“From Adam to Moses”: the Typology of the Old Testament Characters from the Kontakia of Romanos the Melodist and its Assessment on the *Great Canon* of Andrew of Crete

ALEXANDRU PRELIPCEAN*

The subject of the typological images within the kontakia of Romanos the Melodist, the Byzantine Hymnographer who, through his quill pen, fascinated the entire Byzantine Empire in the sixth century, was developed in several topic-related studies. What in fact is the aim of the present study? It tries, on the one hand, to identify those parts within the kontakia of Romanos that speak directly about the typology of the Old Testament characters (including the chronological period from Adam to Moses), and secondly, to examine how Andrew of Crete, (re)known in the Christian hymnography as the “inventor” of the canon, reflects these typological images approximately two centuries after the death of Romanos. In other words, we are concerned with how the typology is present in the new hymnographic production of the eighth century, known under the title of canon, and how the transition from the typology existing in the kontakion to the one in the canon was achieved.

Keywords: Saint Romanos the Melodist, Saint Andrew of Crete, kontakia, Great Canon, typology, hymnography, Old Testament

Τὰ πάντα γάρ ἐν τύπῳ προεῤῥέθη καὶ ἐγράφη...
Σὲ Ἰησοῦ δηλοῦσιν αἱ γραφαί

[For all the accounts in the Bible predict through prototypes...
The Scriptures point you out, Jesus]

The subject of the typological images within the kontakia of Romanos the Melodist¹, the Byzantine Hymnographer who, through his quill pen, fascinated the entire Byzantine Empire in the sixth century, was developed

* Alexandru Prelipcean, Ph.D. candidate at the “Aristotle” University of Thessaloniki and Associate assistant at the Faculty of “Dumitru Stăniloae” Orthodox Theology from Iași. Contact details: Str. Cloșca, no. 9, 700066, Iași, Romania; e-mail: alprelipcean@yahoo.com

¹ For all the kontakia of Romanos the Melodist we used the two well known critical editions, namely: Paul Maas, Konstantin Athanasios Trypanis (ed.), *Sancti Romani Melodi Cantica. Cantica genuina*, Oxford 1963; José Grosdidier de Matons (ed.), *Romanos le Mélode. Hymnes*, in: *Sources Chrésiennes*, vol. I, no. 99, Paris 1964; vol. II, no. 110, 1965; vol. III, no. 114, 1965; vol. IV, no. 128, 1967, vol. V, no. 283. For the English translation we used the edition: Marjorie Carpenter, *Kontakia of Romanos, Byzantine Melodist*, vol. I: *On the person of Christ*, vol. II: *On Christian life*, Columbia 1970-1973.

in several topic-related studies. Clearly, the scientific literature was enriched in recent decades with numerous contributions that directly or indirectly touched the topic of the kontakia of Romanos the Melodist. We have to mention the Ph.D. theses written by R.J. Reichmuth², J. Grosdidier de Matons³, R.J. Schork⁴, Ioannis G. Kourembeles⁵, Alexander S. Korakidis⁶, Christelle Mulard⁷, Sarah Elizabeth Gador-Whyte⁸ and Uffe Holmsgaard Eriksen⁹. The first four authors cited in this list have actually contributed the most to the recovery of the typological images of Romanos's kontakia.

What in fact is the aim of the present study? It tries, on the one hand, to identify those parts within the kontakia of Romanos that speak directly about the typology of the Old Testament characters (including the chronological period from Adam to Moses), and secondly, to examine how Andrew of Crete, (re)known in the Christian hymnography as the “inventor” of the canon¹⁰, reflects these typological images approximately two centuries after

² Roland Joseph Reichmuth, *Typology of the Genuine Kontakia of Romanos the Melodist*, Phd degree, University of Minnesota 1975 (in manuscript).

³ J. Grosdidier de Matons, *Romanos le Mélode et les origines de l'hymnographie byzantine*, These présentée devant l'Université de Paris IV 1974, p. 568-573 (in manuscript); idem, *Romanos le Mélode et la origines de la poésie religieuse a Byzance*, foreword by Paul Lemerle, Paris 1977, p. 258-260.

⁴ R. Joe Schork, “Typology in the kontakia of Romanos” in: *Studia Patristica*, 6 (1962), p. 211-220; idem, *Sacred Song from the Byzantine Pulpit: Romanos the Melodist*, Gainesville 1995, p. 14-16.

⁵ Ιωάννη Γ. Κουρεμπιλέ, *Ἡ χριστολογία τοῦ Ῥωμανοῦ τοῦ Μελωδοῦ καί ἡ σωτηριολογική σημασία τῆς, διατριβῆς ἐπὶ διδακτορία, Θεσσαλονίκη 1998, p. 158-181 (in manuscript).*

⁶ Ἀλεξάνδρου Σ. Κορακίδη, *Ῥωμανοῦ τοῦ Μελωδοῦ ὕμνος καί λόγος. Δύο μελέτες*, συλ. “Φιλοσοφική καί Θεολογική Βιβλιοθήκη”, 18, Εκδόσεις Π. Πουρναρά, Θεσσαλονίκη 1990, p. 144-147 (section “Ἡ τυπολογία γιά τό Χριστό στά Κοντάκια”); idem, *Τὰ περὶ τοῦ Ῥωμανοῦ τοῦ Μελωδοῦ Μελετήματα*, Εκδόσεις Π. Πουρναρά, Θεσσαλονίκη 2002, p. 185-186 (section “Ἡ τυπολογία τοῦ Ῥωμανοῦ”), p. 438-441 (section “Ἡ τυπολογία γιά τό Χριστό στά Κοντάκια”).

⁷ Christelle Mulard, *La pensée symbolique de Romanos le Mélode*, Phd thesis, Strasbourg 2011, p. 107-122 (in manuscript).

⁸ Sarah Elizabeth Gador-Whyte, *Rhetoric and Ideas in the Kontakia of Romanos the Melodist*, Submitted in total fulfilment of the requirements of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, Center for Classics and Archaeology, The University of Melbourne 2011, p. 89-101 (in manuscript).

⁹ Uffe Holmsgaard Eriksen, *Drama in the Kontakia of Romanos the Melodist: A Narratological Analysis of Four Kontakia*, Phd dissertation, Graduate School of Arts, Aarhus University, 2013, p. 120-121, 227-228 (in manuscript).

¹⁰ Although there are voices who deny Andrew of Crete as the “inventor” of the canon, see: Jean- Baptiste Pitra, *Juris Ecclesiastici Graecorum. Historia et monumenta*, vol. I, Rome 1868, p. 29; Wilhelm Weyh, “Die Akrostichis in der byzantinischen Kanonesdichtung” in: *Byzantion*, XVII (1908), p. 8; Σ. Ευστρατιάδης, *Ποιηται καί ὑμνογράφοι τῆς Ὁρθοδόξου*

the death of Romanos¹¹. In other words, we are concerned with how the typology is present in the new hymnographic production of the eighth century, known under the title of *canon*, and how the transition from the typology existing in the *kontakion* to the one in the *canon* was achieved.

1. Towards a history of typology in the *kontakia* of Romanos

Any researcher who analyzes the typology of Romanos's *kontakia* is tempted to draw on the article written by R.J. Schork¹² and the PhD thesis of Roland Joseph Reichmuth¹³. The reason is clear: only these studies directly problematize the way in which Romanos merged the two Testaments in the Person of Christ, through the use of typology. But what do the two fundamental studies for the research of Romanos's typologies aim to present?

The first, in diachronic order of drafting the studies, namely R.J. Schork, shows that the Byzantine Hymnographer uses the Holy Scriptures in three

¹¹ *Ἐκκλησίας, ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις* 1940, p. 546 (the “inventor” of the canon is St. John of Damascus); Π. Τρεμπέλα, *Ἐκλογή Ἑλληνικῆς Ὁρθοδόξου Ὑμνογραφίας*, Ἀθήναι ²1978, p. 25, 279-280; Θεοχάρη Ε. Δετοράκη, *Κόσμος ὁ Μελωδός. Βίος καὶ ἔργο*, col. “Ἀνάλεκτα Βλατάδων”, 28, Πατριαρχικόν Ἰδρυμα Πατερικῶν Μελετῶν, Θεσσαλονίκη 1979, p. 150-151 (citing ancient and Byzantine sources, it indicates Cosma the Melodist as the “inventor” of the canons consisting of three odes), the line already set in Patrology accepts the Andreian paternity. See, for example, his opinions in: L'Abbé Marin, *Les Moines de Constantinople depuis la fondation de la Ville jusqu'à la mort de Photius (330-898)*, Paris 1897, p. 487; Karl Krumbacher, *Geschichte der Byzantinischen Litteratur von Justinian bis zum Ende des Oströmischen Reiches (527-1453)*, München ²1897, p. 673; Henry Julius Wettenhall Tillyard, *Byzantine music and hymnography*, London 1923, p. 19; L. Petit, “André de Crète”, in: Fernard Cabrol et al. (ed.), *Dictionnaire d'Archeologie Chrétienne et de Liturgique*, vol. I/1, deuxième partie: Amict-Azymes, Paris 1924, col. 2035; Δημητρίου Σίμου Μπαλάνου, *Πατρολογία. Οἱ ἐκκλησιαστικοὶ Πατέρες καὶ συγγραφεῖς τῶν ὀκτῶ πρώτων αἰώνων*, Τύποις Ἱ.Λ. Ἀλευροπούλου, Ἐν Ἀθηναῖς 1930, p. 562; Joseph Tixeront, *Précis de Patrologie*, Paris ¹¹1934, p. 412; Basilio Steidle, *Patrologia seu Historia Antiquae Litteraturae Ecclesiasticae*, Friburg 1937, p. 226; etc.

¹² Of course, we derive some information from contemporary studies which indicate Romanos's influence on other hymnographers, including Andrew of Crete, and the relation between the two forms of Byzantine hymnography. See: Egon Wellesz, *A History of Byzantine Music and Hymnography*, Second Edition, revised and enlarged, Oxford 1962, p. 198-245; Mary B. Cunningham, “The reception of Romanos in middle Byzantine Homiletics and Hymnography” in: *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 62 (2008), p. 251-260; Derek Krueger, “The Great Kanon of Andrew of Crete, the Penitential Bible, and the Liturgical Formation of the Self in the Byzantine Dark Age” in: Brouria Bitton-Ashkelony, Lorenzo Perrone (ed.), *Between Personal and Institutional Religion. Self, Doctrine, and Practice in Late Antique Eastern Christianity*, col. “Cultural Encounters in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages”, Turnhout 2013, p. 81-90 (republished in: idem, *Liturgical Subjects: Christian Ritual, Biblical Narrative and the Formation of the Self in Byzantium*, Philadelphia 2014, p. 130-163).

¹³ R. J. Schork, “Typology”, p. 211-220.

¹⁴ R. J. Reichmuth, *Typology*, 234 p.

dimensions: a) the narrative dimension (biblical references that have a direct connection with the action of the hymn); b) lyrical (those short scriptural phrases that have been altered from the original context and accommodated to a new occurrence) and c) allusive (those biblical occurrences linked only to the action of the kontakion to the extent to which they contain characters or events that can be used by the Byzantine poet for the purposes of comparison or contrast)¹⁴.

Through typology, the events in the Old Testament “seek” their fulfillment in the neo-testamentary texts. Obviously, they will be illuminated and fulfilled in the person of Christ, the Son of God and the Son of Man¹⁵. According to R. J. Schork, Romanos was definitely aware of the unifying continuity of the divine oikonomia, in which the historical events received complete meaning. However, the Byzantine poet is not making remarks in his works regarding the metaphysical relationship that exists between type and antitype¹⁶. However, the fundamental thesis of Romanos’s typology lies in the reality that Christ’s Incarnation substantially changed the history of humankind. *Through* and *within* Christ, the events of the New Covenant, otherwise accomplished after a continuous preparation, receive a particular importance¹⁷. In fact, R.J. Schork states that in the Old Covenant, Christ and His historical activity were presented in shadow or “glass” (*1 Co* 13:12), while in the New Testament, as soteriological realities¹⁸. In conclusion, R. Schork points out that:

“the spiritual exegesis in the *kontakia* of Romanos is built on a foundation of typology – a typology which is generally traditional, fundamentally Christological, predominantly historical, and strikingly poetical – a typology which places a strong emphasis on the priority of the second term, the Incarnate Word”¹⁹.

Much denser in terms of describing the nuances of Romanos’s typologies is Roland Joseph Reichmuth. After showing that the typology has as its main goal the discovery of relationships that are involved both in the belief that the Old Testament points to Christ and the similarities that unite the Old Covenant with the New one²⁰, Reichmuth identifies three categories of

¹⁴ R. J. Schork, “Typology”, p. 212-213.

¹⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 215.

¹⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 215.

¹⁷ *Ibidem*, p. 216.

¹⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 217.

¹⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 219.

²⁰ R. J. Reichmuth, *Typology*, p. 7-8.

typological images in Romanos's *kontakia*. The first category is the one of the images from the Old Testament where the typology is mistaken for allegory and where a clear separation between the two species is difficult to achieve. The examples inserted by Reichmuth in support of his theory are taken from the *kontakia* at *Prophet Jonah and Nineveh* (1ε¹⁻¹⁰ where appears the technical term τύπος), at *Noah* and *Abraham's sacrifice*²¹.

The second typological category is generally limited to the extent of a stanza as is the case of the hand of Thomas, who touches the pierced rib of the Saviour, compared by the Byzantine poet in the second stanza of the *kontakion* of *Thomas touch*, with the unburnt pyre in the time of Moses²².

The last category of typology actually sums up the allusions that doesn't have any explicit development in Romanos's *kontakia* (examples: water in the desert, dew from the oven, the rain on Gideon's fleece), though they have Christological connotations²³. Certainly, according to Reichmuth, the terminology particular to Romanos for the typologies does not only contain the classical τύπος, but an entire technical "arsenal": ἐντυπόω, ἐκτύμα, προτυπόω, ζωγραφέω, προσκιάζω, σημαίνω, χειρόγραφον and εἰκών²⁴.

To Reichmuth's vision regarding the typological classifications, Sarah Elizabeth Gador-White opposes, pointing out no less than three methodological issues. First, the distinction between allegory and typology is problematic; Reichmuth's classification is based on the type more than the antitype so that Moses and the events of his life are discussed in a separate chapter about the type expressed through various biblical characters and events; the classification method brings to the foreground the type at the expense of antitype²⁵. The stake of the critical analysis made by S.E. Gador-White is founded on the following reality: "Further work remains to be done on *why* Romanos is using typology"²⁶. We believe that this expression can be perceived as interrogative, whose answer we try to provide to the reader in the next paragraph.

Using typology represents the main element of Romanos's Christological expression. Only in a small number of *kontakia* (seven of them), the

²¹ *Ibidem*, p. 12-13.

²² *Ibidem*, p. 13-14.

²³ *Ibidem*, p. 14.

²⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 14; R. J. Schork indicates the complex terminology of Romanos prior to Reichmuth's study. See: R. Schork, "Typology", p. 215, note 4. Also, a development of the terms τύπος, εἰκών and ζωγραφέω in Romanos' thinking can be read today in the PhD thesis of Ch. Mulard, *La pensée symbolique*, p. 107-131.

²⁵ S. E. Gador-Whyte, *Rhetoric and Ideas*, p. 89.

²⁶ *Ibidem*, p. 89.

Byzantine poet does not use his knowledge on typology²⁷. But when he does it, the purpose of using typology is to render the Holy Scripture’s vivid interpretation and to transmit its message. Of course, Romanos’s typology lays emphasis on the historical event as a vivid testimony²⁸. According to Greek theologian Ioannis G. Kourembeles

“The typological models of Romanos reveal, on the one hand, the mastery of the Holy Scriptures and his remarkable ability to render even the most subtle detail for the sake of his audience’s enjoyment²⁹... Romanos remains, therefore, [anchored] in the truth that the Scripture reveals Christ the Saviour. In this perspective, the *typos* (τύπος) presents itself as less important in the typological models directly related to Christ and His work³⁰”.

Certainly, the typology unites the Old Testament realities with those of the New³¹; the events in the Old Testament are used as types in the New Covenant precisely to prove the reality that history before the Incarnation of the Logos is a prefiguration of the realities after the Incarnation³². As Charles Kannengiesser indicated in the *Handbook of Patristic Exegesis*, the typology is an image of future things, namely the events of the Christian period. *In extenso* the history of Israel is a foreshadowing of later Christian events. Only because the past is not restricted to itself, but has a meaning which is important for another perspective of time, a narrative of the Old Testament can be seen as *typos* of another event. The Old Testament is related to the New Testament by the term *typos* from an historical point of view³³. According to patristic tradition a type is a person, an event or an

²⁷ I. Γ. Κουρεμπιλέ, *Ἡ χριστολογία τοῦ Ῥωμανοῦ*, p. 158, note 1; R. J. Schork’s opinion that “typology... is everywhere in the *kontakia*” (R. J. Schork, *Sacred Song*, p. 15) seems a little bit exaggerated, since Romanos did not use typology for its sake, he used it hoping that the Church’s Christological expression will be more intelligible to its audience.

²⁸ I. Γ. Κουρεμπιλέ, *Ἡ χριστολογία τοῦ Ῥωμανοῦ*, p. 158.

²⁹ According to R. J. Schork, *Sacred Song*, p. 16: “These instances, and many others, amply illustrate the Melodist’s mastery of every aspect of Scripture and his marvelous ability to exploit even the most subtle clue for the enlightenment and delight of his audience”.

³⁰ I. Γ. Κουρεμπιλέ, *Ἡ χριστολογία τοῦ Ῥωμανοῦ*, p. 159.

³¹ See: C. Mulard, *La pensée symbolique*, p. 108 (“le τύπος désigne une réalité généralement issue de l’Ancien Testament sous le rapport que l’exégèse typologique patristique lui trace avec une autre réalité généralement issue du Nouveau Testament”).

³² See: S. E. Gador-Whyte, *Rhetoric and Ideas*, p. 89-90.

³³ Charles Kannengiesser (ed.), *Handbook of Patristic Exegesis: The Bible in Ancient Christianity*, vol. I, Brill, Leiden-Boston 2004, p. 220.

institution which enables that person, event or institution to signify something in the future, in the history where God is acting. The patristic recognition of *typos* is based on a strictly literary element: Adam or any other person from the Old Testament, be it male or female, can be interpreted as being a significant person for the readers of the New Testament³⁴. The New Testament realities go beyond those of the Old³⁵ and this issue is the main characteristic in distinguishing the typology from allegory³⁶. *In facto*, the type needs to have three main elements that differentiate it even more from allegory: a) it must be a true picture of the person or the thing it represents or prefigures; b) it must be of Divine appointment (type and antitype are preordained as constituent parts of the scheme of redemption) and c) a type always prefigures something from the future³⁷. In his kontakia, Romanos exploits every opportunity to find the type in Old Testament and to find the parallel reasons between Old and New Testament, in other words the relationship type-antitype. Moreover, the intention of Romanos is to exploit those types and paradigms that he can put in connection with the contemporary events of the Byzantine Empire³⁸.

³⁴ *Ibidem*, p. 230.

³⁵ S. E. Gador-Whyte, *Rhetoric and Ideas*, p. 91.

³⁶ Commonly found in the studies regarding Romanos is the distinction between allegory and typology. To avoid repeating the ideas, we will mention a few fragments that settle this distinction. See: R. J. Reichmuth, *Typology*, p. 11: "Here, precisely, is where allegory differs from typology: it searches not for connections between two historical phenomena, but for secondary and hidden meanings underlying the primary and obvious meaning of the Scriptural narrative", p. 15: "Allegory, on the other hand, differs from typology because it tends to disregard this historical aspect of type and antitype; it also views the form of the type as a disguise, with no necessary similarity to the reality that lies underneath. It resembles typology, however, since it also is a method of exegesis"; R. J. Schork, *Sacred Song*, p. 14-15: "allegory... seeks a secondary - sometimes exotically subjective - moral lesson underlying the «historical» level of the primary biblical narrative"; "the so-called literal interpretation of Scripture stresses the history of God with men; in contrast to this sense, allegory as a form of symbolic language, is the basis of every meaning of Scriptures different from the literal one"; C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *Handbook of Patristic Exegesis*, vol. I, p. 214. On the other hand, authors such as Alexander Korakidis consider that sometimes the distinction between the allegory and typology in Romanos' kontakia is difficult to achieve: "τυπολογία καὶ ἀλληγορία συναντιοῦνται καὶ τὰ ὅρια τοὺς εἶναι καμιά φορά ἀκαθόριστα" in: Α. Σ. Κορακίδη, *Ρωμανοῦ τοῦ Μελωδοῦ*, p. 144; reissued: idem, *Τὰ περὶ*, p. 439. About the difference between typology and allegory, see in detail: C. Kannengiesser (ed.), *Handbook of Patristic Exegesis*, vol. I, p. 212-242 (with contemporary bibliography).

³⁷ William G. Moorehead, "Type" in: James Orr et al. (ed.), *The International Standard Bible Encyclopaedia*, V: Socket-Zuzim, Chicago 1915, p. 3029.

³⁸ See: U. H. Eriksen, *Drama in the Kontakia*, p. 121.

2. “From Adam to Moses”: typological images in Romanos’s kontakia

2.1 *Adam* is the typological image of Christ, a customary type throughout the patristic thought³⁹. Used also with other Fathers of the Church, with the same valence, the face or the image of Adam reflects “the Image of the image” therefore, the image of Christ, the second Adam. This reason is used by Romanos in many contexts, indicating directly Christ as the “second Adam” because He became a man, through the Incarnation⁴⁰. In other words, in the mentality of Romanos one can notice the insistence on the reality that the divine Logos is the subject of Old Testament theophanies in Adam, Abraham and the exodus of the People of Israel. The divine Logos is the subject of the theophanies of the Old-Testament in Adam, also Abraham in the Exodus of the People of Israel⁴¹. In other words, the divine Logos, the One incarnated in the Trinity recapitulates in the Self the life of Adam and goes beyond it⁴². That is why Romanos explicitly states that Christ is δεύτερος Ἀδὰμ ἀληθῆς καὶ ἦλθον ἐκὼν σῶσαι τὸν Ἀδὰμ τὸν ἐμόν⁴³, that οὐχ ὁ πρῶτος γάρ, ἀλλ’ ὁ δεύτερος Ἀδὰμ Εὐὰν ἐβάστασε⁴⁴, and in the kontakion *the Healing of the Leper*, the Byzantine poet shows how the new Adam became Adam in the face of unspeakable (τὸν Ἀδὰμ ὁ πλαστοουργήσας Ἀδὰμ ἐγένετο ἀρρήτως⁴⁵). The last articulation in Romanos’s texts appears to bear witness of the knowledge of the Hebrew mentality of the $\alpha\beta\gamma$ (in Septuagint: Ἀδὰμ) by the Byzantine poet since Ἀδὰμ can be synonymous with ἄνθρωπος⁴⁶. The Romanos theology shows here the reality according to which Adam is the first man of the creation, just as Christ is the first Man of the new creation⁴⁷,

³⁹ J. Grosdidier de Matons, *Romanos le Mélode et les origines de l’hymnographie*, p. 568; Idem, *Romanos le Mélode et la origines de la poésie*, p. 258. About Adam as typology, see developed extensively in the PhD thesis of R. J. Reichmuth, *Typology*, p. 33-49.

⁴⁰ I. Γ. Κουρεμπελέ, *Ἡ χριστολογία τοῦ Ῥωμανοῦ*, p. 164.

⁴¹ *Ibidem*, p. 182.

⁴² See: S. E. Gador-Whyte, *Rhetoric and Ideas*, p. 92, 94: “Christ fulfils and surpasses Adam’s life”, p. 95: “Christ, as the second Adam, corrects the fault of Adam. He fulfils the life of Adam, but he also surpasses it”.

⁴³ J. Grosdidier de Matons (ed.), *Romanos le Mélode. Hymnes*, vol. 128, XXXIX:γ⁷⁻⁸, p. 328.

⁴⁴ *Ibidem*, vol. 128, XXXVIII:α⁹⁻¹⁰, p. 300.

⁴⁵ *Ibidem*, vol. 110, XX:β³, p. 362.

⁴⁶ R. J. Reichmuth, *Typology of the Genuine Kontakia*, p. 34; I. Γ. Κουρεμπελέ, *Ἡ χριστολογία τοῦ Ῥωμανοῦ*, p. 164.

⁴⁷ S. E. Gador-Whyte, *Rhetoric and Ideas*, p. 93, 101.

Founder of this new creation⁴⁸ and Fulfiller of what Adam had to accomplish in Paradise⁴⁹.

In close connection with this typology is the theme of Paradise Lost, where Christ is presented as ξύλον τῆς ζωῆς⁵⁰, since the Holy Cross makes life itself shine the light of the tree of life or of consciousness⁵¹. Also, Adam's failure to guard, in Paradise, the *commandment of the post*⁵² is repealed by the Person of Christ⁵³, who, through His obedience and fasting for 40 days in the wilderness of Carantana, defeated the erstwhile *Adamic hunger*⁵⁴. In other words, Romanos clearly indicates that every action of Adam must be redeemed by an act of Christ and that every act of disobedience by Adam is redeemed by the acts of obedience of Christ⁵⁵.

2.2. *Eve* is the type of Virgin Mary, "the new Eve". José Grosdidier de Matons, the French publisher of Romanos's kontakia, sees in the ancestor Eve the maidenhood relationship that connects her to Mary, Mother of God, "Eve... vierge quand elle endanta le Christ, comme Eve était vierge quand elle enfanta le péché"⁵⁶. This relationship is clearly based on Romanos's verses that tell in detail that:

γυνὴ τὸ πρὶν κατέβαλε, καὶ γυνὴ νῦν ἀνιστᾷ, ἐκ παρθένου παρθένος·

⁴⁸ *Ibidem*, p. 101.

⁴⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 95, 96: "Christ's human life is the fulfilment of Adam's life: he brings it to what it was supposed to be".

⁵⁰ J. Grosdidier de Matons (ed.), *Romanos le Mélode. Hymnes*, vol. 110, XI:ζ⁴, p. 96.

⁵¹ *Ibidem*, vol. 128, XXXIX:β⁵⁻¹⁰, pp. 326-328: ἐν τῷ μέσῳ δὲ θεάσατο τὸν τύπον ἑξαστράπτοντα, ὃν ἔβλεπεν ἔχοντα τὸν σταυρὸν ὃν ἐπήξατο· ἰσόμετρος γὰρ πάσης ἡλικίας ἐστὶν ἀνθρώπων θνητῶν τοῦτο τὸ φυτὸν τῆς ζωῆς· τὴν αὐτὴν δὲ ἔβλεπε λάμπειν ζωὴν ἐν ἀμφοτέροις φυτοῖς καὶ στενάζει ὅτι ταύτης ὁ Ἀδὰμ ἀπωλίσθησεν; I. Γ. Κουρεμπελέ, *Ἡ χριστολογία τοῦ Ῥωμανοῦ*, p. 165.

⁵² José Grosdidier de Matons (ed.), *Romanos le Mélode. Hymnes*, vol. 99, I:δ³⁻⁶, p. 74: προξενεῖ δὲ ἡμῖν τὸν παράδεισον, τὴν πατρώαν δίδωσιν οἰκίαν τοῖς νηστεύουσιν, ἥς ὁ Ἀδὰμ ἀπωλίσθησεν, εἰλκυσε δὲ θάνατον ἀτιμάσας τῆς νηστείας τὸ ἀξίωμα; see stanza 21-23 of the same kontakion.

⁵³ Paul Maas, C.Y. Trypanis (ed.), *Sancti Romani*, 38:η⁸⁻¹¹, p. 302: ἡμεῖς δὲ Χριστοῦ τοῦ νηστεύσαντος βουλῆσει καὶ ἀφελόντος ἡμῶν τὴν πείναν τὴν ἀρχαίαν, ἣν ἐπεινάσεν Ἀδὰμ διὰ τέρψιν τὴν πρόσκαιρον.

⁵⁴ J. Grosdidier de Matons (ed.), *Romanos le Mélode. Hymnes*, vol. 99, II:ιζ⁹⁻¹², p. 122-124: εὐθὺς οὖν ἐκελήλυθε Νῶε ἀπὸ τοῦ μνήματος κελεύσει τοῦ προστάξαντος μετὰ πάντων τῶν ἔνδοθεν, οὐχ ὥσπερ πρῶην Ἀδὰμ· οὐ γὰρ ἔφαφε φυτοῦ θανατοῦντος αὐτόν, ἀλλ' ἐβλάστηκε καρπὸν μετανοίας βοῶν; see: I. Γ. Κουρεμπελέ, *Ἡ χριστολογία τοῦ Ῥωμανοῦ*, p. 165.

⁵⁵ S. E. Gador-Whyte, *Rhetoric and Ideas*, p. 102.

⁵⁶ J. Grosdidier de Matons, *Romanos le Mélode et les origines de l'hymnographie*, p. 568; idem, *Romanos le Mélode et la origines de la poésie*, p. 258.

τὴν Εὐάν ὁ Ἀδάμ οὐκ ἔγνω τότε, οὐδὲ τὴν θεοτόκον ὁ Ἰωσήφ νῦν⁵⁷

“A woman formerly cast him down, and now a woman raises him up - a virgin from a virgin -

At that time, Adam has not known Eve, nor did Joseph now know the mother of God.”⁵⁸

In other words, Romanos focuses his attention on the historical reality that through Eve the sin entered into the world, which has brought the death of the human species. Virgin Mary or “the new Eve”, after Romanos’s language, brings the Life into the world by giving birth, as to her humanity, to the Son of God, the One who called Himself “the Way, the Truth and the Life” (*Jn.* 14:6)⁵⁹. If Eve’s disobedience brought death to people, in contrast, through Mary’s obedience, who fulfilled the role of θεοτόκος, people received life in the Person of Christ⁶⁰. But the attention of the Byzantine poet focuses also on ἐκ παρθένου παρθένης formula, formula that actually indicates the reality that Eve, before tasting from the tree was a virgin, just as Mary, through whom the Fruit of blessing was brought, was and will be forever virgin. Therefore, Eve’s virginity foreshadows Mary’s virginity⁶¹.

But Eve doesn’t have only these typological connotations. Even the special act of her creation, from Adam’s rib (*Gen.* 2: 21-22), symbolizes in Romanos’s thinking the very rib of Christ himself that was pierced by the lance and through which Eve was taken again in Paradise⁶². *In extenso*, therefore, from the rib of the first Adam, Eve came to life, the one called “life”, while from the rib of Christ, the “second Adam” or “the true Adam”, “it gives a drink and offers a bath, to those who are foul”:

διὸ ὁ σωτήρ μου, ἡ πηγὴ τῶν ἀγαθῶν, ζωῆς νάματα ἔβλυσε βοῶν.
Διὰ τῆς σῆς πλευρᾶς ἐδίψησας,
πίε τῆς ἐμῆς πλευρᾶς καὶ οὐ μὴ διψήσεις εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα·
διπλοῦν ταύτης τὸ ρέιθρον λούει καὶ ποτίζει τοὺς ῥυπωθέντας⁶³.

⁵⁷ J. Grosdidier de Matons (ed.), *Romanos le Mélode. Hymnes*, vol. 110, XII:η³⁻⁶, p. 124.

⁵⁸ M. Carpenter, *Kontakia*, II, p. 22.

⁵⁹ See: S. E. Gador-Whyte, *Rhetoric and Ideas*, p. 96, 101.

⁶⁰ *Ibidem*, p. 97.

⁶¹ *Ibidem*, p. 97.

⁶² J. Grosdidier de Matons (ed.), *Romanos le Mélode. Hymnes*, vol. 128, XXXVIII:ια⁴⁻¹⁰, p. 300: εἶδον τὸ ξύλον ὅπερ ἔφριξας, πεφοινιγμένον αἵματι καὶ ὕδατι· καὶ ἔφριξα, οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ αἵματος λέγω, ἀλλ’ ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος· τὸ μὲν γὰρ δηλοῖ τὴν σφαγὴν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ τὸ δὲ τὴν τοῦτου ζωὴν· ἡ ζωὴ γὰρ ἔβλυσεν ἐκ τῆς πλευρᾶς αὐτοῦ· οὐχ ὁ πρῶτος γὰρ, ἀλλ’ ὁ δεῦτερος Ἀδάμ Εὐάν ἐβάστασε; see: idem, *Romanos le Mélode et les origines de l’hymnographie*, p. 568; idem, *Romanos le Mélode et la origins de la poésie*, p. 258.

⁶³ J. Grosdidier de Matons (ed.), *Romanos le Mélode. Hymnes*, vol. 128, XXXVI:ιη⁴⁻⁷, p. 224-226.

“Therefore, my Savior, Fountain of blessings, has caused to gush forth springs of life,
As He says: You have become thirsty through Eve
Drink, then, from my side and you will never thirst
Twofold is the stream: it gives a drink and offers a bath, to those who are foul”⁶⁴.

Also with reference to Eve, but implying a different pattern, namely, “Pilate’s wife” Romanos recalls how Christ hurt “the rib” of Pontius Pilate: σὺ δὲ τούτου τὴν πλευρὰν βασανίζων ἔδειξας τὴν ἰσχὺν σου⁶⁵. From a dogmatic perspective, in the field of the close relation between soteriology and Christology the great importance becomes understood of the anthropological component that Mary (the second Eve) is the offspring of Adam and becomes follower of Christ, the One from the Trinity Incarnated⁶⁶.

2.3. Closely related to the image of the forefathers is the reality of the *terrestrial Paradise* with its waters, the reality of the *tree of life* (or consciousness) and the *leather clothes* worn by the forefathers after the fall in sin. Certainly, in the reality of the terrestrial Paradise with its waters is encoded the Sacrament of Baptism, Sacrament that can save the lineage of Adam as long as through him fell ill⁶⁷:

πηγῆς ἀενάου τῆς ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ τὰ νάματα
ὄντως εἰς ποταμούς διαιροῦνται
καὶ τούτοις κατατεταγμένος ὁ Ἀδὰμ ἀρρωστήσας μίαν ἀλγηδόνα
οὐ κατέπαυσε⁶⁸.

“The streams of water of the ever-flowing Source in Paradise
In truth divide into rivers,
And in them the sickened Adam, as is written,
Did not assuage one pain.”⁶⁹

The tree of knowledge or life planted in the middle of the Paradise has a bivalent role: it symbolizes both Christ “the tree of life”, which was carried in

⁶⁴ M. Carpenter, *Kontakia*, I, p. 213-214.

⁶⁵ J. Grosdidier de Matons (ed.), *Romanos le Mélode. Hymnes*, vol. 128, XXXVI:ιγ⁶, p. 220.

⁶⁶ I. G. Κουρεμπιλέ, *Ἡ χριστολογία τοῦ Ῥωμανοῦ*, p. 164.

⁶⁷ J. Grosdidier de Matons, *Romanos le Mélode et les origines de l'hymnographie*, p. 568; idem, *Romanos le Mélode et la origines de la poésie*, p. 258.

⁶⁸ J. Grosdidier de Matons (ed.), *Romanos le Mélode. Hymnes*, vol. 283, LII:σ¹⁻⁴, p. 350.

⁶⁹ M. Carpenter, *Kontakia*, II, p. 231.

the womb of the Virgin⁷⁰ as well as the Holy Cross⁷¹; while the leather coats or clothes which were wore by the protoparents after the fall in sin symbolize or are put in relation with the to clouts with which the body of Christ was wrapped in the cave of Bethlehem: τοῖς σπαργάνοις ἐνειλουῖται διὰ τοὺς πάλαι χιτῶνας δερματίνους φορέσαντας⁷².

2.4. *Abel's* unjustly death by Cain prefigures for the Byzantine Melodist both the Saviour's death, condemned by Caiaphas as well as the massacre of the 14,000 infants from Bethlehem⁷³. Romanos emphasizes in his kontakia the soteriological reality that Abel, by his death, brought to God “a pure and undefiled sacrifice”⁷⁴ and that he is a witness (μάρτυς) of the unjust death of which, from the love for the “spiteful people” Christ has suffered: καὶ μάρτυς ὁ Ἄβελ ὑπὸ Κάϊν φθονηθεὶς φονευθεὶς δὲ μετέπειτα ὁ δὴ καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ὑπομεμένηκε⁷⁵. Christ's sacrifice brings upon the descendants of Cain a new “burdening”, just as Abel⁷⁶ brought it through his death. In a different kontakion by Romanos, dedicated to Joseph himself, Christ identifies Himself as the “second Abel” who, through His death has thrown the fear, thus “Cains' legacy”⁷⁷.

2.5. *Enoch* is another typological model of Christ, symbolizing Christ's Ascension to the heavens: οὐχ ὡς Ἐνώχ τὸ πρῶτον, οὕτως ὁ Χριστὸς Ἐνώχ

⁷⁰ J. Grosdidier de Matons (ed.), *Romanos le Mélode. Hymnes*, vol. 110, XI:ζ²⁻⁵, p. 96: καὶ γὰρ ὁρῶ παράδεισον νέον ἄλλον τὴν παρθένον φέρουσαν κόλποις αὐτὸ τὸ ξύλον τῆς ζωῆς, ὅπερ ποτὲ Χερουβὶμ ἐτήρει τὸ ἅγιον πρὸς τὸ μὴ ψαῦσαι με.

⁷¹ *Ibidem*, vol. 128, XXXIX:β⁴⁻⁶, p. 326-328: καὶ ἐθεώρει τὴν τρυφὴν τὴν ἐν Ἐδέμ ἐν τῷ μέσῳ δὲ ἐθεάσατο τὸν τύπον ἐξαστράπτοντα, ὃν ἔβλεπεν ἔχοντα τὸν σταυρὸν ὃν ἐπήξατο; idem, vol. 128, XXXVIII:β⁴⁻⁸, p. 288: τοῦτο τὸ φύλον, ὅπερ ἔφριξας, τῷ ἐκ Μαρίας ἄνω ἐκτεκόνευσας ἐγὼ Ἰουσαίοις ὑπέδειξα τοῦτο πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον ἡμῖν ἐστὶ γὰρ σταυρός, ὃ προσήλωσα Χριστὸν ξύλῳ θέλων ἀνελεῖν τὸν Ἀδὰμ τὸν δεύτερον; for details and the theology of this typology, see: S. E. Gador-Whyte, *Rhetoric and Ideas*, p. 97-100; U. H. Eriksen, *Drama in the Kontakia*, p. 221.

⁷² J. Grosdidier de Matons (ed.), *Romanos le Mélode. Hymnes*, vol. 110, XI:ιδ³⁻⁴, p. 104; see: idem, *Romanos le Mélode et les origines de l'hymnographie*, p. 568; idem, *Romanos le Mélode et la origines de la poésie*, p. 258.

⁷³ Idem, *Romanos le Mélode et les origines de l'hymnographie*, p. 568; idem, *Romanos le Mélode et la origines de la poésie*, p. 258; see: R. J. Reichmuth, *Typology*, p. 186-187.

⁷⁴ J. Grosdidier de Matons (ed.), *Romanos le Mélode. Hymnes*, vol. 110, XV:ιβ³, p. 218: Ἄβελ τοῦ προσάξαντος τὴν θυσίαν τῷ θεῷ καθαρὰν καὶ ἀμόλυντον.

⁷⁵ *Ibidem*, vol. 128, XXXVI:ε⁴⁻⁵, p. 208.

⁷⁶ *Ibidem*, vol. 128, XXXVII:δ⁶⁻⁷, p. 246: τοῖς τοῦ Κάϊν ἐὰν πάλιν κολληθῇς ὡς Ἄβελ ἀνελεῖται δόλω.

⁷⁷ *Ibidem*, vol. 99, V:λδ⁴⁻⁵, p. 238: ὁ δεύτερος Ἄβελ, ζῶν Ἰωσήφ ῥίψαντες τρόμον ἀφ' ὑμῶν τὸν ἐκ τοῦ Κάϊν.

γὰρ ἐκεῖνος τῶν ἐπιγείων μετέστη, οὐκ ἤξιώθη τῶν οὐρανίων, ἀλλ' ἐντέθη σκηναῖς δικαίων⁷⁸.

2.6. Much richer in typological meanings is *Noah* and the ark built by him⁷⁹. If the event of Noah's exit from the ark symbolizes the prefiguration of the universal resurrection (ἐν ταύτῃ προτυπώσω νῦν τὴν πάγκοσμον ἀνάστασιν⁸⁰), the ark itself is the symbol of the cross that saved humankind from the divine wrath, a symbol of salvation and restoration⁸¹. Romanos says clearly in his kontakia ξύλω ὁ Νῶε διεσώζετο, κόσμος δὲ ὅλος ἀπειθήσας ὥλλυτο⁸². Also related to Noah and the flood is the sending of a dove over the waters. His return with an olive branch symbolizes the grace of God at Incarnation, in Romanos's thinking (θεοῦ σημαῖνον τῷ πανολβίῳ τὴν εὐσπλαγχνίαν ἐν μυστηρίῳ⁸³), but it may also be a prefiguration of Mary Magdalene, who announced to the disciples about the Paschal event (ὡς κάρφος ἐλαίας λαβοῦσα με γλώσση τοῖς ἐκ τοῦ Νῶε εὐαγγελίζου⁸⁴).

2.7. *Sarah, Abraham and Isaac* represent other important typological models for the Byzantine Hymnographer. Sarah is mainly related to the issue of sterility, which becomes type in Romanos's hymnography for Anne, the mother of the Virgin Mary:

ἄρα ποτὲ καὶ Σάρρα ἡ πιστὴ ἐπεθύμει γεννήσαι στεριεύουσα...
νῦν δὲ τῷ κόσμῳ χαίρουσα ἐκβοᾷ·
ἡ στεῖρα τίκει τὴν θεοτόκον⁸⁵.

"Did not the faithful Sarah... desire to give birth, even thought she was sterile?

Now, rejoicing, she cries to the world:

The barren woman gives birth to the Mother of God."⁸⁶

When it comes to Abraham, the interpretative facets are more complex: he is both the exponent of Constantine the Great and also of God the

⁷⁸ *Ibidem*, vol. 283, XLVIII:ιδ⁶⁻⁸, p. 162.

⁷⁹ For details, see: R. J. Reichmuth, *Typology*, p. 134-138.

⁸⁰ J. Grosdidier de Matons (ed.), *Romanos le Mélode. Hymnes*, vol. 99, II:ι⁸, p. 114.

⁸¹ See: S. E. Gador-Whyte, *Rhetoric and Ideas*, p. 101.

⁸² J. Grosdidier de Matons (ed.), *Romanos le Mélode. Hymnes*, vol. 128, XXXVIII:ιγ⁴⁻⁵, p. 302.

⁸³ *Ibidem*, vol. 99, II:ιζ⁷, p. 122.

⁸⁴ *Ibidem*, vol. 128, XL:ιδ¹⁰⁻¹¹, p. 404; see: idem, *Romanos le Mélode et les origines de l'hymnographie*, p. 568; idem, *Romanos le Mélode et la origins de la poésie*, p. 258.

⁸⁵ Paul Maas, C.Y. Trypanis (ed.), *Sancti Romani*, 35:η^{1/5-6}, p. 279.; see: R. J. Reichmuth, *Typology*, p. 176, also, the sterility of Sarah may be put in connection with that of Ana, the mother of Samuel, p. 175-176.

⁸⁶ M. Carpenter, *Kontakia*, II, p. 4.

Father, who sacrificed His own Son for the salvation of the world. If the first reference has as a common element number 318 (the 318 fighters whom Abraham took for Lot’s release and the image of the 318 Fathers participating at the First Ecumenical Council of Nicaea)⁸⁷, the second reference is strictly theological. Romanos outlines, through his dramatic verses, the scene of Isaac’s sacrifice by his own father. Abraham resembles God the Father, since he didn’t regret the sacrifice of his own son for God. In the same manner, neither does the supreme Father regret to offer to slaughter his own son, symbolized by Isaac⁸⁸, “the Giver of blessings and Savior of our souls”, for ever born from Him:

τούτου γὰρ χάριν ἐνθάδε σὲ ἀνήγαγον τοῦ δεῖξαι σοι
ὥσπερ οὖν οὐκ ἐφείσω δι’ ἐμὲ τοῦ υἱοῦ σου,
κἀγὼ διὰ πάντας οὐ φείσομαι τοῦ υἱοῦ μου⁸⁹.

“It is for this reason that I had you ascend here, to show you/
Just as you did not spare your son because of me/
Just so, I shall not spare my son because of all men.”⁹⁰

The mystery of the cross is revealed by the wood worn by Isaac on his shoulders, after the image of Christ, who carried the cross on his shoulders, to return the man to the Lost Paradise (οὗτος δ’ ὡς ἐβάσταζε ξύλα τοῖς ὤμοις ὁ σὸς Ἰσαάκ ἐπ’ ὤμων φέρει ὁ ἐμὸς υἱὸς τὸν σταυρόν⁹¹). The hands of the Son of God, which stretch on the cross, are symbolized by the horns of the ram caught in the branches of the shrub⁹².

2.8. With regard to characters such as *Esau*, *Jacob* and *Rebecca*, Romanos states directly that the sons of Isaac are the “prototypes of the future” (οἱ τῶν μελλόντων τύποι)⁹³, that Isav “prefigured the Jews” (τύπος τῶν Ἰουδαίων), Jacob “the image of the Christians” (Χριστιανῶν δὲ εἰκόνα),

⁸⁷ J. Grosdidier de Matons (ed.), *Romanos le Mélode. Hymnes*, vol. 128, XXXIX:1η⁷⁻¹⁰, p. 346: δέκα καὶ ὀκτὼ καὶ τριακοσίους λαβὼν ὀπλίτας πιστοὺς χαλεπὸν πόλεον νικᾷ Ἀβραάμ· ἐν τοσούτοις ἔπαυσε καὶ ὁ πιστὸς καὶ ἀνδρείος βασιλεὺς τὰς αἰρέσεις τὰς ἀθέους.

⁸⁸ *Ibidem*, vol. 128, XXXVI:10⁷, p. 226: οὐ καὶ τύπος ὁ πατὴρ Ἰσαάκ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ ὄρει.

⁸⁹ *Ibidem*, vol. 99, III:κβ⁵⁻⁷, p. 160.

⁹⁰ M. Carpenter, *Kontakia*, II, p. 69.

⁹¹ J. Grosdidier de Matons (ed.), *Romanos le Mélode. Hymnes*, vol. 99, III:κγ¹⁻², p. 162; see also: *Ibidem*, vol. 99, III:ις¹⁻³, p. 154: αὐτὸς ὁ γεννήσας γὰρ σχίδακας τέκνω ἐπέθηκεν καὶ ὤμοις φέρει οἷς ἐτέθετο ὅπως ἐνταῦθα πᾶς πιστὸς νοεῖτω μοι τὸ μυστήριον.

⁹² *Ibidem*, vol. 99, III:κγ^{4/7}, p. 162: βλέψον ἄρτι καὶ κριὸν τὸν ἐν τῷ ξύλῳ... τὰ κέρατα χεῖρας τοῦ υἱοῦ μου σημαίνει. About the relationship between Abraham and Isaac in Romanos’ typology, see extensively: R. J. Reichmuth, *Typology*, p. 138-144.

⁹³ J. Grosdidier de Matons (ed.), *Romanos le Mélode. Hymnes*, vol. 99, IV:β¹, p. 174.

while Rebecca is “the type of the church of Christ” (τύπος δὲ τοῦ Χριστοῦ τῆς ἐκκλησίας)⁹⁴. In the kontakia in which Romanos uses these typologies, he has the central intent of making the audience understand the theological content of these images⁹⁵. Also, the salt by which the food of Isaac was seasoned prefigures Christ, who keeps Christians clean against decay⁹⁶, while the blessing brought on Jacob symbolizes the coming of Christ, the One “who appeared and illumined all things”:

ἐκάστης γενεᾶς σὺ τὸ ἄλλας ὑπάρχεις ἀρτύων τοῖς πιστοῖς
ἀδιάφθορον βρώμα,
οὗ φαγόντες οὐ μὴ ἀποθάνωμεν·
ἤρτυσας ἔδεσμα τῷ Ἰσαάκ, ὥσπερ ἐφίλει φαγεῖν,
καὶ ἡλόγει τὸ τέκνον ἐντυπῶν ταῖς εὐλογίας τὸν φανέντα καὶ
φωτίσαντα πάντα⁹⁷.

“You are the salt of each generation/
Seasoning for the faithful the food which is incorruptible/
If we eat it, we shall not die/
You seasoned a dish for Isaac from which he loved to eat/
And he blessed his son, symbolizing in his blessings/
The One who appeared and illumined all things.”⁹⁸

2.9. Through his life, *Joseph* becomes the “prototype of Jesus” (τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἢν τύπος)⁹⁹. His selling by his own brothers prefigures, over the centuries, the betrayal of Judas¹⁰⁰, while the dinner at which Joseph’s brothers decide his selling symbolizes the Last Supper¹⁰¹. Also, Joseph symbolizes both

⁹⁴ *Ibidem*, vol. 99, IV:ιθ^{3-4/8}, p. 192; idem, *Romanos le Mélode et les origines de l’hymnographie*, p. 569; idem, *Romanos le Mélode et la origins de la poésie*, p. 259; R. J. Reichmuth, *Typology*, p. 144-148.

⁹⁵ U. H. Eriksen, *Drama in the Kontakia*, p. 256.

⁹⁶ J. Grosdidier de Matons, *Romanos le Mélode et les origines de l’hymnographie*, p. 569; idem, *Romanos le Mélode et la origins de la poésie*, p. 259.

⁹⁷ Idem, *Romanos le Mélode. Hymnes*, vol. 110, XVII:ιδ⁵⁻¹⁰, p. 286-288.

⁹⁸ M. Carpenter, *Kontakia*, I, p. 64.

⁹⁹ J. Grosdidier de Matons (ed.), *Romanos le Mélode. Hymnes*, vol. 99, V:α⁷, p. 204; vol. 128, XXXIII:ιθ⁶, p. 92. About this typology, see extensively: R. J. Reichmuth, *Typology*, p. 148-156.

¹⁰⁰ J. Grosdidier de Matons (ed.), *Romanos le Mélode. Hymnes*, vol. 99, V:ζ³⁻⁶, p. 210: φησὶ γάρ, Ἰούδας τοῖς συγγόνις βουλευέται· Πραθείτω τὸ μύρον τῶν ἀδελφῶν. ὦ ἀπὸ πόσων γενεῶν λάμπει Ἰούδας! ὦ τῆς προδοσίας ἀρχαία εἰκὼν.

¹⁰¹ *Ibidem*, vol. 99, V:ζ¹, p. 210: ἡ πρόθεσις ἔσφαξε τὸ λογικὸν πρόβατον, καὶ δεῖπνον παρέθηκεν.

the "immortal water" promised to the woman of Samaria¹⁰² and the resurrection of Christ¹⁰³.

2.10. The Old Testament character with the most typologies in Romanos's kontakia is *Moses*. The history of the three typological images¹⁰⁴ begins with Moses's salvation from the Nile waters that prefigures Christ's salvation in Romanos's theology by fleeing from Egypt:

μετὰ τῆς ἀμπέλου μέλλει εἰς Αἴγυπτον φεύγειν καὶ φυτευθῆναι καὶ
καρπὸν δοῦναι·
φεύγει δὲ χώραν τῶν Ἰουδαίων χερσεύουσαν καὶ ἄμεστον παντὸς
καλοῦ ὑπάρχουσαν·
τὸν Νεῖλον δὲ κατέλαβε τὸν καρποδότης πέλοντα,
οὐχ ὡς Μωσῆς ἐν ποταμῷ καὶ τῷ ἔλει προσριφεῖς καὶ ἐν θίβει
φυλαχθεῖς¹⁰⁵.

"Is going to flee to Egypt along with the vine/
To be planted there and bring forth fruit -
Flee to the land of the Jews/
Arid and barren of anything beautiful/
And arrive at the Nile, which is fertile -
Not as Moses on the river, thrown in the marsh, protected
by a wicker basket."¹⁰⁶

The Byzantine hymnographer is concerned with presenting the typologies in relation to Moses in an escalating manner and, moreover, even chronologically. Thus, the calling of Moses by God, through the burning bush symbolizes the Virgin Mary, who will carry in her womb the Son-Man and the Son of God. Hereby, Romanos states with much emphasis in the kontakion the Annunciation:

διὰ τοῦτο, Μαριάμ, ἐμπλήττομαι·

¹⁰² *Ibidem*, vol. 99, V:α^{2-4/7-8}, p. 202-204: οἱ διψῶντες σωφροσύνην πορευθῶμεν ἐν τῷ λάκκῳ τοῦ Ἰωσήφ. Τούτου γὰρ ὁ πίνων οὐ διψήσει οὐδέποτε· ἀθάνατον ὕδωρ βρῦει ἐκεῖ... ὁ ἐν τῷ Ἰωσήφ τύπος γενόμενος Χριστὸς αὐτὸς βρύων ποτίζει ὡς καὶ τὴν Σαμαρίτιν.

¹⁰³ *Ibidem*, vol. 99, V:λζ⁸⁻⁹, p. 240: ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστάντα, ὃν ὁ πλάστης ἐγείρας Ἰωσήφ ζῶντα ἐχαρίσατο, see: idem, *Romanos le Mélode et les origines de l'hymnographie*, p. 569; idem, *Romanos le Mélode et la origine de la poésie*, p. 259.

¹⁰⁴ R. J. Reichmuth, *Typology*, p. 91; I. Γ. Κουρεμπελέ, *Ἡ χριστολογία τοῦ Ῥωμανοῦ*, p. 166. Related to Moses, we believe that it requires an attainment of all the typological forms from the 23 kontakia by Romanos in which occurs the face of Moses. More opinions regarding Moses as typology, see extensively: R. J. Reichmuth, *Typology*, p. 91-133.

¹⁰⁵ J. Grosdidier de Matons (ed.), *Romanos le Mélode. Hymnes*, vol. 110, XV:τε⁶⁻¹⁰, p. 222, see: I. Γ. Κουρεμπελέ, *Ἡ χριστολογία τοῦ Ῥωμανοῦ*, p. 166.

¹⁰⁶ M. Carpenter, *Kontakia*, I, p. 32.

φύλαξον μὲ καὶ μὴ φλέξης με·
κλίβανος πλήρης πυρὸς ἐγένετο ἄφνω ἢ ἄμεμπτος γαστήρ σου·
μὴ οὖν χωνεύσῃ με δέομαι, ἀλλὰ φεῖσαι μου·
θέλεις, κἀγὼ λύσω ὡς πάλαι Μωσῆς τὰ ὑποδήματα¹⁰⁷.

“And so, Mary, I am struck with amazement/
Protect me and do not consume me/
Your chaste womb has suddenly become a furnace full of fire/
Then do not, I beg of you, melt me, but spare me/
You wish that I too, like Moses long ago, take off my sandals.”¹⁰⁸

But Romanos gives the burning bush seen by Moses another theological connotation: it is likened to Christ's rib, which is like the “burning flame” (φλογὸς καιομένης) which Thomas touched¹⁰⁹. Regarding the ten plagues directed against Egypt, they do not have in Romanos's thinking an exhaustive typological reference. For Romanos only the first plague, namely, the turning of water into blood (Isaiah 7: 14-18) has a typological value indicating the miracle of Cana of Galilee, where Christ turned water into wine:

πρόκειται νῦν καὶ τὸ θαῦμα εἰπεῖν,
ὁ πρῶτον ἔπραξεν ἐν τῇ Κανᾷ ὁ πρῶτην Αἰγυπτίους δείξας καὶ Ἑβραίοις
αὐτοῖς τῶν θαυμάτων τὴν δύναμιν·
τότε μὲν γὰρ εἰς αἷμα ἢ τῶν ὑδάτων φύσις θαυμαστῶς μετεβάλλετο·
δεκάπληγον ὀργὴν Αἰγυπτίους ἐπῆξε¹¹⁰.

“Now we propose to tell of a miracle the one which He performed in Cana/
He who first revealed to the Egyptians and to the Hebrews themselves
the power of miracles/
For at that time, the nature of the waters was miraculously changed to
blood/
He vented His anger on the Egyptians in ten plagues.”¹¹¹

But Romanos does not stop only at these moments. He develops his Christological typologies and correlates them with the passing of the Jews

¹⁰⁷ J. Grosdidier de Matons (ed.), *Romanos le Mélode. Hymnes*, vol. 110, IX:1ε⁴⁻⁸, p. 36; *Ibidem*, vol. 110, XII:prooimion³⁻⁴, p. 118: ἐν τῇ ἀσπόρῳ κησεί σου, θεοτόκε, βάτον ἐν πυρὶ ἀκατάφλεκτον.

¹⁰⁸ M. Carpenter, *Kontakia*, II, p. 15-16.

¹⁰⁹ J. Grosdidier de Matons (ed.), *Romanos le Mélode. Hymnes*, vol. 283, XLVI:β¹⁻⁴, p. 34: ὄντως φέρουσα ἢ βάτος τὸ πῦρ ἐκαίετο καὶ οὐ κατεκαίετο· ἐκ γὰρ τῆς τοῦ Θώμα χειρὸς πιστεύω τοῖς Μωσέως· σαθρὰ γὰρ καὶ ἀκανθώδης ὑπάρχουσα οὐκ ἐφλέχθη ψαύσασα πλευρὰς ὥσπερ φλογὸς καιομένης.

¹¹⁰ *Ibidem*, vol. 110, XVIII:δ¹⁻⁵, p. 304.

¹¹¹ M. Carpenter, *Kontakia*, I, p. 69.

through the Red Sea, with their wanderings through wilderness, with the tense moments from this journey, precisely to underline the miraculous intervention of the unbodied divine Logos. The first event, namely the passing of the Jews through the Red Sea, symbolizes for the Byzantine Hymnographer “the disarming of hell” because, through the death and resurrection of Christ, hell is “depleted” and the man passes from death to life:

καὶ ὥσπερ ἄλλην ἐρθυρὰν διελθοῦσα μου τὰ δῶματα τερπνῶς
ἐτυμπάνιζεν·
ἄσωμεν τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν· ἐνδόξως γὰρ δεδόξασται·
τὸν Ἄϊδην ἐδαφίσας ἀνέστη ὁ κύριος¹¹².

“And coming across my domain like another Red Sea, she joyfully beat the drum/:

Let us praise our God, for He has been gloriously glorified/,
Having demolished Hades, the Lord is risen.”¹¹³

Moreover, this crossing and the seeing of the Red Sea as a land “and then sea again” is understood as the paradox of the birth as a human of the divine Logos: the Virgin who will give birth, will remain virgin after birth (πῶς ἔσται τοῦτο, ὅπερ λέγω, ἀμώμητε; πῶς τῷ λαῷ θάλασσα ὥφθη ξηρὰ πάλιν δὲ θάλασσα; οὕτως γίνεται καὶ ἡ μήτρα σου¹¹⁴). In the scene of the Jews passing through the Red Sea, Moses becomes the mediator of God and co-participant to this miracle (οὔτε γὰρ δίχα τινὸς τοῦ μεταξὺ τοῦτο τὸ θαῦμα ἐγένετο· ἀλλὰ ἦν πρῶτος Μωσῆς, ἔπειτα εὐχαὶ καὶ ῥάβδος μεσάζουσα¹¹⁵), just as Mary becomes co-participant in the unspeakable mystery of the Incarnation of the Lord.

Moses’s staff is the symbol of the Holy Cross in Romanos’s theology. In the description of the events, Romanos is not a (simple) preacher or writer, but a writer-theologian who theologizes¹¹⁶. He is concerned with “dramatiz-

¹¹² J. Grosdidier de Matons (ed.), *Romanos le Mélode. Hymnes*, vol. 128, XLII:α⁵⁻⁸, p. 470.

¹¹³ M. Carpenter, *Kontakia*, I, p. 267.

¹¹⁴ J. Grosdidier de Matons (ed.), *Romanos le Mélode. Hymnes*, vol. 110, IX:η⁷⁻⁹, p. 28.

¹¹⁵ *Ibidem*, vol. 110, IX:θ³⁻⁴, p. 30; *Ibidem*, vol. 110, IX:ι⁸, p. 30: ῥάβδος ποτὲ καὶ ὁ προφήτης Μωσῆς τύποι τούτων ἐγένοντο.

¹¹⁶ There are, unfortunately, many voices that see in Romanos only the philological aspects rather than his ability to be a theologian. See, for example, the contemporary opinion of Ch. Mulard, *La pensée symbolique*, p. 110: “Romanos est avant tout prédicateur et poète, et très peu théologien”. We believe that such views, expressed especially for the sake of the word, take away Melodist’s great talent to translate, through poetry, the drama in the dialogue between man and God. Also, we believe that the opinion of the Greek theologian Ioannis G. Kourembeles points out very well how the contemporary study of Romanos underestimates the theological identity of the Byzantine Hymnographer: I. Γ. Κουρεμπελές,

ing”, through dialogue, the biblical events and “loading” them with theological nuances. Thus, the wood that will grow and by which the people of Israel will be led to freedom is in Romanos’s thinking the symbol of the Cross. If in the old Covenant, through the staff, the people were led to freedom, in the new Covenant, the entire people of Christ are led to the long-ago lost Paradise¹¹⁷. This theological truth is expressed by Romanos in the following verses:

ἰδοὺ γὰρ τὸ ξύλον ἐκεῖνο, ὃ λέγεις ξηρὸν καὶ ἄκαρπον, βλαστάνει
καρπὸν,
οὗ γευσάμενος ληστής τῶν ἀγαθῶν τῆς Ἑδέμ κληρονόμος γέγονεν·
ὕπὲρ τὴν ῥάβδον γὰρ τὴν ἐξάξασαν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου τὸν λαὸν τοῦτο
ἠνήργησε·
τὸν Ἀδὰμ γὰρ εἰσάγει πάλιν εἰς τὸν παράδεισον¹¹⁸.

“For, lo, that wood which you call dry and sterile/
Is blossoming into fruit at whose taste the robber/
Has become an heir to the joys of Eden/.
Beyond the wand which brought the people/
Out of Egypt, this wood has been active/,
For it leads Adam again into Paradise.”¹¹⁹

Romanos has the same reference in the kontakion *On the Victory of the Cross* (κοντάκιον σταυρώσιμον), when he identifies the wood through which Moses sweetened the water in Mara (*Exod.* 15: 23-25), with the Holy Cross:

Ρωμανοῦ Μελωδοῦ Θεολογική Δόξα. Σύγχρονη ἱστοριοδογματική ἄποψη καὶ ποιητική θεολογία, Ἐκδόσεις Π. Πουρναρᾶ, Θεσσαλονίκη ²2010, p. 24-25: “Ὅτι τίτλος τοῦ «θεολόγου», ὅ,τι ἀναφέρεται στή θεολογική του κατάρτιση, ἀναγνωρίστηκε στὸν Ῥωμανό, ὅπως ἔγινε εὐκόλα μὲ τὸν τίτλο τοῦ «Μελωδοῦ». Τὸ ἀντίθετο! Κανένας σχεδὸν δὲν πίστευε τὸν περασμένο αἰῶνα, ὅταν ἄρχισαν νὰ ἐκδίδονται τὰ κοντάκια του, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὡς τίς μέρες μας, ὅτι ὁ Ρωμανός ἦταν καὶ (σπουδαῖος) θεολόγος. Ὅλα ὁμῶς τὰ στοιχεῖα τῆς σύγχρονης ἔρευνας καταδεικνύουν ὅτι ὁ στόχος τοῦ Ρωμανοῦ ἦταν κυρίως θεολογικός (καὶ ὡς ἐκ τούτου καὶ πετυχημένα ποιητικός). Ὅτι ἀναφέρουμε ἓνα ἀπλούστατο παράδειγμα: Ὅταν με τὸ ἐφύμνιο, πού ἐψάλλετο τότε ἀπὸ ὅλη τὴ σύναξη, λέγει ὁ Ρωμανός γιὰ τὸν Χριστό «Παῖδιον νέον, ὁ πρό αἰώνων Θεός», ὁ συμμετέχων στή θεία λατρεία ἐξέφραζε μία πολὺ μεγάλη θεολογική ἀλήθεια, τὴν ὁποία δὲν ταύτιζε τὸ πρόσωπο τοῦ Χριστοῦ μὲ τὸ δεύτερο πρόσωπο τῆς Ἁγίας Τριάδος”.

¹¹⁷ J. Grosdidier de Matons, *Romanos le Mélode et les origines de l'hymnographie*, p. 569; idem, *Romanos le Mélode et la origine de la poésie*, p. 259.

¹¹⁸ Idem, *Romanos le Mélode. Hymnes*, vol. 128, XXXVIII:ε⁶⁻¹¹, p. 292; *Ibidem*, vol. 128, XXXVIII:ιγ⁶⁻¹⁰, p. 302: Μωσῆς δι’ αὐτοῦ ἐδοξάσθη, τὴν ῥάβδον καθάπερ σκῆπτρον λαβών, ἡ Αἴγυπτος δὲ ταῖς πληγαῖς ταῖς ἐξ αὐτοῦ ὥσπερ βαθείαις πηγαῖς ἐμπεσοῦσα πνίγεται· ἃ νῦν γὰρ ἔπραξε, πάλαι ἔδειξεν ἐν εἰκόνι ὁ σταυρός· τί οὖν οὐ κλαίμεν; *ibidem*, vol. 128, XXXVIII:ε⁹⁻¹⁰, p. 292: ὑπὲρ τὴν ῥάβδον γὰρ τὴν ἐξάξασαν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου τὸν λαὸν τοῦτο ἠνήργησε.

¹¹⁹ M. Carpenter, *Kontakia*, I, p. 232.

Ἄρα ὅπερ ἔδειξε τῷ Μωϋσῇ ὁ δεσπότης ξύλον
ὃ ἐγλύκανε ποτὲ τὸ ὕδωρ εἰς Μέρραν,
ἐδίδαξε τί ἦν καὶ τίνος ἡ ρίζα;...
ἐκ ρίζης ἡμῶν ἀνεβλάστησε σταυρός, ὃς ἐνεβλήθη τῇ γῇ καὶ γλυκεῖα
γέγονεν¹²⁰.

“The Lord showed Moses the wood/
Which sweetened the water at Marah/.
He did not teach him, did He, what it was, and of what it was the
root/?...
From our root; and it has become sweet.”¹²¹

In the image in which Moses hits the rock with the staff, from which water sprang, Romanos perceives Christ himself as “the river in the desert” that John later saw in Jordan: τὸν ἐν ἐρήμῳ ποταμὸν καὶ δρόσον ἐν καμίνῳ καὶ ὄμβρον ἐν παρθένῳ ἰδὼν ὁ Ἰωάννης ἐν Ἰορδάνῃ τὸν Χριστὸν¹²².

Other verses from Romanos’s kontakia led the Old Testament events to the act of birth of the Saviour. Thus, the passing of the Jews through the wilderness and their leading by Moses and the pillar of fire prefigures the leading of the Magi, “from Chaldea” (ἐκ Χαλδαίων), by the star to Bethlehem, to the scene of birth. The one who guided the Hebrews in the ancient times through the wilderness, by the pillar of fire, is the One who now, in the new times, in New Testament times, leads the Magi to the shabby crib in Bethlehem:

ὕμεις τὸ πάρος πῶς διωδεύσατε ἔρημον πολλὴν ἥνπερ διήλθετε;
ὁ ὁδηγήσας τοὺς ἀπ’ Αἰγύπτου αὐτὸς ὠδήγησε καὶ νῦν τοὺς ἐκ
Χαλδαίων πρὸς αὐτόν,
τότε στύλῳ πυρίνῳ, νῦν δὲ ἄστρῳ τῷ δηλοῦντι¹²³.

“How did *you* travel through the great desert which you traversed?/
The One who led them out of Egypt is the One who has just guided the
men from Chaldea to Him,
Formerly, it was with a pillar of fire; now with a star to reveal.”¹²⁴

¹²⁰ J. Grosdidier de Matons (ed.), *Romanos le Mélode. Hymnes*, vol. 128, XXXVIII:1ε^{1-3/7-8}, p. 304-306.

¹²¹ M. Carpenter, *Kontakia*, I, p. 236.

¹²² J. Grosdidier de Matons (ed.), *Romanos le Mélode. Hymnes*, vol. 110, XVI:δ¹⁻², p. 240; *Ibidem*, vol. 110, XIX:θ⁴⁻⁶, p. 338: τοῦ ὕδατος γὰρ τοῦτου ὁ πίνων καθ’ ἐκάστην πάλιν διψήσεται, τὸ ὕδωρ δέ, ὃ δώσω τοῖς πίστει φλεγόμενοις, ἐκ δίψης μὲν γὰρ ἀνάψυξις γενήσεται γὰρ ἔνδοθεν τοῖς πιούσι τὸ ρεῖθρον.

¹²³ *Ibidem*, vol. 110, X:η⁴⁻⁹, p. 68-70.

¹²⁴ M. Carpenter, *Kontakia*, I, p. 9-10.

But the pillar of fire is also in the Melodist's view the column of the flagellation that Christ "endured the lash... nude and stretched out on a pillar". In the 14th stanza from the *kontakion on the Passion of the Lord*, Romanos deeply expresses this theological truth which he unites with the pillar of fire and with the Jewish journey through the wilderness:

Μάστιγας φέρει ὁ λυτρωτής, δέσμιος ἦν ὁ λύτης, γυμνωθεὶς καὶ ἐκταθεὶς ἐπὶ στύλου
ὁ ἐν στύλῳ πρὶν νεφέλης Μωσῆ καὶ Ἀαρὼν συλλαλῶν·
ὁ τῆς γῆς τοὺς στύλους στερεώσας, ὡς Δαβὶδ ἔφη, στύλῳ προσδέδεται·
ὁ δείξας τῷ λαῷ ὁδὸν εἰς ἔρημον - πύρινος γὰρ πρὸ αὐτῶν ἔφαινεν ὁ στῦλος - στύλῳ προσήχθη¹²⁵.

"The Redeemer endured the lash; the Deliverer was in chains, nude and stretched out on a pillar/
Is He who in a pillar of cloud formerly spoke to Moses and Aaron/.
He who established the pillars of the earth, as David said, is fastened to a pillar/.
He who showed the people the road in the desert, (for the pillar of fire appeared before them), He has been attached to a pillar."¹²⁶

Returning to the theme of Christ's birth, Romanos seeks a different prefiguration in the images of the Old Testament. This time, the vision of the Byzantine Hymnographer extends to the manna from the wilderness, in which he notices the prefiguration of birth with body of the divine Logos from the womb of the Virgin:

πικρὰν τὴν ἡμέραν τοῦ πάθους μὴ δείξης·
δι' αὐτὴν γὰρ ὁ γλυκύς οὐρανόθεν νῦν κατήλθον ὡς τὸ μάννα, οὐκ ἐν ὄρει τῷ Σινᾷ,
ἀλλ' ἐν γαστρὶ σου... ἐγὼ γὰρ ὑπάρχω, ὅτι λόγος ὢν ἐν σοὶ σὰρξ ἐγενόμην·
ἐν ταύτῃ οὖν πάσχω, ἐν ταύτῃ καὶ σῶζω¹²⁷.

"Do not consider the day of suffering a bitter one -
That day for which I came down from Heaven like the manna -
Not on Mount Sinai but in thy womb...
Consider the meaning, O Holy One, the mountain formed like cheese/.
In it I suffer and in it I save."¹²⁸

¹²⁵ J. Grosdidier de Matons (ed.), *Romanos le Mélode. Hymnes*, vol. 128, XXXVI:18¹⁻⁶, p. 220.

¹²⁶ M. Carpenter, *Kontakia*, I, p. 212.

¹²⁷ J. Grosdidier de Matons (ed.), *Romanos le Mélode. Hymnes*, vol. 128, XXXV:3^{1-3/6-7}, p. 166-168. Regarding the term ὄρος τετυρωμένον of the present stanza, which symbolize the act of conception in the womb of the Virgin, see *ibidem*, vol. 128, p. 167, note 3.

¹²⁸ M. Carpenter, *Kontakia*, I, p. 198.

Romanos's concern is not to “transform” Moses in a “common” character, taken after already known “patterns” in the previous patristic writings. He seeks in Moses a different typological dimension, one that links the Old Testament character with the future martyrs of Christ. In the second hymn sacred to the 40 Martyrs, Romanos describes how the opposition of Moses against Amalek becomes model in the fight of the martyrs against the opponents of God. He states, therefore, highly expressive that:

παρετάξαντο κατὰ τῶν ἀντιθέων,
ὥσπερ παρετάξατο ὁ Μωσῆς πρὸς τὸν Ἀμαλήκ ἀτενίζων πρὸς
κύριον πετάσας
ἐν τῷ ὕψει τὸν νοῦν καὶ τὴν καρδίαν σὺν ταῖς χερσὶ καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν
αἴσθησιν· ...
ἐκείνον ὑπεστήριζον Ἀαρὼν καὶ Ὡρ, ὡς γέγραπται,
καὶ τοῦτον ὑπεστήριξε πίστις, ἐλπίς, ὡς ἔγνωμεν·
ὥφθη Μωσῆς νικητὴς ἐκδιδάσκων ἅπαντας ἀτενίζειν θεῷ¹²⁹.

“They were drawn up against the godless/
Just as Moses was drawn up against Amalek. As he gazed at the Lord/
Reached on high with mind and heart/
And with all his feeling, he raised his hands;/
And as he stretched out his hands and his heart.../
He was almost revealed/
As it is written, Aaron and Or help up his hands/,
And faith and hope supported him, as we know/
Moses was seen as victor, since he taught all men to reach up to God.”¹³⁰

Mount Sinai seems to be for the Byzantine Hymnographer just a historical reference: it is the place where Moses received the theophany and where the old Law was taught to him. But Romanos's preference to “graft” the events of the Old Testament on the New Testament is specific to his style: if Sinai is the mountain where Moses saw God through the unburnt bush, the Mount of Olives is where Christ himself ascends to heaven and sends to all those who will believe in Him His grace. He states, therefore:

τὸ ὄρος τὸ Σινάτιον, λέγοντες, ὑπερέβαλες·
ἐκείνο γὰρ ἐδέξατο τὰ τοῦ Μωσέως βήματα,
σὺ δὲ αὐτοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ·
ἐν ἐκείνῳ νόμος ἦν, ἡ χάρις δὲ ἐν σοὶ
ἡ καὶ πλάσασα Μωσῆν καὶ λέξασα ἡμῖν¹³¹.

¹²⁹ Paul Maas/ C.Y. Trypanis (ed.), *Sancti Romani*, 58:1α²⁻¹¹, p. 501.

¹³⁰ M. Carpenter, *Kontakia*, II, p. 286.

¹³¹ J. Grosdidier de Matons (ed.), *Romanos le Mélode. Hymnes*, vol. 283, XLVIII:1ζ⁹⁻¹³, p. 168.

“They said: You have surpassed Mount Sinai;
for it became the speaker’s platform for Moses’ words/
But you, for the words of Christ/.
The former was the law; but the grace is in Thee/,
The same grace which created Moses.”¹³²

Clearly, a central episode in the life of the Saviour, highlighted by Romanos by using the typology, is the entry into Jerusalem. The Hymnographer is not concerned with the chronological account of the event, as neither with the simple rendering of the soteriological scene. In the scene which Romanos creates for his contemporaries, having as central characters Christ and the Hebrews, Moses is remembered as a decisive character in the salvation of the chosen people from Egyptian slavery. The words addressed by Romanos to the Jews, otherwise unflattering, target the typology between Moses and Christ: just as they had forgotten Moses, even though he freed them from slavery, the same with Christ, the One who has freed us all from the dead, the One who they forgot in a few days demanding his crucifixion. “Friends of Belial”, as the Hymnographer calls the Hebrews, knew neither Moses, nor Christ:

Μωσῆς ἐξαγαγὼν αὐτοὺς ἐξ Αἰγύπτου εὐθὺς ἡρνήθη ὑπ’ αὐτῶν·
καὶ Χριστὸς ὁ σῶσας αὐτοὺς ἐκ τοῦ θανάτου νῦν ἡγνοήθη·
ἡγνόησαν Μωσῆν οἱ γνόντες τὸν μόσχον,
ἡρνήσαντο Χριστὸν οἱ φίλοι Βελίαρ¹³³.

“When Moses led them out of Egypt, immediately he was denied by them/.

And Christ who saved them from death, was not known/!

They did not know Moses who knew the calf/;

Those who were friends of Belial denied Christ.”¹³⁴

Also related to the time of Moses is the rod of Aaron, his brother, with the golden bowl in which was kept the hand from the Ark of the Covenant and also the scapegoat sent in the wilderness for the forgiveness of sins. In Romanos interpretation, Aaron’s staff that grew symbolizes the conception of Christ without seed from the womb of the Virgin¹³⁵, while “the urn of gold [is] the body of Christ” (ἡ στάμνος ἡ χρυσὴ Χριστοῦ τὸ σῶμα), the hand is “the divine word” (θεῖος λόγος), and the ark of the Covenant prefigures the

¹³² M. Carpenter, *Kontakia*, I, p. 357.

¹³³ J. Grosdidier de Matons (ed.), *Romanos le Mélode. Hymnes*, vol. 128, XXXII:ε⁵⁻⁸, p. 36.

¹³⁴ M. Carpenter, *Kontakia*, I, p. 161.

¹³⁵ J. Grosdidier de Matons (ed.), *Romanos le Mélode. Hymnes*, vol. 110, XII:prooimion³⁻⁵, p. 118: ἐν τῇ ἀσπόρῳ κυήσει σου, θεοτόκε, βᾶτον ἐν πυρὶ ἀκατάφλεκτον ῥάβδον Ἀαρὼν τὴν βλαστήσασαν.

“Virgin who gives birth, and after birth, remains a virgin” (παρθένος τίκτει καὶ μετὰ τόκον πάλιν μένει παρθένος)¹³⁶. Romanos is just as straight in typological expression when talking about the lamb sent in the wilderness on the occasion of the redemption days (*Lv* 4:21 sq.). In his *kontakion on the Epiphany*, Romanos reminds his audience that ἀμνὸν ἐκάλει τὸν ποιμένα, καὶ ἀμνὸν οὐχ ἀπλῶς, ἀλλὰ λύοντα πταίσματα¹³⁷.

3. “From Adam to Moses”: typological images in the *Great Canon of Andrew of Crete*

A study to analyze the typologies present in the *Great Canon* of Andrew of Crete¹³⁸ is still lacking in the specialized literature. However, we tried to show several aspects in our Ph.D. thesis dedicated to *the dogmatic Teaching of the Great Canon*¹³⁹. Our ideas on the way Andrew of Crete uses typology in his fundamental work were based on the laconic references found in the comments of Acacius the Sabaite¹⁴⁰ and John of Lind¹⁴¹ and in contemporary literature in the studies of Pannayotis Nellas¹⁴², Olivier Clément¹⁴³, Simeon Koutsas¹⁴⁴, Job Getcha¹⁴⁵

¹³⁶ *Ibidem*, vol. 110, XII:γ⁵⁻⁷, p. 122. About the typologies regarding Virgin Mary, see: Ἀ. Σ. Κορακίδη, *Τὰ περί*, p. 110-112.

¹³⁷ J. Grosdidier de Matons (ed.), *Romanos le Mélode. Hymnes*, vol. 110, XVII:γ¹⁻², p. 286.

¹³⁸ Due to the lack of the critical edition of the *Great Canon* we used the original Greek: Ανδρέας Κρήτης, “Κανὼν ὁ Μέγας” in: Jacques-Paul Migne (ed.), *Patrologia Graeca*, 97, 1330D-1386C.

¹³⁹ Alexandru Prelipcean, *Η δογματική διδασκαλία του Μεγάλου Κανόνα του αγ. Ανδρέα Κρήτης*, διδακτορική διατριβή, Θεσσαλονίκη, 2015, p. 219-229.

¹⁴⁰ Critical edition: Antonia Giannouli, *Die beiden byzantinischen Kommentare zum Großen Kanon des Andreas von Kreta. Eine quellenkritische und literaturhistorische Studie*, Wien 2007.

¹⁴¹ Ἰωάννη του Λίνδιου, *Θησαυρὸς Μετανοίας. Κατανυκτικὴ ἐρμηνεία τροπαρίων τοῦ Μεγάλου Κανόνος τοῦ ἁγίου Ἀνδρέου Κρήτης ἀπὸ τὸν ἀρχιεπίσκοπο Μύρων Ἰωάννη τὸν Λίνδιο* († 1796), Μετάφραση-διασκευή, ἐκδοτικὴ ἐπιμέλεια καὶ ἡ ἠλεκτρονικὴ ἐπεξεργασία τῆς Ἱεράς Μονῆς Παρακλήτου τοῦ Ὁρωποῦ Ἀττικῆς, Ὁρωπὸς Ἀττικῆς ²2003.

¹⁴² Παναγιώτου Νέλλα, “Τὰ ἀνθρωπολογικὰ καὶ κοσμολογικὰ πλαίσια τῆς Ἀκολουθίας τοῦ Μεγάλου Κανόνα” in: *Ζῶον Θεούμενον. Προοπτικὲς γιὰ μιὰ ὀρθόδοξη κατανόηση τοῦ ἀνθρώπου*, Αθήνα 1979, p. 183-224.

¹⁴³ Olivier Clément, *Le chant des larmes. Essai sur le repentir. Suivi de la traduction du poème sur le repentir par saint André de Crète*, Paris 1982; idem, “Notes sur le Grand Canon de Saint André de Crète” in: *Contacts*, XXXII (1980), 3, p. 206-234, 294-330.

¹⁴⁴ Συμεὼν Κούτσα, *Ἀδαμιαῖος θρήνος. Ὁ Μέγας Κανὼν Ἀνδρέου τοῦ Κρήτης*, Εἰσαγωγή-κειμένο-μετάφραση-σχόλια, Σειρά: *Λογικὴ Λατρεία*, Εκδόσεις Αποστολικῆς Διακονίας τῆς Εκκλησίας τῆς Ἑλλάδος, Αθήνα ⁴2009.

¹⁴⁵ Job Getcha, “Le grand canon pénitentiel de saint André de Crète: Une lecture typologique de l’histoire du salut” in: Carlo Braga, Alessandro Pistola (ed.), *La liturgie, interprète de l’Écriture. II. Dans les compositions liturgiques, prières et chants. Conférences Saint-Serge*. 49*

and Sebastian Pașcanu¹⁴⁶. The fundamental work of Andrew “illustrates and dramatizes a style of the self formed in a typological and dialectical relationship with the biblical narrative, particularly as that narrative might be experienced liturgically”, namely, through examples (ὕποδείγματα) from the Testaments of the Holy Bible¹⁴⁷.

As Mary B. Cunningham demonstrated, through its nature theme and through the use of typology and allegory, the kanon distances it self from the literal and narrative style of many kontakia and festal sermons¹⁴⁸. Obviously, the topic is open to scientific discussion since under the influence of great hymnographers, as St. John of Damascus, the kanon indicates „intricate constructions in which typology, prophecy, metaphor, and many other methods of biblical exegesis come together”¹⁴⁹. Compared to the use of typology in the kontakia, the kanon uses much less of this process¹⁵⁰. Even at the philological level this is true, since following the philological analysis of the fundamental work of the Cretan author, we notice a rather small terminological “arsenal”: in five occurrences Andrew uses τύπος¹⁵¹ and in two troparions εἰκονίζω¹⁵²:

3.1. The image of *Adam*, alongside Eve, illustrates “Andrew’s theology of human responsibility in the fall from Paradise and the expulsion from Eden”¹⁵³. Adam is reflected in the *Great Canon* in three contexts¹⁵⁴, none of them having a typological value. They are directly related to the reality that Adam is πρωτόπλαστος and his expulsion from Paradise due to his disobedience towards the divine commandment. The third situation where the

Semaine d’Études Liturgiques, Rome 2003, p. 105-120; idem, “Reading the Bible with Andrew of Crete” in: *Analele Științifice ale Universității “Alexandru Ioan Cuza” din Iași*, SN, XII (2007), Iași 2007, p. 139-152.

¹⁴⁶ Sebastian Pașcanu, *Comentariu la Canonul cel Mare al Sfântului Andrei Criteanul*, Bucharest² 2006.

¹⁴⁷ Derek Krueger, “The *Great Canon*”, p. 63.

¹⁴⁸ Mary B. Cunningham, “The reception of Romanos”, p. 258.

¹⁴⁹ *Ibidem*, p. 259-260.

¹⁵⁰ See: Derek Krueger, “The *Great Canon*”, p. 76.

¹⁵¹ A. Κρήτης, *Κανών ὁ Μέγας*, PG 97:1352A-B: εἰς τύπον τῆς πάλαι, τῆς νέας; 97:1353C: εἰς τύπον τοῦ Κυρίου; 97:1353C: εἰς τύπον τῆς Ταφῆς καὶ τῆς Ἐγέρσεώς σου; 97:1352A: τυπικῶς τὴν ζωοποιόν; 97:1356A: τύπῳ Σταυροῦ τοῦ Θείου.

¹⁵² A. Κρήτης, *Κανών ὁ Μέγας*, PG 97:1356A: τὴν Μωσέως ράβδον εἰκονίζου; 97:1365B: ὁ σταυρὸς εἰκονίζεται.

¹⁵³ D. Krueger, “The *Great Canon*”, p. 76.

¹⁵⁴ A. Κρήτης, *Κανών ὁ Μέγας*, PG 97:1332A: τὸν πρωτόπλαστον Ἀδάμ, τῇ παραβάσει παραζηλώσας, ἔγμων ἑμαυτὸν γυμνωθέντα Θεοῦ; 97:1332B: ἐπαξίως τῆς Ἑδὲμ προεξερίφη ὡς μὴ φυλάξας μίαν σου, Σωτήρ, ἐντολὴν ὁ Ἀδάμ; 97:1337D: ἰλάσθητι, ὡς ὁ Τελώνης βοῶ σοι, Σῶτερ, ἰλάσθητί μοι· οὐδεὶς γὰρ τῶν ἐξ Ἀδάμ.

name “Adam” occurs has a rather spiritual reference: the author considers himself more sinful than anyone in Adam’s breed. However, the theme of the image identifies the relationship between the old Adam and Christ, the “new Adam”. If through Adam Paradise was lost and man met himself “stripped naked of God”¹⁵⁵, through the New Adam, the One who wore “our image”¹⁵⁶ and was crucified “in the midst of the earth”¹⁵⁷ the entire creation is restored.

3.2. *Eve* is presented in the *Great Canon* in two successive troparions. The image of “the first Eve”¹⁵⁸ or of “the physical Eve”¹⁵⁹ is linked, as in the case of Adam, to the moment of the fall in sin, by tasting from the tree, and the consequences of this fall: εἶδες γὰρ κακῶς καὶ ἐτρώθης πικρῶς, καὶ ἦψω τοῦ ξύλου, καὶ ἐγενύσω προπετῶς τῆς παραλόγου βρώσεως¹⁶⁰. But Andrew prefers to plasticize the face of Eve, comparing the fiery thought, which is located within man and through which the man is continuously led into sin¹⁶¹, with the first woman in the world:

Ἀντὶ Εὐᾶς αἰσθητῆς ἡ νοητὴ μοι κατέστη Εὐᾶ, ὁ ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ ἐμπαθὴς λογισμός, δεικνὺς τὰ ἡδέα, καὶ γευόμενος αἰεὶ τῆς πικρᾶς καταπόσεως¹⁶².

Once again, in the case of Eve, the typological references are completely lacking in the *Great Canon*.

3.3. Closely related to the aspects regarding to protoparents is the theme of *Paradise, of the leather clothes* and the reality of the *tree of life* (or consciousness). The Paradise lost by Adam¹⁶³ receives through Christ’s sacrifice on the cross a new dimension: it becomes non-exclusive, it (re)opens to everyone¹⁶⁴ and the first to enter to taste the “heavenly food” from Heaven is, paradoxically, a thief¹⁶⁵.

¹⁵⁵ *Ibidem*, PG 97:1336D: Διέρρηξα νῦν τὴν στολὴν μου τὴν πρώτην, ἣν ἐξυφάνάτο μοι ὁ Πλαστοργὸς ἐξ ἀρχῆς, καὶ ἔνθεν κεῖμαι γυμνός.

¹⁵⁶ *Ibidem*, PG 97:1361A: μεμορφωμένον καθ’ ἡμᾶς.

¹⁵⁷ *Ibidem*, PG 97:1352A: Εἰργάσω τὴν σωτηρίαν ἐν μέσῳ τῆς γῆς, ὁ Κτίστης.

¹⁵⁸ *Ibidem*, PG 97:1332B: Οἶμοι, τάλαινα ψυχὴ! τί ὠμοιώθης τῇ πρώτῃ Εὐᾷ.

¹⁵⁹ *Ibidem*, PG 97:1332B: Εὐᾶς αἰσθητῆς.

¹⁶⁰ *Ibidem*, PG 97:1332B.

¹⁶¹ See: Σ. Κούτσα, *Ἀδαμιαῖος θρῆνος*, p. 48-49.

¹⁶² A. Κρήτης, *Κανὼν ὁ Μέγας*, PG 97:1332B.

¹⁶³ *Ibidem*, PG 97:1332B: ἐπαξίως τῆς Ἐδὲμ προεξερρίφη ὡς μὴ φυλάξας μίαν σου, Σωτὴρ, ἐντολὴν ὁ Ἄδαμ.

¹⁶⁴ *Ibidem*, PG 97:1349D-1352A: Εἰργάσω τὴν σωτηρίαν ἐν μέσῳ τῆς γῆς, ὁ Κτίστης, ἵνα σωθῶμεν· ἐκουσίως ξύλῳ ἀνεσταύρωσαι· ἡ Ἐδὲμ κλεισθεῖσα ἀνεῳγνυτο.

¹⁶⁵ *Ibidem*, PG 97:1364D: Ληστήν τοῦ παραδείσου, Χριστέ, πολίτην; PG 97:1384D: Ἀμήν σοι λέγω, μετ’ ἐμοῦ ἔσῃ ἐν τῷ Παραδείσῳ, ὅταν ἔλθω ἐν τῇ δόξῃ μου.

Clearly, the other two themes are directly related to the theme of Paradise: the touching of the tree and the gaze at its beauty led man to wear “robes of skin” (*Gn* 3:21)¹⁶⁶, “torn robe”¹⁶⁷ “raiment of shame”¹⁶⁸ or of “coat of disgrace that is shamefully bloodstained”¹⁶⁹, and in the end to the loss of Paradise. Andrew of Crete says, very explicitly, in his *Canon* that man “looked upon the beauty of the forbidden tree”¹⁷⁰, fell badly and was bitterly hurt by touching the tree¹⁷¹, while to the original sin has “stitched for me robes of skin”, emptying it from “the garment that God has woven for me”¹⁷². Once again, the typological references for the three themes are completely lacking.

3.4. Although it occurs in one troparion of the *Great Canon*, the face of *Abel* is related to the attribute of justice: Τῇ τοῦ Ἀβελ, Ἰησοῦ, οὐχ ὡμοιώθην δικαιοσύνη¹⁷³. It is also known throughout the entire patristic tradition that *Abel* symbolizes justice. He is the model “of the right man”¹⁷⁴ and the pre-imagining of the justice and the innocence of Christ. Obviously, the philology of the troparion itself in which appears the name of *Abel* clearly stresses the reference to the justice and innocent sacrifice of *Abel* as a prefiguration of Christ’s sacrifice, since in the center of the chiasmus is found the expression οὐ πράξεις ἐνθέους, οὐ θυσίαν καθάραν¹⁷⁵. In other words, the similarity between the two characters stands in the sacrifice and in death¹⁷⁶: on the one hand, *Abel* brings gifts (sacrifices) favoured by God (*Gn* 4: 4; *Heb* 11: 4), and on the other hand, Christ brings himself as gift, as a sacrifice for the sins of the people (*Php* 2).

3.5. The typology of *Enoch* is not expressed directly by Andrew in his *Canon*. Although the Hymnographer recalls that the soul does not imitate *Enoch*, who was elevated to heaven (οὐ τὸν Ἐνὼχ τῇ μεταθέσει), the refer-

¹⁶⁶ *Ibidem*, PG 97:1337A: Κατέρραψε τοὺς δερματίνους χιτῶνας. For details regarding the dogmatic theology created around this theme from the *Great Canon*, see: Π. Νέλλα, “Τὰ ἀνθρωπολογικὰ”, p. 124-125.

¹⁶⁷ Ανδρέας Κρήτης, *Κανὼν ὁ Μέγας*, PG 97:1337A: διερρηγμένον χιτῶνα.

¹⁶⁸ *Ibidem*, PG 97:1337A: τὸν στολισμὸν τῆς αἰσχύνης.

¹⁶⁹ *Ibidem*, PG 97:1337B: ἐστόλισμαι κατεστιγμένον χιτῶνα καὶ ἡμαγμένον αἰσχροῦς.

¹⁷⁰ *Ibidem*, PG 97:1337A: τοῦ φυτοῦ τὸ ὠραῖον.

¹⁷¹ *Ibidem*, PG 97:1332B: εἶδες γὰρ κακῶς καὶ ἐτρώθης πικρῶς, καὶ ἦψω τοῦ ξύλου.

¹⁷² *Ibidem*, PG 97:1337A: γυμνώσασά με τῆς πρὶν θεοῦφάντου στολῆς.

¹⁷³ *Ibidem*, PG 97:1332C .

¹⁷⁴ Σ. Κούτσα, Ἀδαμιαῖος θρῆνος, p. 51 ; S. Pașcanu, *Comentariu*, p. 26.

¹⁷⁵ A. Κρήτης, *Κανὼν ὁ Μέγας*, PG 97:1332C. About the chiasmus of this hymn, see extensively in our research: “*Canonul cel Mare al Sfântului Andrei Criteanul - aspecte tehnice (I)*” in: *Biserica și lumea. Revistă de spiritualitate ortodoxă*, II (2007), 1, p. 71.

¹⁷⁶ S. Pașcanu, *Comentariu*, p. 26.

ence to Christ’s Ascension to Heaven is lacking. Moreover, we find a moral reference of the Byzantine Hymnographer. Through the face of Enoch, the Hymnographer seeks a possible comparison of the soul who, in the continuous road of spiritual ascendancy must break away from the earthly. However, one element nears him to Romanos’s *kontakia*. Both Romanos the Melodist and Andrew of Crete link Enoch to the category of “righteous”:

Πάντας τοὺς πρὸ νόμου παραδραμοῦσα, ὦ ψυχὴ, τῷ Σῇθ οὐχ
ὠμοιώθης, οὐ τὸν Ἐνὼς ἐμιμήσω, οὐ τὸν Ἐνὼχ τῇ μεταθέσει, οὐ τὸν
Νῶε· ἀλλ’ ὥφθης πενιχρὰ τῆς τῶν δικαίων ζωῆς¹⁷⁷.

Such a moral reference is understood also by the insertion of the name of Enos, son of Seth (*Gn* 4:26), which, according to the Fathers, signifies the union of the soul with the virtue¹⁷⁸. In other words, the soul is called to a join the practicing of virtues to a new state, that of grace that penetrates and enlightens the soul to the knowledge of God. For the same moral reference there are also characters like Seth, Elijah¹⁷⁹ and the Shunammite woman¹⁸⁰.

3.6. *Noah* is related, as in the *kontakia* of Romanos, with the building of the ark. But Andrew prefers to unite, in his fundamental work, the saving of the world from the flood¹⁸¹ and implicitly of Noah’s family, the one from the righteous family¹⁸², the salvation of mankind through Christ’s Church, “the Ark of salvation” (τῆς σωστικῆς κιβωτοῦ). In other words, Andrew of Crete sees in Noah’s ark the typological image of the universal Church, which rescues Man, since Christ is its Head:

μόνη ἐξήνοιξας τοὺς καταρράκτας τῆς ὀργῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ σου, ψυχὴ
μου, καὶ κατέκλυσας πᾶσαν, ὡς γῆν, τὴν σάρκα καὶ τὰς πράξεις καὶ
τὸν βίον· καὶ ἔμεινας ἐκτὸς τῆς σωστικῆς κιβωτοῦ¹⁸³.

¹⁷⁷ A. Κρήτης, *Κανὼν ὁ Μέγας*, PG 97:1340B.

¹⁷⁸ Ἰωάννου του Χρισοστόμου, *Homiliae in Genesim*, ὁμιλία κα’ γ’, in: Jacques-Paul Migne (ed.), *Patrologia Graeca*, 53, p. 179.

¹⁷⁹ See: A. Κρήτης, *Κανὼν ὁ Μέγας*, PG 97:1372A: ἐνέπρησεν Ἡλιοῦ ποτε δις πεντήκοντα τῆς Ἰεζάβελ, ὅτε τοὺς τῆς αἰσχύνης προφήτας κατηγάλωσεν; 97:11372A: ἐκλείσθη σοι οὐρανός, ψυχὴ, καὶ λιμός Θεοῦ κατέλαβέ σε, ὅτε τοῖς Ἡλιοῦ τοῦ Θεοβίτου ὡς ὁ Ἀχαάβ ἠπειθήσας λόγοις ποτέ; 97:1376A: ὁ διφρέλατης Ἡλίας ἄρματι ταῖς ἀρεταῖς ἐπιβάς ὡς εἰς Οὐρανούς ἤγετο ὑπεράνω ποτὲ τῶν ἐπιγείων· τοῦτου οὖν, ψυχὴ μου, τὴν ἄνοδον ἀναλογίζου.

¹⁸⁰ *Ibidem*, PG 97:1376B: ἡ Σωμανίτις ποτε τὸν δίκαιον ἐξένισεν, ὦ ψυχὴ, γνώμη ἀγαθῇ· σὺ δὲ οὐκ εἰσφκίσω οὐ ξένον οὐχ ὀδίτην· ὅθεν τοῦ νυμφῶνος ριφήση ἔξω θρηνωδοῦσα.

¹⁸¹ *Ibidem*, PG 97:1344A: Τοὺς ἐπὶ Νῶε, Σωτήρ, ἡσεληγκότας ἐμιμησάμην, τὴν ἐκείνων κληρωσάμενος καταδίκην ἐν κατακλυσμῷ καταδύσεως.

¹⁸² *Ibidem*, PG 97:1340B: Πάντας τοὺς πρὸ νόμου παραδραμοῦσα, ὦ ψυχὴ, τῷ Σῇθ οὐχ ὠμοιώθης... οὐ τὸν Νῶε· ἀλλ’ ὥφθης πενιχρὰ τῆς τῶν δικαίων ζωῆς.

¹⁸³ *Ibidem*, PG 97:1340B; Ἱ. του Λίνδιου, *Θησαυρὸς Μετανοίας*, p. 198-199.

3.7. An enigmatic character in the the Old Testament, which prefigures Christ, is *Melchizedek*, king of Salem and priest of God (Gen 14:18). Andrew of Crete underlines his typological relationship to Christ in one troparion: τὸν ἱερέα Θεοῦ καὶ βασιλέα μεμονωμένον, τοῦ Χριστοῦ τὸ ἀφομοίωμα, τοῦ ἐν κόσμῳ, βίου ἐν ἀνθρώποις, μιμήθητι¹⁸⁴. Andrew's expressions such as "Priest of God" (τὸν ἱερέα Θεοῦ) and "king" (βασιλέα) suggest both the nearness to the biblical image of Melchizedek, as well as the erminia of his prototype¹⁸⁵. Melchizedek, king, and at the same time, priest of God, passes the history of salvation as a figure of the Word of God¹⁸⁶. We don't know his parents, being estranged in the world (τὸ ἀφομοίωμα, τοῦ ἐν κόσμῳ), as Christ "did not have a father as a Human, and, as God, did not have a mother, the One who was eternal, immortal, without beginning and without end – king and priest at the same time"¹⁸⁷. Melchizedek is not a simple person through which God has worked in history but the prefigurative character of Christ, the Bishop, King and Master of the world.

3.8. *Isaac* is another typological exponent of Christ, found in the *Great Canon*¹⁸⁸. Obviously, his image is related to that of his father, Abraham, therefore, "in days of old left the land of his fathers and became a wanderer" (καταλιπόντα γῆν πατρώαν, καὶ γενόμενον μετανάστην)¹⁸⁹. The sacrifice of Isaac mentioned in a single troparion in the *Canon*¹⁹⁰ prefigures "the image of Golgotha"¹⁹¹ where Christ broke "the deed of sin".

In full obedience to God, Abraham the man (symbol of God the Father, even though the Byzantine Hymnographer introduces him to us in the *Canon* only from a historical and spiritual perspective¹⁹²) sacrifices his own

¹⁸⁴ PG 97:1344C.

¹⁸⁵ Ἰ. του Λίνδιου, *Θησαυρὸς Μετανοίας*, p. 297; Σ. Κούτσα, *Ἀδαμαῖος θρήνος*, p. 113; S. Pașcanu, *Comentariu*, p. 52; J. Getcha, "Le grand canon", p. 117; idem, "Reading the Bible", p. 142.

¹⁸⁶ O. Clément, *Le chant des larmes*, p. 59; idem, "Notes", p. 227.

¹⁸⁷ Ἰ. του Λίνδιου, *Θησαυρὸς Μετανοίας*, p. 300.

¹⁸⁸ A. Giannouli, *Die beiden byzantinischen Kommentare*, p. 289: ¹³⁻¹⁶Καὶ οὕτω τύπος γενόμενος τοῦ Σωτῆρος, ὡς ἀγαπητὸς υἱὸς ἀγόμενος εἰς θυσίαν τοῦ θύεσθαι, καὶ οὐ σφαγεῖς ἀλλὰ κριοῦ θεοπέμπτου ἀναπληρώσαντος τὴν θυσίαν, ὡς ἐκ τάφου τοῦ βουνοῦ ἦνεγκε ζῶντα τὸν Ἰσαὰκ ὁ Ἀβραάμ.

¹⁸⁹ A. Κρήτης, *Κανὼν ὁ Μέγας*, PG 97:1344B.

¹⁹⁰ *Ibidem*, PG 97:1344B-C: τὸν Ἰσαὰκ, τάλαινα, γνοῦσα, ψυχὴ μου, καινὴν θυσίαν μυστικῶς ὀλοκαρπούμενον τῷ Κυρίῳ, μίμῃσαι αὐτοῦ τὴν προαίρεσιν.

¹⁹¹ O. Clément, *Le chant des larmes*, p. 59.

¹⁹² Abraham's image is described in three consecutive troparions, which refer to two moments of his life: the leaving of the land of Haran (the first two hymns) and the philoxenia that appeared to him at the Oak of Mamre (last hymn). See: A. Κρήτης, *Κανὼν ὁ Μέγας*, PG 97:1344B.

son, just as the Son of God, in full obedience to God, sacrificed himself and was sacrificed for the entire humankind¹⁹³. The image of Isaac’s sacrifice in the Old Testament reveals not only the typological form of Christ’s sacrifice, but also the mysterious presence of Christ in the Old Covenant. Certainly Andrew sees in the death and sacrifice of Isaac the idea of the Resurrection of Christ.

3.9. *Joseph* the righteous is expressed in the *Great Canon*¹⁹⁴ as the typological image of the entire life of Christ¹⁹⁵. The typological relation of this character with Christ is expressed (also) at a philological level, through the insertion of τύπον. If in the case of the numerous Old Testament characters, the Byzantine Hymnographer presents the typology in a “disguised” manner, leaving the reader to read “between the lines” and about Joseph he says directly that his selling was “as a foretelling of the Lord” (εἰς τύπον τοῦ Κυρίου)¹⁹⁶, and the indwelling in the pit is “was to prefigure Thy Burial and Resurrection” of Christ (εἰς τύπον τῆς Ταφῆς καὶ τῆς Ἑγέρσεώς σου¹⁹⁷). In other words, the selling of Joseph by his brothers or “by his kinsmen” (ὑπὸ τῶν συγγόνων) for twenty pieces of silver (*Gn* 37:1-36) prefigured the selling of the Saviour by Judas, while the indwelling in the pit without water prefigures the burial and Resurrection of the Lord¹⁹⁸. The Byzantine Hymnographer seems atypical through the direct insertion of the two the typological forms. But his theological goal is not only to present a simple Old Testament character, in the present case of the history of Joseph, but to express to the audience the importance of Joseph within the history of salvation. Joseph is named by Andrew in two occurrences “the righteous” (τὸν δίκαιον)¹⁹⁹, as he did with Moses, or as “the fruit of purity and wisdom” (τὸν τῆς ἀγνείας καρπὸν καὶ τὸν τῆς σωφροσύνης)²⁰⁰

¹⁹³ Ἰ. του Λίνδιου, *Θησαυρὸς Μετανοίας*, p. 280.

¹⁹⁴ Joseph’s image appears only in four consecutive occurrences from the *Great Canon*, two occurrences strictly related to the typology. See: A. Κρήτης, *Κανὼν ὁ Μέγας*, PG 97:1353B-C.

¹⁹⁵ A. Giannouli, *Die beiden byzantinischen Kommentare*, p. 289: ²⁰⁻²¹ ὁ δίκαιος Ἰωσήφ, τύπος γενόμενος ὅλος ὁ βίος αὐτοῦ τοῦ Σωτήρος Χριστοῦ; J. Getcha, “Reading the Bible”, p. 142.

¹⁹⁶ For an accurate understanding, we present the entire hymn: A. Κρήτης, *Κανὼν ὁ Μέγας*, PG 97:1353C: ὑπὸ τῶν συγγόνων ἡ δικαία ψυχὴ δέδοτο· πέπρατο εἰς δουλείαν ὁ γλυκύς, εἰς τύπον τοῦ Κυρίου· αὐτὴ δὲ ὅλη, ψυχὴ, ἐπράθη τοῖς κακοῖς σου.

¹⁹⁷ *Ibidem*, PG 97:1353C.

¹⁹⁸ J. Getcha, “Le grand canon”, p. 117: “le séjour de Joseph dans la fosse est interprété comme une figure du séjour du Christ au tombeau”; see: Σ. Κούτσα, *Αδαμιαῖος θρήνος*, p. 148, 150; O. Clément, *Le chant des larmes*, p. 59.

¹⁹⁹ A. Κρήτης, *Κανὼν ὁ Μέγας*, PG 97:1353C.

²⁰⁰ *Ibidem*, PG 97:1353B.

or “the sweet” (ὁ γλυκὺς)²⁰¹. This last expression is also given to Christ in an eminently Christological troparion: Σὺ εἶ ὁ γλυκὺς Ἰησοῦς²⁰². The historical extension in the “case” of Joseph is clear: as the ancient was detested and sold at the price of a slave, so Christ was envied by those of His breed and sold by one of His fellows for a derisory amount of money.

3.10. *Moses* is another exponent of Andrew’s typology. The eight occurrences where his name appears do not relate entirely to the typology. They are rather a concise examination of the life of Moses: from the rescue and accession from the house of Pharaoh to the passing with the people of Israel through the wilderness²⁰³. “Great Moses”, the title awarded by the Byzantine Hymnographer in his fundamental work, is placed in typological relationship in the case of two instances, namely the marking and the hitting of the Red Sea through the middle of which passed the entire people of Israel and the hitting of the rock with his staff:

Τὴν Μωσέως ῥάβδον εἰκονίζου, ψυχὴ, πλήττουσαν θάλασσαν καὶ πηγνύουσιν βυθὸν τύπῳ Σταυροῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ, δι’ οὗ δυνήσῃ καὶ σὺ μεγάλα ἐκτελέσαι²⁰⁴.

In other words, the rod of Moses speaks of Christ, who through the Cross leads his people to supreme freedom. Moses through the sign of the Cross covered the Egyptians and the Pharaoh’s chariots²⁰⁵, using the Red Sea, while Christ through His sacrifice on the cross, destroyed death through His death. This theological expression of the Byzantine Hymnographer is emphasized both in the patristic tradition²⁰⁶ and in the hymnographic one²⁰⁷.

²⁰¹ *Ibidem*, PG 97:1353C.

²⁰² *Ibidem*, PG 97:1341D.

²⁰³ In their order: *Ibidem*, PG 97:1353C: τοῦ Μωσέως ἤκουσας τὴν θήβην, ψυχὴ, ὕδασι, κύμασι φερομένην ποταμοῦ, ὡς ἐν θαλάμῳ πάλαι; 97:1356A: νῦν ὡς ὁ μέγας Μωσῆς τιθηνοῦ τὴν σοφίαν; 97:1356A: ὡς Μωσῆς ὁ μέγας τὸν Αἰγύπτιον νοῦν, οὐκ ἀπέκτεινας; 97:1356A: τὰς ἐρήμους ᾤκησεν ὁ μέγας Μωσῆς; 97:1356A: τὴν Μωσέως ῥάβδον εἰκονίζου, ψυχὴ, πλήττουσαν θάλασσαν καὶ πηγνύουσιν βυθὸν τύπῳ Σταυροῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ; 97:1357D: ἡ χεὶρ ἡμᾶς Μωσέως πιστώσεται, ψυχὴ, πῶς δύναται Θεὸς, λεπτρωθέντα βίον λευκᾶναι καὶ καθᾶραι; 97:1360A: ὡς ἐπληξε Μωσῆς ὁ θεράπων σου ῥάβδῳ τὴν πέτραν; 97:1380D: Μωσέως παρήγαγον, ψυχὴ, τὴν κοσμογένεσιν καὶ ἐξ ἐκείνου πᾶσαν ἐνδιάθετον γραφὴν.

²⁰⁴ *Ibidem*, PG 97:1356A.

²⁰⁵ *Ibidem*, PG 97:1357D: τὰ κύματα, Σῶτερ, τῶν πταισμάτων μου, ὡς ἐν θαλάσῃ Ἐρυθρᾷ, ἐπαναστραφέντα ἐκάλυψέ με ἄφνω, ὡς τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους ποτὲ καὶ τοὺς τριστάτας.

²⁰⁶ See, for example: Ἰωάννου τοῦ Δαμασκηνοῦ, *Ἐκδοσις ἀκριβῆς τῆς ὀρθοδόξου πίστεως*, IV, ια’ [11], in: Jacques-Paul Migne (ed.), *Patrologia Graeca*, 94, 1132C-1133A; Ῥάβδος Μωσαϊκῆ, σταυροτύπως τὴν θάλασσαν πληξάσα, καὶ σώσασα μὲν τὸν Ἰσραὴλ, Φαραὼ δὲ βυθίσασα.

²⁰⁷ See: Σταυρὸν χαράξας Μωσῆς, ἐπ’ εὐθείας ῥάβδῳ, τὴν Ἐρυθρὰν διέτεμε, τῷ Ἰσραὴλ πεζεύσαντι τὴν δὲ ἐπιστρεπτικῶς, Φαραὼ τοῖς ἄρμασι, χροτήσας ἦνωσεν.

The second context is focused on the hitting of the rock with his the staff by Moses. In this example, the Byzantine poet uses the basic term τύπος saying about the event from the wilderness that

ὡς ἔπληξε Μωσῆς ὁ θεράπων σου ράβδῳ τὴν πέτραν, τυπικῶς τὴν
ζωοποιόν σου Πλευρὰν προδιετύπου, ἐξ ἧς πάντες πόμα ζωῆς,
Σωτήρ, ἀντλοῦμεν²⁰⁸.

Basically, the rod of Moses in the entire patristic literature is the *type* that prefigures the Holy Cross²⁰⁹. Although Moses is the one who achieves the miracle in front of the people, its true author is God himself: ἐγὼ εἰμι Θεός, ὁ μάννα ἐπομβρήσας καὶ τὸ ὕδωρ ἐκ πέτρας πηγάσας πάλαι ἐν ἐρήμῳ τῷ λαῷ μου²¹⁰.

Instead of conclusions: several suggestions

The typologies used by Romanos in his kontakia should not be understood as mere poetic techniques that offer a dramatic effect to his poems. Rather, they clearly “serve” in a theological sense that helps the Byzantine hymnologist in making his points: each of the Old Testament events helps to project their image towards the “fulfilment” in the Person of Christ, who reiterates the entire creation. Clearly, the use of typologies proves an extremely thorough knowledge of the biblical text. It is further proof that to the Fathers of the Church, the Scripture remains the main source. Each of its lines, every event, and every character is exhaustively explored by Romanos. He does not make theological poetry, but poetic theology. For Roman, theology, along with poetry and music, vibrates with Christological tones, so any typology he uses embeds itself on the incarnated divine Logos, who redeemed man through His sacrifice. Obviously, Romanos uses an entire “arsenal” of theological terminology to achieve his goal, without falling into the “temptation” of words. In other words, the Melodist did not lose the “appetite” for the *Word*, by becoming fascinated by the “appetite” for the *words*! Neither does

ἐπ’ εὔρους διαγράψας, τὸ ἀήττητον ὅπλον... (*Μηναῖον τοῦ Σεπτεμβρίου*, Εκδόσις της Αποστολικῆς Διακονίας της Εκκλησίας της Ελλάδος, Εν Αθῆναις, p. 236), or the heirmos Ἀρμαρτηλάτην Φαραὼ ἐβύθισε, τερατουργοῦσα ποτέ, Μωσαϊκὴ ράβδος σταυροτύπως πλήξασα, καὶ διελοῦσα θάλασσαν Ἰσραὴλ δὲ φυγάδα, πεζὸν ὁδίτην διέσωσεν (*Μηναῖον τοῦ Φεβρουαρίου*, Εκδόσις της Αποστολικῆς Διακονίας της Εκκλησίας της Ελλάδος, Εν Αθῆναις, p. 278-279).

²⁰⁸ A. Κρήτης, *Κανὼν ὁ Μέγας*, PG 97:1360A.

²⁰⁹ Σ. Κούτσα, *Ἀδαμιαῖος θρήνος*, p. 156; O. Clément, *Le chant des larmes*, p. 59; J. Getcha, “Le grand canon”, p. 117.

²¹⁰ A. Κρήτης, *Κανὼν ὁ Μέγας*, PG 97:1340A.

he “wrap up” his theological words for *the sake of art*, but out of love for the Word, which is revealed *through and in* words.

But does Andrew of Crete, Archbishop of Gortyna and inventor of the canon have the same theological vision when using typologies? Is he inspired by Romanos’s typology? In order to provide an answer, we need to point out some of the peculiarities of the typologies used by Andrew of Crete in the *Great Canon*. First, in his fundamental work, we notice a rather small terminological language (only two terms, τύπος and εικονίζω), while occurrences directly indicating this typological relationship are more reduced in comparison with Romanos’s hymnography. Andrew is rather concerned with the spiritual nuances of the biblical text, looking for patterns that a soul must emulate on its way to the salvation in Christ.

Apart from this aspect, a first similarity between the two Hymnographers is related with the typology of Joseph and Moses. Only for these two Old Testament characters, both Andrew of Crete and Romanos the Melodist directly indicate the typological relationship. We do not know the cause of this identification and the mere expression of the acknowledgment of Romanos’s influence on the fundamental work of Andrew - starting from this identification - is rather risky. We believe, however, that the use of these kontakia of Romanos’s during the *Great Lent*, coupled with the reality that the text of the *Great Canon* was read from the very beginning in this “time of repentance”²¹¹, may indicate an alleged influence from the typology of Romanos.

Clearly, this idea finds support also at textual level. In other words, Andrew of Crete uses the specific terminology and Romanos’s typology in the same contexts over the same characters (Joseph and Moses):

Old Testament characters	in Romanos the Melodist kontakia	in the <i>Great Canon</i> of Andrew of Crete
Joseph	<p>τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἦν τύπος φησὶ γάρ, Ἰούδας τοῖς συγγόνοις βουλευέται· Πραθείτω τὸ μύρον τῶν ἀδελφῶν. ὦ ἀπὸ πόσων γενεῶν λάμπει Ἰούδας! ὦ τῆς προδοσίας ἀρχαία εἰκὼν ὁ ἐν τῷ Ἰωσήφ τύπος γενόμενος Χριστὸς</p>	<p>εἰς τύπον τοῦ Κυρίου εἰς τύπον τῆς Ταφῆς καὶ τῆς Ἐγέρσεώς σου</p>

²¹¹ Perhaps even Andrew’s troparion emphasizes its projection to be read during the *Great Lent*: μετανοίας ὁ καιρὸς· προσέρχομαί σοι, τῷ Πλαστοργῷ μου· ἄρον τὸν κλοιὸν ἀπ’ ἐμοῦ τὸν βαρύν, τὸν τῆς ἁμαρτίας, see: A. Κρήτης, *Κανὼν ὁ Μέγας*, PG 97:1333B.

Moses

ράβδος ποτὲ καὶ ὁ προφήτης
Μωσῆς τύποι τούτων
ἐγένοντο

Τὴν Μωσέως ῥάβδον
εἰκονίζου, ψυχὴ,
πλήττουσαν θάλασσαν καὶ
πηγνύουσιν βυθὸν τύπῳ
Σταυροῦ τοῦ θείου

ὡς ἐπληξε Μωσῆς ὁ
θεράπων σου ῥάβδῳ
τὴν πέτραν, τυπικῶς τὴν
ζωοποιόν σου Πλευρὰν
προδιετύπου, ἐξ ἧς πάντες
πόμα ζωῆς, Σωτήρ,
ἀντλοῦμεν

A distinction between the typological characters presented by Romanos and Andrew is given by the face of Melchizedek. Romanos seems to forget him in his kontakia, while Andrew – although in a terse form – remembers him as a likeness of Christ (τοῦ Χριστοῦ τὸ ἀφομοίωμα). We shall not insist here on the theological content of this expression, but we believe that this reference confirms even more Andrew’s attempt to provide typological models that Scripture itself indicates. The fact that for Melchizedek the expression βασιλέα τὸν ἱερέα Θεοῦ is used, can it be a clue that Andrew might refer here, in a subtle manner, to the Byzantine emperor from his time? Hard to answer, considering the fact that the expression τοῦ Χριστοῦ τὸ ἀφομοίωμα may be attributed only to an emperor who was orthodox in belief, namely either to Justinian II (685-695, 705-711) or to Anastasius II (713-715) or Theodosius III (715-718). To whom should it be attributed? Even harder to answer.

After all, the identification, classification and the erminia of the typologies clearly show us that in the research of the Christian hymnography not the *quantitative nor the qualitative* has the utmost importance, as neither the interrogation “Who is the greatest among the Hymnographers?”, but the theological aim it develops and proposes to the contemporaries for a living confession. Only in this theological manner, the text and *its author*, the hymnography and the *Hymnographer* will lead us closer to Christ “the same yesterday, and today, and for ever” (Heb 13:8).