

## Propositions

1. The history of the patristic exegesis in the 2-5. centuries can not be described in the terms of antagonistic exegetical schools. This conventional method-centred approach of the patristic exegesis draws a false, angled picture of the period under consideration. The different extension of the corpus subsisting during the centuries from these authors cause a large disproportion, which can not be neglected, as well as the subject-matter (traditum) of the exegetical tradition and the way of the tradition. Similarly we have to reckon with the determining character of the literary genres using the embodied exegetical matters to define a balanced position about this tradition.
2. The acceptance of the tradition is not necessarily accompanied with the adoption of the biblical citations used in the interpretation. The choice of these citations belongs to the "inventio" of the author. The diversity of the biblical citations used for interpreting the same biblical passages proves the "biblical" epithet of the exegesis depending on the acceptance of the Church and not on the usage of proof-texts or loci communes.
3. A broad and overall hermeneutic can be observed in Chrysostom's interpretation of the Gospel of John, which is based on the theory of sugkatēbasij resting on the apophatical theology. Contrary to the philosophically elaborated but consistently never used hermeneutic of Origen, that of Chrysostom is a moderate one and adaptable to the whole Scriptures. Chrysostom gives a simple answer to the epistemological problem of the incomprehensibility of God: "God never discloses himself in his essence, but as his beholder can bear", namely the revelation of God accommodates itself to the level of human beings. This accommodation (συγκατάβασις) of the divine Revelation to the human nature corresponds with the incarnation of the Son of God (ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν ἡμερῶν τούτων ἐλάλησεν ἡμῖν ἐν υἱῷ H 1,2). The duality of the terms (ταπεινόν and ὑψηλόν) expressing the accommodation of God offers an easy solution for the interpretation of the seemingly opposite scriptural passages.
4. In the exegesis of Chrysostom the choice of exegetical method does not depend on the struggle of opposing exegetical schools, but on the expectation of his audience and on the inventio of the author. The exegetes respected mainly the methods accepted by the learned of their era (cf. the critic of Porphyry on the allegory of Origen and the decline of this kind of allegorizing). It means however that the choice of the exegetical methods belongs to the field of the elocutio, and hardly determines the output of the interpretation.

5. The reception of the knowledge of God stemming from the Revelation is not an evolution or the increment of knowledge, but a dialectic course of the human misunderstanding and of the divine correction of it, namely the advance in knowledge is shown in this permanent divine correction of human foreknowledge. In Chrysostom's opinion God takes into account the human misunderstanding in point of the salvation-history and the announcement of the salvation, unmistakably unfolding its witnesses before the word. The sentences of the holy writers or the deeds of the scriptural characters correct the foreknowledge or misunderstanding of the audience, setting aside his false suspicions.