Jaakko Olkinuora

Four Typological Images of Mary in the Hymnography for the Feast of the Entrance

Hymnographical texts often include references to biblical persons, places and events – references that are sometimes rather vague, at other times very clear. In the case of the feast of the Entrance of the Theotokos into the temple, the Εἰσόδια,[1] these references are numerous since Mary is often seen as the fulfillment of the ancient prophesies presented in the Old Testament. This article consists of two parts: a more general overview of typology as an exegetical method applied in hymnography, and a more detailed description of some of the typological images of Mary in the hymns of the feast of the Entrance.

Exegetics[2] in the field of Christian theology have been approached, to put it bluntly, from two directions. Probably because of the strong scholastic tendency, Western theology emphasizes archaeological-historical-philological research. On the other hand, the Eastern Orthodox Church has concentrated on *patristic*[3] exegetics, which is an expression of the Orthodox way of considering exegesis as something that takes place inside the Christian community. In other words, the Scriptures can be interpreted only by living according to the principles of those same Scriptures.[4] On account of the more "spiritual" character of Orthodox (read: patristic) exegetics, it has been often rejected by Western theologians as "unscientific" or "subjective". However, as John Breck remarks, this kind of approach could contribute quite significantly to "scientific" exegesis.[5]

This dichotomy in biblical research has led to misunderstandings of the exegesis practiced by the Church Fathers. Orthodox exegetics, often strongly influenced by so-called "critical" exegetics, are still somehow in a quest for the patristic θεωρία[6] as a method of interpreting the Scriptures. The Greek term θεωρία expresses more exactly what the Orthodox Church expects from her exegesis: an inner contemplation of the Scriptures rather than an "explanation" of them as the Greek term "exegetics" suggests.

Applying exegetical methods to hymnography

Because hymnography is written mainly by monastic authors, whose communities aim at living Christ's example in its fullness, it constitutes exegesis in the full patristic meaning of the word.

---

[1]	This is a feast that in the Orthodox Church belongs to the most important festal cycle of twelve great feasts and is celebrated on 21 November.

[2]	Exegetics is the field of research that concentrates on the Scriptures.

[3]	The term "patristic" itself is a disputed one. Some scholars limit it only to the years 100–451, the date of the Council of Chalcedon (see McGrath 1998, chapter 1), while some extend it to the Second Council of Nicaea (787). I have included even later church fathers in the patristic category, the most important of them being Gregory Palamas (1296–1359). This decision can be justified by the great importance of Gregory in later Orthodox thought.

[4]	Breck 2001, 31. In the experience of the Orthodox Church, a life conducted according to Christ is often combined with sanctity: this is why many of the great exegetes of the Church have been canonized as saints. The status of a saint also authorizes the exegetics of the person in question. This is very true also today, when believers ask for interpretations of the Bible from famous spiritual fathers in monasteries and parish churches.

[5]	Breck 2001, 30.

[6]	See Breck 2001, 30. Θεωρία is a term that has several meanings. A direct translation into English would be theory, but it also means "contemplation, a looking at". The term was already used in ancient Greece (by Plato among others) with the meaning of observance and then understanding through consciousness. In the Eastern Orthodox tradition this inner "looking at" is often considered as beholding God.

The exegetical methods used in hymnography are complex, and mix various times and places very efficiently, a matter that has often been underestimated in exegetical studies. However, as Christian Hannick points out,

> In hymnography, from the time of John of Damascus, and to a lesser extent from that of Sophronios of Jerusalem, the distinguishing features which set patristic homily apart from patristic scriptural commentary – namely, typology and allegory, which are far more than simply rhetorical devices – are developed and lead to an independent method of exegesis. Hymnography has its own rules, but it also adopts many taken from homiletics and develops them further. For the homily, a particular point in the liturgical proceedings was prescribed. Hymnography, on the other hand, includes without exception all biblical readings, and, using the format of the troparia and stichera to provide a commentary on individual verses of the psalms, applies a method which breaks down divisions between individual books of Scripture and between the Old and New Testament, in order to reconstruct the entirety of salvation history in relation to the *telos*, the *teleiosis*.[7]

In the case of Εἰσόδια, these individual books of Scripture also naturally include the Protoevangelium of James.[8] In this way the hymnographers manage to compose a creative synthesis between the Old and New Testaments as well as the apocryphal text. In contrast to the dogmatic expressions of the Holy Ecumenical Councils, hymnographical expression often avoids closed dogmatic structures in order to offer its listeners a diverse image of the event it describes: the theological teaching of the hymns is an image with many different points of view.[9] However, this does not apply to all hymnographical repertoire: there are also some hymns that copy and repeat the strictly dogmatic content of the Holy Synods.[10]

Often in the hymnographical material, these exegetical references are presented in the form of a metaphor. Probably because of this, Leena Mari Peltomaa has concentrated in her extensive research into the images of the Theotokos in the Akathistos hymn on the study of metaphors.[11] Nevertheless, in my opinion, remaining too much on the philological level sometimes leads one to ignore to some extent the typological-allegorical (and thus "spiritual") character of these metaphors.[12] As Christian Hannick points out, "it should be borne in mind though that typology is only distantly related to metaphor".[13]

As Hannick notes in the quotation above, the two traditional methods of exegetics both in the biblical and hymnographical fields of study are typology and allegory.[14] Usually Orthodox hermeneutics are concerned more with typology than allegory, mainly because of the radical allegorical interpretations of Origen among others.[15]

As Bogdan B. Bucur points out, this strict division of typology and allegory is no longer tenable.[16] The typological exegesis always includes also a spiritual dimension: the fathers in the

---

[7]   Hannick 2005, 76.

[8]   The Protoevangelium of James (*prot. Jas.*) was written during the 2nd century, probably in about 145 AD. It includes the events previous to the infancy narratives of the Gospels of Matthew and Luke. Thus, it also includes a narrative for the birth and childhood of Mary. The prot. Jas. is the most important source for the Εἰσόδια. An introduction as well as a critical edition with a translation can be found for example in Strycker 1961.

[9]   See Seppälä 2010, 93.

[10]   This is often true in Theotokia, which express the Christological teaching of the Church with different dogmas created by the Synods. Theotokia, however, were added to the standard service books only in the second millennium. Earlier hymnography, especially kontakia, does not emphasize dogmatic expression, but rather a dramatic tension between the characters who participate in the event.

[11]   Peltomaa 2001.

[12]   Peltomaa has added as an appendix to her dissertation a theory of metaphors, which refers very infrequently to theological and patristic authors, taking into consideration that the study is very theological in its character. Despite this, the theory itself as a philological-philosophical study is helpful to the reader.

[13]   Hannick 2005, 73.

[14]   The French theologian and cardinal Jean Daniélou especially promoted a clear distinction between these two interpretative methods (See Daniléou 1950). By typology we usually mean interpreting biblical events stressing connections between historical facts, i.e., persons, events and places of the Old Testament, with their parallels in the New Testament which are considered as their fulfilment. Allegory, on the other hand, is searching for more symbolic or "hidden" meanings of Old Testament phenomena, claiming that the real meaning is deeper than a connection with a New Testament event.

[15]   Breck 2001, 23. Origen, though a renowned theologian in his time, was later considered a heretic because of his dubious promotion of the teaching of the *apokatastasis*, the final reconciliation of all men with God.

[16]   Bucur 2007, 106.

school of Antioch merely wanted to emphasize that the essential meaning of the event has to be grounded in the historical event itself. In addition to the historical *typos* the fathers also included *theoria*, a spiritual view of typology. Bucur correctly points out that the term '*typology*', as we often understand it, is "a 19th century coinage and the allegory-typology distinction reflects the agenda of modern patristic scholars rather than the mind of patristic authors". He later suggests that typology in patristic thought is a species of allegory.[17] Christian Hannick adds that typology "is very frequently used" and it "gives an insight into the exegetical methods of mediaeval Byzantium".[18]

Hannick is very correct in remarking that typology as an exegetical method does not merely mean mentioning an Old Testament event as a mere *protyposis*, or foreshadowing of the New Testament person or event. Sometimes typological terms can be connected to several cases instead of a single Old Testament case.[19] Bucur shares Hannick's thinking concerning this diversity of typology. He points out that "Christian exegetes are reading the Scriptures in the light of Christ as much as they are reading Christ in the light of the Scriptures".[20] By this I understand that the relationship in typology between the *typos* and *antitypos* is more cyclical and dynamic than linear and static. This view is supported by John Breck's statement:

> The unilateral movement from past to future or from earth to heaven represents only part of the story. Most importantly, it must be understood that typology involves a *double movement:* from past to future, but also from the future to the past. That is, within the type the antitype or archetype is already proleptically present, present by anticipation, as in the formula "already but not yet (in fullness)".[21]

This dynamic typological movement, together with the complex typological connections between several factors, in my opinion tears down the strict division between allegory and typology in the traditional sense. Typology should be considered as a horizontal (historical), or sometimes even lateral (heaven-earth), allegory.[22]

Typological images of Mary in the hymnography of the Entrance

The feast of the Entrance is particularly interesting from the point of view of typology because of the typological elements on multiple levels. The whole feast, as I mentioned earlier, is based on the *prot. Jas.*, a large typological "essay" in itself. When we add the typological movement between the Theotokos and the Old Testament as well as later theology, a complex structure of different dimensions is apparent. In this article I concentrate on two biblical images of Mary (the dwelling-place of God, the sacrifice of humanity)[23] and two cases in which Mary is a *typos* for later theological thinking (the type of monasticism, the type of the Eucharist).

The Theotokos, the dwelling-place of God

Because of the Jewish temple cult, which is very strongly present in the feast of the Εἰσόδια, the most important typology presented for the Theotokos in the hymnography of the feast refers to the Theotokos as the place where God lived: the living temple of God dwelt in the physical temple of God. The epithets describing the Theotokos as a dwelling-place of God, deriving

---

[17]   Bucur 2007, 107–108.
[18]   Hannick 2005, 73.
[19]   Hannick 2005, 74–75.
[20]   Bucur 2007, 98. This view has become more and more popular in the field of patristic exegetics. Frances Young clearly states that typology, as we understand it today, is "a modern construct". Young 2002, 152.
[21]   Breck 2001, 23.
[22]   A very interesting rhetorical method that emphasizes this cyclical typology is the use of the word Σήμερον. In the Entrance, the most famous Σήμερον chant is the Doxastikon of the Aposticha by Sergios Hagiopolites: Σήμερον τὰ στίφη τῶν πιστῶν συνελθόντα... As Fr Alexander Schmemann, one of the most important liturgical theologians of the 20th century, pointed out, *today* in the liturgical experience of the Church expresses the eschatological character of Christianity: the events we celebrate come present *in this moment and time as well as space*. (See Schmemann 1994, 39).
[23]   These types are also discussed by Clark Carlton in his article "The Temple that Held God" (2006).

mainly from the Old Testament, are various: most common ones are "ὁ ναὸς ὁ ἔμψυχος", " ἡ οὐράνιος σκηνή", "κιβωτός". In addition, the different epithets of the Theotokos, including perhaps the most famous ones "Παναγία" and "Ὑπεραγία",[24] offer an evident typological relationship to the "holy of holies", "τὰ τῶν ἁγίων ἅγια",[25] with "ἡ τῶν ἁγίων ἁγία", used in hymnography.

The earliest clear references to the Theotokos as the temple of God are written by Proclus of Constantinople (*sed.* 434–46): "Ἡ Παρθένος οὐκ αὐτὴ θεός, ἀλλὰ Θεοῦ ναός."[26] He also contributes to hymnographical expressions by saying that "the Holy Spirit made the temple living": "Τὸ δὲ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον τὸν ναὸν ἐζωοπλαστεῖ."[27] These statements by Proclus were provoked by the heresies of Nestorius. To prevent Nestorian ideas of Christ only growing up "in the flesh" in Mary's womb, Proclus wanted to emphasize the eternal divinity of the second person by the expression "temple of God", "Θεοῦ ναός". As C. Clark Carlton points out, "by referring to the Virgin as the temple of God – not merely the temple of Christ's humanity – Proclus had essentially co-opted the role that Christ's humanity played in the drama of salvation and assigned it to Mary. (…) It is the Virgin, not the man Jesus, who is prepared by the Holy Spirit to be the dwelling place of God."[28] One could claim that drawing connections between the 5th century Proclus and later hymnography would be an exaggeration; however, Proclus's homilies were among the most famous patristic homilies on the Theotokos.[29]

Many of these epithets of the Theotokos are used by Germanos I of Constantinople in his sermon on the Entrance.[30] His homily includes the term "ὁ ναὸς ὁ ἔμψυχος", used several times in the hymns.[31] This is a term that had been used by several patristic authors.[32] An interesting question is whether Germanos himself – as a hymnographer for many Marian feasts – composed any hymns for this particular feast. The textual styles of the homilies bear some resemblance to some of the hymns.[33] Nevertheless, for lack of sufficient evidence, this idea remains merely a hypothesis.

Another important source for the patristic thought are the rubrics, especially the Biblical readings intended for each feast. The Old Testament readings for vespers of the Entrance differ from the standard pericopes for Marian feasts. The first reading (Ex. 40:15, 7, 9, 14, 28–29) speaks of the "Σκηνὴ τοῦ Μαρτυρίου," the Tabernacle, and the second reading (Kings 3 8:1–11) the "Σκήνωμα τοῦ Μαρτυρίου," another synonym for the Tabernacle. The Tabernacle is considered a type of the Theotokos, often referred to in the hymnography. The expressions "ἀμόλυντος σκηνή,[34]" "θεοχώρητος σκηνή,[35]" "οὐράνιος σκηνή" all express the typological relationship of the Theotokos with the Tabernacle, a typology also emphasized by Gregory Palamas in his homily on the Εἰσόδια.[36] According to Gregory, Mary is the "Tabernacle of the Logos, made without hands" ("ἡ ἀχειροποίητος σκηνὴ τοῦ Λόγου"). He also calls her the "true Tabernacle of God" ("ἡ ὄντως τοῦ Θεοῦ σκηνή"), and the answer for this he expresses quite clearly:

---

[24]   Both terms meaning "most holy".
[25]   A biblical expression for the holiest part of the Tabernacle and later of the Temple.
[26]   Constas 2003, 152.
[27]   Constas 2003, 47-48.
[28]   Carlton 2006, 121
[29]   Constas 2003, 57.
[30]   Τσάμη 2000, 34-48.
[31]   For example in the second sticheron kekragarion of the Great Vespers.
[32]   Gregory the Wonderworker (Homily no. 3, PG 10, 1177A), Epiphanios of Konstanteia (?) (Homily 5, PG 43, 496D), Modestos of Jerusalem (Εἰς τὴν Κοίμησιν τῆς Θεοτόκου 10, PG 86, 3301B), Iakobos Kokkinobaphetes (Λόγος 3, 10, PG 127, 609A) and John Chrysostom (?) (Εἰς τὸν Εὐαγγελισμόν, PG 50, 796).
[33]   One of his most "hymnographical" homilies is the homily on the feast of the Annunciation. He uses a series of χαιρετισμοί, two dialogues between Gabriel and Mary and Mary and Joseph. He also uses the akrostichon.
[34]   The first sticheron of Aposticha in the Small Vespers.
[35]   Third ode of the second canon of Orthros, fourth troparion.
[36]   Τσάμη 2000, 70-142.

Διὰ ταύτην ἄρα τοῦ Θεοῦ χωρίον ἔμπνουν ἐσομένην προορῶν, τὴν σκηνὴν ἐκείνην ἤγειρεν ὁ Μωϋσῆς καὶ ταύτης ἕνεκα τὰ ἄδυτα ἐκεῖνα προητοίμασε καὶ τὰ ἐσόμενα ταύτῃ μαθὼν ὑπὸ Θεοῦ τῶν καθ᾽ ὑπερβολὴν ὑπερεχόντων προσρημάτων ἠξίωσεν αὐτά, τὴν ἐκ πρώτης ὡς εἰπεῖν τριχὸς ἐξηλλαγμένην καὶ πάνθ᾽ ὑπερβάλλουσαν ἀξίαν ταύτης ἔργῳ τε καὶ λόγῳ τοῖς πᾶσι προδεικνύς.[37]

Gregory suggests that Moses built the Tabernacle (the typos) having in mind the Theotokos herself (the antitypos). Thus *Theotokos was present also in the original typos, the Tabernacle, not full, but partly.*

The reason that the Tabernacle held God inside it was the most holy object of the Jewish community, the Ark of the Covenant.[38] The third troparion of the ninth ode of the Canon says: "Παραδόξως προδιετύπου Ἁγνή, ὁ Νόμος σε σκηνὴν καὶ θείαν στάμνον, Ξένην κιβωτόν."[39] Also, in the hymns the Theotokos is often mentioned as the "living Ark": "Ὡς ἐμψύχῳ Θεοῦ κιβωτῷ ψαυέτω μηδαμῶς χεὶρ ἀμυήτων".[40] This reference itself has a double typology for the Theotokos: she is both the living κιβωτός, carrying in herself the living Law, Christ, but also a typology for her virginity: as the Ark of the Covenant should not be touched,[41] so shall the Virgin, the antitypos, not be touched (i.e., by destroying her virginity). The first Sticheron Kekragarion of the Great Vespers assures us that the Law living inside Theotokos really is Christ, the Logos:

Σήμερον πιστοὶ χορεύσωμεν, ἐν ψαλμοῖς καὶ ὕμνοις, τῷ Κυρίῳ ᾄδοντες, τιμῶντες καὶ τὴν αὐτοῦ, ἡγιασμένην σκηνήν, τὴν ἔμψυχον κιβωτόν, τὴν τὸν ἀχώρητον Λόγον χωρήσασαν.[42]

In addition to hymnographical references to the Theotokos as the κιβωτός, it is common also in homilies. Proclus mentions this in her fifth homily on the Holy Virgin Theotokos:[43] "Προσκυνεῖται ἡ Μαρία ὅτι γέγονε μήτηρ καὶ δούλη καὶ νεφέλη καὶ θάλαμος καὶ κιβωτὸς τοῦ δεσπότου.[44] "As Nicholas Constas summarizes, this typology is already present in the New Testament, where in the Gospel of Luke (1.39) the Visitation narrative is linked to 2 Kg. 6.2-11 (table 1).[45]

TABLE 1

2 Kg. 6.9	Lk. 1.43	2 Kg. 6.11	Lk. 1. 56
Πῶς εἰσελεύσεται πρὸς μὲ ἡ κιβωτὸς τοῦ κυρίου;	Πόθεν μοι τοῦτο ἵνα ἔλθῃ ἡ μήτηρ τοῦ κυρίου μου πρὸς με;	καὶ ἐκάθισεν ἡ κιβωτὸς τοῦ Κυρίου εἰς οἶκον Ἀβεδδαρὰ τοῦ Γεθθαίου μῆνας τρεῖς.	Ἔμεινε δὲ Μαριὰμ σὺν αὐτῇ ὡσεὶ μῆνας τρεῖς
How can the Ark of the Lord come to me?	Why is this granted to me, that the Mother of my Lord should come to me?	And the Ark of the Lord remained in the house of Abeddara the Gethite three months.	And Mary remained with her about three months.

---

[37] "Because of this, foreseeing that she would become a living dwelling-place of God, Moses built the tabernacle and because of her prepared these altars, and knowing from God that these things would happen to her, he reckoned it correct to call her by the most awesome names and in that way showed to all beforehand in deeds and words the special and amazing value that she had already from her childhood." Τσάμη 2000, 90.

[38] The holiness of the Ark was dependent on the Tablets of Stone containing the Ten Commandments.

[39] "In a strange manner the Law prescribes you, o Pure one, as the Tabernacle and the divine jar, the strange ark."

[40] From the Heirmos of the ninth ode of the Canon: "Let the hand of the uninitiated in no wise touch the living ark of God."

[41] 1 Sam 6:6–7.

[42] "Today let us believers dance with psalms and hymns chanting to the Lord, honouring also His sanctified Tabernacle, the living Ark, that fitted the unfitting Logos."

[43] Constas 2003, 262.

[44] Mary is venerated for she became a mother, a servant, a cloud, a bridal chamber, and the ark of the Lord.

[45] Constas 2003, 272.

Another linguistic evidence of this typology is, again, expressed in the events of the Annunciation.[46] The Archangel Gabriel cried out to Mary: "Πνεῦμα Ἅγιον ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ σὲ καὶ δύναμις ὑψίστου ἐπισκιάσει σοι.[47]" (Lk. 1.35) This phrase has its correspondence in Ex. 40:29: "ἐπεσκίαζεν ἐπ᾽ αὐτὴν ἡ νεφέλη καὶ δόξης Κυρίου ἐνεπλήσθη ἡ σκηνή.[48]"

THE THEOTOKOS, THE EXAMPLE OF MONASTICISM

Today, the feast of the Entrance is particularly loved by monastic communities all over the world: monastics see the Theotokos as their example in the ascetic life. The *Prot. Jas.* uses only one sentence to describe the life the Theotokos led in the temple: "Ἦν δὲ Μαρία ἐν ναῷ Κυρίου ὡσεὶ περιστερὰ νεμομένη καὶ ἐλάμβανε τροφὴν ἐκ χειρὸς ἀγγέλου.[49]" The presence of the "virgins of Israel" would suggest that there was a group of women living in celibacy inside the temple.[50] Another narrative concerning the Entrance, the Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew,[51] dedicates a long passage describing the monastic way of life Mary led in the temple (chapter VI). The character of the narrative reminds one of the Synaxaria. The Theotokos defends her virginity in a monologue that resembles those from early narratives about martyrs: she gives a full theological account of her ascetic calling.[52] The virtues mentioned in the text (prayers, vigils, humility, chanting, abstinence, virginity) are essential elements of the monastic way of life.[53]

The hymns do not include clear references to the Theotokos as a typos of monasticism, but Mary's life acquires a monastic character in some expressions. For example, Mary lived in the temple to prepare herself to become a dwelling place of Jesus ("καὶ ἑτοιμάζου γενέσθαι τοῦ Ἰησοῦ οἰκητήριον[54]"). In monastic life, one prepares oneself to be ready to receive the grace of God in a fuller form. It is noteworthy that though Mary was chosen to become God's Mother before all ages, she also needed this personal *ascesis* to prepare herself for the most important task ever entrusted to humankind. Theophylaktos of Achris suggests also another perspective for this need of education in the temple: Mary's parents admitted that bringing the Theotokos up would be a task too difficult for them to fulfil.[55]

Mary's entrance to the temple is also seen as a kind of monastic tonsure: "Τὰ τῆς νυμφεύσεως ἀπογράφονται θεῖα συμβόλαια.[56]" These "divine contracts" are also written while taking monastic vows, under which one commits oneself to become "a bride of Jesus". Also, the spiritual matureness mentioned in the narrative of pseudo-Matthew, is confirmed in the canon: "Νηπιάζουσα σαρκί καὶ τελεία τῇ ψυχῇ.[57]"

---

46   Carlton 2006, 108.
47   "The Holy Spirit will come upon you, and the power of the Most High will overshadow you."
48   "The cloud overshadowed it, and the tabernacle was filled with the glory of the Lord."
49   And Mary was in the temple of the Lord as a dove that is nurtured: and she received food from the hand of an angel.
50   Most scholars suggest that, according to historical and archaeological evidence, there was no "monastic order" of virgins inside the temple. However, in early rabbinic literature there is a reference to virgins who lived and worked in the Temple of Jerusalem. The tradition is mentioned, for example, in the apocalypse of Baruch. Also in the Jewish haggadah litterature it is said that when the temple was destroyed, the virgins that had weaved its curtain threw themselves in the fire and were burnt to death (Seppälä 2010, 35).
51   Today it is believed that this text was written during the 8th or 9th century, while the older belief was that the text was found by Hieronymus (331/348-419) in a Hebrew MS and then translated into Latin by him. See Τσάμη 2000, 30.
52   These kinds of dialogues or monologues are found in many early narratives, for example the Acta of the Martyrs of Scillium (180, in Latin), the Acta of Maximilianus (295, in Latin), and the Martyrio of Konon (from the 3rd century, in Greek). The last of these especially has a more complex theological character in the dialogue.
53   Most of these virtues are also mentioned in the akolouthia of the Great Schema. The "Katechesis" of the service mentions "φιλαδελφίαν, ἡσυχίαν, ἐπιείκειαν, εὐλάβειαν, μελέτην τῶν θείων λογίων, ἀνάγνωσιν, τήρησιν καρδίας ἐκ ῥυπαρῶν λογισμῶν, ἐργασίαν τὴν κατὰ δύναμιν, ἐγκράτειαν, ὑπομονὴν μέχρι θανάτου." (Ἀκολουθία 2003, 29).
54   Second apostichon.
55   "...ὁμολογοῦντες μέντοι καὶ ἄλλως ὑπὲρ αὐτοὺς εἶναι τὴν ἀνατροφὴν τῆς παιδός." (Τσάμη 2000, 55.)
56   "The divine contracts of becoming a bride are written." second canon, fifth ode, fourth troparion
57   "Child in flesh and perfect in spirit." second canon, sixth ode, fifth troparion.

In homiletics this monastic theme has understandably been most developed by Gregory Palamas – in order to support his hesychastic agenda. He reflects his own monastic life in the Theotokos. In the whole of homily 53, the most evident tendency is the promotion of the idea of θέωσις in Mary's life in the temple. She achieved an extreme θέωσις, concretely fitting God into her, through an ascetic life. Palamas believes that Mary achieved a true θεωρία in the Holy of Holies (where, during the period of the second temple, there was no Ark of the Covenant). According to Gregory, "the carrier angel thus is clearly a symbol of the angelic life of the Virgin at this early age."[58] She received divine teachings directly from God, but also learnt by hearing the Scriptures read in the temple every Saturday: "She listened carefully and with a great attention both to those that Moses wrote and to those that other prophets found out, when the whole people gathered together every Saturday outside the temple."[59]

Palamas lived centuries after the creation of the hymnographical material of the feast, so his thoughts clearly did not influence the hymnographers, but rather express the interpretation of the events during his time. However, his thinking concerning the Theotokos's years in the temple is not unique. Already some early Church fathers, for example Gregory the Theologian, mention this preparation in the temple. Gregory uses the term "προκάθαρσις".[60]

The Theotokos, the sacrifice of humanity

There is also another reason for the dwelling in the temple, mentioned also briefly in an earlier part of this article. The fourth sticheron Kekragarion of the Vespers of Nativity says: "Τί σοι προσενέγκωμεν Χριστέ, ὅτι ὤφθης ἐπὶ γῆς ὡς ἄνθρωπος δι᾽ ἡμᾶς; (--) ἡμεῖς δὲ Μητέρα Παρθένον.[61]" The Theotokos was a triple sacrifice: she was brought to the temple as a sign of gratitude on the part of her parents, but at the same time she was chosen in the eternal divine council to be the sacrifice of all humanity. In addition to this, she sacrificed herself to live in virginity for the rest of her life.[62] Both the hymns and the homilies on this feast emphasize the fact that the Theotokos came to the temple consciously and herself took the decision to dwell there, thus answering positively God's calling.

The background to this thinking is in the *Prot. Jas.* itself. This aspect of her dedication to virginity is well represented in the hymnography. An interesting typological reference is offered in the second troparion of the third ode of the canon for the forefeast: "Ζηλοῦσα τὴν πάλαι θεοφρόνως, ἡ Ἄννα εὐχὴν ἀποπληροῖ, καὶ σὲ προσανατίθεται, τῷ Ἱερῷ Πανάμωμε.[63]" Thus, theologically, Hannah is the typos of the Anna, the mother of the Theotokos, both offering their child to God.

This typology also helps us solve the problem of Mary as a sacrifice to the temple. According to the Levitical law, it was only allowed to sacrifice animals and plants, not men. However, one could vow a child to God and redeem the child back with a certain price (Lev. 27:1–8).[64] Clearly,

---

[58]　"Οὐκοῦν καὶ τῆς κατ᾽ἀγγέλους τῇ Παρθένῳ πολιτείας ἐν τούτῳ τῆς ἡλικίας ἐναργὲς δήπου σύμβολον ὁ διακομιστής." Τσάμη 2000, 120.

[59]　"Ὡς δὲ καὶ τῶν Μωσῇ γεγραμμένων καὶ τῶν τοῖς ἄλλοις προφήταις ἐκπεφασμένων κατηκροᾶτο μετὰ συνέσεως ἀκροτάτης τοῦ λαοῦ παντὸς ἔξωθεν ἑκάστου Σαββάτου διεξιόντος καθ᾽ ἃ νενόμιστο." Τσάμη 2000, 122.

[60]　Oratio 38:13 (PG 36, 325B).

[61]　"What should we offer to you, O Christ, for having become man for our sake? (--) We offer the Mother Virgin."

[62]　See Carlton 2006, 113.

[63]　"Rivalling the ancient Hannah in a godly manner, Anna fulfilleth her vow and dedicateth thee to the sanctuary, O all-blameless Virgin." (The name Hannah does not occur in the original Greek text, because the names Hannah and Anna are similar in biblical Greek). This is a part of a greater dependency between the two narratives: the birth and dedication of the Theotokos in the temple follows literarily a good deal of the narrative of the birth and dedication of Samuel (1 Sam 1-2), especially in the Septuagint. (Smid 1965, 39–40).

[64]　"And the Lord spoke to Moses, saying, 2 Speak to the children of Israel, and thou shalt say to them, Whosoever shall vow a vow as the valuation of his soul for the Lord, 3 the valuation of a male from twenty years old to sixty years old shall be his valuation shall be fifty didrachms of silver by the standard of the sanctuary. 4 And the valuation of a female shall be thirty didrachms. 5 And if it be from five years old to twenty, the valuation of a male shall be twenty didrachms, and of a female ten didrachms. 6 And from a month old to five years old, the valuation of a male shall be five didrachms, and of a female, three

in this case, the vowing was a result of Anna and Joachim's gratitude for the end of their long barrenness. The *prot. Jas.* mentions that Anna was the first one to dedicate the child to God, already before Joachim believed that his wife was pregnant.[65]

The hymnographic material has many references to the sacrifical character of Mary. She is called a "θυσία[66]" and a "θύμα,[67]" "προσφορά,[68]" "τριετίζουσα δάμαλις,[69]" "δῶρον.[70]" In particular, the second canon of the Orthros of the feast concentrates on the theme of sacrifice and includes the largest number of references to sacrificial terminology. However, in the homilies on the Entrance references to Mary's sacrificial character are very few.

The narrative relationship of *Prot. Jas.* with the dedication of Samuel in the temple has been shown several times in this article. When Hannah dedicated Samuel, she also sacrificed a three-year-old bull. However, when Joachim and Anna dedicated Mary, they did not bring any other sacrifices. Thus, the hymnography identifies Mary herself as the sacrifice that Hannah did: a three-year-old bull ("τριετίζουσα δάμαλις"). Thus, Mary *is* the sacrifice of the whole humanity, as the Nativity sticheron, quoted above, suggests.

The Theotokos, a prophecy of the Eucharist

MS Stavrou 109 includes a commentary on the Divine Liturgy with illustrations from the life of the Theotokos. It also includes a scene from the Entrance, where an angel feeds Mary during her stay in the Holy of the Holiest. *Prot. Jas.* mentions that the Theotokos received nurture from the hand of an angel:[71] in the tradition of the Church, this angel is identified as the Archangel Gabriel, the same angel that later announced the birth of Jesus.[72]

The hymnographical references to this "heavenly bread" are numerous, and they often have eucharistic connotations. The third sticheron of the Ainoi says: "Ἐπουρανίῳ τραφεῖσα, Παρθένε ἄρτῳ πιστῶς, ἐν τῷ Ναῷ Κυρίου, ἀπεκύησας κόσμῳ, ζωῆς ἄρτον τὸν Λόγον." The same expression, ἄρτος ζωῆς, is used in the canon of the preparation for the Holy Communion, more exactly in the first troparion of the first ode and the Theotokion of the third ode, where the Theotokos is told to be "ζωῆς τοῦ ἄρτου τράπεζα". Also, the hymnography assures us that the angel that served Mary was Gabriel: "Τότε καὶ Γαβριὴλ ἀπεστάλη πρὸς σὲ τὴν πανάμωμον, τροφὴν κομίζων σοι" (Doxastikon of the Kekragaria).

The homilies do not mention very specifically any connection between the Theotokos's food and the Holy Eucharist. However, many authors emphasize that what sustained her was not food from this world. Germanos tells us that Mary was "ἀμβροσίῳ τροφῆ δι᾽ ἀγγέλου τρεφομένη καὶ τοῦ θείου νέκταρος ποτιζομένη". Ambrosia and nectar were considered food of gods in ancient Greek mythology,[73] thus representing the immortal character of the Divine Eucharist.[74] The clearest eucharistic reference, in my opinion, is by Theophylaktos of Achris. He emphasizes the meaning of the feast and its single events in the lives of the believers. Thus, he

---

didrachms of silver. 7 And if from sixty year old and upward, if it be a male, his valuation shall be fifteen didrachms of silver, and if a female, ten didrachms. 8 And if the man be too poor for the valuation, he shall stand before the priest; and the priest shall value him: according to what the man who has vowed can afford, the priest shall value him."

[65]   "ἐὰν γεννήσω εἴτε ἄρσενα εἴτε θήλειαν, προσάξω αὐτὸ δῶρον αὐτῶ Κυρίῳ τῷ Θεῷ μου, καὶ ἔσται λειτουργῶν αὐτῷ πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς ζωῆς αὐτοῦ." (*Prot. Jas.* 4.1)

[66]   The first sticheron kekragarion of the Small Vespers.

[67]   The second sticheron kekragarion of the Small Vespers.

[68]   The first sticheron of the Lite.

[69]   Doxastikon of the Lite.

[70]   Second canon.

[71]   "Ἦν δὲ Μαριὰμ ἐν τῷ ναῷ Κυρίου ὡς περιστερὰ νεμομένη καὶ ἐλάμβανεν τροφὴν ἐκ χειρὸς ἀγγέλου." (*Prot. Jas.* 8.1)

[72]   Perhaps because of this, in the hymns there are several references to the Annunciation.

[73]   Homer, Iliad xiv.170.

[74]   For example, the expression of the first troparion of the first ode of the canon of the Holy Communion: "Ἄρτος ζωῆς αἰωνιζούσης..."

presents the "heavenly aliment" as a model for the Holy Communion: "Οὕτω δὴ τραφείσῃ τῷ θείῳ ἄρτῳ καὶ μυστικῷ δι᾽ ἀγγέλου κομιζομένῳ καὶ διδομένῳ σοι, εἴπερ ἄγγελος Κυρίου ὁ ἱερεὺς καὶ λέγεται καὶ πιστεύεται.[75]"

Gregory Palamas also sees a biblical typology in the angel that served Mary. The Theotokos had to be served by the angels, not overshadowed by them like the Ark of the Covenant, because she is higher in honour than all the angels. Also, the angels had to be real, not golden statues as in the case of the Ark, because she is the true Ark.[76]

- - -

In this article, I have aimed at analysing and explaining briefly the biblical and patristic background of four typologies of Mary in the hymnography of the feast of the Entrance. However, the next step in studying hymnography is a more complete view of the character of the poetry. Thus far the study of hymnography has remained separated over different fields of study. Philologists approach it linguistically and artistically, theologians often patristically or biblically and musicologists from a musical point of view. However, hymnography as a discipline combines all of these features. A deep insight into the typological structures of the hymns, is nevertheless, a prerequisite for a fuller understanding of the structure of the text. That is why I believe that this kind of study is important to musicologists and even to church singers and composers. They are, after all, in the context of a divine service, responsible for the correct rendering of the text.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Breck, John, *Scripture in Tradition: The Bible and its Interpretation in the Orthodox Church*, Crestwood NY 2001.

Bucur, Bogdan G., *Exegesis of Biblical Theophanies in Byzantine Hymnography: Rewritten Bible*, Theological Studies 68 (2007), pp. 92–112.

Carlton, Clark C., *"The Temple That Held God": Byzantine Marian Hymnography and the Christ of Nestorius*, St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly 50 (2006), pp. 99–125.

Constas, Nicholas, *Proclus of Constantinople and the Cult of the Virgin in Late Antiquity*, Leiden 2003.

Daniléou, Jean, *Sacramentum futuri: Études sur les origines de la typologie biblique* Paris 1950.

Hannick, Christian, *The Theotokos in Byzantine hymnography: typology and allegory*, in *Images of the Mother of God*, edited by Maria Vassilaki. Ashgate, 2005, pp. 69–76.

McGrath, Alister, *Historical Theology: An Introduction to the History of Christian Thought*, Oxford 1998.

Peltomaa, Leena Mari, *The Image of the Virgin Mary in the Akathist Hymn*, Leiden 2001.

Schmemann, Alexander, *Johdatus liturgiseen teologiaan*, Joensuu 1994.

Seppälä, Serafim, *Elämän äiti – Neitsyt Maria varhaiskristillisessä teologiassa*, Helsinki 2010.

Smid, Harm Reinder, *Protoevangelium Jacobi: A Commentary*, translated by G. E. van Baaren-Pape, Apocrypha Novi Testamenti 1, Assen 1965.

---

[75]   Τσάμη 2000, 66.

[76]   "Ἀγγέλων τύποι χρυσήλατοι περιίσταντο τὴν κιβωτὸν ἐπισκιάζοντες, τὴν δὲ ἀληθινὴν ταύτην κιβωτὸν οὐχ οἱ τύποι τῶν ἀγγέλων, ἀλλ᾽ αὐτοὶ οἱ ἄγγελοι, καὶ τὸ μεῖζον, ὅτι μηδ᾽ ἐπισκιάζοντες, ἀλλὰ διακονοῦντες καὶ τὰ πρὸς τροφὴν ὑπηρετούμενοι." (Τσάμη 2000, 118.)

de Strycker, Émile, *La forme la plus ancienne du Protoévangile de Jacques,* Subsidia Hagiographica, no. 33. Bruxelles 1961.

Young, Frances M., *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture,* Peabody Mass., 2002.

Ἀκολουθία τοῦ μεγάλου καὶ ἀγγελικοῦ μοναχικοῦ σχήματος, Λειτουργικὰ βιβλία 1, ἱερὰ βασιλικὴ καὶ σταυροπηγιακὴ μονὴ Μαχαιρᾶ, Κύπρος 2003.

Τσάμη, Δ. Γ., *Θεομητορικόν. Ανθολογία εκκλησιαστικών κειμένων και εικόνων προς τιμήν της Υπεραγίας Θεοτόκου Μαρίας. Τόμος β': Εισόδια, Ευαγγελισμός, Θεοτόκος και Ελισάβετ,* Θεσσαλονίκη 2000.