering God	110
Conclusion.....	119
PART II: CAESARIUS OF ARLES	121
Chapter 4. A Community Built on Virtue: Christian Faith and Conduct in the Sermons of Caesarius of Arles	127

At the Crossroads of Community	130
Preaching to Arles and its Hinterlands	137
The Christian Faith	143
Good Works.....	151
Conclusion.....	165
Chapter 5. Lives, <i>Lives</i> , and Afterlives: Teaching by Example in Sixth-Century Gaul	167
An Exemplary Ideal	170
Lives of the Clergy.....	175
<i>Lives</i> of the Saints	189
Afterlives of Caesarius' Sermons	198
Conclusion.....	203
Chapter 6. Conclusion: Towards a Universal Church.....	205
APPENDIX: Translations of Hesychius' Paschal Homilies	211
BIBLIOGRAPHY	214

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

<i>ACO</i>	<i>Acta conciliorum oecumenicorum</i>
<i>CC</i>	<i>Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina</i>
<i>CSEL</i>	<i>Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum</i>
<i>CTh</i>	<i>Codex Theodosianus</i>
<i>Egeria</i>	<i>Itinerarium Egeriae</i>
<i>Ep.</i>	<i>Epistula</i>
<i>JL</i>	<i>Jerusalem Lectionary</i>
<i>LCL</i>	<i>Loeb Classical Library</i>
<i>LP</i>	<i>Liber Pontificalis</i>
<i>NABRE</i>	<i>New American Bible, Revised Edition</i>
<i>NTh</i>	<i>Novella of Theodosius II</i>
<i>PG</i>	<i>Patrologia Graeca</i>
<i>PO</i>	<i>Patrologia Orientalis</i>
<i>SC</i>	<i>Sources chrétiennes</i>
<i>TTH</i>	<i>Translated Texts for Historians</i>
<i>VC</i>	<i>Eusebius, Vita Constantini</i>

ABSTRACT

This dissertation studies Christian pedagogy, through preaching as well as by less explicit means, in order to reconstruct what ordinary Christians in the fifth and sixth century learned about Christianity and thus how they understood themselves in relation to their local Christian communities and the wider community of a universal church. This approach moves outside the traditional narrative of late antiquity wherein theological controversy was negotiated among the elite. Ordinary Christians who attended the liturgy and tried to live as part of a Christian community as they were taught experienced Christianity as a much simpler and more unified structure, which arguably gave them a source of stability in a politically fraught time.

The analysis takes the form of two case studies, one from the eastern Mediterranean and one from the western, both to emphasize the diversity of experience among Christian communities and to demonstrate that the different local Christian communities from all regions of the Mediterranean world were part of a single, though variegated, phenomenon. The first case study examines the homilies of Hesychius of Jerusalem and the Jerusalem liturgy from the first half of the fifth century. Through his preaching and the sensory experience of the liturgy, Hesychius taught his congregations to understand Christ as both human and divine, and how to encounter the divine as a community in the liturgy. The second case study considers the early sixth-century sermons of Caesarius of Arles and the numerous church councils he led in order to regulate the conduct of the clergy, including

their interactions with ordinary Christians. In his sermons, Caesarius taught Christians how to demonstrate their belonging in a Christian community by acting virtuously. His life and legacy further communicated the same lessons of community and virtue that he taught by preaching.

In these case studies, I argue that bishops and priests taught their congregations that their faith in God, their clergy, and their Christian community made them part of a universal Christian church, despite the higher clergy's simultaneous participation in controversies over establishing an orthodox faith. By focusing on how clerics communicated vertically with ordinary Christians, rather than horizontally among themselves, I demonstrate that bishops and priests taught unity to their congregations and provided positive instructions for how they could demonstrate their faith in a universal Christian church. If the way ordinary Christians experienced Christianity was informed by how they learned about it, then they could rely on their church for continuity and stability even as the church as a whole was in constant flux.

Chapter 1

Introduction: A Mediterranean-wide Christianity in the Fifth and Sixth Centuries

The fifth and sixth centuries were a time of transformation for the Roman Empire and the Mediterranean world. Yet while bishops argued and kingdoms rose and fell and frontiers shifted, countless ordinary people were able to find stability in their communities of faith. Christianity in these centuries is often characterized by intense theological debates among bishops, councils calling for excommunications and redefinitions of faith, and state-sectioned efforts to root out “heresy,” so much so that it is easy to forget that one of the primary goals of these controversies was ecclesiastical unity. The same priests and bishops who participated in controversy also preached a message of unity to their congregations. Through the pedagogical interactions they had with their audiences, fifth- and sixth-century preachers taught ordinary Christians to understand themselves as part of a united and universal church. From the vantage of the ordinary Christian, then, it is possible to see the unsuccessful push for Christian unity in late antiquity as a success, and the myriad local Christian communities around the Mediterranean as one universal church.

By the end of the fourth century, Christianity had normalized somewhat and Christian affiliation was claimed by almost everyone who was not Jewish and lived in an area with access to a bishop or priest. Parents baptized their children when they were young and raised them as Christians. “Conversion” was a word that applied to Christians who changed from a worldly to an ascetic lifestyle, not to pagans who became Christians.¹ The Christianity of the

¹ Bailey 2016, 33-43.

fifth and sixth centuries was not a new religion; it was an established tradition that gave ordinary people everywhere a community they could have faith in during a politically, economically, and even religiously fraught time.

It is the experiences of ordinary Christians during these centuries that I seek to recover. Only after Christianity became not only the official cult of the Roman Empire, but also the most popular, could the category of “ordinary Christian” even exist.² At the same time, as Christianity became enough of a cultural norm to allow for ordinary members, ordinary voices have been lost to history. The story of the innumerable Christians who attended liturgical services at their local churches, however, is necessary for understanding the history of Christianity in the fifth and sixth centuries, for these ordinary Christians complicate the narrative of theological controversy being negotiated among elite bishops, kings, and emperors.³ Aside from interacting with each other, bishops interacted with the congregations who met inside their churches, and these vertical relationships between preachers and congregations affected the horizontal relationships among clerics perhaps as much as the horizontal informed the vertical.

Clerical pedagogy is one way to access the interactions between bishops and priests and the ordinary Christians in their congregations. Bishops had always had an obligation to teach Christians about their faith, and beginning in the fifth century, weekly and festal liturgies became the most effective venues to do so. While fourth-century preachers had an opportunity to perfect Christian pedagogy in elaborate catechetical homilies that they preached as part of a pre-baptismal educational program undergone by adults preparing for

² See below, 13-15, for the definition of “ordinary” I use in this dissertation.

³ For a concise overview of theological controversy in the fifth century, see Wessel 2015. See also Meyendorff 1989 for a survey of the trans-Mediterranean political project of achieving church unity through theological controversy in the fifth and sixth centuries.

Christian baptism, the rise in the practice of infant and childhood baptism, as well as practical concerns associated with the sheer numbers of Christians by the end of the fourth century, had eliminated catechesis as a viable option for teaching all Christians about their faith.⁴ Instead, the preaching that took place in the liturgy itself became the only opportunity for bishops and priests to teach their congregations about what it meant to be a Christian and how to be a part of their Christian community.

In the chapters that follow, I ask what and how preachers in this period after catechesis taught ordinary Christians about their faith.⁵ By exploring how preachers shaped their congregations' understanding of Christianity and the community of Christians they were a part of, and how these communities in turn shaped clerics' theological understandings of the church, I will reconstruct one aspect of the experience of Christianity that was shared by most Christians around the Mediterranean. Christian pedagogy, I argue, though particular to individual communities, provided a sense of unity and stability that allowed Christians to have faith in a church community when it was perhaps not possible to have the same degree of faith in their empire, kingdom, or city.

Recent works on preaching since the end of the last century have taken an interest in the audiences of sermons. Following an earlier debate surrounding the accessibility of sermons given by rhetorically educated clergy to ordinary people, scholars have been in agreement that less-educated or uneducated Christians did understand the words of their preachers, and have since been studying sermons as an oral/aural genre that was constructed

⁴ For an overview of catechesis in the fourth century, see Schwartz 2013, 17-25. The fourth century was the so-called "golden age" of the catechetical homily; after that they began to disappear (Frank, 2001). Even in the fourth century, however, catechetical sermon series were probably not universally employed as a method for educating adult catechumens prior to baptism (Schwartz 2013, 20-21).

⁵ See below, 15-19, for the definition of "faith" I use in this dissertation.

as a conversation with its audience.⁶ Mary Cunningham and Pauline Allen have laid out working definitions of the words “sermon” and “homily,” and proposed a framework for understanding sermons as oral pieces that were preached before audiences, and which the audience interacted with and informed, in *Preacher and Audience: Studies in Early Christian and Byzantine Homiletics*.⁷

Simultaneously, *The Sermon* attempted to define systematically for western medievalists the genre of sermon as it was understood through the analysis of different types of sermons from different sub-periods of the middle ages.⁸ In the introduction to that work, Beverly Mayne Kienzle pinpoints the sermon as “the primary medium for Christian clergy to convey religious education to lay audiences” that also “played an important role in the liturgy and life of religious orders.”⁹ Like *Preacher and Audience*, *The Sermon* also attempted to distinguish between the words “sermon” and “homily,” conceding that, for much of the period discussed, “sermon” and “homily” were synonymous.¹⁰ Like my late antique and early medieval subjects, I also use the words “sermon” and “homily” interchangeably.

More recent scholarship has approached preaching as a conversation with an audience to whom preachers were on some level responding. In *Becoming Christian*, Ray Van Dam’s analysis of the sermons on the Hexaemeron (the first six days of creation) delivered by Basil of Caesarea over the course of five days demonstrates that Basil adapted subsequent sermons

⁶ For arguments about the inaccessibility of sermons for ordinary people, see MacMullen 1989 and McLaughlin 1991. For the “more optimistic view,” see Rousseau 1998.

⁷ Cunningham and Allen 1998, 1-20. The individual essays present case studies of preachers’ interactions with audiences as preaching developed and changed over time from the third through ninth centuries.

⁸ Kienzle 2000. See also Donavin et. al. 2004 and Disenberger et. al. 2013 for other recent edited volumes exploring the genre of early medieval sermons.

⁹ Kienzle 2000, 143.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 161. Thomas Hall, in his chapter on the early medieval sermon, acknowledges the modern distinction of “homily” as a subset of “sermon” characterized by scriptural exegesis, but that the words *sermo*, *homilia*, and a third option, *tractatus*, were used interchangeably in the early middle ages, 205, 210.

in response to requests from and the mood of his audience and tempered his initially philosophical exegesis with a more practical and moral treatment that better suited the needs of his congregation.¹¹ In *Through the Eye of a Needle*, Peter Brown discusses an instance in which Augustine's preaching failed to impress an audience, and how Augustine returned the following day to preach a sermon on obedience.¹² Even when there is no evidence of preachers responding directly to their audiences as in these cases, scholars still acknowledge the conversational nature of sermons and the ways preachers invoked the audience in their rhetoric.¹³

Several recent monographs have undertaken in-depth analyses of the surviving sermon collections of individual preachers using this same approach of preaching-as-conversation. Jaclyn Maxwell's *Christianization and Communication in Late Antiquity* looks at the sermons that John Chrysostom preached in Antioch in order to argue not only that ordinary Christians could understand Chrysostom's rhetorical sermons, but also that Chrysostom had ordinary Christians in mind when composing them, often tailoring parts of sermons to their particular needs.¹⁴ Lisa Bailey's *Christianity's Quiet Success* provides an excellent model for understanding the pastoral concerns of clergy preaching to diverse urban and rural audiences in late fifth- and early sixth-century Gaul. In this study of the anonymous "Eusebius Gallicanus" sermon collection, Bailey argues that these sermons were in fact preached to congregations, but, since they were collections designed to be read by preachers who did not have the resources to compose their own sermons, they had to be somewhat

¹¹ Van Dam 2003, 101-130.

¹² Brown 2012, 340-1.

¹³ See Bailey 2016, 145 for the tendency of preachers to fabricate question and answer dialogues to give the illusion that they were responding to concerns posed by members of the audience.

¹⁴ Maxwell 2006.

generic and were unable to respond to the specific needs of individual congregations.¹⁵ In *Peasant and Empire in Christian North Africa*, Leslie Dossey considers the sermons of Augustine and discusses the possibility of insurrection resulting from peasants' reactions to hearing these sermons preached.¹⁶

One other recent study of a single sermon collection is Daniel Schwartz's *Paideia and Cult: Christian Initiation in Theodore of Mopsuestia*. This work, specifically focused on catechetical sermons, argues that catechesis, at least in the sermons of the fourth-century bishop Theodore of Mopsuestia, was not only about conveying knowledge, but also about building community.¹⁷ This book uses social scientific theory to take a specifically pedagogical approach to the study of sermons.¹⁸ Since bishops understood preaching as a didactic enterprise, all sermons can be understood as pedagogical. The methodological approach Schwartz takes for Theodore's catechetical homilies is therefore useful for understanding all forms of Christian preaching.

Work continues to be done on the preaching and pedagogy of late antique sermons with two recent dissertations on the Syriac homilies of Jacob of Serugh and Christian pedagogy in late antique and early medieval Gaul. In "Preaching and Religious Debate: Jacob of Serugh and the Promotion of his Christology in the Roman Near East," Philip Forness expands a sermon's audience beyond the physical audience listening to a preacher to include future readers of sermon collections while arguing that preaching also served as a discourse of theological debate.¹⁹ Nathan Ristuccia, in "The Transmission of Christendom:

¹⁵ Bailey 2010.

¹⁶ Dossey 2010, 145-94.

¹⁷ Schwartz 2013.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 23-4 and 117-19.

¹⁹ Forness 2016.

Ritual and Instruction in the Early Middle Ages,” expands the scope of Christian pedagogy to include festal and liturgical rituals as well as preaching.²⁰ My dissertation will continue to approach preaching and other forms of Christian pedagogy as these other scholars have in order to suggest ways that ordinary Christians might have experienced their Christian communities in late antiquity.

I also wish to make an historiographical intervention. Most of the recent works on preaching I have outlined here focus on a single author or sermon collection. Those that do not are still limited by region, east or west.²¹ Much of the reasoning for this is practical—thorough scholarship must necessarily limit its scope. Nevertheless, the impression such a bibliography leaves is that eastern, Greek Christianity and western, Latin Christianity were two separate phenomena. This impression presupposes a schism centuries in the making and potentially undermines the efforts of bishops all around the Mediterranean who worked together across political boundaries and language barriers to achieve unity through the legislation of church councils and at the same time taught their congregations that they were part of a united and universal (*catholicos/καθολικός*) Christian church.

Therefore, this dissertation considers two case studies from two very different times and places. Hesychius of Jerusalem, a presbyter who preached to a diverse congregation of local urbanites and pilgrims in the years surrounding the Council of Ephesus in 431, and Caesarius of Arles, a metropolitan bishop who preached widely in Arles and its hinterlands for the duration of his forty-year episcopacy that ended with his death in 542, were both

²⁰ Ristuccia 2013.

²¹ Surveys of late antique Christianity have tended to focus on one or the other Greek or Latin traditions. Peter Brown’s *The Rise of Western Christendom* (2003) traces Christianity from 200-1000 from Latin sources from the western Roman Empire and its successor states. The Byzantinist Judith Herrin’s now older work, *The Formation of Christendom* (1987) takes all of Christianity as its scope, but places a greater emphasis on the Greek tradition and the church councils of the Byzantine Empire.

active in their ecclesiastical networks that connected them to all corners of the Mediterranean world. Each preached in a specifically local context and delivered instruction in the Christian faith that produced two different experiences of Christianity. These were not representative of “Eastern” and “Western” Christianity—two categories that I wish to challenge—but rather local, individual manifestations of Christianity. Furthermore, Hesychius and Caesarius taught their congregations that they belonged to a single church that included all Christians in the world. This church was not uniform, but it was universal. An analysis of these two cases will demonstrate—historiographically as well as historically—that Christian preachers made universality part of their pedagogy, and that most Christians in the late antique Mediterranean world thus experienced Christianity as a source of community and stability rather than of conflict and controversy.

Traditions of Christian Teaching

Christianity began as a teaching community, with Jesus as the first teacher. When the twelve apostles, then Paul, Timothy, Titus, and all other leaders in the early church went out to spread the good news, the εὐαγγέλιον, their mission was pedagogical. Their hearers were students, disciples.²² Texts produced in Christian circles since the generation after the apostles began outlining the roles of Christian leadership positions, including bishops (ἐπίσκοποι/*episcopi*), priests (πρεσβύτεροι/*presbyteri*), and deacons (διάκονοι/*diaconi*).²³ Almost all of these prescriptions emphasized teaching.

The letters in the New Testament dubbed the “pastoral epistles” on account of their concern for existing Christian communities rather than missionary efforts, contain the earliest

²² Rousseau 2002, 128.

²³ See Rapp 2005, 23-32, on early Christian prescriptive sources regarding bishops.

references to the obligation of bishops and priests to teach. The date and order of composition of 1 and 2 Timothy and Titus is disputed among scholars, but they most likely date to the last third of the first century.²⁴ The letter to Titus set out qualifications for the offices of bishop and presbyter and urged them to understand the Christian message so that they would be able “both to exhort with sound doctrine and to refute opponents.”²⁵ The first letter to Timothy developed in more detail some of the same themes of Titus, including the obligation to teach by preaching. In Chapter 3, verses 1-7, the author described the qualifications for bishops, including that they should be “able to teach.”²⁶ Further on, the author recommended teaching for presbyters as well: “Presbyters who preside well deserve double honor, especially those who toil in preaching and teaching.”²⁷ An early second-century compilation reflecting material contemporary to the pastoral epistles, the *Didache*, did not list teaching among the duties of bishops, but instead reserved it for separate teachers, demonstrating nevertheless that teaching was also a part of the Christian communities to which the *Didache* spoke.²⁸

By the late second century, the moniscopate was established in diverse regions around the Mediterranean and authors of theological treatises and church orders started developing the roles of bishops.²⁹ The late second-century bishop and theologian Irenaeus of Lyon applied the concept of apostolic succession to episcopal authority, including “preaching of the truth” among the attributes the apostles passed down to bishops.³⁰ A church order from

²⁴ Aune 2010, 55-6.

²⁵ Titus 1:5-9, trans. *NABRE*.

²⁶ 1 Tim. 3:2.

²⁷ 1 Tim. 5:17, trans. *NABRE*. See also Houlden 1976 for the context of individual prescriptions in 1 and 2 Timothy and Titus.

²⁸ *Didache*, 15.1-2, cited in Rapp 2005, 26.

²⁹ Rapp 2005, 26-7.

³⁰ Τῆς ἀληθείας κήρυγμα, Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses*, 3.4.9.

the first half of the third century, the *Didascalia Apostolorum*, repeated the expectations for bishops from 1 Timothy 3, and concluded the section on requirements for bishops with the exhortation, “Now all these things let the bishop command and enjoin upon all the people. And let him be wise and lowly; and let him be admonishing and teaching with the doctrine and discipline of God.”³¹ The author further emphasized the role of bishop as teacher to his congregations in a chapter addressed to the people: “He is minister of the word and mediator; but to you a teacher, and your father after God.”³²

During the first three centuries of Christianity when these documents were composed, Christianity was still a minority faith developing variously in different cities throughout the Mediterranean world. It was only after the conversion of the emperor Constantine to Christianity, and his subsequent patronage of the church and its hierarchy resulting in an accelerated rate of conversion in the fourth century, that a bishop’s teaching role needed to be formalized.³³ Churches started requiring a program of instruction in the Christian faith for catechumens prior to baptism, usually the period of Lent leading up to a baptism at the paschal vigil.³⁴ Detailed catechetical treatises and sermons written by some of the most eminent theologians in the Roman Empire, such as Gregory of Nyssa, Cyril of Jerusalem, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Augustine of Hippo, began to appear in the later fourth century.³⁵

Although the time for intense catechetical training for adult converts to Christianity was short-lived, Augustine’s works *On Christian Teaching* and *On Catechizing the Rustics*

³¹ *Didascalia Apostolorum* 3, trans. Conolly 1929, 35.

³² *Ibid.* 9, trans. Conolly 1929, 87.

³³ On rates of conversion, see the classic works by Stark 1996 and Hopkins 1998. For fourth-century conversions to Christianity, see Brown 1992, Drake 2000, and Salzman 2002. For the practical implications of Constantine’s patronage of the church, see Lenski 2016.

³⁴ See Schwartz 2013, 17-21, 47-69 and Ristuccia 2013, 15-34 on catechesis.

³⁵ See Frank 2001 on Cyril and Theodore, Schwartz 2013 on Theodore, and Harmless 1995 on Augustine.

were influential to subsequent generations of Christian preachers.³⁶ When teaching the catechumenate, Augustine employed useful pedagogical tactics, such as repeating key points from past lessons and linking lessons to relatable situations, plus a host of rhetorical techniques aimed at aiding memory.³⁷ In Book Four of *On Christian Teaching*, where Augustine outlined instructions for preaching, he placed especial emphasis on speaking in a way that all members of the congregation could understand.³⁸ Fifth- and sixth-century preachers who no longer had the opportunity to teach catechumens specifically adopted models of preaching from earlier catechists in order to teach their entire congregations during Sunday or festal liturgies.

This tradition of Christian teaching was not the only tradition fifth- and sixth-century preachers were working within when they approached their congregations, however. As clerics and members of church hierarchies, bishops and priests were also part of a theological tradition, which, beginning with the reign of Constantine, strove on a universal level to achieve a single, united Christian church community that professed a faith that was agreed to be orthodox. The Council of Nicaea, which Constantine called in 325, became the first, but certainly not the last, “ecumenical council,” in which representatives of Christian communities from all over the known world joined to agree upon a set definition of faith to be called orthodox, and to condemn other theological positions as heretical.³⁹ In calling this council, Constantine set two important precedents: imperial intervention in matters of

³⁶ Bailey 2010, 20.

³⁷ Harmless 1995, 223-5.

³⁸ Augustine, *On Christian Teaching*, 4.5, 10, and 11.

³⁹ The designation “ecumenical,” meaning “supra-regional,” was first applied to Nicaea after the fact by Eusebius in *VC* III.7, though the bishops gathered at Nicaea had the sense that they were representing the whole church (L’Huillier 1996, 18-19). See Ayres 2004 on the theological implications of Nicaea in the fourth century and subsequent church councils.

Christian theology, including increased political importance for bishops, and a goal for Christianity to become unified through orthodoxy.⁴⁰

Bishops and emperors continued to debate orthodoxy throughout the fourth and fifth centuries. It was in the context of the third ecumenical council, the Council of Ephesus in 431, which met to define the relationship between the human and divine natures of Christ, that Hesychius of Jerusalem preached his sermons. Although he supported and helped promote the definition of orthodoxy agreed upon at the Council of Ephesus, Hesychius knew that there were Christians in his congregation who might not, and that there were other Christian communities espousing the views condemned at Ephesus where those Christians might turn if he offended them. Desirous of their salvation, however, he still wished to teach them what he understood as the orthodox belief about Christ's divinity. Hesychius composed his homilies with these tensions in mind.

Twenty years later, the Council of Chalcedon in 451 proved to be so divisive that its definition of orthodoxy ultimately resulted in the creation of schismatic churches in Egypt and Syria, and even a temporary split between the Greek and Latin churches, called the Acacian Schism.⁴¹ Pope Hormisdas corresponded with Caesarius, who as vicar of Gaul had authority over all bishops in Gaul, while negotiating a resolution to the schism with the emperor Anastasius in 515.⁴² Caesarius' relationship with Rome was part of an effort of the popes of Rome to achieve church unity through hierarchical networks of bishops.

Furthermore, Caesarius was involved in a more regional theological controversy over the

⁴⁰ For Constantine's impact on Christianity, see Drake 2006. See also Lenski 2016, especially chapters 8-10.

⁴¹ For a general overview on the political implications of Chalcedon, see Allen 2001, 815-20.

⁴² Caesarius, *Ep.* 10.

roles of grace and free will in salvation. Caesarius' efforts to achieve church unity and orthodoxy informed the interactions he had with ordinary Christians through preaching.

The sermons Hesychius preached to his congregations in early fifth-century Jerusalem and the sermons Caesarius preached to his congregations in early sixth-century Arles were part of a much larger tradition of preaching by Christian clergy. Both men understood preaching for the sake of instruction to be part of their priestly duty. Informed by their specific theological positions, they also both chose content for their sermons they thought was best suited to the salvation of the Christians in their congregations. Although the universal, orthodox Christian church looked different to Hesychius and Caesarius, within their specific times and places, they each sought to achieve unity through interactions with their fellow church leaders; at the same time, they thought that unity was achievable enough that they could teach their congregations that they belonged to a universal church.

Defining Faith for Ordinary Christians

The fundamental question behind this dissertation is how fifth- and sixth-century preachers taught ordinary Christians about their faith. In order to answer that question, I must first define who these ordinary Christians were and what constituted the faith that they were taught.

At first glance, “ordinary” seems like the less problematic of the two terms, but it is actually the more difficult to define because it was not a term that Christians in late antiquity used to describe themselves. Moreover, in modern scholarship, the term often means different things. Many recent and contemporary social and cultural histories of late antique Christianity have used the word “ordinary” to describe a certain subset of Christians or

people's Christianity without comment.⁴³ Other works specifically employed "ordinary" to mean "non-elite" or "popular." For instance, the "ordinary people" in Ramsay MacMullen's *The Second Church: Popular Christianity A.D. 200-400* are people of non-elite classes.⁴⁴ Another approach is to try to define Christians in terms of their commitment to Christianity, as Robert Markus did when he wrote of Augustine's defense of "Christian mediocrity" in his opposition to the perfectionism of Pelagianism.⁴⁵ Such a phrase avoids the class connotations of "popular" but appears judgmental and implies a standard by which someone can be judged Christian.

In her recent work, *The Religious Worlds of the Laity in Late Antique Gaul*, Lisa Bailey escaped the issues of class and evaluating people's faith by focusing on the laity, a group that was constantly undergoing definition vis à vis the clergy in late antiquity.⁴⁶ The laity included people from all socioeconomic strata and allowed for a sliding scale of involvement with Christianity, consisting of "baptized members of the church, who had not been ordained and did not live in organized religious communities as monks or nuns."⁴⁷

For the purposes of this dissertation, however, the "laity" is too broad of a category. Because it lacks socio-economic distinction, the laity includes kings and emperors, as well as elite school friends of men who grew up to be bishops. Such elites, by virtue of their rhetorical educations, would have been exposed to the same complex philosophical frameworks that bishops used for theological argumentation, as well as been in the same social circles as some bishops and priests. Furthermore, the laity also encompassed

⁴³ See Meeks 1983, Van Dam 1985, Hen 1995, and Brakke 2010, for a few examples.

⁴⁴ MacMullen 2009. MacMullen has also used "ordinary" to refer to non-martyred Christians in the persecutions (1990), demonstrating that the word can have different meanings even in works by the same scholar.

⁴⁵ Markus 1990, 45-62.

⁴⁶ Bailey 2016, 4-6.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 5-6.

unordained ascetics, living alone as hermits or on their family estates having renounced their wealth, each expressing an engagement with Christianity that suggested some greater knowledge of the faith than preachers could convey in liturgical sermons. In order to discuss the pedagogy aimed at a group of people who did not have access to Christian educations outside their official, usually liturgical, contact with Christian clerics and churches, it is necessary to consider both class and degree of religious involvement.

“Ordinary,” as a category distinct from “lay,” “popular,” and “mediocre,” is useful for analysis, and it is perhaps for this reason that so many historians of Christianity continue to use the term despite all its problems. It is not a term that comes from the sources, but rather a modern category employed by scholars as a hermeneutic tool. As such, it is defined differently, or not at all, by the individual scholarly works that discuss ordinary Christians. Nevertheless, there was an identifiable group of people who did not have the means or opportunity to learn about Christianity outside of the liturgy, and thus late antique preachers made an effort in their sermons to teach them specifically. These are my “ordinary Christians.” They were most certainly lay, by Bailey’s definition. They were also not elite, but they were not necessarily poor. They participated in their Christian communities by attending liturgical services, but they did not have access to elite or ascetic Christian groups to supplement what they learned from their bishops or priests. Finally, they existed as a category in the minds of preachers when they considered the audiences of the sermons they composed.

When I ask how fifth- and sixth-century preachers taught these ordinary members of their audiences about their faith, however, I am using the word “faith” the way they would have. Preachers at that time spoke of the “correct, universal faith” and referred to the

community of Christians in the church as “the faith.”⁴⁸ In this sense, “faith” means something like “religion,” or the collective features of a set program concerned with interactions beyond human life and the world, including its attendant practices that are performed as a community, and the community itself.⁴⁹ Indeed, the faith communities of late antique Christianity largely fit modern, scholarly definitions of “religion” better than other “religions” of the ancient Mediterranean world, including Christianity of an earlier period.⁵⁰

I will purposely avoid using the word “religion,” however, because the most common definitions of the English word “religion” do not bear any resemblance at all to premodern religion. For most speakers of English, “religion” carries the connotations of belief and interiority, which are the products of continuous theorizing about the nature of religion begun during the aftermath of the Protestant Reformation.⁵¹ Furthermore, “religion” as defined above was not a native category in late antiquity, whereas “faith” was. The Latin word from which the English derives, “*religio*,” only sometimes meant what “faith” meant here for Latin Christian authors, and in any case was not used nearly as frequently as “faith.”⁵²

⁴⁸ See, for example, Caesarius, *Serm.* 10.1, the statement of faith from the Council of Orange, and the Council of Chalcedon, I.157 (an excerpt from the Council of Ephesus) for the former. “The faith” (ἡ πίστις) was already a term used to describe all Christians in the New Testament, (Morgan 2015, 2).

⁴⁹ This short definition owes a substantial debt to the anthropological definition of “religion” provided by Bruce Lincoln in *Holy Terrors*: “1. A discourse whose concerns transcend the human, temporal, and contingent, and that claims for itself a similarly transcendent status; 2. A set of practices whose goal is to produce a proper world and/or proper human subjects, as defined by a religious discourse to which these practices are connected; 3. A community whose members construct their identity with reference to a religious discourse and its attendant practices; and 4. An institution that regulates religious discourse, practices, and community, reproducing them over time and modifying them as necessary, while asserting their eternal validity and transcendent value” (Lincoln 2003, 5-7).

⁵⁰ This is a fraught issue. See Brent Nongbri’s recent (controversial) intervention in the debates surrounding religion in the ancient world, *Before Religion* (2013), in which he argues against the prevalent idea that religion is “simply there” in all cultures at all times, and traces the history of the modern concept of religion in the early modern and modern periods.

⁵¹ See especially Asad 1993, 40-3.

⁵² See Lewis and Short 2006, s.v. “*religio*,” which does not list this definition at all; Souter 1957 lists “order” and “rule” from Cyprian, “rites” from the poetry of Commodian, and “the Christian religion” from Lactantius. Neiermeyer 1954 cites late antique and early medieval sources that use it to describe ascetic or monastic lifestyles.

“*Religio*” also had no obvious Greek equivalent, being variously translated with the too-specific “*threskeia*” or “*eusebeia*,” which actually meant “piety,” among other words.⁵³

Fides, on the other hand, had a direct Greek cognate in “*pistis*.”⁵⁴ “Faith” was a concept that was shared by speakers of both Greek and Latin in the ancient Mediterranean world, and came to be shared by both Greek- and Latin-speaking Christians in late antiquity.⁵⁵

It is also important to note that while “faith” is a term taken from the primary sources, the modern English word “faith” still carries connotations that were absent in ancient and late antique understandings of *pistis* and *fides*. Thus it is necessary to outline precisely what late antique Christian preachers meant when they used the word “faith” and what their audiences understood them to mean.

In addition to referring to Christianity as the “faith,” preachers also used “faith” in another sense when they spoke of Christians as “faithful” and non-Christians, including heretics, as “unfaithful.”⁵⁶ This sense is much more difficult to define, in part due to the fact that modern definitions of “faith” have been informed by Augustine’s division of “faith” into “*fides quae*” and “*fides qua*,” or “faith that” and “faith by which”—or the “what” and the “how.”⁵⁷ This division occurs only once in Augustine’s voluminous writings, however, so it was unlikely to have been very influential in his own day or even among sixth-century preachers such as Caesarius who were influenced by Augustine in other ways.⁵⁸

⁵³ Paris. Lat. 7651 in Goetz et. al. 1888, vol. 2.

⁵⁴ Morgan 2015, 5-7 with Freyberger 2009.

⁵⁵ Gruen 1982 argues for a shared understanding of “faith” between Greek- and Latin-speakers in Polybius against modern scholarship that takes for granted that *pistis* and *fides* had different meanings. See esp. 58-64.

⁵⁶ See, for example, Hesychius, *Hom.* III.2.1-2; 4.7-11; VI.6.28 and below, Chapter 2; see also Caesarius, *Serm.* 12.4.

⁵⁷ Morgan 2015, 11-12. Cf. Justice 2008.

⁵⁸ Augustine, *On the Trinity*, 13.2.5, cited in Morgan 2015, 11.

Modern definitions of “faith” also tend to focus on the “faith that,” and people regularly use “faith” interchangeably with the word “belief.” Although “belief” made up one part of the Greek and Latin definitions of “faith,” I have chosen not to translate *pistis* or *fides* as “belief” in this dissertation because the Greek and Latin words carried different connotations than the word “belief” carries for present-day English speakers. For us, the focus tends to be on propositional belief, or the belief that a given statement is true. For Roman and early medieval speakers of Greek and Latin, however, the core meaning of *pistis* and *fides* was “trust” and “trustworthiness,” and extended meanings included “honesty, credibility, faithfulness, good faith, confidence, assurance, pledge, guarantee, credit, proof, credence, belief, position of trust/trusteeship, legal trust, protection, and security.”⁵⁹ Propositional belief was indeed part of “faith,” but it was far from its chief meaning. Greek speakers tended to use the word *nomizein* rather than *pisteuein* to denote propositional belief,⁶⁰ and Latin speakers preferred *opinor*, *arbitror*, and *puto* to *credo*.⁶¹ Thus, when the Christian statement of faith from the fourth century onward, the Creed, began, “Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἓνα Θεὸν Πατέρα παντακράτορα,” it most likely meant, “We put our trust in one God, the father almighty.”⁶²

To say, “We put our trust in God,” was to describe several relationships—those between faithful individuals and God and those among members of the community of faithful who put their trust in God together. This is consistent with the connotations *pistis* and *fides* had in the Roman Empire and into the middle ages.⁶³ *Pistis* and *fides* relationships were

⁵⁹ Morgan 2015, 7.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 7.

⁶¹ Ristuccia 2013, 29. Although the word *fido* does exist, however infrequently, the verb that corresponds to the substantive *fides* is *credo* (Ernout et. al. 1985, s.v. “credo”).

⁶² Ristuccia notes that Latin patristic authors made a distinction between “*credere in* + accusative” and “*credere* + dative” where “*credere in*” meant “trust in the reliability of,” *Ibid.*, 30-1.

⁶³ Linguistic reforms of the eighth and ninth centuries lie beyond the scope of this dissertation.

reciprocal in the Roman Empire, and they remained reciprocal in Christianity. People had to have faith in God, a disposition that they demonstrated through belief and mindset as well as actions. God, in turn, was faithful to humanity.⁶⁴

Faith, therefore, was both a disposition Christians had to exhibit and a community of people exhibiting faith in God together. The dual sense of “faith” as “trust” and “trustworthiness” communicated both sides of the relationships between Christians and God and among Christians themselves—people had to both have faith in God and in each other and they had to show themselves trustworthy as faithful members of the community by doing the things that were asked of good Christians, such as participating in rituals of worship, conducting themselves morally, and demonstrating their faith in God. When I refer to Christian “faith” in the rest of this dissertation, especially with regards to the teaching of faith, I have in mind all these meanings: trust in God and belief in theological doctrines about God, trust in the community of faithful, and trustworthiness as demonstrated through actions. As such, the Christian faith was more than the institutions of the Christian church. It was a dynamic series of trust relationships centered around the relationship between humans and God and the attendant beliefs, rituals, and institutions required for these relationships to function on such a large scale.

Finally, it is necessary to define three other difficult terms related to the institutional aspect of Christianity. They are “catholic,” “orthodox,” and variations on the word “heresy.” All of these terms were used by late antique Christian authors including those considered in my case studies. Like “faith,” I attempt to use these other words in the same ways they were used in the sources. “Catholic,” in Latin *catholicus*, which was borrowed from the Greek

⁶⁴ See 2 Thessalonians 3, where the “lord is faithful,” i.e. trustworthy.

καθολικός, means “universal,” and while I usually translate the word as “universal,” I sometimes translate it as “catholic” with a small “c.” My use of the word “catholic” does not refer to the future Catholic Church, and it is in no way opposed to “orthodox.” In fact, late antique Christian authors often referred to the church as both “catholic” and “orthodox”—universal and professing the correct faith.

“Orthodoxy” and “heresy” are more difficult terms to define because they are not essential categories but rather relative terms that varied in conjunction with fluctuations in political power. Although logically there could only be one “orthodox” church and all other Christian groups professing different versions of Christian faith had to be considered “heretical,” the “orthodox” party could be different depending on whom you asked. Rather than take the perspective of hindsight and refer to the church that would ultimately become orthodox, I try to stay as close to the sources as possible in my use of the term. At any given moment in the fifth and sixth centuries, there was a specific network of bishops that professed the faith deemed “orthodox” by the most recent ecumenical council and had the official backing of either the Roman Emperor or the bishop of Rome if their territories no longer lay within the Empire.⁶⁵ In the following case studies, I use the word “orthodox” to refer to the Christian communities and leaders that had the official designation of “orthodox” at the time they were active.

Thus, Hesychius and Caesarius were both orthodox when they were preaching. Yet a third preacher considered briefly in the conclusion, Severus, the miaphysite bishop of Antioch at the height of the Acacian Schism whose works were later condemned as heretical,

⁶⁵ On the political weight given to orthodoxy by imperial support, see Lim 1999, 208-11 and Millar 2006, 133-40. On the doctrinal authority of the bishop of Rome in relation to the provinces in the fifth century, see Wessel 2015.

also preached from a position of orthodoxy. To put it another way, Hesychius and Caesarius would have disagreed with Severus over what constituted the orthodox definition of faith, but all three were orthodox at the time they composed their sermons.

A Case for Case Studies

A case study approach is an effective way to study the clerical teaching of ordinary Christians in late antiquity because individual cases allow me to examine different preachers interacting in specific local situations while stressing the importance of belonging to a universal Christian community. Hesychius taught his congregations much about Jesus' birth from the virgin Mary—to have faith in Christ's divinity through his miraculous birth and to emulate Mary's faith. Caesarius primarily taught his congregations to be constantly on the lookout for sin and to act accordingly. Yet both considered their communities to be part of a universal church and, each in his own way, taught their congregations to have faith in the universal church. Separated by a sea and a century, Hesychius and Caesarius both took part in the Mediterranean-wide and centuries-long effort of Christian leaders to achieve a single catholic and orthodox church.

In that regard, the two halves of this dissertation are not meant to be compared, nor are they meant to be seen as representative. Instead, presenting the unique pedagogy of individual preachers should emphasize the diversity of historical experiences within the Christian church.⁶⁶ Further, by choosing case studies from the Eastern and Western

⁶⁶ See Smith 2005, 4, for diversity of experience. Morgan 2015 takes a similar approach to early Christianity in the Roman Empire: “On one level, the Roman empire of the early principate comprises innumerable micro-societies and subcultures, each with a proud history, many with their own language or dialect, and most with at least a few distinctive social structures and cultural practices. On another level, the early Roman empire is a single, vast, multi-cultural complex,” 27.

Mediterranean, I demonstrate that Christianity can be understood as a trans-Mediterranean phenomenon in the fifth and sixth centuries, even as the Latin-speaking church temporarily split from the church of the Byzantine Empire, and several church communities in the Eastern Mediterranean began to break off for good.

The Mediterranean as a category of analysis also provides a framework for understanding how case studies should function. Scholars have long noted the continued communication and connectivity across the Mediterranean after the fall of the western Roman Empire, and recent works taking a trans-Mediterranean approach to late antiquity and the middle ages have demonstrated the importance of such connections to the cultures being studied.⁶⁷ The connections made by individual Christian communities in the fifth and sixth centuries, through pilgrimages and councils, but also letters and other documents sent and circulated far beyond the individuals or communities that produced them, all point toward a larger Christian community with its constituent parts always in dialogue with one another, trying to define itself. Rather than comparing cases or projecting details from cases onto Christian late antiquity as a whole—approaches that tend to isolate local experiences—we should highlight their connections and understand individual preachers and church communities as participants in broader interactions.

Hesychius was connected to the universal Christian community through the pilgrims who came to Jerusalem from all over the known world; Caesarius was connected through his relationships with various popes of Rome, who kept him abreast of their dealings with church leaders from parts east. Hesychius and Caesarius, in their preaching as well as their political actions, expressed a desire for all members of the universal Christian community to be in

⁶⁷ Pirenne 1939, Braudel 1972, Horden and Purcell 2000, and Wickham 2005.

agreement regarding orthodoxy. By positioning my case studies within the late antique Mediterranean world, I show that the interactions among Christians that worked toward achieving theological unity, and not adherence to a unified theological orthodoxy itself, defined the church as a universal Christian community.

With that in mind, let us turn to our cases.

Hesychius of Jerusalem

The first case study examines the sermons of Hesychius of Jerusalem from the early fifth century. Jerusalem was a major city in the eastern Mediterranean whose bishop had ties to the eastern capital of Constantinople, but was not itself an administrative center of the Christian church, like Constantinople or Rome. The surviving evidence from Hesychius includes enough homilies to analyze his preaching and also demonstrates his involvement in the Council of Ephesus. Furthermore, a contemporary lectionary for the church of Jerusalem provides a liturgical context for Hesychius' homilies, allowing for a more developed discussion of his pedagogy.

Chapter 2 focuses on Hesychius' preaching and argues that he presented a christology of Christ as Word-made-flesh without explicitly stating that his theology was in opposition to the christology condemned by the Council of Ephesus. His homilies show that he sought to teach certain theological beliefs about the divine and human natures of Christ that were consistent with the position he supported as orthodox, as well as a set of actions and attitudes that defined a member of a Christian community. He presented his theology in a non-polemical manner in order to maintain a sense of unity with other Christian communities for his congregation. Further, instead of denouncing rival Christian sects as "heretics," he used

Jews as his preferred example of “bad faith,” lest mention of a rival Christian community weaken the congregation’s faith in a universal church.

Chapter Three explores the sensory and material context of Hesychius’ sermons in order to demonstrate the other ways Hesychius conveyed his theology of Christ, salvation, and community to a diverse population of ordinary Christians. The space of the churches in which Hesychius preached, the movable objects present in the liturgy, including a relic of the cross, as well as the topography of Jerusalem, all worked in different ways to promote the same lessons about Christ’s natures and membership within a universal Christian community that he preached in his sermons. By enacting rituals of worship and community formation, I argue, preachers taught the importance of those rituals and the relationships that such rituals reinforced. Hesychius therefore relied on the experiential pedagogy of the liturgy to teach ordinary Christians about the unity and universality of their Christian community and the hierarchical structures that held it together.

Caesarius of Arles

The second case study focuses on the early sixth-century preacher Caesarius of Arles, who left behind a considerably larger collection of sermons than Hesychius and who, as metropolitan bishop, held a higher position in the church hierarchy, but nevertheless had a similar pedagogical relationship to his congregations. Arles was a major city in the Western Mediterranean which, under Caesarius especially, was closely tied to Rome, and can be seen as parallel to Jerusalem in its positioning and networks.⁶⁸ Aside from his sermons, Caesarius

⁶⁸ Although Rome was no longer a political capital, and the institution of the papacy was not yet fully developed in the sixth century, the see of Rome was still exceptional relative to other cities much like the imperial capital Constantinople. On Rome’s exceptionality in late antiquity, see Sessa 2012, 28-30.

also left a legacy of leadership in regional church councils, whose canons survive and can be used as evidence for Caesarius' interactions with other leaders of the Christian church.

An examination of Caesarius' sermons in Chapter Four shows how he strove above all to foster a Christian community that was based on active virtue, which was consistent with the re-emphasis on action in addition to grace for salvation that he promoted at the Council of Orange. Conscious of the different levels of education among his audience, Caesarius developed pedagogical techniques that made his lessons clear and accessible to the least among them. By presenting a set of instructions and examples of how ordinary Christians could enact the virtue of faith, as well as more tangible virtues, Caesarius hoped to establish a Christian community at Arles that demonstrated a connection through virtue with other Christian churches throughout the world.

Chapter Five considers the various ways Caesarius deployed the concept of "example" to teach the same lessons about virtue he taught in his homilies to Christians who could not attend the liturgy or did not fully understand his preaching. In the context of his own congregation, which included a significant number of uneducated and less educated members, he took literally the age-old injunction to teach moral conduct by living his own life as an example and urged his fellow bishops to do the same. He used the small but noticeable class of public penitents as a negative example to help Christians avoid sin. Further, he relied on the *Lives* of saints to teach Christians to live by their example in a narrative form, which had a different pedagogical force from hortatory sermons. Finally, he collected and disseminated his sermons, whose "afterlives" became examples for other preachers to preach, demonstrating his desire to be an example not just for the laity, but for the clergy as well. By teaching conduct by example, Caesarius hoped to teach his

congregation that actions were important for salvation, without making explicit the controversy surrounding that position.

In each of their local contexts, Hesychius and Caesarius made an effort to teach their congregations how to be Christian through preaching and other means. Analysis of their preaching shows a pedagogical interest in communicating to ordinary Christians as well as elites and ascetics, and thus the content of their sermons reveals material they thought ordinary Christians should know about their faith. The following dissertation examines the pedagogies of Hesychius and Caesarius in order to reconstruct how ordinary Christians experienced Christianity in the fifth and sixth centuries by studying what they were taught. Hesychius and Caesarius, both responding to the needs of their local communities and negotiating the wider community of the universal church, taught ordinary Christians to have faith in a Christian community that extended to the ends of the earth.

PART I: HESYCHIUS OF JERUSALEM

Hesychius was born and educated in Jerusalem toward the end of the fourth century and lived to see the Council of Chalcedon in 451.⁶⁹ Few biographical details about him survive except that he was a monk before being ordained presbyter around 412.⁷⁰ As a presbyter, he played a prominent role in the entourage of Juvenal, the bishop of Jerusalem, who was heavily involved with the Council of Ephesus in 431. He also served as a *didaskolos*, or teacher of scriptural exegesis. In addition to the fifteen surviving homilies and probably many others that do not survive, Hesychius also wrote commentaries on Leviticus, Isaiah, and the Psalms. Because Hesychius spent his entire career in Jerusalem (or the desert just outside of it while he was a monk), he offers a perspective that is representative of the political, social, and theological context of the orthodox Christian community in Jerusalem in the early fifth century.⁷¹

Jerusalem at the time of Hesychius' birth was a growing metropolis in the eastern Mediterranean region of Palestine, which experienced large-scale growth and prosperity in late antiquity.⁷² Since the early fourth century, when the emperor Constantine commissioned

⁶⁹ For a detailed description of Hesychius' life and works, including the dating of his death, see Aubineau 1978, xii-xx. For a complete list of Hesychius' works, see Kirchmeyer 1968. Jüssen 1931-4, is still the most comprehensive study of Hesychius.

⁷⁰ One short biographical notice of Hesychius appears in a ninth-century synaxiary under March 28. See *PG* 117, 373D-376A. Hesychius was already an established preacher in 414/15 according to Theophanes, *Chronographia*, an. 5907.

⁷¹ By "orthodox Christian community," I mean the community and hierarchy that was officially recognized as orthodox by the emperor and councils. In the same regard, when I refer to specific doctrines as "orthodox," I apply the same criterion of official recognition at the time. For a greater discussion of my use of the word "orthodox" in this dissertation, see Introduction, 20-21.

⁷² Avni 2014, 109.

the church of the Holy Sepulcher to be built over the site of Christ's crucifixion where a relic of the cross was found, Jerusalem had grown to become the largest and most important center for Christian pilgrims in the world.⁷³ The pilgrimage industry only continued to grow. By the time Hesychius began preaching in the early fifth century, Jerusalem housed many more churches, some of them monumental, built in part to keep up with the growing stream of pilgrims entering the city, some of whom settled there for years.⁷⁴

There was also a visible Jewish community in Jerusalem. Although fourth-century emperors continued Constantine's work of promoting Christianity and Theodosius I even outlawed pagan and "heretical" Christian practices in 380, Jewish communities continued pretty much as they had under previous Roman emperors.⁷⁵ Christian intellectuals had been struggling for centuries to explain the persistence of Jewish communities as Christianity defined itself over the course of its development.⁷⁶ While Hesychius preached a homily on the virgin Mary for her feast on August 15, local Jews and Jewish pilgrims could be seen mourning the destroyed Temple at an annual feast.⁷⁷

In this once-Jewish city with a strong Jewish community continuing to worship inside a rapidly-developing Christian topography, Jews were perhaps the most visible example of,

⁷³ On Jerusalem as a pilgrimage site in late antiquity, see Hunt 1982; Wilken 1992; Wilkinson 2002, and Sivan 2008. See also Jacobs 2004, 3-6 for a description of the scholarship on the development of Jerusalem into a Christian pilgrimage site in the fourth century and the relationships between Christians and Jews in late antique Jerusalem.

⁷⁴ On the growing importance to Christianity, and related material importance, of Jerusalem in the fourth through sixth centuries, see Sivan 2008, 194-229 and Avni 2014, 109-114.

⁷⁵ On the legal status of Jews in the fourth through sixth centuries, see Schäfer 2003, 185-8 and *NTh* 3.1, which prohibited Jews from holding office, converting Christians, and building new synagogues, but provided that they could repair existing synagogues. See also Sanzo and Boustán 2014 on the experience of Jews in the late antique Mediterranean.

⁷⁶ See Boyarin 2004, esp. Parts I and II, on Christians and Jews mutually defining their communities in late antiquity. See also Jacobs 2004 on representations of Jews in Jerusalem by imperial Christian authors.

⁷⁷ Sivan 2008, 198 and 232-43, though Hesychius was more likely to have preached his *Hom.* VI, which contains a lengthy discussion of the bad faith of Jews, during the Epiphany octave than on August 15.

as they were characterized by Hesychius, people who were “unfaithful.”⁷⁸ That is to say, they continued to act according to the law and practices of the “old covenant,” thereby demonstrating a lack of faith in the “new covenant” with God that was forged by Christ. While the Jewish community did not pose an actual threat to the orthodox Christian community of Jerusalem, Hesychius’ emphasis on the differences between Jews and Christians allowed him to obscure the differences among conflicting Christian sects.⁷⁹

It was in this Jerusalem that Hesychius was raised and most likely educated. As evidenced by his writing, he received a traditional elite education in grammar and rhetoric. He was also learned in scriptural exegesis and theology, which is reflected not only in his biblical commentaries but in his sermons as well. The theological controversies of the late fourth century, which were largely concerned with the human and divine natures of Christ, or christology, formed the intellectual context of Hesychius’ own education in Christian theology.⁸⁰ The debates over Christ’s natures were rooted in his birth from the virgin Mary, which was especially relevant in Jerusalem where there was a centuries old devotion to Mary among ordinary Christians.⁸¹

While a vibrant cult of the virgin Mary throughout the Christian church began to appear in late fourth century, there was already a long-standing Marian cult in Palestine that had arisen from traditions commemorating Mary’s death in and around Jerusalem.⁸² While the church in the imperial capital of Constantinople did not have an official Marian feast on

⁷⁸ See, for example, *Hom.* VI.5.1-4 and IX.21.

⁷⁹ Boyarin’s assertion, that fourth-century Christians saw Judaism as “essential to the production of orthodoxy over against heresy” (Boyarin 2004, 211) is perhaps too strong, but the visible category of Jew did present Hesychius with a convenient way to divert his congregations’ attention from heretical Christian communities.

⁸⁰ On the christological controversies of the late fourth and early fifth century, see Wessel 2004.

⁸¹ See below, 36-38, for an overview of the christological controversies leading up to the Council of Ephesus in 431.

⁸² See Shoemaker 2016, 129 and 134-52 on the origins of Marian cult in Roman Palestine.

its liturgical calendar until after the episcopal tenure of Nestorius (who initiated the controversy by condemning the by-then widespread practice of referring to Mary as *Theotokos*, or God-bearer), Jerusalem was already celebrating the Marian feast of August 15 in the early fifth century.⁸³ Hesychius had thus always known a Marian cult in Jerusalem, and it is not surprising that when Mary's status as mother of God became controversial he not only defended the title *Theotokos* but also emphasized the stakes the virgin Mary had in christology.

Theological controversy lay in the background of the Christian community in Jerusalem while Hesychius preached, especially as the Council of Ephesus drew nearer and occupied the time and efforts of Jerusalem's bishop Juvenal. Yet controversy was never the lesson Hesychius set out to convey in his homilies. Instead, he focused on other themes that he deemed more appropriate for his congregation and the Christian community he desired to build for those people. At stake was their salvation, which Hesychius believed could only be achieved through their faith in a certain christological worldview (and consequent inclusion in an orthodox church), but rather than polemicize their salvation, he simply taught them to be part of a Christian community that professed faith in the *Theotokos* and dual nature of Christ.⁸⁴

Because it was a pilgrimage center, the Christian community of Jerusalem was diverse and ever-changing. Christians of all sorts—local and foreign, urban and rural, rich and poor—gathered in the church of the Holy Sepulcher and other monumental churches to participate in the liturgy. A liturgy in Jerusalem, the site of Christ's death and resurrection,

⁸³ *Ibid.*, 180-1.

⁸⁴ On the competing christological worldviews professed by different Christian communities in the early fifth century, see Wessel 2004, 3-5.

was unlike liturgies anywhere else in the world. Yet direct access to the geography of Christian history was not sufficient to teach Jerusalem's Christians everything they needed to know about the orthodox faith. The Christian communities in and around Jerusalem were faced with the same problems as Christian communities elsewhere: congregations were growing as people baptized and raised their children Christian while Christianity's struggle to define its own parameters was made manifest by the existence of multiple parallel church hierarchies, each claiming to be universal and orthodox.

Thus, at the largest Christian pilgrimage site, in a major city with a significant Jewish population, in close proximity to a mostly Syriac-speaking hinterlands, Hesychius attempted to teach the congregations at the liturgies what it meant to be a Christian and a member of a world-wide Christian community, a "universal" (καθόλικος) church. In the early fifth century, christology became a cornerstone of defining the orthodox faith for that universal church. Hesychius' pedagogy fit into the larger ecclesiastical project of promoting a certain christology as orthodox.

The following two chapters make up a case study of the Christian community in Jerusalem as considered through the lens of Hesychius. Chapter 2 outlines Hesychius' pedagogy in his fifteen surviving homilies and examines the specific lessons he taught his congregations. At the core of his theological lessons was a christology of Christ as the Word-made-flesh, which was achieved through his miraculous birth by the virgin Mary. Chapter 3 explores the material context of fifth-century preaching in Jerusalem and comparable eastern Mediterranean churches in order to demonstrate how Hesychius attempted to reach all members of his congregation through more sensory and less explicit pedagogical media contained within the liturgy. In addition to illustrating and reinforcing some of the

theological lessons from his homilies, the experiential pedagogy of the liturgy taught the fundamental relationships of Christian communities. In this way, Hesychius used the liturgy to teach ordinary Christians how to belong faithfully to an orthodox, universal Christian church.

Chapter 2

Orthodoxy without Controversy: The Early-Fifth-Century

Homilies of Hesychius of Jerusalem

Sometime in the early 420s, about a decade into his preaching career, Hesychius preached a sermon on the Annunciation of the angel Gabriel to the virgin Mary.⁸⁵ Although he was a gifted exegete and had produced several biblical commentaries, exegesis was not the primary function of this, or any of his surviving homilies.⁸⁶ A direct address to the congregation about halfway through the homily makes clear that Hesychius' main concern was not with the text of the scriptural passage, but rather with its audience:

But, beloved people, when I see the eagerness of your listening to the divine utterances and your tenderness for their interpreters, overcome by your fondness of hearing, my longing for teaching is stimulated, as I delight in the support of your love. For you, in as much as you are learned students, continually train the ones speaking; you order the helmsman in your capacity as passengers; you hold fast the rudders of my tongue with prayers.⁸⁷

One of the main purposes of this homily was to teach ordinary Christians how to be Christian, which included having such faith in the divinity of Christ as to believe the story of the virgin birth. Hesychius' theological position concerning the nature of Christ informed this lesson, but his pedagogy as he presented it in this particular homily was largely shaped by the needs and desires of his congregation. Throughout his homilies, Hesychius taught theological

⁸⁵ *Hom. VI.*

⁸⁶ The distinction of "homilies" as specifically exegetical discussions did not appear until later in the seventh century.

⁸⁷ Ἐγὼ δέ, ἀγαπητοί, πρὸς τὸ πρόθυμον ὑμῶν τῆς ἀκροάσεως τῶν θείων λογίων ὁρῶν καὶ τὸ περὶ τοὺς ἐξηγουμένους φιλόστοργον, τῇ φιληκοῖα ὑμῶν νικώμενος πρὸς τὸν τῆς διδασκαλίας διανίσταμαι πόθον, τῇ τῆς ἀγάπης ὑμῶν συγκροτήσῃ τερπόμενος· ὑμεῖς γὰρ τοὺς λέγοντας, ὡς πολυῖστορες μαθηταί, συνεχῶς συγκροτεῖτε, ὑμεῖς τὸν κυβερνήτην ὡς ἐπιβάται ρυθμίζετε, ὑμεῖς τὰ τῆς γλώττης πηδάλια προσευχαῖς διακρατεῖτε. *Hom. VI.5.4-11.*

concepts by using rhetorical techniques designed to engage ordinary Christians and teach them about their faith in terms that were significant for their own lives.⁸⁸

It had always been the duty of Christian preachers, whether they were bishops or presbyters like Hesychius, to teach Christians about their faith.⁸⁹ This was a moral obligation, as late antique bishops viewed the education of Christian souls as integral to their salvation: Christians needed to know how to practice their faith properly in order to get into heaven, and it was up to bishops and priests to teach this to the lay, ordinary members of their congregations.⁹⁰ As can be seen in his homilies, Hesychius made a concerted pedagogical effort to reach less educated and more secular lay Christians. He did not alienate them with complex theological discussions and jargon. Rather, like many contemporary preachers, he strove to teach the theology he deemed necessary for Christian participation in terms ordinary Christians could understand, as well as a set of ritual and moral actions that enabled his congregants to identify with a Christian community that was at once universal and orthodox.

Hesychius preached at a time when bishops all across the Roman Empire struggled to establish a definition of Christianity that included all Christians. Each party considered its own community of Christians to possess the right belief (orthodoxy) and desired that their version of Christianity become universal (*καθόλικος/catholicus*). For Hesychius, it was

⁸⁸ For a preacher directly responding to the audience in his homilies, see Van Dam 2003, Chapters 6 and 7. Even when preachers were not directly responding to concerns raised by members of the congregation, they still fabricated question and answer dialogues to make it seem like they were responding to the audience (Bailey 2016, 145).

⁸⁹ Cunningham and Allen 1998, 32. Hesychius' status as presbyter does not suggest that his preaching was less significant than a bishop's preaching. See also Introduction, 8-11, about teaching as a priestly duty.

⁹⁰ See Mayer 2015 and Rylaarsdam 2014 for different approaches to understanding John Chrysostom's homiletic pedagogy as a means of caring for the souls of Christians.

imperative that he teach his congregation not only how to be orthodox, but also to see themselves as part of a universal community of Christians.

An examination of Hesychius' homilies reveals a pedagogical program that sought to teach ordinary Christians certain theological beliefs that were consistent with the theological position Hesychius supported as orthodox, specifically that Christ was the Word-made-flesh and was born of the virgin Mary as the divine Word. He also taught them a set of prescribed actions and attitudes that went along with being Christian. He constructed his theological and practical lessons in such a way that ordinary Christians were left with the assumption that there was only one Christian church for everyone in the world. Although Hesychius did not explicitly teach his congregations that they belonged to a united and universal church, every time he mentioned the universal church in his homilies, the idea was consistent with the rest of his teachings.

In the homilies, Hesychius presented his theology in a non-polemical manner in order to maintain the illusion that the Christians in his congregation were united with all other Christian communities throughout the world. Instead of denouncing rival Christian sects as "heretics," he set up the Jews, who posed no real threat to the makeup of his congregation, as his preferred example of "bad faith," lest mention of rival Christian communities at all weaken the congregation's faith in a universal Christian church. Hesychius understood that if Christians had confidence in the strength of their community, they were more likely to demonstrate Christian faith in other ways. His non-polemical presentation of theology, coupled with his use of Jews as examples of bad faith, enabled him to teach his congregation that they were part of a universal and orthodox Christian church, despite the theological controversy with which Hesychius himself was engaged with other church leaders.

The Council of Ephesus and Hesychius' Word-Made-Flesh-Christology

Concurrent with his preaching career, Hesychius was involved in the christological controversy surrounding the theological position of Nestorius, which culminated in the Council of Ephesus in 431. He supported Cyril of Alexandria against Nestorius and remained committed to this position, which Ephesus defined as orthodox, until his death, shortly after the Council of Chalcedon in 451.⁹¹

The Council of Ephesus, like other ecumenical councils, was an imperial project, whose ultimate goal was the unity and orthodoxy of a universal Christian church community. The eastern emperor Theodosius II had inherited a weak empire and even weaker co-emperors, and thus made every effort in his reign to solidify imperial unity, which for him included ecclesiastical unity.⁹² The council was ostensibly a meeting of the entire Christian church, though in reality it was mostly an eastern and Greek-speaking affair, with Cyril of Alexandria ultimately appointing himself as representative of the bishop of Rome for the council's last session.⁹³

The controversy began when the bishop of Constantinople, Nestorius, began preaching in response to a local dispute over what to call the virgin Mary.⁹⁴ In Constantinople, where there was a vibrant cult of Mary popularized by imperial women, it was common practice to refer to her as *Theotokos*, "God-bearer." When Cyril, the powerful and political bishop of Alexandria, heard that Nestorius was preaching that Mary should instead be called *Christotokos*, he began preaching vehemently against Nestorius, stating that

⁹¹ Aubineau 1978, xvi-xvii.

⁹² On Theodosius' role in theological controversy and the Council of Ephesus specifically, see Millar 2006, 149-67 and Graumann 2013.

⁹³ *ACO I*, 7, 84-117; Festugière 1982, 602-7.

⁹⁴ For a summary of the first council of Ephesus, see Price and Gaddis, 2007, 17-25. See also Wessel 2004, Introduction. For a more detailed discussion of Cyril's Christology, see Meunier 1997.

Theotokos was the more appropriate term because Christ's divine and human natures were so intertwined with one another that when Mary gave birth to Christ she was indeed giving birth to God. The proper name for Mary became an issue of christology, which in turn had soteriological implications. The physiological makeup of Christ affected the way Christians got into heaven. Christology became for Christian leaders the central theological concern, and it continued to occupy Christian leaders well after the Council of Chalcedon in 451.

Christology was also a pastoral concern, as church leaders had to care for the souls of their congregants by making sure their faith was orthodox. Thus, it is no surprise that Hesychius accompanied his bishop Juvenal of Jerusalem to Constantinople in 429 to plead with the emperor in support of Cyril.⁹⁵ At the council itself, which was dominated by Cyril, Juvenal operated as Cyril's closest ally.⁹⁶ The council condemned Nestorius and held up the definition of the faith presented by Cyril in his letter to Nestorius as orthodox. Juvenal spoke first following the reading of Cyril's letter, stating that the definition of faith in the letter was in accordance with that of the Council of Nicaea.⁹⁷

Hesychius' christology echoed that of Juvenal and Cyril, taking as a point of departure the concept of Christ as the Word-made-flesh.⁹⁸ The work in which he presented this concept most explicitly was the passage of his ecclesiastical history that attacked the christology of Theodore of Mopsuestia, a fourth-century Antiochene bishop who possessed a similar theological worldview to that of Nestorius. He wrote, "Yet in his utter folly he

⁹⁵ Aubineau 1978, xv.

⁹⁶ Juvenal was the first (after Cyril) to affirm Cyril's letter to Nestorius as doctrine in accordance with Nicaea (*ACO* II.1.1.242, Price and Gaddis 2007, 177); signed his name second (after Cyril, who also signed as representative of Pope Celestine) to the Council (*ACO* II.1.1.911, Price and Gaddis 2007, 297); signed his name third (after Cyril and the representative of the Holy See) to the decree in Canon 7 of Ephesus (*ACO* II.1.1.945, Price and Gaddis 2007, 333).

⁹⁷ *ACO* I.1.2.45.1, and Festugière 1982, 203.

⁹⁸ Aubineau 1978, xli-xliv.

[Theodore] wrote that Christ is not the Word made flesh, as we have been taught by the gospels, but a man who as a result of progress in life and accomplishing the sufferings was joined to God the Word.”⁹⁹ Hesychius repeatedly emphasized Christ’s σαρκώσις, or “enfleshment,”¹⁰⁰ in his homilies, particularly in those that concerned Christ’s birth from the virgin Mary.¹⁰¹

Mindful of the soteriological implications of orthodox christological belief for his congregation, Hesychius preached the theology that he worked with fellow church leaders to promote against a competing christology. Indeed, controversy pervaded Hesychius’ understanding of and engagement with theology, but he made a concerted effort not to expose his congregations to such controversy while at the same time making sure they only professed the orthodox version of Christian theology. As we shall see in the examination of Hesychius’ preaching that follows, Hesychius gave his congregation a serious representation of his understanding of orthodox theology while simultaneously shielding them from the divisions among Christians created by theological controversy in order to be consistent with another theme present in his homilies, that his congregants belonged to a single, universal Christian community.

⁹⁹ ACO IV.1, 90, trans. Price 2009, 306 (modified).

¹⁰⁰ I translate σαρκώσις, literally a “taking on” or “growth of” flesh, with the neologism “enfleshment” rather than the more standard “incarnation” for two reasons: First, “incarnation” took on a specific theological meaning during the Council of Chalcedon following a definition provided by Pope Leo I in the “Tome of Leo,” and it would be anachronistic to understand Hesychius’ Word-made-flesh christology in terms of the theological concept of Incarnation. Secondly, “incarnation” has become so common in English that it has lost its fleshy connotation for anglophone readers. “Σαρκώσις” certainly would have evoked the fleshiness of bodies for Hesychius’ listeners, and I would like to retain the effect when translating his words.

¹⁰¹ On the implications of the Council of Ephesus on the existing cult of Mary at Jerusalem, evidenced by, among other things, Hesychius’ *Homily V*, preached prior to the Council of Ephesus, see Shoemaker 2016, 205-228.

Hesychius Teaches Jerusalem

Through an analysis of Hesychius' fifteen surviving homilies, it is possible to reconstruct the lessons Hesychius conveyed to the ordinary Christians in his congregation by means of preaching in the liturgy. Although the homilies were all composed for different feast days and contexts throughout the liturgical year, many of them returned to the same lessons. Regardless of the occasion, Hesychius made sure to teach his congregations fundamental lessons about their faith: what to believe concerning Christ's nature, how to act and even feel in order to demonstrate their faith within their community, and how their faith directly contributed to their salvation. He taught these lessons by means of the rhetorical techniques he employed in his homilies, which enabled him to persuade and teach as well as elicit emotional responses from his congregation. Hesychius' pedagogy in the homilies, I argue, relied on his use of rhetoric in order to reach different audience members in different ways, so that listeners need not necessarily have understood all parts of the homily in order to comprehend the key lessons. In this way, Hesychius was able to teach the ordinary Christians of Jerusalem about their faith and community effectively in the limited opportunities afforded by liturgical homilies.

There are twenty-one homilies attributed to Hesychius, but only fifteen are authentic.¹⁰² They survive individually in over sixty manuscripts, with only five manuscripts containing more than one of Hesychius' homilies.¹⁰³ Consequently, there is no indication that Hesychius or a later compiler produced a collection of his homilies, as was a common practice at the time.¹⁰⁴ Although it is impossible to know how closely the surviving text

¹⁰² Aubineau 1978, xxxiii-xli. In this case study of Hesychius, I only consider the fifteen authentic homilies.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, xx-xxvi. The five manuscripts in question each contain only two homilies.

¹⁰⁴ See Chapter Four on Caesarius of Arles for a discussion of sermon collections in late antiquity.

resembles the words that Hesychius preached to his congregation, it is reasonable to assume that the written text is in fact a version of what was preached aloud, as stenographic recording of sermons was a common practice at that time.¹⁰⁵ The manuscript versions of the homilies may be variations on the versions that were preached, but they can be considered independently rather than in the context of a larger work such as a sermon collection that possessed its own overarching goals. Instead, they should be understood in the context of the liturgical feasts for which they were composed.

The Jerusalem liturgy began to be developed in the fourth century, and several lectionaries survive from the fourth through seventh centuries that dictated the precise scriptural readings, and sometimes locations, for the celebrations of individual feast days.¹⁰⁶ Of Hesychius' fifteen homilies, two were composed for Easter, two for the feast of the *Hypapante*, or the Presentation of Christ in the Temple,¹⁰⁷ two for Lazarus,¹⁰⁸ one for each of the saints Anthony,¹⁰⁹ Andrew,¹¹⁰ James and David,¹¹¹ Peter and Paul,¹¹² Stephen,¹¹³ and Procopius,¹¹⁴ one for a Monday in Lent, and two on the virgin Mary *Theotokos* for the fourth day of the Epiphany¹¹⁵ and the Marian feast of August 15.¹¹⁶ Considering the homilies with the entries in the lectionaries for their feast days allows us to situate them alongside the readings from the Old and New Testaments and the psalms that were sung during the same

¹⁰⁵ Olivar 1991, 902-22.

¹⁰⁶ For the Jerusalem Lectionary, see Verhelst 2012 and Renoux 1961.

¹⁰⁷ February 14. A third homily of Hesychius on the Presentation survives in Georgian, but I have not considered it for this dissertation. See Aubineau 1978, lxi.

¹⁰⁸ The second Saturday after Easter, Lazarus Saturday.

¹⁰⁹ January 17.

¹¹⁰ November 30.

¹¹¹ December 25. Outside of Jerusalem, Christians celebrated the feast of the Nativity on December 25.

¹¹² December 28.

¹¹³ December 27.

¹¹⁴ A local saint about whom little is known. See Leemans 2003, 204-5.

¹¹⁵ January 9.

¹¹⁶ This feast had not yet become the modern "dormition" celebration. For a detailed discussion of this feast, called "the memory of Mary," see Shoemaker 2016, 178-85.

liturgy. It also reveals the diversity of liturgical contexts within which each homily was preached. These homilies, delivered to different audiences in different locations around Jerusalem and spanning the entire liturgical calendar, offer a fair representation of the pedagogical processes that occurred throughout Hesychius' preaching.

The liturgies for which Hesychius preached these homilies probably saw a fairly large turnout of ordinary Christians. Easter was the most important feast in the Christian calendar, including both a paschal vigil and liturgies on Easter Sunday, and Christians who did not attend liturgies at other times of year would have made sure to attend at Easter.¹¹⁷ In addition to the numerous local and regional Christians, pilgrims from all over the Mediterranean world also would have been in attendance for Easter. Hesychius' Easter congregations therefore would have been especially diverse. It is thus not surprising that his two paschal homilies were considerably shorter than his other homilies, and that they focused largely on the christological lesson.

The other feast days in question, particularly the Presentation and the saints' feasts, also expected fairly large turnouts from local and regional ordinary Christians. Christians from all social levels participated in feasts of saints, especially saints of local import.¹¹⁸ People from the countryside did not have far to walk to reach Jerusalem, and Hesychius could have expected a considerable rural population in addition to the already diverse urban congregation.¹¹⁹ In his other festal homilies, Hesychius developed the christological lessons of his paschal homilies and supplemented them with other theological and moral lessons.

¹¹⁷ *AL*, 44-5.

¹¹⁸ Leemans 2003, 15-22.

¹¹⁹ See Maxwell 2006, Chapter 3 for the makeup of John Chrysostom's urban congregation in Antioch, but cf. *ibid.*, 78-9, claiming that rural people probably did not venture into the city very often to attend the liturgy. See also Brown 2012, 341-7 on the social classes of Christians in Augustine's congregation in Hippo.

Thus, he made use of well-attended feasts in order to communicate what he deemed the most important lessons of Christianity to as many Christians as possible.

It is important to keep in mind that the audience for Hesychius' homilies was a listening audience, and that although the homilies survive as written texts, they were originally meant to be consumed aurally. In this regard, festal homilies like these are different from the polemical homilies of Cyril and Nestorius that Hesychius would have engaged with in the lead-up to the Council of Ephesus.¹²⁰ Those "homilies" had more in common with theological treatises that were not meant to be heard (or at least appreciated) by ordinary Christians. Hesychius' homilies, in contrast, were composed specifically for a listening audience and, as I demonstrate below, were accessible to all types of listeners.

At the level of language, all local members of the audience would have been able to understand Hesychius' preaching. Greek was the language of all secular activity as well as Christianity in the Eastern Roman Empire, and many groups who spoke local languages were also conversant in Greek.¹²¹ In Syria and Palestine, Syriac competed with Greek as a functional language for religion and commerce.¹²² Christians in the countryside surrounding Jerusalem would have attended church services in Syriac at home, but the liturgies they observed in the major city of Jerusalem were exclusively in Greek. Although most people in the eastern Mediterranean were bilingual in late antiquity, there was always a chance that some people might not understand Greek and, in Jerusalem at least, the church leadership

¹²⁰ *ACO* I.1.10-42; Festugière 1982, 27-68.

¹²¹ On the multilingualism of the eastern Roman Empire in late antiquity, and especially use of Greek for official matters in the eastern provinces, see Millar 2006, esp. Chapter 3.

¹²² Millar argues that while Syriac bishops communicated with other bishops in Greek, there is no evidence that they also preached in Greek to their congregations. There probably were Syriac-speaking parishes before the advent of a separate Syriac-speaking church community, *Ibid.*, 107-116.

tried to make accommodations for them. The late fourth-century pilgrim Egeria wrote of the linguistic diversity of the congregation for the Easter celebration she attended in Jerusalem:

In this province there are some people who know both Greek and Syriac, but others know only one or the other. The bishop may know Syriac, but he never uses it. He always speaks in Greek, and has a presbyter beside him who translates the Greek into Syriac, so that everyone can understand what he means. Similarly the lessons [scriptural readings] read in church have to be read in Greek, but there is always someone in attendance to translate into Syriac so that the people understand. Of course there are also people here who speak neither Greek nor Syriac, but Latin. But there is no need for them to be discouraged, since some of the brothers or sisters who speak Latin as well as Greek will explain things to them.¹²³

A real-time translator was a luxury, perhaps afforded only to the main pilgrimage church in Jerusalem at Easter, rather than the norm. Egeria's mention of congregants constantly talking to one another, asking their neighbors to explain anything from the words of the sermon to the pictures on the walls, however, is something that occurred everywhere. Besides conversing with one another, the small minority of the congregation who could not understand the language of the preacher also would have had recourse to other pedagogical means, such as his gestures and tone of voice, as well as visual and other sensory cues during the homily and the liturgy as a whole.¹²⁴

The majority of Christians in Hesychius' congregation who could understand Greek would also have had no trouble understanding the content of his homilies. Hesychius, like many elite bishops and priests in late antiquity, had received a rhetorical education, and his training is reflected in the language and style of his homilies.¹²⁵ Contrary to some earlier scholarship, which argued that rhetorical homilies like these were inaccessible to uneducated members of the congregation, the rhetorical techniques Hesychius employed actually made

¹²³ Egeria, 47.3-4, trans. Wilkinson 2002, 163.

¹²⁴ See below, Chapter Three, on the sensory experience of the liturgy.

¹²⁵ See Kennedy 1983 for a survey of classical rhetoric in the works of Christian authors in late antiquity and the Byzantine Empire.

his homilies clearer and easier to understand.¹²⁶ Hesychius' homilies were accessible to ordinary Christians not *despite* his rhetoric, but rather *because of* his rhetoric.¹²⁷

Great preachers since the fourth century saw it as their duty to speak in an accessible manner that would be clear to the greatest number of people. John Chrysostom, Hesychius' near-contemporary, aimed his wildly popular homilies at the least educated in the congregation.¹²⁸ Rhetorical tropes and figures that had been in use for centuries, such as repetition, questioning, antithesis, paradox, and prose rhythm among others, aided the understanding and the memory of the audience, as well as affecting the audience's emotions.¹²⁹

Hesychius' homilies were particularly rhetorical. He made such use of prose rhythm that his homilies are almost poetic, and he especially loved Gorgianic parallelism.¹³⁰ Some Syriac preachers in the fifth and sixth centuries actually preached in meter, and Byzantine preachers began to compose homiletic hymns in the later sixth century, trends that support the idea that rhythm contributed to the effectiveness of homilies.¹³¹ Rhythm not only made the homilies pleasing to the ear so that audiences would want to listen, but also clearly demarcated the endings of ideas and emphatic phrases so the audience could easily grasp the main points.¹³² Hesychius also brought his congregation into dialogue in his homilies using various rhetorical forms of questioning.¹³³ He typically explained controversial points of

¹²⁶ Maxwell 2006, *passim*, esp. Chapter 2. Cf. MacMullen 1989.

¹²⁷ Thank you to Ray Van Dam for articulating this so nicely.

¹²⁸ Maxwell 2006, Chapter 4, esp. 91.

¹²⁹ On the use of various rhetorical techniques and the effects they sought to achieve, see Rowe 1997.

¹³⁰ Leemans 2003, 32-3.

¹³¹ No extensive study has been done on the poetry of late antique Syriac metrical homilies. See Brock 2008 for an overview of the Syriac genres and editions of texts. On the development of the Byzantine verse homily, later known as the *kontakion*, see Krueger 2014.

¹³² Rowe 1997, 154.

¹³³ *Ibid.*, 139-40.

theology by posing questions the audience might ask and then answering them. Moreover, his copious use of repetition both emphasized key words and phrases and added to the homilies' poetic effectiveness.

Besides employing numerous rhetorical techniques, Hesychius' homilies were also devoid of theological and other jargon.¹³⁴ Instead, Hesychius taught difficult concepts to his congregation in the form of simple narrative presentations or by using *ethopoiia*, speeches in the character of various theological and biblical figures.¹³⁵ He engaged his audience with narrative, expounding on and sometimes participating in familiar narratives from scripture.¹³⁶ When using examples to explain a concept, he took care to select images and metaphors that related to the everyday lives of ordinary people. He often repeated the same idea using multiple images drawn from different places to ensure the broadest possible appeal. Recent studies in cognitive neuroscience suggest that understanding happens when people match new information into frameworks of existing knowledge, and thus understand better when their teachers explain new concepts with examples that they already understand.¹³⁷ Hesychius' reliance on examples from everyday life and scripture gave his congregation something cognitively easier to grasp and memorize within the homily.

Hesychius thus composed his homilies using rhetorical techniques long known for their pedagogical effectiveness in order to teach the ordinary Christians in his congregation about their faith. In the rest of this chapter, I examine Hesychius' pedagogy in his homilies to demonstrate what he taught his congregations. By employing a mixture of techniques

¹³⁴ Aubineau 1978, xlii. The use of technical jargon in public speaking was considered in ancient and late antique rhetorical thought to be inappropriate for achieving clarity (Rowe 1997, 123-4).

¹³⁵ See Gibson 2008, 355-7, for an introduction to *ethopoiia* and the closely-related and sometimes interchangeable exercise, *prosopoiia*.

¹³⁶ See Kreiner 2014, Chapter 2 on the use of narrative for audience engagement and memory.

¹³⁷ See Sandwell 2011 for an interpretation of the differing pedagogies of John Chrysostom and Basil of Caesarea through the lens of cognitive neuroscience.

designed to help his audience understand and remember, Hesychius taught them a specific christology that he viewed as orthodox, along with appropriate actions and feelings, all of which constituted the faith that defined them as members of a united and universal Christian community.

Christian faith in late antiquity included specific theological beliefs about the divine, as well as trust in the divinity described by those beliefs and God's ability to grant salvation. Hesychius used the concept of "faith" specifically to describe the relationship between Christians and God in one of his Easter sermons. He preached, "Let no one be unfaithful to the symbols of the cross, but let them adore the blessed and thrice-blessed wood of the cross."¹³⁸ The opposite of unfaithfulness, in this context, is adoration, which Christians were supposed to perform for God. Hesychius wanted Christians to put so much confidence in the wood of the cross as to adore it. Further on in the same homily, Hesychius described the "faith" exhibited by the bandit who was crucified on the right side of Jesus. "Let us emulate the good judgment of the murderer [bandit], no rather, of the spirit-bearer, on account of his faith in this situation," he preached. "For what did he also say?—'Remember me, Lord, in your kingdom.' And in one assent of faith, he inhabits paradise and traverses the heavens."¹³⁹ Hesychius' description of the bandit's faith in this episode suggests that faith meant trusting in Jesus' message that God would save him and trusting in God to save him. As a result, he was saved.

¹³⁸ Μή τις τοίνυν ἀπιστεῖτω τοῖς τοῦ σταυροῦ συμβόλοις, ἀλλὰ τὸ μακάριον καὶ τρισμακάριον ξύλον τοῦ σταυροῦ προσκυνεῖτω, *Hom.* III.2.1-2.

¹³⁹ Μιμησώμεθα τοῦ ἀνδροφόνου τὴν ἀγαθὴν γνώμην, μᾶλλον δὲ τοῦ πνευματοφόρου διὰ τὴν μετὰ ταῦτα πίστιν. Τί γὰρ καὶ φησιν; — «Μνήσθητί μου, κύριε, ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ σου.» Καὶ ἐν μιᾷ συγκαταθέσει πίστεως παράδεισον οἰκεῖ καὶ οὐρανὸς περιπολεῖ, *Ibid.* 4.7-11.

Hesychius often presented his congregation with examples of good and bad faith as he did in the paschal homily. For Hesychius the Jews, whether in scripture or out in the world, were the ultimate examples of bad faith.¹⁴⁰ Hesychius constructed an image of Jews as people who continued carrying out the laws because they did not place their trust in Christ and abandon them. In one of his Marian homilies, Hesychius contrasted the Jews with the Magi, who chose not to ask any of the questions Hesychius listed relating to the plausibility of the virgin birth, but rather paid reverence to the child.¹⁴¹ He contrasted the gentiles, who zealously imitated the faith of the Magi, with the Jews, who, “stiff-necked” and “unbending,” did not.¹⁴² In Jerusalem, where present Jews and the landscape of the Jewish past were highly visible to Christians, this portrayal of Jews would have been particularly effective.¹⁴³

Another negative example that appeared in the rhetoric of Hesychius was that of the pagans. The continued existence of pagans in the fifth century is debatable, but in any case pagan practice had been outlawed in the Roman Empire for a generation before Hesychius began preaching.¹⁴⁴ Hesychius’ mentions of the “Hellenes,” or less often, “nations,” usually in a parallel structure with mentions of Jews or heretics, functioned more as a metaphor for bad faith and a way of strengthening the arguments he made against Jews and heretics.¹⁴⁵

Hesychius mentioned the third category of people of bad faith, heretics, even less often than pagans, indicating his desire to direct his congregations’ attention away from

¹⁴⁰ *Hom.* I.6-8; III.3.5; VI.5-8; IX; XII.6-9; and XIV.3.

¹⁴¹ *Hom.* VI.4.

¹⁴² Ἰουδαῖοι δὲ ἀκαμπεῖς, μᾶλλον δὲ σκληροτράχηλοι ὄντες, οὐδὲ τὸν «ἥλιον τῆς δικαιοσύνης» ἐν τοῖς οἰκείοις τόποις φανέντα πρὸς ἐπίγνωσιν ἐσπουδάσαν μιμήσασθαι τοὺς ὑπὸ ἀστέρος μακρόθεν ὀδηγηθέντας, *Hom.* VI.5.1-3. Cf. Exodus 32:9 for “stiff-necked.”

¹⁴³ See Jacobs 2004, 37-44.

¹⁴⁴ See Watts 2015, who defines the “final pagan generation” as those born in the first quarter of the fourth century. Members of the following generation came of age in a Christian world, even if they were themselves pagan.

¹⁴⁵ *Hom.* I.8.9; III.3.5; VI.5.12; IX.11; XII.10.12; XIII.7.14; XIV.3.21, 9.7, 14.

heretical forms of Christianity. Rival communities of Christians who favored the Nestorian party at the Council of Ephesus existed alongside the orthodox churches and they, unlike the Jews and the potentially nonexistent pagans, posed a real threat to the integrity of the universal Christian community and, for Hesychius, the souls of the Christians for whom he was pastorally responsible.

In two of the three times that he mentioned heretics, Hesychius presented them alongside one or both of the other examples of bad faith.¹⁴⁶ In one of those, he listed heretics as the second of two items in a parallel tricolon, stating, “Who will expound your hatred against the pagans? Who will display your boldness against the heretics? Who will be able to report on the enmity on account of the Jews?”¹⁴⁷ The effect on the audience would have only been to underscore the injunction to avoid having bad faith, without drawing too much attention to any of the three examples. Only once did Hesychius give heretics their own mention—in the midst of a discussion of Paul’s conversion on the road to Damascus in his homily on Saints Peter and Paul.¹⁴⁸ He preferred instead to use the negative example of the Jews, with whom he associated heretics in other writings, rather than alert his congregation to the existence of other Christian communities.¹⁴⁹

More often than giving his congregation negative examples of bad faith, however, Hesychius presented his own theology in positive terms, inviting his audience to have faith in it as the Magi had faith in Christ’s miraculous birth. The primary element of Christian faith he sought to teach his congregation was that Christ was the Word-made-flesh: that he was the

¹⁴⁶ *Hom.* VI.5.13 and XII.10.13-14.

¹⁴⁷ Τίς τὸν ζῆλον ὑμῶν ἀπαγγεῖλαι ἐπαξίως δυνήσεται; Τίς τὸ καθ’ Ἑλλήνων ὑμῶν ἐξηγήσεται μῖσος; Τίς τὸ καθ’ αἰρετικῶν ὑμῶν ἀναπετάσει θράσος; Τίς τὸ πρὸς Ἰουδαίους ὑμῶν δυσμενὲς δυνήσεται ἀναγγεῖλαι; *Hom.* VI.5.12-15.

¹⁴⁸ *Hom.* XIII.5.13-15.

¹⁴⁹ Hesychius equated the Christology of Theodore of Mopsuestia with “Jewish impiety” in his *Ecclesiastical History*, ACO IV.I.90.

fully divine, preexistent Word, but that he also became flesh when he was born miraculously of the human virgin Mary. Hesychius presented this lesson most clearly and simply in the two short paschal homilies, knowing that Easter was his only chance of reaching some Christians who were only able to attend the liturgy on that most holy feast.¹⁵⁰ The other theological lessons he taught over the course of his homilies, the relationships among the persons of the Trinity and the virgin Mary's conception and delivery of Jesus, worked in the service of his christology.

For Hesychius, who took part in the christological controversy surrounding the Council of Ephesus and saw in the aftermath that it still was not resolved, it was imperative that he teach his congregation the orthodox understanding of Christ. Yet, he made sure to do so in a completely uncontroversial tone. His christological lesson was thus able to exist side by side with the idea that all Christians belonged to a universal church. Hesychius taught his congregation the correct belief through which they would be saved without compromising their understanding of their Christian community, both physically within Jerusalem and intellectually with all Christians in the known world.

In his first paschal homily, *Homily III*, most likely preached at the vigil, Hesychius discussed his christology in terms of the crucifixion and resurrection. Though the majority of the homily focused on the cross, in the section just before the conclusion Hesychius explicitly stated the relationship between the cross and Christ as the Word-made-flesh. In a personification of Easter day, proclaiming its joy at discovering the empty tomb and seeing Christ raised into heaven, he preached:

¹⁵⁰ The paschal homilies are considerably shorter than all of Hesychius' other homilies. This is not surprising, given the larger amount of readings prescribed for paschal liturgies. See *JL* 43-44, and Chapter 3 for more information on the Easter liturgy. My translation of the two paschal homilies is appended at the end of this dissertation.

For he [Christ] was hidden first in the bowels of flesh, and then in the bowels of the earth, where on the one hand he sanctified those brought into being through conception and where, on the other hand, he brought to life those having died through his resurrection: 'For pain and distress and groaning fled.' 'For who knew the mind of God, or who became its counselor,' if not the Word, having been enfleshed and affixed to wood and raised from the dead and lifted into the heavens?¹⁵¹

Hesychius placed this statement in an emphatic position in the homily and following on a *prosopoiia*, or personification of an inanimate object, to ensure that his audience grasped the most important theological lesson of this homily. The relationships among the concepts and events are clear: Christ was the Word with God, he became flesh, he died on a cross, and he rose from the dead.

Hesychius developed this lesson much more in his second paschal homily, *Homily IV*, which he preached in the morning on Easter Sunday. He made liberal use of repetition in this homily, pairing it with antithesis in order to explain the paradox of Christ's nature: he died on the cross, which was a human act, and he was raised from the dead, which was a divine act, so Christ was simultaneously human and divine. This thesis occupied the majority of the homily.

Hesychius began by asking the audience a series of rhetorical questions concerning how best he should describe Christ and his resurrection.¹⁵² In the final question, he introduced the paradoxes inherent in the resurrection event: "With what kinds of words should I greet a grave begetting life, a tomb free from corruption and patron of immortality, a bedchamber lulling the bridegroom to sleep for three days, a bridal chamber awakening the

¹⁵¹ Οὗτος γὰρ ἐκρύβη πρῶτον μὲν ἐν κοιλίᾳ σαρκός, ἔπειτα δὲ ἐν κοιλίᾳ τῆς γῆς, ὅπου μὲν ἀγιάζων τοὺς γεννωμένους διὰ τῆς κηρίσεως, ὅπου δὲ ζωογονῶν τοὺς τεθανατωμένους διὰ τῆς ἀναστάσεως: «Ἀπέδρα γὰρ ὀδύνη καὶ λύπη καὶ στεναγμός.» «Τίς γὰρ ἔγνω νοῦν θεοῦ, ἢ τίς σύμβουλος αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο», ἀλλ' ἡ ὁ Λόγος ὁ σαρκωθεὶς καὶ ξύλῳ προσηλωθεὶς καὶ ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστὰς καὶ εἰς οὐρανὸς ὑψωθεὶς; *Hom.* III.5.12-19.

¹⁵² *Hom.* IV.1.

bride uncorrupted after her marriage?”¹⁵³ He then answered this question using a series of antitheses leading up to the conclusion that both sides of the paradox exist as one. He opposed the word “corpse” [νεκρόν] with “God,” linking each word to a series of images that each in its own way helped the audience situate their understanding of Christ as both dead man and God in their knowledge of the gospel accounts of the resurrection event:

“Corpse,” [proclaims] the guarded tomb, and “God,” [proclaims] the trembling earth; for on the one hand the body itself indicates “corpse,” and on the other hand the prodigy indicates “God;” the tomb indicates “corpse,” the resurrection indicates “God”; the tears of the women indicate “corpse,” and the utterances of angels indicate “God.” Joseph looked after him as a corpse, but the one being cared for was [cared for] as a man, and this man despoiled death as God. Also the soldiers kept watch over him as a corpse, and the gatekeepers of hell became frightened looking on him as God.¹⁵⁴

He employed progressively longer antitheses, going from a simple word-association to familiar events from the gospels,¹⁵⁵ demonstrating that Christ was both human and divine in any given situation. He continued to use antitheses in the following section in order to link the miraculous resurrection of Christ to his Word-made-flesh christology for the audience:

“Just as it is not right for the Word to be divided from the flesh, so it is necessary for sufferings to be entwined with wonders.”¹⁵⁶ The rhetorical use of paradox enabled Hesychius

¹⁵³ Ποίοις λόγοις ἀσπάσομαι τάφον γεννῶντα ζωὴν, μνήμα φθορᾶς <μὲν> ἐλεύθερον, ἀφθαρσίας δὲ πρόξενον, παστάδα τριήμερον τὸν νυμφίον κοιμήσασαν, νυμφῶνα τὴν νύμφην ἄφθορον μετὰ γάμον ἐγείραντα; *Hom.* IV.2.1-4.

¹⁵⁴ Νεκρὸν ἢ θήκη φυλαττομένη καὶ θεὸν ἢ γῆ σαλευομένη· νεκρὸν μὲν γὰρ αὐτὸν τὸ σῶμα βοᾷ, τὸ δὲ θαῦμα θεὸν· νεκρὸν ἢ ταφὴ, θεὸν ἢ ἀνάστασις· νεκρὸν τῶν γυναικῶν καὶ τὰ δάκρυα, καὶ θεὸν τῶν ἀγγέλων τὰ ῥήματα. Ὡς νεκρὸν αὐτὸν Ἰωσήφ ἐκήδευσεν, ἀλλ’ ὁ κηδευθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος οὗτος ὡς θεὸς τὸν θάνατον ἐσκόλευσεν. Πάλιν ὡς νεκρὸν οἱ στρατιῶται ἐφρούρησαν καὶ ὡς θεὸν οἱ πυλωροὶ τοῦ ἄδου θεωρήσαντες ἔπηξαν, *Hom.* IV.2.4-11.

¹⁵⁵ Cf. Matthew 28, the resurrection narrative recommended for the vigil, *JL* 44.

¹⁵⁶ ἀλλ’ ὥσπερ οὐ θεμιτὸν τὸν Λόγον ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς χωρίζεσθαι, οὕτως ἀνάγκη τὰ παθήματα συμπεπλέχθαι τοῖς θαύμασιν, *Hom.* IV.3.5-7. Although Hesychius was clearly referring to Christ as the Word-made-flesh, the image this sentence would have invoked in the minds of listeners was of any human who has both a body and a *logos*, or reason, which allows them to think and feel. It was also obvious that the two could not be separated.

to teach his congregation that the resurrection event and the Word-made-flesh were not actually paradoxes.¹⁵⁷

Hesychius' use of multiple rhetorical techniques (questioning, paradox, antithesis, and parallelism) in this homily enabled the audience to focus on and remember his crucial lesson about Christ's natures. Furthermore, the multiple images and scriptural references he recalled in this short section gave the diverse individuals in his congregation different associations to help them situate their understanding of christology.

Hesychius used these same rhetorical techniques to explain Christ's nature in other homilies as well. The two homilies on the Presentation of Christ in the Temple, *Homilies I* and *II*, developed the paradox of the simultaneous humanity and divinity of Christ as a crucial component to the presentation narrative. Hesychius opened *Homily I* with the announcement that the presentation "sums up complete the mystery of the enfleshment of Christ; it outlines the entire manifestation of the only begotten son."¹⁵⁸ *Homily II* took as its point of departure the influence of the Holy Spirit on Simeon in the presentation narrative, but in it Hesychius still called attention to the paradoxes apparent in the story to explain Christ's natures.

In each homily, Hesychius walked his congregation through the passage from Luke, breaking it down and explaining each separate component. In *Homily I*, this took the form of a question and answer aetiology similar to that in *Homily IV*: "Who are 'they' [“Αὐτῶν” τίνων]?" he asked in reference to the αὐτῶν in the sentence, "And when the days of their

¹⁵⁷ On Hesychius' use of paradox in the paschal homilies, see Aubineau 1972, 105-110.

¹⁵⁸ ὅλον γὰρ ἀνακεφαλαιοῦται τὸ τῆς σαρκώσεως τοῦ Χριστοῦ μυστήριον, ὅλην διαγράφεται τὴν τοῦ μονογενοῦς υἱοῦ παράστασιν, *Hom. I.1.3-5*.

[αὐτῶν] purification were filled...”¹⁵⁹ He answered that “they” are Joseph and Mary: Joseph, who was not Jesus’ father and thus not responsible for his purification, and Mary who was Jesus’ mother but was not inseminated [οὐκ ἐσπερματίσθη] and therefore was not in need of purification, according to the law of Moses.¹⁶⁰ This paradox laid the groundwork for Hesychius’ explanation of Christ’s becoming flesh, which he developed further in a digression on the virgin birth.¹⁶¹

The virgin birth was itself a paradox that was also crucial to understanding the christological paradox. Hesychius developed explanations of the virgin birth in both of his Presentation homilies as well as the two homilies he composed for Marian feasts, *Homilies V* and *VI*. In each case, he presented the virgin birth in real-life terms, using increasingly graphic imagery, in order to demonstrate as clearly as possible to ordinary Christians that Jesus was not conceived in the traditional way. In *Homily V* on Saint Mary *Theotokos*, for instance, Hesychius devoted the first two long sections to accumulating every image available to describe Mary’s conception of the enfleshed Jesus as a virgin, drawn from both scripture and everyday life:

One greets her ‘The lord is from you,’ on account of the lord having been born from her and with flesh shining upon the race of men. This one calls her ‘Mother of light,’ that one ‘Star of life,’ another addresses her ‘Throne of God,’ another one ‘Temple larger than heaven,’ still another ‘Seat not less than the seat of the cherubim,’ and yet another ‘Garden unsown, fertile, and uncultivated,’ ‘Vine rich in grapes, flourishing, and untouched,’ ‘Dove clean of pollution,’ ‘Pigeon undefiled,’ ‘Cloud gathering rain without destruction,’ ‘Pouch holding a pearl brighter than the sun,’ ‘Mine from which the stone covering the whole earth, uncut by anyone, comes forth,’ ‘Ship full of cargo not needing a pilot,’ ‘Wealth-generating treasure chest.’ And others similarly [call her] ‘Lamp without a mouth from which it is lit’...¹⁶²

¹⁵⁹ Luke 2:22; «Καὶ ὅτε ἐπλήσθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ αὐτῶν, κατὰ τὸν νόμον Μωυσέως.» «Αὐτῶν», τίνων; *Hom.* I.2.1-2.

¹⁶⁰ “If a woman was inseminated [σπερματισθῆ] and gives birth to a male, she will be unclean for seven days,” *Hom.* I.2.6-7, quoting Leviticus 12:2.

¹⁶¹ *Hom.* I.3.

¹⁶² Καὶ ὁ μὲν αὐτῇ χαίρειν λέγει, ὁ δὲ «Κύριος ἐκ σοῦ» προσφωνεῖ, διὰ τὸν ἐξ αὐτῆς τεχθέντα καὶ μετὰ σαρκὸς τῷ γένει τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐπιφανέντα κύριον. Οὗτος αὐτὴν Μητέρα φωτὸς ἐπονομάζει, ἐκεῖνος

You see how much and how great is the worthiness of the God-bearing virgin. For the only-begotten son of God, the creator of the world, was born from her as an infant, and he rehabilitated Adam and sanctified Eve and rendered the serpent ineffective and opened paradise and secured the seal of the womb... He secured the seal of the womb, being God and the Word having become flesh [ὁ σαρκούμενος], he never needed doors for going in and coming out.¹⁶³

[2] So to you, o virgin, the prophets distributed praises and each of the God-inspired ones spoke however many mysteries of the wonders that were believed in faith [ἐπιστεύθη]. And one calls you 'Rod of Jesse,' in order that he might allude to the unwounded and unbending status of your virginity. And another compares [you] to the bush, burning and not burned up, in order that he might allude to the flesh of the only-begotten and the God-bearing virgin: for she, on the one hand, burned and did not burn up, since she gave birth and did not open her womb, conceived and did not destroy her uterus, delivered an infant and left her cavity closed, she administered milk and preserved her breasts untouched. She bore a child and did not know the father of the child. She became a mother and did not become a wife. A son was nursed and a father was not found; the field bore fruit and the fruit did not have cultivation, harvest season yielded and it did not have a sowing; a river ran and the source was closed off from everywhere... Another [prophet] addressed you, 'Gate closed off and placed in the east' and it led in the king with the doors being closed.¹⁶⁴

The combination of different types of images and the way Hesychius used repeated parallel structures to present them ensured that everyone in his audience could grasp that Mary

Ἀστέρα ζωῆς, ἄλλος Θρόνον προσαγορεύει θεοῦ, ἄλλος Ναὸν οὐρανοῦ μείζονα, ἕτερος Καθέδραν τῆς τῶν χειρουβικῶν καθέδρας οὐκ ἐλάττονα, ἕτερος πάλιν Κῆπον ἄσπορον, εὐφορον, ἀγεώργητον, Ἄμπελον εὐβοτρυν, εὐθαλῆ, ἀψηλάφητον, Τρυγὸνα καθαρὰν, Περιστερὰν ἀμίαντον, Νεφέλην τὸν ὑετὸν χωρὶς φθορᾶς συλλαμβάνουσαν, Πῆραν ἧς ὁ μαργαρίτης τοῦ ἡλίου λαμπρότερος, Μέταλλον ἐξ οὗ ὁ λίθος ὄλην καλύπτων τὴν γῆν οὐδενὸς αὐτὸν λατομοῦντος προέρχεται, Ὀλκάδα φόρτου γέμουσαν καὶ κυβερνήτου μὴ χρήζουσαν, Θησαυρὸν πλουτοποιόν. Ἄλλοι δὲ ὁμοίως ἄστομον Λυχνίαν ἀφ' ἑαυτῆς ἄπτουσαν... *Hom. V.1.3-16.*

¹⁶³ Ὅραξ ὅσον τὸ τῆς θεοτόκου παρθένου καὶ πηλίκου ἀξίωμα. Ὁ γὰρ μονογενὴς υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ, ὁ τοῦ κόσμου ποιητής, ὡς βρέφος παρ' αὐτῆς ἐβαστάζετο, καὶ τὸν Ἀδάμ ἀνέπλασε καὶ τὴν Εὐάν ἠγάπησε καὶ κατήργει τὸν δράκοντα καὶ τὸν παράδεισον ἠνοιγε καὶ τὴν σφραγίδα τῆς γαστρὸς ἠσφαλίζετο... Τὴν σφραγίδα τῆς γαστρὸς ἠσφαλίζετο, θεὸς καὶ Λόγος ὑπάρχων ὁ σαρκούμενος οὐδαμῶς θύρας πρὸς τὴν εἴσοδον ἢ τὴν ἐξοδὸν ἐχρηζε, *Hom. V.1.24-29 and 32-34.*

¹⁶⁴ Σοὶ μὲν οὖν, ὦ παρθένε, τοὺς ἐπαίνους οἱ προφήται μερίζονται, καὶ λέγει τῶν θεοφόρων ἕκαστος ὅσα τῶν θαυμάτων ἐπιστεύθη μυστήρια. Καὶ ὁ μὲν σε Ῥάβδον Ἰεσσαὶ καλεῖ, ἵνα τὸ ἄτρωτον καὶ ἀκαμπὲς τῆς παρθενίας αἰνιζῆται. Ὁ δὲ Βάτω παραβάλλει καιομένη καὶ μὴ κατακαιομένη, ἵνα τὴν σάρκα τοῦ μονογενοῦς καὶ τὴν παρθένον τὴν θεοτόκον αἰνιζῆται· ἢ μὲν γὰρ ἐκαίετο καὶ οὐ κατεκαίετο, ἐπειδήπερ ἔτεκε καὶ τὴν γαστέρα οὐκ ἠνοιξεν, συνέλαβε καὶ τὴν μήτραν οὐκ ἔφθειρεν, ἐξήγαγε τὸ βρέφος καὶ τὴν κοιλίαν ἐσφραγισμένην κατέλιπεν, ἐχορήγησε γάλα καὶ τοὺς μασθοὺς ἀψηλαφήτους ἐφύλαξεν, ἐβάστασε παιδίον καὶ τοῦ παιδίου πατέρα οὐκ ἐγίνωσκεν, ἐγένετο μήτηρ καὶ οὐκ ἐγένετο νύμφη. Υἱὸς ἐτρέφετο καὶ πατὴρ οὐχ ἠύρισκετο· ὁ ἀγρὸς ἐκαρποφόρει καὶ ὁ καρπὸς γεωργὸν οὐκ ἐκέκτητο, θέρος ἀπέδωκε καὶ σπόρον οὐκ ἐδέξατο· ποταμὸς ἔτρεχε καὶ ἡ πηγὴ πανταχόθεν ἐκέκλειστο... Ἔτερός σε Πύλην κεκλεισμένην, ἐν ἀνατολαῖς δὲ κειμένην προσηγόρευσε καὶ τὸν βασιλέα, τῶν θυρῶν κεκλεισμένων, εἰσάγουσαν, *Hom. V.2.1-15; 19-21.*

conceived and bore the Word-made-flesh while remaining a virgin the entire time. The more educated or theologically inclined members of the congregation would have appreciated the mystical devotion Hesychius gave Mary in this homily and been able to meditate with Hesychius on the paradox of birth without conception. Those who could not engage the virgin birth on a mystical level would have at least been struck by the language and images Hesychius used in these passages and been able to remember his notion of the virgin birth.

Hesychius returned to the theme of the virgin birth later in the same homily by means of a different pedagogical tactic. In an exegesis of the prophecy from Isaiah that declared a virgin will give birth to a son, Hesychius asked the congregation a series of questions—who the “virgin” was to whom Isaiah referred and from where they thought she conceived in her belly—to all of which he provided immediate answers.¹⁶⁵ He then concluded the section with a final, emphatic question to which the answer should have been obvious: “And yet was God not conceived from a marriage and corruption, and was he not able to be born and made flesh from a man and a marriage-bed?” “Absolutely not!” he answered himself, “But from divine energy, from the intervention of the most high, from the presence of the spirit.”¹⁶⁶

Another rhetorical technique Hesychius employed to teach especially confusing theological concepts such as the virgin birth was *ethopoiia*, or speech in character. His homilies often included some explanation of the scriptural passages that were just read aloud in the liturgy, but one way to make difficult parts of scripture more accessible to ordinary Christians was to role play as the characters in the narrative.¹⁶⁷

¹⁶⁵ *Hom. V.4. Is. 7:14* was prescribed for the feast of Saint Mary Theotokos on August 15, *JL* 64.

¹⁶⁶ Μὴ τοίνυν θεὸς ἀπὸ γάμου καὶ φθορᾶς συλλαμβάνεται, καὶ ἐξ ἀνδρὸς καὶ κοίτης τεχθῆναι ἢ σαρκωθῆναι δύναται; Οὐδαμῶς, ἀλλ’ ἐξ ἐνεργείας θεοῦ, ἐξ ἐπιφοιτήσεως ὑψίστου, ἐκ παρουσίας Πνεύματος, *Hom. V.4.22-5*.

¹⁶⁷ In one instance, Hesychius announced that he would insert speeches into the gospel narrative, for “there we will see the indwelling [παρεμβολήν] of God,” *Hom. I.1.8-10*.

In his other Marian homily, *Homily VI*, Hesychius explained the annunciation narrative by making speeches as both Mary and the angel Gabriel. In the passage from Luke, Mary only asks Gabriel, “How can this be, since I have no relations with a man?”¹⁶⁸ Hesychius substituted a much longer speech, using the same techniques of repetition and variation of images he used in *Homily V*:

How did you dare to assault so presumptuously an unmarried virgin and make an announcement of your untrustworthy utterances? For, you say that I will bear a child without a seed. You said that I will conceive without a marriage, that without a meeting and exchange of a man the organ of my uterus will bear fruit. Who ever saw, who ever heard, for the first time since the origins, that an untilled field bloomed ears of grain, or that earth unplanted brought forth a bunch of grapes, wine without a vine, or a river running without a source, which no one from the first ages either heard with their ears or saw coming to be with their eyes. How will I trust you [πιστεύσω] when you make a fool out of me?¹⁶⁹

Before his congregation, Hesychius acted out the role of Mary asking the very questions he assumed ordinary people in fifth century Jerusalem would have had. His performance allowed the audience to imagine themselves as Mary, who questioned her faith (“How will I trust...?”) the same way they might have been questioning their own faith when asked to believe that God was born as a human from a virgin mother.

In *Homily II* on the Presentation, Hesychius staged a conversation between himself and Luke, the author of the gospel passage in question. Hesychius used *ethopoiia* to explain the virgin birth within the context of the presentation narrative. “For what reason do you call Joseph ‘father,’ O evangelist and author of the divine genealogy?” he asked.

¹⁶⁸ Luke 1:34, trans. *NABRE*.

¹⁶⁹ «Πῶς ἐτόλμησας μὴ μεμνηστευμένη αὐθάδως ἐπιβῆναι παρθένω καὶ τῶν ἀπίστων σου ῥημάτων τὸ κήρυγμα φάναι; Λέγεις γὰρ με τίκτειν ἄνευ σπόρου παιδίον. Ἄνευ γάμου ἔφης συλλαβεῖν, ἄνευ συντυχίας καὶ ὁμιλίας ἀνδρὸς καρπογονῆσαι τὸ τῆς μήτρας χωρίον. Τίς εἶδε, τίς ἤκουσεν ἐξ ἀρχαιογονίας τὸ πρότερον ἄρουραν ἀγεώργητον ἐξανθήσασαν ἄσταχυν, ἢ γῆν ἀφύτευτον βότρυν βλαστήσασαν, οἶνον ἄνευ ἀμπέλου, ἢ ποταμὸν ἄνευ πηγῆς προϊόντα; Ὅπερ οὐδεὶς πρῶτων αἰώνων ἢ τοῖς ὡσὶν ἤκουσεν, ἢ κατώπτευσεν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς γεγονός. Πῶς πιστεύσω σοι πρὸς ἐμὲ κωμωδοῦντι;» *Hom. VI.2.6-15*.

For you showed Gabriel speaking to the virgin, when he explained how the conception would occur and in what manner the virgin would give birth: “The holy spirit will come upon you, and the power of the most high will overshadow you.”

Then he answered as Luke:

I have not forgotten those [words] of mine. “For if I had forgetfulness, the Spirit would have reminded me. But at that time the enfleshed one [Jesus] wished for Joseph to be called thus, in order that the one sabotaging the mystery of our salvation might be deceived.”¹⁷⁰

Here, Hesychius appealed to the authority of the gospel writer rather than try to explain the relationship between Jesus and Joseph himself. As Luke, he could provide a simple answer:

because the human Jesus wanted to call Joseph “father,” he would call him “father.”

Furthermore, by having Luke refer to Jesus as the “enfleshed [σαρκωθεὶς],” Hesychius bestowed the authority of scripture on the most important theological description of Christ, as far as he was concerned.

Another paradox that Hesychius used to help explain Christ’s nature was the crucifixion. The crucifixion and subsequent resurrection of Christ was the central mystery of Christianity, and Hesychius would have needed to teach it regardless of his theological stake in the relationship between Christ’s divinity and humanity. The specific question that Hesychius anticipated everyone would ask was how such a gruesome object of execution as a cross could be revered as an object of salvation. The answer, that by dying on the cross as a human Christ as a divinity saved humanity, was itself the paradox of Christ’s dual nature. Thus, it was imperative that Hesychius teach his congregation how to understand and interact with the cross.

¹⁷⁰ Τίνος χάριν πατέρα τὸν Ἰωσήφ, ὃ τῆς θείας γενεαλογίας εὐαγγελιστὰ καὶ συγγραφεὺ, καλεῖς; Αὐτὸς γὰρ εἰπόντα τὸν Γαβριὴλ πρὸς τὴν παρθένον ἀπέδειξας, ἠνίκα πῶς ἡ σύλληψις ἔσται καὶ τίνα τρόπον ἡ παρθένος τέξεται μεθωδέυτο· «Πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ σέ, καὶ δύναμις ὑψίστου ἐπισκιάσει σοι.» — «Οὐκ ἐπιλέλησμαι τῶν ἐμαυτοῦ», φησὶν· «εἰ γὰρ καὶ λήθην ἐλάμβανον, τὸ Πνεῦμα ἂν ἐμίμησεν. Ἀλλ’ οὕτω τότε καλεῖσθαι τὸν Ἰωσήφ ὁ σαρκωθεὶς ἐβούλετο, ὅπως ἀπατηθῇ ὁ ἐνεδρεύων τὸ τῆς σωτηρίας τῆς ἡμετέρας μυστήριον», *Hom.* II.8.2-11.

In *Homily III* for the paschal vigil, Hesychius directed his congregation to revere the cross: “Let us stand fast by the saving cross in order that we might obtain the first-fruits of the gifts of Jesus.”¹⁷¹ It is clear from the suggestion that they literally stand beside (παραμείνωμεν) the cross, as well as from the rest of this homily, that he was not referring merely to the idea of the cross, a metonymy for Christ’s death and resurrection, but rather to an actual cross his congregation could see. In the early fifth century, the Holy Sepulcher complex contained a large commemorative cross in the square, as well as a relic of the true cross that was purportedly discovered on the site by Helen, the emperor Constantine’s mother, which inspired Constantine to build the church to house it. Hesychius could have been referring either to the relic or to the cross “symbol,” or perhaps both.¹⁷² In the following section, Hesychius linked the crosses in the Jerusalem church where he stood with the many representations of the cross in the forum in Constantinople (the “βασιλεύουσαν Ῥώμην”), reminding his congregation of the universal community of Christians who venerated the cross elsewhere.¹⁷³ Christians everywhere stood fast beside their symbols of the cross at Easter.

Preaching in the Holy Sepulcher of Jerusalem, Hesychius had the advantage of the relic’s presence to help him teach his congregation about the cross, so he devoted much of this homily to a discussion of the relic itself, which he called the “wood of the cross.” Hesychius used the word “wood” four times in a single apostrophe to the cross, wherein he

¹⁷¹ Παραμείνωμεν τοίνυν τῷ σωτηριώδει σταυρῷ, ἵνα τὰς πρώτας ἀπαρχὰς τῶν Ἰησοῦ δώρων ἀπενεγκώμεθα, *Hom.* III.1.7-9.

¹⁷² Cf. *Hom.* III.2.1-2, “Μή τις τοίνυν ἀπιστεῖτω τοῖς τοῦ σταυροῦ συμβόλοις, ἀλλὰ τὸ μακάριον καὶ τρισμακάριον ξύλον τοῦ σταυροῦ προσκυνεῖτω...”

¹⁷³ *Hom.* III.3.1-2, “Ἰδέ μοι, ἀγαπητέ, τὴν βασιλεύουσαν Ῥώμην σταυροῦ συμβόλοις ἐν μέσῳ τῆς ἀγορᾶς σεμνυνομένην.”

attributed to it the same saving power that he attributed to Christ in an earlier part of the sermon:

But, O wood [ξύλον], more magnificent than heaven, exceeding even the heavenly arches, O thrice-blessed wood, transporting our souls into heaven, O wood, bringing salvation to the world and routing the demonic army, O wood, hurling the bandit into paradise and putting him in the chorus of Christ...¹⁷⁴

Following this apostrophe, Hesychius directed the congregation a second time to stand by the cross, this time providing them with an example from scripture to identify with and thus follow the instruction more easily. “Let us also [with the bandit in the gospel] stand fast by the cross of the savior, speaking these very utterances: ‘Lord, remember me in your kingdom,’ in order that we also might become sharers in paradise and have enjoyment of the kingdom of heaven.”¹⁷⁵ The bandit, who was himself crucified on Jesus’ right side, ultimately had faith in the cross’s salvation. If ordinary Christians had difficulty believing that an execution device could save them, Hesychius presumed, how much more difficult would it have been for this man? Hesychius set him up as an example of someone who could easily have doubted the cross’s salvation, yet he had faith.

Elsewhere in the homily, Hesychius employed exegesis of familiar scriptural passages in order to explain his theology of the cross. He alluded to Paul’s epistles, preaching that Paul was not ashamed of the cross and crucifixion, and instead made himself a slave to the cross.¹⁷⁶ In his service to the cross, Paul, as one of Christianity’s earliest missionaries to

¹⁷⁴ Ἄλλ’ ὃ ξύλον μεγαλοπρέπεστερον οὐρανοῦ καὶ τὰς οὐρανίους ἀψίδας ὑπερβάλλον, ὃ ξύλον τρισμακάριστον τὰς ἡμετέρας ψυχὰς διαπορθμεῦον εἰς οὐρανόν, ὃ ξύλον τῷ κόσμῳ τὴν σωτηρίαν πορισάμενον καὶ στρατὸν διαβολικὸν ἐκδιῶξαν, ὃ ξύλον ληστήν εἰς παράδεισον ἀκοντίσαν καὶ μετὰ Χριστοῦ χορεύειν πεποιηκός, *Hom.* III.4.1-6.

¹⁷⁵ Παραμείνωμεν καὶ ἡμεῖς τῷ τοῦ σωτῆρος σταυρῷ, λέγοντες αὐτὰς τὰς φωνάς· «Κύριε, μνήσθητί μου ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ σου», ἵνα καὶ ἡμεῖς τοῦ παραδείσου μέτοχοι γενώμεθα καὶ βασιλείας οὐρανῶν ἀπολαύσωμεν, *Hom.* III.4.12-16.

¹⁷⁶ *Hom.* III.3.3-4; cf. 1 Cor. 1:23-24.

gentiles, “gathered together the churches of the world.”¹⁷⁷ In another exegetical passage, Hesychius equated the wood of the cross with another piece of scriptural wood, Moses’ staff from Exodus. In expelling the plagues from Egypt, he preached, Moses’ staff stopped the sins of men, which is what the cross did later, and “Pharaoh, pursuing Israel, is thrown into the sea, and then the devil was destroyed, and those adoring the savior are saved.”¹⁷⁸ These passages enabled Hesychius to repeat the same concept he had already taught earlier in the homily using images from scripture. This technique, Hesychius well knew, would have helped the audience cement the lessons in their memories by associating them with familiar stories.

Hesychius also explored the paradox of the cross in the two Presentation homilies. In his exegesis of the presentation narrative, he explained Simeon’s prophecy in terms of the cross. Upon receiving the child Jesus, Simeon said “This boy is established for the falling and rising of many in Israel, and to be a sign that will be opposed. And a sword will pierce your own soul so that considerations from many hearts may be revealed.”¹⁷⁹ The σημεῖον ἀντιλεγόμενον according to Hesychius was the cross.¹⁸⁰ In both Presentation homilies, then, he explained that the paradox of the cross encapsulated the contradictory nature of Christ by using repeated antithesis and multiple images to explain the same concept.¹⁸¹

In *Homily II*, Hesychius elaborated on the cross paradox in order to explain its implications for Christian faith. The next line of Simeon’s prophecy, “A sword will pierce your own soul so that the considerations of many hearts may be revealed,” allowed

¹⁷⁷ ἐν σταυροῦ ξύλω τὰς τῆς οἰκουμένης ἐκκλησίας διήγειρεν, *Hom.* III.3.6-7.

¹⁷⁸ Ἐκεῖ Φαραὼ καταποντοῦται τὸν Ἰσραὴλ καταδιώκων, ἐνταῦθα δὲ διάβολος καταλύεται, οἱ δὲ τοῦ σωτῆρος προσκυνηταὶ σφύζονται, *Hom.* III.3.10-12.

¹⁷⁹ Luke 2:34-5, quoted in *Hom.* I.7.5-6; 8.10-12 and *Hom.* II.10.1-2; 11.1-3.

¹⁸⁰ *Hom.* I.8.1 and II.10.2-3.

¹⁸¹ *Hom.* I.8 and *Hom.* II.10.

Hesychius to teach his congregation about the division that can accompany doubt within the framework of a familiar scriptural passage:

“A sword,” that is, doubt [ἡ διάκρισις], will bestride “your soul” on the occasion of the cross: for you will wonder looking at [him] hanging upon the cross, the one born without corruption, conceived without a man, not opening the uterus and having effected his own engendering, without suffering, without corruption.¹⁸²

Hesychius interpreted this sword as “doubt,” or “crisis” of faith occasioned by the crucifixion rather than strict opposition in an effort to teach his theology in a non-polemical manner. He recognized that ordinary Christians would have trouble believing that someone divinely conceived could die on a cross, but he presented the alternative to belief not as disbelief, but rather, as doubt. This enabled him to provide examples from within the scriptural narrative of people who doubted but ultimately had faith.¹⁸³

Besides developing his christology, Hesychius also took the opportunity in some homilies to explain the fundamentals of trinitarian theology, which, while less overtly controversial at the time, was still necessary to fully understand Christ’s nature.¹⁸⁴ In *Homily II*, he inserted a digression on the Trinity into his exegesis of the presentation narrative, at the moment when Simeon praised God:

He praised God the Father with the Son, the Son with the Spirit, since on the one hand the Spirit was in control [τὸ χρηματίζον], but on the other hand he [Simeon] was lifting the Son with his hands, who was content to appear in flesh and become an infant on account of us; and the Father himself was also effecting so many and such great mysteries.¹⁸⁵

¹⁸² «Ῥομφαία σοῦ τὴν ψυχὴν», ἡ διάκρισις, κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦ σταυροῦ διαβήσεται· θαυμάσεις γὰρ ὀρώσα ἐπὶ σταυροῦ κρεμάμενον τὸν χωρὶς φθορᾶς τεχθέντα, τὸν χωρὶς ἀνδρὸς συλληφθέντα, τὸν οὐκ ἀνοίξαντα τὴν μήτραν καὶ τὴν οἰκείαν γέννησιν ἀπαθῶς ἀφθάρτως ἐνεργήσαντα, *Hom.* II.11.3-7.

¹⁸³ See, for example, Cleophas and Mary Magdalen, whose doubt was mitigated after the resurrection, *Hom.* II.12. See also *Hom.* I.8.

¹⁸⁴ Wessel 2004, 2.

¹⁸⁵ Εὐλόγησεν τὸν θεὸν τὸν Πατέρα σὺν τῷ Υἱῷ, τὸν Υἱὸν σὺν τῷ Πνεύματι, ἐπειδὴ τὸ Πνεῦμα μὲν τὸ χρηματίζον ἐτύγχανεν, τὸν Υἱὸν δὲ μετὰ χειρᾶς ἐβάσταζεν, σαρκὶ φανῆναι καὶ βρέφος δι’ ἡμᾶς γενέσθαι εὐδοκήσαντα· ὁ δὲ Πατὴρ καὶ αὐτὸς ἐνεργῶν ἦν τὰ τοσαῦτα καὶ τηλικαῦτα μυστήρια, *Hom.* II.6.2-7.

The presentation narrative specifies that the Holy Spirit spoke to Simeon, and so Hesychius stressed the role of the Holy Spirit in Simeon's actions right from the beginning.¹⁸⁶

Hesychius did not attempt to explain the Holy Spirit on its own terms, however, but rather in terms of the Trinity and the role it played in the presentation narrative. Moreover, by explaining the Trinity in the context of his christology, Hesychius both reinforced his christological lesson by presenting it in a different way and allowed his audience to make sense of the Trinity as well as christology by thinking about those concepts within the already familiar narrative.

In *Homily V* on Mary, Hesychius explained the Trinity in terms of his theology of the virgin birth, by comparing Mary with another familiar scriptural figure, Noah's ark:

That was an ark of the living, but she is [an ark] of life; that was one of the corrupt living, but she is of uncorrupt life; that one carried Noah, but she [carried] the creator of Noah; that one had two and three levels, but she possessed complete the fullness of the Trinity, since the Spirit resided [in her] and the Father overshadowed [her] and the Son occupied her as her offspring. "For the holy spirit," [scripture] says, "will come upon you, and the power of the most high will overshadow you, wherefore the holy one having been begotten will be called the son of God."¹⁸⁷

Here, Hesychius employed a similar pedagogical tactic to that of *Homily II*: he discussed the Trinity only in terms of the role each person played in the narrative, in this case the virgin birth. By comparing Mary to the ark of Noah, Hesychius provided not one, but two familiar scriptural narratives with which his audience could fill in his explanation of the Trinity.

In *Homily VI*, also on the virgin Mary, Hesychius made use of *ethopoiia* in order to have Gabriel explain the concept of the Trinity to doubting Mary, who did not understand

¹⁸⁶ *Hom. II.1.*

¹⁸⁷ ἐκείνη ζῶων κιβωτός, αὕτη δὲ ζωῆς· ἐκείνη ζῶων φθαρτῶν, αὕτη δὲ ἀφθάρτου ζωῆς· ἐκείνη τὸν Νῶε, αὕτη δὲ τοῦ Νῶε τὸν ποιητὴν ἐβάστασεν· ἐκείνη διώροφα καὶ τριώροφα ἐκέκτητο, αὕτη δὲ ὅλον τῆς Τριάδος τὸ πλήρωμα, ἐπειδήπερ καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα ἐπεδήμει καὶ ὁ Πατὴρ ἐπεσκίασε καὶ ὁ Υἱὸς ἐνεσκήνου κυοφορούμενος· «Πνεῦμα γὰρ ἅγιον», φησὶν, «ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ σέ, καὶ δύναμις ὑψίστου ἐπισκιάσει σοι. Διὸ καὶ τὸ γεννώμενον ἅγιον κληθήσεται υἱὸς θεοῦ», *Hom. V.1.17-24.*

how she would conceive and bear a child without encountering a man and everything that involved.¹⁸⁸ “So what [did] Gabriel [say] to the doubting woman?”¹⁸⁹ Hesychius asked his congregation. He replied, as Gabriel:

That which I learned, I said; that which I heard, I say: “The Holy Spirit will come upon you, and the power of the most high will overshadow you: therefore even the begotten will be called Son of God,” in as much as he is the beginning and end of the whole creation, as the creator and craftsman of all things, as the father of the ages, as the begetter of the world, as the maker of all, as being older than the heavens, as the craftsman of the angels, as the sculptor of mankind, as the “savior of the lost.”¹⁹⁰

Like other statements of trinitarian theology he included in the homilies, Hesychius presented this one in the context of a narrative that was already familiar to the audience. Furthermore, Hesychius used this discussion of the relationship between the Father and the Son to reinforce what was for him the more pressing theological lesson, that of Christ’s natures.

It is clear from reading Hesychius’ homilies and imagining how they would have been preached that the most important theological lessons he sought to teach his congregation concerned Christ’s natures, the relationship between Christ and Mary and the virgin birth, and the relationship between Christ and the other persons of the Trinity. Even in the homilies composed for saints’ feasts that did not necessarily present a ready opportunity for teaching about christology, Hesychius found ways to insert some elements of theology either to reinforce a lesson he developed at Easter or another one of the major feasts, or to teach it anew to some audience members who only turned out to celebrate a festival of a saint.

¹⁸⁸ *Hom.* VI.2, see above.

¹⁸⁹ Τί οὖν ὁ Γαβριὴλ πρὸς αὐτὴν δυσπιστοῦσαν; *Hom.* VI.3.1.

¹⁹⁰ «Ὅπερ ἔμαθον εἶπον, ὅπερ ἤκουσα λέγω· «Πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ σέ, καὶ δύναμις ὑψίστου ἐπισκιάσει σοι· διὸ καὶ τὸ γεννώμενον ἅγιον κληθήσεται υἱὸς θεοῦ», ὥσπερ ὑπάρχων πρὸς οὐδὲν, ὡς πρὸς ὄν πάσης κτίσεως, ὡς κτίστης καὶ δημιουργὸς τῶν πάντων, ὡς τῶν αἰώνων πατήρ, ὡς τοῦ κόσμου γεννήτωρ, ὡς τοῦ παντός ποιητής, ὡς τῶν οὐρανῶν ἀρχαιότερος, ὡς τῶν ἀγγέλων δημιουργός, ὡς τῆς ἀνθρωπότητος πλάστης, ὡς «τῶν ἀπολλυμένων σωτήρ», *Hom.* VI.3.1-9.

The feast of Saint Stephen was celebrated in Jerusalem on December 27 in the presence of his relics that were translated to the church of Saint Sion in 415, and a large, local audience would have been in attendance at the feast.¹⁹¹ Hesychius' homily on Stephen praised the proto-martyr at length and recounted his acts and martyrdom. Since Stephen had been famous for refuting the Jews for their bad faith, however, Hesychius was able in this homily yet again to draw his audience's attention to the faithlessness of the Jews and insert a positive christological statement into the mouth of Stephen speaking back against the Jews:

“And [I saw] the son of man standing at the right hand of God,” meaning God the enfleshed [σαρκωθέντα] Word. For, from the time the son of God became son of man, from the time when he, at once from the Father and from a virgin, was placed at the boundary between earth and the heavens...¹⁹²

Hesychius employed one of his favorite rhetorical techniques from homilies that focused on conveying these christological lessons, *ethopoia*, to draw the audience's attention to this theological statement at the end of the homily on Stephen. Furthermore, he positioned the statement in opposition to the Jews in the story of Stephen's martyrdom in Acts of the Apostles, using a narrative with which the audience was already familiar and the example of a group of people whom he repeatedly characterized as people of bad faith. Thus, Hesychius taught his christology to ordinary Christians in a non-polemical manner even at festal liturgies whose primary purpose was to celebrate the life and death of a saint.

Homilies composed for saints' festivals provided Hesychius with other opportunities to teach ordinary Christians about their faith as well. By focusing on the life of a saint, or an exemplary individual, these homilies were particularly suitable for teaching ordinary

¹⁹¹ Aubineau 1978, 318-23.

¹⁹² «Καὶ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐστῶτα ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ θεοῦ», τὸν θεὸν Λόγον τὸν σαρκωθέντα λέγων. Ἀφ' οὗ γὰρ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου γεγένηται, ἀφ' οὗ ὁ ἐκ Πατρὸς αὐτὸς ἐκ παρθένου ἐνέστη τῇ γῆ καὶ τοῖς οὐρανοῖς ὄριον... *Hom.* IX.24.3-7. Hesychius also included a lengthy digression on the crucifixion and the saving power of the cross in this same homily, *Hom.* IX.14-18.

Christians how to act like good Christians. Hesychius was concerned not just that Christians held certain theological beliefs in their hearts, but that they demonstrated their faith to other members of their Christian community as well as those outside the Christian community. Faith was a relationship, and maintaining this relationship required certain conduct and actions. Hesychius used his homilies to teach his congregation how to demonstrate their faith actively, both in a ritual context and in their everyday lives.

In his festal homilies, Hesychius used examples from scripture and saints' lives to demonstrate how Christians of good faith interacted in their communities. In his two homilies on the Presentation, for instance, he described Simeon as "righteous and pious," which he wanted all Christians to be. In *Homily I*, Hesychius inserted a digression on the name and virtues of Simeon in his exegesis of the presentation narrative.

And what is the explanation of the signified name? "Listening to God," such that he obtained, from the dispensation of the spirit, a name suitable to his regime: for, wherever there is "listening to God," there is always obedience to law, keeping of commandments, a good course of life, focus on salvation for the end-times to come. A true man is ascribed with these characteristics, concerning whom [scripture] proposed these things respectively.¹⁹³

Hesychius defined appropriate Christian conduct by describing a character from a familiar scriptural narrative that was both read aloud earlier in the liturgy and the focus of the entire Presentation homily.

Another characteristic of Simeon that Hesychius highlighted was his selflessness with regard to his community. The gospel states that Simeon was "awaiting the consolation of Israel."¹⁹⁴ Hesychius interpreted that phrase thus:

¹⁹³ Καὶ τίς ἡ ἐρμηνεία τοῦ δηλωθέντος ὀνόματος; «Ἀκοὴ θεοῦ», ὥστε πρέπουσαν τῇ πολιτείᾳ τὴν προσηγορίαν ἐκ τῆς τοῦ πνεύματος οἰκονομίας ἐκτίσατο· ὅπου γὰρ «ἀκοὴ θεοῦ», ἐκεῖ πάντως ὑπακοὴ νόμου, τήρησις ἐντολῶν, ἀγαθοῦ βίου δρόμος, σκοπὸς σωτηρίας εἰς τέλος προσερχόμενος· ἐν οἷς ὁ ἀληθινὸς χαρακτηρίζεται ἄνθρωπος, περὶ οὗ ταῦτα κατὰ λόγον ἐπήγαγεν, *Hom.* I.4.18-24.

¹⁹⁴ Luke 2:25.

This is the focus of a just man, to seek not something of his own, but something of another and of the many, to be involved in the common salvation and not his own enjoyment.¹⁹⁵

The example of Simeon also enabled Hesychius to teach his congregation how to act within the real community of Jerusalem, in addition to the broader community of all Christians.

This, as he pointed out, had implications for ordinary Christians' salvation. Christians needed to act morally with respect to other people as well. Moreover, Hesychius implied that salvation was a community effort, and that the moral conduct of all Christians was the goal to which they should aspire.

In *Homily XIV* on Saint Procopius, Hesychius presented Procopius as a moral example for Christians to follow. He began the homily by comparing Procopius to a number of scriptural heroes with respect to their virtue. The rapid-fire association of the saint with Paul, John, Elias of Thebes, Samuel, Samson, David, Noah, Abraham, and Isaac in the first section had the effect of overwhelming the audience, thereby emphasizing Procopius' overwhelming virtue.¹⁹⁶ Over the course of the next two sections, Hesychius developed comparisons between Procopius and Jacob, Moses, Enoch, Job, and Abel in order to set up multiple examples, many of them familiar to the audience, of possessors of given virtues he wanted his congregation to emulate.¹⁹⁷

Later in the same homily, Hesychius listed the most important virtues in terms of the reward of salvation in the afterlife. With each virtue, he paired an image associated with salvation:

¹⁹⁵ «Καὶ ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος δίκαιος καὶ εὐλαβής, προσδεχόμενος παράκλησιν τοῦ Ἰσραήλ»: τοῦτο δικαίου σκοπὸς μὴ ζητεῖν τὸ ἑαυτοῦ, ἀλλὰ τὸ τοῦ ἑτέρου καὶ τῶν πολλῶν, τῆς κοινῆς σωτηρίας μὴ τῆς ἰδίας ἀπολαύσεως γίνεσθαι, *Hom.* I.5.1-4.

¹⁹⁶ *Hom.* XIV.1.10-20.

¹⁹⁷ *Hom.* XIV.2-3.

But if you desire purple raiments, exercise moderation. If linen is important to you, perfect justice. Train yourself in patience: it is a kingly necklace. Work at alms: for its cloth is woven upon the earth but is cut in heaven. If you are eager for a lofty crown to be bound to your head, pursue humility: for nothing is more esteemed by God than this.¹⁹⁸

These images would have helped the audience to remember the virtues by enabling them to situate each image within existing frameworks they might have had. Further, Hesychius' use of both athletic and weaving metaphors encompassed masculine and feminine stereotypes, demonstrating that he tried to reach both men and women equally with his lesson about virtuous conduct.¹⁹⁹

In *Homily XV*, which Hesychius preached during Lent, he instructed his congregation in moral conduct during a larger discussion on how to fast. Hesychius began this homily with a definition of fasting, which he immediately expanded from the ritual fasting from food during Lent to “fasting according to God,” a general fasting from sinful action at all times:

Fasting according to God is the root and foundation of pious people, which was enjoined along with reverence and holy prayers and alms. For God did not wish for abstinence from food and water, but rather abstinence from wicked deeds.... Let us fast, beloved people, a fast suitable to God, concerning which the Lord said: “And when you fast, anoint your head with oil.” Through good works and alms, “and wash your hands,” stripping off all filth of sin.²⁰⁰

Hesychius spent the rest of the homily developing multiple examples from both Testaments of scripture of good “fasters” for Christians to emulate and bad “fasters” (people who went

¹⁹⁸ Σὺ δὲ εἰ πορφύρας ἐπιθυμεῖς, τὴν σωφροσύνην ἄσκησον. Εἰ μέλει σοι βύσσου, δικαιοσύνην κατόρθωσον. Γυμνάζου τὴν ὑπομονήν· βασιλικὸν γὰρ ὑπάρχει περιδέριον. Ἐργάζου τὴν ἐλεημοσύνην· ὁ γὰρ ταύτης ἰστός ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς μὲν ὑφαίνεται, ἐν οὐρανῷ δὲ τέμνεται. Εἰ σπεύδεις τὸν ὑψηλὸν τῆ κεφαλῇ περιδήσασθαι στέφανον, μετέρχου τὴν ταπεινώσιν· οὐδὲν γὰρ ταύτης ἐνδοξότερον παρὰ τῷ θεῷ τέτακται, *Hom.* XIV.5.21-8.

¹⁹⁹ Hesychius also employed this technique to instruct his congregation on what not to do, this time pairing each vice not with an image, but with a familiar maxim from scripture: *Hom.* XVI.6.1-9.

²⁰⁰ Ῥίζα καὶ θεμέλιος τῶν εὐσεβῶν ἢ κατὰ θεὸν νηστεία, ἢ μετὰ εὐλαβείας καὶ ἀγίων εὐχῶν καὶ ἐλεημοσυνῶν ἐπιτελουμένη. Οὐ γὰρ ἀποχὴν ἄρτου καὶ ὕδατος βούλεται ὁ θεός, ἀλλ' ἀποχὴν πράξεων πονηρῶν... Νηστεύσωμεν, ἀγαπητοί, νηστείαν τὴν θεῷ πρέπουσαν, περὶ ἧς φησιν ὁ κύριος· «Σὺ δὲ ὅταν νηστεύῃς, ἄλειψόν σου τὴν κεφαλὴν» δι<ὰ> καλῶν ἔργων καὶ ἐλεημοσυνῶν, «καὶ τὸ πρόσωπόν <σου> νίψαι», περιαιρῶν πᾶσαν ῥυπαρίαν ἁμαρτίας, *Hom.* XV.1.1-4; quotations from Matthew 6:1-7.

through the motions but then acted sinfully), whom Christians should take as negative examples.

It was not enough for Christians to demonstrate their faith by means of moral conduct, however. In the context of controversy in which Hesychius preached to his congregation, it was also important for ordinary Christians to be able to recite an orthodox statement of their faith. An acceptance of the statement of faith (creed, or σύμβολον) was an integral part of the baptismal ritual, initiating new Christians into the faith. After that, baptized Christians recited the Creed together each time they celebrated the Eucharistic liturgy.

By the early fifth century, Hesychius could not rely on all ordinary Christians in his congregation having an understanding of, or even really knowing, the Creed, so he found ways to work an explanation of it into one of his paschal homilies, *Homily IV*. In this homily, which he preached to a large and diverse audience on Easter morning, Hesychius called attention to the moment when they were to say that Christ and the Father are of the same substance [ὁμοούσιος]:

And you will say [ἔρεϊς] that this one and that one are the same, not one and the other, nor one in another, nor one through another: for the enfleshed Word, being one [εἶς] brought together these qualities and those qualities into a unity [ἓν] as he had wished with an unutterable word.²⁰¹

By explaining in the homily that his congregation was about to say that Christ's divine nature was the same substance as God, he increased the pedagogical effectiveness of the recitation of the Creed itself. When the congregation began to say the Creed following the homily, they would have thought back to this explanation. Moreover, by preaching that Christ's

²⁰¹ Τὸν αὐτὸν δὲ τοῦτον κάκεϊνον ἐρεῖς, οὐκ ἄλλον καὶ ἄλλον, οὐδὲ ἄλλον ἐν ἄλλῳ, οὐδὲ ἄλλον δι' ἄλλου· εἶς γὰρ ὢν ὁ σαρκῶθεις Λόγος εἰς ἓν ταῦτα κάκεϊνα ὡς ἠβουλήθη ἀρρήτῳ λόγῳ συνήγαγεν, *Hom. IV.3.1-4*.

enfleshment brought together the Father and the Son, he deployed the statement of trinitarian theology in the Creed in the service of his christology.

In several other homilies, Hesychius included instructions on how to celebrate the rituals of various feasts, including Easter, as if the ritual itself were not enough to teach all ordinary Christians the correct practice. The ritual of the liturgy was indeed pedagogical, as I demonstrate in the following chapter, but in some instances Hesychius thought it was necessary to explain in the homily how Christians should enact certain rituals as well.

In *Homily III*, preached at the nighttime paschal vigil, Hesychius began by instructing his congregation on how they should celebrate the vigil:

Let us celebrate such a sacred night with sacred torches, awakening a godly song and singing out a heavenly hymn. “The sun of justice,” our lord Jesus Christ, lit up even the present day in the cycle of the world: he rose up by means of the cross; he saved the faithful.²⁰²

There were three ingredients necessary for celebrating the paschal vigil in Jerusalem: light, cross, and hymns. By this point in the liturgy, the congregation already would have seen the torches lit at the beginning of the service and sung along with the hymns and venerated the relic of the cross.²⁰³ Now, Hesychius told his congregation that each of those rituals was necessary for celebrating Christ’s resurrection and salvation of the faithful. Christians were to demonstrate their faith in the resurrection by celebrating it in the appropriate way.

Hesychius placed this exhortation at the beginning of the homily—the part most likely to be heard before bored and tired members of the audience stopped listening—to ensure that as

²⁰² Τὴν ἱερὰν ταύτην νύκτα δαδουχίαις ἱεραῖς πανηγυρίσωμεν, μέλος ἔνθεον ἐγείροντες καὶ ὕμνον οὐράνιον ἐξάδοντες. «Ὁ τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἥλιος», ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, καὶ τὴν παροῦσαν ἡμέραν τῷ κύκλῳ τῆς οἰκουμένης κατεφώτισεν, διὰ σταυροῦ ἀνέτειλεν, τοὺς πιστοὺς διέσωσεν, *Hom.* III.1.9-14.

²⁰³ See below, Chapter Three.

much of his congregation as possible would know how to celebrate the resurrection, and that Christ's resurrection was responsible for their salvation.

Homily IX on Saint Stephen included similar instruction on how to celebrate that saint's festival. As in the paschal homily, Hesychius placed the exhortation right at the beginning:

For Stephen, let all the earth carry out the celebration: for he cultivated the whole earth in succession with words and filled the world with sacred laws for all people. He sowed everywhere beliefs of piety, he allowed all the churches to strive towards the light of his teaching. And just as the sun, rising up from some single corner in heaven, was allotted to light up the whole visible foundation, so the Crown [Στέφανος] of graces, flashing lightning out of Jerusalem, filled whole cities and countrysides, nations and peoples, tribes and tongues, with inextinguishable knowledge of the divine.²⁰⁴

Preaching in the presence of Stephen's relics in Jerusalem, Hesychius first needed to tell his congregation that everyone on earth, together, should celebrate Stephen's feast, even though they did not have access to the relics of the saint. Hesychius took this opportunity at the outset to remind his congregation that they were part of a universal church that spanned the entire known world. In Jerusalem, it was perhaps easy for ordinary Christians to imagine that theirs was the only Christian community, since they worshiped in the place where Jesus lived and died and among so many relics.

Hesychius acknowledged the special status of Jerusalem in the next section, stating that Stephen reached out from Jerusalem to all other churches, and therefore the present inhabitants of Jerusalem must show themselves as leaders in worship to other Christian communities throughout the world. He told his congregation that the reason they celebrated

²⁰⁴ Στεφάνῳ πᾶσα μὲν ἡ γῆ τελείτω τὴν πανήγυριν· πᾶσαν γὰρ ἐφεξῆς τοῖς λόγοις ἐγεώργησεν, καὶ νόμων ἱερῶν πανδημί τὴν οἰκουμένην ἐνέπλησεν. Ἐσπειρεν πανταχοῦ τῆς εὐσεβείας τὰ δόγματα, ὅλαις φιλοτιμεῖσθαι ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῷ φωτὶ τῆς αὐτοῦ διδασκαλίας ἔδωκεν. Καὶ καθάπερ ἐκ μιᾶς τινος γωνίας τῆς κατ' οὐρανὸν ἀνατέλλων ὁ ἥλιος φωτίζειν ὅλην τὴν κτίσιν τὴν ὀρωμένην ἔλαχεν, οὕτως ἐξ Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἀστράγας ὁ τῶν χαρίτων Στέφανος πόλεις ὅλας καὶ χώρας, ἔθνη καὶ λαούς, φυλάς καὶ γλώσσας ἀσβέστου θεολογίας ἐνέπλησεν, *Hom. IX.1.*

so many festivals of Stephen was because Jerusalem was the origin of Stephen's teaching to the whole world, and so Jerusalem's Christian community must be the origin of the celebrations of Stephen's feast.²⁰⁵ Hesychius enumerated the various rituals of the festival in order to make it clear that these very rituals were acts of faith for the Christians of Jerusalem:

From there comes the frequent spectacles of celebrations for him in our community, and very often we crown his bridal chamber, we go up to his wine press leaping all the way, and we sing a marriage tune while speaking a chant of grape harvest.²⁰⁶

Most ordinary Christians would have understood these celebrations more as fun than rituals of worship or demonstrations of their faith. They probably associated them more with the vintage than the martyrdom of Stephen. Hesychius took this festival as an opportunity to teach his congregation explicitly that the festivals in which they were already engaging were in fact ways of demonstrating their faith.

Besides instructing his congregation in ritual practice, Hesychius also instructed them how to feel in certain situations. Emotional response was another important way Christians could demonstrate their faith. Affective responses to the liturgy and scriptural and theological events formed the final set of pedagogical goals for Hesychius.

It is impossible for us to know how ordinary Christians in the fifth century felt at certain moments in the liturgy or when they heard certain passages from scripture. Indeed, it was impossible for Hesychius to know how all of his congregants felt. Even those who outwardly expressed emotion at church might not have been accurately broadcasting what they felt inside. Nevertheless, emotions were an important part of community interaction in late antiquity and were integral to the way people discussed and experienced the Christian

²⁰⁵ *Hom.* IX.2.

²⁰⁶ "Ὅθεν αὐτῷ συχνὰ παρ' ἡμῖν τῶν ἑορτῶν τὰ θέατρα, καὶ πολλάκις αὐτοῦ τὴν παστάδα στεφανοῦμεν, συνεχῶς τὴν ληνὸν σκιρτῶντες ἀναβαίνομεν, καὶ μέλος ᾄδομεν γαμικόν, ᾠδὴν ἐπιλήνιον λέγοντες, *Hom.* IX.3.1-4.

faith.²⁰⁷ For Hesychius, having the appropriate emotional response to particular aspects of the Christian faith was part of belonging to the catholic and orthodox Christian community. He made time in his homilies to instruct his congregations how they should feel and, more importantly for their earthly community, how they should express their feelings.

Joy was the emotion Hesychius taught most, which is not surprising since it also featured in the pedagogy of Jesus in Matthew, who concluded the Beatitudes with the directive, “Rejoice and be glad, for your reward will be great in heaven.”²⁰⁸ Joy became a particularly Christian emotion, and even ascetics who were instructed to suffer reported that they felt joy in their suffering because it brought them closer to God.²⁰⁹ Regardless of how each individual in the congregation understood joy and experienced the emotion of joy, Hesychius promoted joy within the Christian faith.

At the paschal vigil, in the midst of viewing and discussing the cross that was the instrument of Christ’s death, Hesychius taught his congregation that they should not weep or be horrified over the execution, but rather that they should be glad [εὐφραίνεται] about the victory of Christ’s resurrection. He began the homily with a reference to this victory,²¹⁰ and the first sentence of the penultimate section circled back to the victory by adopting the same structure as the opening sentence and repeating the key word “[of] victory,”²¹¹ thus signaling the importance of what he said next: “For today the devil was defeated on account of him who was crucified, and our race is gladdened on account of him who rose. For the day today

²⁰⁷ See Rosenwein 2006, 16-20 for a critique of recent scholarship that continues to promote the idea that premodern Christians did not exhibit complex emotions.

²⁰⁸ Matthew 5:12, trans. *NABRE*.

²⁰⁹ See Rosenwein 2006, 95-7 on joy and misery in a sixth-century monastic context.

²¹⁰ *Hom.* III.1.5-7.

²¹¹ Νικητήριον, *Hom.* III.5.1-2.

shouts at my awakening...”²¹² Finally, in the first sentence of the conclusion, Hesychius made the uncharacteristically straightforward, and therefore emphatic, statement, “This day is one for proclaiming joys.”²¹³ Although the effectiveness of this lesson is impossible to detect, the lesson itself could not have been clearer. All Christians must rejoice on Easter. This is a feast for proclaiming joy.

Hesychius also instructed his congregation to respond with joy when listening to certain narratives from scripture. As I have discussed in a previous section, Hesychius presented the Magi in In *Homily VI* on the *Theotokos* as an example of good faith. The Magi demonstrated their faith not just by refusing to question the virgin birth, but also by feeling joy at the encounter with Jesus and Mary. Hesychius preached:

But coming upon the cave with their gifts in silence, bringing reverence fit for a king and God, they were apt to turn back on their way with joy, becoming for the gentiles the first-fruits of the knowledge of God.²¹⁴

As with the resurrection, joy was the appropriate emotion Christians should exhibit when they encountered the infant Jesus, who was God but was born in flesh from a woman. By inserting this injunction to feel joy into a narrative with a familiar story and characters to whom the audience could relate, Hesychius could more effectively incite feelings of actual joy in listeners who became emotionally invested in the narrative. Indeed, one of the goals of rhetoric was to persuade by means of creating an emotional response in the audience. Hesychius taught the emotions appropriate to specific Christian situations by drawing those emotions out through the rhetoric of his homilies.

²¹² Σήμερον γὰρ ὁ διάβολος διὰ τὸν σταυρωθέντα ἠττήθη, τὸ δὲ ἡμέτερον γένος εὐφραίνεται διὰ τὸν ἀναστάντα. Βοῶ γὰρ ἡ σήμερον ἡμέρα τῆ ἐγέρσει μου, *Hom.* III.5.2-4.

²¹³ Αὕτη ἡ ἡμέρα χαρᾶς εὐαγγελισμός, *Hom.* III.6.1.

²¹⁴ Ἀλλὰ μετὰ δώρων σιγῇ καταλαβόντες τὸ σπήλαιον, μετὰ τὴν ἐρώτησιν τῷ βασιλεῖ καὶ θεῷ πρεπῶδες προσκομίσαντες σέβας, πρὸς τὴν ἐνεγκαμένην μετὰ χαρᾶς ἦσαν φιλυπόστροφοι, ἀπαρχὴ θεογνωσίας ἀναδειχθέντες τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, *Hom.* VI.4.15-19.

The centrality of joy in Hesychius' homilies reveals the centrality of Christ's resurrection in general in his pedagogy. Hesychius did not often instruct his congregation on how to feel, but when he did it was to feel the positive emotion of joy. Teaching ordinary Christians to associate christology—in the virgin birth and the resurrection—with joy also had the effect of getting them to understand christology in positive terms. Hesychius' presentation of christology to this congregation was not only non-controversial, it also felt good.

Conclusion

A careful examination of Hesychius' homilies and the rhetorical techniques he employed within them shows the lessons he thought it was most important to teach his congregation and the various rhetorical means he used to make sure they reached the largest possible group of Christians. Despite Hesychius' involvement in the Council of Ephesus and continued christological controversy during the years between Ephesus and Chalcedon, his presentation of Christianity to his congregation was remarkably non-controversial. By presenting his christology in positive terms, he was able to make an argument for a Christ whose human and divine natures were closely intertwined while simultaneously promoting the notion of a universal church among his local Christian community. He primarily conveyed these lessons not by engaging with abstract theology, which elite church leaders used to converse with each other, but through rhetoric and engagement with scriptural narratives.

In addition to the theological lessons, Hesychius also taught his congregations to demonstrate their faith by showing them how to act and feel, both in a ritual, liturgical context and in their everyday lives in their communities. Further, by teaching the ordinary

Christians of Jerusalem that they belonged to a church that radiated outward from Jerusalem to all corners of the known world, and that demonstrations of their faith asserted their belonging to such a community, he was able on a micro level to work towards the same church unity that the ecumenical councils strove for at a macro level. Hesychius' pedagogy complemented rather than contradicted his involvement in the Council of Ephesus, while in his view cultivating a stronger faith in ordinary Christians than if he had engaged them with controversy.

Chapter 3

Learning through the Liturgy: The Experiential Pedagogy of the Jerusalem Liturgy

In the evening on the Saturday before Easter, all Christians in Jerusalem assembled in the Martyrium, or the basilica built by Constantine on Golgotha, where Jesus died and was buried.²¹⁵ Passersby on the row of shops that abutted on the entrance to the Holy Sepulcher complex might have wandered in when they saw something going on, or they might simply have observed the beginnings of a great celebration.²¹⁶ The bishop, who had been singing a song in the smaller church of the Anastasis, or resurrection, ascended to the Martyrium and there, before all the congregation, he lit a candle.²¹⁷ This act signaled the beginning of the paschal vigil. In almost total darkness, with the only light coming from the candles and the stars in the night sky, lectors and presbyters read aloud twelve scriptural lessons. Between the readings from Genesis, Exodus, the prophets, Kings, and Job, everyone knelt to pray. Following the twelve lessons, but preceding the introduction of the newly-baptized Christians into the church, the bishop and several presbyters took their place in the front of the “great church,” as the Martyrium was sometimes called, and preached.

It was in this setting that the ordinary Christians of Jerusalem received Hesychius’ first paschal homily. Many were tired, some having journeyed from the countryside to celebrate Easter in the city, others having come from even farther afield as pilgrims. Even

²¹⁵ *JL* 44.

²¹⁶ Eusebius, *VC*, III.39.

²¹⁷ Renoux 1961 notes that another manuscript of the Armenian Lectionary of Jerusalem instead reports that the bishop lights a lamp in the Anastasis and then ascends to the Martyrium to light three candles, 375, n.2.

those who traveled no farther than their local residences a hundred yards away might have been made weary by the repeated standing and kneeling that accompanied twelve scriptural readings, as well as by the late hour, the absence of light, and the intoxicating fragrance of the candles and holy oil used to anoint the initiates. In spite of their weariness, or perhaps because of it, Christians in the congregation might have also felt a sense of seriousness and a mystical solemnity that suggested an encounter with the divine.

Hesychius' short homily, interjected at this moment in the vigil, was meant in part to explain the feelings elicited by the sensory experience of the liturgy. At the same time, the visual, aural, olfactory, tactile, gustatory, and kinetic elements of the liturgy helped educate the Christians in the congregation and reinforce their understanding of and relationship to the divine as well as to their Christian community. Preachers were conscious of the pedagogical value that visuality and aurality added to their sermons, and they deployed the sensory aspects of the liturgy to aid ordinary Christians' understanding of their lessons. Sensory experience was an effective means for teaching the ordinary Christians of Jerusalem central lessons of Christian community and the hierarchical structures that allowed that community to function. They taught Christians that the church was the place to encounter the divine, and that this encounter happened together with the Christian community and under the leadership of a cleric.

The experiential pedagogy of the liturgy was perhaps the only way for preachers to teach members of the congregation who could not hear, understand, or adequately pay attention to their homilies. More important than their ability to reach the illiterate, however, was this type of pedagogy's ability to teach lessons that preachers could not convey with words. By enacting rituals of worship and community formation, preachers were also

teaching these rituals and their importance as well as the importance of the relationships these rituals reinforced.²¹⁸ Hesychius and other late antique preachers therefore relied on the implicitly pedagogical aspects of the liturgy to teach their congregations about the unity and universality of Christian communities and the hierarchical structures that held them together.

The Multi-Sensory Liturgy

Consistent with the Greco-Roman Mediterranean culture that they inhabited, early and late antique Christian preachers and theologians privileged sight over the other, “baser” senses as the most perfect of the senses and the primary means by which Christians comprehended God.²¹⁹ Sight was also considered to be the most important sense for memory. Cicero wrote in his handbook on oratory that sight was the only way people could experience complete images, and thus they were better retained in the memory. Images formed through other senses such as hearing or smell were necessarily incomplete.²²⁰ Therefore, sight was also the most important sense from a pedagogical standpoint. Preaching was as much a visual act as it was aural; like the Greek and Roman orators in whose tradition they operated, Christian preachers gestured and pointed and expressed themselves visually along with the words they uttered.²²¹

²¹⁸ By “ritual” I refer to the set, repeated (and repeatable) religious actions that took place within the liturgy as well as the liturgy itself, inasmuch as it was an action that people performed as part of their interaction with a deity. I specifically exclude the connotation of ritual as symbolically communicating something else and the idea that ritual in religion opposes itself to an affective spiritual experience, both of which are the product of modern social scientific theory and do not accurately describe the way ancient and medieval people defined, understood, and performed rituals. See Asad 1993 and then Buc 2001 for a developing theory of premodern ritual. For potential pedagogical functions of ritual, see Asad 1993, 63.

²¹⁹ For late antique visual theory, see Frank 2000, 114-18. See also Morales 2004.

²²⁰ Cicero, *De orat.* 2.87-88 cited in Frank 2000, 127-8.

²²¹ See Aldrete 1999 on gesturing in oratory. See Kennedy 1983 on Christian preaching as a form of classical oratory.

The hierarchy of the senses did not exist quite so much in practice as it did in theory, however. Abundant tactile metaphors used to describe sight in late antique Christian literature make clear how closely related touch and sight were in their imagination.²²² The liturgy as a whole was a multi-sensory experience that afforded great importance to touch and taste at some of the most solemn ritual moments.²²³ Even though preachers favored sight and hearing as pedagogical modes, they recognized that the other senses played just as critical a role in the experience of the liturgy.

The ears were the place through which lessons were explicitly directed. In the liturgy, scriptures were read aloud, prayers were uttered, hymns were sung, and sermons were spoken. Not everything that came out of a celebrant's mouth was taken up by the congregation, however, and late antique preachers knew this.²²⁴ People who stood in the back, or perhaps on the porch of the church during crowded liturgies, and people who came to the city from the countryside—or to Jerusalem from the other side of the Mediterranean—and were not fluent in Greek, could not have been expected to grasp much or any of the sermon. Even members of the congregation who sat close enough to the front of the church to hear well and also had a fluent understanding of the language being spoken could not have been expected to catch everything. Yet, the aural element of the liturgy could teach ordinary Christians how to enact their faith and to understand their place in a Christian community simply by being performed and heard, if not actually understood.²²⁵ Hymns and prayers, and the authoritative voice of the clergy, taught all Christians, regardless of whether or not they

²²² Frank 2000, 123-31. Late antique rabbis also understood sight and touch to be closely intertwined. See Neis 2013, 25.

²²³ On the multi-sensory liturgy, see Caseau 2014. Mathews 1971 is still the most comprehensive overview of the early Byzantine liturgy.

²²⁴ Preachers often complained in their sermons about members of their congregations not paying attention. See Maxwell 2006, 94-5.

²²⁵ On the role of aurality in general in late antique Christian worship and prayer, see Harrison 2013, *passim*.

understood the words being spoken, that they encountered God through a communal experience in the liturgy and in so doing developed a sense of belonging to their local and universal Christian communities.

Preachers such as Hesychius who were trained in classical rhetoric recognized the importance that the visuality of the liturgy had for their pedagogy—that is, everything the congregation perceived by means of their sense of sight.²²⁶ Churches and their decorations, as well as the ritual objects used for the liturgy, were manipulated and sometimes even constructed in part in order to aid Christians' understanding through sight and memory. Preachers interacted with existing sights in order to illustrate their preaching, by pointing and by other means. Even when preachers did not purposely interact with their visual surroundings, congregants still beheld the sights of the church and viewed the performance of liturgical rituals. These sights both enhanced the lessons of preachers' homilies and worked independently to teach congregations about hierarchy and authority within their church community.

Of the more bodily senses, smell pervaded the late antique liturgy from the late fourth century onward, whether in the form of incense or scented holy oils.²²⁷ Scented oil tended only to be used for specific rituals of initiation, so ordinary Christians did not encounter them regularly.²²⁸ Evidence for incense in late antiquity also suggests that ordinary Christians encountered it only sporadically. The ritual use of incense did not become formalized in the liturgy until well after late antiquity, but literary and material sources show it was in use in

²²⁶ I employ the term “visuality” in this broad sense to refer to “sights,” which include but are not limited to art objects and other things variously described as “visual culture” with Neis 2013, Chapter 1, esp. 18-26.

²²⁷ For a comprehensive work on smell in late antique Christianity, see Harvey 2006. See also Beatrice Caseau's unpublished dissertation from 1994 on smell in the ancient and early Byzantine world. See the essays in Bradley 2015 for a contextualization of ancient and late antique smell.

²²⁸ Harvey 2006, 66-75.

some places and at special ceremonies, such as Easter.²²⁹ In contrast to these less-frequent scents, candles constantly accompanied various aspects of the liturgy, providing not just light, but a smell.²³⁰ The combination of scents from ritually prescribed combustibles contributed to the pedagogical experience of the liturgy by signaling important events and the presence of the divine in the Gospel reading and the Eucharist.

Taste was afforded a special place in the liturgy which, since its earliest iterations, included a communal meal. In the late antique liturgy of the Eucharist, the clergy as well as lay baptized Christians ate the bread and drank the wine of communion, tasting what had ritually become Christ's body and blood. Fourth-century catechists attempted in their sermons to explain how Christians should see and taste the Eucharistic wine as blood by perceiving it with their inner, "spiritual" senses rather than their physical senses.²³¹ Ordinary people who were raised Christian in the fifth and sixth century, however, did not have the advantage of such detailed instructions on how to taste the Eucharist properly. Rather, ordinary Christians experienced taste as part of the liturgy and the act and experience of tasting contributed individually to each Christian's understanding of the sacrament.

Touch was a special sense in late antique Christian thought. Although it, like smell and taste, was historically rendered one of the baser "bodily" senses, it was given greater significance in Christian piety. Modern scholars have attributed the desire to "touch the holy" to the increase in the transfer and display of relics all over the Mediterranean, as well as at pilgrimage sites like Jerusalem.²³² Moreover, the haptic metaphors that ancient philosophers

²²⁹ Caseau 2007 notes that incense came into use for purificatory purposes in churches in the fourth century. See also Mathews 1971, 138-9 and Harvey 2006, 75-7.

²³⁰ Harvey 2006, 76.

²³¹ Frank 2001, 626-8.

²³² Frank 2000, 118-21; On the rise in importance of Jerusalem as a pilgrimage site, see Wilken 1992.

and theologians consistently used to explain sight made touch an integral part of late antique Christian visuality.²³³ The late-fourth-century pilgrim Egeria's description of Christians touching the cross relic at Jerusalem "with their eyes" attests to the interrelationship between sight and touch in late antiquity.²³⁴ Yet, as Egeria went on to mention, Christians also touched the cross relic with their hands and mouths.²³⁵ Whether Christians were touching relics, other holy objects, or each other, touch played an integral role in liturgical rituals that taught and reinforced values of Christian community.

The materiality of churches and the ritual objects, including relics and the Eucharist, in use in the liturgy is significant for attempting to understand the sensory experience of the liturgy and its pedagogical function. Although, as I argue in this chapter, the sights, sounds, smells and other sensations helped preachers teach certain lessons about Christianity, they were themselves derived from material objects that communicated materially with their beholders.²³⁶ In some instances, the materiality of a given object might have aided the lesson for which it was deployed, such as light reflecting and concentrating in the center of an apse mosaic of Christ, highlighting his divinity. In other instances, materiality could have obstructed the same lessons, such as the bad smell and smokiness of torches or candles lit to signal the victory of Christ at the paschal vigil. The associations that these material objects afforded were as varied as the individual members of the congregation who experienced them. Bearing this consideration in mind, preachers nevertheless used the experiential elements of the liturgy for pedagogical purposes. Thus, when a preacher called attention to the materiality of an object, as Hesychius did with the cross relic, he both anticipated

²³³ Frank 2000, 123-6.

²³⁴ Egeria, 37.3.

²³⁵ *Ibid.*, 37.1-3.

²³⁶ See Bynum 2011, Chapter 1 on considering materiality in premodern Christian worship.

possible objections to the sacrality of an ancient bit of wood and mobilized the relic's woodiness to teach his congregation more effectively about the humanity of Christ.²³⁷

The rest of this chapter examines how Hesychius and other preachers relied on the sensory experience of the liturgy in order to teach. The same theological lessons Hesychius presented verbally in his homilies were greatly aided by the extra-homiletic experience. Lessons regarding Christian communities, both local and universal, as well as the hierarchical relationships within those communities, however, were perhaps better taught through this experiential pedagogy than through words.

Theological Lessons

In his homilies, Hesychius consciously referenced different visual and aural elements of the liturgy in order to draw attention to important theological lessons he taught in his homilies. Each homily was preached on a specific day at a specific feast, for which scriptural readings, psalms, and sometimes special rituals were prescribed. Furthermore, Hesychius preached in specifically prescribed venues that were decorated certain ways and offered their own sets of visual experiences. As classically trained orator, Hesychius deployed the sights, sounds, and other sensations of the liturgy to illustrate and reinforce his homilies.

Psalms were an easy way for church leaders to teach and reinforce theological lessons in the minds of ordinary Christians. Many Christians knew frequently-used psalms by heart, singing them not only in church, but as part of their everyday life, whether in cities or out in the fields.²³⁸ Church fathers writing about psalms discussed their pedagogical value as well as their ability to give pleasure through beauty. The fourth-century author of a treatise *On the*

²³⁷ *Hom. III.*

²³⁸ Harrison 2011, 207, 212-14.

Usefulness of Hymns wrote that while sounds entered through the ear and created a mental image that was remembered, songs were more easily remembered because their beauty brought pleasure to the listener.²³⁹ Late antique Christian authors, who were also preachers, agreed that song was an effective way to package Christian lessons for those who were weak or ignorant,²⁴⁰ and that the way the psalms were sung caught the attention of listeners in a way that speaking could not.²⁴¹

In addition to prescribing which psalms should be sung at each feast, the Jerusalem Lectionary also lists which verse was to function as the antiphon.²⁴² Antiphonal singing has its origins in ancient Greek hymnody, and simply refers to the “response” in a “call-and-response” model of singing.²⁴³ If some members of the congregation did not know the verse at the beginning of the psalm, they would have learned it—and might have sung along with the rest of the group—by the end. Late antique Christian authors were aware of the heightened concentration people experienced as they physically tried to sing with a group, and antiphonal singing required even more concentration, thus focusing their minds on the words and on the function of the psalm as a prayer to God.²⁴⁴ Furthermore, the repetition of the single verse ensured that that verse would stick in the memories of the Christians singing it.

Hesychius frequently alluded to the prescribed antiphon in his homilies, reminding his congregation of a line of song to help them remember the lesson he was preaching. For

²³⁹ Nicetas of Remesiana, *De utilitate hymnorum*, 5, cited in Harrison 2011, 210.

²⁴⁰ Harrison 2011, 220-1.

²⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 213. On the relationship between song and memory in the ancient world and late antiquity, see Horsfall 2003, 11-19.

²⁴² Renoux 1961, 25.

²⁴³ Harrison 2011, 212.

²⁴⁴ *Ibid.*

instance, in *Homily V* on Mary, Hesychius compared Mary’s womb to the ark of Noah.²⁴⁵ Christians listening to this homily would have recalled the antiphon they just recited, Psalm 132, verse 8: “Arise, Lord, come to your resting place, you and your majestic ark.”²⁴⁶ In the context of the psalm, this “ark” has nothing to do with Mary or Noah. To a listener, however, the re-use of the word “ark” [κιβωτός] in the homily would have recalled the ark in the psalm.²⁴⁷ The psalm and antiphon, then, would have given listeners another reference point with which to frame their understanding of the lesson presented in the homily. By developing this comparison of Mary with Noah’s ark, Hesychius gave ordinary Christians the opportunity to associate Mary with the “majestic ark” in the psalm as well, thus adding texture to the lessons about Marian theology that he provided in his homily.

The psalm and antiphon prescribed for the feast of the Presentation emphasized the universality of Christ’s salvation. During this liturgy, the congregation repeatedly sang Psalm 98.3b, “All the ends of the earth have seen the saving power [σωτήριο] of our God.”²⁴⁸ Hesychius noted that the word σωτήριο was the same as that used in the presentation narrative in Luke, when Simeon makes his speech: “My eyes have seen your saving power, which you have prepared in the face of all peoples.”²⁴⁹ Hesychius called attention to this verbal echo in his two homilies on the Presentation in order to help his congregation understand that Christ’s “saving power” derived from his nature as Word-made-flesh.²⁵⁰

When Hesychius explained the quotation from Simeon, he explicitly drew the connection for his audience from σωτήριο to σαρκώσις—salvation to enfleshment. In

²⁴⁵ *Hom.* V.1.17-24.

²⁴⁶ *JL* 64, Feast of Mary Theotokos, August 15.

²⁴⁷ See Aubineau 1978, 126-7.

²⁴⁸ *JL* 13.

²⁴⁹ Luke 2:30-31.

²⁵⁰ *Hom.* I.6; II.7.

Homily I, he repeated the quotation, “For my eyes have seen your saving power, which you have prepared in the face of all the peoples,” and continued,

They have seen those things that many desired to see and did not see, God in flesh, sun shining in a cloud. “My eyes have seen your saving power”—that is, they saw your enfleshment [σου τὴν σάρκωσιν], through which you have dispensed the salvation [τὴν σωτηρίαν] of men.²⁵¹

In this section, Hesychius actually defined “saving power” as “enfleshment,” which he proceeded to define as the vehicle by which ordinary Christians attained salvation. By repeating the same word sung in the antiphon twice in this definition, Hesychius linked his christological lesson to a song that only recently had passed through everyone’s ears and lips, relying on their memory of the song to help them remember the lesson. Further, Hesychius could have hoped that Christians who listened to and understood his homily might think of the lesson about Christ’s enfleshed nature whenever they subsequently heard the psalm and antiphon in other liturgies and other contexts.

Christians in Jerusalem sang a number of other hymns as well as the psalms. A source compiled in the late sixth-century but containing material from as early as the fourth century, the *Jerusalem Georgian Chantbook*, includes the words to a large corpus of hymns prescribed for festal as well as weekly Sunday liturgies.²⁵² One scholar of the *Chantbook* has noticed numerous similarities in phrases between the hymns and the homilies of Hesychius, arguing that Hesychius must have had a hymnographical source at his disposal when he composed his homilies.²⁵³ This overlap could perhaps also be evidence of Hesychius’ direct

²⁵¹ «Ὅτι εἶδον οἱ ὀφθαλμοί μου τὸ σωτήριόν σου, ὃ ἠτοίμασας.» Εἶδον ἃ πολλοὶ ἐπεθύμησαν ἰδεῖν καὶ οὐκ εἶδον, θεὸν ἐν σαρκί, ἥλιον ἐν νεφέλῃ φωτίζοντα. «Εἶδον οἱ ὀφθαλμοί μου τὸ σωτήριόν σου», τουτέστιν εἶδόν σου τὴν σάρκωσιν, δι’ ἧς τὴν σωτηρίαν τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὠκονόμησας, *Hom.* I.6.17-21.

²⁵² The section containing hymns for weekly liturgies, or “Hymns of the Resurrection,” preserved in Georgian manuscripts, has recently been translated into French by Charles Renoux in three volumes, Renoux 2000-2010. For an overview of the source, see Shoemaker 2016, 186-94.

²⁵³ Renoux, 2000, 142-5.

interaction with the words of the hymns in his homilies in order to teach theological lessons about the *Theotokos* and the Word-made-flesh more effectively.²⁵⁴

Psalms and hymns offered an apt complement to the explicit lessons contained within Hesychius' homilies. For some members of the congregation, singing these songs, through repetition and the act of hearing one's own voice utter theological statements, taught the lessons of the homilies more effectively than the homilies could on their own. The same can be said of the visual content of the liturgy. Hesychius interacted visually with his surroundings while he preached in order to illustrate the lessons he taught in his homilies.

Inside the Martyrium there was much to look at. Egeria reported that Constantine "honored the greater church [Martyrium] as well as the Anastasis with gold, mosaic, and precious marble, as much as the might of the kingdom held."²⁵⁵ Sunlight streaming through the three doors at the entrance would have shone down the nave and illuminated the altar during morning liturgies.²⁵⁶ Light from the sun and from artificial sources at vigils would have reflected off the polychrome marble panels on the walls and gilded ceiling, causing the whole church to shimmer.²⁵⁷

Unfortunately, neither the Constantinian Martyrium nor any of its interior decorations survive. We can only speculate, therefore, about the sights displayed in this particular church based on the literary references from Egeria and Eusebius as well as on comparative archaeological material from other contemporary churches around the Mediterranean. Certain

²⁵⁴ More work needs to be done on this topic, and I plan to pursue the comparison between Hesychius' homilies and the hymns in the *Chantbook* established by Renoux when I revise this dissertation for publication as a book.

²⁵⁵ *Nam quid dicam de ornatu fabricae ipsius, quam Constantinus sub praesentia matris suae, in quantum vires regni sui habuit, honoravit auro, musiuo et marmore pretioso, tam ecclesiam maiorem quam Anastasim, Egeria, 25.9.*

²⁵⁶ Eusebius, *VC III.39.*

²⁵⁷ *VC III.36.*

phrases and mentions in Hesychius' sermons, however, are able now as they were then to indicate elements of his surroundings to which he wanted to draw his audience's attention.

Although the Martyrium included extensive mosaic decoration, there is no mention in the sources of where that mosaic appeared or what it depicted. Most likely, the floor was paved with mosaic decoration in the manner of contemporary churches.²⁵⁸ Late antique churches took their cues from other types of communal gathering space, such as great halls of villas and secular basilicas, and so, when not depicting explicitly Christian scenes, mosaics in churches featured much of the same decorations as mosaics appearing elsewhere. Sometimes floor mosaics depicted figural imagery or contained inscriptions, but most often they showed geometric, scrolling, and vegetal designs.²⁵⁹ Intricate decorations along the floor of the nave would have guided the eyes of the congregation towards the altar where the rituals of the liturgy took place.

Churches all over the Mediterranean contained paintings and mosaics depicting gardens and other heavenly scenery, pictorial narratives of stories from scripture or saints' lives, and icons of Christ, the cross, saints, and even donors on their walls. Preachers used the images in the church to illustrate their homilies by gesturing to them at particular moments, just as Roman orators had been doing for centuries.²⁶⁰ Orators who spoke in the forum in Rome or other major cities made use of the rich landscape of buildings, monuments, and statues that surrounded them to enliven their speeches and make them more persuasive.²⁶¹ Christian preachers did the same inside their churches. Hesychius often employed deictic

²⁵⁸ For numerous examples of floor mosaic in surviving Byzantine churches from late antiquity, see Albani and Chalkiá 2013.

²⁵⁹ See, for example, Catalogue no. 45 in Dandrake et. al. 2013, 124-5.

²⁶⁰ Aldrete 1999, 24-7, 33.

²⁶¹ For a study of this technique in the oratory of Cicero, see Vasaly 1993.

language such as the demonstrative pronoun ἐκεῖνος, “that,” at times when it would have been appropriate to point out something that was visible to the congregation. The deictic language in the homilies allows me to suggest possibilities for what images were depicted in the churches where Hesychius preached and how he engaged with them to help teach theological lessons.

Hesychius’ use of ἐκεῖνος to refer to Gabriel in both Marian homilies, a construction that he did not normally use when describing scenes from scripture, suggests that he could have been pointing at an image of the Annunciation.²⁶² In *Homily VI* especially Hesychius seems to have gone out of his way to point out Gabriel to his congregation as someone in a unique position to explain the virgin birth and ultimately Christ’s natures: “And yet let us also learn from the archangelic words of Gabriel about the Lord’s becoming; let us travel following in the footprints of that one [ἐκείνου]; as he [ἐκεῖνος] [did], let us simply consider the power of the birth.”²⁶³ An image of this scene also would have enlivened the speeches Hesychius performed as Gabriel and Mary in these two homilies by illustrating the characters in conversation with one another.²⁶⁴

When Hesychius preached in another homily, “There [Ἐκεῖ] Pharaoh, pursuing Israel, is thrown into the sea,” and “There Adam, stretching out his hands, drew death to us, and our Lord saved everything in the stretching out of his hands,” he could very well have been pointing to mosaic depictions of Pharaoh being washed away by the sea and Adam stretching out his hand.²⁶⁵ Furthermore, Hesychius described Pharaoh in the present tense, rather than

²⁶² *Hom. V.4.16-17* and *Hom. VI.3.14-16*.

²⁶³ Τοῖς ἀρχαγγελικοῖς τοίνυν καὶ ἡμεῖς μαθητεύσωμεν λόγοις τοῦ Γαβριὴλ περὶ τῆς δεσποτικῆς ἐννήσεως, ταῖς ἐκείνου τρίβοις κατόπιν ὁδεύσωμεν, ὡς ἐκεῖνος ἐκθειάζωμεν ἀπεριέργως τοῦ τόκου τὴν δύναμιν, *Hom. VI.3.13-17*.

²⁶⁴ See above, Chapter 2, for these instances of *ethopoiia*.

²⁶⁵ Ἐκεῖ Φαραὼ καταποντοῦται τὸν Ἰσραὴλ καταδιώκων, *Hom. III.3.10-11*; Ἐκεῖ τὰς χεῖρας ἐκτείνας ὁ Ἄδαμ θάνατον ἡμῖν ἐπεσπάσατο, *Ibid. 12-13*.

the imperfect or aorist which he normally used to describe past events, making it even more likely that he was describing something his audience could see in the present.

Mosaics that survive from contemporary churches also present possibilities for what kinds of images may have been visible in the Martyrium while Hesychius preached. For instance, a sixth-century mosaic found hidden under a wall in Istanbul, the only figural mosaic of a Christian subject dating to the period before Iconoclasm to survive in the imperial capital, shows a scene from the presentation of Christ at the Temple.²⁶⁶ Any preacher discussing the narrative there on the feast of the Presentation, as Hesychius did, could have gestured to Mary, Jesus, and the temple guardian, the three figures in the mosaic.

Images of Christ often appeared in churches, usually in the apse, or the area above the altar directly opposite the entrance to the church. I discuss apse imagery in more detail later in this chapter,²⁶⁷ but for now it is useful to state that most late antique apses contained an image of Christ or of a cross. Hesychius' deictic references to the cross suggest the presence of visible crosses in the churches where he preached, whether they were movable processional crosses or crosses depicted in mosaic in the apse.

In his second homily on the Presentation, Hesychius used the demonstrative ἐκεῖνος, “that is the sign,” when referring to the cross as the “sign of contradiction” in the scriptural quotation.²⁶⁸ Here, Hesychius would have gestured to a cross visible to the entire congregation, demonstrating the presence of that “sign” within their midst. In his homily on Saint Procopius, preached in the Church of the Anastasis (Resurrection) in the Holy Sepulcher complex, Hesychius gave his congregation an explicit instruction to look up at the

²⁶⁶ Catalogue no. 96 in Eastmond 2013, 98.

²⁶⁷ See below, 105-6 and 113-14.

²⁶⁸ *Hom.* II.10.3, emphasis added.

cross: “But towards this cross, this kingly [cross] gaze with zeal, observe it and contemplate with it this holy temple, the Resurrection.”²⁶⁹ Hesychius offered his congregation a visual reminder of Christ’s resurrection in the form of the cross. This lesson was not only important in the context of the Anastasis church, but wherever Christians might have encountered a cross, which was everywhere. Hesychius wanted to teach his congregation to associate the cross with resurrection, and a physical cross in the church of the Resurrection presented a perfect opportunity to do so.

In his first paschal homily, Hesychius developed the metaphor of the cross as lampstand while explaining Christ’s death and resurrection. Hesychius devoted a significant portion of that homily to discussing light and Christ as light, a discussion which was certainly aided by the presence of torches lit at the beginning of the vigil. Indeed, Hesychius began the homily with reference to these torches:

Let us celebrate such a sacred night with sacred torches, awakening a godly song and singing out a heavenly hymn. “The sun of justice,” our lord Jesus Christ, lit up even the present day in the cycle of the world: he rose up by means of the cross; he saved the faithful.²⁷⁰

Further on in the homily, Hesychius explained the relationship between Christ-as-light and the cross using both a cross and lampstand as visual illustrations: “The faithful,” he preached,

no longer “light a lamp and place it under a bushel-basket,” and by “bushel-basket,” I mean the [Jewish] Law, “but [they place it] upon a lampstand,” and by “light” I mean the Word... But when he came upon the cross and was placed upon the lampstand, at that time he shined down on the circle of the world.²⁷¹

²⁶⁹ ἀλλ’ εἰς τοῦτον τὸν σταυρὸν τὸν βασιλικὸν ἀπὸ σπουδῆς ἀπόβλεπε, εἰς αὐτὸν θεώρει καὶ κατασκόπει μετὰ τοῦτον τὴν ἱερὰν ταύτην παστάδα, τὴν Ἀνάστασιν, *Hom.* XIV.11.12-14.

²⁷⁰ Τὴν ἱερὰν ταύτην νύκτα δαδουχίας ἱεραῖς πανηγυρίσωμεν, μέλος ἔνθεον ἐγείροντες καὶ ὕμνον οὐράνιον ἐξάδοντες. «Ὁ τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἥλιος», ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, καὶ τὴν παροῦσαν ἡμέραν τῷ κύκλῳ τῆς οἰκουμένης κατεφώτισεν, διὰ σταυροῦ ἀνέτειλεν, τοὺς πιστοὺς διέσωσεν, *Hom.* III.1.9-14.

²⁷¹ Οὐδέτι «καίουσι λύχνον καὶ ὑπὸ τὸν μόδιον τιθέασιν», μόδιον δέ φημι τὸν Νόμον, «ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ τὴν λυχνίαν», λύχνον δὲ τὸν Λόγον... ὅτε δὲ ἦλθεν ἐπὶ σταυροῦ καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν λυχνίαν ἐτέθη, τότε τῷ τῆς οἰκουμένης κύκλῳ κατέλαμψεν, *Hom.* III.2.4-6; 7-9; c.f. Matthew 5.15.

In an effort to show his congregation that the cross should have for them a positive connotation, Hesychius compared it to a lampstand, which everyone could see augmented the light rather than snuffing it out.

Light fixtures were also a large part of the visual culture of late antique churches, and preachers invoked their presence in their homilies just as they did images. Besides the torches and candles lit for the paschal vigil, candles also accompanied the gospel reading, even during the day when artificial light was not needed.²⁷² Oil lamps of all shapes and sizes adorned the interiors of churches as well. The *Liber Pontificalis*, which chronicled the tenures of late antique and early medieval bishops of Rome with varying degrees of accuracy, recorded multiple cups, crown lights, lanterns, candelabras, and chandeliers donated for each of the Constantinian churches established in Rome, at least confirming the ubiquity of different types of light fixtures.²⁷³

Hesychius relied on the interplay of light, either artificial or natural, and the space of the church to illustrate several theological lessons he taught in his homilies. For instance, he emphasized scripture's association of light with salvation. In *Homily I on the Presentation*, during his exegesis on the narrative in Luke, he preached:

“For my eyes have seen your saving power which you have prepared.” They saw those things which many desired to see and did not see, God in the flesh, a sun shining through clouds. [...] “For my eyes have seen your saving power, which you have prepared in the face of all the peoples, a light for the revelation of gentiles and the glory of your people Israel.”²⁷⁴

²⁷² Mathews 1971, 149.

²⁷³ *LP* 34.3-35.4.

²⁷⁴ «Ὅτι εἶδον οἱ ὀφθαλμοί μου τὸ σωτήριόν σου, ὃ ἠτοίμασας.» Εἶδον ἅ πολλοὶ ἐπεθύμησαν ἰδεῖν καὶ οὐκ εἶδον, θεὸν ἐν σαρκί, ἥλιον ἐν νεφέλῃ φωτίζοντα. «Εἶδον οἱ ὀφθαλμοί μου τὸ σωτήριόν σου», τουτέστιν εἶδόν σου τὴν σάρκωσιν, δι' ἧς τὴν σωτηρίαν τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὤκονόμησας· οὐ γὰρ εἶδον γυμνὴν θεότητα, ἐπειδὴ τὸν θεὸν καθὼς ἐστὶν οὐσίᾳ οὐδεὶς ἀνθρώπων ὄψεταί. «Ὅτι εἶδον οἱ ὀφθαλμοί μου τὸ σωτήριόν σου, ὃ ἠτοίμασας κατὰ πρόσωπον πάντων τῶν λαῶν, φῶς εἰς ἀποκάλυψιν ἐθνῶν καὶ δόξαν λαοῦ σου Ἰσραὴλ», *Hom.* I.6.17-25, quoting Luke 2:30-31.

Preaching in the Martyrium on the feast of the Presentation, Hesychius drew his congregation's attention to the natural light of the sun, which would have shone through the three doorways in the back of the church. In this section of the homily, he effectively taught his congregation how to see Christ in his humanity and divinity by looking at sunlight shining through the clouds. By repeating the quotation after the sunlight image in its entirety, including the word "light," Hesychius reinforced the association between Christ, the salvation of mankind, and light.

In his other homily on the Presentation, also preached in the Martyrium in another year, Hesychius developed his use of light imagery in reference to salvation. In addition to commenting on the same quotation from Luke cited above, Hesychius broadened the association of light to include the Holy Spirit, mentioned toward the beginning of the gospel reading: "And he [Simeon] came in the Spirit into the Temple." Hesychius used *ethopoiia*, or speech in character, inserting a speech by the Holy Spirit to Simeon into his homily. "Run, old man, run," Hesychius' Holy Spirit urged Simeon,

Hurry, already, quickly snatch the blessing, before the star appears, before the Magi arrive, lest we ever be insulted. For it is necessary that the light from me be ahead of the arrival of the star in Bethlehem, so that it will be known that from me it [the star] leads the race and has supplied the beam.²⁷⁵

Here, Hesychius taught that the light from the star of Bethlehem came first from the Holy Spirit. Within the context of the presentation narrative, the light coming from the Holy Spirit was the same light of Christ "for the revelation of the gentiles and glory to the people of Israel." Through these lessons, Hesychius' congregations came to understand light, which they saw manipulated in numerous ways in the Martyrium, as a signal of their salvation.

²⁷⁵ Δράμε, πρεσβῦτα, δράμε, σπεῦδε ἤδη, τάχος τὴν εὐλογίαν ἄρπασον, πρὶν ὁ ἀστὴρ φανῆ, πρὶν οἱ Μάγοι παραγένωνται, μὴ ποτε ὑβρισθῶμεν. Τὸ γὰρ ἐξ ἐμοῦ φῶς προλαβεῖν χρὴ τοῦ ἀστέρος τὴν εἰς Βηθλεὲμ ἄφιξιν, ὥστε γνωσθῆναι ὅτι παρ' ἐμοῦ καὶ τὸν δρόμον ὀδηγεῖται καὶ τὴν ἀκτῖνα δανεῖζεται, *Hom.* II.5.10-15.

Hesychius used light imagery to reinforce his lessons on minor feast days in smaller spaces than the Martyrium as well. In *Homily VII* on Saint Andrew, preached at the Anastasis, he used the word “light” [φῶς] six times, all in reference to the light of Christ and his salvation, including one quotation of Christ’s proclamation in John, “I am the light of the world.”²⁷⁶ At the end of the homily, Hesychius invoked an image of the apostles upon being made “fishers of men,”²⁷⁷ as “more luminous than the sun and the moon and the stars,”²⁷⁸ and having “an inextinguishable light, an unstoppable course, ever-shining rays, which we pray might light up our thoughts.”²⁷⁹

In *Homily X* on Saint James and David, he presented an image similar to that at the end of *Homily VII* to teach about the star of Bethlehem. In it, he used the word “torch-bearer” [δαδοῦχος], calling to mind the torches [δαδουχία] used in the Easter liturgies:

In you [Bethlehem], one star ignited as a torch-bearer, but in this one [Sion], many [were illuminated]. That [star] led the Magi, this one brought light to [ἐδαδουχήσε] the Parthians and Medes and Elamites and those from all the nations with the light of lightning.²⁸⁰

Following his discussion of the star of Bethlehem, Hesychius referred to the celebrated apostle James as someone “out-illuminating lamps and out-shining stars.”²⁸¹ The multiplicity of light images in these homilies, illustrated by a multiplicity of natural and artificial light sources within the church, would have had a dramatic effect on the congregation, making it

²⁷⁶ *Hom.* VII.4.19, 5.36, 8.8, 8.15 (quoting John 8:12), and 8.36. Hesychius also used light imagery to signal Christ and his divinity in *Hom.* XIII.5.5 and XV.9.12.

²⁷⁷ Matthew 4:19.

²⁷⁸ ἡλίου καὶ σελήνης καὶ ἀστέρων ἐκλαμπρότεροι, *Hom.* VII.8.34-5.

²⁷⁹ τὸ φῶς ἔχουσιν ἄσβεστον, τὸν δρόμον ἀκατάπαυστον, τὰς ἀκτῖνας ἀειφανεῖς, ἃς ἡμεῖς ἐλλαμφοῦμεθα ταῖς ἡμετέραις διανοίαις εὐξώμεθα, *Hom.* VII.8.36-38.

²⁸⁰ Ἐν σοὶ δαδοῦχος ἀστήρ εἰς ἀνήφθη, ἐν ταύτῃ δὲ πολλοί. Ἐκεῖνος τοὺς Μάγους ὠδήγησεν, αὐτὴ Πάρθους καὶ Μήδους καὶ Ἑλαμίτας καὶ τοὺς ἐξ ἔθνῶν πάντων τῷ φωτὶ τῆς ἀστραπῆς ἐδαδούχησε, X.1.5-8.

²⁸¹ τὸν ἐν λύχνῳις ὑπερλάμποντα, τὸν ἐν ἀστροῖς ὑπερφαίνοντα, *Hom.* X.2.3-4.

easier for some of Hesychius' theological lessons to stick in the memories of the congregants.

Without knowing what images were contained within the Martyrium—or any of the churches in which Hesychius preached, for that matter—it is impossible to know the breadth of ways Hesychius used his surroundings to help teach theological lessons to his congregation. These are but a few possibilities. Aside from acting as aids to the pedagogy of preaching, however, the material and sensory experience of the liturgy served to teach lessons of community, hierarchy, and encounter with God to the Christians who came together to practice their faith in the sacred space of the church. The space, materiality, and ritual that ordinary Christians experienced in the liturgy helped them understand where they fit in their community of Christians on local and universal, as well as cosmological levels.

Communities of Christians

The liturgy itself was an expression of church unity and community. Christians who sang, prayed, and partook in the Eucharistic meal did so as a community. Furthermore, the ritual of the liturgy was more or less the same anywhere one went. Allowing for regional variation and variations in theological formulae across different Christian traditions, the Christian liturgy in one place would have been recognizable as such to a Christian visiting from any other part of the Mediterranean world.

Despite its location at the site of Christ's death and resurrection, marking Jerusalem and especially Jerusalem at Easter as a major pilgrimage destination, Hesychius' paschal vigil was celebrated in the same way as paschal vigils elsewhere, including those in Latin-

speaking regions, as Egeria noted during her pilgrimage.²⁸² By celebrating Easter the same way as they did in other churches throughout the Mediterranean world, the church in Jerusalem enacted the unity with the rest of the universal (catholic) and orthodox church community that members of the catholic and orthodox clergy preached to their congregations. Furthermore, pilgrims who visited Jerusalem would have beheld a liturgy remarkably similar to their own back home and seen ecclesiastical unity first hand in the continuity of prayer and ritual across geography and across language. For some, this would have been a more powerful sight than the Holy Sepulcher itself.

Communal singing allowed Christians to participate in the liturgy as part of a group and hear their own voices together with the voice of the community.²⁸³ Singing the psalms, which happened in every liturgy, among other things taught and reinforced a community ethic. The antiphonal method of singing the psalms lent itself to including more and more people in the song, allowing all Christians who could hear and sing to participate fully in the ritual.

The combination of psalm and antiphon was particularly apt to teaching the universality of the Christian church when congregants could hear themselves sing about the expanse of the church community. The antiphon prescribed for the feast of the Presentation was “All the ends of the earth have seen the saving power of our God.”²⁸⁴ Singing this verse in Jerusalem, one center of the Christian universe, taught Christians that their church community stretched outward to the ends (τὰ πέρατα)—places they could not even imagine. To pilgrims who themselves might have come from the “ends” of the earth, this antiphon

²⁸² Egeria, 38.

²⁸³ Harrison 2013 discusses the importance of “communal listening” to communal prayer, 198-201.

²⁸⁴ Ps. 98.3b; *JL* 13.

might have been particularly resonant. The Christian community had somehow grown to encompass areas far outside the Mediterranean basin, and these pilgrims had made it back to the origins. Christians living in the outer reaches heard their voices singing these words alongside the voices of others from the center as well as from the ends.

Singing in a group also has the effect of unifying the singers, literally in one voice but also spiritually—a phenomenon which was recognized by late antique Christian authors.²⁸⁵ Outside the liturgy, the psalms further brought together local Christian communities in their everyday lives.²⁸⁶ When Christians sang songs they learned in church outside, others who recognized the songs and sang along identified themselves as part of the Christian community and formed a bond with fellow Christians.

Communal prayer in the liturgy also taught Christians to hear themselves, and therefore understand themselves, as part of a larger Christian community. Prayer would have perhaps been more effective than communal singing, since everyone recited the same prayers together at each and every Eucharistic liturgy. Following the gospel and, when present, the sermon, the congregation stood together to pray the Creed, a formalized statement of faith.²⁸⁷ Versions of a creed existed in early Christianity, but by the fourth century the Roman emperor and leading members of the clergy made an effort to produce a single orthodox creed. The first ecumenical council at Nicaea in 325 produced specific credal language, and subsequent councils, such as the Council of Ephesus, reaffirmed the language of Nicaea and anathematized all other creeds as heretical.²⁸⁸

²⁸⁵ Harrison 2011, 214.

²⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 212.

²⁸⁷ Germanus, *On the Divine Liturgy*, 41; c.f. 36.

²⁸⁸ ACO I.1.7.88-9.

The second prayer was the Lord's Prayer, which the baptized Christians remaining in the church during the liturgy of the Eucharist prayed together.²⁸⁹ The Lord's Prayer was, from the earliest Christians onward, understood as the rule for all prayer.²⁹⁰ This was how Jesus taught his disciples to talk to God.²⁹¹ Commentators on the Lord's Prayer from Tertullian onward stressed the definitive nature of the prayer. If this was the only prayer an ordinary Christian knew, most late antique Christian authors agreed that it was enough.²⁹²

Perhaps surprisingly given the importance of these two prayers to Christianity and in the liturgy, Hesychius did not mention them in any of his surviving homilies. Catechetical preachers from the fourth century, such as John Chrysostom and Theodore of Mopsuestia, composed lengthy homilies on these prayers in order to prepare converts to Christianity for their baptism.²⁹³ Later preachers, such as Caesarius of Arles,²⁹⁴ also taught their congregations about the importance of these prayers, but did not go over the theological details the way the catechetical homilists did. Hesychius' future-tense mention in the second paschal homily that his congregation *will* say the Creed suggests he acknowledged the theological importance of the prayer but did not wish to devote space in his homilies to explaining it.²⁹⁵ Instead, he relied on the ritual act of saying these prayers to teach ordinary Christians how to pray as part of a community of faithful.

Communal prayer, like communal song, fostered a sense of cohesion within the group. Furthermore, the same words recited for generations and in every orthodox Christian church expanded the present community of the individual church across time and space.

²⁸⁹ *On the Divine Liturgy*, 42.

²⁹⁰ Augustine, *Sermon*, 56.1 cited in Harrison 2013, 192.

²⁹¹ Matthew 6:9-13.

²⁹² Harrison 2013, 192.

²⁹³ *Ibid.*, 107-113.

²⁹⁴ See below, Chapters 4 and 5.

²⁹⁵ *Hom.* IV.3.1-4. See Chapter 2, 68.

Reciting the same prayers inside different churches in different regions for generations most clearly taught ordinary Christians to experience the sense of community and cohesion that church leaders around the Mediterranean strove to achieve.

No single action or gesture better embodied the experience of community-making, in the liturgy or otherwise, than a kiss shared among friends. Kissing occurred in a number of different contexts throughout the early Christian centuries, but by the late fourth century, the idea that kissing functioned primarily to produce cohesion among Christian communities predominated in the writings of Christian authors.²⁹⁶ Late antique church leaders understood the ritual kiss that took place in the liturgy of the Eucharist as a rite of forgiveness, a true “kiss of peace.”²⁹⁷ Taking their cue from Jesus’ injunction in Matthew to forgive one another before making the offering,²⁹⁸ multiple third- through fifth-century theologians theorized the kiss before the Eucharist as a tool to minimize conflict within the community.²⁹⁹ Moreover, by kissing each other in the context of the liturgy, Christians in the congregation necessarily excluded those outside the community, whether they were pagans, Jews, or members of rival Christian churches.³⁰⁰

The kiss as part of the Eucharist, the communal meal that baptized Christians shared with one another, was a reminder that the Christian liturgy originated as an actual meal within a particular community and recreated the last supper of Jesus and his disciples. Thus, everything about the liturgy worked together to suggest and reinforce a community ethic. The space of the church in which Christians gathered to partake in this meal communicated

²⁹⁶ Penn 2005, 26-56, esp. 55.

²⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 44-5.

²⁹⁸ Matthew 5:23-24.

²⁹⁹ Penn 2005, 49.

³⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 58-70.

through all the senses the notion that a church was the space for Christians to come together as a community.

The architecture of church buildings as well as the images and objects encountered in a church and the effects they achieved and the purposes they served demonstrated to Christians who had the privilege of visiting more than one church that local Christian communities were linked in their practices with other Christian communities around the Mediterranean. As a church building, the Martyrium, and indeed the entire Holy Sepulcher complex, was certainly not an ordinary church. Christians traveled from all over to celebrate the liturgy in this structure, which was singular in its extravagance as well as its commemoration of Christ's death and resurrection. Local Christians who worshiped there every Easter—or even every Sunday—also would have known that their church was extraordinary. Visitors certainly would have beheld a difference in size and material wealth between the Jerusalem church and their smaller churches back home. Yet they would have recognized all the buildings as churches, which were obvious indicators of Christian community and, for Christians able to compare the pilgrimage church to their churches back home, objects of similarity among different Christian communities.³⁰¹

Churches, or rather the entryways to churches, served as entry points into the Christian community as well. According to Eusebius, the Martyrium opened on the east end to a courtyard, or atrium, with arcades on both sides, colonnades at the far end, and finally, “the outer gates to the whole complex upon the middle of a plaza in the marketplace, the beautifully-fashioned entrance to the whole complex provided to those making their way

³⁰¹ This is a key historiographical intervention of Yasin 2009's trans-Mediterranean study of late antique churches.

outside an astonishing view of the sights inside.”³⁰² The presence of such an entrance emphasized the simultaneous exclusivity and accessibility of the Christian community. Christians asserted their sense of community by gathering in a particular space, but the space was nevertheless open and visible to those outside. Outsiders who wanted to join the community of Christians needed only to pass through the gates.

Leaders of the Church

Christian communities, like most complex groups in premodern society, were arranged hierarchically. The hierarchy within the church and the position of the clergy as leaders of local Christian communities was another lesson that was taught most effectively through the sensory experience of the liturgy. Bishops, priests, and deacons performed central Christian rituals in the privileged space beneath the apse dressed in garments specifically designed for performing these rituals. Clerics were sometimes even worked into the fabric of the church, as images, donor inscriptions, and even tombs. These distinctions, communicated only through the sensory experience of the liturgy, both lent the clergy authority by which to teach, so ordinary Christians were more inclined to listen to their homilies, and also visually marked them out as leaders of the local Christian community linked with other clergy and other Christian communities in the universal church network.

The hierarchy of church communities was most visibly taught through the layout of the churches themselves.³⁰³ The Martyrium took the form of a basilica, the most common type of church structure in late antiquity. The straight lines of the nave and the colonnades of

³⁰² ἐπ’ αὐτῆς μέσης πλατείας ἀγορᾶς τὰ τοῦ παντός προπύλαια φιλοκάλως ἡσκημένα τοῖς τὴν ἐκτὸς πορείαν ποιουμένοις καταπληκτικὴν παρεῖχον τὴν τῶν ἔνδον ὀρωμένων θέαν, VC III.39.

³⁰³ On the layout of late antique and early Byzantine churches, especially basilicas, see Mathews 1971 and, more recently, Mulholland 2014. See also Doig 2008 and Lavan 2007 on use of church space in late antiquity.

this rectangular building drew the audience's attention to the altar at the front of the church, or sanctuary, where most of the liturgy was performed. The shape of the nave also facilitated movement through the church space in the form of processions.³⁰⁴

In most basilicas, including this one, the sacred space of the sanctuary was established by the architectural features surrounding it, such as the apse, which was often the site of figural artwork.³⁰⁵ The sanctuary was also often elevated by one or more steps, which both set the area apart from the nave and made the altar more visible to the congregation.³⁰⁶ Clerics preached and performed the other rituals of the liturgy from within this framed and elevated space, which not only increased their visibility, but also demonstrated their authority as Christian leaders. The raised throne from which preachers often gave their homilies also singled them out as teachers who ought to be listened to.³⁰⁷

Churches of different shapes, such as round, square, or octagonal, still had the altar as a central focus.³⁰⁸ The Anastasis rotunda, for example, was built around the tomb of Christ, which was enclosed with columns.³⁰⁹ This and other round or octagonal "concentric churches" also built around holy sites in Jerusalem in the fourth century contributed to a type of church in which the altar was placed in the center.³¹⁰ The effect, however, was the same as in basilical churches: to direct the focus of the congregation to the area where most of the liturgy was performed.

³⁰⁴ See discussion of the role of architecture in directing processions in Davies 2000, 122-7.

³⁰⁵ Yasin 2009, 151.

³⁰⁶ Mathews 1971, 121-5.

³⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, 150.

³⁰⁸ Yasin 2009, 151.

³⁰⁹ VC III.39.

³¹⁰ On these octagonal churches, see Shalev-Hurvitz 2015.

The architectural and liturgical focal point of churches demarcated a hierarchy of sacrality and authority within the church space.³¹¹ Eusebius described the Holy Sepulcher complex in hierarchical terms, beginning with the tomb where Christ was buried: “And indeed of the whole, like a head, [Constantine] adorned first of all things the holy cave”³¹² Next, he described the atrium where the rock of Golgotha lay, then the Martyrium, then the entrance court, and finally the gate visible to passersby. The way these buildings were used also suggests a sacral hierarchy: only baptized Christians were allowed in the Anastasis, and larger liturgies that expected congregations of more ordinary Christians and catechumens all took place in the Martyrium. Inside the Martyrium also exhibited its own sacral hierarchy, with larger liturgies featuring a Eucharistic celebration at the altar under the apse.

More meaningful, perhaps, to the ordinary Christians in the congregation, was the demonstration of hierarchical authority by those individuals who entered the various spaces of the church. While the nave was largely open to everyone, only the clergy were permitted in the sanctuary to perform the liturgy.³¹³ Unlike in later Byzantine churches where they were blocked by a screen, the bishop, priests, and deacons who were involved in the celebration of the liturgy would have been visible to the ordinary Christians in the congregation, showcasing their interaction with the sacred, their authority within the church community, and their ability to teach by virtue of their visibility in a prominent location.

The decoration inside the church also communicated explicit messages of hierarchy and authority. For instance, all late antique churches, not excepting the Holy Sepulcher, contained dedicatory and commemorative inscriptions. They were placed in prominent

³¹¹ Yasin 2009, 26-9.

³¹² καὶ δὴ τοῦ παντὸς ὅσπερ τινὰ κεφαλὴν πρῶτον ἀπάντων τὸ ἱερὸν ἄντρον ἐκόσμηι, VC III.33.3.

³¹³ Mathews 1971, 117-37.

locations throughout churches inviting their viewers to pray for the donors or family members of donors that were mentioned.³¹⁴ They were legible to those who could read and visible to those who could not. Illiterate churchgoers eventually could have learned from others the content of all the inscriptions inside the church that they frequented.

In the Martyrium, which was commissioned by Constantine, there certainly would have been an inscription similar to those in other Constantinian basilicas. The church of Saint Peter at Rome contained an inscription of “Constantinus victor” dedicating the church displayed prominently on the arch that separated the nave from the transept.³¹⁵ All who saw such an inscription would have associated the church with the emperor Constantine. One of Constantine’s contributions as emperor was to bring the Christian community under the patronage of the Roman Empire and to promote the notion of a universal church, united in the Empire. An inscription of Constantine within a church asserted the emperor’s position as leader of the empire-wide Christian community.

Churches that did not have the benefit of an imperial dedication still used inscriptions to reinforce ideas of Christian unity and hierarchy. Bishops and other church leaders frequently dedicated churches, naming themselves in inscriptions placed in similarly prominent locations to those of Constantine.³¹⁶ Bishops were also often buried inside their churches under inscriptions set up by their successors.³¹⁷ The prominence of clergy in dedicatory and funerary inscriptions were a visual lesson about their place as leaders of local Christian communities.

³¹⁴ Yasin 2009, Chapter 3, esp. 129-150.

³¹⁵ “S. Pietro” in Krautheimer 1937, vol. 5, 171-285. See also Krautheimer 1937, vol. 4, 95-142, fig. 120, mentioning a Constantinian monogram in St. Sebastian.

³¹⁶ Yasin 2009, 131ff.

³¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 94-7.

The focal point of every church was the apse. The apse of the Martyrium was

straight ahead of these [doors], the head of everything, placed upon the highest point of the basilica, which indeed was encircled by twelve columns, equal to the apostles of the savior, arranged on their heads with great bowls made of silver, which indeed the emperor himself bestowed as a most beautiful offering to his God.³¹⁸

Situated high above the altar and directly across from the entrance to the church, the domed space of the apse conch was visible to all who entered the building. Artificial and natural light in the church was manipulated to spotlight the altar and the clergy who stood in the sanctuary around the altar performing the rituals of the liturgy, emphasizing that space and the actions that took place within it. The decoration in the apse, figural or otherwise, was the most prominently displayed imagery and thus most pedagogically useful of all the church decoration.³¹⁹ Of the several key lessons communicated by apse imagery, hierarchy was central.

Late antique apse programs varied considerably around the Mediterranean and over the centuries. However, most surviving apse decorations from the period depicted Christ, either alone as an adult or as a child on the lap of his mother Mary.³²⁰ Besides Christ, apse programs also often contained other figures, such as the apostles, the saints to whom the church was dedicated, angels, and clerical donors.³²¹ Some contained the non-figural icon of a simple cross. When other figures were present in the apse program, they appeared on either side of Christ or the cross icon in the center.

³¹⁸ Τούτων δ' ἄντικρυς τὸ κεφάλαιον τοῦ παντὸς ἡμισφαίριον ἦν ἐπ' ἄκρου τοῦ βασιλείου οἴκου τεταγμένον, ὃ δὴ δυοκαίδεκα κίονες ἐστεφάνουν, τοῖς τοῦ σωτῆρος ἀποστόλοις ἰσάριθμοι, κρατῆρσι μεγίστοις ἐξ ἀργύρου πεποιημένοις τὰς κορυφὰς κοσμούμενοι, οὓς δὴ βασιλεὺς αὐτὸς ἀνάθημα κάλλιστον ἐδωρεῖτο, VC.III.38.

³¹⁹ See Thunø 2015 for a recent study on apse mosaics in late antique and early medieval churches.

³²⁰ Yasin 2012, 950.

³²¹ *Ibid.*

Apse depictions of Christ, both as an adult and child, often showed him making oratorical gestures, such as lifting his hands with his fingers slightly curled.³²² These gestures demonstrated to ordinary Christians that Christ was and continued to be a teacher whose words should be heeded. The priests or bishops who preached using the same hand gestures down below seemed to mirror Christ up above, establishing a link between Christ and the clergy as well as bolstering the authority by which they taught their congregations.

Other figures depicted in an apse were further able to teach lessons about hierarchy and authority within the earthly church community. Groups of figures were always arranged hierarchically from Christ in the center to apostles, post-apostolic martyrs, and finally ecclesiastical donors.³²³ These other figures were often shown in a pose of deference to Christ, thus modeling the reverential attitude Christians were supposed to take before God.³²⁴ The poses of these figures demonstrated the proper comportment that ordinary Christians were to show in the presence of Christ. Even emperors and clerics and nobles had an attitude of deference, thus showing that the entire earthly hierarchy was subordinated to the heavenly.

Furthermore, the clerics depicted in the apse, identifiable to ordinary Christian viewers by their vestments,³²⁵ were certainly not as holy as the saints or companions of Christ, but their presence in apse programs and worthiness to be included among Christ and the saints showed Christians in the congregation who looked up at them from below that the clergy occupied a higher status of holiness than lay Christians. An identification of the clerics on the ground with the representations of ecclesiastical donors in the apse further reinforced the authority of bishops and priests as leaders of the earthly church community.

³²² For some examples, see Plates II, V, VIII, X, XI, XII, XIV, and XVII in Thunø 2015.

³²³ Thunø 2015, 64.

³²⁴ Yasin 2012, 953.

³²⁵ On clothing in these icons, see Thunø 2015, 67.

Clerical vestments themselves explicitly communicated lessons of hierarchy and leadership within the church. Clergy of all levels wore ceremonial vestments that set them apart from the laity during the liturgy. The further up in the church hierarchy a cleric was, the more ornate his vestments, such that in the sixth century large crowds gathered to watch the patriarch of Constantinople enter in his patriarchal vestments.³²⁶

Bishops wore bell-shaped capes over their tunics called *phelonia*. These garments were derived from Roman *paenulae*, civilian cloaks that became the required dress for senators inside the city of Constantinople in 382.³²⁷ Beginning in the later fourth century, bishops also adopted a special stole, called an *omophorion*, that distinguished them both from lay men of importance and lesser clergymen such as deacons, who wore a linen stole over one shoulder.³²⁸ A contemporary of Hesychius and another Cyril supporter in the Council of Ephesus, Isidore of Pelusium, was the first to write about the symbolism of the bishops' vestments in a letter to a civic official:

And the *omophorion* of the bishop, being made of wool, but not of linen, symbolizes the skin of the very sheep whom the Lord, searching for him when he wandered off, lifted up onto his own shoulders.

For the bishop is made in the mold of Christ, he fulfills Christ's work, and he points this out to everyone through his appearance, which is an imitation of the good and great shepherd, who proposes that weaknesses should be borne by the shepherd and holds them out exactly.

For whenever the true shepherd is near through the explanation of the worshipful gospels, the bishop stands up and puts away the costume of his imitation, showing that the Lord himself is present, the leader of the pastoral art, God and master.³²⁹

³²⁶ Mathews 1971, 139.

³²⁷ *CTh* XIV.10.1.

³²⁸ *On the Divine Liturgy*, 14-19.

³²⁹ Τὸ δὲ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου ὀμοφόριον ἐξ ἐρέας ὄν, ἀλλ' οὐ λίνου, τὴν τοῦ προβάτου δορὰν σημαίνει, ὅπερ πλανηθὲν ζητήσας ὁ Κύριος, ἐπὶ τῶν οἰκείων ὄμων ἀνέλαβεν. Ὁ γὰρ ἐπίσκοπος εἰς τύπον ὄν τοῦ Χριστοῦ, τὸ ἔργον ἐκείνου πληροῖ, καὶ δείκνυσι πᾶσι διὰ τοῦ σχήματος, ὅτι μιμητὴς ἐστὶ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ καὶ μεγάλου ποιμένος, ὁ τὰς ἀσθενείας φέρειν τοῦ ποιμνίου προβεβλημένος· καὶ πρόσχευς ἀκριβῶς. Ἦνίκα γὰρ αὐτὸς ὁ ἀληθινὸς ποιμὴν παραγένηται διὰ τῆς τῶν Εὐαγγελίων τῶν προσκυνητῶν ἀναπτύξεως, καὶ ὑπανίσταται καὶ ἀποτίθεται τὸ

Ordinary Christians in the congregation may not have known the symbolism attributed to these garments, but they could have seen the hierarchy within their Christian community at work in the vestments. Clergy distinguished themselves from the laity by wearing special clothing, and bishops set themselves apart from deacons by wearing wool, which was visually distinguishable from linen. Further, the bishop showed that, even as the leader of the earthly Christian community, he was still inferior to Christ by removing his stole when Christ arrived in the reading of his words.

The way the clergy moved through the space of the church during the liturgy also enacted a pageant of hierarchy for the congregation. The liturgy contained several processions: two “entrances,” which were rituals performed by the clergy only, and smaller clerical processions as well as a group procession during the liturgy of the Eucharist when all baptized Christians came forward to partake in the communal meal.³³⁰

In the first entrance, which began all regular liturgies and most special liturgies, the bishop, priests, and deacons processed down the center of the nave toward the altar. Significantly, a deacon processed in front of the celebrant.³³¹ This is because the deacon carried the book, which more than symbolized Christ because it contained his words, and as Christ was also the Word, the gospel embodied Christ’s presence in a way that other objects could not. Christians were told this before every gospel reading, but the movement of the book itself did much to convey this lesson to everyone in the audience.³³² The position of the book, carried by the lesser cleric, in front of the priest or the bishop if a bishop was in

σχῆμα τῆς μιμήσεως ὁ ἐπίσκοπος, αὐτὸν δηλῶν παρεῖναι τὸν Κύριον, τὸν τῆς ποιμαντικῆς ἡγεμόνα, καὶ θεὸν καὶ δεσπότην, Isidore, *Ep.* 136, PG 78.272C.

³³⁰ Mathews 1971, 138-47.

³³¹ *Ibid.*, 141-2.

³³² *On the Divine Liturgy*, 24-5.

attendance, demonstrated its superiority to the greater clerics in the hierarchy of church leadership.³³³

The next procession also featured the book of the gospels. Following the scriptural readings from the Old Testament and the Epistles or Acts, which were read by the even lower clerical class of lectors, the deacon carried the book in a procession accompanied by singing and candles up to the ambo where he read.³³⁴ The extra solemnity that candles and processions afforded to the gospel reading in comparison to the other scriptural readings further demonstrated its particular holiness.

Another ritual of central pedagogical importance to the congregation was the liturgy of the Eucharist, which began with the “kiss of peace.” The same kiss that defined congregants as a Christian community also reinforced hierarchy within that community.³³⁵ According to one church order, the clergy and the laity were not supposed to kiss each other; rather, cleric kissed cleric and lay person kissed lay person.³³⁶ This ritual communicated the divide between two separate groups within the Christian community.

After the kiss came the preparation of the gifts and the consecration of the Eucharist before the communal meal. In the “entrance of the mysteries,” the bread and wine were processed to the altar.³³⁷ Distinctions made between gold and jeweled patens and chalices and silver patens and silver “service chalices” (*calices ministeriales*) in the donations lists in the *Liber Pontificalis* suggest that the vessels that made the procession were decorated in a way that indicated the divinity of their contents.³³⁸ Once upon the altar, the celebrant

³³³ Mathews 1971, 142.

³³⁴ *Ibid.*, 148-9.

³³⁵ Penn 2005, 85-88.

³³⁶ *Constitutiones Apostolorum*, 8.11.9.

³³⁷ Mathews 1971, 155-162, esp. 156-7.

³³⁸ *LP* 34, 39, 42, 44, 45, 46, 48, 53, 54, 55, 58 all list smaller numbers of gold and/or jewel-encrusted patens and chalices and larger (some times much larger) numbers of service patens and chalices.

consecrated the bread and wine in a ritual that would have been visible from the nave.³³⁹ In addition to becoming the body and blood of Christ, the bread and wine became the food and drink of a communal meal that baptized Christians shared, clergy and laity alike. All baptized Christians were invited to process toward the altar to receive a piece of the bread and to drink wine from the chalice (hence the need for so many service vessels). The clergy received the sacrament first before passing it on to the laity, demonstrating their position of leadership over the church community.³⁴⁰ Christians who drank from the same chalice were bonded with each other and the cleric who drank from it first in an almost sympotic ritual.³⁴¹

The fact that these rituals were repeated in the same way at each celebration of the liturgy added to their pedagogical effectiveness. Each time congregants saw these rituals enacted by the clergy and participated in them themselves, they were instructed in the hierarchical relationships of the Christian community. The experiential pedagogy of bishops, priests, and deacons performing the rituals of the liturgy as leaders of the church community most effectively taught ordinary Christians their role as Christian leaders and their relationships to one another and to God.

Encountering God

Despite the clear lessons of community and hierarchy that the sensory experience of the liturgy taught ordinary Christians, the most important lesson was that the church was a time and a place for encountering God. The church building itself was constructed specifically for communal worship of the divine, and as such the building and its decoration worked together

³³⁹ Mathews 1971, 168-71.

³⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 172.

³⁴¹ On the ancient symposium, including community bonding through drinking from the same cup, see Murray 1990

with the other sensory aspects of the liturgy to convey a sense of God's presence. Church leaders used the material space to teach that the church was where people prayed to God, and since liturgical prayer was by definition communal, the liturgy taught Christians to pray to God as part of a community. The visual and aural aspects of prayer in the liturgy did not merely reinforce this lesson of divine encounter that was taught elsewhere; rather, they taught it on their own terms.

Many churches in late antiquity were designed to look as if they were places for encountering the divine as well.³⁴² When the emperor Constantine ordered that the Church of the Holy Sepulcher be built on the Golgotha site, he did so knowing that people who beheld the structure, both inside and out, would be reminded of Christ's death and resurrection. In a letter to the bishop of Jerusalem, Constantine asked him "to arrange and make a plan for each necessity so that a basilica be erected that was not just better than basilicas everywhere, but also the remaining such [buildings]."³⁴³ The result, as described by Eusebius, was breathtaking. Starting at the west end of the site, built over the tomb where Jesus' body was buried, was the round Church of the Resurrection (Anastasis), the "revered cave" which "the king's honor colored with columns chosen of the highest order and brightened with all sorts of ornaments."³⁴⁴ Beside the Anastasis were a series of cisterns and a baptistery.³⁴⁵ A courtyard was constructed immediately east of the Anastasis rotunda, with "bright stone spread upon the base," and it was "surrounded by long galleries of columns on three

³⁴² Yasin 2012, 948-9.

³⁴³ Προσῆκει τοῖνον τὴν σὴν ἀγκύοιαν οὕτω διατάξει τε καὶ ἐκάστου τῶν ἀναγκαίων ποιήσασθαι πρόνοιαν, ὡς οὐ μόνον βασιλικὴν τῶν ἀπανταχοῦ βελτίονα ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ τοιαῦτα γίνεσθαι, VC III.31.

³⁴⁴ Τοῦτο μὲν οὖν πρῶτον ὡσανεὶ τοῦ παντός κεφαλὴν ἐξαιρέτοις κίοσι κόσμῳ τε πλείστῳ κατεποίκιλεν ἡ βασιλέως φιλοτιμία, παντοίοις καλλωπίσμασι τὸ σεμνὸν ἄντρον φαιδρύνουσα, VC III.34.

³⁴⁵ Bordeaux Pilgrim, 594.

sides.”³⁴⁶ The southeast corner of the square featured a large commemorative cross that was the site of different liturgical celebrations.³⁴⁷ The original Constantinian cross was replaced in 420 with a gilded cross covered in precious stones, adding to the memorial’s splendor.³⁴⁸

The architectural and decorative features inside church buildings worked together to facilitate an encounter with God for ordinary Christians. The height of the structure focused eyes upward and the doors and windows allowed natural light to illuminate the entire building. All morning, sunlight would have flooded the east-facing doors at the church entrance; at dawn liturgies such as that on Easter Sunday, it could have reached as far as the altar.³⁴⁹ Light also would have reflected off of the mosaic that most likely covered the floors and walls of the church. Each glass tessera acted as a tiny mirror, and their reflections could illuminate the entire space.³⁵⁰ The decoration inside the Martyrium, characterized by a gilded ceiling and reflective marble, worked with light to produce a shimmering effect.³⁵¹ This effect communicated the presence of God inside the church building.

Hesychius taught that Christ was the light of the world in various formulations across several sermons.³⁵² He reinforced the designation of Christ-as-light in one of his Marian homilies by detailing the many epithets for Mary, which included “Mother of light,”³⁵³ “the gate placed in the east,” since ‘the true light [φῶς] lighting up all men coming into the world’

³⁴⁶ ὄν δὴ λίθος λαμπρὸς κατεστρωμένος ἐπ’ ἐδάφους ἐκόσμηι, μακροῖς περιδρόμοις στοῶν ἐκ τριπλεύρου περιεχόμενον, *VC* III.35

³⁴⁷ Egeria, 24.7. This was the “symbol” of the cross that Hesychius mentioned in *Hom.* III.1 (see above, Chapter 2).

³⁴⁸ Theophanes, *Chronographia*, an. 5920.

³⁴⁹ Eusebius, *VC*, II.37; cf. Hesychius, *Hom.* IV.

³⁵⁰ James 1996, 4-5.

³⁵¹ *VC* III.36.

³⁵² John 8:12.

³⁵³ Μητέρα φωτὸς, *Hom.* V.1.6.

is coming forth from your belly as if from some kingly bridal chamber,³⁵⁴ and “lamp with no mouth from which to catch fire.”³⁵⁵

The decorative program in the apse also visually demonstrated the encounter with God that was supposed to take place inside a church. The apse formed, as one art historian has called it, an “iconic zone,” wherein front-facing icons interacted directly with the viewer.³⁵⁶ Figures in the apse gazed into the interior of the church, inviting the congregation to make eye contact. In most cases, a lack of narrative content surrounding the figures drew attention to their gaze.³⁵⁷ The image of Christ (or the non-figural icon of a cross) that occupied the center of the apse provided a theophanic vision that went beyond a visual reminder of the church as space for the divine.³⁵⁸ Light concentrates in the curve of the apse where the central figure resides, which, in combination with the halos and rays of light often worked into images of Christ, highlighted the divinity of the central figure.³⁵⁹ The image’s gaze, then, offered the Christians in the congregation a point of interaction with the divine.³⁶⁰

Greeks and Romans throughout the Mediterranean world had interacted with images of their gods as if they contained the presence of those gods in this way for centuries.³⁶¹ Ancient Jews encountered the face of God in the Temple, and rabbis following the destruction of the Temple had to imagine ways both to cope with the loss of God’s face and to be able to see it symbolically in other objects.³⁶² The theophanic vision constructed in

³⁵⁴ Πύλην ἐν ἀνατολαῖς κειμένην, ἐπειδὴ «τὸ φῶς τὸ ἀληθινὸν τὸ φωτίζον πάντα ἄνθρωπον ἐρχόμενον εἰς τὸν κόσμον» ἐκ τῆς σῆς γαστρὸς καθάπερ ἐκ τινος παστάδος βασιλικῆς προέρχεται, *Hom.* V.2.23-6.

³⁵⁵ ἄστομον Λυχίαν ἀφ’ ἐαυτῆς ἄπτουσαν, *Hom.* V.1.15-16.

³⁵⁶ Thunø 2015, 82.

³⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 65-6.

³⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 93-8.

³⁵⁹ James 1996, 7.

³⁶⁰ Thunø 2015, 134ff. See also Kessler 2000 on visually encountering the ineffable God in medieval art.

³⁶¹ Elsner 2007, 29-48.

³⁶² Neis 2013, Chapters 2 and 3.

church apses was one opportunity that Christianity provided the faithful to see God. Larger-than-life apse programs flooded with light presented in the clearest terms that the church was a space and the liturgy was the occasion for Christians to encounter God.³⁶³

Furthermore, the depictions of Christ in the apses of late antique churches, particularly when he was illuminated by light sources and his own mosaic tesserae, represented a theological “east” towards which Christians in the congregation were supposed to direct their prayers.³⁶⁴ Many late antique churches, the Church of the Holy Sepulcher included, did not face east. A visual program showing Christ as the light of the morning sun instead served to orient the prayers of the congregants. A combination of the domed surface of the apse, the composition of the entire program directing attention to the icon in the center, and, when available, the commanding gaze of Christ drew the viewers’ attention directly to the image of the divine.³⁶⁵ Thus, apse imagery was particularly important for teaching ordinary Christians how to pray. It gave them a direction to pray, along with everyone else inside the church, as well as a visual image to focus on when directing their prayers, even though God himself was invisible and ineffable.

Christians also encountered God in a more tangible fashion by interacting with the book of the gospels, the Eucharist, and, in Jerusalem and other places that held a relic of the true cross, his relic.³⁶⁶ The gospel book was often decorated in such a way as to convey its connection to Christ’s divinity. Very few gospel books survive from late antiquity, but what little material evidence does survive suggests that they were often ornately decorated.³⁶⁷

³⁶³ Frank 2000, 114-18.

³⁶⁴ Thunø 2015, 131-2.

³⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 134.

³⁶⁶ On touch in the early Byzantine liturgy, see Caseau 2013, 69-77.

³⁶⁷ Mathews 1971, 149.

Written sources often mention gospel books bound in gold and jewels.³⁶⁸ Light from the candles carried on either side of the book would have produced a glittering effect on a jeweled or metallic surface.

That the clergy interacted with the gospel book as if it were Christ conveyed the notion that the church was a space for interaction with the divine more explicitly than the space itself. When the clergy treated the book with such reverence, it showed the congregation that Christ indeed was before all of them. Christians who attended a liturgy in which the book was brought forward for people to touch and kiss could have observed this even more clearly.³⁶⁹ In Hesychius' congregation, in which the Word-made-flesh was paramount to the understanding of the relationship between Christ's humanity and divinity, the gospel book was effectively a personification of this lesson.³⁷⁰ A book constructed of animal skins containing God's word and representing Christ was literally the Word-made-flesh.

At the Church of the Holy Sepulcher, Christians could also physically encounter God through the piece of the cross from Christ's crucifixion, referred to in literary sources as the "wood of the cross." The relic was housed in the Martyrium, so ordinary Christians attending a liturgy in that space also would have been made aware of its presence.³⁷¹ When Hesychius repeatedly mentioned the "wood" in his first paschal homily, it is easy to imagine all eyes turning towards the relic that sat in their midst.³⁷²

³⁶⁸ See, for example, *LP* 54.10.

³⁶⁹ Mathews 1971, 149.

³⁷⁰ See above, Chapter 2.

³⁷¹ Aubineau 1972, 54.

³⁷² *Hom.* III.2-5.

Among saints' relics, which were readily available in churches all across the late antique Mediterranean, the "wood of the cross" was special—since Christ was raised from the dead and ascended bodily into heaven, a piece of the cross on which he was hung was the closest thing to a relic of Christ himself. It is in part because of this significance that pilgrims flocked from everywhere to behold this particular relic.

The "wood of the cross," which Hesychius preached about in his paschal homilies, was brought out at Golgotha behind the cross (in the courtyard between the Anastasis and the Martyrium), in a ceremony that Egeria described thoroughly in her pilgrimage narrative:

And thus the chair for the bishop is placed on Golgotha behind the Cross, where he stands now; the bishop sits in the chair; a table draped with linen is placed before him; deacons stand around the table and a small silver and gilded box is brought forth in which there is the holy wood of the cross; it is uncovered and brought forth, both the wood of the cross and the title are placed on the table. Therefore, while it is placed on the table, the seated bishop presses with his hands the highest parts of the holy wood; moreover, the deacons, who stand in a circle, keep watch. It is thus guarded over for this reason, because there is a custom that one by one all people coming, the faithful as well as catechumens, leaning themselves towards the table, kiss the holy wood and pass by. And although I do not know when, it is said that a certain person affixed a bite and stole from the holy wood, to this point now it is thus guarded over by deacons, who stand in a circle, in order that no one coming might dare do it again. And so therefore all people go by, one by one, all of them leaning themselves forward, first with the forehead and then with the eyes touching the cross and title, and thus kissing the cross they pass by, and no one sends forth his hand for touching.³⁷³

³⁷³ Et sic ponitur cathedra episcopo in golgotha post crucem, quae stat nunc; residet episcopus in cathedra; ponitur ante eum mensa sublindeata; stant in giro mensa diacones et affertur locus argenteus deauratus, in quo est lignum sanctum crucis, aperitur et profertur, ponitur in mensa tam lignum crucis quam titulus. Cum ergo positum fuerit in mensa, episcopus sedens de manibus suis summitates de ligno sancto premet, diacones autem, qui in giro stant, custodent. Hoc autem propterea sic custoditur, quia consuetudo est ut unus et unus omnis populus ueniens, tam fideles quam catechumini, acclinantes se ad mensam, osculentur sanctum lignum et pertranseant. Et quoniam nescio quando dicitur quidam fixisse morsum et furasse de sancto ligno, ideo nunc a diaconibus, qui in giro stant, sic custoditur, ne qui ueniens audeat denuo sic facere. Ac sic ergo omnis populus transit unus et unus toti acclinantes se, primum de fronte, sic de oculis tangentes crucem et titulum, et sic osculantes crucem pertranseunt, manum autem nemo mittit ad tangendum, Egeria, 37.1-3.

Pilgrims who were in town for Easter would have had the recent experience of kissing the cross relic when they heard Hesychius discuss the “wood of the cross” at the vigil the following evening.³⁷⁴

In his homily, Hesychius drew especial attention to the cross relic’s woodiness, both by contrasting it with cross symbols and comparing it to another instance of sacred wood, Moses’ staff.³⁷⁵ The physical interaction with the wood of the cross that pilgrims had with this particular relic helped make them feel connected to the narrative of Christ’s death and resurrection. In touching the cross, they could, with the bandit crucified beside Christ, “stand fast by the cross of the savior, speaking these very utterances: ‘Lord, remember me in your kingdom,’ in order that [they] also might become sharers in paradise and have enjoyment of the kingdom of heaven.”³⁷⁶

Touching this relic, like touching other relics of local saints everywhere, enabled contemporary Christians to be part of the past that produced the relic. Touching the piece of the true cross at Jerusalem, the most important pilgrimage site in late antique Christianity, also made Christians feel connected to the wider community of Christians who came from all around the Mediterranean to touch this same piece of wood. As Hesychius preached in his paschal homily, “In the wood of the cross, he gathered together the churches of the world.”³⁷⁷ Moreover, by kissing other Christians in their home churches after kissing the relic of the cross, pilgrims brought Christians from their local communities into the broader network of association with that relic without their having to go on pilgrimage themselves.

³⁷⁴ *Hom.* III.

³⁷⁵ *Hom.* III.3.

³⁷⁶ Παραμείνωμεν καὶ ἡμεῖς τῷ τοῦ σωτῆρος σταυρῷ, λέγοντες αὐτὰς τὰς φωνάς· «Κύριε, μνήσθητί μου ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ σου», ἵνα καὶ ἡμεῖς τοῦ παραδείσου μέτοχοι γενώμεθα καὶ βασιλείας οὐρανῶν ἀπολαύσωμεν, *Hom.* III.4.12-16.

³⁷⁷ ἐν σταυροῦ ξύλῳ τὰς τῆς οἰκουμένης ἐκκλησίας διήγειρεν, *Hom.* III.3.6-7.

Finally, Christians experienced the most physical contact with God during the Eucharist, when they not only touched a piece of Christ's body in the form of the consecrated bread, but tasted it and ate it as well.³⁷⁸ The sense of taste necessitated by the communal meal provided baptized Christians with another sensory cue to help them associate and remember the lessons of the liturgy.

Perhaps more significantly, by ingesting the bread Christians were able to embody Christ and God. Catechetical preachers of the fourth century made a point to teach Christians a new way of seeing that would enable them to see the bread and wine of the Eucharist as the body and blood of Christ.³⁷⁹ Many ascetics in late antiquity and the middle ages were especially moved by this sort of interaction with God.³⁸⁰ Yet, the difficulty catechetical preachers had explaining the Eucharist and the infrequency of such discourse in later pastoral homilies suggests that this deep, mystical understanding of interaction with God by consuming the body of Christ was not the way every ordinary Christian experienced tasting the Eucharist. Although for some taste became the most effective means of communicating with the divine, for many others the fact of sharing a communal meal with fellow baptized Christians was the primary experience they associated with the sense of taste.

Smells also appeared in various aspects of the Christian liturgy and at times were explicitly employed to signal the presence of the divine.³⁸¹ Indeed, perfumes, whether introduced through incense, oils, or other aromatic media, had long been associated with the

³⁷⁸ Caseau 2013, 73-4.

³⁷⁹ Frank 2001, who also concedes that, for the catechetical preachers discussed in her article, "receiving the Eucharist required a stretch of the imagination," 619.

³⁸⁰ See, for instance, Bynum 1987 on the particular relationship between female ascetics and consumption of the Eucharist in the later middle ages.

³⁸¹ Harvey 2006 notes that fourth- and fifth-century Christian authors used olfactory metaphors to describe the encounter with humans and the divine, arguing that the ritual context with which smells were encountered taught Christians the meanings of these smells, 64-79.

divine in various ancient Mediterranean cultures.³⁸² The torch or candle lit at the start of the paschal vigil, the candles that accompanied the gospel book in procession, and the incense that was brought out on very special occasions all contributed to the sensory experience of the divine inside the church. Similar to taste, smell also offered another association for the congregation to reinforce lessons about the divine in their memories.

The encounter with God facilitated by multiple sensory experiences was one of the primary functions of the liturgy. Part of this encounter was a conversation between God and Christians that took place through prayers and song. The very act of singing taught ordinary Christians about how to interact with God in a liturgical context. Church fathers who wrote about the psalms all wrote about their spiritual nature and power to direct the soul toward the divine.³⁸³ The Lord's Prayer, which Christians prayed together during each liturgy, was a model of a conversation with God.³⁸⁴ Group recitation of this prayer taught ordinary Christians how to talk to God. Hesychius called attention to the importance of praying together in the liturgy. Being able to hear the voices of everyone else in the congregation conversing with God through prayer also taught that this conversation with God was a community endeavor.³⁸⁵ Through prayer, Christians could learn from each other the appropriate way to converse with God.

Conclusion

The ritual of the liturgy as experienced by the congregation was a pedagogical process that served on its own and in conjunction with the pedagogy of preaching to teach ordinary

³⁸² Caseau 2007, 82-5.

³⁸³ Harrison 2011, 215-18.

³⁸⁴ Harrison 2013, 192ff.

³⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, Ch 6, esp. 198-201.

Christians about their place in the Christian community and hierarchy and their encounter with God that occurred within the liturgy. The liturgy communicated lessons of hierarchy and community visually, as well as through sound, touch, movement, and other sensory experiences that participation in the liturgy provided. The multi-sensory experience also aided the pedagogy of preaching, illustrating theological lessons from preachers' sermons, making them easier to understand and remember, and reinforcing such lessons in multiple ways.

Furthermore, the similarities in form between different church buildings, apses, vestments, hymns, prayers, and the Eucharist, despite significant local variation, enabled Christians to get a sense of the universality of the catholic Christian community. Each liturgy in each church within the orthodox network of Christian leadership tried to recreate the experience that was happening in churches all over the Mediterranean world. While they performed the rituals of the liturgy, preachers hoped to teach their congregations that their communal encounter with God inside a church made them part of a united and universal community of Christians. They taught this concept by enabling Christians to experience belonging to such a community themselves.

PART II: CAESARIUS OF ARLES

Caesarius of Arles was born to an elite family around 470 in the northern Gallic city of Chalon-sur-Saône, which at the time was located in the Burgundian kingdom.³⁸⁶ He received a traditional grammatical education as was typical of the Gallo-Roman elite into the sixth century, and when he reached adulthood he moved south to the island monastery of Lérins until the late 490s, when his extreme asceticism prompted the abbot to send him to Arles to regain his health. Lérins had been a popular destination for elite men desiring the contemplative life during the fifth century, and it eventually became a stepping stone to episcopal careers. Monastically-trained priests can be said to have ushered in a sort of church reform movement in fifth-century Gaul whose goal was for bishops to behave more like monks and less like secular aristocrats.³⁸⁷

Once at Arles, Caesarius studied rhetoric with the North African teacher Pomerius and was ordained a deacon, and then a priest, by Aeonius, the bishop of Arles who was also his relative. After returning to Lérins for three years to serve as its abbot, he was chosen by Aeonius to succeed him as bishop after his death. Caesarius was consecrated bishop of Arles in December 502, and he remained in that position until his death forty years later.

Arles was a metropolitan see, which meant that Caesarius had authority over other episcopal sees in his ecclesiastical province. He exercised this authority in large part by

³⁸⁶ The most recent comprehensive work on Caesarius is Klingshirn 1994. See also Klingshirn's translation and commentary of the *Life*, *Testament*, and *Letters* of Caesarius, 1994b. For Caesarius' life before becoming bishop, see *Life* I.3-14.

³⁸⁷ Klingshirn 1994, 72-87.

presiding over multiple provincial and regional church councils over the course of his tenure. The fact that his province was divided between the Burgundian and Visigothic kingdoms, however, made that difficult. Although bishops could communicate with each other across political boundaries, a central administrative system in which all bishops in Gaul could meet for a council was impossible.³⁸⁸ Caesarius' effective authority to summon bishops to a council only applied within the political boundaries of the kingdom where his see resided. Nevertheless, through his councils he worked to define a uniform conduct and orthodox theology for at least the clergy that fell within his jurisdiction.³⁸⁹

Caesarius also developed a close relationship with the bishops of Rome, in contrast to previous Gallic bishops and metropolitans.³⁹⁰ In 514, he was given the *pallium* by pope Symmachus, making him the *vicarius* of Gaul and theoretically in charge of the entire Gallic church.³⁹¹ He was in close contact with popes Hormisdas and Symmachus during the Acacian Schism, a dispute beginning in the late fifth-century when the patriarch of Constantinople and like-minded bishops of eastern cities, with the support of the emperor Anastasius, disagreed with western bishops over how to resolve some problems of theological doctrine raised by the Council of Chalcedon in 451. During the schism, the church hierarchy under Constantinople considered the western churches under Rome to be heretical, and vice versa. Through his contact with bishops of Rome, Caesarius worked to unite the eastern Christian community with the community deemed by Rome to be orthodox and repair the schism, which officially ended in 519.³⁹²

³⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, Chapter 5, esp. 129.

³⁸⁹ The council that primarily dealt with orthodox theology was the Council of Orange in 529. On Orange, see below, 135-6.

³⁹⁰ On the tensions between bishops of Rome and Gaul in the fifth century, see Mathisen 1989.

³⁹¹ Caesarius, *Ep.* 7b.

³⁹² See *Ep.* 10.

Focusing on the episcopate of Caesarius, a metropolitan bishop of a major western city with close ties to Rome, responsible for numerous other bishops and sees as well as a large congregation of ordinary Christians in Arles and its hinterlands, reveals the concerns he had as an administrator and those he had as a pastor, and how both those concerns affected the ways he taught his congregation. Through his sermon collection and his official actions as metropolitan, most notably in the Gallic church councils, Caesarius attempted to teach not only his immediate congregation, but countless other congregations beyond Arles whose leaders followed his precepts and copied his sermons. Thus, Caesarius' pedagogy can be understood to have applied to Christian communities throughout Gaul in the sixth century and even later by virtue of Caesarius' own promulgation of his teachings.

The city of Arles, where Caesarius preached most of his homilies, was a major Mediterranean port city of great commercial and political importance in the Roman Empire. Located on the southeastern coast of France on the Mediterranean Sea, Arles retained its importance as it changed hands from the Roman Empire to the Visigothic kingdom to the Ostrogothic kingdom and finally to the Frankish kingdom over the course of the late fifth and early sixth centuries.³⁹³ The city was home to a diverse urban population that included Jews as well as Christians and native Greek speakers among the more populous native Latin speakers. There was also a small population of Gothic military leaders, who practiced an Arian form of Christianity that was considered heretical. The Goths were few in number, however, with much civic and ecclesiastical administration left to the existing Gallo-Romans, and this Arianism did not really pose a threat to Caesarius' orthodox Christian community.

³⁹³ For an overview of the city of Arles in antiquity to the sixth century, see Klingshirn 1994, 33-71. See *Ibid.*, 104-17 for the transition from Visigothic to Ostrogothic rule and 256-60 for the Frankish acquisition of Arles towards the end of Caesarius' life.

Outside the city was a vibrant hinterland, by this time occupied almost exclusively by Christians worshipping in rural parishes whose administration was the responsibility of Caesarius.³⁹⁴ The fifth century saw rapid growth in the Christian population on account of the mass conversion of the Gallic countryside to Christianity, which created a diverse laity who still took part in some pagan activity, as well as a noticeable shortage of priests who met the requirements for Christian leadership agreed upon by bishops.³⁹⁵ As is evident from the canons of church councils forbidding soothsaying and other pagan rituals and exhortations against pagan activity of various sorts in Caesarius' sermons, elements of traditional religion were still very much a part of Arlesian rural culture, even among people who considered themselves to be Christian and participated in the Christian faith community.³⁹⁶

Coincident with the rapid growth of Christianity was an increase in private shrines and oratories being built on estates and villas in the countryside. It was not until the later fifth century that bishops started to regulate these private churches, but even then there was no real push to restrict their construction or usage.³⁹⁷ For his part, Caesarius attempted to ensure that all rural Christians who normally attended liturgies at private shrines or oratories received some official instruction in Christianity by requiring that they attend liturgies at churches in the city for the important feast days of Easter, the Nativity of the Lord, the Epiphany, the Ascension of the Lord, and Pentecost.³⁹⁸ He also preached in rural parishes himself sometimes and collected his own sermons and sent them to parishes throughout Gaul

³⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 202-9.

³⁹⁵ See my discussion on Caesarius' legislation on the topic in church councils, below 131-5.

³⁹⁶ See Klingshirn 1994, 209-226 on "peasant religion" within Caesarius' congregation.

³⁹⁷ On episcopal control of shrines and oratories on private land, see Sessa 2012, 161-72, esp. 163-3.

³⁹⁸ Council of Agde (506), 21.

so that priests and bishops who did not have a talent for composing speeches could read them aloud to their congregations.

As metropolitan bishop, Caesarius was thus faced with the challenge of composing sermons that could effectively teach the Christian faith to wealthy urban elites and rural peasants alike. Theologically, he was influenced both by his colleagues at Lérins, some of whom became fellow bishops, and the bishops of Rome, yet it was the Christian community at Arles that most influenced his pedagogy. In his sermons, Caesarius spoke to the needs of the ordinary Christians in his community and presented the theological lessons he deemed necessary for salvation in terms that made sense for the many people who were rural, uneducated, and steeped in pagan tradition. He carried his ascetic lifestyle with him to his episcopate, where he strove to present himself as an example of virtue to all who saw and interacted with him. Moreover, the pastoral interactions he had with ordinary Christians affected the way he administered the Gallic church in the councils, demonstrating that the practical unity of the universal Christian church relied on the ability of bishops to communicate with actual local Christian communities like the one at Arles.

The following two chapters show the different lessons that Caesarius taught the diverse and largely rural population under his jurisdiction. Chapter 4 demonstrates how he attempted to unite his Christian community through virtue by teaching his congregation both how to act virtuously and to believe that virtue, enabled by the grace of God, made them part of the faith community. Chapter 5 details the various means by which he employed the pedagogical concept of “example” to teach the same lessons about living virtuously as a Christian to those who might not have heard or fully understood his sermons. In all of his lessons, Caesarius strove to teach ordinary Christians how to act in accordance with the

catholic and orthodox church, all the while working with other bishops to determine precisely what defined a member of the *fides catholica*.

Chapter 4

A Community Built on Virtue:

Christian Faith and Conduct in the Sermons of Caesarius of Arles

With a single agricultural metaphor meant to appeal to a rural audience yet still be accessible to an urban one, Caesarius of Arles described the relationship he had with the Christians in his church and their relationship to God. He concluded with a statement of what was required of priests as well as laypeople to be part of that community:

Now, in the church priests [*sacerdotes*]³⁹⁹ seem to bear the likeness of cows, while the Christian people tend toward the type of calves...Just as a cow has two udders from which she nourishes her calf, so too must priests feed the Christian people from the two udders of the Old and New Testaments. Moreover, consider, brothers, and see that not only do cows in the flesh come to their calves themselves, but the calves also go to meet [their mothers]...⁴⁰⁰

We believe, from the mercy of God, that he will thus deem it worthy to give to us the eagerness for reading and preaching, and to you the desire of hearing, so that before the tribunal of the eternal judge we will be able to render a suitable account concerning our preaching and you, through your kind obedience and perseverance in good works, deserve to come through to eternal rewards.⁴⁰¹

³⁹⁹ *Sacerdos*, the word for “priest” taken from pagan Roman religion, referred to bishops and priests (any ordained cleric who could consecrate the Eucharist) in late antiquity, per Niermeyer 1954, s.v. “sacerdos.” It was not until later that *sacerdos* came to mean “priest” as opposed to “bishop.” Pre-eighth-century authors used the terms borrowed from Greek, *episcopus* and *presbyter*, when they wanted to distinguish between “bishop” and “priest.”

⁴⁰⁰ *Sacerdotes enim in ecclesia similitudinem videntur habere vaccarum; christiani vero populi typum praeferunt vitulorum...sicut enim vacca duo ubera habet, ex quibus nutriat vitulum suum, ita et sacerdotes de duobus uberibus, scilicet veteris vel novi testamenti, debent pascere populum christianum. Considerate tamen, fratres, et videte quia carnales vaccae non solum ipsae ad suos vitulos veniunt, sed etiam vituli sui eis obviam currunt...* Caesarius, *Serm.* 4.4.1-15.

⁴⁰¹ *Credimus tamen de dei misericordia, quod ita et nobis studium legendi vel praedicandi, et vobis desiderium praestare dignabitur audiendi, ut ante tribunal aeterni iudicis et nos de praedicationibus nostris bonam possimus rationem reddere, et vos per benignam oboedientiam et bonorum operum perseverantiam ad aeterna praemia mereamini pervenire, Ibid.* 37-43.

Caesarius understood the community of Christians to be a complex hierarchical network organized by relationships of obligation that were in turn overseen by God. Laypeople had to look up to the clergy for instruction and guidance and the clergy were duty-bound to educate their congregations. These relationships, according to Caesarius, were held together on the surface by the virtuous conduct of both clerics and laypeople. Ultimately, for Caesarius, this virtue was a gift from God, but ordinary Christians did not need to trouble themselves over the chicken and the egg. Instead of laboring over complex theological definitions in his sermons, Caesarius focused on teaching his congregations how to act in order to show that they belonged to the universal Christian community.

Caesarius' words and actions throughout his administrative and pastoral career demonstrate an effort to build a church community upon virtuous conduct, and that he consequently taught his congregations to act as virtuous members of the community. More than any other theological lesson, his homilies focused on correct moral conduct. This was in part due to his diverse and diversely educated congregation, of which many still took part in pagan rituals and celebrations though their families had been Christian for generations.⁴⁰² Yet, Caesarius was also attentive to the moral conduct of his fellow clergy, legislating on it again and again through the numerous provincial and regional church councils over which he presided while he was metropolitan.⁴⁰³ Moreover, his theological position, which he defined in the Council of Orange in 529, cleared a space for moral conduct, or "good works," in a model of Christian salvation predicated on God's grace. Caesarius and his teachings can

⁴⁰² Much of the Gallic countryside had converted to Christianity over the course of the fifth century, but their practice of it and continued engagement with pagan practices was problematic to some contemporary Christian authors, including Caesarius. For a discussion of the devotional practices of rural people in Caesarius' Arles, see Klingshirn 1994, 209-26.

⁴⁰³ These were the councils of Agde (506), Arles (524), Carpentras (529), Orange (529), Vaison (529), and Marseilles (533). On the authority of the metropolitan in ecclesiastical councils, see Gaudemet 1985, 51-3.

therefore only be understood in the context of his involvement both with other bishops at councils and with lay Christians in church and at festivals.

Aside from his interest in moral conduct, Caesarius was also particularly concerned with achieving church unity. Each day he encountered fragmentation on multiple levels. Not only was he in charge of the episcopal see of Arles, but as metropolitan he also governed an ecclesiastical province that stretched across multiple kingdoms and was only “reunited” by the Ostrogoths at the cost of Arles’ coming under siege.⁴⁰⁴ He experienced ecclesiastical fragmentation at home in the form of the Arian Christianity practiced by the Visigothic and Ostrogothic military leaders, and the opposing understandings of the roles of grace and free choice in salvation held by the bishops in Gaul and the bishop of Rome.⁴⁰⁵ Abroad, the alliance he sought with the pope Hormisdas involved him in the restoration of unity between the eastern and western churches following the Acacian Schism.⁴⁰⁶ Finally, his local community was divided between urban and rural, with rural populations increasingly celebrating liturgies in small parishes and at shrines and oratories on private land and thus outside his immediate control.⁴⁰⁷

Faced with such fragmentation, Caesarius adopted a pedagogy of remediation. He wanted first and foremost to teach his community how to demonstrate their belonging within the universal Christian church, which he called the *fides catholica*.⁴⁰⁸ This “universal faith” for Caesarius consisted of conduct that could be seen by other Christians and by outsiders, or

⁴⁰⁴ Klingshirn 1994, 88-117.

⁴⁰⁵ On the controversy over grace and free will in the fifth and sixth century, see below, 135-6.

⁴⁰⁶ Caesarius, *Ep.* 10.

⁴⁰⁷ For shrines and oratories, see Bowes 2008, Chapter 3 on estate-based worship in late antiquity, and Sessa 2012, 161-72 on the tendency starting in the late fifth century of bishops to attempt to control worship on private land.

⁴⁰⁸ For example, *Serm.* 43.3, *Serm.* 10, which Caesarius adapted from a sermon collection, and the statement of faith in the Council of Orange.

virtues. In his sermons, Caesarius discussed “faith” in the correct beliefs, such as those outlined in the creed that Christians recited during the liturgy and in the definition of faith he proposed at the Council of Orange, as if it were another one of the virtues that Christians actively demonstrated by their conduct.⁴⁰⁹ His focus on correct moral conduct was thus intertwined with his goal of achieving a united and unified church community. Like grace and the free choice to do good works, these two pedagogical aims of Caesarius cannot be disentangled.

This chapter presents a reconstruction of Caesarius’ pedagogy through preaching through an examination of his large collection of sermons. I argue that Caesarius primarily sought to teach his diverse congregations how to demonstrate belonging to a universal Christian community by actively manifesting the virtue of faith alongside more visible virtues such as mercy and love. Conscious of the different levels of general as well as Christian and scriptural education among his audience, he developed pedagogical techniques that made his lessons clear and accessible to the least among them and meaningful to the more erudite or devout. By presenting a set of instructions and examples of correct conduct, Caesarius hoped to establish a community based on virtues that all Christians could strive to enact themselves.

At the Crossroads of Community

Caesarius presents an ideal case study of the Christian community in Arles because he stood at the center of the vertical relationships between laypeople and clergy and God and the horizontal relationships among the clergy. It is evident from the sources produced by

⁴⁰⁹ *Serm.* 35.1.

Caesarius—sermons, letters, and canons of church councils—that both his pastoral and administrative roles were significant enough that they mutually informed one another. Caesarius understood that unifying the way bishops and priests led congregations was necessary for uniting all Christians into a single universal community. He also understood the realities of ministering to a specific congregation full of individual people who all had different needs. The community of virtue he desired to create through preaching and councils, then, was constructed from the existing community that supplied his congregation.⁴¹⁰

Caesarius began with an ideal in mind that was most likely inherited from his monastic experience at Lérins and the legacy of fifth-century Gallic church councils.⁴¹¹ With the changing political tides of the sixth century, metropolitans began to use councils to define the Christian communities of the new post-Roman kingdoms and to unite them with each other and to the episcopal see of Rome and elsewhere. The Council of Agde, convened in 506 under the auspices of the Visigothic kingdom, was one such council and the first to be overseen by Caesarius. This council sought to confirm earlier canons and connect the church in Gaul to the rest of the *fides catholica*.⁴¹² Later in Caesarius' career he called several more provincial councils, largely in order to reaffirm the canons of Agde and impose stricter regulations on the growing church.⁴¹³

⁴¹⁰ On the tensions between Caesarius' admonitions and the existing Christian community of Arles, see Klingshirn 1994, Chapters 7 and 8, 171-243. See also Grig 2013, who sees a more antagonistic relationship between Caesarius and his congregation, arguing that he "aimed at nothing less than the wholesale reform, or even assassination, of popular culture, as he saw it, and its replacement with a new Christian culture" 198.

⁴¹¹ Provincial councils in Gaul (Gallic councils) began meeting with increasing frequency in the fifth century, in part due to Lérins alumni acquiring episcopal sees and using councils to consolidate their authority, both within Gaul and in contrast to Rome. See Mathisen 1989, *passim*. esp. 93 and 101-16.

⁴¹² Agde (506); Klingshirn 1994, 97-104.

⁴¹³ *Ibid.*, 139ff; Councils of Arles (524), Carpentras (527), Orange (529), Vaison (529), Valence (529), and Marseilles (533).

The collected canons of the Gallic councils survive in numerous early manuscripts, and the earliest collections of canons are believed to have been compiled almost contemporaneously with their respective councils.⁴¹⁴ The distribution and survival rate of manuscripts containing canons suggests that collections of canons were continuously compiled and disseminated throughout Gaul in the fifth and sixth century.⁴¹⁵ Additionally, there is at least one canonical reference to their dissemination.⁴¹⁶ By the mid-sixth-century, bishops seem to have been making an effort to circulate these collected canons down the hierarchy to parish priests in order to regulate their conduct and the way they managed their churches. How enforceable these canons were remains a question, yet the language used in many of the canons as well as the concerted effort to compile and circulate makes it clear that the metropolitans and bishops who signed their names to them wanted them to be followed. Every bishop who was in attendance at the council signed his name below the canons in order to give them authority. The continued use of councils by the region's bishops and secular rulers into the eighth century further indicates that they did have some practical authority, at least among bishops.⁴¹⁷

Caesarius' Council of Agde was the first of three inter-provincial, or regional, councils designed in part to reinforce the authority of the ruling power by allying itself with the local church and, by extension, the entire catholic church.⁴¹⁸ The bishops also saw the

⁴¹⁴ On the canons of the Gallic councils, dating, and manuscript tradition, see Gaudemet 1985, 49-50 and 84-6; Munier 1963, v-xi, and 209-36 and Mathisen 2014 and 1997.

⁴¹⁵ For a detailed discussion of sixth-century canon compilation, see Mathisen 1997.

⁴¹⁶ Canon 6 of the 541 Council of Orléans states: That parish clerics receive from their bishops the necessary statutes of the canons to be read by them, which were decreed for their safety, after they allege that they are ignorant [of them]. "Ut parrochiani clerici a pontificibus suis necessaria sibi statuta canonum legenda percipiant, ne se ipsi uel populi, quae pro salute eorum decreta sunt, excusint postmodum ignorasse," Orléans (541) c. 6.

⁴¹⁷ See Halfond 2010 for the continued practice of holding councils and promulgating canons under the Merovingian Franks, esp. 131-58 on enforcement of conciliar rulings.

⁴¹⁸ The other two were Orléans, convened by the Franks in 511, and Epaon, convened by the Burgundians in 517. On the regional Gallic councils, see Gaudemet 1985, 106-9.

council as an opportunity to increase the authority of the church by setting rules meant to preserve its authority in a practical sense. The specific elements about which the canons of Agde legislated reveal the problems apparent in Christian communities throughout southern and south-western Gaul. The Gallic church was not just fragmented politically; there were other threats to its integrity as well.

Most problems were related to the sheer size of the Christian community, which had grown considerably in the fifth century. Naturally, Caesarius wanted to make sure that all Christians attended the liturgy, that they stayed the entire time, and that, most significantly, the clergy who ministered to them were legitimate, effective, and able to provide the same liturgical experience in the rural parishes as in the city. Indeed, the overwhelming majority of the canons of Agde refer to ordinations of clergy and their conduct once ordained. This focus is consistent with the aims of councils in the fourth and fifth centuries, which were largely concerned with policing the clergy as well as defining orthodoxy.⁴¹⁹ Yet insofar as the quantity and quality of the clergy affected the way laypeople participated in the Christian faith, rules for clergy were also important for the laity. Moreover, the existence of canons specifically referencing laypeople and the liturgies or festivals they attended also demonstrates that these councils were not just for the clergy. They were an attempt to define the entire Christian community.

In order to ensure that all Christians had access to this community, and consequently to the salvation obtained through Christianity, canon 18 required all Christians to attend a liturgy at least on the Nativity of the Lord, Easter, and Pentecost, or else they were not to be considered members of the catholic community.⁴²⁰ Canon 21 further specified that on those

⁴¹⁹ Gaudemet 1985, 55-6.

⁴²⁰ Agde (506), 18. This injunction was repeated in Orléans (511), 25 and Clermont (535), 15.

special feast days, as well as the Epiphany, the Ascension of the Lord, and the birthday of Saint John the Baptist, Christians needed to attend a liturgy in a city or parish church rather than in one of the many chapels and oratories that appeared in rural areas.⁴²¹

Caesarius and his fellow bishops recognized the need for parish churches and even private chapels as the only realistic way to enable all Christians in Gaul to celebrate the liturgy.⁴²² This is perhaps why they took special care to legislate on the nature of liturgical services. Canon 30 specified that liturgies in Gaul needed to contain certain elements that were common in liturgies celebrated elsewhere:

And because it is fitting that the order of the church be observed by everyone equally, one must strive that, just as it is everywhere, collections be spoken in order by bishops or priests after the antiphons, and that morning hymns and vespers be sung on all days, and that at the conclusion of matins and vesper masses after the hymns, chapter titles of psalms be spoken and the people, with their evening prayer having been collected, be dismissed by the bishop with a blessing.⁴²³

The final blessing was considered so significant that an entire canon, canon 47, was dedicated to admonishing all Christians to stay inside the church until after the blessing had concluded.⁴²⁴ Caesarius was especially concerned that Christians remain in church until after the blessing, even going so far as to lock the doors of his church after the gospel reading.⁴²⁵

Another problem associated with the expanded numbers of lay Christians was a growing need for clergy, a problem a later council addressed specifically in one of its canons

⁴²¹ Agde (506), 21. This was also repeated in Orléans (511), 27.

⁴²² On Christian worship on private estates in late antiquity, see Bowes 2008, Chapter 3 and Bowes 2015. Cf. MacMullen, 2009, who argues on the basis of limited space in purpose-built churches that many ordinary Christians celebrated rituals outside of the church and in cemeteries.

⁴²³ Et quia conuenit ordinem ecclesiae ab omnibus aequaliter custodiri, studendum est ut, sicut ubique fit, et post antiphonas collectiones per ordinem ab episcopis uel presbyteris dicantur et hymnos matutinos uel uespertinos diebus omnibus decantari et in conclusione matutinarum uel uespertinarum missarum post hymnos capitella de psalmis dici et plebem collecta oratione ad uesperam ab episcopo cum benedictione dimitti, Agde (506), 30.

⁴²⁴ Agde (506), 47. This injunction was also found in the fifth-century *Statuta Ecclesiae Antiqua*, 31, and was later repeated in Orléans (511), 26 and Orléans (538), 32(29).

⁴²⁵ *Life of Caesarius* 1.27. Cf. *Serm.* 73-4.

designating priests and deacons the right to preach or read out previously published homilies in the absence of a bishop.⁴²⁶ The majority of the canons of Agde were thus concerned with proper ordinations of qualified candidates, regulating the behavior of the clergy, and implementing mechanisms of punishment for clergy who did not follow these rules.⁴²⁷ Some canons explicitly related to clerical ministry of parishes. Canon 2 required that clerics not neglect to frequent their churches and administer communion.⁴²⁸ Canon 41 forbade clerical drunkenness, threatening excommunication for a period of thirty days or corporal punishment as a consequence.⁴²⁹ Canon 42 threatened excommunication for all clerics or laymen who practiced augury or divination by “lots of the saints” on the grounds that it defiled the “faith of the catholic religion.”⁴³⁰ This last canon highlights the issue of pagan practices persisting in Christian communities that Caesarius repeatedly addressed in his sermons.⁴³¹

At the Council of Orange in 529, Caesarius promoted a theological, rather than administrative, agenda, which was in part informed by his pastoral concerns. He convened this council in order to address the theological issue of the roles of grace and free will for Christian salvation. For a century Gallic clergy had adopted the position, later termed “semipelagianism,” that Christian salvation began with human action and God’s grace only factored in later, contrary to the radical predestinarian doctrines Augustine presented in his later writings.⁴³² Around 520, councils in Rome and Constantinople began condemning “semipelagian” doctrines as heresy.⁴³³ A Gallic council in Valence, whose canons have since

⁴²⁶ Vaison (529), 2.

⁴²⁷ On Caesarius’ role in this process, see Klingshirn 1994, 95-106, esp. 98-101. *Life of Caesarius* I.18 describes Caesarius’ instruction to bishops and priests.

⁴²⁸ Agde (506), 2.

⁴²⁹ Agde (506), 41.

⁴³⁰ Agde (506), 42.

⁴³¹ Klingshirn 1994, 212-16.

⁴³² For an overview of the “semipelagian” controversy, see Markus 1989 and Weaver 1996.

⁴³³ Markus 1989, 223-26.

been lost, then met sometime in 528, presumably to condemn the Augustinian interpretation of grace and free will, which was associated with Caesarius.⁴³⁴ Caesarius, already deeply tied to Rome both politically and theologically, called the Council of Orange in order to stop the controversy in Gaul once and for all.⁴³⁵

At Orange, Caesarius adopted a middle position between his opponents in Gaul and Augustine. He rejected the doctrine that anyone could be predestined toward evil, and mitigated the doctrine of predestination toward good by making space for the importance of good works for salvation:

This also we believe according to the catholic faith, that after grace has been accepted through baptism, all baptized people, with Christ aiding and working together with them, are able and ought, if they wish to work faithfully, to carry out those things that pertain to the salvation of the soul.⁴³⁶

With this definition, Caesarius achieved a compromise between his colleagues in Gaul and those in Rome. He perhaps reconciled within himself the influences of Lérins with the influence of his teacher, the North African Pomerius, who had Augustinian leanings. Most significantly, however, his compromise included what one scholar has deemed a “pastorally useful definition of grace.”⁴³⁷ One difference between Caesarius and Augustine was that Caesarius thought about theology with his congregation in mind. While Augustine’s theology of grace might have been more logically sound in theory, Caesarius recognized that he could not hold together a Christian community with theory alone. The ordinary Christians of Arles needed to know that their conduct mattered.

⁴³⁴ *Life of Caesarius* I.60.

⁴³⁵ Klingshirn 1994, 140-3.

⁴³⁶ Hoc etiam secundum fidem catholicam credimus, quod post acceptam per baptismum gratiam omnis baptizati Christo auxiliante et cooperante, quae ad salute animae pertinent, possint et debeant, si fideliter laborare uoluerint, adimplere, Orange (529), *Definitio fidei*, 205-8.

⁴³⁷ Klingshirn 1994, 142.

The same values that Caesarius upheld in the councils he also strove to teach his congregations through his sermons. He not only taught them correct moral conduct and correct theology, he also taught them to work toward belonging in the universal and unified Christian community that his involvement in councils sought to bind together. Shortly after the Council of Orange, Caesarius and eleven other bishops in his province convened the Council of Vaison in order to address local pastoral issues, such as the need for more preachers mentioned above.⁴³⁸ Three out of the five canons of this council served to link the churches of southeast Gaul with Rome and the east, both liturgically and hierarchically.⁴³⁹ The unity with a universal church Caesarius tried to establish with the canons of this council was a topic he constantly came back to in his sermons, even when he was primarily concerned with teaching correct moral conduct.

Preaching to Arles and its Hinterlands

Caesarius' dedication to teaching his congregations how to live as a virtuous community was described by his biographers in the *Life* written about him shortly after his death.⁴⁴⁰ "His forethought in the work [of teaching] was so pious and wholesome," they wrote, "that even when he was not able on account of sickness he instructed presbyters and deacons to carry out that duty and decreed that they preach in church."⁴⁴¹

Such dedication is also evident from the collection of over 200 sermons Caesarius compiled and sent to other bishops in Gaul to be read in their churches and in the parishes of

⁴³⁸ Vaison (529). Klingshirn 1994, 143-4.

⁴³⁹ Vaison (529), 3-5.

⁴⁴⁰ *Life* I.15-20; 52-54.

⁴⁴¹ Docuit...in quo opere tam pia atque salubris eius provisio fuit, ut cum ipse pro infirmitate iam non posset, ad ipsum officium peragendum presbyteros et diaconos imbuerit atque statuerit in ecclesia praedicare... *Life* I.54.1-5.

their provinces.⁴⁴² The content of these sermons, which he composed or adapted not only to preach to his personal congregations, but also so that they would be suitable for the educations of other congregations, offers a clear insight into Caesarius' pedagogy.⁴⁴³ Specifically, I argue, Caesarius declined to teach theological concepts and instead focused on teaching his congregations how to act like good Christians. He taught them a list of virtues to uphold and vices to avoid. Further, he taught them the virtue of faith as an act of trusting in God, their community, and the words of the Creed and the Lord's Prayer without thoroughly explaining the theological bases of those prayers. Finally, the scriptural passages he chose to illustrate his sermons supported his lessons about moral conduct, thus allowing him simultaneously to teach the word of God alongside virtue.

These lessons are most explicit in the eighty sermons that the editor of their critical edition, Germain Morin, has labeled the "Admonitiones."⁴⁴⁴ Nevertheless, the exegetical and festal sermons that form the majority of Caesarius' collection still exhibit an overarching goal of communicating virtue and faith as a virtue. Caesarius' interest in unity and uniformity of the Christian faith also informed his pedagogy, and though he rarely referred to a catholic church in his sermons,⁴⁴⁵ he frequently emphasized unity in his lessons about love.⁴⁴⁶

The reality of teaching these lessons to the ordinary Christians of Arles was not as simple as composing and compiling written sermons, however. Caesarius also had to preach

⁴⁴² See *Life* I.56 and Caesarius, *Serm.* 1, which was actually a cover letter for his sermon compilation, and my discussion of the afterlives of his sermons in Chapter 5, below.

⁴⁴³ See Morin 1937, xi-cxv on the manuscript tradition of Caesarius' sermons and a discussion of which sermons are thought to be fully his, modified from sermons published by other preachers, and a combination of the two.

⁴⁴⁴ Morin organized the sermons by theme and brought eighty hortatory sermons to the front of the collection under the heading "Admonitiones" in order to distinguish them from the remaining sermons, which are primarily exegetical or festal.

⁴⁴⁵ Cf. *Serm.* 138-9.

⁴⁴⁶ For example, *Serm.* 24.6-7.

these sermons aloud to a group of people who may or may not have been listening, and he had to do so in such a way that they would understand no matter what their background.⁴⁴⁷

On the receiving end of the sermons was a congregation made up of individuals as diverse as the city of Arles and its hinterlands. The makeup of the congregation and their participation in the liturgy (or lack thereof) contributed significantly to the pedagogical effectiveness of the sermons.⁴⁴⁸

The audience for whom Caesarius composed his sermons included everyone from the wealthiest, most educated elite down to the lowliest peasant.⁴⁴⁹ His admonitions addressed “men and women, religious and lay.”⁴⁵⁰ He mentioned the plight of farmers who were too busy with their land to engage in spiritual matters.⁴⁵¹ In one sermon, he even acknowledged his efforts to keep the liturgy short and end it on time so that peasants and craftsmen could return to their work.⁴⁵² He illustrated his sermons with examples of merchants,⁴⁵³ soldiers,⁴⁵⁴ and doctors.⁴⁵⁵ He urged his congregations to read scripture while acknowledging that such recommendations were only possible for people who had access to books, much less basic literacy.⁴⁵⁶ He also exhorted those present to convey the lessons they learned in church to

⁴⁴⁷ Caesarius frequently called out members of his congregation for gossiping idly, conducting business, or otherwise not paying attention during the liturgy. For some examples, see *Serm.* 6.1; 7.5; 19.3; 50.3; 55.1, 4; 64.2; 68.72; 73.1, 5; 76.2; 77.1, 7; and 80.

⁴⁴⁸ For the role of the audience in preaching see Cunningham and Allen 1998, Maxwell 2006, and Bailey 2010. See also Van Dam 2003, 101-130.

⁴⁴⁹ On the makeup of Caesarius’ congregation, see Klingshirn 1994, 172-3.

⁴⁵⁰ *Serm.* 80.1 and *passim*.

⁴⁵¹ *Serm.* 6.3, which was actually preached at a rural parish. See also *Serm.* 7.1 and 44.7.

⁴⁵² *Serm.* 76.3.

⁴⁵³ *Serm.* 7.1.

⁴⁵⁴ *Serm.* 115.5 and 159.1.

⁴⁵⁵ *Serm.* 5.5; 17.4; 43.9; 57.1; and 207.1.

⁴⁵⁶ *Serm.* 6.1-2 and 8.1.

those who were unable to attend⁴⁵⁷—a group that presumably included slaves as well as the small children parents were preparing for baptism.⁴⁵⁸

Caesarius therefore had to construct his sermons in such a way that they could be understood by everyone in attendance. His audience was certainly able to understand the sermons at the linguistic level. Through an analysis of the historical situation of Merovingian Gaul and several genres of surviving Latin texts, it has been demonstrated that some form of Latin, but recognizable as Latin, was not only the written language, but also the spoken language of all classes in Gaul.⁴⁵⁹ Indeed, the true separation of Latin and an early Romance vernacular probably did not occur until Carolingian language reforms restored Latin's ancient pronunciation.⁴⁶⁰

The diversity of education and experience among his congregations, however, motivated Caesarius to compose sermons in simple language that could be understood and appreciated by everyone. He began one of his exegetical sermons with a statement of his pedagogical method:

Because unskilled and simple people are not able to ascend to the heights of scholars, the erudite must deign to lower themselves to the ignorance of the latter. For whatever was spoken to simple people, scholars were able to understand. Whatever was spoken to the erudite, however, simple people are entirely unable to grasp.⁴⁶¹

In the circular letter that accompanied his sermon collection, he consoled priests who worried that they were not eloquent enough to preach well that “neither eloquence nor lofty memory is sought here, where a simple admonition in pedestrian speech is thought to be

⁴⁵⁷ *Serm.* 225.6 and 229.6.

⁴⁵⁸ *Serm.* 130.5; 225.6; and 229.6.

⁴⁵⁹ Hen 1995, 21-9.

⁴⁶⁰ On this later phenomenon, see McKitterick 1989.

⁴⁶¹ Et quia inperiti et simplices ad scolasticorum altitudinem non possunt ascendere, eruditi se dignentur ad illorum ignorantiam inclinare: quia, quod simplicibus dictum fuerit, et scolastici intellegere possunt; quod autem eruditis fuerit praedicatum, simplices omnino capere non valebunt, *Serm.* 86.1.8-13.

necessary,”⁴⁶² and he warned the eloquent that “it is out of place enough if he wishes to speak in church such that his admonition is not useful to the whole flock of the lord, but is scarcely able to reach the small number of scholars. Therefore all my priests of the lord should preach rather with simple and pedestrian speech, which the whole population is able to grasp.”⁴⁶³

Caesarius’ biographers noted that Caesarius frequently reminded his congregations that “simple [preaching] was sufficient instruction for the learned as well as the simple.”⁴⁶⁴

Most late antique preachers attempted to follow the precepts that Augustine laid out in *On Christian Teaching* 4.24-5, which were to preach clearly and understandably.⁴⁶⁵

Caesarius’ sermons have been acknowledged as being particularly clear and easy to understand.⁴⁶⁶ True to his word, Caesarius kept his sermons short and stuck to a single subject.⁴⁶⁷ He employed strategies taken from rhetorical school exercises in order to present his lessons persuasively and understandably. He posed questions to the congregations which he then proceeded to answer—some of them rhetorical, but others actually raised by a member of the community, demonstrating an active effort to respond to the specific needs of ordinary Christians.⁴⁶⁸ Most sermons featured a conclusion in which Caesarius reiterated the main points of that day’s lesson in order to reinforce beliefs or actions his congregations were then supposed to demonstrate as Christians.⁴⁶⁹ Caesarius also made heavy use of repetition, not just of certain words and phrases, but also of specific formulas, particularly at

⁴⁶² Non hic aut eloquentia aut grandis memoria quaeritur, ubi simplex et pedestri sermone admonitio necessaria esse cognoscitur, *Serm.* 1.13.3-5.

⁴⁶³ Satis incongruum est, si ita voluerit in ecclesia loqui, ut admonitio eius non ad totum, sicut expedit, dominicum gregem, sed vix ad paucos possit scolasticos pervenire. Unde magis simplici et pedestri sermone, quem totus populus capere possit, debent dominici mei sacerdotes populis praedicare, *Serm.* 1.20.8-12.

⁴⁶⁴ Quod vero simpliciter, et doctos simul et simplices competenter instrueret, *Life* II.1.16-17.

⁴⁶⁵ On this understandable style, called *sermo humilis*, see the classic works by Auerbach 1952 and 1965, and MacMullen 1966.

⁴⁶⁶ See Delage 1971, 180-208 for a discussion of Caesarius’ Latin and style.

⁴⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 196.

⁴⁶⁸ On the rhetorical use of question and answer in homilies, see Bailey 2016, 144-5.

⁴⁶⁹ Delage 1971, 201.

the beginnings and ends of sermons. Thus, Caesarius offered ordinary Christians multiple ways of understanding, and even contributing to, the lessons he taught in his sermons.

Caesarius reinforced his admonitions with specific examples taken from everyday life as well as from scripture.⁴⁷⁰ He made sure to choose examples that people from all classes, urban and rural, could relate to and use to situate their understanding of his moral lessons.⁴⁷¹ Scriptural references also offered his congregations another frame of reference for understanding moral lessons. For some, however, readings in church and the subsequent explanations of scriptural passages in the sermons were the only exposure they had to the Old and New Testaments, and so scriptural readings became lessons in their own right.

Through his preaching, Caesarius taught his congregations how to belong to a Christian community by acting virtuously. Even those Christians who only came to church on three or four feast days per year, including those from the countryside, were able to hear something of his pedagogy. Certainly those who attended every week or periodically throughout the year could have taken advantage of Caesarius' repeated exhortations and multiple presentations of the same lessons. In the rest of this chapter, I demonstrate from his sermon collection how he taught that faith was a virtue and how Christians could perform that virtue alongside other virtues like mercy and love. He also taught his congregations to avoid vices and immoral actions, including the "false religion" of local celebrations long in practice since before the introduction of Christianity to Gaul. Participating in their local Christian community by enacting virtues and avoiding vice, then, helped the ordinary

⁴⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 198.

⁴⁷¹ On the cognitive phenomenon of understanding through matching new information into existing frames of knowledge and the effectiveness of late antique preachers who used relateable examples, see Sandwell 2011.

Christians of sixth-century Arles view themselves as part of a universal, or catholic, Christian community.

The Christian Faith

Upon a cursory glance at his sermons, especially the first eighty “admonitiones,” it appears that Caesarius was not interested in theology.⁴⁷² His involvement in church councils, particularly the Council of Orange, however, belies that assumption. When seen as pedagogical tools for ordinary Christians, Caesarius’ sermons reveal that the relative lack of theological material contained within suggests that he thought his congregations only needed to know a small amount of theology in order to be good Christians. Two particular statements of faith, the Lord’s Prayer and the Creed, with which Caesarius expected his congregation to actively engage, contained all the theology he thought ordinary Christians ought to know.⁴⁷³

Faith, for Caesarius, was something Christians had to maintain actively. “Where is faith?” he asked his congregation in one sermon on the Lord’s Prayer. “Faith [*fides*] takes its name from that which happens [*fiat*]. Therefore, let what you say happen: ‘as we also forgive.’”⁴⁷⁴ It was not sufficient simply to trust in the words of the Lord’s Prayer, but Christians also had to forgive. In other words, in order to have faith, Christians had to *do* something.

At times when Caesarius did use the word “faith” to refer to propositional belief, it still possessed an active quality.⁴⁷⁵ For instance, at the beginning of a sermon detailing Christian beliefs, Caesarius preached, “whoever wishes to be saved, let him learn the right

⁴⁷² Klingshirn 1994 notes that the theological content of his sermons was largely based on the work of earlier preachers, especially Augustine, 2.

⁴⁷³ The Lord’s Prayer and the Creed formed the cornerstone of fourth-century catechesis, which Caesarius was attempting to salvage with his pedagogical sermons. See Harrison 2013, 87-116.

⁴⁷⁴ Ubi est fides? Fides eo quod fiat, inde nomen accepit. Fiat ergo quod dicis, SICUT ET NOS DIMITTIMUS, *Serm.* 35.1.14-16.

⁴⁷⁵ On use of the words *fides* and *pistis* to refer to propositional belief in antiquity, see Morgan 2015, 23-35.

and catholic faith, let him hold to it firmly, and let him preserve it inviolate. Thus it is necessary that each observe that he believes the Father, believes the Son, believes the Holy Spirit.”⁴⁷⁶ The accumulation of active verbs suggests that Caesarius understood faith as something Christians should constantly be working towards.

The idea that faith was a virtue, alongside other virtues like mercy and chastity, was not new for Caesarius or even for Christianity: *fides* and its Greek cognate *pistis* had long been discussed among the virtues in Greco-Roman culture.⁴⁷⁷ Christian authors, especially since the fourth century, however, often emphasized the aspect of faith that referred to propositional belief.⁴⁷⁸ While propositional belief was important to Caesarius, the “faith” he wanted to teach his congregations was something active that they could do, along with all the other good works he urged them to undertake. This “faith” was the trust in and reliance on a community of Christians, and the demonstration that one was a trustworthy member of a Christian community.

The Lord’s Prayer offered Caesarius an expedient way of teaching all aspects of the catholic faith. The community relationships between God and Christians and Christians and each other were encompassed in the short petition, “Forgive us our debts as we also forgive our debtors,” *demitte nobis debita nostra, sicut et nos dimittimus debitoribus nostris*. Aside from *Sermon* 147, which was a line-by-line explanation of the prayer derived from an earlier catechetical manual, Caesarius’ sermons on the Lord’s Prayer took forgiveness as their focal point.⁴⁷⁹

⁴⁷⁶ Quicumque vult salvus esse, fidem rectam ac catholicam discat, firmiter teneat, inviolatamque conservet. Ita ergo oportet unicuique observare, ut credat Patrem, credat Filium, credat Spiritum sanctum, *Serm.* 10.1.1-3.

⁴⁷⁷ Morgan 2015, 444-72, esp. 458-61.

⁴⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 509-514.

⁴⁷⁹ Morin 1937, 569.

Caesarius repeatedly emphasized that Christians would not be forgiven by God (and therefore saved) unless they forgave others. In *Sermon 28*, Caesarius explained God's promise to forgive the sins of humans who forgave their debtors in terms of a financial surety. He began with an elaborate moneylending analogy that would have appealed to a large portion of Caesarius' urban congregation.⁴⁸⁰ He then explained that the surety came in the form of Christ's death and resurrection. "The Son of God died for us, brothers," he preached.

If, perhaps, you do not believe, believe in the works [*operibus*]. Those things that we see only now were not yet before the eyes of his disciples; when the apostles saw Christ after the resurrection, they did not see the church spread out through the whole world. They saw the head; they believed about the body. We see the body; let us believe about the head.⁴⁸¹

Here, Caesarius taught that forgiveness was guaranteed by Christ's death and Christians needed to trust that Christ's death provided adequate security by having faith in the resurrection. "Works," or physical manifestations of faith in God, Christ, and Christianity, in the form of communities of Christians all over the world, were an integral part of faith for Caesarius.

The theme of God's forgiveness through forgiveness of others recurs in several of Caesarius' other homilies. He began *Sermon 35* by reminding his congregants that they needed to be in a state of having been forgiven before they received the Eucharist, and that in order to ask for God's forgiveness in the Lord's Prayer they needed to have forgiven their enemies.⁴⁸² In other sermons, he preached that no one could "safely" [*securi*] say the words,

⁴⁸⁰ *Serm.* 28.1.

⁴⁸¹ *Filius dei pro nobis mortuus est, fratres: si forte non creditis, operibus credite. Ista quae modo videmus, nondum erant ante oculos discipulorum suorum. Quando Christum apostoli videbant post resurrectionem, ecclesiam toto orbe diffusam non videbant. Illi caput videbant, credebant de corpore; nos videmus corpus, credamus de capite, Serm.* 28.1.23-28. Caesarius repeats this lesson at the end of *Serm.* 28.

⁴⁸² *Serm.* 35.1.

“forgive us our debts as we also forgive our debtors” in prayer if they did not truly forgive their own debtors.⁴⁸³ Caesarius also closely linked this necessity to forgive with the scriptural injunction for Christians to love their enemies,⁴⁸⁴ and sometimes conflated the two in discussions of the Lord’s Prayer, preaching, “Preserving hatred for no man in our hearts, and loving not only our friends but also our enemies and adversaries, let us say with an untroubled [*secura*] conscience in the Lord’s Prayer, ‘Forgive us our debts, as we also forgive our debtors.’”⁴⁸⁵

Finally, forgiveness coincided with the two main virtues Caesarius wanted his congregations to perform, love and mercy, or alms.⁴⁸⁶ Caesarius’ discussions of love often gravitated toward love of enemies and forgiveness. In discussions of alms [*elemosynae*], Caesarius often noted that there were two kinds of almsgiving—the literal giving of material goods to the less fortunate and the conferral of forgiveness on others.⁴⁸⁷ Thus, Caesarius’ key lessons concerning good works were also contained within the Lord’s Prayer alongside his lesson that salvation and community hinged on forgiveness.

The words of the Lord’s Prayer taught the first theological lessons encountered by all Christians, as Christian parents were supposed to teach this prayer to their children at home.⁴⁸⁸ Baptized Christians who perhaps did not learn it from their parents could easily have picked it up by attending church regularly: the congregation recited the Lord’s Prayer

⁴⁸³ *Serm.* 19.2. He spoke variations on this warning in *Serms.* 30.3; 35.1; 37.6; 38.6; 39.1; 91.7; 147.7; 177.5; 185.1; 200.3; 229.5; and 235.3.

⁴⁸⁴ Matthew 5:44.

⁴⁸⁵ *Contra nullum hominem odium in corde servantes, et non solum amicos sed etiam inimicos et adversarios diligentes, cum secura conscientia in oratione dominica dicamus: DIMITTE NOBIS DEBITA NOSTRA, SICUT ET NOS DIMITTIMUS DEBITORIBUS NOSTRIS, Serm.* 107.4.32-36. He repeated this almost verbatim in *Serm.* 202.4.

⁴⁸⁶ I discuss these at greater length below, 151-61.

⁴⁸⁷ E.g. *Serm.* 34.5.

⁴⁸⁸ *Serm.* 13.12 and 16.2.

together at each liturgy following the consecration of the Eucharist.⁴⁸⁹ Since this prayer was something Caesarius could have reasonably assumed that most ordinary Christians knew, it makes sense that he chose it as a paradigm for the moral lessons he taught in his homilies. The Lord's Prayer not only provided many congregants with a frame of reference in which to situate Caesarius' lessons about forgiveness and other virtues, it also acted as a mnemonic device that could remind people of what they learned in the sermon when they spoke the words together before the Eucharist.

The other prayer that baptized Christians were expected to know, the Creed, provided the rest of the theological knowledge Caesarius taught his congregation. As with the Lord's Prayer, the most important lesson Caesarius wanted his audience to take from the Creed was the link between faith and salvation. Faith in the Creed, which meant both propositional belief that the statements of the Creed were true as well as trust and faith in God the Father, Son, Holy Spirit, and the universal church community, was necessary for Christian salvation.⁴⁹⁰

⁴⁸⁹ Delage 1971, 158; Caesarius, *Serm.* 73.2, 74.2.

⁴⁹⁰ The version of the Creed that was most closely contemporary with Caesarius appears in a sermon on the Creed that Caesarius included in his collection, *Serm.* 9.

I believe in God the father almighty, creator of heaven and earth.
I believe also in Jesus Christ, only-begotten, eternal son of him.
Who was conceived from the holy spirit, born from the virgin Mary.
He suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, died, and was buried.
He descended into hell.
On the third day he resurrected from the dead: he ascended into heaven.
He is seated at the right hand of God the father almighty.
From there he will come to judge the living and the dead.
I believe in the holy spirit; the holy universal church;
The communion of saints; the remission of sins;
The resurrection of the flesh; eternal life. Amen

CREDO IN DEUM PATREM OMNIPOTENTEM, CREATOREM CAELI ET TERRAE.
CREDO ET IN IESUM CHRISTUM, FILIUM EIUS UNIGENITUM SEMPITERNUM.
QUI CONCEPTUS EST DE SPIRITU SANCTO, NATUS EST DE MARIA VIRGINE.
PASSUS EST SUB PONTIO PILATO, CRUCIFIXUS, MORTUUS ET SEPULTUS.
DESCENDIT AD INFERNA.

Caesarius devoted far less time to explaining the theology of the Creed than he did the Lord's Prayer. The only mentions of the Creed in the sermons Caesarius composed himself appeared in exhortations to congregations to remember and pray the Creed and the Lord's Prayer.⁴⁹¹ The only sermons in Caesarius' collection that explain any aspect of the Creed were drawn from the work of earlier preachers.

One such sermon, *Sermon 3*, contained a brief explanation of the Athanasian Creed, or the version of the prayer considered orthodox by the Roman Empire and the bishop of Rome from the mid-fifth century onward.⁴⁹² Tellingly, the sermon begins and ends with very clear statements that link believers in this creed to salvation and the universal church:

“Whoever wishes to be saved, brothers, before all things it is necessary that he know and hold the universal faith [*fidem catholicam*]; if anyone should not preserve this entire and intact, without a doubt he will perish in eternity,”⁴⁹³ and “This is the universal faith, which, if anyone does not believe it faithfully and firmly, he will not be saved.”⁴⁹⁴

Sermon 9, a borrowed sermon that also appears in the Eusebius Gallicanus sermon collection, contains the text of the Creed as well as a line-by-line explanation of its statements of belief.⁴⁹⁵ This sermon, too, placed the link between faith and salvation ahead of the theology behind the words of the Creed, beginning “And thus whoever has faith along

TERTIA DIE RESURREXIT A MORTUIS: ASCENDIT AD CAELOS.
SEDIT AD DEXTERAM DEI PATRIS OMNIPOTENTIS.
INDE VENTURUS IUDICARE VIVOS ET MORTUOS.
CREDO IN SANCTUM SPIRITUM: SANCTAM ECCLESIAM CATHOLICAM:
SANCTORUM COMMUNIONEM: REMISSIONEM PECCATORUM:
CARNIS RESURRECTIONEM:
VITAM AETERNAM. AMEN.

⁴⁹¹ *Serm.* 13.2; 16.2; 19.3; 54.1; and 130.5. Cf. *Serm.* 1.12.

⁴⁹² Morin 1937, 22.

⁴⁹³ Quicumque vult salvus esse, fratres, ante omnia opus est ut fidem catholicam sciat et teneat; quam si quis non integram inlaesamque servaverit, sine dubio in aeternum peribit, *Serm.* 3.1-3.

⁴⁹⁴ Haec est fides catholica: quam nisi quisque fideliter firmiterque crediderit, salvus esse non poterit, *Serm.* 3.40-1.

⁴⁹⁵ On the Eusebius Gallicanus sermon collection, see Bailey 2010.

with works in this world, he will receive eternal life in the future. And it is for this reason that the beginning of the Creed has ‘I believe in God,’ and afterward in the conclusion of the Creed, ‘eternal life.’”⁴⁹⁶ The rest of the sermon focused on teaching Christians how to memorize the Creed as a statement of faith. In one instance, it specifically asks the audience not to question how such statements could be: “Certainly, how God the Father begot the Son, I do not wish you to discuss. It must be believed, therefore, that God is the father of his only son our lord, not discussed: indeed, it is not right for a slave to argue about the birth of his lord.”⁴⁹⁷

Sermon 147, the borrowed sermon explaining the words of the Lord’s Prayer, also contains a brief mention of the Creed at the beginning. The author preached that Christians first needed to have faith in the God to whom they were about to pray before they could say the Lord’s Prayer: “Since you should not be able to invoke someone in whom you have not believed, with the apostle saying, ‘How did they invoke someone in whom they did not believe?’ you have therefore learned the Creed before.”⁴⁹⁸ This sermon established the priority of the Lord’s Prayer for ordinary Christians: Christians only needed to know the Creed insofar as it helped them pray to God.

The inclusion of these three sermons in Caesarius’ collection, coupled with his lack of discussion of the Creed in his original sermons, suggests that Caesarius did not prioritize theology in his teaching. The lesson of faith—that all Christians should have faith in God by both believing statements about him and putting their trust in him—was what Caesarius

⁴⁹⁶ Ac sic qui fidem cum operibus habuerit in hoc saeculo, vitam aeternam recipiet in futuro: et ideo statim in principio symboli habet CREDO IN DEUM, et postea in conclusione symboli VITAM AETERNAM, *Serm.* 9.1.

⁴⁹⁷ Quomodo sane deus Pater genuerit Filium, nolo discutias. Credendus est ergo deus esse Pater unici Filii sui domini nostri, non discutiendus: neque enim fas est servo de natalibus domini disputare, *Serm.* 9.44-6.

⁴⁹⁸ Quoniam invocare non possetis in quem non credidissetis, apostolo dicente: QUOMODO INVOCABUNT, IN QUEM NON CREDIDERUNT? Ideo prius symbolum didicistis, *Serm.* 147.1.1-3.

thought was most important for his congregations to know. The faith that Christians learned with the Creed and demonstrated by reciting the words of the Creed in turn marked them out as members of the “faithful,” or the universal community of Christians. One of the last statements listed in the Creed is the “holy universal [*catholicam*] church.” Thus, when Christians spoke that they believed the words of the Creed, they were asserting their association with other Christians who confessed the same thing. This active assertion of community was a higher priority for Caesarius than consideration of the statements themselves.

Both the Creed and the Lord’s Prayer reinforced bonds of Christian community among the congregants by their very recitation.⁴⁹⁹ When Christians prayed these prayers together during the liturgy, they were participating in a ritual that taught them to identify themselves with their community of faithful.⁵⁰⁰ Conversely, asserting beliefs branded as orthodox in this ritual of communal prayer also served to set Christians apart from others outside their community, such as the local Goths who practiced Arian Christianity and members of the eastern church hierarchy during the Acacian Schism. By presenting the theological lessons of the Creed and Lord’s Prayer in terms of salvation, as he did, Caesarius taught that the prayers Christians prayed together in church were key to their salvation.

Thus, Christians were to be saved as a community by the faith they demonstrated within that community. They demonstrated their faith actively by reciting prayers together and making an effort to believe the statements of faith, to trust in God to provide their salvation, and to have faith in the universal community of Christians.

⁴⁹⁹ For a fuller discussion of communal prayer, see Chapter 3, 97-99.

⁵⁰⁰ Harrison 2013, 199-201. On the pedagogical function of rituals such as this, see Asad 1993, 63. I use the word “ritual” in this dissertation only to refer to the set actions undertaken to interact with God. For my discussion of the pedagogy of ritual in the Christian liturgy, see above, Chapter 3.

Good Works

Aside from the virtue of faith, Caesarius focused on teaching his congregations to exhibit more visible forms of Christian virtue, or “works,” which were just as necessary for salvation as was faith. Recognizing a tendency among some Christians to believe that they could sin all they wanted and God’s grace would save them, Caesarius emphasized its importance for salvation in numerous sermons, making it explicit in one:

Indeed we should know that it is not sufficient for us that we have taken the name of Christians if we do not do Christian works... If you say a thousand times that you are a Christian, and constantly sign yourself with the cross of Christ, and you do not give alms according to your resources, and you do not wish to have love and justice and chastity, the Christian name will not be able to profit you at all.⁵⁰¹

Because of the centrality of good works to the salvation of all Christians, Caesarius made a concerted effort to teach everyone in his congregation to exercise moral virtues in their daily lives and to participate actively in Christian rituals, utilizing both rhetorical strategies and examples from scripture to aid everyone’s memory and understanding. Furthermore, by teaching virtues and vices as paired opposites, Caesarius hoped to instill correct moral conduct into the lives of even those members of his congregation whom he decried as pagans and sinners.

The two most important virtues for Caesarius were love, especially love of enemies, and mercy, which included giving alms. Love [*caritas*] was, for Caesarius, the teacher of all good works,⁵⁰² and without love, all good works were empty.⁵⁰³ 1 Corinthians 13:3, “If I give

⁵⁰¹ Scire enim debemus quia non nobis sufficit quod nomen christianum accepimus, si opera christiana non fecerimus... Si te milies christianum dicas, et iugiter cruce Christi te signes, et elemosynam secundum vires tuas non feceris, caritatem et iustitiam vel castitatem habere nolueris, nihil tibi prodesse poterit christianum nomen, *Serm.* 13.1. See also *Serm.* 4.3; 9.1; 12.1; 14.1; 15.4; 16.2; 18.1; 22.1-2; 23.3; 28.1; 29.2; 30.6; 39.3; 45.5; and 50.4. The roles of grace and good works in salvation were central to the theological controversy Caesarius engaged with in the Council of Orange.

⁵⁰² *Serm.* 29.2.

⁵⁰³ *Serm.* 23.3.

away everything I own...but do not have love, I gain nothing,” was one of Caesarius’ favorite scriptural passages, quoted in six of his sermons.⁵⁰⁴ Love was also the easiest of the virtues for ordinary Christians to perform because it required no resources—Christians who were prevented from practicing other virtues by poverty or ailment could still love.⁵⁰⁵ Love served to unite all members of the Christian church.⁵⁰⁶ Love was greater than every other virtue, because while all other virtues were advised, love was commanded by Jesus in the gospels when he told his followers to love their enemies and to love their neighbors as themselves.⁵⁰⁷ In one sermon, Caesarius even argued that good works necessarily followed from love of one’s neighbor.⁵⁰⁸

Love of one’s enemies was a bit more difficult to achieve, but was arguably more important because of its relationship to forgiveness. Caesarius reminded his congregations of the injunction from Matthew 5:44, “But I say to you, love your enemies, and pray for those who persecute you,” in over twenty of his sermons, and even devoted five sermons to explaining the concept of love of enemies.⁵⁰⁹ The five sermons on love of enemies, one of which Caesarius adapted from sermons by Augustine, feature multiple pedagogical strategies for teaching ordinary Christians the importance of loving one’s enemies.⁵¹⁰

In some instances, Caesarius highlighted the benefit of loving enemies for the person performing the act of charity. He opened *Sermon* 36 by presenting love of enemies as a cure for a soul that was sick and wounded with sin. The first of these cures was love, including

⁵⁰⁴ *Serm.* 23.4; 37.5; 39.3; 66.1, 182.3; and 129.2.

⁵⁰⁵ *Serm.* 38.5.

⁵⁰⁶ *Serm.* 24.5.

⁵⁰⁷ *Serm.* 29.3-4; 37.4; and 39.2.

⁵⁰⁸ *Serm.* 35.5.

⁵⁰⁹ *Serm.* 15, 20, 22, 29, 31, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 61, 107, 137, 145, 150, 151, 160B, 166, 173, 179, 187, 199, 219, 220, 223, 225, 234, and 238 all mention love of enemies. (Sermons 35-39 take love of enemies as their focus.) Caesarius also discussed the forgiveness of enemies in *Serm.* 12, 19, 30, 44, and 64.

⁵¹⁰ *Serm.* 38.

love of enemies.⁵¹¹ In other places, Caesarius answered hypothetical dissenters who might claim that they were unable to love their enemies or they did not want to love their enemies. To the first, he replied, “In all the holy scriptures, God said to you that you were able; you, on the contrary, respond that you are not able. Consider now, whether it should be believed from God or from you.”⁵¹² He urged the second category of dissenter to see themselves as enemies who deserved to be forgiven by people they have wronged and by God: “Indeed, if you search for someone who has not done it [sinned], you will not find him... Even you persecuted others before you were justified.”⁵¹³ He continued, preaching, “Ask, therefore, that he [God] spare not only others, but also you. This, then, brothers, is like a hallmark of all unjust people: they do not want God to spare the unjust, and they do not see what they are themselves, even from this very thing that they so desire.”⁵¹⁴ In another sermon, Caesarius simply urged his congregation to identify with their enemies on the basic level of their humanity. “But love those who are unjust,” he preached, “because they are humans, and let the fact they are bad be held in hatred.”⁵¹⁵ Caesarius wanted his congregation to understand that they were all enemies to someone, and at the very least they were all people.

In case some members of the congregation were not persuaded by these abstract arguments, Caesarius also tried to present this difficult lesson in more mundane terms. In one sermon, Caesarius commented on an instance of social isolation brought on by someone’s

⁵¹¹ *Serm.* 36.1.10-13.

⁵¹² In omnibus scripturis sanctis deus tibi dixit quia potes: tu e contra te non posse respondes. Considera nunc, utrum deo an tibi debeat credi, *Serm.* 37.2.2-4.

⁵¹³ Si enim quaeris qui non fecerit, non inuenies... Et tu antequam iustificareris, alios persequeris, *Serm.* 38.1.10-13.

⁵¹⁴ Roga ergo, ut non solum aliis, sed etiam et tibi parcat. Hoc itaque, fratres, habent quasi proprium omnes iniqui: nolunt ut parcat deus iniquis, et non vident quid ipsi sint, etiam ex hoc ipso quod ita volunt, *Serm.* 38.2.10-13. See also *Serm.* 39.2.

⁵¹⁵ Qui vero iniqui sunt ama, quia homines sunt, et odio habeto, quia mali sunt, *Serm.* 35.5.8-9.

unwillingness to forgive someone who had slandered him.⁵¹⁶ Caesarius spoke of salvation as the heavenly Jerusalem that Christians who did not love their enemies would not be able to enter, just as on earth they “do not wish to come to the banquet [with their enemy].”⁵¹⁷

Caesarius also resorted to dehumanizing those who did not love their enemies. He preached in one instance, “Do you love your children and parents? So does a bandit love, and a lion love, and a snake love, and bears love, and wolves love...but if we love only those who love [us], we do not seem to differ from those very beasts.”⁵¹⁸ Further along, Caesarius cited Jesus’ lesson in Matthew on how loving enemies makes one better than pagans and tax collectors, concluding, “Therefore whoever loves only their friends, just as you yourselves see, are so far in this instance the same as tax collectors and pagans. So in order that we become superior to both pagans and beasts, let us also love our enemies and adversaries.”⁵¹⁹ Caesarius hoped that association with people traditionally seen as evil (bandits and tax collectors) and animals might deter some members of his congregation from being unwilling to love their enemies.

Finally, Caesarius employed numerous examples from scripture and early Christian history for his congregations to imitate. He included the Old Testament examples of Jacob, Joseph, Moses, Job,⁵²⁰ and David,⁵²¹ and the New Testament examples of Stephen⁵²² and

⁵¹⁶ *Serm.* 36.7. He could have been referring to an event that actually happened in his community, but this discussion was still relatable as a hypothetical situation.

⁵¹⁷ *Serm.* 36.7.12-20.

⁵¹⁸ *Amas filios et parentes? Amat et latro, amat et leo, amat et draco, amant et ursi, amant et lupi...si vero amantes tantum diligimus, nihil ab ipsis bestiis distare videmur, Serm.* 37.5.2-6.

⁵¹⁹ *Qui ergo solos amicos diligunt, sicut ipsi videtis, adhuc in hac parte publicanis et gentibus similes sunt. Ut ergo superiores et gentibus et bestiis simus, etiam inimicos et adversarios diligamus, Serm.* 37.5.10-12.

⁵²⁰ *Serm.* 36.2.

⁵²¹ *Serm.* 36.3.

⁵²² *Serm.* 37.3.

Paul.⁵²³ He cited admonitions from John the Evangelist,⁵²⁴ and of course Jesus.⁵²⁵ He even urged his congregations to imitate James and the martyrs.⁵²⁶ To those who were familiar with the scriptural narratives Caesarius was referencing, the injunction to love one's enemies might have been easier to understand or remember. In any case, using examples from scripture was one of many ways Caesarius taught his congregations about the most important virtue.

Another fundamental Christian virtue was mercy [*misericordia*], which Caesarius discussed in conjunction with human acts of mercy, or alms [borrowed from Greek as both *elemosina* and *elymosina*].⁵²⁷ *Sermons* 25 through 28 all concern the relationship between divine and human mercy, which Caesarius defined respectively as forgiveness of sins, and the tangible giving of alms. Caesarius began *Sermon* 25, which contains the most straightforward lesson on mercy, by commenting on a verse from that day's gospel reading, the Beatitudes: "Blessed are the merciful, for they will be shown mercy."⁵²⁸ "And though all humans wish to have it [mercy]," he preached,

what is worse, not all of them act accordingly... though all wish to take mercy, there are few who wish to give mercy... Therefore whoever desires to receive it in heaven should give mercy in this world. And for that reason, dearest brothers, that we all want mercy, let us make it a patron for us in this time so that it might free us in a future time.⁵²⁹

⁵²³ *Serm.* 38.3.

⁵²⁴ *Serm.* 37.6.

⁵²⁵ *Serm.* 37.3.

⁵²⁶ *Serm.* 37.2-3.

⁵²⁷ *Serm.* 25.1.

⁵²⁸ Matthew 5:7.

⁵²⁹ Et cum eam omnes homines habere velint, quod peius est, non toti sic agunt..., cum omnes misericordiam velint accipere, pauci sunt qui velint misericordiam dare... Debet ergo in hoc mundo misericordiam dare, qui illam optat in caelo recipere. Et ideo, fratres carissimi, quia omnes misericordiam volumus, faciamus nobis illam patronam in hoc saeculo, ut nos ipsa liberet in futuro, *Serm.* 25.1.4-11.

From there, Caesarius commented that there were two kinds of mercy: earthly and heavenly, human and divine: “What is human mercy?” he asked his congregation. “Certainly, it is that you look after the miseries of the poor. And what is divine mercy? It is, without a doubt, what bestows forgiveness on sinners.”⁵³⁰

Following this abstract discussion of mercy, Caesarius devoted the rest of the sermon to alms. Alms were a functional manifestation of mercy that Caesarius could reasonably expect ordinary Christians in his congregation to perform. Caesarius detailed examples of giving alms according to one’s means; the poorest of poor could give alms by demonstrating patience in the face of their poverty.⁵³¹ At the end of the sermon, Caesarius returned to the division between divine and human mercy, this time describing it in terms of alms:

And that, as I have frequently admonished, there are two types of alms: one good, the other better: one, that you hand out a morsel of food to the poor, the other, that you swiftly forgive your brother having sinned against you.⁵³²

The value judgment he placed on divine and human alms in this instance reinforced his emphasis on forgiveness as the cornerstone of Christian communities.

The lesson concerning two kinds of alms that Caesarius developed in *Sermon 25* frequently appeared in his other sermons as well, especially those that primarily dealt with forgiveness.⁵³³ Caesarius ended *Sermon 28*, which contained a lengthy discussion of both kinds of alms,⁵³⁴ by concluding that his congregation should now understand how they can and should love their enemies, and that they therefore could securely say the Lord’s

⁵³⁰ Est ergo et terrena et caelestis misericordia, humana scilicet et divina. Qualis est misericordia humana? Ipsa utique, ut respicias miseras pauperum. Qualis vero est misericordia divina? Illa sine dubio, quae tribuit indulgentiam peccatorum, *Serm.* 25.1.13-20.

⁵³¹ *Serm.* 25.1-2.

⁵³² Et quia, sicut frequenter ammonui, duo sunt elemosynarum genera: unum bonum, aliud melius: unum ut pauperibus bucellam porrigas, alterum ut peccati in te fratri tuo cito indulgeas, *Serm.* 25.3.1-3.

⁵³³ For example, *Serm.* 28.3; 30.3-5; 34.5; 38.5; and 39.1.

⁵³⁴ *Serm.* 28.2 on alms for the poor and *Serm.* 28.3 on forgiveness.

Prayer.⁵³⁵ *Sermon 29* actually focused on all kinds of love, but Caesarius included mercy under the rubric of love in a section that began with an admonition to love one's enemies.⁵³⁶ "Certainly you see," he preached, "that in the gospel reading the lord named nothing from all the virtues in the world except alms alone, which works in the service of love."⁵³⁷ In *Sermon 30*, Caesarius mentioned the divine mercy of forgiveness as a type of alms that everyone was able to give, including the destitute who had no material to give.⁵³⁸

Caesarius cited references from scripture, particularly from the gospel readings that were read aloud in the liturgy just before the sermon, in order to help teach these lessons of divine and human mercy to his congregations. It is clear from the context in which he introduced the passage from the Beatitudes in *Sermon 25* and the gospel reading he referenced in *Sermon 29* that he was calling his audience's attention to readings that they had just heard.⁵³⁹ Caesarius understood that many ordinary Christians did not have access to scripture outside the readings they heard in the liturgy.⁵⁴⁰ Therefore, the discussions of gospel and other scriptural readings Caesarius included in his sermons not only helped his congregations understand the relevant moral lesson but also taught them key scriptural passages by pairing them with moral lessons. Caesarius frequently urged his congregations to perform acts of mercy, such as offering hospitality to strangers, visiting the sick, and giving to the poor, in sermons that did not specifically address mercy or alms.⁵⁴¹ In a similar vein, Caesarius most frequently cited scriptural passages that dealt with the primary virtues of

⁵³⁵ *Serm.* 28.4.1-7. See also *Serm.* 19.3; 47.4; and 39.1 for other instances where Caesarius linked the two kinds of alms with the Lord's Prayer.

⁵³⁶ *Serm.* 29.3.1-3.

⁵³⁷ *Certe videtis quod in lectione evangelica nihil aliud dominus nominaverit de universis virtutibus, nisi solam elemosinam, quae cum caritate operatur, Serm.* 29.3.6-8.

⁵³⁸ *Serm.* 30.1, 4.

⁵³⁹ *Serm.* 25.1 and 29.3.

⁵⁴⁰ Klingshirn 1994, 183-5. Caesarius, *Serm.* 6, *passim*; 13.2; 16.2; and 19.3.

⁵⁴¹ For example, *Serm.* 14.2-3; 15.2; 19.2; 24.3; 25.1; and 26.3.

mercy and love.⁵⁴² In this way, scriptural passages and moral lessons mutually reinforced each other in Caesarius' pedagogy.

One final way that Caesarius taught the virtue of mercy was through narrative. In *Sermon 27*, Caesarius discussed the parable of the elm tree and the vine from *The Shepherd of Hermas*, equating the elm tree to a rich man who did not give alms to the poor.⁵⁴³ Listeners process narrative content differently from other types of material, so presenting mercy in this fashion enabled Caesarius to reach his congregations in yet another manner.⁵⁴⁴ Furthermore, Caesarius provided scriptural support, as well as the support of another narrative, by referencing the parable of the rich man and Lazarus from Luke 16.⁵⁴⁵ His desire to shape a community of Christians through moral interactions is evident from the numerous ways he presented mercy and alms to his congregation. He wanted to make sure that all ordinary Christians understood why and how they should express love within their Christian community.

The opposite of love, which Caesarius presented as a vice that should be avoided, was hatred. Caesarius viewed hatred as especially problematic, since it prevented the forgiveness of others.⁵⁴⁶ Since love was the key to good works and salvation, it makes sense that hatred would be the thing that prevented it. Caesarius preached in a sermon of admonition to his church, "Let no one reserve in his heart hatred against his neighbor, but love: for whoever holds even one person in hatred is not able to be secure with God."⁵⁴⁷ Caesarius presented

⁵⁴² Matt. 5:7, 6:12-14, 7:12, 25:34-5, and 40-1; Luke 6:38 and 11:24-6.

⁵⁴³ *Serm.* 27.1-2.

⁵⁴⁴ See Kreiner 2014, Chapter 2, on the way narrative functions in the creation of memory and the implications for early medieval hagiography.

⁵⁴⁵ *Serm.* 27.2.10.

⁵⁴⁶ For example *Serm.* 30.4.

⁵⁴⁷ Nullus contra proximum suum odium reservet in corde, sed amorem: nam qui vel unum hominem odio habuerit, securus apud deum esse non poterit, *Serm.* 14.2.7-9. See also *Serm.* 30.4; 35.1; 36; 37; and 39.

hatred as the adversary of love in other sermons as well.⁵⁴⁸ For scriptural support, he repeatedly cited the verse from the first letter of John that reads, “Everyone who hates his brother is a murderer.”⁵⁴⁹ Here, both the authority of scripture and the negative association with murderers gave this lesson greater appeal.

Other vices also opposed themselves to love. Perverse desire [*cupiditas*], which Caesarius termed “the mother of all vices,” presented a direct obstacle to loving completely.⁵⁵⁰ Avarice, which Caesarius mentioned much more often with the quotation from the first letter of Timothy, was “the root of all evils.”⁵⁵¹ Much like all virtues could fall under the rubric of love, all vices could fall under the rubric of greed and desire for things that were not good for the soul.

Caesarius relied on these rubrics in order to teach his congregations about correct moral conduct. He was not afforded the time in the weekly sermons that not all Christians attended to teach everyone thoroughly about the benefits of each virtue and the harm caused by each vice. Rather, by teaching them to love and show mercy, and to avoid hatred and desires that precluded love and mercy, Caesarius hoped to teach his congregations how to discern moral and immoral conduct for themselves by deciding whether their actions manifested love or hate.

Although Caesarius devoted a few sermons to describing specific virtues, such as the three on chastity⁵⁵² and the one on humility,⁵⁵³ and vices, like adultery⁵⁵⁴ and drunkenness,⁵⁵⁵

⁵⁴⁸ For example *Serm.* 23.4 and 44.1.

⁵⁴⁹ 1 John 3:15. *Serm.* 19.2; 25.3; 37.6; 39.5; 90.6; 145.2; 172.1; 180.2; 185.2; 187.4; 219.2; 221.3; 223.4; 229.5 and 235.6.

⁵⁵⁰ *Serm.* 35.3. See also *Serm.* 96, 97, 99, and 146.

⁵⁵¹ 1 Tim. 6:10; Caesarius, *Serm.* 22, 23, 39, 71, 87, 120, 182, and 189.

⁵⁵² *Serm.* 43-5.

⁵⁵³ *Serm.* 48.

⁵⁵⁴ *Serm.* 42.

⁵⁵⁵ *Serm.* 46-7.

the primary method Caesarius used to teach other virtues and vices was simply listing them. In sermons focusing on penance and asking God's forgiveness for one's own sins, Caesarius listed vices for each Christian to consider as a form of examination of conscience. For example, in *Sermon* 64 he preached,

Let us consider, since the time we began to have reason, what [faults we have committed]⁵⁵⁶ for the sake of an oath, for the sake of perjury, for the sake of insults, for the sake of defamations, for the sake of hateful speeches, for the sake of hatred, for the sake of anger, for the sake of envy, for the sake of evil desire, for the sake of gluttony, for the sake of sleepiness, for the sake of dirty thoughts, for the sake of desires of the eyes, for the sake of sweet delights of the ears, for the sake of exasperation with the poor...⁵⁵⁷

More often, Caesarius listed corresponding virtues and vices together in parallel sets of paired opposites. In *Sermon* 10 on the "catholic faith," Caesarius' lists of virtues and vices immediately followed on his discussion of beliefs from the Creed. "Let whoever was proud be humble, whoever was unfaithful be faithful, whoever was wanton be chaste; whoever was a bandit be lawful, whoever was drunk be sober, whoever was sleepy, be vigilant, whoever was greedy, be generous, whoever was two-tongued be kind in speech..." he preached.⁵⁵⁸

In *Sermon* 37 on love of enemies, Caesarius gave a list of virtues supplanting vices that culminated in the central theme of the sermon:

Let us work so that goodness may prevail in our souls more than malice, patience more than hot-headedness, favor more than envy, humility more than pride; and, that I may briefly conclude this whole speech, may the sweetness of love take over our

⁵⁵⁶ Supplied with Mueller 1956, 308.

⁵⁵⁷ Cogitemus, ex quo sapere coepimus, quid pro iuramentis, quid pro periuriis, quid pro maledictis, quid pro detractationibus, quid pro otiosis sermonibus, quid pro odio, quid pro ira, quid pro invidia, quid pro concupiscentia mala, quid pro gula, quid pro somnolentia, quid pro sordidis cogitationibus, quid pro concupiscentia oculorum, quid pro voluptuosa delectatione aurium, quid pro exasperatione pauperum... *Serm.* 64.2.5-11. See also *Serm.* 65.

⁵⁵⁸ Qui fuit superbus, sit humilis: qui fuit incredulus, sit fidelis: qui fuit luxoriosus, sit castus: qui fuit latro, sit idoneus: qui fuit ebriosus, sit sobrius: qui fuit somnolentus, sit vigilis: qui fuit avarus, sit largus: qui fuit bilinguis, sit beneloquius... *Serm.* 10.3.2-6.

whole heart, with the result that the bitterness of hatred might not be able to gain a foothold inside us.⁵⁵⁹

Here, Caesarius defined the rubrics of love and hatred for his congregations by setting up the paired opposites in advance. Presenting lists of virtues and vices as paired opposites also gave ordinary Christians an alternative means of understanding moral conduct. For instance, people who had trouble understanding how to be patient might more easily understand how to check how easily they became angry.

Caesarius' virtues and vices also extended to conduct exhibited in a liturgical setting. Caesarius continued the list of virtues and vices he presented in *Sermon* 10 with, "whoever before came late to church now frequently runs to it."⁵⁶⁰ Caesarius also devoted entire sermons to exhorting his congregations to adopt an appropriate comportment and attitude in church.⁵⁶¹ Some of the content of these sermons suggests that there were many in Caesarius' congregation who did not pay attention during the liturgy, preferring to talk to one another instead,⁵⁶² many who did not stay until the end of the liturgy,⁵⁶³ and many who did not have a suitably prayerful attitude when singing the psalms⁵⁶⁴ or praying the Lord's Prayer and the Creed.⁵⁶⁵ Each of these was an example of poor Christian conduct that Caesarius wished to eradicate from his community.

Reading the scriptures was another essentially Christian action that Caesarius encouraged among his congregations. In *Sermons* 6-8, he outlined the importance of scripture

⁵⁵⁹ Laboremus, et in animis nostris plus praevalent bonitas quam malitia, plus patientia quam iracundia, plus benignitas quam invidia, plus humilitas quam superbia; et ut totum brevi sermone concludam, sic totum cor nostrum obtineat caritatis dulcedo, ut in nobis amaritudo odii locum habere non possit, *Serm.* 37.1.35-9.

⁵⁶⁰ Qui aliquando ad ecclesiam tarde veniebat, modo frequentius ad eam currat, *Serm.* 10.3.7-8.

⁵⁶¹ *Serm.* 72-80.

⁵⁶² See, for example, *Serm.* 6.1; 7.5; 19.3; 50.3; 55.1, 4; 64.2; 68; 72; 73.1, 5; 76.2; 77.1, 7; and 80.

⁵⁶³ See especially *Serm.* 73-74.

⁵⁶⁴ See especially *Serm.* 75.

⁵⁶⁵ See especially *Serm.* 72-3.

for salvation and urged his audience to read as much as they could, even going so far as to suggest that they read for several hours a day.⁵⁶⁶ This exhortation was certainly aimed at elites, who not only had the ability and the leisure time to read scripture at home, but also access to a physical text, a very expensive luxury item in late antiquity. Caesarius anticipated the arguments of the illiterate and those whose time was consumed with working in the fields or at a trade, indicating his desire for all Christians, regardless of class or occupation, to read the scriptures.

To those who might say they do not have enough time to read scripture, Caesarius recommended they stop engaging in idle and luxurious activities, including sleep.⁵⁶⁷ To those who could not read, he suggested that they have scripture read to them, and even pay literate people to perform this service.⁵⁶⁸ To the rural members of his congregation who were continually engaged in working their land, he replied:

How many rural men and rural women retain in their memories diabolical and shameful little love songs and sing them with their mouth! They are able to retain and produce these things that the devil taught, and they are not able to retain that which Christ presented? By how much more quickly—and better!—could some rustic or some rural woman, how much more usefully, learn the Creed, and the Lord’s Prayer, and some antiphons, or the fiftieth and ninetieth psalms?⁵⁶⁹

Caesarius’ admonitions for Christians to avoid talking with one another in church were juxtaposed with exhortations to pay attention to the words of the scriptures that were read aloud. While very few ordinary Christians would have had access to a text of the scriptures

⁵⁶⁶ *Serm.* 6.2 and 7.1.

⁵⁶⁷ *Serm.* 6.1-2; 7.5; and 8.2.

⁵⁶⁸ *Serm.* 6.1-2 and 8.1.

⁵⁶⁹ *Quam multi rustici et quam multae mulieres rusticanae cantica diabolica amatoria et turpia memoriter retinent et ore decantant! Ista possunt tenere atque parare, quae diabolus docet: et non possunt tenere, quod Christus ostendit? Quanto celerius et melius quicumque rusticus vel quaecumque mulier rusticana, quanto utilius poterat et symbolum discere, et orationem dominicam, et aliquas antiphonas, et psalmos quinquagesimum vel nonagesimum? Serm.* 6.3.3-9.

or the means to pay a person to read scripture aloud to them outside the liturgy, everyone was able to hear the word of God by paying attention to the readings inside the liturgy.

Singing the psalms was another Christian action Caesarius exhorted his congregations to perform.⁵⁷⁰ Ordinary Christians did not need a text of the psalms because they could learn them through singing them during the liturgy. The fiftieth and ninetieth psalms that Caesarius recommended for rural Christians in *Sermon 6* concerned God's mercy and salvation respectively, and thus functioned on their own as methods for teaching these two key lessons Caesarius taught elsewhere in his sermons.

In *Sermons 75* and *76*, Caesarius preached about the importance of singing the psalms and how beneficial they were for Christians, both as a ritual and as a teacher of moral conduct.⁵⁷¹ "It is indeed good and acceptable enough to God when you faithfully sing the psalms with your tongue," he preached, "so it is truly good if your life is also in accord with your tongue."⁵⁷² In *Sermon 75*, Caesarius also gave his congregation specific examples of how the psalms could help them remember appropriate Christian conduct: "When any one of you sings the verse of the psalm that says, 'Let the proud be ashamed, because they have wronged me unjustly,' let him try to give flight to pride, so that he might warrant to escape eternal confusion."⁵⁷³ He continued to suggest psalms that warned against the vices of perverse desire⁵⁷⁴ and idleness.⁵⁷⁵

⁵⁷⁰ Cf. Agde (506), 30.

⁵⁷¹ See also *Life of Caesarius*, I.19.

⁵⁷² Bonum quidem est et satis acceptabile deo, quando lingua fideliter psallit; sed tunc est vere bonum, si cum lingua concordet etiam vita, *Serm. 75.2.4-6*. See also *Serm. 76.7-8*.

⁵⁷³ Quando quisque vestrum psallit versiculum psalmi, ubi ait CONFUNDANTUR SUPERBI, QUIA INIUSTE INIQUITATEM FECERUNT IN ME, conetur superbiam fugere, ut aeternam confusionem mereatur evadere, *Serm. 75.3.2-5*, Ps. 118.78.

⁵⁷⁴ *Serm. 75.3.5-7*, Ps. 72.27.

⁵⁷⁵ *Serm. 75.3.7-10*, Ps. 1.2.

Singing the psalms, like the other rituals of the Christian liturgy, also effectively linked the Christians in Caesarius' church with the rest of the universal Christian community. Christians all over the world sang the same psalms, and when the Christians of Arles sang them, they participated in a ritual that extended across the Mediterranean. When Caesarius preached, "I desired that you sing the psalms just as they are sung in other neighboring cities," he invited his congregation to reflect on the universality and association with other places that singing the psalms invoked.⁵⁷⁶

Finally, singing the psalms was something that every Christian was able to do, regardless of social class or material resources. Part of why Caesarius contrasted the psalms with "diabolical and shameful love songs" that rural peasants sang in *Sermon 6* was to encourage them in their efforts to memorize some psalms and prayers: if they could memorize these other songs, certainly they could memorize the songs they heard in church. Although Caesarius numbered "shameful songs" within lists of vices in a several sermons,⁵⁷⁷ he did not seem to be suggesting that popular singing be entirely replaced with psalms.⁵⁷⁸ Rather, Caesarius looked to the songs he already observed the rural people of the Arles hinterlands singing as an opportunity to urge them to learn new songs.

There were some aspects of ordinary—and particularly, but not exclusively, rural—conduct that Caesarius did wish to eradicate from his Christian community, however. Any activities that Caesarius understood as "pagan," particularly those that involved divination,⁵⁷⁹ were unsuitable for Christians, and Caesarius preached against them vehemently in several of

⁵⁷⁶ Cum enim vos ego ita psallere desiderarem, quomodo in aliis vicinis civitatibus psallebatur, *Serm.* 75.1.6-8.

⁵⁷⁷ For example, *Serm.* 13.4; 16.3; 19.3; 33.4; 55.2; and 255.5.

⁵⁷⁸ Cf. Grig 2013.

⁵⁷⁹ Outlawed by Agde (506), 42.

his sermons.⁵⁸⁰ Some sermons not only advised Christians to cease, for example, worshipping at springs or trees, consulting seers and sorcerers, using magical charms and phylacteries, and participating in nightly celebrations,⁵⁸¹ but also to reproach their fellow Christians who failed to cease such activities⁵⁸² or inhibit their ability to perform them by destroying their shrines.⁵⁸³ Other sermons warned Christians not to celebrate saints' feasts at night with drinking and lewd dancing as pagan festivals were celebrated.⁵⁸⁴

Caesarius was not worried about the Christians in his congregation actually leaving Christianity to become pagans, but his continued exhortations against pagan activity demonstrated a real concern over the effectiveness of pagan activity. Caesarius understood these “diabolical” actions as particularly sinful, and recommended strict penance to be absolved from them.⁵⁸⁵ Moreover, they were by definition un-Christian, and engaging in them set people outside the Christian community. The community that Caesarius strove to create through virtuous action could not exist if many of its members continued to participate in pagan practices.

Conclusion

Caesarius' sermons reveal a consistent pedagogical program centered around the formation of a Christian community. Through his preaching, Caesarius taught ordinary Christians how to conduct themselves in the way he understood that Christians should. He focused on clear, imitable actions that could be performed by everyone, such as love and forgiveness, and he

⁵⁸⁰ See Klingshirn 1994, Chapter 8, for a thorough discussion of Caesarius' denunciation of pagan activity.

⁵⁸¹ *Serm.* 13.5; 14.4; 19.4; 33.4; 50-54.

⁵⁸² *Serm.* 13.5; 33.4; 51.1; and 53.2.

⁵⁸³ *Serm.* 14.4; 53.2; and 54.5.

⁵⁸⁴ *Serm.* 33.4 and 46.8.

⁵⁸⁵ *Serm.* 50.1; 51.1; 53.3; and 54.1, 5.

presented them in numerous ways so that the greatest number of people could understand what they had to do. By teaching his congregations how to act like good Christians, including demonstrating their faith, possessing virtues, avoiding vices, participating in the rituals of the liturgy, and refraining from pagan activity, Caesarius hoped to bring them into the wider Christian community.

Caesarius brought such pastoral concerns with him when he presided over church councils as metropolitan of Arles, indicating his desire to shape the Christian community on a broader level as well. His involvement in episcopal and clerical administration through these councils informed how he approached community formation through his teaching; the interactions he had with his diverse congregations in and around Arles informed how he legislated in the councils. In order for the community to flourish, the clergy had to be virtuous as well. These mutual influences enabled Caesarius to teach his congregations effectively to understand themselves as part of a universal Christian community and ultimately to create a local Christian community through the actions and interactions of its members.

Chapter 5

Lives, *Lives*, and Afterlives: Teaching by Example in Sixth-Century Gaul

In 513, Ennodius, the bishop of Pavia, wrote a letter to his friend Caesarius. In it he wrote:

“Wherever you go, good people discover aspects to imitate from your way of life; and aspects to be avoided are demonstrated to the wicked. You are blessed, whom God has directed to teach by warnings and examples.”⁵⁸⁶ This praise, appearing thus in the rather

formulaic genre of a friendship letter, could easily be dismissed as a mere commonplace.⁵⁸⁷

Yet, the fact that by the sixth century it was a commonplace to praise bishops for their ability to teach by the examples of their own lives suggests that this way of teaching actually was a central part of late antique and early medieval bishops’ occupation.

Caesarius certainly viewed teaching by example as part of his pastoral mission, as evidenced by his exhortation in the circular letter included with his sermon collection that his fellow clergy do the same: “Therefore let us, however much it is in our power, with the lord inspiring and aiding us, be eager to inform by words and examples the people relying on us.”⁵⁸⁸ Indeed, his sermon collection, along with the letters he sent with it, functioned as an example provided to priests as far as the collection circulated. Fully aware of the pedagogical value the way he lived his life had, not only for ordinary Christians but for other clerics who

⁵⁸⁶ Ennodius, *Ep.* IX.33, trans. Klingshirn 1994b, 79.

⁵⁸⁷ See Matthews 1975, 5-11 on late antique Latin letter-writing.

⁵⁸⁸ Nos ergo, quantum in nobis est, inspirante et auxiliante domino studeamus plebem nobis creditam verbis informare et exemplis, *Serm.* 1.19.53-5.

in turn should teach their own congregations by their examples, Caesarius furthered the pedagogical mission begun in his sermons by trying to lead an exemplary life.

The makeup of the Christian community in Arles and difficulties inherent in administering Christians throughout Gaul made teaching by example an attractive option for someone whose primary pedagogical goal was to teach his congregations to act virtuously.⁵⁸⁹ Caesarius was well aware that preaching was not sufficient for educating all the ordinary Christians in his ministry. Absence from liturgical celebrations alone—which Caesarius mentioned in some sermons as well as worked to ameliorate in church councils—was enough to inspire him to teach outside the liturgy.⁵⁹⁰ For the Christians who were present to hear Caesarius' sermons, there was also no guarantee that they were paying attention. Caesarius' repeated mentions of members of the congregation gossiping idly while the scriptures were being read offer some evidence that at least some Christians were not listening at least some of the time—or Caesarius perceived that they were not.⁵⁹¹

Thus, Caesarius and his contemporaries adopted various methods of teaching by example in order to supplement the teachings of their sermons for congregations that were large, diverse, and difficult to administer across several political domains and with a paucity of clergy. By living as an example, not just inside the church but out in the world as well, Caesarius was able to bring some of the primary lessons that he stressed in his sermons, such as the virtuous and moral actions that defined a Christian community, to those his sermons did not reach. Furthermore, Caesarius offered himself as an example to parish priests who may not have had the elite education he had, but still were expected to teach their

⁵⁸⁹ For Caesarius in context, see above, Chapter 4.

⁵⁹⁰ *Serm.* 6.1; Council of Agde (506), 21.

⁵⁹¹ *Serm.* 72-80, among others.

congregations as effectively as Caesarius could. In this way, Caesarius taught his Christian community how to live in a community of virtue by enacting the relationships of a virtuous community.⁵⁹² His example as bishop also taught ordinary Christians how to interpret the hierarchical relationship between clergy and the laity that held the local community together and linked it to the universal church and also to God.

This chapter examines Caesarius' life and how it functioned as an example to others through the lens of the *Life* written about him by several contemporaries and through his actions in the church councils over which he presided. All of Caesarius' actions, including the administrative, were pedagogical actions insofar as they demonstrated to ordinary Christians how to belong to a Christian community. It further considers saints' *Lives*—that of Caesarius as well as those of others about whom Caesarius would have preached to his congregations at their feasts—as an expansion of the biblical examples Christians encountered in scriptural readings. The immediacy of the lives of saints conveyed through the materiality of their relics and their association with the local Christian community rendered them more effective *exempla* for ordinary Christians. Finally, it treats the afterlives of such texts as Caesarius' sermons and their ability to provide additional examples to priests and laity across space and time as the Gallic church moved into the middle ages. Teaching by example, I argue, became the way forward for priests wishing to teach ordinary Christians about their faith in the sixth century.

⁵⁹² See above, Chapter 4, for how Caesarius defined a virtuous community in his sermons.

An Exemplary Ideal

The idea of teaching by example was not new in the sixth century. In fact, *exempla*, or models to imitate, were a common pedagogical trope in Latin literature. Livy famously stated in the preface to his history of Rome that people should learn from both the positive and negative examples illustrated in the history.⁵⁹³ Valerius Maximus, addressing the emperor Tiberius in the first century C.E., laid out a compendium of “memorable doings and sayings” as a sort of one-stop shop for moral *exempla*.⁵⁹⁴ The purpose of such a work was to collect *exempla* for orators to use in their speeches.

The use of examples (παράδειγματα in Greek) in rhetoric was first theorized by Aristotle, who stated that a rhetorical argument could be supported by historical or invented examples. Because examples relied on inductive reasoning, or some outside knowledge of the provided example, in order for the argument to be understood, they were less effective when used alone. Instead, Aristotle suggested ending an argument with a specific example in order to drive home the point.⁵⁹⁵ Later authors of rhetorical handbooks in both Greek and Latin did not develop the use of *paradeigmata* or *exempla*, but these figures’ continued use in speeches throughout the Hellenistic and Roman periods attest to their value in public speaking.⁵⁹⁶ A recognizable example appearing at the end of an argument offered listeners a second means of understanding the argument by situating it within the context of their existing knowledge.

⁵⁹³ Livy, *History*, I.Preface.10.

⁵⁹⁴ Valerius Maximus, *Memorable Doings and Sayings*, I.Preface.

⁵⁹⁵ Kennedy 1999, 83.

⁵⁹⁶ Kennedy’s summaries of later rhetorical handbooks make mention of little or no discussion of Aristotle’s examples and *enthymemes* by their authors. See Kennedy 1983, *passim*.

Christian preachers began using *exempla* in their sermons almost as soon as they started recording sermons. Some of the earliest sermons from the second and third centuries were exegetical homilies deriving from the Jewish exegetical tradition, and even those not classified as “exegetical” were based on scriptural texts.⁵⁹⁷ By the fourth century, sermons had taken on the form they would retain into the middle ages including the use of short passages from scripture, or even passing references to well-known biblical personages, in order to illustrate lessons on morality.

Caesarius’ sermons were certainly no exception.⁵⁹⁸ As I have shown in the previous chapter, Caesarius used *exempla* from scripture to reinforce lessons about moral Christian conduct.⁵⁹⁹ He composed several exegetical sermons on the exemplary figures of Abraham, Isaac, Rebecca, Jacob, Joseph, Moses, Samson, David, Solomon, Elijah, Elisha, and Job. Outside these sermons, he also frequently included references to Moses, Abraham, Samson, and Job, even when he was not explicitly discussing their stories.⁶⁰⁰ Caesarius also employed negative *exempla*, such as Pharaoh in Exodus, to illustrate conduct that Christians should not imitate.⁶⁰¹ In one sermon warning against the vice of drunkenness, Caesarius listed Pharaoh alongside Lot and Herod as examples of the bad things that happen when people drink too much.⁶⁰² As with positive *exempla*, the knowledge members of the congregation already had about these figures’ stories enlivened the illustrations of exemplary (or un-exemplary) conduct that Caesarius wished to convey.

⁵⁹⁷ Kennedy 1999, 155-6. See also also Olivari 1991, 47-61 for examples of second-century Christian homiletics.

⁵⁹⁸ *Life of Caesarius*, I.16.

⁵⁹⁹ Chapter 4, 151-61.

⁶⁰⁰ Scriptural verses concerning these figures are among the most frequently cited in Caesarius’ sermons.

⁶⁰¹ Caesarius, *Serm.* 95; 97; 99; and 101.

⁶⁰² *Serm.* 46.5.

The concept of teaching by example goes beyond the use of *exempla* in preaching, however. Greek philosophy had long had a tradition of the lives of philosophical teachers being examples for their students to emulate.⁶⁰³ John the Evangelist brought this concept into early Christian literature with his depiction of Jesus presenting himself as an example to his disciples: “You call me ‘teacher’ and ‘master,’ and rightly so, for indeed I am,” John’s Jesus says. “If I, therefore, the master and teacher, have washed your feet, you ought to wash one another’s feet. I have given you a model [ὑπόδειγμα] to follow, so that as I have done for you, you should also do.”⁶⁰⁴ An exhortation for a priest or bishop, in his capacity as teacher, to set an example follows in one of the pastoral epistles: “Let no one have contempt for your youth, but set an example for those who believe, in speech, conduct, love, faith, and purity.”⁶⁰⁵ Thus, “example” was early touted as one way for clerics to demonstrate the authority necessary for teaching their community.⁶⁰⁶

The formulation of this ideal for preachers in the phrase “by words and examples,” [*verbis et exemplis*] which occurs frequently in Caesarius’ works, first appeared in the writings of the tetrarchic-era teacher of Latin rhetoric, Lactantius.⁶⁰⁷ Lactantius developed the idea that Jesus taught by example in his *Divine Institutes*, and in several places mentioned that Christian preachers could teach by their examples more effectively than with words.⁶⁰⁸

⁶⁰³ Hadot 1986, 444-55 describes the relationship philosophers had with their students as that of “spiritual guide” in Hellenistic and Roman philosophy.

⁶⁰⁴ John 13:13-15, trans. *NABRE*.

⁶⁰⁵ 1 Timothy 4:12, trans. *NABRE*. See also Titus 2:6-7.

⁶⁰⁶ The second-century Christian writer Ignatius of Antioch discussed a bishop’s authority as dependent on his way of life, Rapp 2005, 27-8; the third-century *Didascalía* exhorts bishops to imitate the life of Christ and encourage Christians to imitate them, *Ibid.* 31.

⁶⁰⁷ This phrase does not have an equivalent in Greek, but the injunction that priests should teach by example, derived from Timothy, existed in contemporary Greek-speaking Christian communities.

⁶⁰⁸ Nam cum iustitia nulla esset in terra, doctorem misit quasi vivam legem, ut nomen ac templum novum conderet, ut verum ac pium cultum per omnem terram **et verbis et exemplo** seminaret, *Divine Institutes* 4.25.2; Homines enim malunt **exempla quam verba**, quia loqui facile est, praestare difficile, 4.23.8; Nos autem **non verbis modo, sed etiam exemplis** ex vero petitis vera esse quae a nobis dicuntur ostendimus, 5.17.8, emphasis added.

The fifth-century bishop of Clermont, Sidonius Apollinaris, an aristocrat more famous for the erudition demonstrated in his collected letters and poems than his pastoral activity, expressed anxiety about his ability to be an example to his congregations in some of his letters.⁶⁰⁹ Prior to his consecration as bishop, he wrote, “I, miserable, compelled to teach before learning and presuming to teach good before doing it, am just like a fruitless tree, since I do not have works for fruit, I sprinkle words for leaves.”⁶¹⁰ He lamented his inadequacy in another letter, writing,

Most unworthy of mortals, I out of necessity have to say what I refuse to do, and I am damned in the face of my very words, since I do not fulfill what I admonish, and every day I am forced to speak my same verdict against myself.⁶¹¹

Although we should not take the rhetorical Sidonius’ expression of his own sinfulness at face value, that his claim would have had the intended effect in his letter indicates that Sidonius and his colleagues strove towards an ideal in which bishops demonstrated the proper conduct that they preached to their congregations.

A generation after Sidonius, a North African grammarian living in Arles wrote an influential pastoral handbook that circulated in Gaul and Spain throughout the sixth century. The author of that handbook, misleadingly titled *On the Contemplative Life*, was Caesarius’ teacher of rhetoric in Arles, Julianus Pomerius.⁶¹² The pastoral ideals he put forth in *On the Contemplative Life* directly influenced his student and are evident in the way Caesarius tried to live his life as an example to the ordinary Christians in his community.

⁶⁰⁹ On Sidonius, see Harries 1994.

⁶¹⁰ Qui miser, ante praesumens bonum praedicare quam facere, tamquam sterilis arbor, cum non habeam opera pro pomis, spargo verba pro foliis, Sidonius *Ep.* V.III.3.

⁶¹¹ Indignissimus mortalium necesse habeo dicere quod facere detrecto, et ad mea ipsa verba damnabilis, cum non impleam quae moneo, idem in me meam cotidie cogor dictare sententiam, *Ep.* VI.I.5.

⁶¹² For Pomerius, see Leyser 2000, Chapter 3.

The relationship between a priest's life and his authority as teacher is evident in Pomerius' text as well. "Whatever good he [the bishop] omits he will not order to be done," he wrote, "and whatever evil he commits he will not forbid to be done because by his own contradictory action he either loses or lessens the authority that must be his as a teacher."⁶¹³ When Pomerius discussed how priests should teach their congregations, however, he stressed the pedagogical importance of teaching by example in addition to preaching. He wrote, "faithful Catholics usually profit more by good example than by brilliant words; and the best and perfect teaching is that which a spiritual way of life exemplifies."⁶¹⁴ Pomerius also offered teaching by example as an antidote to priests who might not be able to preach well: "it is possible to gain approval, whether you preach or not, for what you establish as worthy by deeds and impress on people disposed to follow an example, as something they can find delight in achieving."⁶¹⁵ Caesarius' teacher was already aware of the central pastoral problem that Caesarius ultimately had to face: too many Christians meant not enough good teachers to teach them adequately. Pomerius, and Caesarius after him, developed teaching by example as a way for priests of all levels of education to teach all the Christians they ministered to in their churches.

The way bishops and priests lived their own lives was an integral part of their pedagogy in fifth- and sixth-century Gaul. Teaching by example was an effective means of teaching for priests who did not have the skill to preach, and living the moral exhortations they preached granted authority to priests who were young, uneducated, or were ordained precipitously on account of an increased need for priests. Caesarius, who lacked neither

⁶¹³ *On the contemplative life*, 1.15, trans. Suelzer 1947, 37, modified.

⁶¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 1.17, trans. Suelzer 1947, 38-9, modified.

⁶¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 1.17, trans. Suelzer 1947, 39.

rhetorical skill nor episcopal authority, understood the pedagogical effectiveness of teaching by example within the context of Arles and seized on the opportunity to further his teaching efforts. As I will demonstrate in the rest of this chapter, Caesarius interpreted the injunction to teach “by words and examples” in a number of ways in his effort to communicate the same lessons he preached in his sermons to those whom his sermons did not reach or who needed further reinforcement.

Lives of the Clergy

First of all, Caesarius used his own life as a pedagogical tool. He thought that everyone should teach the Christian faith by words and examples—not just bishops and priests,⁶¹⁶ but also parents teaching their children in preparation for baptism.⁶¹⁷ He tried to live his life in such a way that he would be an example of Christian virtue to those who interacted with him.

Evidence that Caesarius actually did live his life as an example to others as much as he said that he should is a bit more difficult to establish from the sources on Caesarius’ life, namely his saint’s *Life*, written shortly after his death by people who knew him personally, and the canons of the Gallic councils that he administered. Neither source is a record of Caesarius’ actions, yet both are evidence of his legacy and performance as bishop. The following, therefore, cannot be more than a reconstruction or a representation of how Caesarius actually lived. Nevertheless, my reconstruction of Caesarius’ life from his *Life* and the councils is useful as a model for what such pedagogy looked like, whether practiced by Caesarius or by other bishops and priests who read his *Life* and his numerous prescriptions to lead by example.

⁶¹⁶ *Serm.* 1.19.53-5.

⁶¹⁷ *Serm.* 229.6.19ff.

The *Life* of Caesarius is simultaneously the most useful and the most problematic source for describing the real life of Caesarius. Because it is itself a form of biography, it purports to include the significant events that occurred in his life. Yet the genre of hagiography in late antiquity often included formulaic tropes and fictionalized accounts that make it difficult to discern the actual person about whom the *Life* was written. Many hagiographies were written decades, or sometimes centuries after the death of the subject and are therefore too far removed to be of much use for reconstructing the life of the individual.⁶¹⁸ Furthermore, because saints' lives were composed for the specific purpose of providing an exemplar for Christians to imitate, using Caesarius' *Life* as evidence for his exemplarity could easily become circular. Therefore, it is necessary to proceed with extreme caution.

As far as composition is concerned, the *Life* of Caesarius passes the tests of time and detail that enable it to be considered a useful source for Caesarius' life. It was completed within seven years of his death by five clerics who knew him in different capacities. Two of them, a priest and a deacon, had served him since their youth.⁶¹⁹ Although it includes some stories borrowed from biblical *exempla* or the lives of earlier saints, it features many more specific details that the authors substantiated with plausible eyewitness claims, evidence from named informants, and quotations from Caesarius' sermons. Background details that enhanced the narrative could also be taken as evidence for the general situation, as they would have had to make sense to a contemporary audience. Finally, use of tropes and biblical *exempla* to describe events does not necessarily preclude those events from having happened.

⁶¹⁸ On the problems inherent in using hagiography as an historical source, see Bailey 2016, 13-14.

⁶¹⁹ On the *Life* of Caesarius, see Delage 2010. See also Klingshirn 1994b, 1-8 on the value of the *Life* as an historical source.

Ancient authors often paraphrased existing descriptions to apply to present events rather than composing their own descriptions. Moreover, people in places of high visibility often acted in accordance with the cultural expectations of their offices. For example, Caesarius might have ransomed captives because ransoming captives was something bishops in late antiquity were supposed to do, but he still ransomed captives.⁶²⁰ Such moments of detail and descriptions of specific events in the life of Caesarius are where I focus my attention in this section on Caesarius' conduct.

In their description of his life, Caesarius' biographers explicitly stated that Caesarius taught by example as well as by words: "Indeed, he used to conduct [love] especially with his heart and mouth, and that we ought to love our enemies, with a most pleasing exhortation, he used to commendably instruct by word and example [*sermone et exemplo*]." ⁶²¹ One of the primary lessons Caesarius taught in his sermons, love of enemies, he also taught by his own example. His biographers also wrote that Caesarius' way of life reflected his inner virtue. "His exterior projected his interior...he did not teach with words [*verbis*] what he did not fulfill with examples [*exemplis*]." ⁶²² While this statement does carry the sense that Caesarius had the authority to make the exhortations he made in his sermons because he worked to achieve them in his life, combined with the previous statement and descriptions of his actions throughout the *Life*, it is clear that the biographers were making a connection between the two types of pedagogy Caesarius employed—words and examples.

⁶²⁰ On Caesarius' ransoming of captives, see Klingshirn 1985.

⁶²¹ Ille enim hoc maxime et corde et ore gestabat, et ut *inimicos diligere* deberemus, hortatu blandissimo, sermone et exemplo laudabiliter instruebat, *Life* I.53.7-9.

⁶²² Ad interiorem suum prodebat exterior...nec docuit uerbis, quod non adimpleuit exemplis, *Ibid.* I.46.1-8. See also *Ibid.* II.35.

Caesarius' example would have been an effective form of pedagogy for the ordinary Christians in and around Arles for the simple reason that, as bishop, he was very visible in public. He made the rounds of rural parishes,⁶²³ often performing healing miracles and other acts of charity in addition to celebrating the liturgy in the local church. He also received visitors in his episcopal residence, making sure to treat them with kindness and charity, feeding them, praying for them, and asking about their families.⁶²⁴ The urban Christians of Arles, who rejoiced when he was made bishop,⁶²⁵ also came out to greet him on occasions of his return to the city.⁶²⁶ On these occasions, when he was appearing in public as the metropolitan bishop, Caesarius would have performed as such and made a point to conduct himself in an exemplary manner.

The *Life* records one event that Caesarius performed in public specifically so that his example could instruct those who witnessed it. After a meeting with the Ostrogothic king Theoderic in Ravenna, Caesarius was gifted with a silver bowl. "But he," continued the biographers, "who never used silver at his table except for spoons...publicly sold the bowl and with the profits from it began to free many captives."⁶²⁷ Caesarius' actions earned more praise from Theodoric, which prompted nobles at court to give him more money so that he could free more captives and distribute the rest as charity.⁶²⁸

Visible acts of mercy such as this were Caesarius' primary means of teaching by example. As I have shown in the previous chapter, mercy and alms, which were closely tied to the virtue of love [*caritas*], were the actions that Caesarius thought were key for the

⁶²³ *Ibid.* I.50 and II.22.

⁶²⁴ *Ibid.* I.17 and 62.

⁶²⁵ *Ibid.* I.13.

⁶²⁶ *Ibid.* I.26 and 43.

⁶²⁷ Ille uero, qui in usu mensae suae argentum numquam habuit absque coeliaria...discum facit publice uenumdari, eiusque pretio coepit captiuorum plurimos liberare, *Ibid.* I.37.7-11.

⁶²⁸ *Ibid.* I.28.

functioning of a Christian community and taught that all Christians could and should perform in their daily lives. He communicated this lesson to Christians who did not hear his sermons—or did not pay attention during his sermons, or benefited from a reminder of the sincerity of his exhortations—by visibly showing mercy to the poor and captives within his own community.

He set up a sort of hospital near his basilica for sick and provided for the poor.⁶²⁹ He was also particularly committed to helping captives. Aside from the instance in Ravenna, he ransomed captives in Arles and fed them,⁶³⁰ and “did not deny to captives and poor people the place and freedom for making requests.”⁶³¹ He also showed his mercy towards a man sentenced to death by interceding “now that the populace was coming together with stones,” asking that the man be pardoned and become a penitent.⁶³²

Acts of charity, specifically caring for the sick and poor and ransoming captives, were expected of all bishops, so it would be a mistake to think that Caesarius was motivated only by pedagogy.⁶³³ Yet, Caesarius chose to do his good works visibly rather than follow Jesus’ injunction in Matthew not to perform his righteous deeds where people could see them.⁶³⁴ By demonstrating his mercy in view of all sorts of people, Caesarius taught the importance of mercy by showing them firsthand what mercy looked like. Not recorded in the *Life* were descriptions of what happened to that man after he became a penitent, the looks on captives’ faces once they found out they could go home, and the shelter provided to the poor and sick near the basilica. But the ordinary Christians in Caesarius’ community would have seen these

⁶²⁹ *Ibid.* I.20.

⁶³⁰ *Ibid.* II.8; 23

⁶³¹ *Locum libertatemque suggerendi captiuis et pauperibus non negavit, Ibid.* I.20.6-7.

⁶³² *Ibid.* I .24, “Iamque cum lapidibus populi concurrentes.”

⁶³³ Rapp 2005, 223-34.

⁶³⁴ Matthew 6:1.

things. Caesarius hoped that this firsthand knowledge of the effectiveness of mercy would have taught them to be merciful themselves.

Caesarius also demonstrated his preferred posture for prayer—either on his knees or, more often, prostrate on the ground—whenever he set out to pray for a miracle.⁶³⁵ The authors of *Book II*, who knew Caesarius more intimately than the *Book I* authors, mentioned once that Caesarius did not like to be seen prostrate in prayer (though the other mentions in the *Life* make it clear that he was often seen in such a pose).⁶³⁶ Perhaps Caesarius felt himself too vulnerable in this position, or that prostrate was the way one should pray to God in private but not in the presence of other people. In another instance, the authors of *Book II* recorded a healing miracle of a sick girl: “Fastening his knee to the ground, [Caesarius] prayed over the girl with her father and mother.”⁶³⁷ Thus, Caesarius demonstrated to the girl’s parents the proper way to pray by getting on his knees. Ordinary Christians who saw Caesarius praying while lying down could also have inferred that that was an appropriate way to pray as well, especially if they witnessed a miracle following Caesarius’ prostrate prayers.

The second way Caesarius used the example of people’s lives as a pedagogical tool was to legislate about the conduct of clerics, including bishops, priests, and deacons, as well as male and female ascetics and public penitents, in the councils he presided over as metropolitan. Although we do not have the *acta* of the Gallic councils detailing what was said and done at the meetings, the canons of the councils are themselves a legacy of

⁶³⁵ *Life* I.22; 40; 43; II.2; 8; 16; and 29. The effectiveness of Caesarius’ miracles does not concern us here as much as the prayers and rituals performed in order to bring on a miracle. See Klingshirn 1994, 159-70 and Van Dam 1993, 82-6.

⁶³⁶ *Life* II.8.

⁶³⁷ *genu in terra figens, cum patre et matre puellae orauit, Ibid.* II.29.17-18.

Caesarius. The surviving canons were compiled close enough to the dates of the actual councils that they reflect the legislation that was agreed upon at those councils. Furthermore, Caesarius himself was involved with compiling canons of earlier councils.⁶³⁸ The canons that survive are evidence of Caesarius' efforts to influence the conduct and actions of other clergy and church orders.

The Council of Agde, which Caesarius led in 506 under the auspices of the Visigothic rulers, in large part reaffirmed the ideals for clerical conduct that had been established in the fifth century by other Gallic church councils and the *Statuta ecclesiae antiqua*.⁶³⁹ In this regard, councils primarily served to demarcate the clergy as a separate category of people from the laity.⁶⁴⁰ Ordinary Christians were not supposed to imitate the lives of clerics whose actions were meant to define them as distinctly not-lay. Nevertheless, just as the councils' legislation on the liturgy indirectly affected the laity, their legislation on the conduct of all members of church orders, including penitents, also had an effect on the religious educations of ordinary Christians. By prescribing that clerics act a certain way, Caesarius was ensuring that members of the Christian community saw clerics performing virtues and fulfilling their roles in the hierarchy of community. Similarly, penitents visibly demonstrated their place at the bottom of the Christian hierarchy and served as a negative example.

Clerics who appeared as clerical were necessary for teaching ordinary Christians about the relationships that held up Christian communities. Lay Christians needed clerics to teach them, to celebrate the ritual of the liturgy, and to perform acts of mercy on an

⁶³⁸ Caesarius collected canons of earlier councils for the Council of Marseille in the early 530s. On this, see Mathisen 2014, 182. See also Mathisen's caveat not to overestimate the agency of Caesarius in the sixth-century trend of compiling canons in Mathisen 1997, *passim*.

⁶³⁹ The Frankish and Burgundian counterparts, the Councils of Orléans in 511 and Epaon in 517 respectively, did the same thing.

⁶⁴⁰ Bailey 2016, 24-28.

institutional level that was arguably more effective than relying on wealthy individuals to care for all the sick and poor.⁶⁴¹ When clerics acted virtuously in view of ordinary Christians, they taught not only about the importance of the virtues they were enacting but also about the nature of the Christian community as a whole.

One canon in particular addressed the physical appearance of members of religious orders:

Clerics who grow their hair, even if they did not want to, must unwillingly be beaten by an archdeacon; also it is not permitted for them to use or to own clothing or shoes except those that are suitable for religious life.⁶⁴²

This canon was meant to be an elaboration on previous canons restricting the physical appearance of clerics that were read out and affirmed at the beginning of the council, according to the first canon.⁶⁴³ The *Statuta ecclesiae antiqua*, which would have been read alongside canons of previous councils, specified that clerics should neither grow their hair nor shave their beards,⁶⁴⁴ and that they should demonstrate their profession by their “habit” [*habitu*], which included appropriate hair and shoes.⁶⁴⁵ These canons reflect the desire of fifth- and sixth-century Gallic bishops, Caesarius included, to make clerics visible members of the community in order to effectively lead and teach their lay congregations.

Other canons prohibited clerics from engaging in some of the same vices Caesarius denounced in his sermons. Canon 41 stated, “Before all things, drunkenness is forbidden to clerics, which is the kindling and nourisher of all vices. Thus we decided that whoever is agreed to have been drunk must be removed from communion for the space of thirty days, or

⁶⁴¹ For institutional charity, see Brown 2012, 481-502 on the management of church wealth in sixth century Gaul.

⁶⁴² Clerici qui comam nutriunt, ab archidiacono, etiamsi noluerint, inviti detundantur; vestimenta vel calciamenta etiam eis, nisi quae relegendem deceant, uti uel habere non liceat, Agde (506), 20.

⁶⁴³ Agde (506), 1.

⁶⁴⁴ SEA, 25 (XLIV).

⁶⁴⁵ SEA, 26 (XLV).

subjected to corporal punishment.”⁶⁴⁶ While it was certainly considered sinful for ordinary Christians to drink to excess, the church had no mechanism for punishing everyone for drunkenness and other sinful actions. Clerics, on the other hand, who were supposed to be closer to God than lay people and also lead their communities toward God by their virtue, were expressly prohibited from engaging in vices. When clerics were punished by their superiors—or, in the case of bishops, their colleagues—in sight of ordinary Christians, they sent a message about just how awful the vices were for which they were punished.

Similarly, the large number of canons that dealt with clerical involvement with women demonstrated the importance of chastity as a virtue. According to the canons of Agde and previous councils, clerics were supposed to give up relations with their wives upon ordination and were not supposed to associate at all with women outside their immediate family.⁶⁴⁷ Clerics were even forbidden to attend wedding celebrations.⁶⁴⁸ Although marriage and weddings were not considered sinful as such, the language of these canons indicates that they were insufficiently pure for a priest or bishop who performed the Eucharistic ritual.⁶⁴⁹

The conspicuous absence of clerics from the company of women conveyed the message that clerics should never put themselves in a situation that might lead to sexual relations with women. Caesarius made his thoughts on the matter clear in *Sermon 44*, a lengthy sermon on conjugal chastity, among other things. He stated in no uncertain terms that all Christians must only have relations for the purposes of having children,⁶⁵⁰ and that they

⁶⁴⁶ Ante omnia clericis uetetur ebrietas, quae omnium uitiorum fomes ac nutrix est. Itaque eum quem ebrium fuisse constiterit, ut ordo patitur, aut triginta dierum spatio a communione statuimus submouendum, aut corporali subdendum supplicio, Agde (506), 41.

⁶⁴⁷ For example Agde (506), 10 and 11.

⁶⁴⁸ Agde (506), 39.

⁶⁴⁹ Canon 39 of Agde concludes: “do not let the hearing and sight designated for the sacred mysteries be polluted by the infection of shameful spectacles and words,” ne auditus et obtutus sacris mysteriis deputatus turpium spectaculorum atque uerborum contagio polluat.

⁶⁵⁰ *Serm.* 44.1.

must fast from intimacy several days before receiving the Eucharist and all through Lent.⁶⁵¹ He did not stop there, however. He developed five additional points refuting claims that men might make concerning the sinfulness of sex in marriage. To those who might claim that they were young and could not control their desires, he preached that with God's help, they would learn to restrain themselves, and in any case, if they could not exercise restraint, they could redeem themselves through fasting and alms.⁶⁵² Clerics, on the other hand, were not given so much leeway.⁶⁵³ As with drunkenness, clerics had to visibly set themselves apart from sexual conduct, thus reinforcing for ordinary Christians who interacted with them the importance of the virtue of chastity.

By refusing to interact with women, clerics also could have been sending the message that they, like the young men Caesarius addressed in his sermon, could not trust themselves to be around women. This notion could have had a potentially damaging effect on their authority. Conversely, their action could have sent the opposite message—that they did not trust women. These two examples represent the manifold other ways ordinary Christians might have interpreted the actions of their church leaders. When attempting to teach through their actions, clerics ran the risk of conveying unintended lessons that would have shaped the faith of ordinary Christians. Because there is no evidence for such unintended lessons, they are necessarily beyond the scope of this project. Nevertheless, it is important to keep in mind that everyone who interacted with Caesarius and other clerics variously interpreted the conduct of their church leaders, and that that would have had an impact on the way they understood their Christian faith and community.

⁶⁵¹ *Ibid.* 3.

⁶⁵² *Ibid.* 4.

⁶⁵³ See Agde (506), 16, 17, and 19 on age restrictions for clerical ordinations meant to avoid the problem of young men's sexual urges.

One specific category of non-lay Christian, the public penitent, functioned in the sixth century especially as a visual manifestation of the dangers of deviant conduct. While Caesarius urged the majority of Christians to do penance privately and individually in their hearts, he used the small group of people who did penance publicly as a pedagogical tool for Christians who saw them inside and outside church. The opposite of a cleric but still not ordinary, public penitents were meant to appear to ordinary Christians as a negative example and as motivation to avoid vice.⁶⁵⁴

Like Christian worship in general, the sacrament of penance changed significantly in the fifth and sixth centuries, partially in response to the growing numbers of ordinary Christians that made it impracticable in its earlier form. Public penance, which included a long and rigorous ascetic period that preceded absolution, started to decline in the fourth century on account of the lifelong restrictions placed on absolved penitents.⁶⁵⁵ In the late fifth and early sixth centuries, public penance became something reserved for only the most serious or public cases.⁶⁵⁶ This is clear both from the particularly grievous sins for which the councils recommended penance—murder, adultery, false witness, and idolatry—and from the emergence of two other forms of penance during this period, death-bed penance and personal atonement performed continuously by all Christians.⁶⁵⁷

Caesarius explained his understanding of public penance in several of his sermons, making it clear that he thought that public penance could be deployed more effectively as a pedagogical tool than as a means of atonement. He differentiated between major [*capitalia*]

⁶⁵⁴ On public penance in late antique Gaul, see especially Uhalde 2007, 105-134; De Jong 2000; and Vogel 1952.

⁶⁵⁵ Vogel 1952, esp. Parts I and II.

⁶⁵⁶ De Jong 2000, 190.

⁶⁵⁷ Vogel 1952, 62-3 and 106; De Jong 2000, 197-200.

and minor sins, stating that only major sins necessitated public penance. In *Sermon 179*, he detailed the countless “slight” [*minuta*] sins that included among other things immoderate consumption of food and drink, flattery, and sleeping with one’s wife without desire for children.⁶⁵⁸ He exhorted individual Christians to redeem themselves for their *minuta peccata* by means of virtuous actions:

Whenever we visit the sick, ask after prisoners, recall the discordant into accord, fast when a fast is declared in the church, wash the feet of guests, gather at vigils more frequently, give alms to poor people passing before our door, forgive our enemies when they seek it: indeed by these works and works similar to them, slight sins are daily redeemed.⁶⁵⁹

In the same sermon, Caesarius argued that such works would not suffice for more grievous sins, for which he encouraged sinners to perform their penance publicly.⁶⁶⁰

As far as the majority of his congregation was concerned, Caesarius thought that they did not need to become public penitents. He repeated his call to perform good works individually as atonement for slight sins in several sermons, sometimes in detail. In *Sermon 61*, he claimed that the effectiveness of death-bed penance could only be guaranteed if the penitent had been constantly atoning all his life.⁶⁶¹ In *Sermon 63*, Caesarius preached, quoting Augustine, that slight sinners could daily be forgiven by saying the Lord’s Prayer.⁶⁶² Most Christians only needed this constant personal atonement in the form of prayer, fasting, and alms in order to achieve eternal life in heaven.

⁶⁵⁸ *Serm.* 179.3. Caesarius’ teacher Pomerius also made this distinction in *On the Contemplative Life*, 2.7.3, Uhalde 2007, 108.

⁶⁵⁹ Quotiens infirmos visitamus, in carcerem requirimus, discordes ad concordiam revocamus, indicto in ecclesia ieiunio ieiunamus, hospitibus pedes abluimus, ad vigiliis frequentius convenimus, elemosynam ante hostium praetereuntibus pauperibus damus, inimicis nostris quotiens petierint indulgemus: istis enim operibus et his similibus minuta peccata cotidie redimuntur, *Serm.* 179.6.2-7.

⁶⁶⁰ “paenitentium etiam publice agentes,” *ibid.* 7.6. See also *Serm.* 64.2, where Caesarius preached that a superabundance of slight sins could also require penance.

⁶⁶¹ *Serm.* 61.1.

⁶⁶² *Serm.* 63.1. See also *Serm.* 62 and 66.

As the canons indicate, public penance still had significance in Caesarius' community, but it had greater significance as a pedagogical tool than as a means of salvation. The *Statuta ecclesiae antiqua* had already detailed rules concerning the conduct of public penitents that visibly set them apart from other members of the Christian community:

65. (LXXX) On every occasion of the appointed fast [Lent], hands should be placed on the penitents by the bishops.

66. (LXXXI) Penitents should carry out and bury the dead of the church.

67. (LXXXII) Also penitents should kneel on the days of their absolution.⁶⁶³

Gallic councils from the fifth century also enjoined many of the same regulations on chastity applied to clerics on penitents as well.⁶⁶⁴ Thus, as a category of Christians separate from the ordinary, their actions and interactions were on display for ordinary Christians. The Council of Tours stated so explicitly in a canon recommending excommunication for penitents who relapsed into sinfulness:

But if anyone, after having accepted penance, so reverted to secular allurements just as a dog to his vomit, with the penance which he professed having been left behind, he should be held outside from communion of the church and from the company of the faithful, by how much more easily he might accept remorse through this confusion and *others might be made afraid by his example*.⁶⁶⁵

Caesarius added to previous regulations on public penitents at the Council of Agde. Canon 15 concerns their physical appearance and further delineates them from other groups of Christians:

Penitents, at the time when they seek penance, should follow the laying on of hands and the goat hair shirt over their head by the priest just as is constituted everywhere;

⁶⁶³ 65. (LXXX) *Omni tempore indicti ieiunii manus paenitentibus a sacerdotibus imponantur.*

66. (LXXXI) *Mortuos ecclesiae paenitentes efferant et sepeliant.*

67. (LXXXII) *Paenitentes etiam diebus remissionis genua flectant (SEA).*

⁶⁶⁴ For example, Arles (442-506), 21, 22.

⁶⁶⁵ *Si quis uero post acceptam paenitentiam sicut canis ad uomitum suum, ita ad saeculares illecebras derelicta quam professus est paenitentia, fuerit reuersus, a communione ecclesiae uel a convicio fidelium extraneus habeatur, quo facilius et ipse compunctionem per hanc confusionem accipiat et alii eius terreantur exemplo,* Tours (461), 8, emphasis added.

and if they either do not cut their hair, or they do not alter their clothing, let them be abandoned, and unless they repent worthily, let them not be received.⁶⁶⁶

Only public penitents who appeared as such to ordinary Christians could have been effective examples of vices to avoid when they were seen digging graves in their hair shirts and being turned away from the Eucharistic celebration.

In his sermons, Caesarius preached about how ordinary Christians should understand the public penitents in their midst. For instance, he began *Sermon 67* with a direct instruction to feel sorry along with the penitents:

Whenever, dearest brothers, we see some of our brothers or sisters seek penance publicly, we can and should arouse great remorse of divine fear in ourselves, with God inspiring it. Indeed, who would not rejoice and be glad, and how many thanks could they render to God, seeing a sinner raging against his own sins, exclaiming with a public voice that what he was accustomed to defend with a most shameless expression he began, with great benefit, to accuse.⁶⁶⁷

Later in the sermon he repeated this injunction to sympathize and added that everyone should pray on behalf of the penitent.⁶⁶⁸ In this regard, the penitent was not merely an example, but also a proxy for the atonement of everyone else. As something visible to the congregation, public penitents taught ordinary Christians to avoid the grievous sins that necessitated their penance as well as how to atone privately for their own sins.⁶⁶⁹

Although Caesarius made an effort to teach in his sermons how ordinary Christians should interpret the positive and negative examples set by the lives of clerics and penitents,

⁶⁶⁶ Paenitentes, tempore quo paenitentiam petunt, impositionem manuum et cilicium super caput a sacerdote sicut ubique constitutum est, consequantur; et si aut comas non deposuerint, aut uestimenta non mutauerint, abiiciantur et nisi digne paenituerint, non recipiantur, Agde (506), 15.

⁶⁶⁷ Quotiescumque, fratres carissimi, aliquos de fratribus vel sororibus nostris paenitentiam publice videmus petere, magnam in nobis ipsis deo inspirante conpunctionem divini timoris possumus et debemus accendere. Quis enim non gratuletur et gaudeat, et quantas potest deo gratias agat, videns peccatorem contra peccata sua irascentem, publica voce clamantem; ut, quae solebat inpudentissima fronte defendere, salubriter incipiat accusare? *Serm.* 67.1.1-7.

⁶⁶⁸ *Ibid.* 2.

⁶⁶⁹ Uhalde 2007, 122-7.

the sermons might not have reached all Christians, and the example of these “lives” might have conveyed messages that Caesarius did not intend. Nevertheless, Caesarius and other bishops involved in the Gallic councils must have thought that the pedagogical benefits of leading exemplary lives outweighed the risks. Furthermore, the actual manifestations of virtuous interactions within the Christian community demonstrated in the only real way the community of virtue Caesarius sought to teach in his sermons. The best way to teach his community of virtue was to live it.

Lives of the Saints

On the anniversary of the burial of Honoratus, founder of Lérins and Caesarius’ predecessor as bishop of Arles, Caesarius began his short sermon with a statement that the lives of saints were lights sent by God “in order to dissipate and illuminate the gloom of faithlessness” among Christians.⁶⁷⁰ This sermon, which invited the congregation to remember Honoratus’ faith and good works, was probably followed by a reading of a hagiography of Honoratus, a common practice in late antique Gaul. As Caesarius noted, saints’ *Lives*, read in place of or in addition to sermons on the feasts of saints, were effective means of educating ordinary Christians through narratives of their exemplary lives on earth.⁶⁷¹

Throughout the fifth and sixth centuries and later, hagiographies were often read to congregations in liturgies held for the feasts of saints.⁶⁷² Saints’ festivals were community celebrations that among other things focused on the presence of the saint in the local community and the goal of uniting with the saint in the heavenly community after death.

⁶⁷⁰ Ad discutiendam atque inlustrandam infidelitatis caliginem, *Serm.* 214.1.5-6. Caesarius began Sermon 215 on the feast of Saint Felix with the exact same preface.

⁶⁷¹ On the genre of hagiography in late antique Gaul, see Van Acker 2007 and Kreiner 2014.

⁶⁷² Van Acker 2007, 21-49.

They were also an occasion to celebrate the lives of people whose remains, as relics, formed an integral part of the day-to-day workings of local Christian communities.⁶⁷³ Although Caesarius was himself somewhat suspicious of some relic veneration practices, noting their troubling similarity to pagan worship, he nevertheless saw their value for enabling ordinary Christians to relate to their local saint.⁶⁷⁴ He concluded one sermon on the veneration of martyrs by preaching

Therefore we, brothers, with the lord aiding us, should act in such a way that...the rituals and patronage of the holy martyrs not bring down judgment on us, but progress. And thus, however much we are able, let us be eager to act in such a way that we deserve to obtain in heaven a community of those whose feasts we celebrate on earth.⁶⁷⁵

This desire on the part of Christians to extend their community to the saints in heaven whose presence was experienced on earth through the veneration of their remains as relics made saints more tangible and relatable *exempla* than *exempla* from scripture.

Hagiographies were written in clear, simple Latin so that everyone would be able to understand them. Although hagiography in this period was by no means a popular genre, and at times authors were explicitly conscious of the elite audience they were writing for, *sermo humilis* nevertheless prevailed.⁶⁷⁶ Like contemporary sermons, saints' *Lives* were for everyone—elite and ordinary—and they had to be written in a way that was intelligible to the least educated members of the community.

⁶⁷³ Van Dam 1985, 190-1.

⁶⁷⁴ Klingshirn 1994, 166-7. Klingshirn also notes that Caesarius' sermons on saints (*Serm.* 214-26) emphasized their exemplary lives rather than their miracles.

⁶⁷⁵ Nos ergo, fratres, auxiliante domino sic agamus, ut...sollemnitates vel patrocina sanctorum martyrum non nobis iudicium pariant, sed profectum. Et ita quantum possumus agere studeamus, ut, quorum festivitates celebrabimus in mundo, eorum consortium obtinere mereamur in caelo, *Serm.* 184.7.18-23.

⁶⁷⁶ On the makeup of the audience for early medieval hagiography, see Van Uytfanghe 2001. See Kreiner 13-14, for a discussion of the elite audience for Merovingian hagiographies.

Unlike sermons, hagiographies were purely narrative in form, and thus offered an alternative pedagogical means to teach all Christians how to be part of their Christian communities. Rather than exhorting, hagiographies told stories of exemplary saints and the ordinary people who followed them while they were alive and venerated their remains after they died. These narratives offered several levels of example for ordinary Christians to learn from including their more easily comprehensible presentation. Narratives were by nature easier to understand than other literary forms used in late antiquity. The abundant use of parallel structure, deictic pronouns and adverbs, present, active verbs, and exclamations in place of more elaborate rhetorical devices in the hagiographies of late antique Gaul rendered the genre easy to understand, and therefore easy to remember.⁶⁷⁷ Authors of hagiographies understood the connections between memory and persuasion in their texts and thus were able to manipulate their narratives to persuade listeners to act in accordance with the virtues reported in the work.⁶⁷⁸ These texts were constructed to be pedagogical.

Narratives about saints also included, in however cursory a manner, fictionalized representations of laypeople.⁶⁷⁹ Although these extra characters, some of them ordinary Christians, were not the focal point of hagiographies, they still provided another sort of example to ordinary Christians listening to the *Lives* of saints. *Lives* often told of saints interacting with ordinary people, whether rebuking them or healing them, and sometimes included ordinary people's reactions to the saints or their miracles.⁶⁸⁰ Ordinary Christians

⁶⁷⁷ Kreiner 2014, 92-104.

⁶⁷⁸ Kreiner 2014, 104-125 combines social scientific theory with philological rigor to demonstrate this for later Merovingian hagiography.

⁶⁷⁹ Bailey 2016, 119-22.

⁶⁸⁰ Van Dam 1988, 20.

who could see themselves in the narratives, whether in a positive or negative light, would have had a more direct example to follow in addition to the idealized life of a saint.

The early *Life* of Saint Honoratus was actually a sermon preached by Hilary, Honoratus' immediate successor as bishop of Arles, in the 430s. In form, this sermon resembled a panegyric, or speech in praise of an individual, insofar as it followed the general outline of other late antique Latin panegyrics.⁶⁸¹ Yet it avoided some of the more complex flourishes common in panegyrics and was composed in the traditionally Gallic style that was rhetorical but understandable to a broad audience.⁶⁸² Furthermore, it diverged from panegyric in one significant way, right at the beginning: while panegyrics began with an encomium of the city or region that brought forth the person being praised, Hilary left off all mention of Honoratus' origins, instead preaching,

But “in Christ we all are one,” and the peak of nobility is “to be counted among the children of God,” and the glory of earthly origin is not able to add anything to our dignity except through its despising. No one is more glorious in the heavens than whoever, having repudiated his family tree, chose to be assessed solely by the paternity of Christ.⁶⁸³

This upsetting of the expectations of the genre effectively communicated a notion of Christian community that was not bound by geography, but rather by association with Christ, a lesson that late antique Gallic preachers often stressed in their sermons.

The bulk of this sermon narrated the events of Honoratus' life, repeating his virtues of faith, chastity, and mercy at every stage. The situation of often-exhorted virtues into a narrative of a saint's life offered congregations a different way of understanding the virtues

⁶⁸¹ For an overview of the genre of Latin panegyric, see Nixon and Rogers 1994, 10-26.

⁶⁸² Deferrari 1952, 355-8. Cf. Valentin 1977, 29-36.

⁶⁸³ Nos autem in Christo omnes unum sumus et fastigium nobilitatis est inter Dei filios computari, nec addere nobis quicquam ad dignitatem terrenae originis decus nisi contemptu suo potest. Nemo est in caelestibus gloriosior quam qui repudiato patrum stemmate, elegit sola Christi paternitate censer, *Life of Honoratus* 4.1.

they heard preached in other types of sermons. Lay people did not figure prominently in this sermon, but in the couple of places where Hilary mentioned Honoratus' interacting with people other than himself, such characters provided positive and negative examples for the laypeople in the congregation.

When he was young, Honoratus was hindered by his father from adopting a life of asceticism.⁶⁸⁴ Hilary presented Honoratus' father as a foil for his virtue, exemplifying all the vices that were obstacles to holiness. After Honoratus' baptism,

his father, looking to the future and made anxious by his expectation of earthly piety, provoked him with various delights, enticed him with pursuits of youth, entangled him in diverse pleasures, and became young as if he were a peer of his adolescent son; he was occupied by hunts and varieties of games, and was equipped with the whole sweetness of this world in order to subjugate that stage of life.⁶⁸⁵

The narrative function of the father, to hold back the young Honoratus from becoming the saint everyone knew him to be, set up all of his actions as obstacles to holiness and therefore negative examples. This passage explicitly taught ordinary Christians not to hinder their children from pursuing a religious life, but it also taught them to avoid or to moderate worldly activities such as hunting and games.

At the end of the *Life*, Hilary incorporated examples of laypeople reacting to Honoratus' death. While he lay dying, high-ranking public officials flocked to his death bed and listened to a final sermon exhorting them to virtue.⁶⁸⁶ These laypeople modeled the action of listening to and heeding sermons on virtue. Following Honoratus' death, crowds filled the church to attend his body, and everyone beheld, touched, and kissed it in

⁶⁸⁴ *Ibid.* 5.

⁶⁸⁵ Hinc iam prouidus pater et terrenae pietatis suspicione sollicitus, uariis eum oblectationibus prouocare, studiis iuuentutis illicere, diuersis mundi uoluptatibus irretire et quasi in collegium cum filio adolescente iuuenescere, uenatibus ludorumque uarietatibus occupari, et tota ad subiugandam illam aetatem saeculi huius dulcedine armari, *Ibid.* 6.1.

⁶⁸⁶ *Ibid.* 32.

eneration.⁶⁸⁷ These laypeople modeled proper deference for deceased saints and ultimately the veneration of relics that all Christians were supposed to supply for their local saints, even those who had died well before their time.

Hilary's own *Life* was composed in the late fifth century as a proper hagiography by another Honoratus, bishop of Marseilles. The author of Hilary's *Life* was less interested in constructing a complete biography than presenting an exemplary life of a saint.⁶⁸⁸ He enumerated Hilary's virtues at each stage of his life and devoted a section to discussing his pastoral virtues.⁶⁸⁹ He also narrated several episodes of Hilary's interactions with other people that showcased Hilary's saintliness while displaying the responses of laypeople.

In one anecdote, the prefect of Gaul, whom Honoratus neglected to name in the *Life*, interrupted Hilary while he was celebrating the liturgy. The prefect, whom Hilary had already privately rebuked for his injustices, suddenly burst into the church with his entourage. Hilary

stopped preaching, saying that it was not fitting that whoever disdained his own warnings for the sake of their safety receive the nourishment of spiritual food. But when the prefect, flooded with suitable confusion, left, [Hilary], with newfound zeal began again to provide to the crowds of people the feast, a meal of spiritual delicacies, which so profusely had begun. He sent ahead and left behind an example of how worldly powers should be scorned by the virtue of steadfastness.⁶⁹⁰

The prefect in this story offered lay people both a positive and a negative example. The prefect's actions of injustice, ignoring Hilary's admonitions, and most visibly, interrupting the liturgy while Hilary was preaching, all illustrated sinful conduct, as they were met with

⁶⁸⁷ *Ibid.* 34-5.

⁶⁸⁸ Jacob 1995, *passim*. esp. 67-83.

⁶⁸⁹ Honoratus, *Life of Hilary of Arles* 11.

⁶⁹⁰ ...a praedicatione cessavit, dicens non esse condignum, ut qui eius pro salute propria contempserat monita, spiritalis cibi perciperet alimenta. At ubi ille digna confusione perfusus egressus est, convivium quod incohaerat spiritalium deliciarum profusissime cibum rursus innovato studio coepit praebere agminibus populorum. Praemisit et reliquit exemplum, qualiter constantiae virtute mundanae contemni debeant potestates, *Ibid.* 13.

rebuke. The prefect's response modeled appropriate conduct for all Christians in the face of rebuke for their sins. The interactions between Hilary and the prefect also illustrated an important lesson about relationships of power within Christian communities. Resembling as it does narratives of other bishops rebuking public officials, most famously Ambrose and the emperor Theodosius, this narrative taught listeners that, while the prefect may have had political jurisdiction, the bishop was the leader of the Christian community.

Ordinary Christians appeared in Honoratus' narrative again for Hilary's deathbed sermon and after his death.⁶⁹¹ The entire city, including Jews, congregated for Hilary's funeral. They held a vigil at night during which they burned candles, cried, and chanted, overcome with sadness.⁶⁹² The universal mourning undertaken by the Arles community in this story exemplified the appropriate community response to the death of so virtuous a bishop, which was underscored by the presence of Jews in the mourning congregation. Community and veneration of saints, particularly local saints, were the key lessons on display in this passage.

Caesarius would have read *Lives* of these local saints, Honoratus and Hilary, to the Christians of Arles to provide examples of virtuous conduct. As their successor to the see of Arles, Caesarius was probably well aware that when he died, someone would write a *Life* of him and he could continue being an example to his community in that way. Some of his colleagues certainly did write a *Life* of Caesarius, and the authors of *Book II* of the *Life* explicitly stated exemplarity as one of their primary goals:

Therefore, we will attempt, as much as we are able, to intimate to faithful listeners with unvarnished and untouched words (God willing), those things which we know truly to have been said and done by him, in order that from them compunction might

⁶⁹¹ *Ibid.* 26 for the deathbed sermon.

⁶⁹² *Ibid.* 28-9.

be supplied to the infirm, joy to the perfect, and an example to those working towards perfection.⁶⁹³

Later bishops and priests in Arles and beyond read the *Life* of Caesarius to their own congregations, enabling Caesarius to continue to teach the virtues that he thought a Christian community should be founded on through the example of his life.

Throughout this *Life*, Caesarius' biographers included numerous mentions of his virtues and holiness. Caesarius was chaste, kind, merciful, and patient; he was eager to pray, sing the psalms, and read the scriptures.⁶⁹⁴ Following one list of his virtues, his biographers asked, "Who, then, could ever imitate the fervor of love with which he loved all humanity?"⁶⁹⁵ The sense was that no one would be able to match Caesarius' charity, but that loving all people as Caesarius had done was something that all Christians should strive to do.

Elements of Caesarius' *Life* that recorded evidence of his real life have already been discussed in the previous section, but those same elements continued to educate later generations of ordinary Christians as narrative constructs within the *Life*. The communities who rejoiced at Caesarius' election as bishop and came out to greet him at his entrances into the city became narrative examples to later Christians on how to interact with their bishop.⁶⁹⁶

The *Life* of Caesarius also includes far more examples of lay people, including several women, for ordinary Christians to model their lives after than had the *Lives* of Honoratus and Hilary. One example is a virtuous couple whom Caesarius met in his youth: Georgia and Firminus were wealthy elites who spent their money on bringing relief to the

⁶⁹³ Ergo ea quae ueraciter ab eo facta dictaue cognouimus aggrediemur Deo propitio uerbis infucatis et integris, pro parte qua possumus, fidelibus auditoribus intimare, ut ex ipsis et infirmis conpunctio et perfectis gaudium et ad perfectionem tendentibus ministretur exemplum, *Life of Caesarius* II.1.23-27.

⁶⁹⁴ *Life passim*, esp. I.45.

⁶⁹⁵ Caritatis autem eius ardorem, qua omnes homines dilexit, quis umquam poterit imitari? *Ibid.* I.53.5-7.

⁶⁹⁶ *Ibid.* I.13, 26, and 43.

poor.⁶⁹⁷ Other examples appeared in the many miracle stories recorded in *Book II* of the *Life*. One of these was a couple whose daughter was afflicted with a demon. Her father approached Caesarius humbly and in tears, asking Caesarius to take pity on him and cure his daughter. When Caesarius had him return the next day with his daughter and her mother, he got on his knees and prayed with them, and the daughter was cured.⁶⁹⁸ The parents in this story demonstrated respect and humility, they asked the bishop for help, and they prayed together with him. The healing of their daughter at the end marked them out as positive examples whose interactions with their bishop resulted in a miracle.⁶⁹⁹

The women mentioned in these stories also gave women in the congregation a more explicit example to follow besides trying to follow the examples of men or find themselves in the crowds of people that appeared at intervals in other hagiographies. Saints' *Lives* of women, such as Jerome's *Life* of Paula and Gregory of Nyssa's *Life* of Macrina, existed in the fourth century, but towards the end of the sixth century, *Lives* of women saints from Gaul specifically became more frequent, including one written by a woman.⁷⁰⁰ These *Lives* held up a model of particularly female virtue, which focused primarily on chastity and ascetic renunciation of material wealth.⁷⁰¹ Women in hagiography served as examples to women in congregations at a time when the female clergy was declining and there were fewer living examples to learn from.⁷⁰² The lay women in the *Life* of Caesarius modeled this same type of female piety for the women in attendance at readings of his *Life*.

⁶⁹⁷ *Ibid.* I.8.

⁶⁹⁸ *Ibid.* II.29.

⁶⁹⁹ For a theory of how to understand miracle stories in their historical context, see Van Dam 1993, 82-6.

⁷⁰⁰ Baudonivia, *Life of Saint Radegund*. On this *Life*, see Bailey 2016, 120.

⁷⁰¹ See Coon 1997, 1-27, esp. 19-23.

⁷⁰² See *Statuta ecclesiae antiqua*, 37 (XCIX), 41 (C), and the Council of Orléans (533), 18, early canons reducing the authority of women deacons.

The characters that inhabited hagiographical narratives, both the saints and the secondary figures the saints interacted with, all functioned as different types of examples for ordinary Christians. People listened to narrative differently than they listened to exhortations, so these models of virtue appearing in a narrative offered an alternative means of teaching or reinforcing the lessons on virtue that Caesarius and preachers like him taught in their sermons.

Afterlives of Caesarius' Sermons

The *Life of Caesarius* was one way that Caesarius was able to live on as an example for the Christians of Arles after his death. Another was his sermon collection, which he compiled and circulated specifically to be used by other bishops and priests in churches throughout Gaul, Spain, and Italy for centuries to come. Thus, Caesarius was an example to other preachers, literally providing them with a model of how to preach and how to teach the Christian faith to their own local Christian communities.

Collections of homilies, sometimes compiled and edited by their authors, began to appear in the fifth century in Latin-speaking areas of the Roman Empire. Augustine mentioned in his work on Christian preaching that preachers were allowed to deliver sermons previously written by more eloquent men.⁷⁰³ Gennadius of Marseilles, writing his continuation of Jerome's *On Illustrious Men* at the end of the fifth century, mentioned that Greek bishops memorized the homilies of Cyril of Alexandria for reading.⁷⁰⁴ Gennadius' entry on the early-fifth-century presbyter Salvian of Marseilles also hints at an active practice of compiling sermons for others to preach. He referred to Salvian as a "teacher of

⁷⁰³ Augustine, *On Christian Teaching*, 4.29.4-5.

⁷⁰⁴ Gennadius, *De viris inlustribus*, 58; Forness 2016, 197.

bishops.”⁷⁰⁵ Furthermore, in his list of Salvian’s writings that he himself read, he included “many homilies prepared for bishops, of which I do not remember how many were *sacramenta*.”⁷⁰⁶ Although these homilies do not survive, Gennadius’ reference is evidence that the practice of compiling sermons for other bishops to preach was already underway in the first half of the fifth century.

The largest and most famous of these late antique sermon collections besides that of Caesarius is the anonymous “Eusebius Gallicanus” sermon collection which was compiled in the early sixth century out of sermons composed and collected throughout the fifth century by various bishops in southern Gaul.⁷⁰⁷ Caesarius had access to many of the sermons in the Eusebius collection, and perhaps even the collection in its final form.⁷⁰⁸ Although the compiler or compilers of the collection had different pastoral goals from Caesarius, the collections had the same function: as handbooks to aid and enable preaching.⁷⁰⁹

When Caesarius compiled his own sermons for distribution, he was both acting in an already-established tradition and responding to a need by the growing ranks of uneducated or less-educated priests for help preaching to their congregations. A canon of one of Caesarius’ councils, the Council of Vaison in 529, gave not only priests, but also deacons permission to preach homilies of the “holy fathers” if they were not capable of preaching on their own.⁷¹⁰ This canon was controversial, failing to receive the support of some bishops who had subscribed to the Council of Orange earlier that year.⁷¹¹ Some bishops were perhaps

⁷⁰⁵ “episcoporum magister,” *De viris*, 68. This designation could refer to the fact that Salvian was formally the teacher of two men, Salonius and Veranius, who eventually became bishops. On Salvian, see Alciati 2009, 113.

⁷⁰⁶ *De viris*, 68.

⁷⁰⁷ For a survey of the authorship of the Eusebius Gallicanus collection, see Bailey 2010, 31-38.

⁷⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, 36.

⁷⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, 36-7.

⁷¹⁰ Vaison (529), 2.

⁷¹¹ Klingshirn 1994, 144.

understandably upset that the canon extended the privilege of preaching, formerly enjoyed only by bishops, to priests and deacons, but Caesarius clearly thought it was important that these other groups should be able to preach.

Caesarius' commitment to allowing priests and deacons to preach is evident by his repeated mentions of them in addition to bishops in the instructions to preachers he provided as *Sermons* 1 and 2.⁷¹² He also did not take extending this privilege to priests and deacons lightly, and much of the lengthy *Sermon* 1 is devoted to outlining the same regulations for appropriate clerical conduct he promoted in the Council of Agde.⁷¹³ Caesarius saw a real need for more preachers, but, for the sake of the Christian community of which he was ultimately in charge, he wanted these newly-minted preachers to succeed. Therefore, he offered his own sermon collection as a model for preaching.

The collection itself includes 238 sermons, over 150 of which Caesarius authored himself and preached in Arles. The rest of the sermons Caesarius adapted from those of earlier preachers, including Augustine as well as some authors in the Eusebius collection.⁷¹⁴ According to the *Life of Caesarius*, he sent it to other bishops in southern Gaul, as well as bishops in Spain, Italy, and the Frankish Kingdom of northern Gaul.⁷¹⁵ His sermons survive today in numerous manuscripts containing collections that originated in Arles as well as more general medieval homiliaries, suggesting that his venture was successful.⁷¹⁶

As Caesarius adapted and compiled these sermons, he strove to be a model for other bishops and priests to imitate. The sermons as they survive contain little specific material—

⁷¹² *Serm.* 1.12, 13, and 15 and *Serm.* 2.

⁷¹³ *Serm.* 1.12, 17-18. On Agde, see above, 131-5.

⁷¹⁴ Morin 1937, xi-cxv.

⁷¹⁵ *Life of Caesarius*, I.55.

⁷¹⁶ Delage 1971, 65-93, esp. 70-73; Morin 1937.

they are ideals. They work well as stand-alone sermons, but the versions Caesarius preached would have contained some elements specific to his community, and Caesarius expected future preachers to adapt his models to fit the needs of their communities. But this idealizing of his sermons was not just something that occurred in the compilation and revision process; even as he composed his original sermons, he would have been cognizant of the stenographer sitting in the congregation recording his words, and thus would have written them for future audiences as well as his immediate audience.⁷¹⁷ The lessons he developed to teach his own Christian community also had to be relevant for other Christian communities who would later hear his own sermons preached to them by other preachers.

In the letters to other clergy that he sent out with his sermons, *Sermons* 1 and 2, Caesarius outlined his theory of preaching and instructions for how preachers should use his sermons. Caesarius began *Sermon* 1 with a lengthy scriptural justification for the moral obligation of priests to teach their congregations to be good Christians and to correct them when they sin,⁷¹⁸ which he followed with a series of arguments against rhetorical objections.⁷¹⁹ In response to the objection that someone might not be eloquent enough to preach, he distilled all the main lessons of his homilies—faith, moral virtue, and avoiding vices and pagan activity—into one short summary, in the midst of which he admonished, “Indeed all these [lessons] and those similar to them not only lord bishops [*sacerdotes*] in cities, but also priests [*presbyteri*] and deacons in parishes can and should preach rather frequently.”⁷²⁰ Then, as an aid to clerics who still believed they lacked the necessary

⁷¹⁷ See Forness 2016, Chapter 4, on the role of multiple audiences for homilies in their compositions. For the recording of Caesarius’ homilies specifically, see Klingshirn 1994, 9-12.

⁷¹⁸ *Serm.* 1.3-6.

⁷¹⁹ *Ibid.* 1.7-11.

⁷²⁰ *Ista enim omnia et his similia non solum sacerdotes domini in civitatibus, sed etiam in parrochiis presbyteri et diaconi et possunt et debent frequentius praedicare, Ibid.* 12.29-31.

eloquence for preaching, he offered his own sermons and the sermons of earlier Christian Fathers, citing an established Eastern tradition:

And if perchance, for some of my lords the bishops [*sacerdotibus*] it is burdensome to preach on their own, why should they not admit the ancient custom of the saints, which is observed productively up to today in parts of the East, that, for the health of souls, homilies are read aloud in churches?⁷²¹

Caesarius clearly thought that teaching all Christians was more important than how that teaching was administered or even who administered it, as his digression on the suitability of deacons to preach the sermons of saints Augustine, Hilary, and Ambrose indicates.⁷²²

While *Sermon 1* was a lengthy rhetorical piece, *Sermon 2* was a short letter detailing precisely what Caesarius wanted future readers of his sermon collection to do with it. The first sentence states in no uncertain terms the three goals he had for the text: “To whoever’s hands this little book has come, I ask and I humbly beg that he read frequently himself, and that he not just hand it over, but that he impose it on others to read and transcribe...”⁷²³ In one family of manuscripts, *Sermon 2* continues with another call for transcription and circulation: “And because it was necessary that we make many little books of these simple admonitions, and if they are not displeasing to you, you can and should transcribe them...and give them to other parishes to transcribe.”⁷²⁴

With these exhortations, Caesarius outlined the scope of the audience he imagined for his sermons: he wanted bishops to read them and learn from them; these bishops were in turn to teach their contents to other members of the clergy and encourage them to read the

⁷²¹ Et si forte aliquibus dominis meis sacerdotibus per ipsos laboriosum est praedicare, quare non intromittant antiquam sanctorum consuetudinem, quae in partibus Orientis usque hodie salubriter custoditur, ut pro salute animarum homiliae in ecclesiis recitentur? *Ibid.* 15.1-4.

⁷²² *Ibid.*

⁷²³ In cuiuscumque manibus libellus iste venerit, rogo et cum grandi humilitate supplico, ut eum et ipse frequentius legat, et aliis ad legendum et ad transscribendum non solum tradat, sed etiam ingerat... *Serm.* 2.1-3.

⁷²⁴ Et quia nobis necesse fuit ut de istis simplicibus admonitionibus plures libellos faceremus, vobis vero si non displicuerint et potestis et debetis...et in aliis parrochiis ad transcribendum dare, *Serm.* 2(Z).30-8.

sermons themselves if they could; and finally he wanted them to copy the sermons and pass them on to other bishops to read, teach, copy, and pass on. The scope was infinite. Caesarius wanted his sermons to reach all clergy who could trace their network back to him. Through their preaching, Caesarius' sermons would also reach the countless ordinary Christians who attended liturgies at churches that possessed Caesarius' collection. By circulating his sermons the way he did, Caesarius was an example to the entire Christian church, or at least the parts of it that spoke Latin.

While Caesarius' sermons taught his congregations directly when he preached them, the afterlives of his sermons in the form of the circulated collection taught bishops, priests, and deacons how to preach by their example. The sermon collection also allowed Caesarius to model a community of virtue outside Arles or even Gaul. By extending his pedagogy outward and downward to other clergy, he also contributed to church unity on a pastoral level: the Christian faith he taught in Arles could then be taught elsewhere. In this way, Caesarius was a "pattern for bishops,"⁷²⁵ as well as priests and deacons, as far as his sermon collection reached.

Conclusion

Caesarius understood that his obligation to teach his Christian community extended beyond preaching sermons in the liturgy. He was well aware of expanded numbers of Christians in the countryside and their need for a more direct form of pedagogy. As an administrator, he also understood the need for larger numbers of clergy to preach to the Christians in the countryside. He saw "example" as an effective way to teach both ordinary Christians how to

⁷²⁵ *Life of Caesarius*, I.45.

act virtuously within their community and less-educated priests and deacons to preach to and teach the congregations of their rural parishes whom Caesarius could not teach directly.

“Example” could be interpreted broadly, and Caesarius interpreted it in various ways in order to reach his pastoral goals. He made an effort to live his life as an example of virtue and exhorted his fellow clergy to do the same. He made a negative example of public penitents that discouraged ordinary Christians from sinning. He preached saints’ *Lives* and sermons on the lives of saints as narrative *exempla* that employed a different pedagogy from admonitory preaching that reached different members of the audience and reinforced the same lessons he taught in his sermons. Finally, he compiled a collection of his sermons that he sent out as an example for other preachers, whether they were bishops, priests, or deacons, of how they should preach to and teach their congregations. Caesarius’ legacy of this sermon collection as well as seven church councils demonstrates his efforts to teach by example in order to establish a community of virtue—one that reached beyond Arles to Rome and into the East—as part of a united and universal Christian church.

Chapter 6

Conclusion: Towards a Universal Church

In 512 the pro-Chalcedonian patriarchal bishop of Antioch was deposed, and the miaphysite Severus succeeded him. Severus of Antioch served as patriarch for six years until 518 when the new emperor Justin, a Chalcedonian committed to repairing the Acacian Schism between eastern and western bishops, assumed the throne, and Severus fled Antioch to Egypt to avoid one of his enemies' plot to kidnap him.⁷²⁶ While he was patriarch, however, Severus had the support of the previous emperor Anastasius as well as other eastern patriarchal bishops. While he was patriarch, he enjoyed the designation "orthodox" and considered the pro-Chalcedonian dyophysite church in the west, which included Caesarius, to be heretical. It was from that position of orthodoxy that Severus preached his 125 sermons that survive today.⁷²⁷

I mention Severus by way of concluding this dissertation in order to put the "universal church" of Hesychius and Caesarius into perspective. Like "orthodoxy" and "heresy," the "catholic" church was also relative and dependent on the interests and influence of the people defining it. For Severus, there was still one catholic and orthodox church, but the boundaries and criteria for admission were different than those of Hesychius' and Caesarius' churches. Yet, through his pastoral ministry, Severus engaged in the same efforts to to achieve a universal church as Hesychius and Caesarius and, more importantly, taught his congregations that the universal church was something they could have faith in.⁷²⁸

⁷²⁶ For an overview of Severus' life, see Brock and Fitzgerald 2013, 1-8.

⁷²⁷ On Severus' patriarchate, see Alpi 2009.

⁷²⁸ Severus' "universal church" was located geographically in the east and the seat of Antioch was its center. See Alpi 2009, 293-5.

As patriarch of Antioch, Severus both preached to his congregations and interacted with other bishops at regional church councils and monks in eastern monasteries. He also had a good relationship with the emperor Anastasius, as evidenced by several homilies in praise of his munificence.⁷²⁹ When Severus preached in the cathedral at Antioch on important holy days such as Easter, the Nativity, and the feasts of several saints, he taught his congregations about Christ's single nature and Christ's relationship to Mary and to flesh. He also taught them about love, moral conduct, and vices to avoid.⁷³⁰ He taught a developed ecclesiology that owed more to time than to space, focusing on the apostolic origins of Antioch.⁷³¹ In his specific local context, Severus taught the ordinary Christians in his congregation to see themselves as part of a catholic and apostolic church.

From a historiographical standpoint, the same analytical approach I took with Hesychius and Caesarius can also be applied to their theological opponents to reveal multiple pastoral perspectives on a universal church. Pastoral concerns, especially those relating to the education and salvation of ordinary Christians, seemed to prioritize community over theology. When preachers taught ordinary Christians about their faith, they favored lessons about how they could participate in a Christian community, regardless of how they defined that community. By concentrating on the pedagogy of individual preachers, rather than on their interactions with other church leaders in councils and controversies, I have shown how the local churches of each preacher were stable communities that ordinary Christians could have faith in. Faith in a universal church relied on the trust Christians put in the leaders of their church communities and in the communities themselves.

⁷²⁹ Severus, *Cathedral Homilies*, 13 and 24. See Allen and Hayward 2004, 107-11.

⁷³⁰ For a list of Severus' *Cathedral Homilies* and their topics and dates and places of delivery, see table in Alpi 2009, 188-93.

⁷³¹ See Akhrass 2016.

Pedagogy also allows us to glimpse the experiences of ordinary Christians. As a group of people envisioned by preachers to make up a significant portion of the audience for their sermons, they can be discerned through the pedagogy preachers used to reach them. The case studies of Hesychius and Caesarius have shown that ordinary Christians came in all shapes and sizes: rich, poor, impoverished or middling; women and men; slave and free; young and old; literate and illiterate; and employed in all manner of work. They were also busy, and could not be counted on to take time to study theology, or even scripture, so preachers had to condense the theological lessons they valued into a few overarching points that formed the foundations of Christian teaching. They varied in intelligence and level of education, so preachers made an effort to appeal to common elements of everyday life and to teach the same lessons in different ways. Yet, preachers also viewed them as capable of understanding the basic lessons they taught about the Christian faith and thus held them equally responsible for being faithful Christians as more elite or ascetically-minded Christians. In the pedagogy of Hesychius and Caesarius, “ordinary Christians” were not mobs of oblivious pagans whom bishops sought to convert and chastise, but rather a diverse group of people who could learn how to participate in a Christian community.

The pedagogy of Hesychius and Caesarius also helped actively shape the faith experienced by the ordinary Christians in their communities. Lessons about salvation, statements of faith, and appropriate Christian conduct contributed to the way ordinary Christians understood the concept of Christian community and their place within it. Lessons that communicated and reinforced the ideal of a universal church, whether explicitly preached in sermons or implicitly conveyed by other means, encouraged ordinary Christians to have faith in a world-wide community that was united by a shared faith in God.

The Christians in Hesychius' local congregation had a unique experience by virtue of their liturgies occurring on the site of Christ's death and resurrection. Wherever they walked, they walked in the steps of Jesus. All around them were monuments to his life and death. The relic in their church was a piece of the cross that had been found on site by the mother of Constantine who had built their magnificent church. Nowhere on earth could they experience Christianity in the same way, and they knew it. But they also learned that there were Christians outside Jerusalem by the references to other churches and other crosses in other cities in Hesychius' sermons. Furthermore, they were introduced to real-life foreign Christians when pilgrims from all over the known world flocked to Jerusalem to behold the true cross and hear the liturgy in the Holy Sepulcher. When Hesychius preached a Word-made-flesh christology to Christians from all over the world, any indication that Hesychius' theological position was in any way controversial was obscured by the community celebration.

Pilgrims, certainly, were able to experience the universal church firsthand when they left their local communities, wherever they happened to be, and traveled to Jerusalem. They would not have expected to encounter the same experiences they had at home, or else they would not have ventured so far, but the Christian community they found in Jerusalem had to be a plausible extension of what they had left. That is to say, the church had to be recognizable as a church, the priest as a priest, the liturgy as a liturgy, and the community of Christians as Christian. The rituals of the liturgy, discussed and standardized and agreed upon and disagreed upon at councils in different regions all over the Mediterranean world taught that Christian worship was unified in form. In this regard, ecclesiastical politics also mattered little. An ordinary Christian coming from Gaul to Jerusalem during the Acacian

Schism would not have noticed that there was a rift between the eastern and western Christian churches.

The ordinary Christians in Caesarius' congregation had a very different experience of Christianity in early sixth-century Arles. Though Arles was a big city that saw an influx of foreign Christians for commerce and politics, it was not a large pilgrimage site. Furthermore, pilgrims from Arles in late antiquity were less likely to travel all the way to Jerusalem when they had several popular pilgrimage sites within Gaul they could visit. Thus, their experience of Christianity was much more localized than that of the Christians of Jerusalem. In addition, what they learned about their faith was centered much more on moral conduct than on theology, as a result of the administrative concerns particular to Caesarius. Nevertheless, Caesarius taught them to act and to worship in a way that was consistent with the Christians in Rome and in the east because they were all part of a universal church.

An analysis of the pedagogy of Hesychius and Caesarius has revealed two distinctly local Christian communities that were nevertheless shaped through the pedagogy of their preachers by broader concerns of orthodoxy, unity, and universality. Despite, or perhaps because of, the controversies in which church leaders engaged in the fifth and sixth centuries, they taught the ordinary Christians in their congregations that they belonged to a church that stretched beyond the bounds of their local communities and included all other Christians in the known world.

That two unconnected preachers could strive for and arrive at the same goal of teaching universality offers further support for understanding Christianity in the fifth and sixth centuries as a single phenomenon. Bishops and priests all over the Mediterranean world, regardless of how far their networks actually reached, or even who was in them,

thought that the Christian faith should be united and universal and worked to make it so. They were also confident enough in that goal that they taught it to their congregations. At least for the ordinary Christians who absorbed this lesson, then, bishops and priests were able to achieve through their pedagogy what they were unable to achieve through centuries of conciliar activity—a united and universal Christian church.

APPENDIX

Translations of Hesychius' Paschal Homilies, from the text established by Aubineau

Homily III

- (1) Bright is heaven, shining with a chorus of stars, and everything is brighter when the morning star rises, but the present state of night is not so much illuminated by stars as it now glories in our victorious God and savior. For, he says, "Be of good courage. I have conquered the world." And with God having conquered the unseen enemy, we likewise will carry away victory against demons. And yet let us stand fast by the saving cross in order that we might obtain the first-fruits of the gifts of Jesus. Let us celebrate such a sacred night with sacred torches, awakening a godly song and singing out a heavenly hymn. "The sun of justice," our lord Jesus Christ, lit up even the present day in the cycle of the world: he rose up by means of the cross; he saved the faithful.
- (2) And yet let no one be unfaithful to the symbols of the cross, but let them adore the blessed and thrice-blessed wood of the cross, and [let no one be unfaithful] to the symbols of the cross, which opens the doors of heaven for us. They no longer "light a lamp and place it under a bushel-basket," and by "bushel-basket," I mean the Law, "but [they place it] upon a lampstand," and by "light" [I mean] the Word. But the Word used to be under the Law and was being hidden by the unfaithful just as under a bushel-basket. But when he came upon the cross and was placed upon the lampstand, at that time he shined down on the circle of the world.
- (3) Look, my beloved, at Rome, reigning with exalted symbols of the cross in the middle of the forum. Look at Paul, having written immortal letters and appointed himself a slave of the cross. He was not ashamed of the cross, the scandal of the Jews, the folly of the nations. He drew it on like a phylactery of wisdom. In the wood of the cross, he gathered together the churches of the world. One staff of Moses expelled the scourges from Egypt, and the staff, in its kinship to the wood of the cross, stopped the sins of men. There Pharaoh, pursuing Israel, is thrown into the sea, and thus the devil is destroyed and those adoring the savior are saved. There Adam, stretching out his hands, drew death to us, and our Lord saved everything in the stretching out of his hands.
- (4) But, O wood, more magnificent than heaven, exceeding even the heavenly arches, O thrice-blessed wood, transporting our souls into heaven, O wood, bringing salvation to the world and routing the demonic army, O wood, hurling the bandit into paradise and putting him in the chorus of Christ: "For Amen, Amen I say to you, that today you will go with me into paradise." Let us emulate the good judgment of the murderer, no rather, of the spirit-bearer, on account of his faith in this situation. For

what did he also say?—"Remember me, Lord, in your kingdom." And in one assent of faith, he inhabits paradise and traverses the heavens. "For, Amen I say to you," he says, "today you will go with me in paradise." Let us also stand fast by the cross of the savior, speaking these very utterances: "Lord, remember me in your kingdom," in order that we also might become sharers in paradise and have enjoyment of the kingdom of heaven.

- (5) Of victory is the present festival, brothers, of victory of the king of all, the son of God. For today the devil was defeated on account of him who was crucified, and our race is gladdened on account of him who rose. For the day today shouts at my awakening and says, "On my walk I saw a new sight, an open tomb and an awakened man and rejoicing bones and gladdened souls and reformed men and heavens split apart and powers croaking, 'Lift up the gates, rulers among you, etc.' Today I saw the heavenly king ascending, encircled with light, above the lightning and the rays, above the sun and sources of water, above the clouds and the spirit of power and eternal life." For he [Christ] was hidden first in the bowels of flesh, and then in the bowels of the earth, where on the one hand he sanctified those brought into being through conception and where, on the other hand, he brought to life those having died through his resurrection: 'For pain and distress and groaning fled.' 'For who knew the mind of God, or who became its counselor,' if not the Word, having been enfleshed and affixed to wood and raised from the dead and lifted into the heavens?
- (6) This day is one for proclaiming joys: for on this day, the lord arose, raising together the herd of Adam; for he was born on account of man and he rose for man [ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ]. Today, on account of him having been raised, paradise was opened and Adam was brought to life and Eve was consoled and the calling resounds and the kingdom is made ready and the man is saved and Christ is adored: for having trampled death underfoot and having taken the tyrant prisoner and having despoiled hell, he ascended into heaven, as a triumphing king, as an esteemed ruler, as an uncatchable charioteer, saying to the Father: "Behold, I, and the children which you have given me, O God, etc." And he listened to the Father: "Sit down at my right hand so that I might make your enemies a stool for your feet." Glory to him, now and into the ages of ages. Amen.

Of the blessed Hesychius, priest of Jerusalem, on the Pasch.

Homily IV

- (1) A sacred and kingly trumpet has constructed for us this spiritual theater, a trumpet which Bethlehem fulfilled and Sion set aflame, in which the Cross was a hammer and the resurrection was anvil, [a trumpet] whose beauty I do not know how I should proclaim. I do not know how I should describe its light, how I should reveal the delight in it, how I should explain its kingliness. But with what kind of hand will I touch it?
- (2) With what kinds of words should I greet a grave begetting life, a tomb free from corruption and patron of immortality, a bedchamber lulling the bridegroom to sleep for three days, a bridal chamber awakening the bride uncorrupted after her marriage? "Corpse," [proclaims] the guarded tomb, and "God," [proclaims] the trembling earth;

- for on the one hand the body itself indicates “corpse,” and on the other hand the prodigy indicates “God;” the tomb indicates “corpse,” the resurrection indicates “God”; the tears of the women indicate “corpse,” and the utterances of angels indicate “God.” Joseph looked after him as a corpse, but the one being cared for was [cared for] as a man, and this man despoiled death as God. Also the soldiers kept watch over him as a corpse, and the gatekeepers of hell became frightened looking on him as God.
- (3) And you will say that this one and that one are the same, not one and the other, nor one in another, nor one through another: for the enfleshed Word, being one brought together these qualities and those qualities into a unity as he had wished with an unutterable word. And he had, on the one hand, given the flesh to serve the passions, and on the other hand he is proclaimed a divinity in accordance with the signs and the wonders. But just as it is not right for the Word to be divided from the flesh, so it is necessary for sufferings to be entwined with wonders. For the one having descended into hell as a corpse freed the dead as God; then somehow the angels were serving the tomb, and somehow the ones clad in white were manifest to the women as upon a spouse, and somehow they said to them, “You seek Jesus the Nazarene, the one who was crucified; he is not here, for he has been raised just as he said. That is to say, heaven is his place; send your perfumes there. He has risen, and we did not raise him. It was on account of you that we rolled away the stone: for before we descended, the tomb was emptied. He has risen, just as he himself said.”
- (4) What the angel said, a prophet does not have the capacity to explain: Hosea speaks of the time of the resurrection, Isaiah knows but does not understand how. For on the one hand these are the words of the prophecy of Hosea: “Let us go and let us go back to the lord our God, that he “smote” and will heal us: he will beat and he will patch us up after two days; on the third day, we will arise and we will live in his sight.” Listen again to what sorts of things Isaiah trumpeted: “Libanos was disfigured, Saron became marshes. Galilee and Carmelos will be prominent. Now I will rise, the lord said, now I will be extolled, now I will be lifted up. Now you see, now be ashamed.” For he extended the word toward the Jews; now I will rise when I awaken Adam, whom transgression cast out, now I will be extolled when I bring to the nations [my] impassability to suffering; now I will be raised up, lifting up your offering into heaven and raising into the seat of the Cherubim “the form of the slave,” which I acquired from you; now you will see the icons ceasing and the truth flourishing; now you will feel ashamed misrepresenting [yourselves] with words and being lessened in deeds. May there be glory to God, to the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, now and always and for eternity of the ages. Amen.

Of the blessed Hesychius, on the holy Pasch.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources:

- Acts of the Council of Chalcedon. Ed. E. Schwartz. 1933-37. *ACO* II.1-3. Berlin: De Gruyter.
Trans. Price, R. and M. Gaddis. 2005. *The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon*. *TTH*.
Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.
- Acts of the Council of Constantinople. Ed. J. Straub. 1971. *ACO* IV.1. Berlin: De Gruyter.
Trans. Price, R. 2009. *The Acts of the Council of Constantinople of 553: with related
texts on the Three Chapters Controversy*. *TTH*. Liverpool: Liverpool University
Press.
- Acts of the Council of Ephesus. Ed. E. Schwartz. 1922-30. *ACO* I. Berlin: De Gruyter.
Trans. Festugière, A.J. 1982. *Ephèse et Chalcédoine: actes des conciles, textes,
dossiers, documents*. Paris: Beauchesne.
- Augustine. *De doctrina christiana*. Ed. K.D. Daur and J. Martin. 1962. *CC* 32. Turnhout:
Brepols.
- Bordeaux Pilgrim. Ed. P. Geyer, O. Cuntz, A. Francheschini, R. Weber, L. Bieler, J.
Fraipoint, F. Glorie. 1965. *Itineraria et alia geographica*. *CC* 175. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Caesarius. *Opera omnia*. 1937. Ed. G. Morin. Mariettioli.
Trans. M. M. Mueller. 1956. *Sermons* 3 vols. New York: Fathers of the Church, Inc.
Trans. W. Klingshirn. 1994. *Caesarius of Arles: Life, Testament, Letters*. *TTH*.
Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.
- Codex Theodosianus*. Trans. C. Pharr. 1969. *The Theodosian Code and Novels, and the
Sirmondian Constitutions*. New York: Greenwood Press.
- Concilia Galliae*. Ed. C. Munier and C. de Clercq. 1963. *Concilia Galliae*. *CC* 148.
Turnhout: Brepols.
- Constitutiones Apostolorum*. Ed. J.P. Migne. *PG* 1.
Trans. J. Donaldson. 1867. *Ante-Nicene Christian Library*. Edinburgh: T. Clark.
- Didascalia Apostolorum*. Trans. R. Connolly. 1929. Oxford: The Clarendon Press.
- Eusebius. *VC*. Ed. B. Bleckmann and H. Schneider. 2007. *De vita Constantini*. Turnhout:
Brepols.
- Gennadius. *De viris inlustribus*. Ed. E. Cushing Richardson. 1896. *Heironymus liber De viris
inlustribus*. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs.
- Germanus. *On the Divine Liturgy*. Trans. P. Meyendorff. 1984. Crestwood: St. Vladimir's
Seminary Press.
- Hesychius. *Homilies*. Ed. M. Aubineau. 1978. *Les homélies festales d'Hésychius de
Jérusalem*. Bruxelles: Société des bollandises.

- Trans. (Hom. IX and XIV) J. Leemans. 2003. *“Let Us Die That We May Live”*: Greek Homilies on Christian Martyrs from Asia Minor, Palestine, and Syria (c. AD 250-AD 450). Routledge.
- Trans. (Hom. I, II, V, and VI). S. Pittman. 1974. *The Marian Homilies of Hesychius of Jerusalem*. PhD Dissertation. Catholic University of America.
- Hilary. *Life of Honoratus*. Ed. M.D. Valentin. 1977. *Vie de Saint Honorat*. SC 235. Paris: Éditions du Cerf.
- Trans. R. Deferrari. 1952. *Early Christian Biographies*. New York: Fathers of the Church Inc.
- Honoratus. *Life of Hilary*. Ed. P.-A. Jacob. 1995. *La vie d’Hilaire d’Arles*. SC 404. Paris: Éditions du Cerf.
- Irenaeus. *Adversus haereses*. Ed. L. Doutreleau and A. Rousseau. 1974. *Contre les hérésies, tome II. Livre III: Édition critique, texte et traduction*. SC 211. Paris: Éditions du Cerf.
- Isidore of Pelusium. *Epistulae*. Ed. J.P. Migne. PG 78.
- Itinerarium Egeriae*. Ed. P. Geyer, O. Cuntz, A. Francheschini, R. Weber, L. Bieler, J. Fraipoint, F. Glorie. 1965. *Itineraria et alia geographica*. CC 175. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Trans. J. Wilkinson. 2002. *Egeria’s Travels*. Warminster: Aris & Phillips.
- Jerusalem Lectionary*. Ed. A. Renoux. 1961. “Un Manuscrit du Lectionnaire Arménien de Jérusalem (cod. Jérus. Arm. 121).” *Muséon* LXXIV (3-4):25.
- Trans. J. Wilkinson. 2002. *Egeria’s Travels*. Warminster: Aris & Phillips.
- Lactantius. *Divine Institutes*. Ed. S. Brandt. 1890. *Divinae Institutiones*. CSEL 19. Turnhout. Brepols.
- Liber Pontificalis*. Ed. L. Duchesne. 1886. *Le Liber pontificalis*. Paris: E. Thorin.
- Trans. R. Davis. 2000. *The Book of Pontiffs*. TTH. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.
- Life of Caesarius*. Ed. G. Morin, M.-J. Delage, and M. Heijmans. 2010. *Vie de Césaire d’Arles*. SC 536. Paris: Éditions du Cerf.
- Trans. Klingshirn. 1994. *Caesarius of Arles: Life, Testament, Letters*. TTH. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.
- Livy. *History*. Trans. B.O. Foster. 1919. *Ab urbe condita*, 1. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- The New American Bible: Revised Edition*. 2012. Huntington: Our Sunday Visitor Inc.
- Pomerius. *On the Contemplative Life*. Trans. M.J. Suelzer. 1947. *The Contemplative Life*. Westminster: Newman Bookshop.
- Severus of Antioch. *Cathedral Homilies*. 1906-76. PO 15, 37, 57, 81, 97, 108, 112, 121, 124, 127, 138, 165, 167, 169, 170, 171, and 175.
- Trans. (four homilies) P. Allen and R. Hayward. 2004. *Severus of Antioch*. London; New York: Routledge.
- Sidonius. *Epistulae*. Ed. A. Loyen. 2003. *Oeuvres*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Trans. W.B. Anderson. 1936. *Poems and Letters*. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Theophanes. *Chronographia*. Trans. C. Mango, R. Scott, and G. Greatrex. 1997. *The Chronicle of Theophanes Confessor*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Valerius Maximus. *Memorable Doings and Sayings*. Trans. D.R. Shackleton Bailey. 2000. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Secondary Sources:

- Akhrass, Roger-Youssef. 2016. "Se glorifier de sa ville et de son siège? La grandeur d'Antioche et le mépris des titres chez Sévère le Grand." In *Severus of Antioch: His Life and Times*, edited by John D'Alton and Youhanna Youssef, 14-31. Leiden: Brill.
- Albani, Jenny and Evgenía Chalkiá, ed. 2013. *Heaven & Earth. 2, 2*. Athens; Benaki Museum: Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sports.
- Alciati, Roberto. 2009. "Eucher, Salvien et Vincent: Les *Gallicani Doctores* de Lérins." In *Lérins et la Bourgondie dans le haut Moyen Âge*, edited by Y. Codou and M. Lauwers. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Aldrete, Gregory S. 1999. *Gestures and Acclamations in Ancient Rome*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Allen, Pauline. 2001. "The Definition and Enforcement of Orthodoxy." In *The Cambridge Ancient History*, edited by Averil Cameron, Bryan Ward-Perkins and Michael Whitby. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 811-834.
- Allen, Pauline and Robert Hayward. 2004. *Severus of Antioch*. London; New York: Routledge.
- Alpi, Frédéric. 2009. *La route royale: Sévère d'Antioche et les églises d'Orient (512-518)*. Beyrouth: Institut français du Proche-Orient.
- Asad, Talal. 1993. *Genealogies of Religion: Discipline and Reasons of Power in Christianity and Islam*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Aubineau, Michel. 1972. *Homélie pascales (cinq homélie inédites), SC 187*. Paris: Éditions du Cerf.
- Aubineau, Michel. 1978. *Les homélie festales d'Hésychius de Jérusalem*. Bruxelles: Société des bollandistes.
- Auerbach, Erich. 1952. "SERMO HUMILIS." *Romanische Forschungen* 64 (3/4):304-364.
- Auerbach, Erich. 1965. *Literary Language & Its Public in Late Latin Antiquity and in the Middle Ages*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Aune, David E. 2010. "The Pastoral Letters: 1 and 2 Timothy and Titus." In *The Blackwell Companion to the New Testament*. Wiley-Blackwell, 551-569.
- Avni, Gideon. 2014. *The Byzantine-Islamic Transition in Palestine: An Archaeological Approach*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ayres, Lewis. 2004. *Nicaea and Its Legacy: An Approach to Fourth-Century Trinitarian Theology*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bailey, Lisa Kaaren. 2010. *Christianity's Quiet Success: The Eusebius Gallicanus Sermon Collection and the Power of the Church in Late Antique Gaul*. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Bailey, Lisa Kaaren. 2016. *The Religious Worlds of the Laity in Late Antique Gaul*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Bowes, Kimberly Diane. 2008. *Private Worship, Public Values, and Religious Change in Late Antiquity*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Bowes, Kimberly Diane. 2015. "Sixth-Century Individual Rituals: Private Chapels and the Reserved Eucharist." In *Group Identity and Religious Individuality in Late Antiquity*, edited by E. Rebeillard and J. Rupke. Washington DC: The Catholic University of America Press.

- Boyarin, Daniel. 2004. *Border Lines: The Partition of Judaeo-Christianity*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Bradley, Mark. 2015. *Smell and the Ancient Senses*. Abingdon; New York: Routledge.
- Brakke, David. 2010. *The Gnostics: Myth, Ritual, and Diversity in Early Christianity*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Braudel, Fernand. 1972. *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of Philip II*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Brock, Sebastian P. 2008. "Poetry and Hymnography (3): Syriac." In *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Studies*, edited by Susan Ashbrook Harvey and David G. Hunter. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 657-71.
- Brock, Sebastian P., and Brian Fitzgerald. 2013. *Two Early Lives of Severos, Patriarch of Antioch, TTH 59*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.
- Brown, Peter. 1992. *Power and Persuasion in Late Antiquity: Towards a Christian Empire*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Brown, Peter. 2003. *The Rise of Western Christendom: Triumph and Diversity, A.D. 200-1000*. Malden: Blackwell Publishers.
- Brown, Peter. 2012. *Through the Eye of a Needle: Wealth, the Fall of Rome, and the Making of Christianity in the West, 350-550 AD*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Buc, Philippe. 2001. *The Dangers of Ritual: Between Early Medieval Texts and Social Scientific Theory*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Bynum, Caroline Walker. 1987. *Holy Feast and Holy Fast: The Religious Significance of Food to Medieval Women*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Bynum, Caroline Walker. 2011. *Christian Materiality: An Essay on Religion in Late Medieval Europe*. New York; Cambridge: Zone Books; Distributed by the MIT Press.
- Caseau, Béatrice. 1994. *Euōdia: The Use and Meaning of Fragrances in the Ancient World and their Christianization (100-900 AD)*. PhD Dissertation, Princeton.
- Caseau, Béatrice. 2007. "Incense and Fragrances from House to Church." In *Material Culture and Well-Being in Byzantium (400-1453)*, edited by M. Grünbart, E. Kislinger, A. Muthesius and D. Stathakopoulos. Vienne: Verlages der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 75-92.
- Caseau, Béatrice. 2013. "Experiencing the Sacred." In *Experiencing Byzantium: Papers from the 44th Spring Symposium of Byzantine Studies*, edited by Claire Nesbitt and Mark Jackson. Farnham: Ashgate, 59-77.
- Caseau, Béatrice. 2014. "The Senses in Religion: Liturgy, Devotion, and Deprivation." In *A Cultural History of the Senses in the Middle Ages*, edited by R. Newhauser. Oxford: Bloomsbury.
- Coon, Lynda L. 1997. *Sacred Fictions: Holy Women and Hagiography in Late Antiquity*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Cunningham, Mary, and Pauline Allen. 1998. *Preacher and Audience: Studies in Early Christian and Byzantine Homiletics*. Leiden; Boston: Brill.
- Davies, Penelope J. E. 2000. *Death and the Emperor: Roman Imperial Funerary Monuments, from Augustus to Marcus Aurelius*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- De Jong, Mayke. 2000. "Transformation of Penance." In *Rituals of Power from Late Antiquity to the Early Middle Ages*, edited by Frans Theuws and Janet L. Nelson. Leiden: Brill, 185-224.

- Deferrari, Roy J. 1952. *Early Christian Biographies*. New York: Fathers of the Church, inc.
- Delage, Marie-José. 1971. "Introduction." In *Césaire d'Arles: Sermons au peuple I*, SC 175. Paris: Éditions du Cerf.
- Delage, Marie-José. 2010. "Introduction." In *Vie de Césaire d'Arles*, SC 536. Paris: Éditions du Cerf.
- Diesenberger, Max, Yitzhak Hen, and Marianne Pollheimer. 2013. *Sermo Doctorum: Compilers, Preachers, and their Audiences in the Early Medieval West*. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Doig, Allan. 2008. *Liturgy and Architecture from the Early Church to the Middle Ages*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Donavin, Georgiana, Cary J. Nederman, and Richard J. Utz. 2004. *Speculum Sermonis: Interdisciplinary Reflections on the Medieval Sermon*. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Dossey, Leslie. 2010. *Peasant and Empire in Christian North Africa*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Drake, H. A. 2000. *Constantine and the Bishops: The Politics of Intolerance*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Drake, H. A. 2006. "The Impact of Constantine on Christianity." In *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Constantine*, edited by Noel Lenski. New York: Cambridge University Press, 111-136.
- Drandake, Anastasia, Demetra Papanikola-Mpakirtze, and Anastasia G. Turta. 2013. *Heaven and Earth: issued in conjunction with the exhibition "Heaven and earth: art of Byzantium from Greek collections" held at the National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., from October 6, 2013, through March 2, 2014, and at the J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles, from April 9 through August 25, 2014*.
- Eastmond, Antony. 2013. *The Glory of Byzantium and Early Christendom*. London; New York: Phaidon.
- Elsner, Jaś. 2007. *Roman Eyes: Visuality & Subjectivity in Art & text*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Ernout, A., A. Meillet, and Jacques André. 1985. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine: histoire des mots*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Forness, Philip Michael. 2016. *Preaching and Religious Debate: Jacob of Serugh and the Promotion of his Christology in the Roman Near East*, PhD Dissertation, Princeton Theological Seminary.
- Frank, Georgia. 2000. *The Memory of the Eyes: Pilgrims to Living Saints in Christian Late Antiquity*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Frank, Georgia. 2001. "'Taste and See': The Eucharist and the Eyes of Faith in the Fourth Century." *Church History* 70:24.
- Freyburger, Gérard. 2009. *Fides: étude sémantique et religieuse depuis les origines jusqu'à l'époque augustéenne*. Paris: Belles lettres.
- Gaudemet, Jean. 1985. *Les sources du droit de l'église en occident du IIe au VIIe siècle*. Paris: Éditions du Cerf/Éditions du C.N.R.S.
- Gibson, Craig A. 2008. *Libanius's Progymnasmata: Model Exercises in Greek Prose Composition and Rhetoric*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Goetz, Georg, Gustav Loewe, Gotthold Gundermann, W. Heraeus, Paul Wessner, and W. M. Lindsay. 1888. *Corpus glossariorum latinorum a Gustavo Loewe incohatur, auspiciis Academiae litterarum saxonicae*. Lipsiae; Berolini: B.G. Teubner.

- Graumann, Thomas. 2013. "Theodosius II and the Politics of the First Council of Ephesus." In *Theodosius II: Rethinking the Roman Empire in Late Antiquity*, edited by Christopher Kelly. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 109-129.
- Grig, Lucy. 2013. "Approaching Popular Culture in Late Antiquity: Singing in the Sermons of Caesarius of Arles." *Studia Patristica* LXIX:197-204.
- Gruen, E. S. 1982. "Greek πίστις and Roman *fides*." *Athenaeum: studi periodici di letteratura e storia dell'antichità* 60:50-68.
- Hadot, I. 1986. "The Spiritual Guide." In *Classical Mediterranean Spirituality: Egyptian, Greek, Roman*, edited by A. H. Armstrong. New York: Crossroad, 436-459.
- Halfond, Gregory I. 2010. *Archaeology of Frankish Church Councils, AD 511-768*. Leiden; Boston: Brill.
- Hall, Thomas N. 2000. "The Early Medieval Sermon." In *The Sermon*, edited by Beverly Mayne Kienzle. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Harmless, William. 1995. *Augustine and the Catechumenate*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press.
- Harries, Jill. 1994. *Sidonius Apollinaris and the Fall of Rome, AD 407-485*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Harrison, Carol. 2011. "Enchanting the Soul: The Music of the Psalms." In *Meditations of the Heart*, edited by A.G. Andreopoulos Andrew Louth, Augustine Casiday, and Carol Harrison. Turnhout: Brepols, 205-23.
- Harrison, Carol. 2013. *The Art of Listening in the Early Church*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Harvey, Susan Ashbrook. 2006. *Scenting Salvation: Ancient Christianity and the Olfactory Imagination*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hen, Yitzhak. 1995. *Culture and Religion in Merovingian Gaul, A.D. 481-751*. Leiden; New York: Brill.
- Herrin, Judith. 1987. *The Formation of Christendom*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Hopkins, K. 1998. "Christian Number and its Implications." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 6:41.
- Horden, Peregrine, and Nicholas Purcell. 2000. *The Corrupting Sea: A Study of Mediterranean History*. Oxford; Malden: Blackwell Publishers.
- Horsfall, Nicholas. 2003. *The Culture of the Roman Plebs*. London: Duckworth.
- Houlden, J. L. 1976. *The Pastoral Epistles: I and II Timothy, Titus*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Hunt, E. D. 1982. *Holy Land Pilgrimage in the Later Roman Empire, AD 312-460*. Oxford: New York: Oxford University Press.
- Jacob, Paul-André. 1995. "Introduction." In *La vie d'Hilaire d'Arles, SC 404*. Paris: Éditions du Cerf.
- Jacobs, Andrew S. 2004. *Remains of the Jews: The Holy Land and Christian Empire in Late Antiquity*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- James, Liz. 1996. *Light and Colour in Byzantine art*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Jüssen, Klaudius. 1931-34. *Die dogmatischen Anschauungen des Hesychius von Jerusalem*. Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Justice, Steven. 2008. "Did the Middle Ages Believe in Their Miracles?" *Representations* 103 (1):1-29.
- Kennedy, George A. 1983. *Greek Rhetoric Under Christian Emperors, A History of rhetoric*

- v. 3. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Kennedy, George A. 1999. *Classical Rhetoric & its Christian & Secular Tradition From Ancient to Modern Times*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Kessler, Herbert L. 2000. *Spiritual Seeing: Picturing God's Invisibility in Medieval Art*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Kienzle, Beverly Mayne. 2000. *The Sermon*. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Kirchmeyer, J. 1968. "Hesychius." In *Dictionnaire de Spiritualité Ascétique et Mystique, Doctrine et Histoire*, edited by Marcel Viller, et. al. Paris: G. Beauchesne et ses fils.
- Klingshirn, William. 1985. "Charity and Power: Caesarius of Arles and the Ransoming of Captives in Sub-Roman Gaul." *Journal of Roman Studies* 75.
- Klingshirn, William. 1994. *Caesarius of Arles: Life, Testament, Letters, TTH 19*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.
- Klingshirn, William. 1994. *Caesarius of Arles: The Making of a Christian Community in Late Antique Gaul*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Krautheimer, Richard. 1937. *Corpus basilicarum christianarum Romae. The early Christian basilicas of Rome (IV-IX cent.)*. Città del Vaticano: Pontificio istituto di archeologia cristiana.
- Kreiner, Jamie. 2014. *The Social Life of Hagiography in the Merovingian Kingdom*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Krueger, Derek. 2014. *Liturgical Subjects: Christian Ritual, Biblical Narrative, and the Formation of the Self in Byzantium*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Lavan, Luke. 2007. "Religious Space in Late Antiquity." In *Objects in Context, Objects in Use: Material Spatiality in Late Antiquity*, edited by Luke Lavan et. al. Leiden: Brill.
- Leemans, Johan. 2003. "Let us die that we may live" : *Greek Homilies on Christian Martyrs from Asia Minor, Palestine, and Syria (c. AD 350-AD 450)*. Routledge.
- Lenski, Noel Emmanuel. 2016. *Constantine and the Cities: Imperial Authority and Civic Politics*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Lewis, Charlton T., and Charles Short. 2006. *A Latin Dictionary: Founded on Andrews' Edition of Freund's Latin Dictionary*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Leyser, Conrad. 2000. *Authority and Asceticism from Augustine to Gregory the Great*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.
- L'Huillier, Peter. 1996. *The Church of the Ancient Councils: The Disciplinary Work of the First Four Ecumenical Councils*. Crestwood: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press.
- Lim, Richard. 1999. "Christian Triumph and Controversy." In *Late Antiquity: A Guide to the Postclassical World*, edited by G.W. Bowersock, Peter Brown and Oleg Grabar. Cambridge: Belknap, 196-218.
- Lincoln, Bruce. 2003. *Holy Terrors: Thinking About Religion After September 11*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- MacMullen, Ramsay. 1966. "A NOTE ON "SERMO HUMILIS"." *The Journal of Theological Studies* 17 (1):108-112.
- MacMullen, Ramsay. 1989. "The Preacher's Audience (AD 350-400)." *Journal of Theological Studies* 40 (2):9.
- MacMullen, Ramsay. 1990. "Ordinary Christians in the Later Persecutions." In *Changes in the Roman Empire: Essays in the Ordinary*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- MacMullen, Ramsay. 2009. *The Second Church: Popular Christianity A.D. 200-400*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

- Markus, R. A. 1989. "The Legacy of Pelagius: Orthodoxy, Heresy and Conciliation." In *The Making of Orthodoxy: Essays in Honour of Henry Chadwick*, edited by Rowan Williams. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 214-34.
- Markus, R. A. 1990. *The End of Ancient Christianity*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Mathews, Thomas F. 1971. *The Early Churches of Constantinople: Architecture and Liturgy*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Mathisen, Ralph W. 1989. *Ecclesiastical Factionalism and Religious Controversy in Fifth-Century Gaul*. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press.
- Mathisen, Ralph W. 1997. "The "Second Council of Arles" and the Spirit of Compilation and Codification in Late Roman Gaul." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 5 (4):511-554.
- Mathisen, Ralph W. 2014. "Church Councils and Local Authority: The Development of Gallic *Libri canonum* during Late Antiquity." In *Being Christian in Late Antiquity: A Festschrift for Gillian Clark*, edited by Caroline Humfress, Carol Harrison, and Isabella Sandwell. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 175-196.
- Matthews, John. 1975. *Western Aristocracies and Imperial Court, A.D. 364-425*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Maxwell, Jaclyn LaRae. 2006. *Christianization and Communication in Late Antiquity: John Chrysostom and his Congregation in Antioch*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Mayer, Wendy. 2015. "Shaping the Sick Soul: Reshaping the Identity of John Chrysostom." In *Christians Shaping Identity from the Roman Empire to Byzantium*. Leiden: Brill.
- McKitterick, Rosamond. 1989. *The Carolingians and the Written Word*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- McLaughlin, R. Emmet. 1991. "THE WORD ECLIPSED? PREACHING IN THE EARLY MIDDLE AGES." *Traditio* 46:77-122.
- Meeks, Wayne A. 1983. *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Meunier, B. 1997. *Le Christ de Cyrille d'Alexandrie: l'humanité, le salut et la question monophysite*. Paris: Beauchesne.
- Meyendorff, John. 1989. *Imperial Unity and Christian Divisions: The Church, 450-680 A.D.* Crestwood: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press.
- Millar, Fergus. 2006. *A Greek Roman Empire: Power and Belief under Theodosius II (408/450)*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Morales, Helen. 2004. *Vision and Narrative in Achilles Tatius' Leucippe and Clitophon*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Morgan, Teresa. 2015. *Roman Faith and Christian Faith: Pistis and Fides in the Early Roman Empire and Early Churches*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mulholland, Bernard. 2014. *The Early Byzantine Christian Church: An archaeological re-assessment of forty-seven early Byzantine basilical church excavations primarily in Israel and Jordan, and their historical and liturgical context*. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Murray, Oswyn. 1990. *Symptica: A Symposium on the Symposium*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Neis, Rachel. 2013. *The Sense of Sight in Rabbinic Culture: Jewish Ways of Seeing in Late Antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Niermeyer, Jan Frederik and C. van de Kieft. 1954. *Mediae Latinitatis lexicon minus*. A

- medieval Latin-French/English dictionary*. Leiden: Brill.
- Nixon, C. E. V., and Barbara Saylor Rodgers. 1994. *In Praise of Later Roman Emperors: the Panegyrici Latini: Introduction, Translation, and Historical Commentary, with the Latin Text of R.A.B. Mynors*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Nongbri, Brent. 2013. *Before Religion: A History of a Modern Concept*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Olivar, Alexandre. 1991. *La predicación cristiana antigua*. Barcelona: Herder.
- Penn, Michael Philip. 2005. *Kissing Christians: Ritual and Community in the Late Ancient Church*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Pirenne, Henri. 1939. *Mohammed and Charlemagne*. London: G. Allen & Unwin.
- Price, Richard and Michael Gaddis. 2007. *The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon, TTH 45*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.
- Rapp, Claudia. 2005. *Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity: The Nature of Christian Leadership in an Age of Transition*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Renoux, Athenase, O.S.B. 1961. "Un Manuscrit du Lectionnaire Arménien de Jérusalem (cod. Jérus. arm. 121)." *Muséon* LXXIV (3-4):25.
- Renoux, Charles. 2000. *Les Hymnes de la Résurrection I: Hymnographie liturgique georgienne Textes du Sinai 18*. Paris: Les Éditions du Cerf.
- Renoux, Charles. 2010. *Les hymnes de la Résurrection. II*. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Renoux, Charles. 2010. *Les hymnes de la Résurrection. III*. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Ristuccia, Nathan J. 2013. *The Transmission of Christendom: Ritual and Instruction in the Early Middle Ages*. PhD Dissertation, Notre Dame.
- Rosenwein, Barbara H. 2006. *Emotional Communities in the Early Middle Ages*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Rousseau, Philip. 1998. "The Preacher's Audience: A More Optimistic View." In *Ancient History in a Modern University: Proceedings of a conference held at Macquarie University, 8-13 July, 1993: to mark twenty-five years of the teaching of ancient history at Macquarie University and the retirement from the chair of professor Edwin Judge*, edited by T. W. Hillard and E. A. Judge. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans Pub. Co.
- Rousseau, Philip. 2002. *The Early Christian Centuries*. London; New York: Longman.
- Rowe, Galen O. 1997. "Style." In *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B.C.-A.D. 400*, edited by Stanley E. Porter. Leiden: Brill.
- Rylaarsdam, David. 2014. *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy: The Coherence of his Theology and Preaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Salzman, Michele Renee. 2002. *The Making of a Christian Aristocracy: Social and Religious Change in the Western Roman Empire*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Sandwell, Isabella. 2011. "How to Teach Genesis 1.1-19: John Chrysostom and Basil of Caesarea on the Creation of the World." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 19 (4):25.
- Sanzo, Joseph, and Ra'anana Boustán. 2014. "Mediterranean Jews in a Christianizing Empire." In *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Attila*, edited by Michael Maas. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 358-75.
- Schäfer, Peter. 2003. *The History of the Jews in the Greco-Roman World*. London: Routledge.
- Schwartz, Daniel Louis. 2013. *Paideia and Cult: Christian Initiation in Theodore of Mopsuestia*. Washington, D.C.; Cambridge: Center for Hellenic Studies; Distributed

- by Harvard University Press.
- Sessa, Kristina. 2012. *The Formation of Papal Authority in Late Antique Italy: Roman Bishops and the Domestic Sphere*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Shalev-Hurvitz, Vered. 2015. *Holy Sites Encircled: The Early Byzantine Concentric Churches of Jerusalem*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Shoemaker, Stephen J. 2016. *Mary in Early Christian Faith and Devotion*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Sivan, Hagith. 2008. *Palestine in Late Antiquity*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Smith, Julia M. H. 2005. *Europe after Rome: A New Cultural History 500-1000*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Souter, Alexander. 1957. *A Glossary of Later Latin to 600 A. D.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Stark, Rodney. 1996. *The Rise of Christianity: A Sociologist Reconsiders History*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Thunø, Erik. 2015. *The Apse Mosaic in Early Medieval Rome: Time, Network, and Repetition*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Uhalde, Kevin. 2007. *Expectations of Justice in the Age of Augustine*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Valentin, Marie Denise. 1977. "Introduction." In *Vie de Saint Honorat, SC 235*. Paris: Éditions du Cerf.
- Van Acker, Marieke. 2007. *Ut quique rustici et inlitterati hec audierint intellegant: hagiographie et communication verticale au temps des Mérovingiens (VIIe-VIIIe siècles)*. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Van Dam, Raymond. 1985. *Leadership and Community in Late Antique Gaul*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Van Dam, Raymond. 1988. "Images of Saint Martin in Late Roman and Early Merovingian Gaul." *Viator* 19:1-27.
- Van Dam, Raymond. 2003. *Becoming Christian: The Conversion of Roman Cappadocia*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Van Dam, Raymond. 1993. *Saints and their Miracles in Late Antique Gaul*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Van Uytvanghe, Marc. 2001. "L'hagiographie antique tardive: une littérature populaire?" *Antiquité Tardive* 9.
- Vasaly, Ann. 1993. *Representations: Images of the World in Ciceronian Oratory*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Verhelst, Stéphane. 2012. *Le lectionnaire de Jérusalem: ses traditions judéo-chrétiennes et son histoire: suivant l'index des péricopes évangéliques, conclu par le sanctoral du Sin. Géol. 58 novus, Spicilegii Friburgensis subsidi*. Fribourg: Academic Press Fribourg.
- Vogel, Cyrille. 1952. *La discipline pénitentielle en Gaule des origines à la fin du VIIe siècle*. Paris: Letouzey et Ané.
- Watts, Edward Jay. 2015. *The Final Pagan Generation*. Oakland: University of California Press.
- Weaver, Rebecca Harden. 1996. *Divine Grace and Human Agency: A Study of the Semi-Pelagian Controversy*. Macon: Mercer University Press.

- Wessel, Susan. 2004. *Cyril of Alexandria and the Nestorian Controversy: The Making of a Saint and of a Heretic*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wessel, Susan. 2015. "Religious Doctrine and Ecclesiastical Change in the Time of Leo the Great." In *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Attila*, edited by Michael Maas. New York: Cambridge University Press, 327-43.
- Wickham, Chris. 2005. *Framing the Early Middle Ages: Europe and the Mediterranean 400-800*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wilken, Robert Louis. 1992. *The Land Called Holy: Palestine in Christian History and Thought*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Wilkinson, John. 2002. *Egeria's Travels*. Warminster: Aris & Phillips.
- Yasin, Ann Marie. 2009. *Saints and Church Spaces in the Late Antique Mediterranean: Architecture, Cult, and Community*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge Univ Press.
- Yasin, Ann Marie. 2012. "Sacred Space and Visual Art." In *The Oxford Handbook of Late Antiquity*, edited by Scott Fitzgerald Johnson. Oxford: Oxford University Press.