

9. THE PARACLETE'S TEACHING: THE TEXT AND EXEGESIS OF JOHN 14:25–26 AND JOHN 16:12–15 IN THE WRITINGS OF EUSEBIUS OF CAESAREA AND CYRIL OF JERUSALEM

VALENTIN ANDRONACHE

This chapter discusses a few fragments of tradition and brings a contribution to the history of reception and interpretation of the Gospel of John. For this purpose, it looks at the exegesis of John 14:25–26 and 16:12–15 in general, but also with a particular focus on the subject of the Paraclete's teaching in the writings of Eusebius of Caesarea and Cyril of Jerusalem. Specifically, it sets out to indicate the places where either John 14:25–26 or 16:12–15, or both texts, are cited in the works of these two writers, and to describe their function and interpretation in their immediate literary context. Given that these authors were not interpreting and commenting on the same text of John 14:25–26 and 16:12–15, special attention will be paid to the form in which they cite one or the other Johannine passages in order to see whether the form of the text influences the interpretation of these passages. In what follows, a brief overview of the current state of research on the reception of the Gospel of John is offered. Then, I discuss the passages from the works of Eusebius and Cyril where John 14:25–26 or 16:12–15 are cited, with attention to the form of the quoted

text and to the way the citations fit within these passages. The survey is concluded by a comparison between the two authors' text and exegesis.

The selection of these Johannine texts and early Christian writers of the fourth century was made because the Gospel of John was widely used by Christian writers during the doctrinal debates of the fourth and fifth century.¹ I chose to look at the interpretation of John 14:25–26 and 16:12–15 because these passages overlap in their description of the Spirit's teaching function, and they are often cited together in patristic works. Furthermore, I was inspired by the editors of the fourth volume of *Biblia Patristica* in selecting Eusebius and Cyril—both from Palestine. These editors divide the numerous patristic works of the fourth century following a geographical principle. As they explain, the criterion of 'region' can offer some sense of unity: in language, in way of life, and in theological and exegetical concerns.²

Most research on the reception history of the Gospel of John has in view the second century CE. Such studies deal with issues related to John's canonicity and authority as reflected by the Gospel's influence on other early Christian writings. These studies focus on the ways by which the literary dependence between John and other early texts can be determined, by analysing verbal agreement, similar vocabulary, themes, and ideas.³ Consequently,

¹ See Charles E. Hill, 'The Gospel of John', in *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Biblical Interpretation*, ed. Paul M. Blowers and Peter W. Martens, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), p. 602.

² See Jean Allenbach et al., *Biblia Patristica: Index des citations et allusions bibliques dans la littérature patristique. 4. Eusèbe de Césarée, Cyrille de Jérusalem, Epiphane de Salamine*. (Paris: CNRS, 1987), p. 5. This volume groups Eusebius and Cyril together with Epiphanius of Salamis. Although there are three references to John 14:25–26 in the works of Epiphanius, he has no citation of the passage and, implicitly, does not interpret this. For this reason, Epiphanius is not considered in this paper.

³ The earliest modern study on this subject is J. N. Sanders, *The Fourth Gospel in the Early Church: Its Origin and Influence on Christian Theology up to Irenaeus* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1943); among the most recent, see Lorne R. Zelyck, *John Among the Other Gospels: The Reception of the Fourth Gospel in the Extra-Canonical Gospels*, WUNT II 347

they do not consider how the text of John was interpreted. There are three main studies that look at how the Gospel of John was interpreted by early Christian authors beyond the second century CE, namely, Wiles' *The Spiritual Gospel: The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel*, Casurella's *The Johannine Paraclete in the Church Fathers*, and Keefer's *The Branches of the Gospel of John*.⁴ Wiles and Keefer examine how different Christian writers have interpreted John, but they are more interested in the kinds of exegetical methods these writers used to interpret John and how they understood certain themes or concepts in the Gospel.⁵ Casurella is the only one to address the content of the patristic exegesis of John. He focuses on five specific passages, namely, the so-called Paraclete sayings.⁶ His study gathers interpretations of the Paraclete sayings from Greek and Latin Christian writers from the first seven centuries. However, Casurella's survey is problematic with respect to the way in which he presents these interpretations. For example, when he deals with the exegesis of Greek authors between the councils of Nicaea and Constantinople, he distinguishes between doctrinal and exegetical writings. This gives the impression that there are two kinds of interpretations. He groups the doctrinal exegesis into three categories—Trinity, Christology, and Pneumatology—and within each category he describes how certain authors used the Johannine passages to conceive of the Trinity, or Christology, or Pneumatology. How-

(Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013); for a discussion of the studies that focus on the second century reception of John, see Dan Batovici, 'The Second-Century Reception of John: A Survey of Methodologies', *Currents in Biblical Research* 10.3 (2012), pp. 396–409.

⁴ See Maurice F. Wiles, *The Spiritual Gospel: The Interpretation of the Fourth Gospel in the Early Church* (New York: Cambridge University press, 1960); Anthony Casurella, *The Johannine Paraclete in the Church Fathers: A Study in the History of Exegesis*, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Biblischen Exegese* 25 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983); and Kyle Keefer, *The Branches of the Gospel of John: The Reception of the Fourth Gospel in the Early Church*, *Library of New Testament Studies* 332 (London: T&T Clark, 2006).

⁵ Wiles investigates Origen, Cyril of Alexandria, and Theodore of Mopsuestia; Keefer investigates Heracleon, Irenaeus, and Origen.

⁶ The five Paraclete sayings are: John 14:16–17, 14:25–26, 15:26–27, 16:7–11, and 16:12–15.

ever, this does not do justice to the variety of contexts in which the Johannine passages are cited and interpreted. Furthermore, in the exegetical section, Casurella groups the interpretations according to the five Paraclete sayings, which makes it look as if all Christian writers had the same, or similar, interpretations of a passage. Most importantly, he does not consider at all the actual text of the citations of the five Paraclete sayings. This shows that there is need for a study that pays attention not only to the interpretations of a biblical text, but also to the context in which these occur, that highlights both the similarities and the differences between explanations of the same biblical text, and that takes into account the form of the text which the writers interpret.

THE TEXT AND EXEGESIS OF JOHN 14:25–26 AND JOHN 16:12–15

According to the fourth volume of *Biblia Patristica*, there are sixteen references to John 14:25–26 and twenty references to John 16:12–15 in the works of Eusebius and Cyril.⁷ These references include both instances where the Johannine passages are cited entirely or partially and where there is lesser verbal correspondence, such as allusions and reminiscences. In this paper, only those references that contain verbatim citations of John 14:25–26 and/or John 16:12–15 will be considered.

Eusebius of Caesarea (ca. 264–339)

Eusebius of Caesarea cites passages from John 14:25–26 in three places. He cites only verse 26 in *Commentarius in Isaiam* 2.16, verses 25–26 in *Commentarius in Psalmos* (Ps 56: PG 23.512), and in *De ecclesiastica theologia* 3.5.5–6 he cites verses 25–26 twice.⁸

⁷ See *Biblia Patristica* 4, pp. 272–274. In gathering the references and the citations for this paper, I have used the fourth volume of *Biblia Patristica*, BiblIndex (www.biblindex.org/en), and the *ITSEE Citations Database* (<https://itsee-wce.birmingham.ac.uk/citations>).

⁸ For the Greek text of *Comm. Isa.*, see Joseph Ziegler, ed., *Eusebius Werke. 9: Der Jesajakommentar*, GCS 60 (Berlin: Akademie, 1975); for the Greek text of *Comm. Ps.*, see PG 23.501–517. Although this work has never been properly edited, according to Michael J. Hollerich, *Eusebius of Caesarea's Commentary*

Table 1 displays Eusebius' citations alongside the NA28 text of John 14:25–26, divided into its constituent parts.⁹

	NA28	<i>Comm. Isa.</i> 2.16	<i>Comm. Ps.</i> 56	<i>Eccl. theol.</i> 3.5.5–6
25.	ταῦτα		ταῦτα	ταῦτα
a	λελάληκα ὑμῖν		λελάληκα ὑμῖν,	λελάληκα ὑμῖν,
b	παρ' ὑμῖν μένων·		παρ' ὑμῖν μένων·	παρ' ὑμῖν μένων·
26.	ὁ δὲ	ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ	ὁ δὲ	ὁ δὲ
a ₁	παράκλητος,	ὁ παράκλητος,	παράκλητος,	παράκλητος,
b	τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον,	τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον,	τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον,	τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον,
c	ὁ πέμψει ὁ πατὴρ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου,	ὁ πέμψει ὁ πατὴρ μου ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου,	ὁ πέμψει ὁ πατὴρ μου ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου,	ὁ πέμψει ὁ πατὴρ μου ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου,
a ₂	ἐκεῖνος ὑμᾶς διδάξει πάντα	ἐκεῖνος ὑμᾶς διδάξει πάντα	ἐκεῖνος ὑμᾶς διδάξει πάντα	ἐκεῖνος ὑμᾶς διδάξει πάντα
d	καὶ ὑπομνήσει ὑμᾶς πάντα		καὶ ὑπομνήσει	καὶ ὑπομνήσει ὑμᾶς πάντα
e	ἃ εἶπον ὑμῖν [ἐγώ].			ὅσα εἶπον ὑμῖν (3.5.5) ὅσα εἶπον (3.5.6)

Table 1. Eusebius' citations of John 14:25–26

on Isaiah: *Christian Exegesis in the Age of Constantine*, Oxford Early Christian Studies (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), p. 9, n. 35, the text of the commentary on Ps 51–95:3 (PG 23.441c–1221c) is authentic; for the Greek text of *Eccl. theol.*, see Erich Klostermann and Günther Christian Hansen, eds., *Eusebius Werke. 4: Gegen Marcell; Über die kirchliche Theologie; Die Fragmente Marcells*, 3rd ed., GCS 14 (Berlin: Akademie, 1989).

⁹ The text of John 14:26 in NA28 consists of two main clauses, two relative clauses, and an apposition. The first main clause starts in 26a₁ by expressing its grammatical subject, ὁ παράκλητος. Then, the first main clause is interrupted by an apposition, in 26b, which is immediately followed by a relative clause, in 26c. Afterwards, the first main clause is resumed in 26a₂, where the first main verb is expressed, διδάσκω. The second main clause, in 26d, containing the verb ὑπομνήσκω, is linked to the first main clause through the coordinating conjunction καί. Then, in 26e, there follows another relative clause.

The text of John 14:25–26 is identical in Eusebius' citations, except for the beginning of verse 26 in *Comm. Isa.* 2.16, which differs from the citations in *Comm. Ps.* 56 and *Eccl. theol.* 3.5.5–6 and from the text of NA28. In *Comm. Isa.* 2.16, the citation starts with ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ, instead of ὁ δὲ παράκλητος, likely because Eusebius mixes the beginning of John 14:26 with the beginning of John 15:26, which he also cites in *Comm. Isa.* 2.16, immediately after John 14:26. Further, the two citations in *Eccl. theol.* 3.5.5 and 3.5.6 are identical to each other, except that in 3.5.5 verse 26 ends with εἶπον ὑμῖν, while in 3.5.6 it ends simply with εἶπον. M. Jack Suggs suggests that Eusebius' text of John did not contain ὑμῖν in 3.5.5 either, and that this is a later scribal addition.¹⁰ However, Klostermann's edition of *Eccl. theol.* does not register any textual variants in either of the two citations, which makes Suggs' suggestion difficult to support.¹¹ It is more likely that, in *Eccl. theol.* 3.5.6, Eusebius simply stopped citing after ὅσα εἶπον.

Except for the beginning of verse 26 in *Comm. Isa.* 2.16, there are two other places where Eusebius' citations differ from NA28. First, all four citations of Eusebius contain the genitive pronoun μου after ὁ πατήρ in verse 26c, which is not present in NA28. And second, both citations in *Eccl. theol.* 3.5.5–6 have ὅσα instead of ἃ in verse 26e, and, in the same verse, ἐγώ is missing from *Eccl. theol.* 3.5.5.

Eusebius cites passages from John 16:12–14 in *Comm. Ps.* 56 and *Eccl. theol.* 3.5. In *Comm. Ps.* 56, the author cites verses 12a–13c, followed immediately by 14b–c. In *Eccl. theol.* 3.5, he cites multiples times various phrases from John 16:12–14 and once verses 12–14 entirely.¹² Since the text of the partial citations is generally identical to that of the entire citation in *Eccl. theol.* 3.5.15–16, Table 2 displays only the text of John 16:12–14 as it is found in *Eccl. theol.* 3.5.15–16.

¹⁰ See M. Jack Suggs, 'The New Testament Text of Eusebius of Caesarea' (unpubl. diss., Duke University), 1954, p. 259.

¹¹ See Klostermann and Hansen, *Eusebius Werke.* 4, pp. 160–161.

¹² There are also a couple of citations of John 16:13–14 in *Eccl. theol.* 3.4: one of verses 13–14, and four of verse 14b–c. However, since the citations of verses 13–14 and two of the citations of verse 14b–c are part of a block quote from Marcellus, they are not included in this discussion.

	NA28	<i>Comm. Ps. 56</i>	<i>Eccl. theol.</i> 3.5.15–16
12.	Ἔτι πολλὰ ἔχω ὑμῖν λέγειν,	ἔτι πολλὰ ἔχω λέγειν ὑμῖν	ἔτι πολλὰ ἔχω λέγειν ὑμῖν
a	ἀλλ' οὐ δύνασθε βαστάζειν ἄρτι·	ἀλλ' οὐ δύνασθε βαστάζειν ἄρτι·	ἀλλ' οὐ δύνασθε βαστάζειν ἄρτι·
13.	ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ ἐκεῖνος,	ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ ἐκεῖνος	ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ ἐκεῖνος
a			
b	τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας,	τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας,	τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας,
c	ὁδηγήσει ὑμᾶς ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ πάσῃ·	διηγῆσεται ὑμῖν τὴν ἀλήθειαν	διηγῆσεται ὑμῖν τὴν ἀλήθειαν πᾶσαν·
d	οὐ γὰρ λαλήσει ἄφ' ἑαυτοῦ,		οὐ γὰρ ἄφ' ἑαυτοῦ λαλήσει,
e	ἀλλ' ὅσα ἀκούσει λαλήσει		ἀλλ' ὅσα ἀκούσει,
f	καὶ τὰ ἐρχόμενα ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν.		καὶ τὰ ἐρχόμενα ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν.
14.	ἐκεῖνος ἐμὲ δοξάσει,		ἐκεῖνος ἐμὲ δοξάσει,
a			
b	ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λήμψεται	ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λήψει	ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λήμψεται
c	καὶ ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν.	καὶ ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν.	καὶ ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν.

Table 2. Eusebius' citations of John 16:12–14

Eusebius' citations of John 16:12–14 differ from one another in two places: verses 13c and 14b. In verse 13c, the word *πᾶσαν* is missing from the citation in *Comm. Ps. 56*. Given the position of *πᾶσαν* in this verse, it is likely that the missing adjective in *Comm. Ps. 56* is a reading Eusebius created when he abbreviated the citation of John 16:12–14 by skipping also verses 13d–14a. In verse 14b, Eusebius' citations differ from one another and from NA28. The citation in *Comm. Ps. 56* reads *λήψει*, and the citation in *Eccl. theol. 3.5.15–16* reads *λήψεται*, unlike *λήμψεται* in NA28. Whereas *λήψεται* is a spelling variant to *λήμψεται*—both future indicative third-person singular—, *λήψει*, which is future indicative second-person singular, is a curious reading, because the subject of verses 13–14 is *ἐκεῖνος*, *τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας*, and all the verbs are in the third-person singular. Besides the variants in verse 14b, Eusebius' citations differ from NA28 in three other places. First, in both *Comm. Ps. 56* and *Eccl. theol. 3.5*, Eusebius' text differs from NA28

by inverting ὑμῖν with λέγειν in v. 12a. Second, both citations read διηγῆσεται ὑμῖν τὴν ἀλήθειαν in v. 13c instead of ὁδηγήσει ὑμᾶς ἐν κτλ. as in NA28. And third, another inversion is found in verse 13d in *Eccl. theol.* 3.5, where λαλήσει and ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ are reversed.

Having considered the text Eusebius used, we can consider his exegesis of John 14:25–26 and 16:12–14. In *Comm. Isa.* 2.16 Eusebius interprets the text of Isa 40:1–2, where God commands a group of persons to comfort his people (παρακαλεῖτε παρακαλεῖτε τὸν λαόν μου).¹³ The keyword παρακαλέω reminds Eusebius of the Spirit-Paraclete, and thus he thinks that those who comfort are those who have received the Spirit-Paraclete (οἱ μὲν οὖν παρακαλοῦντες εἶεν ἂν οἱ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ παράκλητον ὑποδεδεγμένοι). This prompts Eusebius to insert in his interpretation of Isaiah a number of New Testament texts where παρακαλέω or cognates of it—παράκλητος—are used: John 14:16–17, 14:26, 15:26, 16:7, 2 Cor 1:3–7 and 2 Cor 5:10. Yet he does not interpret these texts further.

In his interpretation of Ps 56 (LXX), Eusebius inserts three Johannine passages mentioning the Spirit (John 14:15–17, 14:25–26, and 16:12–13) when commenting on verses 8–12.¹⁴ It is not clear what in Ps 56:8–12 triggers Eusebius to think of these three Johannine texts. The citations come immediately after the lemma text, and the phrase Eusebius uses to introduce them simply states that Jesus said these things about the Holy Spirit to his disciples. However, the citations are followed by a comment:

Δι' ὧν παρίστησι μείζονα μὲν εἶναι τὰ παρ' αὐτοῦ καὶ μὴ χωρούμενα ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων· Οὐ γὰρ δύνασθε, φησὶ, βαστάζειν· τὸ δὲ Πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας τὸ ἐξ αὐτοῦ χορηγούμενον καὶ τοῖς ἀποστόλοις ὑπ' αὐτοῦ πεμπόμενον ἀναγγέλλειν αὐτοῖς πᾶσαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν.¹⁵

Through these words he (Jesus) shows that he has greater things which cannot be understood by the apostles. For you cannot bear them, he says. But the Spirit of truth, who bestows

¹³ See Eusebius of Caesarea, *Commentary on Isaiah*, ed. Joel C. Elowsky, trans. Jonathan J. Armstrong, Ancient Christian Texts (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity press, 2013), pp. 191–193.

¹⁴ See Eusebio di Cesarea, *Commento ai Salmi 1 (1-71)*, ed. M. Benedetta Artioli, Testi Patristici 176 (Rome: Città nuova, 2004), pp. 385–396.

¹⁵ PG 23, 512d.

from him (Jesus) and is sent by him (Jesus) to the apostles, proclaims the whole truth to them.¹⁶

This comment is a paraphrase of John 14:26 and 16:12–13, through which Eusebius highlights the gist of them: Jesus has greater things (μείζονα) to teach the disciples, but due to their lack of understanding, Jesus' earthly teaching remains incomplete; yet, the Spirit, who bestows from Jesus and is sent by Jesus—probably an indicator of subordination—, brings this teaching to completion by proclaiming the whole truth, including, supposedly, the μείζονα.

Eusebius' main point in *Eccl. theol.* 3.5 is to show that the Spirit is different from the Son (ἕτερόν ἐστιν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον τοῦ υἱοῦ).¹⁷ He builds up his argument mainly by citing and interpreting passages from John that talk about the Spirit and/or the Paraclete, including John 14:25–26 and 16:12–15. Eusebius comments on these two passages, having in view the teaching function of the Paraclete. Thus, immediately after citing John 14:25–26 in *Eccl. theol.* 3.5.6, he says:

ἐγὼ μὲν γὰρ τέως ταῦθ' ὑμῖν λελάληκα, φησὶν, τὸ δὲ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, ὃ καὶ αὐτὸ πέμψει ὁ πατήρ μου, πάντα ὑμᾶς διδάξει, ὅσα νῦν οὐ μεμαθήκατε διὰ τὸ μὴ χωρεῖν ὑμᾶς· ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνος ἐλθὼν, λέγω δὲ ὁ παράκλητος, ἀναπληρώσει τὴν διδασκαλίαν, μετὰ τοῦ καὶ τῶν νῦν λεγομένων ὑπ' ἐμοῦ μνήμην ὑμῖν ἐμποιῆσαι.¹⁸

For I have up to this time said these things to you, he says, but the Spirit of truth, whom my Father will also send, he will teach you everything that you have not learned now because you were not capable of it; but when he has come, I mean the Counselor, he will complete the teaching, along with calling to your remembrance even the things now said by me.¹⁹

¹⁶ My translation.

¹⁷ See *Eccl. theol.* 3.5.1. See Eusebius of Caesarea, *Against Marcellus and On Ecclesiastical Theology*, trans. Kelley McCarthy Spöerl and Markus Vinzent, FC 135 (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2017), pp. 304–313.

¹⁸ *Eccl. theol.* 3.5.7–8.

¹⁹ Eusebius of Caesarea, *Against Marcellus and On Ecclesiastical Theology*, p. 309.

According to this comment, Eusebius understands the Paraclete's task towards the disciples as follows. During his earthly ministry, Jesus taught ταῦτα. Of these, the disciples understood a part, and a part they did not understand (ὅσα νῦν οὐ μεμαθήκατε). Therefore, the Paraclete's task is to teach the disciples everything they did not understand of Jesus' teaching, thus completing it. In addition to teaching the disciples that which they did not understand of ταῦτα, the Paraclete also reminds the disciples of τὰ νῦν λεγόμενα—presumably that part of ταῦτα which the disciples understood.

After citing John 16:12–15 in *Eccl. theol.* 3.5.15–16, Eusebius says: ἐν οἷς πάλιν ἃ μὴ αὐτὸς ἐδίδαξεν ταῦτα μαθήσεσθαι τοὺς αὐτοῦ μαθητὰς ὑπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐπαγγέλλεται, that is, 'in these words he promises again that his disciples will learn from the Holy Spirit [these] things that he himself did not teach'.²⁰ From this comment it appears that Eusebius' understanding of the Paraclete's teaching is slightly different from earlier: now, he says that what the Paraclete teaches the disciples are the things they have not heard previously from Jesus. Yet, pointing to ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ ἔμοῦ λήψεται καὶ ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν of John 16:14, Eusebius makes it clear that the Paraclete is subordinate to Jesus, and that what the Spirit teaches still comes from Jesus.²¹ However, either because they did not comprehend everything from Jesus, or because Jesus did not teach everything, Eusebius' point is that the Spirit teaches the disciples something they did not learn from Jesus. This interpretation emphasises the Spirit's otherness in relation to Jesus, which is what Eusebius wants to prove in *Eccl. Theol.* 3.5, namely, that the Spirit is distinct from Jesus.

Cyril of Jerusalem (315–387)

Cyril of Jerusalem cites passages from John 14:25–26 and from John 16:12–15 only in his 16th and 17th *Catecheses ad illuminandos*, in which he focuses on the Holy Spirit.²² He has four citations of

²⁰ *Eccl. theol.* 3.5.16. For the translation, see Eusebius of Caesarea, *Against Marcellus and On Ecclesiastical Theology*, p. 311.

²¹ See *Eccl. theol.* 3.5.17–18.

²² For the Greek text of *Catech. illum.* 16–17, see Wilhelm Karl Reischl and Joseph Rupp, eds., *Cyrilli Hierosolymarum archiepiscopi Opera quae supersunt omnia*, 2 vols. (Munich, 1848–1860, repr. Hildesheim: Olms, 1967), pp. 2:

John 14:25–26, in *Catech. illum.* 16.14, 17.4, 17.11, and 17.34. In *Catech. illum.* 17.4 and 17.34, Cyril cites only verse 26a₁–b, and in both places the text of the citation is identical to the editorial text of NA28 and *Catech. illum.* 17.11, reading ὁ δὲ παράκλητος, τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον. For this reason, they are not included in Table 3. In *Catech. illum.* 16.14, Cyril cites only verse 26a₂–e, although he interrupts the citation after 26d with a comment, to which I will return later. In *Catech. illum.* 17.11, he cites verses 25–26 entirely.

	NA28	<i>Catech. illum.</i> 16.14	<i>Catech. illum.</i> 17.11
25. a	ταῦτα λελάληκα ὑμῖν		ταῦτα λελάληκα ὑμῖν
b	παρ' ὑμῖν μένων·		παρ' ὑμῖν μένων·
26. a ₁	ὁ δὲ παράκλητος,		ὁ δὲ παράκλητος,
b	τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον,		τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον,
c	ὃ πέμψει ὁ πατὴρ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου,		ὃ πέμψει ὁ πατὴρ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου,
a ₂	ἐκεῖνος ὑμᾶς διδάξει πάντα	ἐκεῖνος ὑμᾶς διδάξει πάντα	ἐκεῖνος διδάξει ὑμᾶς πάντα
d	καὶ ὑπομνήσει ὑμᾶς πάντα	καὶ ὑπομνήσει ὑμᾶς πάντα	καὶ ὑπομνήσει ὑμᾶς πάντα
e	ἃ εἶπον ὑμῖν [ἐγώ].	ὅσα εἶπον ὑμῖν	ἃ εἶπον ὑμῖν

Table 3. Cyril's citations of John 14:25–26

The text of John 14:25–26 in Cyril's citations agrees generally with NA28, with three exceptions. First, the citation in *Catech. illum.* 16.14, in verse 26e, reads ὅσα instead of ἃ as NA28 and *Catech. illum.* 17.11. Second, in *Catech. illum.* 17.11, in verse 26a₂, there is an inversion of ὑμᾶς and διδάξει. In his study of the New Testament text of Cyril, Roderic L. Mullen characterizes this reading as a 'Cyril variant'.²³ Third, neither of Cyril's citations have ἐγώ at the end of verse 26e.

204–297; see further Leo P. McCauley and Anthony A. Stephenson, trans., *The Works of Saint Cyril of Jerusalem*, 2 vols., FC 61, 64 (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1969–1970), pp. 2:76–119.

²³ See Roderic L. Mullen, *The New Testament Text of Cyril of Jerusalem*, *The New Testament in the Greek Fathers* 7 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997), p. 163.

Cyril cites passages of John 16:12–15 in three places: in *Catech. illum.* 16.24, 17.4, and 17.11. In *Catech. illum.* 17.4, he cites only verse 13a–b, reading ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ ἐκεῖνος, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, just as NA28 and *Catech. illum.* 17.11. For this reason, this is not included in Table 4. In *Catech. illum.* 16.24, Cyril cites verses 13a–b and 14a–c. He intentionally skips verse 13c–f, as in between verses 13a–b and 14a–c he adds καὶ ἐξῆς. In *Catech. illum.* 17.11, Cyril cites John 16:12–15 entirely.

	NA28	<i>Catech. illum.</i> 16.24	<i>Catech. illum.</i> 17.11
12. a	Ἔτι πολλὰ ἔχω ὑμῖν λέγειν,		ἔτι πολλὰ ἔχω λέγειν ὑμῖν
b	ἀλλ' οὐ δύνασθε βαστάζειν ἄρτι·		ἀλλ' οὐ δύνασθε βαστάζειν ἄρτι·
13. a	ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ ἐκεῖνος,	ὅταν ἔλθῃ ἐκεῖνος	ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ ἐκεῖνος
b	τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας,	τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας,	τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας,
c	ὁδηγήσει ὑμᾶς ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ πάσῃ·		διηγήσεται ὑμῖν τὴν ἀλήθειαν πᾶσαν·
d	οὐ γὰρ λαλήσει ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ,		οὐ γὰρ ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ λαλήσει,
e	ἀλλ' ὅσα ἀκούσει λαλήσει		ἀλλ' ὅσα ἂν ἀκούσῃ λαλήσει
f	καὶ τὰ ἐρχόμενα ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν.		καὶ τὰ ἐρχόμενα ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν.
14. a	ἐκεῖνος ἐμὲ δοξάσει,	ἐκεῖνος ἐμὲ δοξάσει,	ἐκεῖνος ἐμὲ δοξάσει,
b	ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λήμψεται	ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λαμβάνει	ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λήψεται
c	καὶ ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν.	καὶ ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν.	καὶ ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν.
15. a	πάντα ὅσα ἔχει ὁ πατὴρ ἐμὰ ἐστίν·		πάντα ὅσα ἔχει ὁ πατὴρ ἐμὰ ἐστίν·
b	διὰ τοῦτο εἶπον		διὰ τοῦτο εἶπον ὑμῖν
c	ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λαμβάνει		ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λήψεται
d	καὶ ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν.		καὶ ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν.

Table 4. Cyril's citations of John 16:12–15

There are six points in which the text of John 16:12–15 in Cyril's citations differs from NA28. First, in *Catech. illum.* 16.24, δέ is omitted in verse 13a. However, as Mullen points out, since Cyril

twice cites this verse with δέ, in 17.4 and 17.11, it is likely that Cyril's text of John had δέ, and that the omission in 16.24 is an oversight by the author.²⁴ Second, Cyril's citation in *Catech. illum.* 16.24 has the present indicative λαμβάνει in verse 14b, unlike NA28 and *Catech. illum.* 17.11 that have the future indicative λήψεται/λήψεται. Assuming that Cyril's text read λαμβάνει in verse 15c, it could have happened that Cyril mistook 14b–c for 15c–d, as they are similar. Yet, it is difficult to say whether Cyril's text indeed read λαμβάνει in 15c, especially since in *Catech. illum.* 17.11, the citation reads λήψεται. It could be that λήψεται in *Catech. illum.* 17.11 is Cyril's harmonization to 14b, and that Cyril's New Testament had λήψεται in 14b, and λαμβάνει in 15c. However, according to Mullen, Cyril's text of John read λήψεται in both 14b and 15c, and the present indicative λαμβάνει in *Catech. illum.* 16.24 is a 'Cyril variant'.²⁵ Third, there are two inversions in *Catech. illum.* 17.11: one in verse 12a, where ὑμῖν and λέγειν are reversed, and one in verse 13d, where λαλήσει and ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ are reversed. Fourth, in verse 13c, Cyril's citation in *Catech. illum.* 17.11 reads διηγῆσεται κτλ., unlike ὁδηγήσει κτλ. in NA28. Fifth, in verse 13e, in *Catech. illum.* 17.11, the verb is in the aorist subjunctive form, unlike NA28, where the verb is in the future indicative form. Sixth, another difference between the citation in *Catech. illum.* 17.11 and NA28 stands in the absence or presence of ὑμῖν at the end of 15b.

Having considered Cyril's text of John 14:25–26 and 16:12–15, we turn to his use and interpretation of these passages. In *Catech. illum.* 16.14, Cyril focuses on the speaking of the Spirit and, thus, emphasises the Spirit's personhood. For this purpose, he cites several passages where the Spirit appears to be talking to different persons (to Philip in Acts 8:29, to Ezekiel in Ezek 11:5, and others). In this context, Cyril also cites John 14:26 partially, ἐκεῖνος ὑμᾶς διδάξει πάντα καὶ ὑπομνήσει ὑμᾶς πάντα ὅσα εἶπον ὑμῖν, which he interrupts before the relative clause with a brief comment: οὐκ εἶπε διδάξει μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑπομνήσει. While the other references depict the Spirit talking, the passage from John 14:26 indicates the content of the Spirit's communication which, according to Cyril, is

²⁴ See Mullen, *The New Testament Text of Cyril of Jerusalem*, p. 166, n. 65.

²⁵ See Mullen, *The New Testament Text of Cyril of Jerusalem*, pp. 166–167.

the teaching of Jesus. Cyril's comment highlights that Jesus does not describe the Spirit only as teaching, but also as reminding of his own words, which means that the teaching of Jesus and that of the Holy Spirit are not different but the same (οὐ γὰρ ἄλλα Χριστοῦ διδάγματα καὶ ἄλλα ἁγίου πνεύματος, ἀλλὰ τὰ αὐτά).

In *Catech. illum.* 16.24 Cyril describes the relationship between the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit with respect to their possession of spiritual gifts (χαρίσματα), saying that the Father gives to the Son and the Son shares with the Spirit (καὶ πατὴρ μὲν δίδωσιν υἱῷ, καὶ υἱὸς μεταδίδωσιν ἁγίῳ πνεύματι). In this context, Cyril quotes passages from Matt 11:17 and John 16:13–14. Although these texts do not talk about spiritual gifts, they are important to Cyril for their description of sharing between the Father and the Son, and respectively, between the Son and the Spirit. The passage from Matt 11:17 (πάντα μοι παρεδόθη ὑπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς μου) supports the first part of his claim, that the Father gives to the Son. The passage from John 16:13–14, especially verse 14b–c, supports the second part of Cyril's claim that the Son shares with the Spirit. Thus, Cyril concludes the three possess the same spiritual gifts (οὐκ ἄλλα πατρὸς χαρίσματα καὶ ἄλλα υἱοῦ καὶ ἄλλα ἁγίου πνεύματος).

In *Catech. illum.* 17.4, Cyril's aim is to show that the Holy Spirit is named in multiple ways in the Scriptures. For this purpose, he cites ὁ δὲ παράκλητος, τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον from John 14:26, and ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ ἐκεῖνος, τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας from John 16:13. He thus shows that 'Holy Spirit', 'Paraclete', and 'Spirit of truth' are titles that refer to one and the same entity.

After he presents four different interpretations concerning the descent of the Spirit at Jesus' baptism in *Catech. illum.* 17.9–10, in 17.11 Cyril sets out to offer another interpretation, which comes from Jesus' own words.²⁶ Accordingly, he cites passages about the Spirit such as John 3:5, Luke 11:13, John 4:23–24, Matt 12:28, 31–

²⁶ Consider how Cyril begins *Catech. illum.* 17.11: Καὶ περὶ μὲν τούτων ἴσως καὶ ἄλλως ἐξηγητέον. αὐτοῦ δὲ τοῦ σωτῆρος καὶ νῦν ἀκουστέον τῶν περὶ ἁγίου πνεύματος ῥημάτων, that is, 'Concerning these matters perhaps another explanation should be given; we should listen to the words of the Savior Himself regarding the Holy Spirit'. For the Greek text, see Reischl and Rupp, *Cyriilli Hierosolymarum archiepiscopi*, p. 262, and for the translation see McCauley and Stephenson, *The Works of Saint Cyril of Jerusalem*, p. 102.

32, John 14:16–17, 14:25–26, 15:26, 16:7–8, and 16:12–15. The entire section consists of these citations, which Cyril introduces with different formulas (φησὶ γάρ, καὶ πάλιν, καὶ πάλιν λέγει). However, he offers neither an interpretation of these passages, nor an explanation for why he chose to cite these passages as an interpretation of the Spirit's descent at Jesus' baptism.

In *Catech. illum.* 17.34, Cyril partially cites John 14:26 (ὁ δὲ παράκλητος, τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον), together with John 4:24 (πνεῦμα ὁ θεός), and Lam 4:20 (πνεῦμα πρὸ προσώπου ἡμῶν χριστὸς κύριος), to show that the word 'Spirit' is applied to all three divine persons in the Scripture. With this, he teaches his audience that the three, although sometimes named in a similar way, should not be confused.

Comparing Eusebius with Cyril

The exposition above has identified places in the writings of two fourth-century Christian authors where the full text or smaller passages of John 14:25–26 and John 16:12–15 are cited. It has also showed the form in which these passages are cited and how they are used and interpreted. Next, since both authors comment on the teaching function of the Paraclete, I will compare their views on the subject in relation to the biblical text which they present. Tables 5 and 6 display each author's text of John 14:25–26 and John 16:12–15. This text is a reconstruction based on the textual observations made above, which leaves out the variants created, unintentionally or not, by either of the two authors and aims to reflect the text of John 14:25–26 and 16:12–15 in the form available to them.

	Eusebius	Cyril
25. a	ταῦτα λελάληκα ὑμῖν,	ταῦτα λελάληκα ὑμῖν
b	παρ' ὑμῖν μένων·	παρ' ὑμῖν μένων·
26. a ₁	ὁ δὲ παράκλητος,	ὁ δὲ παράκλητος,
b	τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον,	τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον,
c	ὃ πέμψει ὁ πατὴρ μου ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου,	ὃ πέμψει ὁ πατὴρ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου,
a ₂	ἐκεῖνος ὑμᾶς διδάξει πάντα	ἐκεῖνος ὑμᾶς διδάξει πάντα
d	καὶ ὑπομνήσει ὑμᾶς πάντα	καὶ ὑπομνήσει ὑμᾶς πάντα
e	ὅσα εἶπον ὑμῖν	ὅσα/ᾶ εἶπον ὑμῖν

Table 5: John 14:25–26

Except for μου in Eusebius' text of 26c, and for ἄ in Cyril's text of 26e, the two texts of John 14:25–26 are identical.

	Eusebius	Cyril
12. a	ἔτι πολλὰ ἔχω λέγειν ὑμῖν	ἔτι πολλὰ ἔχω λέγειν ὑμῖν
b	ἀλλ' οὐ δύνασθε βαστάζειν ἄρτι·	ἀλλ' οὐ δύνασθε βαστάζειν ἄρτι·
13. a	ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ ἐκεῖνος	ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ ἐκεῖνος
b	τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας,	τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας,
c	διηγήσεται ὑμῖν τὴν ἀλήθειαν πάντα·	διηγήσεται ὑμῖν τὴν ἀλήθειαν πάντα·
d	οὐ γὰρ ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ λαλήσει,	οὐ γὰρ ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ λαλήσει,
e	ἀλλ' ὅσα ἀκούσει λαλήσει	ἀλλ' ὅσα ἂν ἀκούσῃ λαλήσει
f	καὶ τὰ ἐρχόμενα ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν.	καὶ τὰ ἐρχόμενα ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν.
14. a	ἐκεῖνος ἐμὲ δοξάσει,	ἐκεῖνος ἐμὲ δοξάσει,
b	ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λήψεται	ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λήψεται
c	καὶ ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν.	καὶ ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν.
15. a		πάντα ὅσα ἔχει ὁ πατὴρ ἐμὰ ἐστίν·
b		διὰ τοῦτο εἶπον ὑμῖν
c		ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λήψεται
d		καὶ ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν.

Table 6. John 16:12–15

The only difference is in verse 13e, where Cyril's text has the aorist subjunctive of ἀκούω, unlike the future indicative in Eusebius. The possible implication of this variant for the understanding of the Paraclete's teaching function will be highlighted in what follows.

As described above, Eusebius has two slightly different conceptions of the Paraclete's teaching function. First, interpreting John 14:25–26 in *Eccl. theol.* 3.5.6–8, he says that the Spirit completes the work of Jesus by teaching the disciples that which they did not understand from him. In addition, the Spirit also reminds the disciples of the words of Jesus. Second, interpreting John 16:12–15 in *Eccl. theol.* 3.5.15–19, Eusebius says that the Spirit teaches something that Jesus himself did not teach. He has a similar conception in *Comm. Ps.* 56, where he says that Jesus had greater things to teach the disciples, which they

could not bear yet, but the Spirit would teach them all the truth. It is not clear whether Eusebius viewed these two conceptions as complementary, in the sense that the object of the Spirit's teaching comprises both the things that Jesus taught but the disciples did not grasp and things that Jesus did not teach at all, or whether this distinction comes about unintentionally in Eusebius' interpretation of John 14:25–26 and 16:12–15. Also, it is difficult to say whether the form in which Eusebius read the text of either of the two Johannine passages influenced his understanding of the Paraclete's teaching.

Cyril touches on the subject of the Paraclete's teaching only when he interprets John 14:26 in *Catech. illum.* 16.14. Cyril's comment, οὐκ εἶπε διδάξει μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑπομνήσει, shows that he gives as much importance to the Paraclete's teaching as to the Paraclete's reminding, and that he conceives the didactic function of the Spirit as made up of both activities, unlike Eusebius in *Eccl. theol.* 3.5.6–8. Also, the way Cyril phrases his last comment on this subject, οὐ γὰρ ἄλλα Χριστοῦ διδάγματα καὶ ἄλλα ἁγίου πνεύματος, ἀλλὰ τὰ αὐτά, indicates his emphasis on the fact that the Paraclete teaches the same things as Jesus, and not things that Jesus never taught, as Eusebius thinks in *Eccl. theol.* 3.5.15–19. Since Cyril's text of John 14:25–26 is almost identical to Eusebius' text, it is improbable that the form of this text impacted Cyril's conception of the Paraclete's teaching. However, even if Cyril discusses the Paraclete's teaching function only in relation to John 14:25–26, there is a slight chance that the variant in the text of John 16:13e had some influence on him. In a text-critical study of John 16:13, Reimund Bieringer argues that the variant ἂν ἀκούσῃ is a theological correction, which links the Paraclete closely to the Father and the Son, and which emphasises that the Paraclete speaks only about what he hears from the Father and the Son.²⁷ Such an interpretation of ἂν ἀκούσῃ seems to overlap with Cyril's second comment, οὐ γὰρ ἄλλα κτλ., and suggests that this variant

²⁷ See Reimund Bieringer, 'The Spirit's Guidance into All the Truth: The Text-Critical Problems of John 16,13', in *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis. Festschrift J. Delobel*, ed. A. Denaux, Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 161 (Leuven: Leuven University Press; Leuven: Peeters, 2002), p. 196.

could be a factor that influenced Cyril's interpretation of the Paraclete's teaching function in contrast to Eusebius.

CONCLUSIONS

This paper has investigated how the teaching function of the Paraclete is understood by Eusebius of Caesarea and Cyril of Jerusalem based on John 14:25–26 and 16:12–15. It analysed first the text of the Fathers' citations in order to see the form in which they knew the biblical texts. Then, it looked at how the Fathers used and interpreted the two Johannine passages in their works. Lastly, it compared the two Fathers' text and exegesis of John 14:25–26 and 16:12–15 in order to see whether any differences between the fathers' interpretations are due to certain textual variants. From this, the following conclusions may be drawn. To begin with, in the works of Eusebius and Cyril, these two Johannine passages are used in different contexts, and they are never cited specifically to be interpreted themselves, but to support certain arguments. This makes it difficult to separate the interpretation of the passages from the arguments in which they were used, and in turn makes it difficult to compare their interpretation. Furthermore, the subject of the Paraclete's teaching function is never discussed for its own interest but is used to affirm or disprove particular ideas. Eusebius discusses the Paraclete's teaching in order to stress the Spirit's otherness in relation to Jesus in *Eccl. theol.* 3.5, and Cyril employs it to strengthen the Spirit's personhood in *Catech. illum.* 16.14. While Eusebius has two slightly different conceptions of the Paraclete's teaching based on John 14:25–26 and 16:12–15, Cyril discusses this subject only in relation to John 14:25–26. This makes it difficult to trace any influence that the form of the text could have had on the conceptualization of the Paraclete's teaching function. Finally, this study shows that Eusebius and Cyril knew John 14:25–26 and 16:12–15 in very similar forms, with some variation, and that in at least one case the form of the text may have influenced the understanding of the didactic function of the Paraclete.