

---



---

## APPENDIX E: MARK 6:3 - THE 'BROTHERS' OF THE LORD

---



---

If we exclude the case of Helvidius (c. 370s) and possibly Tertullian (c. 220),<sup>a</sup> the consistent tradition of the early Fathers and writers has been to call the Mother of the Lord “ever-virgin,” (*aeiparthenos*) and this in spite of numerous references to the “brothers and sisters” of Jesus and possibly problematic texts such as Matthew 1:24–25.

In contrast with the early Reformers (notably Luther and Calvin) who maintained the view that Mary did not have children with Joseph, most modern Protestants (especially Evangelicals) seem quite eager to affirm the very opposite; that Mary did have a normal marital life with Joseph, and that James ‘the Lord’s brother’<sup>b</sup> was indeed our Lord’s younger brother in the full sense of the word. While it may be argued that the traditional position aimed at safeguarding the ever-virginity of Mary the Theotokos,<sup>c</sup> it is quite clear that the modern Protestant position is, in part, an attempt to uphold the dignity of marriage and a counter-reaction to extremely ascetic views (such as St. Jerome’s).

### THREE VIEWS

Three theories have been presented to account for the complex philological,<sup>d</sup> contextual and theological data contained in Holy Scripture.

The so-called **Epiphanian view** (named after St. Epiphanius of Salamis in Cyprus) is the traditional position of Eastern Orthodoxy and the preferred exegesis of the Greek Fathers. It holds that the brothers and sisters of the Lord are most probably children of Joseph by a previous marriage as well as other close relatives such as cousins, etc.<sup>e</sup>

The **Helvidian view** (named after Helvidius who was Jerome’s opponent in the controversy) is that of most Evangelicals and Protestants today: it holds that the “brothers and sisters” mentioned in the New Testament are children which Joseph had with Mary subsequent to the birth of Jesus.

Finally, what I shall call the **Jeromian view**<sup>f</sup> is named after St. Jerome who did not accept the idea that the “brothers and sisters” could have been children of Joseph (whose virginity he also sought to uphold). Instead, he proposed an interpretation of the Scriptural data which concluded that the “brothers and sisters” were in fact close cousins. This is the preferred (if not official) position of Roman Catholic theology.

As we shall see, the Scriptural data is more complex than it may seem. In terms of understanding who the *adelphoi* of the Lord might be, the discussion will center on the identity of “Mary of Clopas” and “James, the Lord’s brother.”

---

<sup>a</sup> (neither of which were saints or Fathers)

<sup>b</sup> Galatians 1:19; also 1 Corinthians 9:5

<sup>c</sup> See Origen’s opinion below

<sup>d</sup> Philology is the study of ancient texts and languages

<sup>e</sup> This would include the children of Clopas (Joseph’s brother) who would qualify as cousins (Jesus being Joseph’s adoptive son).

<sup>f</sup> Also called the Hieronymian view

## DOGMAS AND CONVICTIONS

From an Eastern Orthodox perspective, it is important to understand that the Orthodox Faith does not include Marian dogmas as such: even the dogmatic title 'Theotokos' belongs to the realm of Christology, not 'Mariology:' it is a soteriological dogma about the nature of Christ, not about his mother. The same can be said about the belief in the Dormition/Assumption of the Virgin Mary which is a dogma in Roman Catholicism<sup>a</sup> but not in Eastern Orthodoxy. Within an Eastern Orthodox context, these should be considered as "ecclesial convictions:" the Church is convinced that these things are true (that she remained ever-virgin and that "in giving birth, you preserved your virginity. In falling asleep you did not forsake the world, O Theotokos. You were translated to life, O Mother of Life<sup>b</sup>"), but these truths, although precious, do not belong to the essence of the gospel.<sup>c</sup> Hence, every Orthodox liturgical service includes several references to "our most holy, pure, blessed, and glorious Lady, the Theotokos and ever-virgin Mary." This confident conviction is also expressed in canon 2 of the Fifth Ecumenical Council at Constantinople in 553:<sup>d</sup>

If anyone does not confess that there were two nativities of the Word of God, one before the ages... the other in the last days... who came down from heaven, and was incarnate of the holy, glorious ever virgin Mother of God Mary, and was born of her, let him be anathema.

However, St. Basil – himself as all Orthodox should be, a believer in the perpetual virginity of the Theotokos – could still write that:

[The opinion that Mary bore several children after Christ] ... is not against the faith; for virginity was imposed on Mary as a necessity only up to the time that she served as an instrument for the Incarnation. On the other hand, her subsequent virginity was not essential to the mystery of the Incarnation. (*Homilia in sanctam Christi generationem*, PG 31:1468)

Nevertheless, the same text<sup>e</sup> also contains the following admonition:

The friends of Christ do not tolerate hearing that the Theotokos ever ceased to be a virgin... (§5)

This Orthodox position is consistent with the exegesis and teachings of Origen, St. Gregory of Nyssa<sup>f</sup> and St. John Chrysostom among others. Commenting on the Gospel of Matthew, the great preacher noted:

When Joseph had taken Mary [as wife], he did not know her until she had brought forth her first-born Son.' Here, [Matthew] used the word until, not that you should suspect that afterwards he did know her, but to inform you that before the birth, the Virgin was wholly untouched by man. But why then, it may be said, did he use the word until? Because it is usual in Scripture to do this and to use this expression without reference to limited times... Here, likewise, it uses the word until to make certain what was before the birth, but as to what follows, it leaves you to make the inference. Thus, what it was necessary for you to learn of Him, this he said; that the Virgin was untouched by man until the birth; but that which both was seen to be a consequence of the former statement, and was acknowledged, this in its turn he leaves for you to perceive; namely, that not even after this, she having so become a mother, and having been counted worthy of a new sort of travail, and a child-bearing so strange, could that righteous man ever

<sup>a</sup> Defined by Pope Pius XII in 1950 (*Munificentissimus Deus*). "Hence if anyone, which God forbid, should dare willfully to deny or to call into doubt that which we have defined, let him know that he has fallen away completely from the divine and Catholic Faith"

<sup>b</sup> Tropar for the Feast of Dormition

<sup>c</sup> That is, they are not dogmas

<sup>d</sup> Also, the Lateran Council of 649 (Rome) which confessed the same belief can be considered part of Orthodox tradition.

<sup>e</sup> (whose authenticity is disputed, as is the case of many patristic writings)

<sup>f</sup> See *On Virginity*, 13

have endured to know her. For if he had known her, and had kept her in the place of a wife, how is it that our Lord commits her, as unprotected, and having no one, to His disciple, and commands him to take her to his own home? (St. John Chrysostom, *On the Gospel of Matthew*, V.5)

### THE NEW TESTAMENT TEXTS

This exegesis by a native Greek speaker and Biblical exegete leads us back to the question of the Scriptural terminology:

YLT<sup>a</sup> Matthew 1:18 And of Jesus Christ, the birth was thus: For his mother Mary having been betrothed to Joseph, before their coming together, she was found to have conceived from the Holy Spirit,

YLT Matthew 1:24 And Joseph, having risen from the sleep, did as the messenger of the Lord directed him, and received<sup>b</sup> his wife,

YLT Matthew 1:25 And did not know her until<sup>c</sup> she brought forth her son -- the first-born, and he called his name Jesus.

YLT Luke 2:7 And she brought forth her son -- the first-born, and wrapped him up, and laid him down in the manger, because there was not for them a place in the guest-chamber.

YLT Matthew 12:46 And while he was yet speaking to the multitudes, lo, his mother and brethren had stood without, seeking to speak to him, and one said to him, 'Behold, your mother and your brothers stand outside, seeking to speak to you.' And he answering said to him who spoke to him, 'Who is my mother? And who are my brothers?'

YLT Matthew 13:55 Is not this the carpenter's son? Is not his mother called Mary, and his brothers James, and Joses, and Simon, and Judas? And his sisters -- are they not all with us?

RSV Mark 3:31 And his mother and his brothers came; and standing outside they sent to him and called him.

YLT Luke 8:19 And there came unto him his mother and brothers, and they were not able to get to him because of the multitude,

YLT John 2:12 after this he went down to Capernaum, he, and his mother, and his brothers, and his disciples; and there they remained not many days.

RSV John 7:1-5 After this Jesus went about in Galilee; he would not go about in Judea, because the Jews sought to kill him... So his brothers said to him, "Leave here and go to Judea, that your disciples may see the works you are doing. For no man works in secret if he seeks to be known openly. If you do these things, show yourself to the world." For even his brothers did not believe in him...

YLT John 7:10 And when his brothers went up, then also he himself went up to the feast, not manifestly, but as in secret...

YLT Acts 1:14 These all were continuing with one accord in prayer and supplication, with women, and Mary the mother of Jesus, and with his brothers...

YLT Galatians 1:19 And other of the apostles I did not see, except James, the brother of the Lord...

As we can see, the argumentation in favor of the Helvidian/Protestant view rests on what seems to be the most natural reading of the text, especially from a modern mindset and considered in a translated version. Let us then review these texts in order.

As John Chrysostom observed, Matthew 1:18 stresses the fact that St. Joseph had positively nothing to do with the conception of Jesus. Even though he was betrothed to

<sup>a</sup> YLT = Young's Literal Translation, used here for accuracy and adapted by the editor

<sup>b</sup> παρέλαβεν can also mean "to take charge / responsibility" for

<sup>c</sup> Greek ἕως ου

Mary, he had not known her before she became pregnant, and Matthew makes sure that this point is established so that the application of Isaias (Isaiah) 7:14 LXX can be justified. As all scholars recognize, this text gives no information as to what happened afterwards. In fact, Matthew 1:24 tells us that following a supernatural dream, the righteous Joseph accepted to “take charge of her,” “to take her to himself,” or “to take her home.” The Greek word παρέλαβεν can have a variety of meanings, but the traditional Orthodox understanding is that Joseph accepted to continue his responsibility of protection towards Mary in spite of her unexpected (and supernatural) pregnancy.

Matthew 1:25 contains the controversial expression “until” which may certainly indicate a reversal in the course of action, especially in its ἕως ου form. We have already encountered the exegesis presented by St. John Chrysostom which refuted the idea of reversal in the previous course of action (which was abstinence). In the light of recent attempts by Protestant apologists<sup>a</sup> to establish a rule of Greek construction to the effect that ἕως ου would always imply a reversal, it is especially important to realize that both Chrysostom and Origen (who rejected the reversal idea) were intimately conversant with the Greek language in its manifold forms,<sup>b</sup> especially that of the Septuagint and of the New Testament. If ἕως ου always meant reversal for native Greek speakers, this would have been known to all and their arguments would have been absurd. Because Origen was the foremost Greek scholar of the Early Church, his assessment cannot be refuted by modern speculations as to the possible exclusive meaning of ἕως ου at that time that Matthew was composed:

For if Mary, as those declare who with sound mind extol her, had no other son but Jesus, and yet Jesus says to His mother, Woman, behold thy son... (*Commentary on John*, 1.6)

The Book [the Protoevangelium] of James [records] that the brothers of Jesus were sons of Joseph by a former wife, whom he married before Mary. Now, those who say so wish to preserve the honor of Mary in virginity to the end, so that body of hers which was appointed to minister to the Word... might not know intercourse with a man after the Holy Spirit came into her and the power from on high overshadowed her. And I think it in harmony with reason that Jesus was the first-fruit among men of the purity which consists in [perpetual] chastity, and Mary was among women. For it were not pious to ascribe to any other than to her the first-fruit of virginity. (Origen, *Commentary on Matthew*, 2:17 [A.D. 248]).

The Greek Fathers knew their beloved language quite well, and they understood the permanent influence of Septuagintal terminology in the New Testament,<sup>c</sup> even as “Thou shalt not” is used and understood by all even to this day.

In Luke 2:7, the “firstborn” argument (with the suggestion that “firstborn” implies subsequent children) seems especially weak since *prototokos* only implies a special legal status for “the one who opens the womb” (Exodus 13:2, Numbers 8:16).<sup>d</sup>

We then arrive to the meaning of the Greek word *adelphos* (brother). Obviously, this word can have the meaning of brother in the biological sense and this can be generally taken as the natural sense (as in Matthew 4:21 to describe the relationship of James and John).<sup>e</sup> Moreover, we should note that the Greek language had a specific word for

<sup>a</sup> Such as Eric Svendsen in *Who Is My Mother? The Role and Status of the Mother of Jesus in the New Testament and Roman Catholicism*

<sup>b</sup> Attic, Koine, LXX

<sup>c</sup> This is relevant to the use of *heos* and *adelphos*

<sup>d</sup> It should also be noticed that “firstborn” is only applied in Luke’s gospel which focuses on Mary (by contrast with Matthew’s gospel which focuses on Joseph). The Epiphonian view excludes the possibility that Jesus could have been Joseph’s “firstborn” (in a legal sense).

<sup>e</sup> In Mark 6:17, *adelphos* clearly means half-brother

cousin (*anepsios*) and kinsman (*sungenes*), although the latter had a very wide meaning, most often that of “fellow countryman.”

In the Septuagint, *adelphos* often meant “close relative,”<sup>a</sup> and it is interesting that in the New Testament, *adelphos* is best translated as “close one,” both in the biological and spiritual sense. If we consider the New Testament use of *adelphos* in the framework of the Epiphonian view, it becomes apparent that neither *anepsios* nor *sungenes* would do: the Theotokos would have been a widow with an only-son, and she would have been “adopted” by the family clan (or clans – both on Joseph’s side and her own). Hence, the *adelphoi* would have been a combination of step-brothers (Joseph’s sons by a previous marriage) and cousins (through Mary’s relatives and through Clopas who may have been Joseph’s brother). In summary, *adelphoi* is the word that we should expect to find in the New Testament to describe the Lord’s ‘close relatives’ but not necessarily ‘biological siblings.’

At this point, we can see that there are no direct, unambiguous reasons that would force the biblical student to conclude that Joseph and Mary had other children. Indeed, it is significant that no one in Scripture is called son or daughter of Mary, except Jesus Christ himself. In fact, we can now turn to positive evidence, or at least indications that Jesus was in fact the first-born and only-born son, as this was discerned by the God-illuminated Fathers.

### POSITIVE EVIDENCE AND INDICATIONS

Mark 6:3, which mentions the *adelphoi* of Jesus, may also indicate that only Jesus was *the* son of Mary:

Is this not the carpenter, *the* son of Mary and brother of James and Joses and Judas and Simon, and are not his sisters here with us?" And they took offense at him.

This point, although minor, should be noted, especially in light of the fact that no one else in Scripture is called “son of Mary.”

One of England’s finest scholars, Richard Bauckham,<sup>b</sup> offered a comprehensive analysis of this text in the *Catholic Biblical Quarterly*.<sup>c</sup> When “son of Mary” is used in Mark 6:3, Bauckham contends that calling Jesus by his mother’s name (a metronymic) indicates that locally, there was knowledge that Jesus was to be distinguished from his “step brothers and sisters” because the locals knew that these *adelphoi* had different mothers. Bauckham cites various Old Testament genealogies where sons are ‘sons of a woman’ (named after their mother, not their father) to support this view.<sup>d</sup>

Another indication that the *adelphoi* were not younger brothers of Jesus is that their forceful attitude is at odds with the respect normally accorded to the elder brother. This is especially noticeable in Mark 3 and John 7.

Certainly the most significant indication that the *adelphoi* were not sons of Mary and Joseph is found in the dialogue at cross when Mary and John are entrusted to each other as Mother and Son:

<sup>a</sup> For instance, in Genesis 14:14,16; 29:12,15

<sup>b</sup> Pr. Bauckham has adopted the Epiphonian view which is the preferred view in the Eastern Orthodox tradition. For a full documentation, see his *Jude and the Relatives of Jesus in the Early Church*

<sup>c</sup> Issue 56; 1994 - pp. 686-700

<sup>d</sup> Hur the firstborn of Ephrath (1 Chron 2:50; 4:4), Adonijah son of Haggith (1 Kgs 1:5, 11; 2:13; cf. 2 Sam 3:2-5; 1 Chron 3:1-9), other sons of David in rabbinic texts: b. Bat. 109b; b. Ketub. 62b, Philo, Fug. 73., Joseph and Aseneth 22:11

When Jesus saw his mother, and the disciple whom he loved standing near, he said to his mother, "Woman, behold, your son!" Then he said to the disciple, "Behold, your mother!" And from that hour the disciple took her to his own home. (John 19:26-27)

This account only makes sense if the Mother of the Lord had lost her only son and needed to be entrusted to a new 'son' who would look after her. If Mary was the mother of several other children by Joseph, this entrusting to John would be neither necessary nor socially acceptable. This was, for instance, St. Hilary's interpretation:

If they [the brethren of the Lord] had been Mary's sons and not those taken from Joseph's former marriage, she would never have been given over in the moment of the passion [crucifixion] to the apostle John as his mother, the Lord saying to each, 'Woman, behold your son,' and to John, 'Behold your mother' [John 19:26-27], as he bequeathed filial love to a disciple as a consolation to the one desolate" (Hilary of Poitiers, *Commentary on Matthew*, 1:4 [A.D. 354]).

The Protestant rebuttal that Mary needed to be entrusted to a believer because her alleged 'other children' did not believe in Jesus is untenable. There is no indication that **none** of the Lord's relative believed in him and our Lord must have known that he would personally appear to James<sup>a</sup> (and perhaps to his other *adelphoi*) and that the latter would soon become not only a 'Christian' but even the first bishop of the Mother Church of Jerusalem. The dialogue at the cross is perhaps the most compelling piece of evidence that the *adelphoi* could not have been Mary's children.

Indeed, the grief which the Holy Theotokos endured at the foot of cross, described in Simeon's prophecy as "a sword will pierce your soul,"<sup>b</sup> must have been that of a mother mourning for her only son:

NIV Zechariah 12:10 "And I will pour out on the house of David and the inhabitants of Jerusalem a spirit of grace and supplication. They will look on me, the one they have pierced, and they will mourn for him **as one mourns for an only child, and grieve bitterly for him as one grieves for a firstborn son.**

This may explain why, on his own initiative, the Lord took it upon himself to approach the funeral procession of Nain:

Soon afterwards he went to a town called Nain, and his disciples and a large crowd went with him. As he approached the gate of the town, a man who had died was being carried out. He was his mother's only son, and she was a widow; and with her was a large crowd from the town. When the Lord saw her, he had compassion for her and said to her, "Do not weep." Then he came forward and touched the bier, and the bearers stood still. And he said, "Young man, I say to you, arise!" The dead man sat up and began to speak, and Jesus gave him to his mother. (Luke 7:11-15 RSV)

As a result, postulating the existence of 'other children of Mary' has the result of depriving the Mother of our Lord of a fullness of her unique grief as a widow losing her only son in fulfillment of the texts presented above.

Another passage which points to Mary's perpetual virginity is Luke 1:34:

YLT Luke 1:31 And behold, you shall conceive in the womb, and shall bring forth a son, and call his name Jesus; 1:34 And Mary said to the messenger, 'How shall this be, seeing a husband I do not know?'

In the context of the Helvidian theory, this dialogue makes little sense: if Mary, who was engaged and about to get married, indented to have a usual marital relationship with Joseph, it would have been with the expectation that she would naturally conceive a child. The answer should have been, "Yes, I shall conceive because I am about to get married, and you Gabriel are telling that it shall be a son and that he will be great." Instead, the idea that she will conceive is seen as impossible and the reply seems to

<sup>a</sup> 1 Corinthians 15:7

<sup>b</sup> Luke 2:35

indicate that Mary was a consecrated virgin who had taken a vow of virginity. This is the understanding presented in an influential early Christian text known as the *Protevangelium of James*<sup>a</sup> where Joseph is presented as a widower with other children who would act as betrothed protector of the Virgin.

The New Testament gives us an indication that this practice of ‘betrothal protection,’ undoubtedly unusual to modern minds, was widely adopted, probably in imitation of the Theotokos and St. Joseph:

<sup>36</sup>Nevertheless, if any man thinks that he is behaving inappropriately toward his virgin,<sup>b</sup> if she has past the flower of her age, and if it is required, let him do what he wills:<sup>c</sup> he does not sin, let them marry. <sup>37</sup>As for the one who stands steadfast in his heart, (having no necessity, but having control over his own heart to keep his virginity): he does well. <sup>38</sup>And so, he who marries his [betrothed] virgin does well, and he who does not does better. (EOB: 1 Corinthians 7:36-38)

Finally, we should consider the age relationship between Jesus and his most prominent *adelphos*: James. The Helvidian view would require that Joseph and Mary would have had six to seven children including Jesus, and that James would have been Jesus’ ‘younger brother.’ Not only is this perspective improbable practically and culturally, it is also contradicted by at least one indication that James was older than Jesus. Although neither Hegesippus nor Eusebius specifically addressed James’ age at his martyrdom in 62-66 AD, Epiphanius (†403) indicated that he was ninety-two years old. However, James would have had to be less than 62-68 years old at his death for the Helvidian view to be tenable.

## THEOLOGY AND TYPOLOGY

In addition to the historic-textual data discussed above, the fact that the inspired Scriptures present the Theotokos as the antitype of the holy dwelling place of God, especially the Ark is significant. This typology, presented in the introductory section of the EOB, is unmistakable and precludes the idea that any human hand would have touched the Ark of God, both in type and fulfillment.<sup>d</sup>

When the issue of the perpetual virginity of the Theotokos came under discussion, some of the Fathers, notably St. Ambrose and St. Augustine, also pointed to Ezekiel’s vision:

Ezekiel 44:1 Then he brought me back to the outer gate of the sanctuary, which faces east; and it was shut. The Lord said to me: This gate shall remain shut; it shall not be opened, and no one shall enter by it; for the Lord, the God of Israel, has entered by it; therefore it shall remain shut. Only the prince, because he is a prince, may sit in it to eat food before the Lord; he shall enter by way of the vestibule of the gate, and shall go out by the same way. Then he brought me by way of the north gate to the front of the temple; and I looked, and behold, the glory of the Lord filled the temple of the Lord; and I fell upon my face.

As heirs of ancient Israel, princes and seers of the glory of the Kingdom, Orthodox Christians honor the Mother of the King with same reverence which the Davidic princes accorded to their mother:

<sup>a</sup> Or “Infancy Gospel of James” (140-170 AD). This is the ancient source of the names Joachim and Anna for the parents of the Theotokos. This account also mentions that Mary had been chosen to weave the curtain of the sanctuary, which is why she is depicted with a spindle on the icon of the Annunciation. Of course, the veil was a symbol of the body of the Logos or indeed of space and time (see Introduction to John and to the Revelation).

<sup>b</sup> This seems to be a reference to a Christian man who was betrothed to a virgin with the intention to remain in an unconsummated relationship, perhaps in imitation of St. Joseph and the Theotokos.

<sup>c</sup> Or “desires”

<sup>d</sup> 2 Samuel 6:6-7

The queen stood by on thy right hand, vested in gold and arrayed in embroidery.<sup>a</sup>

LXE 1 Kings 2:13 And Adonias the son of Aggith came in to Bersabee the mother of Solomon, and did obeisance<sup>b</sup> to her: and she said, Dost thou enter peaceably? and he said, Peaceably...

LXE 1 Kings 2:19 And Bersabee went in to king Solomon to speak to him concerning Adonias; and the king rose up to meet her, and kissed her, and sat on the throne, and a throne was set for the mother of the king, and she sat on his right hand.

Hence, the place of the Spirit, “the household of God, which is the Church of the living God, the pillar and foundation of the truth” reads such Old Testament passages on the feasts of the Mother of the Savior who is called ‘our Lord and our God’ (John 20:28).

### EARLY CHRISTIAN WITNESSES

Writing in the middle of the second century, Origen was aware of at least two pre-existing texts which affirmed the Epiphonian view: The so-called *Infancy Gospel of James*<sup>c</sup> (already mentioned) and the *Gospel of Peter*<sup>d</sup>. We should also add to this list the *Infancy Gospel of Thomas*,<sup>e</sup> the *Ascension of Isaiah*<sup>f</sup> and the *Odes of Solomon*. These early works are not heretical Gnostic texts but belong to the Judeo-Christian tradition, which is why they were widely respected in many early Churches. Origen and the Greek Fathers after him felt that the story presented by the *Protevangelium of James* represented a most likely account, especially on theological grounds.

This particular ‘proto-gospel’ belongs to the so-called *pseudepigrapha* and presents itself as a tradition from James himself. According to the story, the Theotokos was miraculously conceived by Joachim and Anna in their old age, after much prayer. She was entrusted to the priests to be raised in the Temple, and one of her task was to participate in the weaving of the great curtain<sup>g</sup> which represented matter and more specifically the flesh of the Lord of Glory. When she reached the age to leave the Temple, she was entrusted to Joseph who was a *Tzadik*<sup>h</sup>, an older man, and the father of other children by his first marriage. Hence, James ‘the Lord’s brother’ is presented as a step-brother of the Lord, which seems to have been the view of Hegesippus and Eusebius.

This account makes perfect theological sense and is accepted by Orthodox Christians as worthy of their pious belief.

### INVESTIGATING JAMES AND ‘THE OTHER MARY:’ A WORD ABOUT THE JEROMIAN VIEW

The theory proposed by St. Jerome is that the *adelphoi* of the Lord were most probably cousins, and that both Mary and Joseph were always virgins. The nexus of the Jeromian view is to identify the “other Mary” of the synoptics as well as her son “James.”

This enigmatic figure must have been a close disciple of the Lord since she is mentioned so frequently: at the foot of the Cross of Crucifixion of our Lord, at His

<sup>a</sup> Psalms 45:9 / 44 LXX (LXX text) and preparation of the Holy Gifts (proskomede) at the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom

<sup>b</sup> Greek προσεκύνησεν

<sup>c</sup> Protevangelium of James 9:2; 17:1-2; 18:1

<sup>d</sup> Gospel of Peter (acc. to Origen, Comm. on Matt. 10:17)

<sup>e</sup> Infancy Gospel of Thomas 16:1-2

<sup>f</sup> 11:5 “And he did not approach May, but kept her as a holy virgin, though with child.”

<sup>g</sup> Which is why the Theotokos is shown holding a spindle on the icon of the Annunciation

<sup>h</sup> “Righteous, Just” - James was also called “the Just”

Tomb, and in the Upper Room. She is also identified as the mother of a certain James (James being a very common name). In Matthew 27:56 she is at the Cross, called “Mary, the mother of James and Joseph.” In verse 61, at the Tomb, she is called “the other Mary.” In Matthew 28:1, she is going to the Tomb and referred to as “the other Mary;” and in Mark 15:40 as “Mary, the mother of James the younger and of Joses.” Again, in verse 47, we have “Mary the mother of Joses” and in Mark 16:1, going to the Tomb with spices, she is called “Mary the mother of James.”

In the gospel of Luke, she is mentioned in 24:10, speaking to the Apostles about the Resurrection, as “Mary the mother of James.” Finally, John 19:25 reads: “So the soldiers did this. But standing by the cross of Jesus were his mother, and his mother’s sister, Mary the wife of Clopas, and Mary Magdalene.”

These are text are actually quite ambiguous on at least three points: (1) Is “Mary of Clopas” the same as “his mother’s sister” in John 19:2? This is very probable based on the construction but not absolutely certain. (2) Does “sister” mean “biological” sister? This is very unlikely because parents would not give the same first name to two of their children! Hence, “sister” could mean close relative or sister in law, as well shall see. (3) Was “Mary of Clopas” the wife or daughter of the man named Clopas (Κλωπᾶ)?

At this point, we must ask ourselves if we are willing to go outside the Scriptural data and consider Early Christian traditions to help us elucidate the situation. If so, the testimony of Hegesippus (+180, quoted in Eusebius) is very helpful:

After the martyrdom of James and the conquest of Jerusalem which immediately followed, it is said that those of the apostles and disciples of the Lord that were still living came together from all directions with those that were related to the Lord according to the flesh (for the majority of them also were still alive) to take counsel as to who was worthy to succeed James. They all with one consent pronounced Symeon, the son of Clopas, of whom the Gospel also makes mention; to be worthy of the episcopal throne of that parish. He was a cousin, as they say, of the Savior. For Hegesippus records that Clopas was a brother of Joseph.<sup>a</sup>

Pr. Bauckham uses this information to shed further light on these relatives of the Lord:

According to Hegesippus, Joseph had a brother named Clopas. The name is extremely rare: only two other certain occurrences of it are known. One of these is in John 19:25. We can therefore be sure that the man to whom this verse of the Fourth Gospel refers is the same Clopas, Joseph's brother. If 'Mary of Clopas' was Clopas's wife, then she was in fact Jesus' mother's husband's brother's wife - a relationship which, not surprisingly, the evangelist has preferred to state less precisely as: 'his mother's sister'. So it seems that an aunt of Jesus, as well as his mother, was among those Galilean women who accompanied him on his last journey to Jerusalem and were present at the cross.

Probably Clopas himself was also in Jerusalem at this time. Luke names one of the two disciples in his story of the walk to Emmaus as Cleopas (Lk. 24:18). This Greek name is not the same as the Semitic name Clopas, but it was common for Palestinian Jews at this period to be known by both a Semitic name and a Greek name which sounded similar (Simon / Simeon). Luke names him because he was a sufficiently significant person in the early church for some of Luke's readers to have heard of him. Perhaps his companion on the road to Emmaus was his wife Mary. This uncle and this aunt of Jesus were among his loyal followers at the end of his ministry.<sup>b</sup>

We can therefore conclude that Mary of Clopas was a relative of the mother of Jesus, and the “mother of James the Less and Joses” where “the Less” (τοῦ μικροῦ) can also be translated “the Younger / the Least / the Smallest.” What is significant is that “James and Joses” are counted among the *adelphoi* of the Lord in Mark 6:3. These were

<sup>a</sup> HE 3.11; pp. 105-106 in Paul Maier's edition

<sup>b</sup> "The Relatives of Jesus" by Richard Bauckham (*Themelios* 21.2 (January 1996): 18-2) and reproduced at [http://www.biblicalstudies.org.uk/article\\_relatives\\_bauckham.html](http://www.biblicalstudies.org.uk/article_relatives_bauckham.html)

common names, but it is very possible that these 'brothers / relatives' of Jesus mentioned in Mark 6:3 were in fact sons of Mary of Clopas who may well have been Joseph's sister-in-law. This identification would go against the Epiphanian / Greek view which sees James 'the Lord's brother' as a son of Joseph but both approaches are compatible: James the Just and "of Jerusalem" (one of the *adelphoi*) could have been Jesus' step-brother through Joseph and James the Less (brother of Joses/Joseph) could be a different James, i.e. a son of Clopas who would be Joseph's brother.

It should also be noted that some have suggested that in Mark 15:40, "Mary the mother of James the younger and of Joses" (also in Matthew 27:56) was in fact the mother of Jesus, but this seems close to impossible.

What remains extremely complex is the identification of "James" in various passages.

Before discussing this issue at length, the *Catholic Encyclopedia* reminds the reader of who is called 'James' in the New Testament:

- (1) James, the son of Zebedee -- Apostle, brother of John, Apostle; also called "James the Greater".
- (2) James, the son of Alphaeus, Apostle -- Matthew 10:3; Mark 3:18; Luke 6:15; Acts 1:13.
- (3) James, the brother of the Lord -- Matthew 13:55; Mark 6:3; Galatians 1:19. Without a shadow of doubt, he must be identified with the James of Galatians 2:2 and 2:9; Acts 12:17, 15:13; 21:18; and 1 Corinthians 15:7.
- (4) James, the son of Mary, brother of Joseph (or Joses) -- Mark 15:40 (where he is called *ὁ μικρός* "the little", not the "less", as in the D.V., nor the "lesser"); Matthew 27:56. Probably the son of Cleophas or Clopas (John 19:25) where "Maria Cleophae" is generally translated "Mary the wife of Cleophas", as married women are commonly distinguished by the addition of their husband's name.
- (5) James, the brother of Jude -- Jude 1:1. Most Catholic commentators identify Jude with the "Judas Jacobi", the "brother of James" (Luke 6:16; Acts 1:13), called thus because his brother James was better known than himself in the primitive Church.

The article continues with a discussion of the possible identification the Apostle James (2), the son of Alphaeus and James (3), the brother of the Lord and Bishop of the Church of Jerusalem (Acts 15, 21) which is favored in the Roman Catholic view but which was never embraced in the East:

The identity of the Apostle James (2) and James (3), although contested by many critics and, perhaps, not quite beyond doubt, is at least most highly probable, and by far the greater number of Catholic interpreters is considered as certain (where the chief argument, taken from Galatians 1:19, in favor of the Apostleship of St. James the brother of the Lord, is to be found). The objection moved by some against the common statement that "Apostles" in Galatians 1:19<sup>a</sup> is to be taken strictly in the sense of the "Twelve" has been strongly [debated]. The James (5) of Jude 1:1 must certainly be identified with James (3), the brother of the Lord and the Bishop of Jerusalem. The identification of James (3), the brother of the Lord and James (4), the son of Mary, and probably of Cleophas or Clopas offers some difficulty. This identification requires the identity of Mary, the mother of James (Matthew 27:56; Mark 15:40), with Mary the wife of Cleophas (John 19:25), and, consequently, the identity of Alphaeus (2) and Clopas (4). As Clopas and Alphaeus are probably not two different transcriptions of the same Aramaic name Halpai, it must be admitted that two different names have been borne by one man. Indeed, there are several examples of the use of two names (a Hebrew and a Greek or Latin name) to designate the same person (Simon-Petrus; Saulus-Paulus), so that the identity of Alphaeus and Cleophas is by no means improbable.<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> This would be the position taken in the Eastern/Epiphanian view.

<sup>b</sup> However, the same *Encyclopedia* notes in the article on Mary of Cleopas: "In the first place, St. Luke, who speaks of Cleophas (24:18), also speaks of Alphaeus (6:15; Acts 1:13). We may question whether he would have been guilty of such a confused use of names, had they both referred to the same person."

On the whole, although there is no full evidence for the identity of James (2), the son of Alphaeus, and James (3), the brother of the Lord, and James (4), the son of Mary of Clopas, the view that one and the same person is described in the New Testament in these three different ways, is by far the most probable. There is, at any rate, very good ground (Galatians 1:19, 2:9, 2:12) for believing that the Apostle James, the son of Alphaeus is the same person as James, the brother of the Lord, the well-known Bishop of Jerusalem of the Acts.

Some aspects of this theory are possible and since St. Jerome is undoubtedly a saint of East and West, his view may be considered to belong to the wider heritage of Orthodox Christianity. This being said, the view that James of Jerusalem was a son of Joseph (prior to his becoming a widower) is on traditional grounds the one that is to be considered normative in Eastern Orthodoxy.

This being said, there remains a hesitation to offer a dogmatic interpretation of this data, as illustrated by the entry for “James the Apostle, Brother of Our Lord” published by the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of America:

According to some, this Saint was a son of Joseph the Betrothed, born of the wife that the latter had before he was betrothed to the Ever-virgin. Hence he was the brother of the Lord, Who was also thought to be the son of Joseph (Matt. 13: 55). But some say that he was a nephew of Joseph, and the son of his brother Cleopas, who was also called Alphaeus and Mary his wife, who was the first cousin of the Theotokos. But even according to this genealogy, he was still called, according to the idiom of the Scriptures, the Lord's brother because of their kinship.

This James is called the Less (Mark 15:4) by the Evangelists to distinguish him from James, the son of Zebedee, who was called the Great. He became the first Bishop of Jerusalem, elevated to this episcopal rank by the Apostles, according to Eusebius...

However, we have seen that the ideas that ‘Cleopas was also called Alphaeus and that Mary his wife, was the first cousin of the Theotokos’ are extremely speculative. Also, by stating that “This James is called the Less (Mark 15:4) by the Evangelists to distinguish him from James, the son of Zebedee,” one gains the impression that James of Jerusalem was possibly one of the Twelve, whereas the primary Orthodox tradition favors the view that he was an apostle of the Seventy.

The preferred view of this article is that not every one of the Lord's relatives failed to believe in him. As we have seen, while Joseph had already gone to his rest, his brother Clopas/Cleopas and sister-in law (Clopas' wife Mary) were well-known disciples of Christ. One of Clopas' sons, Symeon, later became the second bishop of Jerusalem after James; and this Symon may be the one mentioned as an adelphos in Mark 6:3. It is also be suggested that Clopas should not in fact be identified with Alphaeus, which means that “James of Alphaeus” (one of the Twelve) should not be confused with James the son of Mary of Clopas.<sup>a</sup> Regarding the identification of James of Jerusalem and the Apostle James of Alphaeus, it would seem preferable to maintain the traditional Orthodox view that these are two different men. In doing so, we must concede that Galatians 1:19 is a difficult text since it seems to place “James the Lord's brother” among the apostles. However, it is likely that James was in fact among the Seventy (as attested in the Slavic tradition) and that the Twelve apostles did not see it fitting that any of them should become bishop of a particular city.

Finally, it seems clear that among “his brothers James and Joseph/Joses and Simon and Judas,” the first three are most probably sons of Mary of Clopas and therefore ‘step cousins’ of Jesus. If Mary and Jesus had been ‘adopted’ in Joseph's clan, they could indeed have been called *adelphoi* in a Jewish / Aramaic context. However, it may also be that the James of Mark 6:3 was a son of Joseph and the future bishop of Jerusalem if we

<sup>a</sup> Mark 3:21-35 distinguishes the Lord's family members from the Twelve.

adopt the view that this James is not identical with the James the Less/Younger of Mark 15:40.

### SUMMARY

The same Fathers who discerned the canon of the New Testament, read Greek natively, and left us a model of reverence for the biblical text are the same Fathers who called the mother of our Lord not only 'Theotokos' (bearer of the divine one) but also 'aeiparthenos' (ever-virgin). Indeed, not a single Father or Council ever interpreted the Scriptures to teach that the Mother of the Savior who is the very icon of the Church had more than one biological child. According to the bold witness of Scripture,<sup>a</sup> we are brothers and sisters of the Great High Priest, sharing one Father and indeed one 'Mother' who is inseparably connected with the Church, the Spirit and the Theotokos.

Hence, the same Athanasius who was the first to list the canonical books of the New Testament could also write:

Let those, therefore, who deny that the Son is by nature from the Father and proper to his essence deny also that he took true human flesh from the **ever-virgin** Mary. (Athanasius, *Discourses Against the Arians*, 2:70).

With the saints glorified by the vision of the Lord of Glory and the contemplation of and participation in the holy mysteries beyond the curtain, we can say with the inspired psalmist:

So great is your faithful love, I may come into your house, and I bow down before your holy temple, filled with awe! (Psalm 5:7)



---

<sup>a</sup> Hebrew 2:11-17







---

## TYPOLOGIES<sup>1</sup>

---

A consideration of the words used in Scripture to express a type will show how extensively the system of teaching by types, pervades the Old Testament and how fully this method is employed in the interpretation of the Old Testament by the writers of the New Testament. At least six words are used to express the nature of a type:

(1) The word type itself is used in John 20: 25: “Except I shall see in His hands the type (print) of the nails and put my finger into the type (print) of the nails and thrust my hand into His side, I will not believe.” This verse gives us the clue to the meaning of the word. As the hole corresponds in size, shape and is an exact counterpart to the nail which makes it, so the type corresponds to the, antitype, or the reality of which it is the type.

(2) The word shadow is used in Col. 2:16, 17: “Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath days : which are a shadow of things to come.”

(3) The word example is used in Hebrews 8: 4, 5: “There are priests that offer gifts according to the law: who serve unto the example and shadow of heavenly things, as Moses was admonished of God when he was about to make the tabernacle.”

(4) The word sign is used in Matthew 12: 39: “An evil and adulterous generation seeks after a sign; yet no sign shall be given to it, except the sign of the prophet Jonas.”

(5) The word figure is used in Hebrews 11:19: “From whence also he received him in a figure.”

(6) The word allegory is used in Galatians 4: 24: “There things are an allegory...”

Similarly a number of terms are used to express the nature of the antitype or reality to which the type corresponds and which it prefigures or shadows forth:

(1) The word antitype itself is used in 1 Peter 3: 21: “The like antitype (figure) whereunto even baptism doth also now save us.”

(2) The word body is used in Colossians 2:17: “Which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ.”

(3) The words very image are used in Hebrews 10:1: “For the law having a shadow of good things to come and not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices which they offered year by year continually make the comers thereunto perfect.”

(4) The expression “good things to come” is used in Hebrews 10:1: “The law having a shadow of good things to come.”

(5) The words things in the heavens are used in Hebrews 9:23: “It was necessary therefore that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these.”

(6) The words the true are used in Hebrews 9: 24: “For Christ did not entered into holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true.”

(7) The word spiritually is used in Revelation 11: 8: “The great city, which spiritually is called Sodom and Egypt, where also our Lord was crucified.”

It will greatly assist us in this study if we have a clear definition of what is meant by a type and this is given us in Scripture itself. A type is “a shadow of good things to come” (Hebrews 10:10). A type

---

<sup>1</sup> References are according to the Masoretic naming of the books

involves three things: (1) an outward sensible object or thing which represents some other higher thing; (2) that other higher thing represented, which we call the antitype or the reality and (3) the work of the type which is expressed in the term “representing” or “shadowing forth.” A type is a sign, a resemblance, a pattern, a figure, a shadow. As a parable is an earthly story with a heavenly meaning, so a type is an outward and visible earthly thing by which God has designed to teach us some invisible, spiritual, heavenly thing. A type is some outward and sensible thing ordained of God under the Old Testament to hold forth something of Christ or something in relation to Him in the New Testament. The type is the shadow, the antitype is the substance; the type is the shell, the antitype is the kernel; the type is the letter or the law, the antitype is the spirit or the gospel.

The work of the type is to announce or foreshadow forth something about Christ, His Kingdom and His blessings. In summary, a type is a divinely instituted resemblance.

Four useful guidelines were offered in Samuel Mather's 18<sup>th</sup> century classic work “Figures or Types of the Old Testament”:

### **RULE 1: GOD IS THE ONLY AUTHOR OF THE TYPE.**

We should not contend that anything is a type unless we have solid Scriptural, Patristic and Liturgical reasons to do so.

Scripture warrant for regarding anything as a type is given in three forms.

(1) By express statement, e.g. Adam was “the figure of Him that was to come” (Rom. 5:14). The law “was a shadow of good things to come” (Heb.10:1). The land of Canaan was a figure of “a better country, a heavenly one.” (Heb.11:16).

(2) By permutation, or change of names between the type and the antitype, e.g. when Christ is called David (Ezekiel 34: 23), or Adam (1 Cor. 15:45), or the Lamb of God (John 1: 29), or our Passover (1 Cor. 5:7); or a sheep is called a sacrifice, or is said to make - atonement, or to expiate sin, there being in truth but one Mediator, one Sacrifice, one Atonement and one Expiation, of which Moses and the victims offered on the altar are but types.

(3) Where there is a clear and evident analogy and parallel between things under the law and things under the Gospel, enabling us to conclude that such legal dispensations were intended and given by God as types of the Gospel mysteries whose image they bear. Thus Joseph may be looked upon as a type of Christ, though Scripture nowhere expressly calls him such and the deliverance out of Egypt may be regarded as a type of the deliverance of the Church from the of sin. The analogy is so clear that we may justly infer that God intended the one to be a type of the other. On the other hand, we should refrain from making anything a type unless we have Scripture ground for it. The constitution of the type, like every other method of Revelation, is the prerogative of God and God alone.

### **RULE 2: TYPES ARE NOT ONLY SIGNS BUT SEALS.**

As signs they shadow forth, but as seals they pledge and make sure the benefits of Christ to which they are related. Abraham received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of faith (Rom. 4:11). If they were signs at all, then they were more than signs, for if they signified to our intellect what the Messiah would be, they at the same time assured our faith that the Messiah certainly would be that which the type signified.

### **RULE 3: TYPES RELATE NOT ONLY TO THE PERSON OF CHRIST BUT ALSO TO ALL HIS BENEFITS, TO ALL GOSPEL TRUTHS AND MYSTERIES AND EVEN TO OUR MISERIES WITHOUT CHRIST.**

Thus Circumcision is a type of Baptism. The Passover is a type of the Lord's Supper. Leprosy is a type of our natural pollution through sin. Hagar and Ishmael are types of the Old Covenant. Doeg and Ahithophel are probably types of Judas. Gehenna (the Valley of Hinnom) is a type of Hell. The Queen Mother and the Ark are types of the Theotokos.

**RULE 4: THERE IS BOTH A SIMILITUDE AND A DISPARITY BETWEEN THE TYPE AND THE ANTITYPE IN CERTAIN ASPECT THINGS.**

Adam is a type of Christ, but the second Adam infinitely transcends the first. Some types are partial and represent Christ in one particular only, as Jonah, who foreshadowed Christ in the one thing of His abiding in the grave for three days and rising again. David is also a type of Christ, because he resembled Him in so many points; but no type can be called total, certainly not David.

The following classification embraces all the principal kinds of sensible objects or things selected and used in Holy Scripture, as types representing or shadowing forth corresponding spiritual realities:

1. Individual persons, e.g. Adam
2. Orders of persons, e.g. priests
3. Events, such as deliverances and destructions, e.g. the passage of Israel through the Red Sea
4. Things, e.g. Jacob's ladder
5. The institutions of the ceremonial law, e.g. circumcision
6. Holy places, e.g. the burning bush
7. The Tabernacle and the Temple

**I. INDIVIDUAL PERSONS**

Rom. 5	Adam = Christ, the head of a new race
1 Thess. 4	Enoch = Christ's ascension and a pledge of ours
1 Pet. 3	Noah = Christ preaching and saving believers
Heb. 7	Melchizedek = Christ the Great High Priest
Gen. 22	Abraham = God the Father
Heb. 11	Isaac = Christ (miraculous birth, sacrifice)
Ps. 105	Joseph = Christ in suffering and exaltation
Exod. 3	Moses = Christ delivering us from slavery
Josh. 1	Joshua = Christ bringing us into rest
Judg. 16	Samson = Christ in strength, suffering and death
1 Kings 4	Solomon = Christ in wisdom and dominion
Matt. 17	Elijah = John the Baptist, the forerunner
Matt. 12	Jonah = Christ's death, burial and resurrection
Ezra 5	Zerubbabel = Christ leading out of captivity
Zech. 3	Joshua (the High Priest) = Christ restoring purity of worship

**II. ORDER OF PERSONS**

Is. 49	The Jewish nation = Christ who is called Israel
Gal. 6	The Jewish nation = the Church which is also called Israel
Rom. 8	The firstborn = Christ: "the firstborn among many brethren."

Heb. 12	The firstborn = “the Church of the firstborn.”
Num. 6	The Nazarite = Christ, separated unto God
1 Pet. 2	The Nazarite = the Church, a holy people
Deut. 18	Prophets = types of Christ, who taught the will of God
I Cor 14	Prophets = types of the Church, with its gift of prophecy
Heb. 5	Priests = types of Christ, our great High Priest
Rev. 1	Priests = types of the Christian, a priest unto God
Ps. 2	Kings = types of Christ in their authority
2 Sam.7	Kings = types of Christ in their perpetuity
Ps. 72	Kings = types of Christ in their executive activity
1 Kings 2:19-20	Queen Mother = type of the Theotokos as Mother and Intercessor

### III. ACTIONS AND EVENTS

Ex. 12 + Ps. 105	Deliverance out of Egypt = baptism
Ex. 14-15	The passage of the Red Sea = baptism
Deut. 1 + Ps. 95	The march through the wilderness = earthly pilgrimage of age
Josh. 3-4	The passage of the Jordan = Christ’s baptism and death
Deut. 11 + Josh 5	Entrance into Canaan = Christ leading his people to the age to come
Is. 35 + 40	Deliverance out of Babylon = deliverance from false worship
2 Pet. 2 + Jude	Destruction of Sodom = unnatural lusts and uncleanness
Ezek. 30 + Rev.11	Destruction of Egypt = idolatry, oppression and cruelty
Jer. 1. + Rev. 18	Destruction of Babylon = destruction of the enemies of the Gospel.
Jer. 7 + 19	Tophet and Gehenna (The Valley of Hinnom) = hell

### IV. THINGS (SEE ALSO VII)

Gen. 28	Jacob's ladder = Theotokos and Christ connecting heaven and earth
Exod. 3	The burning bush = the Theotokos and the Church
Num. 9	The pillar of cloud and fire = Christ's perpetual presence
John 6	Manna = Christ, the Bread of Life and the Eucharist
1 Cor. 10	The smitten rock = Christ, the Water of Life
Num. 21	The brazen serpent = Christ lifted up on the Cross

### V. THE INSTITUTIONS OF THE CEREMONIAL LAW

Gen. 17 / Mark	Circumcision = a seal of admission to the Covenant (baptism)
----------------	--

16	
Lev. 1	Sacrifices: the burnt offering, a type of obedience
Lev. 2	Sacrifices: the meal offering, a type of service
Lev. 3	Sacrifices: the peace offering, a type of fellowship
Lev. 4	Sacrifices: the sin offering, a type of expiation
Lev. 5	Sacrifices: the trespass offering, a type of restitution
Lev. 6	Sacrifices: the consecration offering, a type of separation unto God
Heb. 9	Purifications and cleanings, ceremonial and spiritual
Lev. 23	Festivals: The Feast of the Passover = Redemption
Lev. 23	Festivals: The Feast of Pentecost = The Holy Spirit
Lev. 23	Festivals: The Feast of Tabernacles = The Incarnation
Num. 29	Festivals: The Feast of Trumpets = the sound of the Gospel
Lev. 16	Festivals: The Day of Atonement = the expiation of sin
Ezek. 46	Festivals: The New Moon = a solemn assembly, the Church
Exod. 31	Festivals: Sabbaths, the seventh day = a day of rest (burial of Christ)
Deut. 15	Festivals: Sabbaths, the seventh year = a year of release from debt
Lev. 25	Festivals: Sabbaths, the year of jubilee = a year of release from slavery

## VI. HOLY PLACES

Acts 7	The burning bush = the Theotokos and all Christians
Josh. 5	The place where God appeared to Joshua holy ground.
Exod. 19	Mount Sinai = Heaven
2 Pet. 1	The mount of transfiguration = The Kingdom
Zech. 2	The land of Canaan, the holy land = Heaven, the age to come
Josh. 20	Cities of Refuge = holy places of refuge
Ps. 48 –	Jerusalem = the holy city (Heaven, the age to come)

## VII. THE TABERNACLE AND THE TEMPLE

Exod. 38	The altar of burnt offering = atonement
2 Chron. 4	The molten sea and lavers = cleansing, baptism
Exod. 30	The altar of incense = the prayer of the saints
Exod. 25, 31-40	The golden candlestick = Christ, the Light of the World
Exod. 25:23-30	Showbread = the Eucharist
Ez. 43-44	The Gate of the Temple = The Theotokos, Ever-Virgin
	The Holy of Holies = Heaven

Exod. 40 + 1 Sam. 8	The ark of the covenant = Mary the Theotokos
------------------------	--

## SPECIAL STUDY: THE ARK AND THE MARY THE THEOTOKOS

The liturgical readings and hymns for the feast of the Dormition of Theotokos make it clear that the Church sees the Ark of the Covenant as the type of Mary the Theotokos who is herself the type or icon of the Church and of heavenly wisdom<sup>1</sup>.

As we shall see, this typology is solidly scriptural and it was clearly understood by the holy fathers:

Athanasius of Alexandria: “O noble Virgin, truly you are greater than any other greatness. For who is your equal in greatness, O dwelling place of God the Word? To whom among all creatures shall I compare you, O Virgin? You are greater than them all O [Ark of the] Covenant, clothed with purity instead of gold! You are the ark in which is found the golden vessel containing the true manna, that is, the flesh in which divinity resides”. (Homily of the Papyrus of Turin)

Gregory the Wonder Worker: “Let us chant the melody that has been taught us by the inspired harp of David and say, 'Arise, O Lord, into your rest; you and the ark of your sanctuary.' For the Holy Virgin is in truth an ark, wrought with gold both within and without, that has received the whole treasury of the sanctuary”. (Homily on the Annunciation to the Holy Virgin Mary)

The Septuagint is especially significant if one considers the parallel between Exodus and Luke:

At the Annunciation, Gabriel declared: “The Holy Spirit will come upon you and the power of the Most High will overshadow you” (Luke 1:35). Here, the word translated “overshadow” is used nowhere else in the New Testament. It occurs only once more in the Greek Scriptures (LXX and NT), specifically in Exodus 40:34-35 (EOB):

34 The cloud covered the tabernacle of witness and the tabernacle was filled with the glory of the Lord. 35 Moses was not able to enter into the tabernacle of testimony, because the cloud overshadowed it and the tabernacle was filled with the glory of the Lord.

In the LXX, the word often translated as “settled down upon” (“the cloud settled down upon it”) is the same as Luke's word “overshadow”. Clearly, Luke is making a correspondence between the power and glory of God overshadowing Mary just as it overshadowed the Ark of the Covenant in the tent. The rest of Luke's account makes this typology very obvious:

<b>The Ark of the Old Covenant</b>	<b>Mary: The Ark of the New Covenant</b>
The ark traveled to the house of Obed-Edom in the hill country of Judea (2 Sam. 6:1-11).	Mary traveled to the house of Elizabeth and Zechariah in the hill country of Judea (Luke 1:39).
Dressed as a priest, David danced and leapt in front of the ark (2 Sam. 6:14).	John the Baptist — of priestly lineage — leapt in his mother's womb at the approach of Mary (Luke 1:41).
David asks, “How can the ark of the Lord come to me?” (2 Sam. 6:9).	Elizabeth asks, “Why is this granted me, that the mother of my Lord should come to me?” (Luke 1:43).
David shouts in the presence of the ark (2 Sam. 6:15).	Elizabeth “exclaimed with a loud cry” in the presence of the Mary (Luke 1:42).

<sup>1</sup> Reading of Proverbs 9 at the Vespers for Annunciation and Dormition

The ark remained in the house of Obed-Edom for three months (2 Sam. 6:11).	Mary remained in the house of Elizabeth for three months (Luke 1:56).
The house of Obed-Edom was blessed by the presence of the ark (2 Sam. 6:11).	The word blessed is used three times (Luke 1:39-45).
The ark returns home and later on goes Jerusalem to be placed in the temple (2 Sam. 6:12; 1 Kgs. 8:9-11).	Mary returns home and later on goes Jerusalem, where she presents the incarnate Word of God in the temple (Luke 1:56; 2:21-22).

Other similarities between the Ark and the Theotokos are presented below:

<b>Inside the Ark of the Old Covenant</b>	<b>Inside Mary, Ark of the New Covenant</b>
The stone tablets of the law = the word of God engraved in stone	The body of Jesus Christ = the Word of God made flesh
The jar filled with manna from the wilderness which was a miraculous bread from heaven	Jesus, the bread of life from heaven (John 6:41)
The rod of Aaron that budded to establish his status as true high priest	The actual and eternal Great High Priest of the God Most High
<b>Vision of the Ark</b>	<b>Vision of the Woman</b>
Rev. 11:19	Rev 12:1