JOHN CHRYSOSTOM
PAST, PRESENT, FUTURE

Doru Costache
Mario Baghos
editors

AIOCS
The Australian Institute
for Orthodox Christian Studies

John Chrysostom
Past, Present, Future

John Chrysostom
Past, Present, Future

Edited by
Doru Costache and Mario Baghos

AIOCS Press
Sydney, 2017

John Chrysostom
Past, Present, Future

AIOCS Press
https://www.aiocs.org/publishing-house

National Library of Australia Cataloguing-in-Publication entry

Title: John Chrysostom : past, present, future
edited by Doru Costache, Mario Baghos.

ISBN: 9780646975375 (paperback)

Subjects: John Chrysostom, Saint, -407
Church history--Primitive and early church, ca. 30-600.
Christian literature, Early--Criticism and interpretation.
Christian saints--Byzantine Empire.
Theology--Early works to 1800.

Other Creators/Contributors:
Costache, Doru, editor.
Baghos, Mario, editor.

The publication of this volume was made possible by a grant from Australian Research Theology Foundation Inc.

ISBN (10): 0-646-97537-4
ISBN (13): 978-0-646-97537-5

Cover design by Ion Nedelcu
Cover photo St John Chrysostom, Cappella Palatina, Palermo, by Mario Baghos (2016)

Contents

Preface

The volume you are now reading, *John Chrysostom: Past, Present, Future*, collects ten chapters which in an earlier form were presented for the Seventh St Andrew's Patristic Symposium, held in Sydney in September 2016. The conference was convened by the editors of this book, together with our esteemed colleagues, Adam Cooper and James Harrison.

The chapters included here, written by eight scholars from Australia and two from abroad, offer new interdenominational and crossdisciplinary perspectives on the life, thought, and legacy of one of the most influential bishops of Late Antiquity, Saint John Chrysostom of Constantinople (d. 407). In so doing, they join a global phenomenon which, as highlighted by Wendy Mayer in chapter eight, represents a significant shift of direction in early Christian, patristic, and medieval studies. Throughout the twentieth century, the scholarly landscape was dominated by research on such representatives of the Christian tradition as Origen the Alexandrian, Gregory of Nyssa, Augustine of Hippo, and Maximus the Confessor, whose manifold contributions have been and still constitute the focus of analyses that have reached industrial proportions. In the shadow of the speculative thinking, mystical insight, ascetic wisdom, and doctrinal acumen of these giants, the input of Chrysostom seemed unable to elicit similar attention on the part of scholars. Indeed, when considering the specialised literature, one notices that his otherwise imposing corpus of writings has not sparked an equal scholarly fascination in the last century.

Against this backdrop, the rise of Chrysostomian studies in the last couple of decades amounts to a landslide. They fill a gap in the overall understanding

of the early Christian centuries, casting fresh new light upon forgotten horizons of ecclesial, social, and cultural complexity. Within this new setting emerges out of oblivion another side to Chrysostom, equally gigantic, that of a versatile pastor, exegete, preacher, and theologian of note, whose lasting impact on Christian history, east and west, is undeniable. It is this figure, we read in chapter two, by Pauline Allen, who was perceived long after his own time as "a man for all seasons," frequently claimed as supporter by opposite sides and so not a marginal player at all. It seems that a similar intuition concerning the relevance of his manifold contributions fuels the development of Chrysostomian studies in our time.

Perhaps not without a providential nudge, the revived scholarly interest in Chrysostom is without a doubt motivated, possibly on a subconscious level, by the exigencies of our time, which, more than the illustrious input of the great speculative theologians, system builders, and polemicists of the past, needs the grassroots oriented discourse of one like him. And although scholars will continue to pursue their academic interest in Chrysostom irrespective of the ecclesial setting, an attentive observer will not miss that today, more than ever, Christianity needs lessons in wisdom to guide it through the internal and external challenges of anachronism, fundamentalism, intolerance, marginalisation, conflict, and violence inherent to its current circumstances. In the light of these circumstances, by his realistic and pastoral cast of mind, Chrysostom is a Church father for our age of tremendous challenges—cultural, psychological, social, religious, ecological, and economic. At least, the shared conviction of the contributors to this volume seems to be that Chrysostom has much to offer today and, why not, tomorrow, as he had yesterday.

But the scholarly rediscovery of Chrysostom is not the only side of his story. Whereas his personality and contributions have long slipped under the scholarly radar, as they did up until very recently, that was not his destiny in the collective memory of the ecclesial world. Christians have never ceased to honour him, through the centuries, as Ecumenical Teacher in the east and Doctor of the Church in the west. They have celebrated him, and still do, as a scriptural interpreter, spiritual guide, preacher, political activist, ascetic, contributor to culture, pastor, theologian, and saint. Particularly his martyr's end at the hands of hostile imperial and ecclesiastical agents engendered the admiration and reverence of Christians worldwide. He has been a landmark and a source of inspiration for the renewal of the ecclesial life—epitomised in the ascription by the Byzantines of one of their eucharistic liturgies to him. That very liturgy is still the most familiar fixture of the Orthodox Christian experience, being celebrated throughout the year, every year since at least the ninth century. It is fortunate therefore that scholarship has caught up

with this towering figure, in turn bringing to the fore fresh new facets of his diverse activity. In studying Chrysostom, everyone gains: Late Antique scholarship and worldwide Christianity alike.

The portrait that emerges is not without contradictions. Chrysostom was a profound thinker, but not one who would gladly immerse in speculative thought. Out of care for the safety of his flock, he stirred the Christian crowds against what he construed as dangerously different, yet he remained foreign to xenophobia and violence. An exponent of classical learning, he was at the same time a consummate shepherd, concerned with the wellbeing of his flock. He was a refined theologian, with crucial contributions in the areas of theodicy, providence, and free will, but never tempted by endless doctrinal polemics, so favoured by many of his episcopal confrères. He was a skilled exegete whose engagement of Scripture transcended the artificial boundaries drawn by scholars between Antiochene and Alexandrine hermeneutics. He was an ascetic, but not one that would turn a lenient eye to the irregularities caused by the monastics of his diocese. A persecuted man, he was nevertheless a fierce protector of the exiled and the oppressed, which actually cost him both his career and life. Not always matching his devout representation by the Church, this complex portrait nevertheless belongs to a hero of whom the Church should be prouder than it is. Likewise, against the minor position to which he was relegated by older scholarship, the complex portrait which emerges is that of a star of first magnitude. Much more is still to be sorted out—from his posthumous role in shaping later christology to his immediate pastoral and missionary concerns, from his adherence to the philosophical trends of his time to the complexity of his approach to Scripture and the spiritual life, and from his reception in east and west to the pastoral and ecumenical lessons which can be inferred from his wisdom. Combined effort across the disciplines is required to perform this enormous task. The book you are now holding aims to do, albeit partially, just that, namely, to circumscribe the universe of Chrysostom from a variety of viewpoints.

The topics addressed in what follows range from hagiography (chapter one, by M. Baghos) and *Nachleben* (chapters two, three, four, and five, by P. Allen, D. Anlezark, A. Stambolov, and A. Cooper) to particular Chrysostomian contributions, such as christological (chapters five and six, by A. Cooper and S. Macdonald), pastoral (chapters eight and nine, by W. Mayer and P-W. Lai), rhetorical (chapters six, seven, and nine, by S. Macdonald, C. Baghos, and P-W. Lai), exegetical (chapters six, seven, and ten, by S. Macdonald, C. Baghos, and D. Costache), and ecological (chapters one and ten, by M. Baghos and D. Costache). Most of these contributions straddle various topics and areas. The authors had to so proceed due to the complexity of the matters of interest,

namely, Chrysostom's diverse ways of handling things, which demanded the adoption of crossdisciplinary angles. The contributions collected here consequently illustrate methods pertaining to anthropology, cosmology, ecology, hagiography, hermeneutics, history, linguistics, pastoral studies, pedagogy, philosophy, sociology, spirituality, and theology.

The crossdisciplinary aspect is well represented within the volume. Chapters two, seven, eight, and nine, by P. Allen, C. Baghos, W. Mayer, and P-W. Lai, offer useful surveys of past and recent Chrysostomian scholarship. Chapters two, three, and five, by P. Allen, D. Anlezark, and A. Cooper explore the history of reception, theological, and ecumenical impact of Chrysostom's christology in Chalcedonian and non-Chalcedonian sources, in medieval England, and in the seventh century Roman and Byzantine controversies. Chapters one and four, by M. Baghos and A. Stambolov, consider Chrysostom's representation in Late Ancient historiography, hagiography, and the ascetic literature. His pastoral handling of the challenges inherent to a diverse cultural, social, and religious context, together with his views of the spiritual life and priesthood, are examined in chapters eight and nine, by W. Mayer and P-W. Lai, through the lens of ascetic theology, hermeneutics, rhetoric, sociology, and virtue ethics. The same contributions of Mayer and Lai bring to the fore Chrysostom's take on philosophy as a way of life. Chapters six, seven, eight, and nine, by S. Macdonald, C. Baghos, W. Mayer, and P-W. Lai, search for the impact of the various philosophical ideas, concepts, and methods of Late Antiquity upon Chrysostom's thinking and writing. Particularities pertaining to Chrysostomian exegesis with reference to the Pauline corpus, the pro-Nicene use of scriptural passages, and Genesis 1–3 are discussed in chapters six, seven, and ten, by S. Macdonald, C. Baghos, and D. Costache. The volume begins and concludes with analyses by the editors, which bear on environmental studies and highlight the impact of holiness, and lack thereof, on the terrestrial ecosystem and the cosmos as a whole. And whereas M. Baghos' chapter considers these matters from the vantage point of religious studies, Church history, and hagiography, D. Costache's contribution addresses the same topic within a certain interpretive tradition of Genesis 1–3 in the early Christian centuries, together with its assumptions concerning theological anthropology, and from the viewpoint of contemporary anthropic cosmology.

The topics examined within this volume highlight the richness of Chrysostom's universe, of which some aspects, apart from their scholarly significance, still have a ring for the Christian ear. In turn, the methods applied throughout this book reveal the immensity of the task of spelling out his multifaceted contributions, and how new approaches bring to light further

aspects of his creativity. Together, these topics and methods point to the reasons behind the subtitle of this book, for which the editors are indebted to Pauline Allen—namely, the conviction that Chrysostom's voice, which reaches us from the past, will certainly reverberate beyond our own age.

Chrysostom was, of course, a man of his own time and for that matter, for us, a man of the past. This historical dimension is reflected in most chapters herein through explorations of what he said and why he said that within his own timeframe. The same dimension transpires through explorations of how his contributions have been received at the end of Late Antiquity and in the Middle Ages. Chrysostom is also a man for the present time in that, as pointed out above, beyond the gulfs of history his practical wisdom offers solutions for impasses which challenge us today, as Christians and as a civilisation. Consequently, several chapters herein draw parallels between his solutions and contemporary issues. But Chrysostom is also a man for the future. It is not difficult to predict that many of the problems which currently confront our culture, society, and ecclesial life will stay for awhile. Thus, irrespective of how appealing and uplifting the input of the other giants of patristic tradition may be, the contributions of Chrysostom, by their resonance with matters of everyday life, will offer wisdom and guidance for as long as these challenges will confront humankind. On the scholarly front, it is equally predictable that the largely unexplored Chrysostomian corpus will offer opportunities for excavation for many more decades. In particular, the adoption of new methodological approaches seems to mark the way ahead. In chapter eight, Wendy Mayer offers, from the viewpoint of her concerns, an illuminating summary of the current status and future possibilities in Chrysostomian studies. In her words,

> If viewing Chrysostom solely from the perspective of theology has in the past led to a decidedly negative view of his contribution to the development of Christian doctrine, while emphasis on his debt to his secular education and his local environment is opening up significant new vistas, the current challenge, they [i.e. scholars] would argue, is to marry together the two—theology and his moral-philosophical soul-therapy ... What is emerging from this approach is acknowledgement that Chrysostom did contribute to the development of eastern Christian thought in a number of not insignificant ways, with the potential that more contributions will in the future be acknowledged.

Through extrapolation, Mayer's assessment is valid for any other topic discussed in this book and very likely many more that have escaped our attention. On this front, the last three chapters, by W. Mayer, P-W. Lai, and

D. Costache, show fruits of such new investigative avenues and, implicitly, suggest further ways of approaching Chrysostom's universe.

The authors and editors of this volume hope that this tribute will be of service to scholars and students of early Christianity, Late Antiquity, and patristics, and also to the various branches of Christianity in Australia and abroad, which revere Saint John Chrysostom as a preacher, exegete, shepherd, and theologian of note. We, the editors, are thankful to the authors for their trust in our capacity to see this project to its completion. We express our debt of gratitude, likewise, to the tireless and competent scholars who have secured the anonymous peer review of the contributions published here. It would be remiss of us not to express our wholehearted appreciation to Ion Nedelcu, for his invaluable assistance with the graphic design, the layout of the book, and the index. Furthermore, we voice our satisfaction at the achievement of this first major contribution of The Australian Institute for Orthodox Christian Studies (AIOCS), whose co-founders we are, together with Chris Baghos. Last but not least, we express our heartfelt gratitude to The Australian Research Theology Foundation, Inc., for a grant that made possible the publication of this volume by AIOCS Press.

Doru Costache
Mario Baghos

Sydney
August 2017

Memory and reception

Chapter One

Ecosystemic Agency
Christ, His Saints, and John Chrysostom

Mario Baghos

Ioan P. Couliano coined the terms "ecosystemic intelligence" in relation to the Gnostic debate concerning the extent to which "the universe in which we live can be attributed to an intelligent and good cause."[1] The word 'ecosystem' etymologically derives from the Greek οἶκος, meaning "house" or "dwelling place," and σύστημα meaning "composite" or "ordered whole."[2] In light of these definitions, "ecosystemic intelligence" can be interpreted as a force that brings into order the 'house' of the cosmos. Since the agents of this sort of ordering can be more than mere 'minds,' I have opted in this chapter to use 'agency' instead of 'intelligence.'[3] Alternately, 'world-shaping' can be used to describe this sort of activity, which is basic to human beings on several levels, including: the ordering or cosmicisation of profane space,[4] the phenomenological reciprocity between conscious, perceiving subjects

[1] Ioan P. Couliano, *The Tree of Gnosis: Gnostic Mythology from Early Christianity to Modern Nihilism,* trans. H. S. Wiesner (San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1992) xv.

[2] Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996) 1204, 1735.

[3] As used by Doru Costache in his article 'John Moschus on Asceticism and the Environment' *Colloquium* 48:1 (2016) 21–34 esp. 30, 33, 34.

[4] Mircea Eliade, *The Myth of the Eternal Return*, trans. Willard R. Trask (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2005) 20.

and the objects of their experience[5], and the effect, on a quantum level, of human perception on the cosmos.[6] What is different about the way I am using ecosystemic agency in this chapter is that, while it can include all three of the activities just described, it is nevertheless characterised by a synergy between the grace of the creator God and human beings, specifically the saints. In other words, the saints are able through their prayers to affect the natural world, and—since they are imbued with the grace of God—their very presence or absence has traditionally been interpreted as determining the stability of a geographical region, a presiding government, a city, and even the Church.

Here I am stating a fact known in the traditional Churches, specifically the Orthodox Church: that the saints are co-workers with God for the salvation of the world. It is a belief of the Orthodox that since Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is providentially active in the natural world that he creates,[7] then the saints—as participants in Him (and, by extension, in God the Trinity), and as persons transformed through that experience—can by grace do the same. This has recently been aptly put by Doru Costache, who demonstrated in relation to the late sixth century Byzantine monastic text, the *Leimonarion* (*Spiritual Meadow*), that the "wellbeing of the terrestrial ecosystem is unthinkable without the spiritual transformation of its human participants."[8] The human participants referred to here are the saints, who in the *Leimonarion* are depicted, on account of their holiness, as affecting the natural world, stabilising it in various ways, such as: taming animals to the point of almost personalising them, facilitating good weather, and preventing natural catastrophes.[9] Other monastic texts—some of which are referred to throughout this chapter—demonstrate that, since the cooperation between God and the saints stabilises the world, then, conversely, when violence is

---

[5] Neal DeRoo and John P. Manoussakis (eds), 'Introduction' in *Phenomenology and Eschatology: Not Yet in the Now* (Cornwall, Britain: Ashgate, 2009) 3.

[6] Michel Bitbol, 'The Quantum Structure of Knowledge' *Axiomathes* 21 (2011) 357–71.

[7] In the seventh century *Great Canon* of St Andrew of Crete, Christ is described as actively shaping and 'conquering' the natural world that he creates via the incarnation. Referring, in the *theotokion* of the Canon's fourth ode, to the paradoxical status of the Mother of God as remaining a virgin despite having given birth, it continues that the One born of her "renews the laws of nature (καινίζει νόμους φύσεως)," for "where God wills, the order of nature is conquered (Θεὸς ὅπου θέλει, νικᾶται φύσεως τάξιν)." My translation of PG 97, 1353A.

[8] Costache, 'John Moschus' 34.

[9] Concerning the personalisation of animals and the quelling of catastrophes (such as fires), see Costache, 'John Moschus' 30–32. For the shaping of weather, see *An Epistle of the Most Blessed and Hallowed Bishop Serapion to the Monks* (= *Ser.*) in *Sarapion of Thmuis: Against the Manichaeans and Pastoral Letters*, trans. Oliver Herbel, Early Christian Studies 14 (Strathfield, NSW and Banyo, QLD: St Pauls Publications and Centre for Early Christian Studies, 2011) 70.

done to a saint, tumult ensues in the created order.[10] It is no surprise that this phenomenon occurs in the lives of the saints since it is based upon what happened at Christ's crucifixion, which was accompanied by both the disruption of nature and the human-made world, reflected in the eclipse, the earthquake, the raising of the dead, and tearing of the curtain in the temple of Jerusalem.[11] It is because the saints are truly participants in Christ that these disruptions occur, and one such saint whose sufferings were accompanied by natural disturbances that also affected the human-made world—in this case the city of Constantinople—is St John Chrysostom. In the case of John's ecosystemic impact on the city, it is important to highlight that in the ancient world the city was considered an image of the cosmos, meaning that, like the universe, it had to be harmonious and ordered. The opposite of this, chaos, ensued when the ecosystemic factors maintaining the stability of the city were violently interrupted. This, we shall see, is precisely what happened in Constantinople when John was persecuted there and twice exiled.

In this chapter, I presuppose that contemporary depictions of saints, like John Chrysostom, are conditioned by the positivism inhering within modern historiography that cannot consider representations of Church fathers or mothers precisely as holy persons imbued with the grace of God. As such, certain features of their holiness, including their ability to shape the world, are not taken into serious consideration, being dismissed as 'hagiographical' hyperbolae. Furthermore, the received representations of saints—usually inhering within the traditional Churches—is dismissed as 'confessional' in light of which more secular reconstructions are employed.[12] That these reconstructions have merit is undeniable, especially in terms of more accurately determining the raw data (chronology, authenticity of works, etc.) in relation to a saint's life. But this chapter argues that such representations of John Chrysostom, rather than arriving at an accurate portrait of him, are agnostic and reductionist constructs that, in addressing

[10] This is the kind of ecosystemic agency attributed to John and addressed below.

[11] For the eclipse and tearing of the temple curtain, see Mark 15:33, 38, Matthew 27:45, 51 and Luke 23:44–55. For the earthquake and the raising of the dead see Mt 27:51–53.

[12] Bronwen Neil has described the secular approach in patristic studies as "a need to demystify and secularise our scholarly undertakings so as to reach a broader audience." While this is a valid point, I would argue that removing the theological dimension to patristics and other disciplines addressing theological material could have the opposite effect, namely, giving people truncated perspectives and unnecessary raw data on topics that otherwise (i.e. if framed theologically) could have been relevant to their personal lives. Bronwen Neil, 'Patristics in Australia: Current Status and Future Potential' in *Patristic Studies in the Twenty-First Century*, ed. Brouria Bitton-Ashkelony, Theodore de Bruyn, and Carol Harrison (Turnhout: Belgium: Brepols Publishers, 2015) 145–61 esp. 159.

the saint's profile exclusively in relation to activities that do not include God's role in his life—a characteristic of the received sources which, for generations, have lauded him as a saint—do not give us the whole picture. Moreover, such representations are not existentially beneficial to Christians, who are supposed to learn from and venerate the saints as intercessors to Christ.

After giving a brief outline of contemporary historiographical depictions of John, this chapter tries to solve the impasse of positivism by bringing to the fore a characteristic of the saint's holiness, namely, his effect, by God's grace, on nature and the city of Constantinople. It does this by turning to insights from another academic discipline, one that, unlike many trends in modern historiography, is capable of appreciating sacredness in a positive way, namely the history of religions.[13] Specifically, I apply Ioan P. Coulianu's notion of ecosystemic intelligence defined above—or, as it is termed herein, ecosystemic agency—to the ministry of Chrysostom in order to demonstrate that tacit references to him as affecting nature and the city locate him in a tradition of saints as co-workers with God for the positive reshaping of the world. This phenomenon has an ancient pedigree, so I give some examples of it in the ancient—by which I mean pre-Christian—cultures of Mesopotamia, Egypt, Greece, Israel, and Rome, where order or cosmos was considered as being maintained at the expense of chaos by various ecosystemic agents, usually gods and rulers.

After this, in order to place the historiographical depiction of John within the broader context of literature from other genres that depict the saints as world-shapers, I turn to references to ecosystemic agency in early Christian monastic literature. In this literature, it is not earthly rulers, but Christ and his saints who are considered as world-shapers; the latter by virtue of their active participation in the grace of the former. This did not mean that rulers did not continue to be represented, or represent themselves, as ecosystemic agents. Thus, in my assessment of references to John Chrysostom as an ecosystemic agent in the final part of this chapter, I contrast the self-representation of the empress Aelia Eudoxia, wife of the emperor Arcadius and persecutor of John, as a world-shaper—one that had no basis in reality—and John's ecosystemic effect on the city of Constantinople. The latter, since it is articulated tacitly, appears in an ensuing outline of the saint's life that also serves as a biography for this volume. While I engage with secondary sources in order to establish chronological accuracy for certain events, nevertheless the representation

[13] This is especially the case in the writings of the foremost exponent of this discipline in the twentieth century, Mircea Eliade.

of John in texts including the *Funerary Speech* on him by Pseudo-Martyrius,[14] the *Dialogue on the Life of St John Chrysostom* by his disciple Palladius of Helenopolis,[15] and the Church histories of Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret,[16] all take precedence.[17] It is important to point out that these texts—with the exception of Socrates' *Ecclesiastical History*—almost always refer to the ecosystemic agency of Chrysostom in light of the consequences of the persecutions he endured. John's ecosystemic agency is therefore modelled on the passion and crucifixion of Christ, making him a martyr or witness to the sufferings of the Lord himself.

I anticipate a possible criticism, namely that we cannot be certain that the events depicted in these texts transpired in precisely the way they are represented. In answer to this, I would like to make clear, from the outset, two points. The first is that what follows is a reconstruction, from the available primary sources, of a certain representation of John Chrysostom precisely as a saint of the Church, and apart from which we cannot address his role as an ecosystemic agent. In my estimation, this representation is all that we have: in the received sources that give an outline of his life, there is no 'John Chrysostom' apart from this one. The second pertains to the fact that, despite some great achievements in determining a more accurate chronology and the authenticity of sources attributed to John that were otherwise spurious, the modern historiographical portraits of him are not, by virtue of their supposed non-confessional basis, more reliable than the so-called confessional sources. This is because it is precisely the latter that inhere within an ongoing traditional memory passed down from generation

[14] In a recent translation of the *Funerary Oration*, the author of the text is "tentatively" identified as Cosmas the deacon, "a contemporary of John in a tenth century list of authors who had written about John." Timothy D. Barnes and George Bevan, 'Introduction' in *The Funerary Speech for John Chrysostom* (= *Speech*), trans. Barnes and Bevan (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2013) 8–9. Since this position has not yet gained traction in scholarship, I simply continue the classic reference to the author of this text as Pseudo-Martyrius (henceforth ps.-Martyrius).

[15] The *Speech* was published in 407, the year of Chrysostom's death; the *Dialogue* between 408–19. Wendy Mayer, 'Chapter 9: John Chrysostom' in *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Patristics*, ed. Ken Parry (West Sussex: Wiley Blackwell, 2015) 141–54 esp. 147–48.

[16] Socrates, Sozomen and Theodoret wrote their "histories during the reign of Theodosius II in the 430s, 440s," and around 450, respectively. Mario Baghos, 'The Traditional Portrayal of St Athanasius according to Rufinus, Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret' in *Alexandrian Legacy: A Critical Appraisal*, ed. Doru Costache, Baghos, et al. (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2015) 139–71 esp. 143.

[17] Although there exists "a lengthy homily in Greek concerning Chrysostom's life" produced by Theodore of Trimethus in the seventh century, as well as a lengthy hagiography written in the "late seventh or early eighth century attributed to George of Alexandria," for the sake of brevity these sources will not be addressed in this chapter. See Mayer, 'John Chrysostom' 148.

to generation within the Church (such as the Orthodox Church, but not precluding other traditional Churches). Elsewhere I have argued that this traditional memory can claim just as much—if not more—legitimacy than secular approaches that are conditioned by, we shall see below, ideological factors that emerged three hundred years ago in the Enlightenment period.[18] In the case of the Church's memory, however, this goes all the way back to the time of St John (indeed, the earliest sources, the *Funerary Speech* and the *Dialogue*, are near-contemporary)[19] and is confirmed by the fact that the saint is still considered an intercessor to God in behalf of the faithful. But before addressing the saint's role as an ecosystemic agent within the context of his biography, we must address the critical challenge that this chapter responds to, namely the impact of positivism on historiographical profiles of saints generally, and on John Chrysostom in particular.

Critical Challenge

Historiography is a slippery undertaking that is contingent upon the contemporary thought-world of the historian, as well as the available evidence—and dispositions—from the past contexts the historian studies.[20] This is especially manifested in contemporary historiographical representations of figures from the past, such as saints of the Christian Church, with the former representations usually contradicting the status of the saints in the latter.

There are reasons for this. Since the Enlightenment, historians have been conditioned by positivism, a rigidly empirical methodology that attempted to elide the role of the interpreter in the accumulation and assessment of historical data.[21] The impact of positivism on the historian's craft was accompanied by an analogous dismissal, if not outright rejection, of theology's

---

[18] Baghos, 'Ecclesial Memory and Secular History in the Conflicting Representations of St Cyril of Alexandria' in *Alexandrian Legacy: A Critical Appraisal* (cit. n. 16) 246–80 esp. 253–57.

[19] See cit. n. 16 above.

[20] Jacques Le Goff pointed out that history as a discipline depends on a dialectic tension between the reality of the past and the present study of that reality. This is also conditioned by various factors, including "the dependence of the history of the past on the historian's present." Jacques Le Goff, *History and Memory*, trans. Steven Randall and Elizabeth Claman (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988) 108.

[21] According to E. H. Carr, in the positivist view of history or historical writing (which he did not subscribe to): "Facts, like sense-impressions, impinge on the observer from outside and are independent of his consciousness. The process of reception is passive: having received the data, he then acts on them." E. H. Carr, *What is History?* ed. R. W. Davies (Victoria, Australia: Penguin Group, 2008) 9.

place in the academy, this being related to the rapid secularisation of society and scholarly milieus.[22] In light of these interrelated factors, neither the Christian God nor the sacred in a general sense were seen as having any role in the lives of human beings.[23] As such, and since contemporary ideas condition the historian's approach to the study of the past, then figures from the past who were considered imbued with God's grace—the saints—could not be considered as such by many scholars. This would mean that historians would read the primary texts that depicted these figures as saints in a secular, reductionist way. They did not, for the most part, consider relevant references to the holiness of these persons: a disposition towards them still maintained by the traditional Churches. Explaining away such representations as 'confessional' or biased, many historians did not self-consciously consider that their own approach was also biased, i.e. influenced by the factors that I outlined above.

Moreover, the positivist method of reconstructing accurate portraits of such figures was not only inconsistent with the received primary sources that depicted them as saints, but in fact resulted in constructs that had no basis in reality. In more extreme cases, since most of the primary sources that lauded such figures as saints were considered biased, historians prioritised other sources that came from the plume of the enemies of these saints. Thus, in modern historiographical reconstruals of the dispute between St Athanasius the Great and Arius, the Eusebians, and the Melitians, the latter are vindicated whereas the former is made to look like a tyrant.[24] The same goes with St Cyril of Alexandria, who, according to this mode of representation, was the aggressor in the conflict with Nestorius—not the other way around—and responsible for the death of the philosopher Hypatia despite the fact that, a) there is no evidence of this, and b) such an act would have been totally out of character and contrary to the Christian Gospel to which Cyril was committed.[25] In the cases just mentioned, since hagiographical representations were not considered reliable, the scandalous details in other texts were brought to the foreground. This was accompanied by deliberate, decontextualised readings of their works—something that

---

[22] Keith Jenkins, *Re-thinking History* (London and New York: Routledge, 2003) 71–72.

[23] According to Michel Foucault, developments in the human sciences, in economics, sociology, anthropology, archaeology, and, gradually, psychology, addressed humanity alone as constitutive of "that which must be conceived of and that which is to be known" in Western culture. Michel Foucault, *The Order of Things* (Oxford: Routledge, 2008) 376. Theology was therefore pushed to the sidelines.

[24] Baghos, 'The Traditional Portrayal of St Athanasius' 148–49, 151–52.

[25] Baghos, 'Ecclesial Memory and Secular History' 250–53, 260–65, 274–76.

has also been done in relation to John Chrysostom. In John's case, his person has been reconstrued along tyrannical lines (like Athanasius and Cyril), and his works have been reevaluated in a facile, out of context way resulting in accusations of misogyny and anti-Semitism.[26] In other words, John, who for many centuries and in the memory of various Churches is considered a saint, has been construed in negative ways by scholars who ignore hagiographical approaches that do not fit the rationalist, or secular, character of our time.

More constructive have been approaches that attempted a middle ground that has navigated between approaches to John that render him as a "naïve and harsh authoritarian"[27] and the hagiographical assessments of him. This approach has been exemplified by the very important work of Wendy Mayer, the foremost Chrysostom scholar in the world today. Apart from nuancing issues relating to dates for John's biography and works (as well as the reception history of both),[28] and deftly navigating the authentic and spurious texts attributed to him,[29] she has also shown—in a manner that is relevant for the present chapter—that it is precisely the early historiographical accounts that attest to the hagiographical representation of John.[30] Problematic are attempts to construe John's representation as an outcome of a propaganda war between his enemies and the so-called "Johannite authors," which led to the victory of the latter's version that promoted John as "a martyr, saint, and champion

---

[26] Wendy Mayer, who has done much to rehabilitate John's reputation in scholarly circles, gave an outline of the accusations of misogyny in the writings of John and aptly refuted them. Wendy Mayer, 'John Chrysostom and Women Revisited' in *Men and Women in the Early Christian Centuries*, ed. Mayer and Ian J. Elmer (Strathfield, NSW: St Paul's Press, 2014) 211–25. Accusations of anti-Semitism are problematic. St John's ostensible 'anti-Semitic' statements have been taken out of context and tragically used by later, real anti-Semites in inexcusable and anti-Christian ways. It is important to remember, however, that St John belonged to a context where vitriol between Jews, pagans, and Christians was commonplace in their competition for the public space which was religious, and not secular (and thus, more or less religiously neutral) as it is in the West today. This fact, alongside St John's criticisms of Gentiles, clergy, and imperial persons, should alert scholars to the truism that he was—in the spirit of the prophetic tradition that reaches back to the Old Testament—pedagogically critical of anyone and everyone who fell short of the standards of God; in this case the standards of the Gospel. To accuse John's "vicious bias" of consuming "millions of Christian souls and Jewish lives" is a prejudicial twisting of the evidence. Abel Mordechai Bibliowicz, *Jews and Gentiles in the Early Jesus Movement: An Unintended Journey* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013) 192.

[27] Pauline Allen and Wendy Mayer, 'Chapter 45: John Chrysostom' in *The Early Christian World*, vols I–II, ed. Philip F. Esler (London and New York: Routledge, 2000) 1128–50 esp. 1131.

[28] In relation to St John's biography, see Wendy Mayer, 'The Making of a Saint: John Chrysostom in Early Historiography' in *Chrysostomosbilder in 1600 Jahren: Facetten der Wirkungsgeschichte eines Kirchenvaters*, ed. Martin Wallraff and Rudolf Brändle (Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2008) 39–59. For the reception of his works, see Mayer, 'John Chrysostom.'

[29] Mayer, 'John Chrysostom' 151.

[30] Mayer, 'The Making of a Saint' 39.

of orthodoxy."[31] This 'us versus them' approach gives the impression that the representation of John as a saint is contingent upon partisan factors.[32] It could just as easily be argued from a Christian point of view that the victory of the representation of John as a saint was precisely because *he was one*: the ultimate criterion—the participation in Christ's life and sufferings—being manifested in his profile based on these sources addressed below. That similar arguments have been made in modern representations of Athanasius and Cyril demonstrates the general tendency to avoid, and to subtly criticise, the traditional representations of saints in modern scholarship.

Also problematic, and related to the above, is Mayer's attempt to prioritise Socrates Scholasticus' "more negative portrayal of John" insofar as he is ostensibly not one of his partisans.[33] This point is valid if we were to consider the other sources mentioned by Mayer, ps.-Martyrius, Palladius, Sozomen, and Theodoret as partisan; and indeed she depicted them as such while at the same time exonerating Socrates as a "historian seeking to demonstrate the importance of the unity of church and empire and the damaging effects of dissension."[34] Elsewhere, however, Mayer described John's antagonistic relationship with the Novatian bishop of Constantinople based on Socrates' account and without questioning it.[35] If we are to accept the consensus of scholars that Socrates was favourable to the Novatians (although perhaps not a Novatian himself), then his bias against John—an enemy of the Novatians in Socrates' eyes—is easily explained.[36] This means that Socrates is not as

---

[31] Mayer, 'John Chrysostom' 142.

[32] The label of 'Johannites' or 'Johnites' (Ἰωαννῖται) appears in the early Christian historians such as Sozomen. Sozomen, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 8.21.4–5 in *Sozomenus. Kirchengeschichte*, ed. Joseph Bidez and Günther Christian Hansen (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1960) (retrieved via TLG). In referring to the fact that, while he was being persecuted, the supporters of John were called "Johnites," Sozomen, who was a fan of St John, implied that they were being singled out as partisans by the 'mainstream' Church and imperial court. It is demonstrated below that in fact it was the mainstream Church and state that was partisan insofar as they were attacking a saint of God. Taking up this description of John and his followers as "Johnite" or "Johannite" in fact perpetuates the stereotype that they were partisan. See also Mayer, 'The Making of a Saint' 39.

[33] Mayer, 'The Making of a Saint' 40. See Socrates' description of John: "…the liberty of speech he allowed himself was offensive to very many. In public teaching he was powerful in reforming the morals of his auditors; but in private conversation he was frequently thought haughty and assuming by those who did not know him." *The Ecclesiastical History of Socrates Scholasticus* (= *Socr.*) 6.3, trans. A. C. Zenos in *Socrates, Sozomenus: Church Histories*, NPNF 2nd series, vol. 2 (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1976) 139.

[34] Mayer, 'The Making of a Saint' 40, fn. 6.

[35] Ibid. 43, fn. 22.

[36] Warren Treadgold, *The Early Byzantine Historians* (Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010) 136. Theresa Urbainczyk, *Socrates of Constantinople: Historian of Church and State* (Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, 1997) 26.

objective as one might think, and that his representation of John, motivated by bias against him, is not more reliable than the so-called partisan sources by ps.-Martyrius, Palladius, Sozomen, and Theodoret that depict him as a saint. It is precisely these latter sources that reflect the ecclesial memory of John and include references to his ecosystemic agency, which is why they shall take precedence in this chapter. I now turn to the pre-Christian and Christian backgrounds to the notion of ecosystemic agency, before addressing the biography of St John and the manner in which he can be considered an ecosystemic agent.

Defining Ecosystemic Agency and its Background

Ecosystemic Agency in Ancient Cultures

While this chapter is concerned with defining ecosystemic agency in relation to John Chrysostom, it is important to highlight that the notion of sympathy between some persons—usually those related to gods or the divine—and the cosmos is a very old one, and it is pertinent that it was often seen as taking place from the vantage point of cities which were constructed as images of the world.[37] This is because John's ecosystemic agency was considered as affecting not only the natural world but also Constantinople; thereby indicating, in some way, a continuation of these old motifs. Of course, in ancient cultures it was often the demiurge god who was credited with founding a city as the reflection of an ordered cosmos *illo tempore*.[38] Since, however, the rulers of cities were variously perceived as tangible representations of demiurges, separate gods in themselves, or as endowed with divine qualities, then it is in relation to them that I give the following examples of ancient, pre-Christian ecosystemic agency.[39]

In Mesopotamia for instance, rulers such as Sargon[40] and Naram-Sin,[41] in representing themselves as divine and under the matronage of Ishtar—the

[37] Mario Baghos, 'Religious Symbolism and Well-being in Christian Constantinople and the Crisis of the Modern City' in *Well-being, Personal Wholeness and the Social Fabric*, ed. Doru Costache, Darren Cronshaw and James R. Harrison (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2017) 324–54 esp. 326–30.

[38] Mircea Eliade, *The Sacred and the Profane: The Nature of Religion*, trans. Willard R. Trask (New York: Harcourt Inc., 1987) 30–31.

[39] Eliade, *The Myth of the Eternal Return* 8–9, 37–38.

[40] Samuel A. B. Mercer, ''Emperor'-Worship in Babylonia' *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 36 (1916) 360–80 esp. 364.

[41] Joan Aruz and Ronald Wallenfels, *Art of the First Cities: The Third Millennium B.C. from the Mediterranean to the Indus* (New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2003) 195, 197.

goddess of the city of Agade from which they ruled—could cosmicise the world from this central point. Ishme-Dagan, an Amorite Mesopotamian ruler, went a step further insofar as his restoration of the Ekur ziggurat in the city of Nippur was considered as involving his gathering together of all of the ontological principles constitutive of the cosmos—the *mes*. In Mesopotamian thought, the *mes* (or, in the singular, *me*) functioned within the parameters of a cosmos-chaos dialectic that was thought to be in the ruler's control, thereby making him an ecosystemic agent.[42] Likewise, for the ancient Egyptians it was Pharaoh who had to constantly uphold *ma'at* or order at the expense of *isfet*, which is chaos.[43] Pharaoh could do this on account of his association with the demiurge Ra, a principal agent of *ma'at* whose defeat of *isfet*'s main cause, the demon Apophis, was meant to be re-enacted on a daily basis by Pharaoh's representatives, the priests in temples throughout Egypt.[44] Thus *ma'at* was engendered from the focal point of the city by its ecosystemic king and his agents in order to stave off chaos. For the Egyptians, the latter was a threat that had to be prevented at all costs.

The motif of ecosystemic agency can also be discerned in the ancient Greek context by king Ilus' establishment of Troy upon the body of the defeated chaos goddess, Ate,[45] and the god Apollo's defeat of Typhon before the founding of Delphi,[46] the navel of the world (implying thereby the ecosystemic status of Apollo).[47] In relation to the former, however, the Greeks were ambivalent towards kings: they were not considered divine.[48] It was not until Plato's contribution of the notion of the philosopher-king, who organised his city, just like the demiurge, on the pattern of the cosmos, that ecosystemic agency in relation to kingship was resurrected in Greek thought,[49] to be spread throughout the world—in a misguided way—by his student Aristotle's pupil, Alexander the Great.[50]

---

[42] Norman Cohn, *Cosmos, Chaos and the World to Come: The Ancient Roots of Apocalyptic Faith* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1993) 35.

[43] Ibid. 9–21.

[44] Ibid. 20–21.

[45] Apollodorus, *The Library* 3.12 in *Apollodorus 2: Book 3*, trans. Sir James George Frazer (London: William Heinemann, 1921) 41–43.

[46] Hesiod, 'The Homeric Hymns III.—To Pythian Apollo' in *Hesiod, The Homeric Hymns and Homerica*, trans. Hugh G. Evelyn-White (London: William Heinemann, 1914) 345.

[47] Described as τῆς γῆς ὀμφαλόν in Strabo, *Geography* 9.3 in *The Geography of Strabo IV: Books VIII–IX*, trans. Horace Leonard Jones (London: William Heinemann Ltd, 1968) 354–55.

[48] A. R. Burn, *The Penguin History of Greece* (London: Penguin Books, 1985) 66.

[49] Plato, *The Republic* 6.508E in *Plato V: Republic I*, trans. Paul Shorey (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1982) 104–5.

[50] John Maxwell O'Brien, *Alexander the Great, the Invisible Enemy: A Biography* (London: Routledge, 1992) 83.

In ancient Israel, the role of the king functioned much like in the Greek conception (until before Alexander). David and his dynasty were appointed by God to rule over his people from the vantage point of the holy city, Jerusalem.[51] Although David was considered inspired by God and as a coworker with him in the ecosystemic project of reshaping Israel, he was not, as the Mesopotamian and Egyptian rulers, considered divine.[52] But subsequent conquests of the city resulted in a re-interpretation of the promises made by God to David. This meant that in periods of captivity the Hebrews expected a messianic king—a son of David—to come and establish God's kingdom on earth permanently.[53] These expectations looked towards this figure to liberate the Israelites from their oppressors and restore the kingdom of Israel from the central point of Jerusalem. With each captivity these expectations went from strength to strength and were bound up with the fate of Jerusalem, so much so that when the Romans besieged the city in 70 AD, Josephus remarked that there were disruptions in the cosmos, such as a star "very like a broadsword" hanging over the city, and the appearance of a comet for a whole year. The Roman siege was also associated with other natural disturbances, including a cow giving birth to a lamb, and the withdrawal of God from the temple and his people.[54]

In Rome, emperors since Augustus were considered ecosystemic agents. According to the *Fifth Ode* of Horace's third book, the auspices associated with Augustus' presence endowed the natural world with fecundity: the ground was nourished by the goddess Ceres, the ocean was calmed, and religion and morality, which were interrelated, increased.[55] For the Romans, the cosmos was intimately associated with the city, and this was best reflected—albeit

---

[51] As expressed in 2 Samuel 7:16, where God informs David through the prophet Nathan that "his kingdom shall be made sure forever" and that his "throne shall be established forever." Also Psalm 89:3–4 recalls this promise: "I have made a covenant with my chosen one, I have sworn to my servant David: 'I will establish your descendants forever, and build your throne for all generations.'"

[52] 2 Sam 7:12 indicates that David will, like all mortals, "lie down with" his ancestors. That is, perish.

[53] The fall of Jerusalem to the Babylonians and their exile to Babylon, however, effectively broke the continuity of the Davidic line. Since God's promise could not be in vain, the Hebrews re-signified the concept of the "anointed one" as the expectation of a king from David's progeny. The book of Jeremiah, which belongs to the exilic period (6th century BC), contains the following prophecy concerning the restoration of Israel after the exile: "The days are surely coming, says the Lord, when I will raise up for David a righteous Branch, and he shall reign as king and deal wisely, and shall execute justice and righteousness in the land. In his days Judah will be saved and Israel will live in safety. And this is the name by which he will be called: 'The Lord is our righteousness'" (Jeremiah 23:5–6).

[54] Josephus, *The Jewish War*, trans. G. A. Williamson (London: Penguin Books, 1981) 360–61.

[55] Horace, *The Third Book of the Odes of Horace* 3 in *The Works of Horace*, trans. C. Smart (London: Henry G. Bohn, 1853) 67–68.

in a negative fashion—in Lucan's *Pharsalia* or *Civil War*. In detailing Julius Caesar's impending attack on Rome and Pompey's flight from the city, Lucan stated that:

> ...the menacing gods filled earth, sky, and sea with portents. The darkness of night saw stars before unknown, the sky blazing with fire, lights shooting athwart the void of heaven, and the hair of the baleful star—the comet which portends change to monarchs. The lightning flashed incessantly in a sky of delusive clearness, and the fire, flickering in the heavens, took various shapes...[56]

To this is added a whole host of natural catastrophies: the lesser stars appeared at noon, the moon and sun were eclipsed, the sea turned to blood; in the temple of Vesta the fire was extinguished—equating to the cessation of Rome's eternity[57]—with the earth stopping on its axis. There were floods, and statues of deities began to weep as they "bore witness to the city's woe."[58]

This cursory view of several pre-Christian civilisations, including Mesopotamia, Egypt, Greece, Israel, and Rome, demonstrates that the notion of ecosystemic agency can be found in these in relation to rulers who were related to gods—and to the gods themselves—who were perceived as stabilising agents in the cosmos which was often related to the city. Since I believe that this ecosystemic agency really takes place in the case of Christ and his saints, then how do we explain references to this sort of world-shaping activity in non-Christian, ancient cultures? First of all, it is clear that the ancients had holistic visions of nature and perceived the interrelatedness of the role of the gods and people in natural affairs, and in cities that reflected the cosmos or nature. Secondly, and related, is the fact that there is a line of thinking in the Christian tradition that affirms that, since human beings are created in the image of God as revealed in Christ, then their creative or cultural productions reflect their deepest longings and aspirations that are only fulfilled in Christ and his saints by virtue of Christ's activity in their lives. In other words, the ancient longing for the world to be shaped by divine-like figures was legitimate but misplaced. Such activity can only properly take place in the God-man Jesus Christ—the true and only ruler and king of the world[59]—and the saints to whom he grants this ability on account of their active participation in, and cooperation with, him. Moreover, in Christ this

---

[56] Lucan, *The Civil War* 1 in *The Civil War*, trans. J. D. Duff (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1997) 41–43.

[57] Jean-Joseph Goux 'Vesta, or the Place of Being' *Representations* 1 (1983) 91–107 esp. 92.

[58] Ibid. 43.

[59] Christ is described as the "ruler of the kings of the earth" in Revelation 1:5, highlighting his supremacy over all sovereigns, and, it can be inferred, their ostensible ecosystemic agency.

ecosystemic activity is not circumscribed to the cityscape insofar as he is master of the whole cosmos, dwelling in his saints irrespective of where they are, whether in cities, "deserts and mountains," or in "dens and caves of the earth" (Hebrews 11:38).

Ecosystemic Agency in Christianity

Two relevant trends converge in relation to the representation of Jesus Christ as an ecosystemic agent. Although he was referred to as the expected Davidic messiah who would restore the kingdom of Israel,[60] in the Gospels Christ repeatedly refers to himself as the Son of Man[61] who is mentioned in the Old Testament book of Daniel 7:13–14 as inaugurating an "everlasting dominion" that encompasses all peoples. The kingdom of the Son of Man is thus more encompassing or rather universal in scope insofar as it was given to him by "the Ancient of Days."[62] To this universal reign of Christ would be added cosmic nuances when St John the Evangelist described him in his Gospel as the Word or Logos of God who creates "all things" (John 1:3) before assuming flesh and living or 'making his tent' among us (1:14).

The Logos was in fact the Stoic term for a universal or cosmic organisational principle.[63] Although in the very same century that saw the production of John's Gospel, Seneca and Plutarch described the Roman emperor as the Logos,[64] once again what is conspicuous about Christ the Logos' activity is that he is not consigned, as previous 'ecosystemic' rulers were, to a specific city or topographical location. Moreover, with the ancient rulers described above ecosystemic agency could be discerned in many consecutive kings, whereas the implication in John's Gospel, and indeed throughout the New Testament and the early Christian experience, is that the Logos assumed

[60] See, as examples, Mt 1:1 and Lk 18:38. It is interesting to note that in Mt 22:41–46, Christ asks the Pharisees about the identity of the messiah, who refer to him as "son of David" to which Christ responds: "How is it then that David by the Spirit calls him Lord?" Quoting Psalm 110, he rejects the title son of David, to which he implicitly takes precedence as "Lord."

[61] To give just one example, the Lord refers to himself as the Son of Man in an apocalyptic context in Lk 17:22, 24, 26, 30.

[62] The Ancient of Days bestows upon the Son of Man "dominion and glory and a kingdom, that all peoples, nations, and languages should serve him … and his kingdom is one that shall not be destroyed."

[63] Adam Drozdek, *Greek Philosophers as Theologians: The Divine Arche* (Aldershot, Hampshire: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2007) 64.

[64] Glenn F. Chesnut, *The First Christian Histories: Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, and Evagrius* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1986) 155.

humanity once and for all as Christ Jesus.[65] But the differences between pre-Christian conceptions of ecosystemic agency and the Christian one run deeper.

St Paul in fact described Christ's ecosystemic activity as both cosmic and personal insofar as he reconciles not only the celestial and terrestrial realms, but also people to himself.[66] This is unheard of in most pagan religions, since the demiurge—an epithet also used in relation to Christ[67]—could not be considered as entering personally into the lives of people.[68] In any case, in relation to Christ's cosmic activity, in Ephesians Paul spoke of Christ bestowing gifts upon the apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers—the saints—after his ascension into heaven in order to assist them in "building up the body of Christ," which is the Church (Eph 4:11–12). In relation to Christ's activity on a personal level, in Philippians, after referring to Christ's universal lordship, Paul exhorted them to work out their "salvation with fear

---

[65] With the exception of the various forms of Gnosticism that were docetic, i.e., that put forward "that the Saviour could not assume any bodily form because there is nothing to save in the material dimension, which is ontologically alien to him and dark-demonic." Giulia Sfameni Gasparro, 'The Disputation with Felix: Themes and Modalities of Augustine's Polemic' in *'The Search of Truth': Augustine, Manichaeism, and other Gnosticism*, ed. Jacob Albert van den Berg et al. (Leiden and Boston: Brill 2011) 519–44 esp. 542.

[66] In Ephesians 1:10, St Paul wrote that in "the fullness of time" God will gather up all things in himself, "things in heaven and things on earth." But it is in Colossians that the cosmic reconciliation between heaven and earth are related to the communitarian reconciliation of the Church to Christ. In Colossians 1:15–18, Paul described Christ as "the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of all creation (πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως); for in him all things on heaven and on earth were created, things visible and invisible … all things have been created through and for him. He himself is before all things, and in him all things hold together." This sentiment is abbreviated in chapter 1 verse 20 and related to Christ's sacrifice on the cross, where he stated: "God was pleased to reconcile to himself all things, whether on earth or in heaven, through the blood of the cross." Then, in chapter 1:21,23, he explicitly related this cosmic reconciliation to the existential reconciliation in the Church, where the recipients of the Gospel, formerly hostile in mind and deed, are through the cross "made holy and blameless and irreproachable before him," provided that they endure in the faith.

[67] In *Oration* 38, St Gregory the Theologian described Christ as the "Demiurge Logos (δημιουργοῦ Λόγου)." My translation of PG 36, 321C.

[68] Christ's cosmic and personal ecosystemic status contrasts with pagan conceptions of demiurges in two ways. First, pagan demiurges were almost unilaterally posterior to the creation, in other words, the world, albeit in a shapeless form, existed before they were born or emerged from chaos. This was not the case for Christ, who we have seen (see cit. n. 66) "is before all things, and in him all things hold together" (Col 1:17). Second, these demiurges were not considered like Christ as incorporating believers into themselves in a manner that preserved the distinct identities of both, but rather gave them access to the fecundity of the cosmogony *illo tempore*. Mircea Eliade put this clearly, since "religious man yearns for *being*," he imitates the gods in order to re-actualise their paradigmatic acts of creation when the fullness of being—the sacred—was first made manifest. Eliade, *The Sacred and the Profane* 63–64.

and trembling," for God is "at work" in them, enabling them "both to will and to work for his good pleasure" (Phil 2:12–13).

Moreover, in other places we read testimonies that Christ, as he increasingly dwells in his saints, endows them with the ecosystemic qualities that properly belong to him. We get glimpses of this in the Acts of the Apostles via their healing power, such as Peter healing a lame beggar (3:1–10) and raising Tabitha from the dead (9:36–41), and Paul doing the same for the young man Eutychus (20:7–12). That such miracles testify to ecosystemic agency is made clear from the fact that the 'natural order' is positively reshaped by the saints as they work with the grace of God. Conversely, that the persecution of the saints results in the disruption of the natural order is reflected in the apocryphal accounts of the martyrdoms of saints such as Paul.[69] In fact, according to Eusebius of Caesarea, the Roman siege of the city of Jerusalem in AD 70 is described as a result of the abandonment of Jerusalem by the ecosystemic saints who were exiled from there around the same time.[70]

Of course, when discussing the manner in which the saints affect the natural world, it is important to emphasise that they do not do so because of any inherent abilities or powers. As repeated throughout this chapter, it is by participating in God—where his grace takes precedence but the saints actively respond—that the saints are able to act as ecosystemic agents. More specifically, it is, as stated in the introduction, through their prayers to God that this occurs. For relevant examples coming from a few generations before John Chrysostom's episcopal tenure in Constantinople, I turn to the fourth century letters of St Serapion *To the Disciples of Antony* and his *Epistle to the Monks*. In the former, which was sent by Serapion to St Antony the Great's disciples upon his death, he writes:

> See, now, brothers! As soon as the old man departed from us—that blessed Antony, who had been an intercessor for the world—behold we were suddenly thrown down and laid low; and all the elements together were anguished; and the wrath of God from above first consumed Egypt … As long as the saint was on earth he spoke and cried out. And he kept his holy hands always stretched out to God; and by speaking with him, he was gloriously radiant before the

[69] According to an apocryphal testimony, St Paul was decapitated and milk "spurted upon the soldier's clothing" from the wound. *The Acts of Paul*, trans. Wilhelm Schneemelcher and Rodolphe Kasser in *New Testament Apocrypha II: Writings Related to the Apostles, Apocalypses and Other Related Subjects*, ed. Schneemelcher and R. McL. Wilson (Louisevill, KE: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1992) 262.

[70] Eusebius stated that it was "as if holy persons had utterly abandoned the royal metropolis of the Jews." Eusebius of Caesarea, *The History of the Church from Christ to Constantine* 3.5, trans. G. A. Williamson (London: Penguin Books, 1989) 68.

> Lord. He did not allow wrath to come down; and by faithfully lifting up his thoughts, the saint prevented God's wrath from coming upon us…[71]

Anyone who has read Athanasius' *Life of Antony* knows the extent to which Antony was considered a holy person and participant in God.[72] Thus, in the above we see that the lifting up of Antony's hands in prayer towards God represents his active participation in God's ecosystemic activity to preserve order in the world, and upon his repose the world is anguished—much like the world was anguished upon the death of Christ. Here Antony's disciples are being encouraged to imitate him, denoting that although God (or Christ) is the ecosystemic agent par excellence, still he desires a response by those created in his image in order for his ecosystemic activity to be shared and consistently maintained in our behalf. The latter text, the *Epistle to the Monks*, describes similar ecosystemic activity but in a more positive light. After giving an account of the way of life of the monks, their vigorous asceticism and prayer, it reads:

> Therefore you are blessed before God and the world is also blessed through you. The deserts are being exalted through you and the inhabited world is being saved by your prayers … The river, flooding yearly and watering the whole of Egypt, forming into marshy lakes and distributing a great amount into the seas, makes known the power of your supplications…[73]

Thus, wee see that in Serapion's *To the Disciples of Antony* and *Epistle to the Monks*, he outlined the extent to which the intercessions of the saints to God stabilise the world. Before we turn to John Chrysostom's ecosystemic agency, it is important to further contextualise this phenomenon in relation to the following, dramatic example, occurring just after his time. It concerns a correspondence between a monastic community in Gaza and the hermit Barsanuphius in the sixth century. Perceiving that the world was in danger, possibly due to the plague that swept through Palestine during the reign of the emperor Justinian in 542–43, the monks wrote to St Barsanuphius to "have compassion on the world that is perishing" and intercede to God on their—and the world's—behalf.[74] Barsanuphius' response hints at the fact

---

[71] Serapion of Thmuis, *To the Disciples of Antony* 5–7 in *The Life of Antony: The Coptic Life and the Greek Life*, trans. Tim Vivian and Apostolos N. Athanassakis (Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 2003) 42.

[72] *The Coptic and Greek Life of Antony* in *The Life of Antony: The Coptic Life and the Greek Life*, trans. Tim Vivian and Apostolos N. Athanassakis (cit. n. 71).

[73] *Ser.* (Herbel 70).

[74] *Letters from the Desert* 569 in *Barsanuphius and John: A Selection of Questions and Responses*, trans. John Chryssavgis (Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2003) 153.

that the current circumstances are related to human sinfulness and lack of righteousness, before stating that there

> are three men, perfect in God, who have exceeded the measure of humanity and have received the authority to loose and bind, to forgive and hold sins (Mt 18.18 and Jn 20.23). These men stand before the shattered world (Ps 105.23), keeping the whole world from complete and sudden annihilation. Through their prayers, God combines his chastisement with his mercy … Therefore, pray with them. For, the prayers of these three are joined at the entrance to the spiritual altar of the Father of lights (Jas 1.17). They share in each other's joy and gladness in heaven (Eph 1.3). And when they turn once again toward the earth, they share in each other's mourning and weeping for the evils that occur and attract his wrath.[75]

The elder's response highlights, firstly, that humanity's decision to respond or not to God's ecosystemic agency has cosmic consequences, and secondly, that those who do respond to God—i.e. the three saints mentioned—are granted an ecosystemic agency by the former that enables them to decisively shape the affairs of the earth, in this case preventing its destruction.[76]

These references to ecosystemic agency both before and after John's episcopal tenure serve as a context for the biography of the saint below. It is striking, however, that despite the shift of emphasis from ancient gods and rulers as ecosystemic agents to Christ and his saints as such, the former perception persisted even in the ostensibly Christian empire in the form of the ruler cult. Christian emperors and empresses in fact inherited aspects of this cult that posited the ruler as inherently shaping the world from their capital city, which was also considered as endowed with ecosystemic properties insofar as we have seen that a) it was considered an image of the cosmos and b) the ruler reigned from this vantage point. Thus, in what follows, the ecosystemic agency of St John—a result of his participation in Christ God—is contrasted to the representation of the empress Aelia Eudoxia, the one responsible for the second exile of John from Constantinople, in order to show that even while rulers continued to masquerade as world-shapers, true ecosystemic agency lay with Christ and his saints. This contrast is, as mentioned above, undertaken within a biography of the saint based on those sources that extol him as such.

[75] Ibid. 154.

[76] I thank Fr Doru Costache for pointing me to this text.

John Chrysostom as an Ecosystemic Agent

In this section we shall see that the *Funerary Speech* on John Chrysostom, Palladius' *Dialogue* on the life of the saint, and the histories of Sozomen and Theodoret, represent the saint in ecosystemic terms that reflect: the cosmic disturbances which took place during the crucifixion of our Lord, Serapion's approach towards Antony the Great and his disciples, and Barsanuphius' description of the unnamed saints interceding in behalf of the world. Beginning with the *Funerary Speech*, there is much dispute as to who authored this text, and various attributions, from John's disciple Palladius of Helenopolis[77] to Martyrius, bishop of Antioch, who could not have written the text since he was active in the late fifth century.[78] The text is almost certainly by someone who knew John and was his follower, although even this has been disputed (but I do not believe successfully).[79] Timothy D. Barnes and George Bevan, who recently translated the *Funerary Speech* into English, ascribe it to Cosmas the deacon,[80] who is mentioned in a tenth century Byzantine list of biographies of John.[81] However, since even the latter has not been established with any certainty, I will simply follow Wendy Mayer[82] and others and refer to the author as ps.-Martyrius.[83] It should be noted that ps.-Martyrius is prompted in his task by rumours concerning the death of John, as he expressed uncertainty as to whether or not he had really passed away,[84] but for all intents and purposes he was correct. John had in fact died during his second exile, initially to the Caucasus (Armenia) and finally to Pitiunt (Pityus), a destination he never reached, having reposed at Comana Pontica in 407.[85]

---

[77] *Palladius: Dialogue on the Life of St John Chrysostom* (= *Pal.*), trans. Robert T. Meyer (New York: Newman Press, 1985).

[78] Barnes and Bevan, 'Introduction' in *Speech* 13–14.

[79] J. H. W. G. Liebeschuetz, *Ambrose and John Chrysostom: Clerics Between Desert and Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011) 114. Liebeschuetz's argument that ps.-Martyrius did not know John personally because he did not describe his early life—including "wealth, family background, and education" at Antioch, is bogus, mainly because not only are such details irrelevant for a Christian biography (Christ himself denigrating wealth/status and familial ties if they become an impediment to the Gospel, see Lk 16:19–31, Mt 19:16–28, Lk 9:59–62, Mt 10:27) but the *Speech* addresses the circumstances leading to the saint's martyrdom. His early life is not immediately relevant to this topic.

[80] Barnes and Bevan, 'Introduction' 8–9.

[81] Barnes and Bevan, 'Introduction' 9–11.

[82] Mayer, 'John Chrysostom' 147.

[83] Liebeschuetz, *Ambrose and John Chrysostom* 114–16.

[84] *Speech* 136 (cit. n. 14) (Barnes and Bevan 114).

[85] J. N. D. Kelly, *Golden Mouth: The Story of John Chrysostom—Ascetic, Preacher, Bishop* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1995) 284.

Ps.-Martyrius described the departed John as a "holy soul" who has been "transferred to the unsullied life of blessedness" by the Lord.[86] According to him, the reposed John was "an agent not of entry into the present life, but of rebirth in God."[87] Related to this, he situated John in the company of saints including Abel, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, Moses, Aaron, Job, David, Samuel, Elijah,[88] Elisha, John the Baptist, Peter and Paul, and the martyrs. Highlighting the fact that St John, like Job, was victorious over the devil and thus "overcame and gained from the Lord the same proclamation of victory,"[89] he continued by affirming that this victory was accomplished in his martyrdom, so that "the choir of martyrs has received one who fought with them and with them won the crown. In short, all <the holy ones> have one of their own."[90]

Thus, John Chrysostom, who reared his disciples into the participation in God, is, on account of his sufferings in Christ, considered as translated to the company of the saints in heaven immediately upon his death. The absence of John on the terrestrial plane, however, leads the orator to lament that

> We alone are left as orphans, in desolation, in darkness and confused in thought, with a varied, all-consuming loss. For by those things which that blessed man possessed when he arrived among the holy ones, he has shown of how many he has deprived us. His soul, the receptacle of virtues, has flown from his body and is dancing with them, while among us those winged lips have closed in silence, my friends, and the tongue is at rest that yielded to silence only in death…[91]

This perception, that the absence of an agent of God—who is the ecosystemic agent par excellence—has resulted in chaos in the world that once benefited from his presence, is akin to Serapion's description of Egypt and the world in tumult after the repose of Antony. What Antony accomplished in the desert for the monks, therefore, John accomplished in the city of Constantinople, and indeed in the world. Ps.-Martyrius continued that in the absence of John the demons are stirred to frenzy against the church,[92] and "drunken

[86] *Speech* 5 (Barnes and Bevan 40).
[87] *Speech* 1 (Barnes and Bevan 37).
[88] In relation to Elijah the author makes the qualification that St John did not resurrect anyone. *Speech* 3 (Barnes and Bevan 39).
[89] *Speech* 3 (Barnes and Bevan 38).
[90] *Speech* 3 (Barnes and Bevan 39).
[91] *Speech* 4 (Barnes and Bevan 39).
[92] *Speech* 4 (Barnes and Bevan 39–40).

envy"[93] (φθόνος)[94]—which in the Roman and early Byzantine historians[95] is a demonic agent of chaos in the world—has "burst upon the church of God."[96] In this way, John's absence results in so much instability in the world that the chaotic demons, along with envy, reign.

It is interesting to note that the demon envy is described by ps.-Martyrius as having as its particular locus the imperial capital of Constantinople. Before turning to his assessment of this city, however, it should be made clear that at the time of ps.-Martyrius' writing, Constantinople, the New Rome, was envisaged as the centre and image of the world and was intended as such by its founder. In the 330s, Eusebius of Caesarea described the city as dedicated to "the martyr's God,"[97] and only a few decades later the historians Philostorgius and Sozomen would variously describe the city as founded according to divine providence[98] and as either the centre of, or as encompassing, the world.[99] Even ps.-Martyrius described it as "a whole world in miniature."[100] In fact, the city was considered as having its own ecosystemic agency, but only on account of the fact that it was the "acropolis of all" the empire[101] from where the rulers governed God's city that mirrored the cosmos. It was a terrible yet—in the providence of God, glorious—irony that in this period the rulers of Constantinople would produce so many martyrs for the Church, beginning with the saints, like Athanasius[102] and the former bishop of the city, Paul the Confessor, who were persecuted—and, in the case of the latter, murdered—during the Arian crisis.[103] John Chrysostom, of course, would be numbered among them.

---

[93] *Speech* 5 (Barnes and Bevan 40).

[94] Pseudo-Martyrius, *Oratio funebris in laudem Joannis Chrysostomi*, ed. M. Wallraff (Spoleto: Fondazione Centro Italiano di studi sull' alto medioevo, 2007) (retrieved via TLG).

[95] So depicted by Eusebius of Caesarea and Sozomen. See *Vita Constantini* 2.42.2 in *Eusebius Werke, Band 1.1: Über das Leben des Kaisers Konstantin*, ed. F. Winkelmann (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1975) (retrieved via TLG) and *The Ecclesiastical History of Sozomen* (= *Soz*.) 1.19, trans. Chester D. Hartranft in *Socrates, Sozomenus: Church Histories* (cit. n. 33) 255.

[96] *Speech* 5 (Barnes and Bevan 40).

[97] Eusebius, *Life of Constantine* 3.48, trans. Averil Cameron and Stuart G. Hall (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999) 140.

[98] *Philostorgius: Church History* 2.9a, trans. Philip R. Amidon (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007) 25–26. *Soz*. 2.3 (Hartranft 259–60).

[99] *Soz*. 2.3 (Hartranft 260).

[100] *Speech* 23 (Barnes and Bevan 52).

[101] Sozomen, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 7.4.5; my translation.

[102] See my chapter 'The Traditional Portrayal of St Athanasius' 139–71.

[103] *The Ecclesiastical History of Theodoret* (= *Theod*.) 2.4, trans. Blomfeld Jackson, in *Theodoret, Jerome, Gennadius, Rufinus*, NPNF 2nd series, vol. 3 (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1979) 67.

Ps.-Martyrius described Constantinople before the appointment of John as its bishop, as follows:

> [God saw] a great and populous city, greater than all those that lie under the sun, inferior to one city alone—I speak here of the city of Constantinople, the daughter of Rome, in which is set the throne of the emperor, which persuades those from everywhere who need help to look to it, <where> there is a multitude of magistrates since the emperor is present, and crowds of soldiers, and of men bearing shields and spears, whose units one would not easily count. <There is> thriving trade, since every ship brings everything from everywhere to the city, and <there is> much gold and much silver in the city, which flutters around uselessly and in vain, some of it being accumulated and buried unjustly, gathered from the tears of the poor, some of it being spent more unjustly and more illegally, contributing to no end except to the ruin of both those who give and those who receive it, and what is still more grievous, those who do this regard their activity as the height of happiness; and <there is> there a multitude of false accusations and slanders and plotting and making some who were rich destitute and others exiles and wanderers, and now allowing some to escape the hands of the public executioners, since those <who are> held in high esteem in the emperor's house are always envied, while the very men who envy them press on to being in their turn the object of envy by others, while not even those who have succeeded in being close to the emperor are ever satisfied with their wealth—our common Saviour and God, seeing that this city needed the oversight of this saint, brought him and put him in charge of the city.[104]

Ps.-Martyrius begins with a seeming panegyric for the city but his sarcasm is evident when, after describing all of the city's external glories and wealth, he affirms that, because of the greed of its inhabitants, it poisons them and destroys the lives of the poor. Likewise, because of this wealth, which contributes "to no end except to the ruin of both those who give and those who receive it," in the city "there [is] a multitude of false accusations and slanders and plotting" inspired by envy, which is tragically directed to those in the imperial household by persons who would press on to become objects of envy themselves. This city is therefore described in stark contrast to the way many cities were envisaged in the ancient world, as seats of ecosystemic agents and as exemplifying cosmic order. The reason for this could be the fact that ps.-Martyrius understood that cities could not on their own act as centres of harmony or cosmic order, but that the behaviour of their inhabitants and their proximity to God was ultimately what shaped a place, for better or worse.

[104] *Speech* 13 (Barnes and Bevan 45–46).

Moreover, the significance of the ecosystemic agency of Christ and his saints is made clear by ps.-Martyrius' musings that the city in fact needed the saint—and it is not for no reason that John Chrysostom made so many enemies among the elite, which included corrupt clergy, who shared in the avarice of their 'worldly' contemporaries to the destitution of Constantinople and its church at the time. In fact, according to St John's disciple, "divine grace had chosen the man for the episcopate of the city,"[105] and so much so was he desired by the people that, according to ps.-Martyrius, the public acclamation of ἄξιος or "he is worthy" did not cease even after the consecration of John to the bishopric had taken place. This prompted him to suggest that angels must have resounded in the chorus, much to the shock of the emperor Arcadius who was present at the event.[106]

Ps.-Martyrius writes that upon his accession to the bishopric, the following sign—"the most divine sign of all signs"—came from God that John "had obtained the oversight of Christ's flock very justly,"[107] and that was the peace of Christ, promised to the disciples (Jn 14:27), which was manifested, according to the author, when John first took the episcopate in Constantinople. John is then described in ecosystemic terms:

> And just like an angel descending from the sky as a bestower of concord, so this amazing man brought together the whole world, making the many churches truly one, when the one church had formerly been divided into many parts. In contrast, when the just man was forcibly removed from the city, peace flew off once again from the earth, with hardly a sound, saying only: 'Without this amazing man who has learned my nature well and has sown it among the whole human race, I will in no way tolerate living on the earth.' Again the affairs of the church lapsed into discord or rather into schism.[108]

It is implied here that John is an ecosystemic agent precisely because he is a participant in Christ,[109] the divine-human ecosystemic agent par excellence. And just as chaos descended upon Jerusalem at the crucifixion of Christ, and upon the monks in Egypt upon the death of their father Antony, so too did chaos rupture both the Church—and, we shall see, the state—when John was persecuted and martyred.

The circumstances that led to the deposition of John are related to his tenure in Constantinople. It is important to reiterate that the Byzantine historians

---

[105] *Speech* 16 (Barnes and Bevan 47).

[106] *Speech* 16 (Barnes and Bevan 48).

[107] *Speech* 19 (Barnes and Bevan 49–50).

[108] Ibid.

[109] The description is more nuanced: "buoyed up by his own wisdom and the power of the <Holy> Spirit." *Speech* 22 (Barnes and Bevan 52).

portray the saint in conflicting terms. Socrates described him as prone to irritability and haughty.[110] But Socrates, we have seen, was a Novatian sympathiser, a group that contested with John. Moreover, Socrates was a staunch Constantinopolitan and often represents poorly those who challenged the imperial court.[111] Sozomen, on the other hand, described John in more positive terms and underscored his far-reaching pastoral care, which, following ps.-Martyrius, he rhetorically affirmed extended to the whole earth.[112] In his *Ecclesiastical History*, Theodoret was in agreement with Sozomen and lauded John as "the great luminary of the world (τὸν μέγαν τῆς οἰκουμένης φωστῆρα)," [113] "teacher of the world (ὁ τῆς οἰκουμένης διδάσκαλος)," [114] and a "great chief." [115] Indeed, in Theodoret's reckoning John's ecosystemic agency was a threat to "envy (φθόνος)" [116] who

> could not endure the bright rays of his philosophy. It put in practice its wonted wiles and deprived of his eloquence and his wisdom the imperial city—aye indeed the whole world [τὴν οἰκουμένην ἅπασαν].[117]

Although Theodoret's use of the word οἰκουμένη denotes the Greek term for the Roman empire, etymologically it also means the "inhabited land or earth," [118] thereby bolstering the representation of John as one who effects the human-made world as an ecosystemic agent. Thus, according to Theodoret, John taught the world as a philosopher and luminary, until this human-made world, exemplified by the city of Constantinople, revolted against him.

I turn now to the circumstances that led to the first expulsion of John from Constantinople in 403. In the city at least, his reprovals of the clergy, wandering monks,[119] and the elite were met with indignation if not outright reprisal. His dispute with his former confidant Severian, bishop of Gabala in Syria,[120] is important in this regard, as it brought John into a direct conflict with the empress Aelia Eudoxia. For a straightforward outline of this admittedly complex matter, I defer to Sozomen, who described it in relation

---

[110] *Socr*. 6.3 (Zenos 139).

[111] Elsewhere I have argued that Socrates negatively portrayed St Cyril of Alexandria for similar reasons. See Baghos, 'Ecclesial Memory and Secular History' 250.

[112] *Speech* 25 (Barnes and Bevan 53); *Soz*. 8.3 (Hartranft 400).

[113] PG 82, 1236C (this, and all subsequent translations from this text, are by me).

[114] PG 82, 1261A.

[115] *Theod*. 5.33 (Jackson 153).

[116] PG 82, 1261B.

[117] Ibid. Greek text from PG82, 1261C.

[118] G. W. H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961) 944.

[119] *Soz*. 8.9 (Hartranft 405).

[120] *Soz*. 8.10 (Hartranft 405).

to an incident involving John's archdeacon, Serapion.[121] Serapion happened to insult Severian by not rising to salute him as he passed by, resulting in a misreport by Serapion's friends to John that Severian uttered: "Christ was not incarnate."[122] Whatever the real nature of the dispute, it culminated in Severian's expulsion from the city, which in turn prompted Eudoxia to beseech John by placing her son, the young Theodosius II, on his knee as an entreaty to restore relations with Severian, which was successful.[123] This was followed by an incident that was stirred in Egypt and ended up on John's doorstep, namely the crusade of Theophilus of Alexandria against his former friends Isidore and the Origenist 'Tall Brothers' from Nitria—Ammonius, Dioscorus, Eusebius, and Euthymius—who believed that God does not have a human form.[124] These men were used as scapegoats by Theophilus in his dispute with the anthropomorphite monks of Egypt, those who believed that God does indeed have a human form.[125] Theophilus once held Origenist views, but under pressure from the anthropomorphites did an 'about-face' against his former confidants, the Tall Brothers, who fled to Constantinople for a fair audience with the emperor Arcadius and the bishop, John.[126]

Sozomen attested that John did not receive the Tall Brothers into communion,[127] and even claimed that the saint, having found that the sentiments of the Tall Brothers concerning God were correct,[128] besought Theophilus to readmit them into the Church.[129] Both Socrates and Sozomen also agree in relation to what happened next, namely that Theophilus heard a false report that John had actually permitted the brothers to participate in holy communion,[130] which would have been uncanonical if it were true, and from that point onwards sought a way in which he would depose the saint, namely by invoking these canonical grounds.[131] Theophilus tried to bring this deposition about by sending Epiphanius of Salamis to solicit the condemnation of Origen—and thus the Tall Brothers who adhered to Origen's

---

[121] Serapion in fact envied John's mentorship to the deaconess Olympias. *Soz*. 8.10 (Hartranft 404–5).

[122] *Soz*. 8.10 (Hartranft 405).

[123] Ibid.

[124] *Soz*. 8.12 (Hartranft 406–7).

[125] *Soz*. 8.11 (Hartranft 406).

[126] *Soz*. 8.13 (Hartranft 407).

[127] Ibid.

[128] The Greek reads: ὀρθῶς περὶ θεοῦ δοξάζουσιν which translates into "their worship concerning God was right"—see Sozomen's *Historia Ecclesiastica* 8.13.3.

[129] *Soz*. 8.13 (Hartranft 407).

[130] Ibid. *Socr*.6.9 (Zenos 145).

[131] *Socr*. 6.10 and 6.15 (Zenos 145 and 149); *Soz*.8.14 (Hartranft 407–8).

teachings—throughout the empire and in Constantinople in particular.[132] These machinations, however, were ignored by John[133] until, according to Socrates he discovered, after Epiphanius had left Constantinople, that the empress "Eudoxia had stimulated Epiphanius against him."[134] This caused John to indirectly insult the empress, which motivated the imperial couple—Eudoxia and Arcadius—to permit Theophilus "to convoke a Synod without delay against John."[135] This led to the first exile of John Chrysostom. This exile was facilitated by Theophilus at the Synod of the Oak held in Chalcedon in 403,[136]and, to reiterate, was an outcome of the bishop of Alexandria's attempt to condemn Chrysostom ostensibly for readmitting Isidore and the Tall Brothers into communion—which, according to Socrates, John never did[137]—but which, as Norman Russell has pointed out, was probably motivated by the fact that Theophilus considered John a threat to the prominence of the Alexandrine see.[138] That Theophilus used Origen and his teachings as a pretext to condemn John is especially made clear by the complete neglect of the 'problems' posed by either Origen or Origenism at the Synod of the Oak.[139] The goal of this synod was the expulsion of John, which it accomplished, and which led the people of Constantinople to revolt.[140]

In his *Funerary Speech*, ps.-Martyrius described these events in spiritual terms. John's divinely inspired work in the Church—fittingly encapsulated in the expression—"He made all into lovers of singing psalms, through which they made the night day, the public square a church, and the church heaven"[141]—enraged the devil. This prompted it to make of Eudoxia a new Jezebel,[142] and ps.-Martyrius described her as being controlled by the enemy through her "insatiable avarice" and "power and wickedness, great wickedness."[143] Avarice, we have seen, was the particular folly not only of the

---

[132] *Soz*. 8.14 (Hartranft 407–8).
[133] *Soz*. 8.14 (Hartranft 408).
[134] *Socr*. 6.14 (Zenos 148).
[135] Ibid.
[136] *Socr*.6.14 (Zenos 148–49).
[137] The Greek reads something like he could not admit them into communion "before a diagnosis could be given to them (πρὸ διαγνώσεως μεταδώσειν αὐτοῖς)." Socrates, *Historia Ecclesiastica* 6.9.34 in *Socrate de Constantinople, Histoire ecclésiastique*, trans. Pierre Maraval and Pierre Périchon (Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 2004–2007) (retrieved via TLG); my translation. See also *Soz*. 8.13 (Hartranft 407).
[138] *Soz*. 8.13 (Hartranft 407).
[139] *Socr*. 6.14 (Zenos 149); *Soz*.8.17 (Hartranft 410).
[140] *Socr*. 6.16 (Zenos 149).
[141] *Speech* 31 (Barnes and Bevan 57).
[142] *Speech* 31 (Barnes and Bevan 59).
[143] *Speech* 36 (Barnes and Bevan 60).

Constantinopolitans,[144] but of Theophilus and his retinue, who are likewise described as "full of evil cunning and wickedness" and under the sway of "the father of envy (τοῦ φθόνου τὸν πατέρα)," the devil.[145] The exile of John after the Synod of the Oak is described in both martyric and ecosystemic terms, for when he was informed that he had been deposed, he

> …stood up, raised his hands to the sky and uttered the words of the blessed Stephen, which have, I think, warded off the anger of God from the heads of those men even until today. Saying 'Forgive them, Lord, for this sin' (Acts 7.60), he departed taking great care to avoid the attention of the people as he left. Thus the church became bereft of its shepherd.[146]

Assimilating John to St Stephen implies the fact that the persecution of both men is modelled on the persecution of Christ, who on the cross first uttered the prayer of forgiveness recited by Stephen[147] and then by John. Ps.-Martyrius went on to say that:

> I am convinced that the sky, the sun, the earth and the sea, if anyone had granted them a small capacity for feeling, would then have groaned mightily together for the pain of the church.[148]

The cosmic sympathy evoked in relation to the Church here calls to mind the death of Christ that, we have seen, was associated with cosmic disturbances. The suffering of the Church, in the absence of John, therefore evokes the suffering of the world upon the death of the Lord, a motif, we saw earlier, which also appeared in relation to the death of St Antony the Great. According to ps.-Martyrius and Palladius,[149] natural catastrophies as divine retributions occurred in relation to the empress Eudoxia for her role in the Synod of the Oak: her child was stillborn within hours of John's exile.[150] According to Theodoret, "a great earthquake" took place "and the empress was struck with terror."[151]

Whether we consider the stillbirth or the earthquake—or both—as taking place as a result of John's exile from Constantinople, the message is the same: that the saint's absence caused natural disturbances to rock the city, and this

---

[144] *Speech* 13 (Barnes and Bevan 45–46).
[145] Martyrius, *Oratio funebris* 39.10; my translation.
[146] *Speech* 58 (Barnes and Bevan 72–73).
[147] In Lk 23:34 the Lord says "forgive them Father, for they do not know what they are doing." St Stephen, in imitation of Christ, prays, "Lord, do not hold this sin against them" (Acts 7:60).
[148] *Speech* 59 (Barnes and Bevan 73).
[149] *Pal*. 9 (Meyer 57).
[150] *Speech* 66 (Barnes and Bevan 77).
[151] *Theod*. 5.34 (Jackson 154).

is because John's ecosystemic agency was temporarily absent. In any case, according to Socrates these circumstances, along with the revolt of John's flock,[152] led within a few days[153] to his recall. The saint was compelled to take up his episcopal seat, despite his protests that the participants of the Synod of the Oak should have revoked the sentence against him before he could do so.[154] The crowd however prevailed, and without being 'officially' reinstated John was restored to his flock in Constantinople, before once again incurring the wrath of the empress after he publicly criticised her for erecting a silver statue of herself atop a porphyry column near the cathedral church of Holy Wisdom (Hagia Sophia). This is an interesting episode, insofar as the statue of the empress, erected outside of the church, "was celebrated there with applause and popular spectacles of dances and mimes, as was then customary on the erection of the statues of the emperors."[155]

The festivities associated with the erection of the statue indicate lingering features of the ruler cult, which we know was present in Constantinople, at least at the city's founding, when Constantine the Great erected a statue of himself as the god Apollo—who, we have seen above, was considered by the pagans as an ecosystemic agent—on a porphyry column in the Forum named after himself.[156] The official founding of Constantinople involved the erection of this statue, which was venerated in a pagan manner, and which included forty-days of festivities in the Hippodrome.[157] Not only was this statue at the time of Theodoret's writing—roughly half a century after the death of John—still an object of popular praise,[158] but it was venerated yearly on the anniversary of the city's founding up until the sixth century.[159]

In fact, the very act of erecting statues on columns, which were considered as intersecting heaven and earth as *axes mundi*,[160] was to highlight the precedence of the figure on top of the column over the earth below.

---

[152] *Socr*. 6.16 (Zenos 149).

[153] *Pal*. 9 (Meyer 57).

[154] *Socr*. 6.16 (Zenos 149).

[155] *Soz*. 8.20 (Hartranft 412).

[156] More precisely, the statue was "reputed to have originally been … of Apollo with a portrait head of Constantine replacing that of Apollo." Allan Doig, *Liturgy and Architecture from the Early Church to the Middle Ages* (Aldershot, Hampshire: Ashgate, 2008) 53.

[157] *Constantinople in the Early Eighth Century: The Parastaseis Syntomoi Chronikai* 56, trans. Averil Cameron and Judith Herrin (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1984) 131, 133.

[158] *Theod*. 1.32 (Jackson 64).

[159] *The Chronicle of John Malalas* 13.8, trans Elizabeth Jeffreys et al. (Melbourne: Australian Association for Byzantine Studies, 1986) 175.

[160] We know from Mircea Eliade that pillars were generally considered *axes mundi* insofar as they effectuated a "communication with heaven." Eliade, *The Sacred and the Profane* 36.

Constantine therefore established a pattern that was followed by Eudoxia who, in overshadowing the cathedral with her statue, was perhaps indicating her privileged status—even over the Church—as 'world-shaper' in the city. The persistence of the ruler cult in her time is aptly pointed out by the fact that Constantinople "was having images of her, arrayed in honorific mantle and diadem appropriate to an Augusta, distributed throughout the empire" that, together with the statue, pointed towards her "divinely appointed role."[161] It is no wonder that John reacted. In any case, according to Sozomen, Eudoxia was so incensed that she became determined to convene another council against him, but John

> did not yield, but added fuel to her indignation by still more openly declaiming against her in the church; and it was at this period that he pronounced the memorable discourse commencing with the words, "Herodias is again enraged; again she dances; again she seeks to have the head of John in a basin."[162]

Around this time the enemies of John, Leontius bishop of Ancyra and Acacius of Berea,[163] as well as an entourage of bishops left behind by Theophilus—who had fled the city once he realised John was to be reinstated[164]—brought a new charge against the saint, namely, that he had contradicted a canon legislated, according to Palladius and Sozomen,[165] by the Arians against Athanasius the Great, that stipulated that a bishop who had been deposed could not be reinstated without permission from a synod.[166] We have seen that this was something John seems to have anticipated before his reinstatement after his first exile, but instead yielded to the will of the people to have him returned as their bishop. Ps.-Martyrius in his *Funerary Speech* referred back to the episode with Athanasius,[167] indirectly pointing out the parallels between the former's persecution at the hands of the Arian bishops and the Arian emperor Constantius, and John's current predicament under the emperor Acacius and empress Eudoxia. In his defence, St John appealed to the fact that some bishops who had deposed him at the Synod of the Oak had now entered into communion with him, to which his accusers replied that his defence was insufficient because

---

[161] Kelly, *Golden Mouth* 239.
[162] *Soz*. 8.20 (Hartranft 412).
[163] Ibid.
[164] *Speech* 82 (Barnes and Bevan 85).
[165] *Pal*. 9 (Meyer 59); *Soz*. 8.20 (Hartranft 412).
[166] *Pal*. 9 (Meyer 59).
[167] *Speech* 98–100 (Barnes and Bevan 94–95).

> those who had held communion with John were inferior in point of number to those who had deposed him, and that a canon was in force by which he stood condemned. Under this pretext they therefore deposed him, although the law in question had been enacted by heretics…[168]

Sozomen continued that after "his deposition, John held no more assemblies in the church, but quietly remained in the episcopal dwelling-house."[169] Palladius, Sozomen, and ps.-Martyrius describe the chaos—including the two murder attempts against John[170]—that followed his deposition. John was then exiled for a second time in 404, upon which utter chaos broke out in the city, resulting in the burning of the cathedral church of Hagia Sophia. According to Palladius

> …there appeared a flame in the middle of the throne where John used to sit. It was just as the heart situated in the middle of the body controls the other members and communicates the oracles of the Lord. The flame looked for the expounder of the Word and not finding him it consumed the church furnishings. Then it took shape like a tree and grew up through the rafters to the very roof and like an adder it consumed the belly and crept up on the back of the church buildings. It was as though God was paying the wages of iniquity for the penalty assigned, to chide and warn those who would not be warned except by the sight of these calamities sent by God himself … But the burning of the church was as nothing compared to that of the building known as the Senate House, which is opposite the church many paces to the south. The fire as though endowed with intelligence leaped over the people in the street like a bridge and it destroyed first of all the part closest to the church, but the part on the side of the royal palace. So we cannot say that it really burned because of the proximity of the structures, but it showed that it was only too clear that it had come from heaven. (One could see people going about their regular business between two mountains of fire without any harm.) So the fire was whirling and seething like the sea, stirred up by a strong wind as though proceeding under signal.[171]

Here, John's ecosystemic agency is indirectly described. While, as we have seen, his presence in Constantinople was a stabilising factor (albeit a cause of chaos for his enemies, whose behaviour was contrary to the saint and thus to God), his absence inevitably brought down God's wrath upon the city. This is manifested in the fact that, according to Palladius, this mysterious fire began in the middle of John's empty episcopal throne and, behaving in

[168] *Soz*. 8.20 (Hartranft 412).
[169] *Soz*. 8.21 (Hartranft 412).
[170] *Soz*. 8.21 (Hartranft 412–13).
[171] *Pal*. 10 (Meyer 67–68).

a sentient manner, destroyed Hagia Sophia and much of the senate house. Moreover, according to ps.-Martyrius—who also described this event—the church pointed "with the edge of the fire, just as with a finger, at the guilty neighbours," i.e. the senate representing the empire.[172] However, since both the church and the senate house were destroyed—and if the cathedral represents the Church at large, and the senate house the state—then it could be said that both were being chastised for their mistreatment of the agent of providence. This point was elaborated upon by Sozomen—who also described the fire that consumed the cathedral and the senate house[173]—when he affirmed that after the deposition of John: "the dissensions by which the Church was agitated were followed, as is frequently the case, by disturbances and commotions in the state."[174] He went on to outline these dissensions as political in nature. Provinces of the empire were devastated by the Huns and robbers, and civil strife was fomented by the general Stilicho who appointed Alaric the Goth as a general under the co-emperor reigning from Ravenna, Honorius.[175] This would of course backfire due to Honorius' mistreatment of Alaric and the latter's vengeance, which was taken out on Rome itself in AD 410 when the Goths sacked the city.[176]

The need for sympathy between the Church and the empire—that unity in the former would lead to unity in the latter—had of course been promoted by Constantine the Great a century earlier.[177] Here Sozomen seems to be picking up on this theme, but he inverted it to show that the disturbances in the Church negatively affected the state. Nevertheless, in describing the destruction of the cathedral and the senate house, both Sozomen and Palladius pointed to the fact that both Church and state were simultaneously being castigated for their mistreatment of God's saint, irrespective of their relationship. It is interesting to note that for both Palladius and ps.-Martyrius, the fire, while burning everything else to the ground, did not touch the treasury where many sacred vessels of gold and silver were kept. This, they both affirmed, was to expose Theophilus and others who accused John of stealing from the treasury as liars.[178]

Thus, in the perception of ps.-Martyrius, Palladius, and Sozomen, the ecosystemic agency of John is indirectly referred to via the destruction of the

---

[172] *Speech* 112 (Barnes and Bevan 101).
[173] *Soz*. 8.22 (Hartranft 413).
[174] *Soz*. 8.25 (Hartranft 415).
[175] Ibid.
[176] *Soz*. 9.6 (Hartranft 423); *Socr*. 7.10 (Zenos 157–58).
[177] Eusebius of Caesarea, *Life of Constantine* 2.64–65 (Cameron and Hall 116).
[178] *Pal*. 10 (Meyer 68–69); *Speech* 113 (Barnes and Bevan 101).

cathedral and the senate house by the miraculous fire—which is a natural element that is here, according to these writers, being used as a means of chastisement by God himself. This chastisement was extended to further representatives of the empire. Ps.-Martyrius referred to the death of the empress Eudoxia by a second miscarriage that took place around this time.[179] Sozomen also described her death, but as preceded four days earlier by "some hailstones of extraordinary magnitude [which] fell at Constantinople and in the suburbs of the city."[180] Sozomen continued that "[t]hese occurrences were by many regarded as indications of Divine wrath on account of the persecution that had been carried on against John."[181] We mentioned above that cities were often considered as having an ecosystemic, world-shaping agency of their own on account of the presence of the ruler within the city, or, in the case of ancient Rome, the association of the emperor with the city. In this case, the false ecosystemic agency of both the empress and the city is being disrupted by the ecosystemic agent par excellence—that is, God—whose disfavour is manifested in the fact that his saint, who is an ecosystemic agent by grace and in synergy with God, has suffered at this city's hands and has died as an exile from a city that he had been sent to by God.

Despite the seemingly tragic nature of these circumstances, the comfort given to the saint by God is described by both Palladius and Theodoret. Near Comana, from where St John was to be further exiled to Pityus, the saint in a dream encountered Basiliscus, the bishop of Comana, who had died as a martyr during the great persecution in 303 AD.[182] Basiliscus told the saint that on the following day they would be together, and John is described by Palladius as thereafter making preparation for his repose.[183] Receiving holy communion, he offered his last prayer, which was "Glory to God for all things," before falling asleep and being interred in the same shrine as Basiliscus.[184] Theodoret, who gave a brief summary of the events leading to the saint's repose—including the fact that the saint was to be further exiled to the isle of Pityus—poignantly affirmed:

> the loving Lord did not suffer the victorious athlete to be carried off to this islet, for when he had reached Comana he was removed to the life that knows

[179] *Speech* 121 (Barnes and Bevan 104–5).
[180] *Soz*. 8.27 (Hartranft 417).
[181] Ibid.
[182] *Theod*. 5.34 (Jackson 154); *Pal*. 11 (Meyer 72–73).
[183] *Pal*. 11 (Meyer 73).
[184] Ibid. Other sources speak about the presence of Sts Peter, John, and Lucian of Antioch at his repose. 'Appendix C: John in the Calendar of the Church of Constantinople' in *Funerary Speech for John Chrysostom*, trans. Barnes and Bevan (cit. n. 14) 167.

> nor age nor pain. The body that had struggled so bravely was buried by the side of the coffin of the martyred Basiliscus, for so the martyr had ordained in a dream.[185]

The date of John Chrysostom's repose was 14 September, but it is celebrated by the Orthodox Church on 13 November so that it does not coincide with the feast of the exaltation of the holy cross, which was inaugurated in the seventh century.[186]

Ps.-Martyrius described St John as a martyr. We saw above that he did this at the beginning of his *Funerary Speech*, and he did so again when describing the saint's death. This might seem strange given that the term martyr is usually reserved only for those who are immediately executed for their commitment to Christ. In reality, however, if we consider the word martyr according to its etymology—namely μάρτυς or witness—then John's steadfast witness to Christ throughout his life, and the sufferings he endured for the sake of Christ, are enough to warrant the use of this term in relation to his person; a term I have argued elsewhere can equally be applied to Athanasius the Great and Origen before him.[187]

What characterises the description of the martyrs is their immediate participation in Christ. This perception of John as an immediate participant in Christ is referred to by Palladius and ps.-Martyrius in relation to his death, and is explicitly outlined as having transpired throughout his life both in these texts and in the histories of Sozomen and Theodoret. It was this participation in Christ that made John an ecosystemic agent, an ability that, it can be inferred, persisted well after his death, as manifested in the following scenarios. First, John was the cause for bringing together the churches in the West and East that had been in division on account of the dropping of John's name from the diptychs, the official list of names of Orthodox bishops that were commemorated in the liturgy. The situation is aptly summarised by Theodoret:

---

[185] *Theod*. 5.34 (Jackson 154).

[186] This feast celebrates the return of the cross to Jerusalem by the Byzantine emperor Heraclius after it had been stolen by the Persians in the early seventh century. According to Louis Tongeren, this feast was introduced to Constantinople between 670 and 730, but it might have antecedents in a feast day celebrating the initial discovery of the cross by St Helen in the fourth century. Louis Tengeren, *Exaltation of the Cross: Toward the Origin of the Feast of the Cross and the Meaning of the Cross in Early Medieval Liturgy* (Leuven, Paris, Sterling: Peeters, 2000) 2–3.

[187] Baghos, 'The Traditional Portrayal of St Athanasius' 171. Also, Mario Baghos, 'The Conflicting Portrayals of Origen in the Byzantine Tradition' *Phronema* 30:2 (2015) 69–104 esp. 89–90.

> On the death of the great teacher of the world [τοῦ μεγάλου διδασκάλου τῆς οἰκουμένης], the bishops of the West refused to embrace the communion of the bishops of Egypt, of the East, of the Bosphorus, and in Thrace, until the name of that holy man had been inserted among those of deceased bishops. Arsacius his immediate successor they declined to acknowledge, but Atticus the successor of Arsacius, after he had frequently solicited the boon of peace, was after a time received when he had inserted the name in the roll.[188]

Rome had been in schism with Constantinople since 405, while John was still alive, when Pope Innocent I had convoked a council that condemned the accusations against him, excommunicated Theophilus of Alexandria and Arsacius—the immediate (and short-tenured) successor to John—and called on emperor Arcadius to convoke a synod in the East to do the same.[189] When the latter rebuffed the pope's envoys, the churches of Rome and Constantinople lapsed into schism, which persisted until John's name was restored to the diptychs sometime during the episcopal tenure of Atticus and the reign of emperor Theodosius II, perhaps between the years 412–15.[190]

The second scenario that confirms John's role as an ecosystemic agent even after the his repose took place in 438, when his relics were transferred by the then bishop of Constantinople, St Proclus, from Comana to the capital city, and were interred in the high altar[191] of the church of the Holy Apostles.[192] This event is commemorated as taking place on 27 January in the Synaxarion of the Church of Constantinople, which describes the transference of the relics as putting an end to an earthquake in the city;[193] thereby affirming the saint's ecosystemic agency. Finally, a lengthier description of the transference of his relics that appears in the Synaxarion relates that when the saint's body was being transferred to the city—to much solemn celebration by its inhabitants—his body is said to have been placed upon the episcopal throne in the church of the Holy Apostles, upon which St John "pronounced a benediction on the congregation."[194] Before his body was deposited in a coffin that was placed beneath the holy altar of the church, a paralytic is described as being

---

[188] *Theod*. 5.34 (Jackson 154). Greek text from PG 82, 1264D.

[189] Kelly, *Golden Mouth* 278.

[190] See 'Letter 75: The letter of blessed Atticus, Bishop of Constantinople, to the most blessed Cyril…' in *St. Cyril of Alexandria: Letters 51–110*, trans. John I. McEnerney (Washington D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1987) 83, fn. 1.

[191] 'Appendix C' (Barnes and Bevan 167).

[192] *Socr*. 7.45 (Zenos 177).

[193] 'Appendix C' (Barnes and Bevan 166).

[194] Ibid. 167.

healed after touching his coffin, pointing to the healing ecosystemic agency of the saint from beyond the grave.[195]

Concluding Remarks

"I myself will show him how much he must suffer for the sake of my name"—these are the words of Christ to Ananias concerning Saul of Tarsus in the Acts of the Apostles (9:16). They follow the Lord's assurance to Ananias that Saul, to be renamed Paul, was to become Christ's instrument to bring his name "before Gentiles and kings and before the people of Israel" (9:15). The same could be said about John Chrysostom, whom we have seen according to ps.-Martyrius was called by God to Constantinople precisely to bring Christ's Gospel to a city—to an imperial court and Church institution—that had been corrupted by avarice and envy. As in the case of Paul, this calling came with a price, for both saints suffered at the hands of those to whom they were sent to preach the Good News. But, as in Paul's case, both received the grace from above in this life; a grace that was manifested in their co-working with God for the reshaping of the world, what we have termed in this chapter 'ecosystemic agency.'

I have demonstrated that modern scholarship does not do justice to such representations of the saints; representations that prevail in both their immediate contexts and in the traditional Churches. This is because of the positivism inhering in modern historiography that does not appreciate the grace of God in history or in the lives of persons. We have seen that this is part of the legacy of the Enlightenment that is retrospectively imposed onto past epochs that had very different perceptions towards holy persons like John. Thus, we have discovered that ps.-Martyrius' *Funerary Speech*, Palladius' *Dialogue on the Life of St John Chrysostom*, and the histories of Sozomen and Theodoret, all depict him as an ecosystemic agent. This chapter has prioritised these accounts to others—such as Socrates' *History*—that portray John in a negative light, in order to demonstrate that it is precisely the positivist bias that motivates historians to prioritise the latter representation over the former ones.

That the positive depictions of John—inhering within tradition and the Church's memory—are immediately relevant to the faithful is made clear from the fact that modern Christians continue to undergo persecution even in ostensibly Christian frameworks. Indeed, that Aelia Eudoxia, who claimed the

[195] Ibid. 167–68.

false ecosystemic agency of the ruler cult, bishop Theophilus of Alexandria, and others masqueraded as Christians but at the same time were driven by their passions and the devil against a saint of the Lord is a phenomenon that is often repeated within the life of the Church on an institutional level. That the saint patiently withstood these attacks, and that his ecosystemic agency was demonstrated as a consequence of the persecution he endured, namely, in Eudoxia's two stillbirths—the latter of which resulted in her death—earthquakes, a hailstorm, and the fire that devoured both the cathedral of Holy Wisdom and the senate house, shows the outcome of exiling the ecosystemic agent from the city to which he was sent by God to bring about peace and healing, the latter being manifested even after his death through his relics.

It is tempting to see in these 'negative' ecosystemic events a sort of divine retribution, and even though this may have been the case, Christians should not be provoked to anger over John's sufferings—which are natural to the Christian experience insofar as it is an imitation of Christ—and which won for him in the end "the life that knows nor age nor pain."[196] Instead, Christians should learn the following two lessons from his life. The first is that Christians should always be alert for the presence of these ecosystemic agents, lest we fall into the same error as John's enemies, who, although claiming to be Christian, persecuted him, and suffered terrible consequences as a result. The second is the fact that the saints really are agents of Christ who can positively shape the world, both natural and human-made. This should inspire us on the Christian journey.

Select Bibliography

Baghos, Mario. 'Ecclesial Memory and Secular History in the Conflicting Representations of St Cyril of Alexandria.' In *Alexandrian Legacy: A Critical Appraisal*. Edited by Doru Costache, Baghos, et al., 246–80. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2015.

—. 'The Traditional Portrayal of St Athanasius according to Rufinus, Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret.' In *Alexandrian Legacy: A Critical Appraisal*. Edited by Doru Costache, Baghos, et al., 139–71. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2015.

Chesnut, Glenn F. *The First Christian Histories: Eusebius, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, and Evagrius*. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1986.

Costache, Doru. 'John Moschus on Asceticism and the Environment.' *Colloquium* 48:1 (2016) 21–34.

[196] *Theod*. 5.34 (Jackson 154).

Couliano, Ioan P. *The Tree of Gnosis: Gnostic Mythology from Early Christianity to Modern Nihilism*. Translated by H. S. Wiesner. San Francisco: HarperCollins, 1992.
Eliade, Mircea. *The Myth of the Eternal Return*. Translated by Willard R. Trask. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2005.
Kelly, J. N. D. *Golden Mouth: The Story of John Chrysostom—Ascetic, Preacher, Bishop*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1995.
Liebeschuetz, J. H. W. G. *Ambrose and John Chrysostom: Clerics Between Desert and Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
Mayer, Wendy. 'Chapter 9: John Chrysostom.' In *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Patristics*. Edited by Ken Parry, 141–54. West Sussex: Wiley Blackwell, 2015.
—. 'The Making of a Saint: John Chrysostom in Early Historiography.' In *Chrysostomosbilder in 1600 Jahren: Facetten der Wirkungsgeschichte eines Kirchenvaters*. Edited by Martin Wallraff and Rudolf Brändle, 39–59. Berlin and New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2008.
Treadgold,Warren.*The Early Byzantine Historians*. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010.
Urbainczyk, Theresa. *Socrates of Constantinople: Historian of Church and State*. Michigan: The University of Michigan Press, 1997.

Chapter Two

John Chrysostom after Chalcedon
A Useful Ecumenist?

Pauline Allen

Introduction: Chalcedon and Its Aftermath

John Chrysostom appears manifold times in the florilegia after Chalcedon, both in those pro- and anti-Chalcedonian. Perhaps because he was not properly speaking a systematic theologian as we understand this term today and preached well before the Council of 451, he seemed to be acceptable to both sides. However, the picture is more complicated than that because we see him cited extensively by the anti-Chalcedonian patriarch of Antioch, Severus (512–18), in his homilies and letters, as well as in the works of post-Chalcedonian Nestorians. Emperor Justinian I, Anastasius of Sinai, John of Damascus, and others also made use of Chrysostom's work, leaving the impression that the Golden Mouth was a useful ecumenist and a man for all seasons.

In the *acta* of Chalcedon themselves there is scant mention of John Chrysostom. His name does not occur in a list of Patristic *testimonia* in the first session which recapitulates the Council of Ephesus in 431.[1] There is a

[1] ACO 1/1, ed. Eduard Schwartz (Berlin and Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter, 1933) reference

reference to him in *actio* 13,[2] and he is quoted three times in a list of *testimonia* disseminated after the council.[3]

While in the East Cyril of Alexandria became the touchstone of orthodoxy for both proponents and opponents of the Council of Chalcedon after 451, other Fathers were also called upon in the fight for orthodoxy, particularly the Cappadocians, Athanasius, and John Chrysostom himself. Cyril's position was assured because of the sometimes ambiguous character of his arguments over the natures in Christ, depending on whether he was fighting Arians or Nestorians.[4] His stature was reinforced by the movement in the East in the early sixth century known as neo-Chalcedonianism, which was an attempt to make Cyril the intermediary in the debate about Chalcedon, such that the 'one nature' against Nestorius could be combined with the 'two natures' against Eutyches.[5] The *Tome* of Leo remained an offence for those opposed to Chalcedon. This debate, however, became more rather than less virulent and was complicated by the splintering of the anti-Chalcedonians, particularly in Syria, rendering ecclesiastical harmony even more elusive and resulting in the separation of the Syrian church.[6] Successive sixth-century emperors, especially Justinian,[7] tried in vain to reconcile the pro-Chalcedonian and anti-Chalcedonian parties, as we shall see, but the lack of success persisted into the seventh century and beyond.

In view of these obstacles to ecumenism it is understandable that John Chrysostom was enlisted by all sides as a support for their christologies. In

---

only; in *The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon* vol. 1, trans. Richard Price and Michael Gaddis, Translated Texts for Historians 45 (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2007) 301–23.

[2] ACO 2, 3/3, ed. Eduard Schwartz (Berlin and Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter, 1937) 120–21, 122 in *The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon* vol. 3 (Price and Gaddis 28).

[3] ACO 1/1, ed. Schwartz, 23 in *The Acts of the Council of Chalcedon* vol. 3 (Price and Gaddis 117–20).

[4] Alois Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition* (hereafter *CCT*) vol. 2: *From the Council of Chalcedon (451) to Gregory the Great (590–604)*, part two. *The Church of Constantinople in the Sixth Century* (London, Mowbray, and Louisville KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1995) 23 (trans. Pauline Allen and John Cawte of *Jesus der Christus im Glauben der Kirche* 2/2 [Freiburg: Herder, 1995)]).

[5] See Marcel Richard, 'Le néochalcédonisme' *Mélanges de science religieuse* 3 (1946) 156–61 = *Opera Minora* 2, n. 56, whose position, however, is questioned by Grillmeier, *CCT* 2/2, 327–28.

[6] On which see Volker L. Menze, *Justinian and the Making of the Syrian Orthodox Church*, Oxford Early Christian Studies (Oxford University Press, 2008).

[7] On Justinian as theologian see 'Drei dogmatische Schriften Justinians' ed. Eduard Schwartz, *Abhandlungen der bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Phil.-hist. Abt. NF 18 (Munich: Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1939); Karl-Heinz Uthemann, 'Kaiser Justinian als Kirchenpolitiker und Theologe' *Augustinianum* 39 (1999) 5–83; Carlo Dell'Osso, *Cristo e logos. Il calcedonismo del VI secolo in Oriente*, Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum 118 (Rome: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, 2010) esp. 257–90.

what follows I shall attempt to discuss a selection of the parties who used Chrysostom down to 680. I shall also be paying attention to aspects of the 'canon' of Chrysostomic writings after Chalcedon in discussing the ways in which some of his works, authentic or inauthentic, were used and transmitted during this period.

First a word about the vehicles through which Chrysostom's works were used and transmitted after Chalcedon. The florilegia, or collections of texts by various authors on a particular theme or doctrinal stance, played an important part in the transmission of Chrysostom's ideas, but it is necessary to ascertain the authenticity of John's texts which they transmit and to consider the company he keeps in these compilations. The attention which the compilers pay to verifying the texts they transmit is variable. Some seventy years ago Abbé Marcel Richard pointed to the fact that the dogmatic florilegia of the fifth century were a new phenomenon and the compilers took the trouble to consult the works of the Fathers themselves. Most of these florilegia were independent of each other. Another sign of this new genre is the fact that it contains so few apocrypha, excepting the Ps.-Apollinarian material in Cyril of Alexandria. By contrast, the compilations of the sixth century contain a multiplication of pseudepigraphical citations and are interconnected,[8] although I submit that Severus of Antioch, whom we shall consider in more detail in a moment, was forensic in his choice of texts. Although Abbé Richard did not pursue the nature of seventh-century florilegia, we suspect that the same holds true for that period as well. This degradation of sources explains the recurrence of, for example, John Chrysostom's supposed letter *To Caesarius* in what survives to us, a letter which I shall have occasion to mention several times in this chapter: once a text was in the florilegium system, so to speak, there it stayed, whether authentic or not.

While it is sometimes difficult to distinguish between the florilegia and the *testimonia* in which Chrysostom's works were transmitted after Chalcedon, I shall attempt to make a distinction. To my mind the compilation of *testimonia*, such as the ones already mentioned in the *acta* of Chalcedon, are shorter and less systematic than the florilegia. A good example of such a compilation we shall encounter later when we consider the seventh-century *Doctrina Patrum*, a lengthy work arranged according to themes, not authors. As with the florilegia, so too with the *testimonia*: it is necessary to ascertain as far

[8] Marcel Richard, 'Les florilèges diphysites du Ve et du VIe siècle' in Alois Grillmeier and Heinrich Bacht (eds), *Das Konzil von Chalcedon. Geschichte und Gegenwart* 1 (Würzburg: Herder, 1952) 721–48, esp. 728 = idem, *Opera Minora* 1 (Turnhout: Brepols, and Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1976) n. 3.

as possible the authenticity of the citations from Chrysostom's works and the company which they keep in the compilations.

Severus of Antioch

> [A]ll the days of his life [Chrysostom] did not cease richly watering all the suprasensual vineyard of the Lord of Sabaoth, and as with violent rain he destroys and removes all heresies, and with lightning flashes of theology blinds their teachers…[9]

> I look toward the tongue of the great John the high-priest, who rightly defines theology and soars and is lifted up by means of doctrines…[10]

These sentiments could have come from any of the Eastern Fathers writing after Chalcedon, but in fact they come from one of Chrysostom's greatest proponents, Severus, the anti-Chalcedonian patriarch of Antioch from 512–18. Indeed, one of the most significant sources for the documentation of the status of John Chrysostom in the debate after Chalcedon is the extensive corpus of Severus.[11] It has been amply demonstrated by Professor René Roux

---

[9] Hymn 188-I-VI, ed. and trans. Ernest W. Brooks, *James of Edessa. The Hymns of Severus of Antioch and Others (II)*, Patrologia Orientalis 7/35 (Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1911; reprint Turnhout: Brepols, 2003) 650.

[10] Hymn 189-II-IV (Brooks 651).

[11] For a select bibliography on Severus and his background see Joseph Lebon, *Le monophysisme sévérien. Étude historique, littéraire et théologique* (Louvain: J. Van Linthout, 1909; repr. New York: AMS Press, 1978), revised in 'La christologie du monophysisme sévérien' in Alois Grillmeier and Heinrich Bacht (eds), *Das Konzil von Chalkedon. Geschichte und Gegenwart* vol. 1 (Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1951) 425–580; Roberta C. Chesnut, *Three Monophysite Christologies. Severus of Antioch, Philoxenus of Mabbug, and Jacob of Sarug* (Oxford University Press, 1976) 9–56; Robin Darling Young, *The Patriarchate of Severus of Antioch, 512–518*, PhD diss., Chicago, 1982; Pauline Allen and C. T. Robert Hayward, *Severus of Antioch*, The Early Church Fathers (London and New York: Routledge, 2004); Frédéric Alpi, *La route royale. Sévère d'Antioche et les Églises d'Orient (512–518)* 2 vols, Bibliothèque archéologique et historique 188 (Beirut: Presses de l'ifpo, 2009). The main works of Severus referred to in this chapter are: *The Sixth Book of the Select Letters of Severus Patriarch of Antioch in the Syriac Version of Athanasius of Nisibis*, ed. and trans. Ernest W. Brooks, vol. 1 (London: Williams & Norgate, 1902; repr. Farnsborough, Hants.: Gregg International Publishers Limited, 1969) (text); vol. 2 (London: Williams & Norgate, 1903; repr. Farnsborough, Hants.: Gregg International Publishers Limited, 1969) (trans.), hereafter referred to as *SL*; *A Collection of Letters of Severus of Antioch*, ed. and trans. Ernest W. Brooks, Patrologia Orientalis (= PO) 12/2 (Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1915; 2nd edn Turnhout: Brepols, 1973), and 14/1 (Paris: Firmin-Didot 1920; 2nd edn Turnhout: Brepols, 1973), hereafter referred to as *CL*. Severus' 125 cathedral homilies are edited and translated by various scholars in PO in different years (for the details see CPG 7035). The *Lives* of Severus used in this chapter are those of Zachariah Scholasticus, ed. and trans. Marc-Antoine Kugener, PO 2/1 (Paris: Firmin Didot, 1907), English trans. Sebastian Brock and Brian Fitzgerald, *Two Early Lives of Severos,*

that Severus used the exegesis of Chrysostom as his model, even more so than he did that of Cyril of Alexandria.[12] For example, Roux supposes that in his cathedral homily 124 on Matthew 16:13 ("Now when Jesus came into the district of Caesarea Philippi he asked his disciples: Who do they say that the son of man is?") Severus depends directly on John Chrysostom's homily on Matthew 54.1, even if the patriarch of Antioch develops other aspects in his preaching: as usual Severus avails himself liberally of the exegetical tradition.[13] Another example is the explanation by the patriarch in his cathedral homily 79 on Matthew 15:5–6 concerning honouring one's father and mother. Compared with Chrysostom's treatment of the same verses in his commentary on Matthew in homily 51.1, Severus' approach is characterised by a greater interest in the historical exegetical tradition and by a finer attention to human psychology.[14]

Severus' various works against Bishop Julian of Halicarnassus provide another testimony to how the patriarch of Antioch used Chrysostom. Although Severus and Julian had met in Constantinople in about 510 and collaborated in unseating the Chalcedonian patriarch Macedonius from the see of that city, it was not until both the patriarch of Antioch and the bishop of Halicarnassus were together in exile in Egypt that their dispute over the corruptibility of the body of Christ began. While for Julian calling Christ's body 'corruptible' or subject to human suffering was tantamount to saying that Christ's suffering was caused by sin, Severus argued that his opponent's teaching of the incorruptibility of Christ's body was akin to the doctrines of Manes and Eutyches. This dispute was to last through the sixth century in

---

Patriarch of Antioch, Translated Texts for Historians 59 (Liverpool University Press, 2013) 33–100; and an anonymous *Life* attributed to John of Beit Aphtonia, ed. and trans. Marc-Antoine Kugener, PO 2/3 (Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1907); English trans. Brock and Fitzgerald, 101–39. On Severus' exegetical method see René Roux, *L'exégèse biblique dans les* Homélies cathédrales *de Sévère d'Antioche*, Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum 84 (Rome: Institutum patristicum Augustinianum, 2002); Sever J. Voicu, 'Quoting John Chrysostom in the sixth century: Severus of Antioch' *La teologia dal V all'VIII secolo fra sviluppo e crisi. XLI Incontro di studiosi dell'antichità Cristiana, Roma, 9–11 maggio 2013*, Studia ephemeridis Augustinianum 140 (Rome: Institutum patristicum Augustinianum, 2014) 633–43; René Roux, 'Severus of Antioch at the crossroad of the Antiochene and Alexandrian exegetical tradition' in John D'Alton and Youhanna Youssef (eds), *Severus of Antioch: His Life and Times*, Texts and Studies in Eastern Christianity 7 (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2016) 160–82.

[12] Roux, *L'exégèse biblique dans les* Homélies cathédrales *de Sévère d'Antioche*, passim. See also Pauline Allen, 'Severus of Antioch: Heir of Saint John Chrysostom?' in *Severus of Antioch: His Life and Times* 1–13.

[13] Roux, *L'exégèse biblique dans les Homélies cathédrales de Sévère d'Antioche* 131. Text of Severus in PO 29/1, 208–31.

[14] Roux, *L'exégèse biblique dans les Homélies cathédrales de Sévère d'Antioche* 165–66. Text of Severus in PO 20/2, 296–323.

various forms and locations, particularly in Egypt and Armenia.[15] Emperor Justinian was supposed to have lapsed into the heresy shortly before his death.[16] Passages on corruptibility and incorruptibility in Chrysostom's homilies on 1 and 2 Corinthians play a significant role in Severus' rebuttal of Julian's arguments,[17] and, as one would expect, Chrysostom's voluminous homilies on the Gospel of John are also cited many times by the patriarch of Antioch.[18]

While his surviving homilies on saints and martyrs do not transmit a single instance of his preaching on John Chrysostom, Severus' letters exhibit many appeals to John, even though he is not always quoted directly.[19] John is referred to in such terms as "the holy/wise John who was bishop of Constantinople,"[20] "the holy John also the great in spiritual wealth,"[21] and "John, the holy and renowned, who adorned the church of Constantinople."[22] In his letters Severus quotes John's homilies on Matthew and John, on 1 Corinthians, Hebrews, and Titus.[23] In addition, apart from quoting repeatedly from John's commentary on the Psalms, Severus refers to John's homiletical series *Against the Jews*

---

[15] On the debate between Severus and Julian see René Draguet, *Julien d'Halicarnasse et sa controverse avec Sévère d'Antioche sur l'incorruptibilité du corps du Christ. Étude d'histoire littéraire et doctrinale suivie des fragments dogmatique de Julien,* Universitas Catholica Lovaniensis. Dissertationes ad gradum magistri in Facultate Theologica consequendum conscriptas, series 2, tome 12 (Louvain: P. Smeesters, 1924); *CCT* 2, 79–111. See also the valuable work on this topic by Yonatan Moss, *Incorruptible Bodies: Christology, Society, and Authority in Late Antiquity* (Oakland, CA: University of California Press, 2016).

[16] Evagrius, *Church History* 4.39; text in *The Ecclesiastical History of Evagrius with the Scholia*, ed. Joseph Bidez and Leon Parmentier (London: Methuen & Co., 1898; repr. Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1964) 190. See further *CCT* 2/2, 467–72.

[17] See e.g. *Sévère d'Antioche*, *La polémique antijulianiste* IIA, *Le contra additiones Juliani*, ed. and trans. Robert Hespel, CSCO 295 (text) and 296 (trans.) (Louvain: Sécretariat du Corpus SCO, 1968); (text) 10–11 (trans.); 30 (text), 24–25 (trans.); 62 (text), 53 (trans.); 94 (text), 78 (trans.); 98 (text), 82 (trans.); 108 (text), 90 (trans.); 145–46 (text), 122 (trans.); 146–47 (text), 123–24 (trans.).

[18] See e.g. *La polémique antijulianiste* III. *L'apologie du Philalèthe*, ed. and trans. Robert Hespel, CSCO 318 (text) 319 (trans.) (Louvain: Sécretariat du Corpus SCO, 1971); 42–45 (text) 36–40 (trans.)—five long extracts.

[19] In the rest of this paragraph I will recapitulate what appears in Allen, 'Severus of Antioch: Heir of Saint John Chrysostom?' 10.

[20] *SL* 1.53; *SL* 2.3; *SL* 5.1; *SL* 10.7.

[21] *CL* 94 (Brooks 178).

[22] *CL* 84 (Brooks 138–39).

[23] For references to Chrysostom's commentary on Matthew see *CL* 85 (Brooks 142–43); *CL* 87 (Brooks 149). On the commentary on John see e.g. *CL* 81 (Brooks 99–101); *CL* 91 (Brooks 163); *CL* 93 (Brooks 171–72). For John on Hebrews see e.g. *CL* 88 (Brooks 152). For 1 Cor. see *CL* 69 (Brooks 99–101). For John on Titus see e.g. *SL* 2.3.

and the *Praises of St Paul*,[24] and to John's homilies on martyrs.[25] As Dr Sever Voicu from the Vatican library points out, "Severus' choice of sources remains impressive, and shows a deep acquaintance with Chrysostom's oeuvre," noting that Severus usually makes first-hand quotations and deserves to be trusted.[26]

Post-Chalcedonian Nestorians

I come now to a very interesting and significant post-Chalcedonian florilegium in Syriac emanating from the Nestorian church, which unfortunately can only be dated between broad parameters: after 570 and before 823, thus well after the Council of 451.[27] The editors give the make-up of the eighty-nine excerpts in the florilegium as follows:[28]

1–8	John Chrysostom
9–27	Athanasius of Alexandria
28–32	Eustathius of Antioch
33–35	Basil of Caesarea
36	Ephrem the Syrian
37–71	Gregory Nazianzen
72–89	John Chrysostom

The two blocks of citations from Chrysostom thus book-end the florilegium, giving an indication of the esteem in which this son of Antioch was held by the Nestorians after Chalcedon. A further salient point is that other sons of the Antiochene persuasion, like Diodore of Tarsus, Theodore of Mopsuestia, and Theodoret of Cyrrhus, are not included in the florilegium. No doubt the intention of the compiler was to cite only non-contentious Patristic authorities. In any case the compiler made quite free translations of the Chrysostomic excerpts in nrs 72–89 and chose the material selectively so that the distinction of the two natures in Christ was emphasised,[29] something that the Golden Mouth himself would not have consistently brought to the fore. Throughout

[24] See *CL* 84 and *SL* 5.1, respectively.
[25] *SL* 8.5.
[26] 'Quoting John Chrysostom in the sixth century' 636, 637.
[27] Ed. and trans. Luise Abramowski and Albert Van Roey, 'Das Gregor-Florileg mit den Gregor-Scholien aus Vatic. Borg. Syr. 82' *Orientalia Lovaniensia Periodica* 1 (1970) 131–80.
[28] Abramowski and Van Roey, art. cit. 132.
[29] Abramowski and Van Roey, art. cit. 137–38.

the florilegium the citations are changed from the Greek originals, and include abbreviations, enlargements, comments and dogmatic changes. The bulk of the citations from Chrysostom derive from his commentaries on the Gospels of Matthew and John (nrs 5, 72–89); otherwise there are two extracts from John's authentic homily on the ascension (CPG 4352) (nrs 6, 7), which, as we shall see, appears in many post-Chalcedonian works,[30] and two texts which the editors cannot identify (nrs 4, 8). Once again the spurious letter *To Caesarius* (CPG 4530) is quoted, no fewer than three times (nrs 1–3).[31] These appearances of Chrysostom in Syriac dress underline the importance of the transmission of his works in Syriac translations and the fact that he was accepted and sought after as an authority by all denominations in Syrian Christianity.[32]

From the anti-Chalcedonian side we have *Codex Vaticanus gr. 1431*, a compilation from the time of Emperor Zeno (474–91).[33] The compiler's aim is to demonstrate the single nature in Christ, in the course of which testimonies are adduced in both Greek and Latin from Cyril, Athanasius, Gregory Nazianzen, Basil of Caesarea, Ambrose of Milan, Epiphanius, John Chrysostom, Amphilochius of Iconium, Theophilus of Alexandria, and Proclus of Constantinople. Of the four citations from Chrysostom two are of dubious authenticity, namely the two from the homily on the cross (CPG 4525), quoted in Latin, and a second one quoted in Greek.[34] There follow three excerpts in Latin from the authentic homily on the Ascension (CPG 4342), already familiar to us from its inclusion in florilegia and compilations,[35] and one from the homily on the cross and the robber (CPG 4338), also in Latin.[36]

---

[30] See e.g. *Codex Vaticanus Graecus 1431* (below), Justinian, *Against Origen*, Anastasius of Sinai, *Hodegos*. On homilies on the Ascension, including this homily of Chrysostom, see further *Preaching after Easter. Mid-Pentecost, Ascension, and Pentecost in Late Antiquity*, ed. Richard W. Bishop, Johan Leemans, and Hajnalka Tamas, Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae (Leiden: Brill, 2016); especially Nathalie Rambault, 'La fête de l'Ascension à Antioche d'après l'homélie de Jean Chrysostome *In ascensionem Christi*' 141–57.

[31] Abramowski and Van Roey, art. cit. 161 (text) 141 (trans.).

[32] See further Jeffrey W. Childers, 'Chrysostom in Syriac dress' *Studia Patristica* 67 (2013) 323–32 at 326; Wendy Mayer, 'John Chrysostom' in Ken Parry (ed.), *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Patristics* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2013) 141–54 at 146–47.

[33] Ed. Eduard Schwartz, 'Codex Vaticanus gr. 1431, eine anti-chalkedonische Sammlung aus der Zeit Kaisers Zenos' in *Abhandlungen der bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Phil.-hist. Abt. 32, 6 (Munich: Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1927). See further *CCT* 2/1, 64–67.

[34] PG 50, 818 and 819; *Codex Vaticanus Graecus 1431* (Schwartz 36, 58 respectively).

[35] PG 50, 445–48; *Codex Vaticanus Graecus 1431* (Schwartz 78–79).

[36] PG 49, 405; *Codex Vaticanus Graecus 1431* (Schwartz 79).

It goes without saying that many florilegia concerned with the reception of the Council of Chalcedon must be lost to us. Let me give just two known examples. The first is that of the neo-Chalcedonian Nephalius,[37] an opponent of Severus, thanks to whom we know that the compiler quoted Gregory Nazianzen, Proclus of Constantinople, and John Chrysostom on the ascension, in order to support Chalcedon and prove that earlier Fathers had spoken of 'two natures.'[38] My second example is the seventh-century patriarch of Jerusalem, Sophronius, who in 634/5 was possibly responsible for the compilation of a florilegium of 600 anti-monoenergist quotations from the Fathers. Professor Richard Price suggests that "this could only have been a laborious collection of passages,"[39] but in any case it has not survived to us.[40]

We come now to a florilegium in Justinian's work *Against the Monophysites*, a later title because the opponents of Chalcedon were not designated as such until late in the seventh century.[41] As Abbé Richard noted, Emperor Justinian or his compiler was careful in ascertaining the authenticity of the texts cited. The florilegium is designed to deal with christological concepts, with testimonies from Ps.-Athanasius, Chrysostom, Basil, Cyril, and the two Gregories:[42] in other words, testimonies that were acceptable to the anti-Chalcedonians, a ploy that was repeated by his successors.[43] Here we see Chrysostom and others deployed ecumenically in imperial strategies for reconciliation.

Next I wish to consider an important seventh-century compilation known as the *Doctrina Patrum de Incarnatione Verbi*, which encompasses a large number of Patristic texts assembled to refute monoenergist and monothelite arguments, or arguments against the doctrine of one activity (*energeia*)

---

[37] On whom see Charles Moeller, 'Un réprésentant de la christologie néochalcédonienne au début du sixième siècle en Orient: Néphalius d'Alexandrie' *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* 40 (1944/1945) 73–140; *CCT* 2/2, 47–52.

[38] See *CCT* 2/1, 55 and *CCT* 2/2, 48, n. 76. This is reported by Severus, or. 2 to Nephalius, *Severi Antiocheni orationes ad Nephalium, eiusdem ac Sergii Grammaticum epistulae mutuae*, ed. and trans. Joseph Lebon, CSCO 119 (text), and 120 (trans.) (Louvain: Sécretariat du Corpus SCO, 1949) 120, 34–35.

[39] Price, *Acts of the Lateran Synod* 288 n. 10.

[40] See further Pauline Allen, *Sophronius of Jerusalem and Seventh-Century Heresy: The* Synodical Letter *and Other Documents*, Oxford Early Christian Texts (Oxford University Press, 2009) 22 with n. 65 on the sources.

[41] Ed. Schwartz, 'Drei dogmatische Schriften Justinians' 7–43; trans. Kenneth P. Wesche, *On the Person of Christ. The Christology of Emperor Justinian* (Crestwood NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1991) 27–107. On the florilegium see *CCT* 2/1, 62.

[42] See *CCT* 2/1, 399.

[43] For a telling example see the efforts of Justin II (565–78); Pauline Allen, *Evagrius Scholasticus the Church Historian*, Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense (Leuven: Spicilegium Sacrum Lovaniense, 1981) 212–14.

and one will in Christ, which was intended as yet another attempt to break the deadlock between both sides of the Chalcedonian divide.[44] While there has been much scholarly discussion about the authorship of this work, it is generally considered to derive from the circle of Maximus the Confessor and most probably from his disciple, Anastasius Apocrisiarius, thus a staunch supporter of the Council of Chalcedon.[45]

Now let me give an overview of the authentic and inauthentic citations from Chrysostom in the *Doctrina Patrum*.

Firstly we have four excerpts from the inauthentic letter *To Caesarius* (CPG 4530) to support the argument for the duality of natures in Christ. The topic of this section in the compilation is Christ's existence from two natures and in two natures, thus an echo of the neo-Chalcedonian position. In this section Ps.-Chrysostom is accompanied by the Patristic authorities Ambrose of Milan, Cyril of Alexandria, Amphilochius of Iconium, Gregory Thaumaturgus, and Gregory of Nyssa.[46]

Since this pseudepigraphic letter bearing the name of Chrysostom recurs time and again in the debate about Chalcedon by all sides, it will be good to pause here and consider why.[47] The spurious letter, supposedly written

---

[44] For the text see *Doctrina Patrum de Incarnatione Verbi. Ein griechisches Florilegium aus der Wende des 7. und 8. Jahrhunderts*, ed. Franz Diekamp (Münster: Aschendorff, 1907), 2nd edn by Basileios Phanourgakis and Evangelos Chrysos (Münster: Aschendorff, 1981). On the monoenergist/monothelite dispute see Friedhelm Winkelmann, 'Die Quellen zur monotheletischen Streites' *Klio* 69 (1987) 2, 515–59; repr. in idem, *Studien zu Konstantin dem Grossen und zur byzantinichen Kirchengeschichte* (University of Birmingham Centre for Byzantine, Ottoman and Modern Greek Studies, 1993) n. 7; Serhiy Hovorun, *Will, Action and Freedom: Christological Controversies in the Seventh Century*, The Medieval Mediterranean 77 (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2008); Marek Jankowiak, 'Essai d'histoire politique du monothéletisme' PhD thesis, University of Warsaw, 2009; Pauline Allen and Bronwen Neil, *The Oxford Handbook of Maximus the Confessor* (Oxford University Press, 2015) esp. the contributions in 'Part 1. Historical Setting' 3–124.

[45] So J. Stiglmayr, 'Der Verfasser der Doctrina Patrum de Incarnatione' *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 18 (1919) 14–40, followed e.g. by Rudolf Riedinger, 'Griechische Konzilsakten auf dem Wege ins lateinische Mittelalter' *Annuarium Historiae Conciliorum* 9 (1977) 262–82 = idem, *Kleine Schriften zu den Konzilsakten des 7. Jahrhunderts* (Turnhout: Brepols, 1998) n. V. On the *Doctrina Patrum* see further *CCT* 2/1, 75. On Anastasius Apocrisiarius see Pauline Allen and Bronwen Neil (ed. and trans.), *Maximus the Confessor and His Companions: Documents from Exile*, Oxford Early Christian Texts (Oxford University Press 2002) passim.

[46] *Doctrina Patrum*, ed. Diekamp et al. 18–19, n. XXV.

[47] On this letter see the reconstructed texts in PG 52, 755–60 (CPG 4530) and, more importantly, the critical edition of the Greek fragments and a ninth/tenth-century Latin translation in Panagiotos G. Nikolopoulos, Αἱ εἰς τὸν Ἰωάννην τὸν Χρυσόστομον ἐσφαλμένως ἀποδιδόμεναι ἐπιστολαί (Athens: Τυπογραφεῖον Γεωργίου Κ. Τσιβεριώτου, 1973) 512–30. Roland Delmaire, in a magisterial essay, does not include this letter in his inventory of Chrysostom's genuine letters: 'Les "lettres d'exil" de Jean Chrysostome, Études de chronologie et de prosopographie' *Recherches Augustiniennes* 25 (1991) 71–180. It is also included in CPG

by Chrysostom to the monk Caesarius during the patriarch's second exile, is also cited four times by the sixth-century Chalcedonian theologian Leontius of Jerusalem.[48] It is easy to see why this text, especially with its alleged Chrysostomic pedigree, achieved such currency in the debate about Chalcedon. The following extracts demonstrate the appeal of the letter to proponents of the council of 451:

> made known in an unconfused and undivided sense, not in one nature, but in two complete natures. And after a bit: What hell belched forth the idea of saying one nature in Christ? And after a bit: Even if the nature is twofold, the union is nonetheless undivided and inseparable, being confessed in one person of sonship.[49]

> Let us flee those who make up the fairy-tale of one nature after the union. Through the idea of the one nature they hasten to attribute suffering to the impassible God.[50]

In the interest of space I shall summarise the use of other quotations in the *Doctrina Patrum* which are taken from John Chrysostom.

On the topic of the duality of natures in Christ the compilers cite John's homily on the cross and the robber, also appealed to in *Cod. Vatic. gr. 1451.*[51] In the entries on this topic (18–19) Chrysostom is in the company of one or more of the following: Gregory of Nazianzus, Athanasius, Justin Martyr, Basil, Amphilochius, Ambrose, Gregory Thaumaturgus, Gregory of Nyssa, Cyril of Alexandria, and Cyril of Jerusalem.[52] On the topic that some of the Fathers gave the name *krasis* to the union of Christ according to the divine plan, the compilers of the *Doctrina Patrum* cite the inauthentic letter *To Caesarius*, together with Ambrose and Cyril.[53] In a section devoted to the doctrine of two *energeiai* or operations in Christ Chrysostom's homily 5.3 on 2 Colossians appears in the company of Gregory of Nyssa and Ps.-Dionysius,[54] while John's homily *On the widow and the two obols* (CPG 4495.2) is found alongside passages from Ambrose, Gelasius of Caesarea, Cyril of Alexandria,

---

under *dubia et spuria*. Nikolopoulos, 530, suggests that the letter was composed between 433 and 450 by an adherent of Antiochene theology such as Theodoret of Cyrrhus.

[48] See Patrick T. R. Gray (ed. and trans.), *Leontius of Jerusalem. Against the Monophysites*: Testimonies of the Saints *and* Aporiae, Oxford Early Christian Texts (Oxford University Press, 2006) 68, 70, 72, 92.

[49] *Testimonies of the Saints* (Gray 73).

[50] *Testimonies of the Saints* (Gray 93).

[51] Ed. Diekamp et al. 19, n. XXIX.

[52] Ed. Diekamp et al. 18–19.

[53] Ed. Diekamp et al. 66, n. III.

[54] Ed. Diekamp et al. 90, n. XI.

Justin Martyr, Leo of Rome, Eustathius of Beirut, Gregory of Nyssa, Ps.-Dionysius, Athanasius, and Cyril of Jerusalem.[55] This testimony is followed by two citations from the pseudo-Chrysostomic homily *On Thomas the apostle*, which here and sometimes elsewhere has the subtitle 'against the Arians.'[56] When the compilers' attention turns to the topic of the two wills in Christ, they cite *On the consubstantiality against the Anomoeans* 7.5 (CPG 4320),[57] and the homily *Father, if it is possible* (CPG 4369).[58] On the subject of the divine and human wills in Christ the same passages from *On the consubstantiality against the Anomoeans* and the homily *Father, if it is possible*, are cited, as well as John's homily 67.2 *On John*.[59] The other testimonies to the two wills derive from Cyril of Alexandria, Severian of Gabala, Theophilus of Alexandria, and Gregory of Nyssa.

In the *Doctrina Patrum* there is also a section devoted to the refutation of Origen on the basis of Patristic evidence, and no fewer than fourteen passages from Chrysostom are used for this purpose. Maximus' knowledge of Origen and his use and opposition to some of his views are well known, so this is no surprise.[60] These fourteen citations from Chrysostom are accompanied by supporting statements from Methodius, Theophilus, Amphilochius, Cyril of Alexandria, and Basil.[61] The final citation in the *Doctrina Patrum* from Chrysostom derives from *On the obscurity of the prophets* hom. 2.5 (CPG 4420), in order to illustrate the term *physis anhypostatos*.[62]

Let us move to Anastasius of Sinai, a pro-Chalcedonian monk, theologian, and spiritual writer of the seventh century, who has a few citations from John Chrysostom in his extensive work, the *Hodegos* or *Guide*, which was intended to guide people to the correct christological beliefs (CPG 7745).[63] Here we

---

[55] Ed. Diekamp et al. 91–92, n. I.

[56] Ed. Diekamp et al. 91–92, n. I; 101, n. XXXIII. On the longevity of this spurious work see further below in the treatment of the Lateran *acta*.

[57] Ed. Diekamp et al. 119, n. VII.

[58] Ed. Diekamp et al. 120, n. IX.

[59] Ed. Diekamp et al. 120, n. X.

[60] On Maximus' knowledge of Origen and the distance he took from him see Pascal Mueller-Jourdan, 'The foundations of Origenist metaphysics' in *The Oxford Handbook of Maximus the Confessor* 149–63; more extensively in idem, *Typologies spatio-temporelle de l'ecclesia Byzantine: La Mystagogie de Maxime le Confesseur dans la culture philosophique de l'antiquité tardive*, Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae 74 (Leiden: Brill 2005).

[61] *Doctrina Patrum*, ed. Diekamp et al. 183–85.

[62] *Doctrina Patrum*, ed. Diekamp et al. 196, n. III.

[63] Anastasius of Sinai, *Hodegos* (*Viae dux*), ed. Karl-Heinz Uthemann, Corpus Christianorum Series Graeca 8 (Turnhout and Leuven: Brepols 1981). On this author see John Haldon, 'The works of Anastasios of Sinai: a key source for the history of East Mediterranean society and belief' in Averil Cameron and Laurence Conrad (eds), *The Early Medieval East: Problems in the*

encounter familiar quotations from the Golden Mouth: from the much-cited homily *On the consubstantiality against the Anomoeans*, where Cyril, Athanasius, Proclus, and Ambrose are also quoted;[64] from the homily *On the Ascension*, already familiar to us because of its frequent use in florilegia after Chalcedon, quoted three times, in the company of Ps.-Dionysius, Irenaeus, Ambrose, Gregory of Nyssa, Athanasius, and Basil;[65] a passage from the much-used homily 67.2 on John, and citations from the commentary on Matthew's Gospel.

In the *Statement of Faith* of John of Damascus[66] there is one citation from Chrysostom's homilies on Acts, recycled from the *Doctrina Patrum*.[67] Among the other sources appealed to are Gregory Nazianzen, Athanasius, Cyril, Maximus, perhaps surprisingly the fourth-century writer Nemesius of Emesa, who is cited seventy times on the subjects of psychology and anthropology, Gregory of Nyssa, and Ps.-Dionysius the Areopagite.

The large commentary attributed to John Damascene on the Pauline letters, including excerpts from Chrysostom's works on Romans, 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Hebrews, 2 Timothy, Titus, and Philemon, cannot be considered authentic,[68] but it is still a testimony to the regard in which the Golden Mouth was held long after Chalcedon.

Let me state the obvious at this point: during the debate after Chalcedon the canon of John Chrysostom's work was not fixed. For example, the editors of the Nestorian florilegium were unable to identify some quotations from John. Admirable work across a lifetime has been conducted by our colleague and friend, Dr Sever Voicu, whom I have already mentioned, mostly on Ps.-Chrysostomic homilies.[69]

Literary Source Materials, Studies in Late Antiquity and Early Islam 1 (Princeton University Press 1992) 107–47.

[64] *Hodegos* 6.1 (Uthemann 96).

[65] *Hodegos* 10. 2.5 (Uthemann 171–72).

[66] Text of Boniface Kotter, originally published as *Die Schriften des Johannes von Damaskos herausgegeben vom Byzantinisher Institut der Abtei Scheyern*, Patristische Texte und Studien 12 (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter 1973); repr. in Sources Chrétiennes 535 and 540 as *Jean Damascène. La foi orthodoxe*, with introduction, translation, and notes by P. Ledrux et al. 2 vols (Paris: Cerf 2010) 2011. See further *CCT* 2/1, 76.

[67] Ed. Diekamp et al. 86, n. XVI.

[68] See CPG 8079: PG 95, 441–1033.

[69] For a selection of his articles see Sever J. Voicu, 'La littérature pseudo-chrysostomienne: inventaire et itinéraires de la recherche' *Annuaire EPHE, Section sciences religieuses* 104 (1995–1996) 351–53; 'Pseudo-Giovanni Cristostomo: i confini del corpus' *Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum* 39 (1996) 105–15; 'Johannes Chrysostomus II (Pseudo-Chrysostomica)' *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* 18 (1997) 503–15; 'Quoting John Chrysostom in the sixth century.'

In the fifth session of the acts of the Lateran synod of 649, where the topic was Christ's natural wills and operations, there are extensive florilegia recycled from Maximus the Confessor in which, apart from John Chrysostom, we find such authorities as Justin Martyr, the three Cappadocians, Amphilochius of Iconium, Cyril, Ambrose, Augustine, Athanasius, Leo, Hippolytus, Theophilus, Severian of Gabala, and Ps.-Dionysius.[70] The three citations from Chrysostom are already familiar enough to us: *On the consubstantiality* (CPG 4320), *On the widow and the two obols* (CPG 4495.2), which survives to us in fragmentary form, and homily 67.2 from the commentary on John (CPG 4425). However, the synod also cited the pseudo-Chrysostomic homily, *On Saint Thomas* (CPG 4574), also found in *Doctrina Patrum*[71] and in Maximus the Confessor, which was subsequently adduced at the third Council of Constantinople in 681.[72] The extract from the supposed words of Thomas reads:

> Hearing this, I cleansed my soul from disbelief, shed a doubtful mind and recovered conviction. I touched the body, rejoicing and trembling, I opened with my fingers also the eye of the soul, and was then aware of two operations.

Professor Richard Price points out astutely that this citation does not refer to the two operations or activities (*energeiae*) in Christ, but to the two operations of the body and soul as experienced by Thomas.[73] However, this Ps.-Chrysostomic passage was pressed into service by the opponents of the monothelite doctrine in the seventh century, an example of how cautious we must be in dealing with the compilers of florilegia, their sources, and their ulterior motives.

The irony of this is that a passage from this pseudepigraphic homily *On Saint Thomas*, together with citations from Basil of Caesarea's *On the Holy Spirit*, Gregory of Nazianzen's *Oration* 3.12, and the *Tome* of Leo, was inscribed in the interior of the church of Santa Maria Antiqua in Rome in celebration of the Lateran synod,[74] a symbol of the authority which John Chrysostom, even pseudepigraphically, was accorded by the members of the synod.

---

[70] ACO ser. sec. 2/1, ed. Rudolf Riedinger (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1984) 270–314; trans. in *The Acts of the Lateran Synod of 649*, trans. with notes by Richard Price, with contributions by Phil Booth and Catherine Cubitt, Translated Texts for Historians 61 (Liverpool University Press, 2014) 306–44. There is a complete list of the Patristic authorities in Price, *Acts of the Lateran Council* 288–89.

[71] Ed. Diekamp et al. 101, n. XXXIII.

[72] ACO ser. sec. 2/1 (Riedinger 340, 11–16); trans. Price, *Acts of the Lateran Synod* 288.

[73] See Price, *Acts of the Lateran Synod* 342 n. 316.

[74] See Price, *Acts of the Lateran Synod* 342 n. 315.

Concluding Observations

I have attempted in this chapter to show that John Chrysostom was used by proponents and opponents of the Council of Chalcedon, as well as by the Nestorian church. One of the reasons for this may be that since, like Cyril of Alexandria, he was not involved in the council (being dead), he was considered an impartial witness on the topics of two natures, two activities, and two wills in Christ.

Obviously Chrysostom's post-Chalcedonian influence extends well after the chronological parameters I have had to set in this chapter. I have tried to give an overview of John's authentic and inauthentic works as cited in the transmission process in the two centuries after Chalcedon. The stand-out examples of the inauthentic works of his which found their way into florilegia are the letter *To Caesarius* and the homily *On Thomas*, both of which took on a life of their own. My learned colleague Professor Wendy Mayer has demonstrated this with regard to Ps.-Chrysostomica.[75] The authentic works of John that were much used in the debate after Chalcedon, as we have seen repeatedly, are his homilies on the Ascension and on the cross, on the widow and the two obols, homily 67.2 from the commentary on John's Gospel, and the work *On the consubstiantiality against the Anomoeans*.

Let us not be too smug about our superior heuristic skills in the twenty-first century, when we have at our disposal such tools as the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*, the *Clavis Patrum Graecorum* and *Latinorum*, and many internet sites to help us in our researches. The Fathers of the church did an extraordinary job in transmitting what was available to them, and let us remember that travel and communication at the time were difficult, not to say dangerous—a subject that has received much attention in recent years,[76] and many of them were writing during protracted periods in exile, notably Chrysostom himself but also Athanasius and Severus of Antioch, all without decent access to resources or scribes. Severus and Justinian, as already mentioned in this paper, were outstanding examples of those who

[75] 'John Chrysostom' 143–44; 'A life of their own: preaching, radicalisation, and the early Ps.-Chrysostomica in Greek and Latin' forthcoming in Francesca P. Barone, Caroline Macé and Pablo Ubierna (eds), *Pseudepigrapha Graeca, Latina et Orientalia. Mélanges en l'honneur de Sever J. Voicu*, Instrumenta Patristica et Mediaevalia (Turnhout: Brepols).

[76] As examples of recent works on this topic see Anne Kolb, *Transport und Nachrichtentransfer im Römischen Reich* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag 2000); Jean Andreau and Catherine Virlouvet, *L'information et la mer dans le monde antique*, Collection de l'École française de Rome 297 (Rome: École française de Rome 2002); Linda Ellis and Frank L. Kidner (eds), *Travel, Communication and Geography in Late Antiquity. Sacred and Profane* (Aldershot and Burlington, VT: Ashgate 2004).

did careful research into their sources, but, as I have suggested, once texts, whether those of John Chrysostom or others, were in the florilegium system they remained there, whether authentic or not.

Finally, let us return to the question of whether John Chrysostom was a useful ecumenist in the debate after Chalcedon. The answer is obviously in the affirmative for the period we have been studying, namely the fifth, sixth, and seventh centuries, where his works were used by both pro- and anti-Chalcedonians, as well as by Nestorians. However, we should not lose sight of the fact that well after this period, notably in the Reformation and Counter-Reformation, Chrysostom figured large in religious debates, and indeed down to our own day he has been appropriated by both East and West,[77] making him a man for all seasons.

Select Bibliography

Allen, Pauline. 'Severus of Antioch: Heir of Saint John Chrysostom?' In *Severus of Antioch: His Life and Times*. Edited by John D'Alton and Youhanna Youssef, Texts and Studies in Eastern Christianity 7. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2016: 1–13.

Allen, Pauline and C. T. Robert Hayward. *Severus of Antioch*, The Early Church Fathers. London and New York: Routledge, 2004.

Alpi, Frédéric. *La route royale. Sévère d'Antioche et les Églises d'Orient (512–518)*, 2 vols, Bibliothèque archéologique et historique 188. Beirut: Presses de l'ifpo, 2009.

Chesnut, Roberta C. *Three Monophysite Christologies. Severus of Antioch, Philoxenus of Mabbug, and Jacob of Sarug*. Oxford University Press, 1976.

Childers, Jeffrey W. 'Chrysostom in Syriac dress.' *Studia Patristica* 67 (2013) 323–32.

Grillmeier, Alois. *Christ in Christian Tradition* vol. 2: *From the Council of Chalcedon (451) to Gregory the Great (590–604)*, part two: *The Church of Constantinople in the Sixth Century*. Trans. Pauline Allen and John Cawte. London, Mowbray, and Louisville KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1995.

Grillmeier, Alois and Heinrich Bacht, eds. *Das Konzil von Chalkedon. Geschichte und Gegenwart*, Vol. 1. Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1951.

Lebon, Joseph. *Le monophysisme sévérien. Étude historique, littéraire et théologique*. Louvain: J. Van Linthout, 1909; repr. New York: AMS Press, 1978.

Mayer, Wendy. 'John Chrysostom.' In *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Patristics*. Ed. Ken Parry. Oxford: Blackwell, 2013: 141–54.

Moss, Yonatan. *Incorruptible Bodies: Christology, Society, and Authority in Late Antiquity*. Oakland, CA: University of California Press, 2016.

Roux, René. *L'exégèse biblique dans les* Homélies cathédrales *de Sévère d'Antioche*, Studia Ephemeridis Augustinianum 84. Rome: Institutum patristicum Augustinianum, 2002.

[77] See further Mayer, 'John Chrysostom' 141, 149–51.

—. 'Severus of Antioch at the crossroad of the Antiochene and Alexandrian exegetical tradition.' In *Severus of Antioch: His Life and Times*. Edited by John D'Alton and Youhanna Youssef, Texts and Studies in Eastern Christianity 7. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2016.

Voicu, Sever J. 'Quoting John Chrysostom in the sixth century: Severus of Antioch.' *La teologia dal V all'VIII secolo fra sviluppo e crisi. XLI Incontro di studiosi dell'antichità Cristiana, Roma, 9–11 maggio 2013*, Studia ephemeridis Augustinianum 140. Rome: Institutum patristicum Augustinianum, 2014.

Menze, Volker L. *Justinian and the Making of the Syrian Orthodox Church*, Oxford Early Christian Studies. Oxford University Press, 2008.

Young, Robin Darling. *The Patriarchate of Severus of Antioch, 512–518*, PhD diss., Chicago, 1982.

Chapter Three

The Reception of John Chrysostom in Early Medieval England

Daniel Anlezark

The knowledge of the works of Saint John Chrysostom in the early medieval west was not extensive, and often where his works were thought to be known, attributions to him are often dubious. When early medieval authors thought that they knew his works, often they were wrong because of false attribution, but the problem also occurs that at times they did indeed know one of John Chrysostom's works, but without the correct attribution to him. My focus in this chapter is on the early English Church in the centuries between the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons to Christianity which began from the end of the sixth century, up until the eleventh century. The confusion of attributions means that the John Chrysostom known to the early English Church was a construct different from the more historically accurate patristic author known today. This is not, of course, a phenomenon unique to early medieval England: Chrysostom's prolific output meant that both dubious attribution and the appropriation of parts of his works by others became a widespread practice soon after his death. Part of what I would like to explore is what the construct of John Chrysostom looked like in various places at various times in this one Church of the early medieval west.

The Anglo-Saxons were part of the great migration of Germanic peoples in northern and western Europe that troubled the Western Roman Empire

up until the collapse of its administration in the second half of the fifth century, though unlike some other Germanic peoples, such as the Goths, the Anglo-Saxons would be converted to Orthodox Catholic Christianity rather than Arianism. The pagan Anglo-Saxons, whom we also know as the English, began their invasion of sub-Roman Britain in the middle of the fifth century, and their migration was complete by the end of the sixth. These settlers completely dominated those parts of the island of Britain which today roughly correspond with England. The Celtic lands of Wales and Cornwall remained mostly Christian, but made no effort to convert the English. This conversion was accomplished by a dual effort from Rome and Iona.[1] From Rome Pope Gregory the Great (*Dialogos*) sent a missionary group of monks who arrived at Canterbury in 597. At around the same time, Irish monks from Saint Columba's community in Iona began a mission in the North of Britain. In both cases the missionaries represented the social elite of their respective societies—the leader of the Roman missionaries, Augustine, had been prior of Pope Gregory's personal monastery on the Caelian Hill, converted from Gregory's ancestral home, and dedicated to Saint Andrew.[2]

By the middle of the seventh century the national and notional English conversion was complete, though tensions had emerged between the Irish and Roman zones of influence over various aspects of church life. The most contentious of these was the dating of Easter, but others stemmed from the more rigid asceticism of Irish monastics beside other canonical and customary differences. In the year 664 these differences were settled at the Synod of Whitby in favour of Roman practice, which reflected that of the Eastern Churches.[3] This firm reorientation towards Rome and the East would soon have a profound impact on the learning of the English Church. In 667 the priest Wighard travelled to Rome to be ordained bishop by Pope Vitalian, but died on the journey.[4] Vitalian took the executive decision of sending as his replacement a Greek monk resident in Rome, Theodore of Tarsus. I will discuss this important theologian in more detail later, but will note for now that when he arrived in England the following year, he was already sixty-six years old, and ruled as Archbishop of Canterbury for another twenty-two years, dying in 690. With the stimulus of Theodore and others, the late seventh and early eighth centuries were a high time for English scholarship and

[1] Henry Mayr-Harting, *The Coming of Christianity to Anglo-Saxon England* (London: Batsford, 1972) 13–113.

[2] *Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People*, ed. B. Colgrave and R. A. B. Mynors (Oxford: Clarendon, 1969) I.23, 68–71.

[3] *Ecclesiastical History* III.25, 298–309.

[4] *Ecclesiastical History* IIII.1–2, 328–37.

theology.[5] Theodore founded a school in Canterbury in the south of England, in the kingdom of Kent. At the same time and into the early eighth century learning also flourished in Northumbria in the North, producing one of the great scholars of the early medieval west, the Venerable Bede (died 735), who was a mathematician, historian, and above all biblical commentator. Later in the same century the school at York, a major Northumbrian centre, produced Alcuin, who was recruited by the emperor Charlemagne in the 780s and 790s to reform and renew education in the reconstituted Western Empire.

The following century, the ninth, was one of decline for the English church, which struggled in the face of the invasions of the Vikings, and an accompanying, but not entirely related, erosion of ecclesiastical discipline. With the reforms of King Alfred the Great in the 890s, things began to turn around. Scholars and books were imported, and by the middle of the tenth century a monastic renewal dominated the life of the early English Church.[6] This also saw a renewal of learning, but with little to compare to the glory days of earlier centuries. This renewed discipline in church life waned across the eleventh century, and when Duke William of Normandy invaded England in October 1066, he did this with papal approval, and the mandate to reform the English Church.[7] The post-Conquest church in England rapidly lost similarities in various ways to the pre-Conquest church. This was partly because of reform and change on the continent at the same time, but the importation of books in particular means that manuscripts of Chrysostom's works found in English collections even a few years after the Conquest do not necessarily provide an indication of knowledge of his works in the Anglo-Saxon Church before the Conquest.

Archbishop Theodore

The story of our knowledge of John Chrysostom and his reputation in the early English Church begins with Archbishop Theodore. Theodore was born in Tarsus in Asia Minor in 602, and was probably still there when the Persian invasions of 613–14 took place. He was later educated in Antioch, where he

[5] See the collection of essays in Michael Lapidge, ed., *Archbishop Theodore*: *Commemorative Studies on his Life and Influence*, Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 11 (Cambridge University Press, 1995).

[6] See H. Gneuss, 'King Alfred and the History of Anglo-Saxon Libraries' in *Modes of Interpretation in Old English Literature: Essays in Honour of Stanley B. Greenfield*, ed. Phyllis Rugg Brown, Georgia Ronan Crampton, and Fred C. Robinson (University of Toronto Press, 1986) 22–49.

[7] See Frank Barlow, *The English Church 1066–1154* (London: Longman, 1979) 279.

probably also became a monk. His later career, by the late 630s, places him in Constantinople, where his studies were expanded. How he came to be there, we do not know with certainty, but the Arab invasions of the Eastern Empire in the 630s produced many refugees, and he was perhaps one of them. We know that he was in Rome by the 660s, and Michael Lapidge has argued persuasively that he was already there for the Lateran Council of 649, living in the Greek monastery of Saint Athanasius.[8] He was also probably an associate of Maximus the Confessor at least by this time, and perhaps was earlier in Constantinople. It is not clear why Pope Vitalian would choose this elderly and erudite Greek monk, as fluent in his mother tongue as he was in Latin and Syriac, to become Archbishop of Canterbury, at the far end of the world. But it may well have been because of his association with Maximus and his opposition to the Monothelete heresy, and the awkwardness posed by the presence of such a man for Rome while Constans II still ruled, and was based in Italy. After the emperor's assassination, and in preparation for the Third Council of Constantinople, which would confirm the orthodoxy of the Dyothelete position in 680–81, attempts were made to have Theodore attend.[9] At the age of nearly eighty, the journey must have looked impossible. By then Theodore's place of safety or banishment had become home.

The geographic trajectory of Archbishop Theodore's early career bears curious similarities to John Chrysostom's. Most important, of course, is Theodore's education in Antioch. As we shall see, there is evidence in Theodore's learning not only of an emphasis on the Antiochene school of exegesis championed by Chrysostom's teacher Diodore (who, like Theodore, was from Tarsus), but also Theodore's wide and easily familiar knowledge of Chrysostom's works. When he arrived at Canterbury, Theodore quickly established a school there with the collaboration of Hadrian, a Neapolitan abbot who had accompanied him from Italy. The Canterbury libraries that they found on arrival were probably well stocked with the kinds of books a missionary and monastic church would need—biblical texts, books of canons, liturgical books, and no doubt the works of Pope Gregory the Great, whom the English regarded as their apostle.[10] Some of these would have been books to serve the needs of the monastic community and its *lectio divina*—homilies, saints' lives, and ascetical treatises. Canterbury probably would not have had an advanced theological library, and we know from various

[8] See Michael Lapidge, 'The Career of Archbishop Theodore' in *Archbishop Theodore*: *Commemorative Studies* 1–29.

[9] Lapidge, 'The Career of Archbishop Theodore' 21–24.

[10] Michael Lapidge, *The Anglo-Saxon Library* (Oxford University Press, 2006) 31–33.

sources that Englishmen in search of a more sophisticated education would normally seek it in Ireland at this time, others would travel as far as Rome. Theodore's school changed this. We have no way of knowing which books or how many he and Hadrian brought with them. But we do have some surviving commentaries on biblical texts that derive from their Canterbury school, in the form of written-up lecture notes.[11]

In these Canterbury school commentaries, John Chrysostom is mentioned by name seven times, more than any other cited authority.[12] Unfortunately, most of these references have not been traced to any work, either by Chrysostom or even to currently known works dubiously or spuriously attributed to him. Unless Theodore himself was to blame for deliberate or accidental misattribution, these ascriptions provide evidence that in the two centuries or so that passed between Chrysostom's death and Theodore's education in both Antioch and Constantinople—places where Chrysostom's works were produced and published—the industry of false attribution had seriously obscured his authentic corpus. These attributions are found in three different commentary texts, on the Pentateuch, on the gospels, and another on various scriptural books:

> PentI 28 *Ad imaginem* [Gen I.26] .i. esse regem super terrena, ut est ipse super omnia. Et nos similiter, .i. similes ei erimus post resurrectionem incorrupti, ut Iohannes dicit.
>
> To our image: that is, that man should be king of terrestrial beings, as is God of all beings. And likewise for us: that is, we shall be incorrupt like Him after the resurrection, as John says.[13]
>
> PentI 44 *Ad auram post meridiem* [Gen III.8] .i. incipiente septima hora, quia Iohannes Crisostomus dicit Adam factum terita hore et sexta peccasse et quasi ad horam nonam eiectum de paradiso. Et hoc dicit per conuenientiam futuram de passiona Christi destinatam. Alii autem eum septem annos peregisse in paradiso praeter .xl. dies, ut in Leptigeneseos dicit.
>
> At the afternoon air: that is, at the beginning of the seventh hour, since John Chrysostom says that Adam was created at the third hour, sinned at the sixth hour and was cast out of paradise at the ninth hour. And he says this à propos the future occurrences at the crucifixion of Christ. Other commenta-

[11] Bernhard Bischoff and Michael Lapidge, *Biblical Commentaries from the Canterbury School of Theodore and Hadrian*, Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 10 (Cambridge University Press, 1994).

[12] Bischoff and Lapidge, *Biblical Commentaries* 214–15.

[13] Bischoff and Lapidge, *Biblical Commentaries* 306–7.

tors say that he spent seven years less forty days in Paradise, as it says in the *Little Genesis*.[14]

Gen-Ex-EvIa 22 [On the Gospels] Iohannes Crisostomus ait omnes homines resurrecturos quasi .xxx. annos habentes, in illa figura qua Christum discipuli uiderunt in monte Thabor transfiguratum.

John Chrysostom says that all men are to be resurrected having the age of thirty as it were, in that likeness in which the disciples saw Christ transfigured on Mount Tabor.[15]

EvII 3 *Ecce magi* [Matt II.1] Magi duobus annis in uia fuerunt, quia duos annos ante natiuitatem Christi apparuit eis stella, ut Iohannes Constantinopolitanus dixit Crisostomus, quem Graeci Crisostomum .i. os auri clamant.

Behold, there came wise men: The wise men were on the road for two years, since the star appeared to them two years before Christ's birth, as John Chrysostom of Constantinople said. The Greeks call him 'Chrysostomos," that is, 'mouth of gold.'[16]

EvII 41 *Apparuit illis Moyses et Helias* [XVII.3]. Quaestio nodosa de hac re oritur. Quomodo Moyses apparuit qui sub potestate aduersariorum fuit, cum Christus adhuc per crucem de diabolo non triumphauit? Iohannes Crisostomus sic dicit: quia si in uiuis per miracula Christus glorificatus est, caecos inluminando, leprosos mundando et caetera, ita et in mortuis, ut Moyses et Lazarus et Caeteros quos suscitauit. Sunt qui dicunt in hoc esse impletum quod ab angelo ad diabolum dicitur cum altercaretur de corpore Moysi, 'Imperet tibi Deus, diabole.'

There appeared to them Moses and Elias. A knotty question arises from this statement. How did Moses appear, who was at that time in the power of adversaries, since Christ had not yet triumphed over the devil through the Cross? John Chrysostom says as follows: since if Christ was glorified through miracles among the living, by restoring sight to the blind, purifying lepers, and so on, so too among the dead, such as Moses and Lazarus, and others whom he resuscitated. There are those who say that in this event was fulfilled that which was said by the angel to the devil when he was contending about the body of Moses: 'the Lord command thee, o devil.'[17]

EvII 87 Iohannes Crisostomus .vii. Marias dixit esse [Mark XV.40].

[14] Bischoff and Lapidge, *Biblical Commentaries* 310–11.
[15] Bischoff and Lapidge, *Biblical Commentaries* 392–93.
[16] Bischoff and Lapidge, *Biblical Commentaries* 396–97.
[17] Bischoff and Lapidge, *Biblical Commentaries* 404–5.

John Chrysostom said that there were seven Marys.[18]

EvII 97 Iohannes Crisostomus ait de hac piscatione in qua rumpebantur retia, ut non solum recte caperentur sed etiam sponte misissent se in nauem [Luke 5:6]

John Chrysostom said of this fishing-catch in which the nets were broken, that not only were the fish duly caught in the net but even willingly threw themselves into the ship.[19]

What emerges from these commentary notes is not so much a reliable portrait of the knowledge of John Chrysostom's works in early Anglo-Saxon England, but an interesting glimpse of how his authority was used in the classroom. Despite the dubious character of most of these attributions (that is, to date), it is noteworthy that all the readings represent attempts to understanding the letter of the scriptural text, and do not indulge in Alexandrine *allegoresis*. In other words, even if Theodore is misattributing, perhaps understandable in an eighty-year-old school teacher working from memory and with few books, he still knows what kind of reading is attributable to a product of the Antiochene school. A second insight we gain is of how a Greek monk-scholar educated in two of the great centres of learning of the Eastern Church teaches in practice. These classroom notes offer us an echo of the methods and format of the Antiochene schoolroom of the first decades of the seventh century, in the tradition in which John Chrysostom himself was trained. And in that scholastic tradition, corrupted as it may have become, the authority of the 'golden mouth' looms large, even when transplanted to the far end of the world. Especially noteworthy is Theodore's reverential explanation of John's Greek appellation to his English students: *id est os auri clamant*.

The Venerable Bede

Writing in the early 730s, the Venerable Bede tells us that men who had studied at Canterbury were still alive at the time.[20] Knowledge that Bede uses in his *Questiones octo* was derived from Theodore's school through some of these men, but it came by word of mouth.[21] This short work of Bede belongs

[18] Bischoff and Lapidge, *Biblical Commentaries* 412–13.
[19] Bischoff and Lapidge, *Biblical Commentaries* 414–15.
[20] *Ecclesiastical History* IIII.2, 334–35: Indicio est quod usque hodie supersunt de eorum discipulis, qui Latinam Graecamque linguam aeque ut propriam in qua nati sunt norunt.
[21] See Charles D. Wright, 'The Fate of Lot's Wife: A Canterbury School Gloss in *Genesis A*' in *Old English Philology: Studies in Honour of R. D. Fulk*, ed. Leonard Neidorf (Cambridge: D. S.

to a small group among his commentaries that focus on the literal meaning of the scriptural text, in contrast to most of his long commentaries, which often develop elaborate mystical readings. Bede, born in about 670, spent his whole life in the far north of England, and never studied under Theodore. The *Questiones octo* concern both the Old and the New Testaments, and in one of them Bede tells the reader that he has heard "from certain people" concerning Archbishop Theodore's explanation of the Apostle Paul's reference to the depth of the sea in 2 Cor 11:25. This discussion is otherwise unsourced, but there is no reason here to suspect any use of John Chrysostom based on our current knowledge of his works.

However, Bede's secondhand contact with Theodore's exegesis takes on an interesting aspect in the light of a comment in his commentary *Thirty Questions on the Books of Kings*. Bede develops a discussion of 4 Kings 23:11, which tells of "horses which the kings of Judah had given to the sun," and also the "chariots of the sun" that are burnt with fire. Bede associates these with 4 Kings 2:11, a passage which describes Elias' ascension to heaven. This ascension, Bede says, was accomplished with a fiery chariot:[22]

> quia curru igneo et equis igneis est raptus ad caelum Iohannes Constantinopolitanus episcopus aestimat. Quia enim Graece helios dicitur sol.
>
> because Bishop John of Constantinople reckons he was whisked to heaven in a fiery chariot and by fiery horses, for *helios* in Greek means 'sun.'

André Wilmart first observed in 1918 that this appears to be an allusion to a Pseudo-Chrysostomian homily, which Wolfgang Wenk in his 1988 edition cautiously argues was originally composed around the end of the fourth or beginning of the fifth century, but certainly before 415.[23] The sermon circulated as part of a collection of thirty-eight homilies in Latin, and had already been assembled by the 420s, when three of them were cited by Augustine of Hippo. Wenk argues persuasively that the collection was made in North Africa. It includes fourteen authentic homilies by Chrysostom, four spuriously and four dubiously attributed homilies, nine original Latin compositions; four additional Chrysostom works in Latin translation are often appended to the collection.

Brewer, 2016) 298–310, at 303; Michael Gorman, 'Bede's VIII *Quaestiones* and Carolingian Biblical Scholarship' *Revue bénédictine* 109 (1999) 32–74.

[22] Bede, *In Regum librum XXX Quaestiones*, ed. D. Hurst, Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 119 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1962) *Quaest*. xxviii, 319.

[23] André Wilmart, 'La collection des 38 homélies latines de saint Jean Chrysostome' *Journal of Theological Studies* 19 (1918) 305–27.

The homily Bede appears to be citing is Wilmart no. 6, *De ascensione Heliae*, which discusses at length Elias's ascension:[24] igneo curru atque equis flammantibus (in a fiery chariot and with flaming horses). The homily also provides an etymological interpretation tying the meaning of Elias's name to the Greek word for the sun:

> Sol enim Graeco sermone Helios appellatur. unde Helias quasi Helios vere curru atque equis igne fulgentibus ... ascendit.
>
> For in the Greek language the sun is called 'helios,' so that Elias really did ascend as if he were the sun, in a chariot and with horses radiant with fire.

Wilmart argued that Bede's use of the homily made him one of the earliest witnesses to the collection of thirty-eight Latin Chrysostom sermons. This would seem to be confirmed by close textual parallels also noted by Wilmart to another Pseudo-Chrysostom sermon in the Latin collection, Wilmart no. 33 with the incipit *Omnium quidem de scripturis*, in Bede's *Commentary on Luke*.[25] The two passages borrowed by Bede concern Luke 15:22, on the significance of the ring and the shoes in the Parable of the Prodigal Son, and the smoke rising from the sacrificed calf, described in the following verse. There is no attribution to Chrysostom here, which is curious given Bede's normal habit of acknowledging his sources. It could be that Bede suspected these allegorical interpretations had dubiously been attributed to John, if we assume that Bede was generally familiar with the normal interests of Chrysostom's exegesis. Later in the Middle Ages this same sermon circulated under the name of Jerome.[26]

It is possible that Bede knew something of John Chrysostom's preferred mode of exegesis from his contact with students of the Canterbury School, and it is most unlikely that they discussed together only one textual crux as interpreted by Archbishop Theodore—Chrysostom's name must have come up frequently. But there is little doubt that Bede's contact with the Pseudo-Chrysostom homilies was direct. The Canterbury commentaries call Chrysostom variously "John," "John Chrysostom," and "Iohannes Constantinopolitanus dixit Crisostomus"; none call John bishop. Bede's appellation reflects none of these Canterbury usages, but rather quotes the

---

[24] Wolfgang Wenk, ed., *Zur Sammlung der 38 Homilien des Chrysostomus Latinus* (mit Edition der Nr. 6, 8, 27, 32, und 33), Wiener Studied, Beiheft 10 (Vienna, 1988) 101–2. See forthcoming Thomas N. Hall, ed., *Sources of Anglo-Saxon Literary Culture*, Volume 5: *Julius Caesar to Pseudo-Cyril of Alexandria* (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute Publications).

[25] Bede, *In Lucam*, ed. D. Hurst, Corpus Christianorum Series Latina 120 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1960) 291. See Hall, *Sources of Anglo-Saxon Literary Culture*.

[26] Wilmart, 'La collection des 38 homélies' 308.

attribution commonly found in Wilmart's Latin homily collection: *Incipiunt omeliae sancti Iohannis episcopi Constantinopolitani*.

Ascetical works

Three of the genuine Chrysostom works which were often appended to Wilmart's Latin homily collection, and circulated with it, were ascetical in character, and travelled under the Latin titles: *De reparatione lapsi*; *De compunctione cordis I ad Demetrium*; *De compunctione cordis II ad Stelechium*. Another text that sometimes accompanied them was *Quod nemo laeditur*. *De reparatione lapsi* is in fact two separate works travelling under one title. These were the letter addressed by Chrysostom to his friend Theodore of Mopsuestia, and a long treatise on the same subject advocating the preference for an ascetical monastic life over a secular one, long assumed also to be directed at Theodore.[27] The reader is counselled not to abandon the monastic vocation for secular responsibilities, especially marriage. Latin translations of both works were available from the first quarter of the fifth century, probably made by Anianus of Celeda.[28] In their combined form they were used by Isidore of Seville in his *De uiris illustribus* XIX, which was written one hundred years later, between 615 and 618, giving some indication of their circulation.[29]

There is indisputable evidence that *De reparatione lapsi*, with the letter and treatise, was known in the north of England, in the church of the Anglo-Saxon kingdom of Northumbria, by the middle of the eighth century. This comes in the form of manuscript fragments preserved in the Düsseldorf Landes und Stadtbibliothek, from a text copied in Northumbria before the book containing it found its way to the Anglo-Saxon mission area in Germany. (The Anglo-Saxons participated in the conversion of the Germans to Christianity across the course of the eighth century.) It is possible to surmise but impossible to know whether the collection of Latin 'Chrysostom' homilies circulating in Northumbria and available to Bede included *De reparatione lapsi* as an appendix, but this nevertheless seems likely.

[27] See Hall, *Sources of Anglo-Saxon Literary Culture*.
[28] See Jean Dumortier, 'L'ancienne traduction latine de l'*Ad Theodorum*' *Studia Patristica* 7 (1966) 178–83.
[29] *Patrologia Latina* 83, coll. 1093–94.

Alcuin of York

Among the vast number of John Chrysostom's authentic output of homilies are thirty-four exegetical homilies on the Epistle to the Hebrews. The received tradition that these were preached in Constantinople at the end of his career has been undermined by Pauline Allen and Wendy Mayer,[30] so that we no longer know when these homilies were preached. Some early manuscripts contain rubrics claiming that the homilies were published from stenographic notes taken by the Antiochene priest Constantinus (or Constantius), though Bauer disputed this.[31] We know with certainty that the homilies on Hebrews were translated as a complete collection by Mutianus, at the request of Cassiodorus Senator at his monastery of Vivarium at the southern end of Italy. Cassiodorus lived an active public and political life in the sixth century, including time living and studying in Constantinople, before retiring to a life of study in his monastery in around 540. He died in c. 585, aged nearly 100. Cassiodorus would not have needed the translation for himself, but tells us in his *Institutiones* that he asked Mutianus to complete the task, probably because of the absence of a reliable commentary on the epistle;[32] this translation was the Hebrews commentary known to the early medieval West. It was used substantially by Alcuin of York in his own commentary on Hebrews, which was left incomplete at his death. Despite the fact that up to two thirds of Alcuin's material is lifted directly from Mutianus' translation, Douglas Dales argues for the "depth and originality of his thought."[33] Alcuin's focus is Christological, and he is asserting orthodoxy in the face of the adoptionist heresy which had erupted in northern Spain. John Chrysostom's own assertion of orthodoxy in the wake of early Christological heresies becomes a crucial element re-authored into Alcuin's appropriation of Chrysostom's commentary. Dales comments that:[34]

> …his selection from Chrysostom's homilies on Hebrews reveals the foundations and rudiments of his rebuttal of Adoptionism, wrought out of many years of personal reflection and answering the questions of his pupils, as well as having to respond to the exigencies of the controversy itself.

---

[30] Pauline Allen and Wendy Mayer, 'The Thirty-Four Homilies on Hebrews: The Last Series Delivered by Chrysostom in Constantinople' *Byzantion* 65 (1995) 309–48.

[31] Chrysostome Bauer, *John Chrysostom and his Time*, trans. M. Gonzaga, 2 vols. (London: Newman Press, 1959–60) 2:94.

[32] *Cassiodori Senatoris Insitutiones*, ed. R. A. B. Mynors (Oxford: Clarendon, 1937) I.8.3.

[33] Douglas Dales, *Alcuin: His Theology and Thought* (Cambridge: James Clarke, 2013) 163.

[34] Dales, *Alcuin* 164.

The question arises, did Alcuin know Chrysostom on Hebrews before he left England for the Frankish court? In his poem on the *Bishops, Kings and Saints of York*, Alcuin celebrates the contents of the great library that existed there in the middle of the eighth century when he was a pupil of Ælberht. In 778 his former teacher bequeathed a great part of this library to Alcuin. Alcuin lists the authors included, who range from Vergil to Aristotle to Basil the Great, but also includes "Chrysostomus ... Iohannes." As far as I am aware, the only work of Chrysostom cited by Alcuin, and indeed known intimately and used prolifically by him, is Mutianus' translation of the commentary on Hebrews, and therefore it may be this work Alcuin is referring to in the York library. However, as we have seen, the collection of thirty-eight Latin homilies and their appended ascetical treatises were certainly known in Alcuin's homeland of Northumbria, and these may be the works referred to.[35]

On the Epistle to the Hebrews

Some evidence which may throw light on the question of the circulation of Chrysostom's homilies on Hebrews in England has only recently come to light. The late tenth-century manuscript Biblioteca Capitolare CXVIII, in the cathedral library in Vercelli in northern Italy, is a collection of texts in Old English which lay hidden there from around the eleventh century until it was discovered by Friedrich Blume in 1822. The book contains poems and homilies copied around the year 970, but in many cases these were authored much earlier. The source of Homily 7 in this collection has been unknown until very recently, when Samantha Zacher showed it was largely a faithful rendering of Mutianus' Latin translation of Chrysostom's twenty-ninth homily on Hebrews.[36] Codicological evidence suggests that this short homily has been excerpted from a long, fuller version of the source homily. The date of the translation into Old English is unknown, but it could be as early as the ninth century. Very few books were imported into England in the course of the ninth century, making it more likely that the work came to England much earlier. Without doubt, Vercelli 7 presents the earliest translation of any work of John Chrysostom into English. It ends:[37]

---

[35] Compare Lapidge, *Library* 230.

[36] Samantha Zacher, 'The Source of Vercelli VII: an Address to Women' in *New Readings in the Vercelli Book*, ed. Samantha Zacher and Andy Orchard, Toronto Anglo-Saxon Series 4 (University of Toronto Press, 2009) 98–149.

[37] Zacher, 'The Source of Vercelli VII' 148–49.

Ac of þære oferfylle cumað þa unrihtan lustas gelice and on meresteallum wyrmas tyddriað, and of ðære gemetegunge god wiorc gelice and of clænre eorðan gode wæstmas. For þan ic lære þæt we urne lichoman mid oferfylle ne gewemmen, ac mid gemetegunge gefrætewigen, and us fram awiorp þa wol and geearnien and onfon þa god þe us gehatene synt on þam hælendan Criste and mid þam halegan gaste in ealra worulda woruld.

But from gluttony come those illicit desires just as also in stagnant water worms propagate, and from moderation [come those] good deeds just as also from that pure earth [come those] good fruits. Therefore I teach that we not harm our bodies with gluttony, but that we adorn them with moderation, and that we cast away from ourselves that pestilence, and that we earn and receive those good things which are promised to us in the Saviour Christ and with the Holy Spirit in the age of ages.

This is a mostly accurate rendering of Mutianus' Latin with some minor omissions and condensed expression, but despite being twice removed from John's original Greek, John's voice advocating simple living and penitence rings true:

Quae uero generat absurdas cupiditates, illa est abundantia, quae se delicis tradit. Sicut enim terra, quae ualde humecta est, generat uermes, et fimus cum compluitur, uel cum plurimum sibi humorem retinet; terra uero quae libera est ab humoribus, fructuum foecunditate decoratur, si ex abundantia non corrumpatur aquarum; ac si etiam non colatur, ultro tamen gramina subministrat; si uero colatur, fructuum foecunditate pollebit. Obsecro igitur ne nosturm corpus uitiosum et inutile faciamus, neque ei uitia inseramus, sed praeparemus ei fructus utiles et arbusta fructuosa, nec ea dissoluamus per immoderationem cidorum: immoderatio quippe, pro fructibus uermes facit. Sic etiam insita nobis cupiditas, si eam deliciarum inundationibus ebries, cupiditates generat turpes et uoluptates admodum turpiores. Abiiciamus itaque hanc luem, ut possimus adipisci bona quae promissa sunt, in Christo Iesu Domino nostro, cum quo Patri gloria, una cum sancto Spiritu, nunc et semper, et in saecula saeculorum. Amen.

That which generates foolish lusts, is abundance, which surrenders itself to delights. For just as the earth, which is very wet, generates worms, and dung when it rains, or when it retains a lot of fluid in itself; in truth the earth which is free from fluids is decorated with the richness of fruits, if it is not corrupted by an abundance of water; but even if it is not cultivated, nevertheless it further supplies grass; if in truth it is cultivated, it will be fertile with the richness of fruits. I therefore ask that we not make our body full of vice and useless, and not plant sins in it, but let us prepare for it useful fruits and fruit-bearing plants, and let us not dissolve it through the immoderation of food: immoderation certainly generates worms in place of fruits. So also

our innate desire, if you moisten it with the floods of delights, it generates disgraceful lusts and still more disgraceful desires. Let us cast away this plague, so that we are able to obtain those good things which are promised, in Jesus Christ our Lord, with whom the Father, together with the Holy Spirit, be glory now and always, forever. Amen.

Conclusion

Who was John Chrysostom for early Anglo-Saxon England? He was a biblical commentator above all, but also an ascetical writer and advocate of a life that avoided luxury and the heresies that the love of wealth produced. Through Alcuin's appropriation he found a role in the defence of Christological orthodoxy in the West at a time when knowledge of the writings of the Greek Fathers was patchy at best. It is ironic that the John Chrysostom brought to England and taught at Canterbury by Theodore is the most evasive and least reliable. John's authority was probably unknown in England before the seventh century, which means that the archbishop would have gained no authority for his attributions by ascribing them to John. It seems likely that Theodore himself had been inducted into a school where claiming commentary for John was rampant, certainly at Antioch where his authority never waned, but also in Constantinople where his posthumous victory over his opponents was complete. There is no doubt that John became well known to Anglo-Saxon scholars, and that there too his voice spoke with an undisputed authority, making him in his *Nachleben* an important teacher of the early English Church.

Select Bibliography

Allen, Pauline and Wendy Mayer. 'The Thirty-Four Homilies on Hebrews: The Last Series Delivered by Chrysostom in Constantinople.' *Byzantion* 65 (1995) 309–48.

Barlow, Frank. *The English Church 1066–1154*. London: Longman, 1979.

Bauer, Chrysostome. *John Chrysostom and his Time*. Translated by M. Gonzaga, 2 vols. London: Newman Press, 1959–60.

Bischoff, Bernhard and Michael Lapidge. *Biblical Commentaries from the Canterbury School of Theodore and Hadrian*, Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 10. Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Dales, Douglas. *Alcuin: His Theology and Thought*. Cambridge: James Clarke, 2013.

Dumortier, Jean. 'L'ancienne traduction latine de l'*Ad Theodorum.*' *Studia Patristica* 7 (1966) 178–83.

Gneuss, H. 'King Alfred and the History of Anglo-Saxon Libraries.' In *Modes of Interpretation in Old English Literature: Essays in Honour of Stanley B. Greenfield*. Phyllis Rugg Brown, Georgia Ronan Crampton, and Fred C. Robinson, 22–49. University of Toronto Press, 1986.

Gorman, Michael. 'Bede's VIII *Quaestiones* and Carolingian Biblical Scholarship.' *Revue bénédictine* 109 (1999) 32–74.

Lapidge, Michael, ed. *Archbishop Theodore*: *Commemorative Studies on his Life and Influence*, Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England 11. Cambridge University Press, 1995.

Mayr-Harting, Henry. *The Coming of Christianity to Anglo-Saxon England*. London: Batsford, 1972.

Wenk, Wolfgang, ed. *Zur Sammlung der 38 Homilien des Chrysostomus Latinus*. mit Edition der Nr. 6, 8, 27, 32, und 33. Wiener Studied, Beiheft 10. Vienna, 1988.

Wilmart, André. 'La collection des 38 homélies latines de saint Jean Chrysostome.' *Journal of Theological Studies* 19 (1918) 305–27.

Wright, Charles D. 'The Fate of Lot's Wife: A Canterbury School Gloss in *Genesis A*.' In *Old English Philology: Studies in Honour of R. D. Fulk*. Edited by Leonard Neidorf, 298–310. Cambridge: D. S. Brewer, 2016.

Zacher, Samantha. 'The Source of Vercelli VII: an Address to Women.' In *New Readings in the Vercelli Book*. Edited by Samantha Zacher and Andy Orchard. Toronto Anglo-Saxon Series 4. University of Toronto Press, 2009.

Chapter Four

Chrysostomic or Ephremian? Tracing the Origins of a Saying Attributed to Chrysostom in the *Apophthegmata Patrum*

Alexey Stambolov

Traditionally acknowledged as a great preacher, church father ("great hierarch and ecumenical teacher" in the East, "doctor of the Church" in the West), and biblical interpreter, St John Chrysostom is less known as one of the authors whose wisdom was anthologised in the famous classic of monastic spirituality, *Apophthegmata Patrum* or *Sayings of the Desert Fathers*. In some Greek manuscripts and editions of the Systematic Collection of the *Sayings*, one apophthegm is attributed to him. This chapter aims to present that short text, endeavouring, first, to answer the question to what extent these words could be considered genuinely Chrysostomian, then, to trace their origin, and, lastly, to explain their presence in the *Sayings*.

Before anything, a few introductory words on the literary context of the supposed Chrysostomian passage in discussion. The *Sayings of the Desert Fathers*[1] is the name given to various collections, consisting of pithy sayings

I am grateful to Very Revd Dr Doru Costache (AIOCS) for his valuable advices and assistance in writing this article.

[1] The work is known under various names. Latin, *Apophthegmata Patrum*. Greek. *Ἀποφθέγματα τῶν ἁγίων γερόντων*, *Ἀποφθέγματα τῶν πατέρων*, *Βίβλος τῶν γερόντων*, *Τὸ (Μέγα) Γεροντικόν*.

and simple narratives of the first generations of Christian ascetics who lived primarily in the Egyptian deserts, but also in Sinai, Palestine, and Syria, in the 4th–6th century. The *Sayings* has come down to us in two basic forms: the Alphabetical Collection and the Systematic Collection. The Alphabetical gathers roughly 1,000 items under the names of 130 prominent monks called *abbas*, "fathers" or "elders" (among them three female ascetics called *ammas*, "mothers"),[2] arranging these items or "chapters" according to the Greek alphabet. Attached to certain manuscripts of the Alphabetical Collection there is an additional set of sayings and stories that had come down to the ancient editors without names (the Anonymous Collection).

The Systematic Collection contains many of the same sayings and narratives but gathers them under 21 (in some manuscripts and editions, 22) different themes, such as "discretion," "unceasing prayer," "hospitality," "obedience," and "humility." The Greek version contains about 1,200 sayings. In the mid-6th century, an early version of the Systematic Collection was translated from Greek into Latin by two Roman clerics, the deacon Pelagius (who perhaps became the later Pope Pelagius I, 556–561) and the subdeacon John (probably the later Pope John III, 561–574). This version, called the *Verba Seniorum* ("Sayings of the Old Men"), was apparently known to St Benedict and powerfully influenced the spirituality of Western medieval monasticism.[3] In time, various collections of *Sayings* appeared not only in Greek and Latin, but also in many ancient languages of the Christian tradition.[4]

These collections are obviously the result of a long development during which the individual sayings of the most famous ascetics of the golden era of Christian monasticism at first have been handed down and thus circulated orally by their disciples.[5] Only later were they passed on as written texts

---

[2] Their names are Theodora, Sarah, and Syncletica of Alexandria. Another female ascetic named Eugenia is mentioned in some manuscripts and editions of the Systematic Collection of the *Sayings*.

[3] William Harmless, *Desert Christians: An Introduction to the Literature of Early Monasticism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004) 169–70.

[4] Samuel Rubenson, *The Letters of St. Antony: Monasticism and the Making of a Saint* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995) 145.

[5] In two articles, J.-Cl. Guy argues for the existence of three stages in the development of the sayings: first, there were simple and relatively short pronouncements (λόγοι) that were later developed to longer statements about the general nature of monastic life, finally to become full narratives or sermons. Rubenson, *The Letters of St. Antony* 151. See Jean-Claude Guy, 'Remarques sur le texte des *Apophthegmata Patrum*' *Recherches de science religieuse* 43 (1959) 252–58, and idem, 'Note sur l'évolution du genre apophtegmatique' *Revue d'ascétique et mystique* 32 (1956) 63–68. Guy's account has been challenged for its implied assumption that some of the sayings (or the short nucleus of the narrative) are more "genuine" and authentic, and that scholars can discern that "authentic nucleus." In a short yet important note on the *Sayings*, Gr. Gould warns against this use of a "theory that is too simple for the

and gathered into various small collections, sometimes as the sayings of one or other father, sometimes as those dealing with the same subject. In time, starting with the end of the 5th or the beginning of the 6th century, these minor anthologies were brought together and incorporated into the large collections containing several hundred items, presented in the two main forms that have reached our age.[6]

Despite the *Sayings*' focus primarily on the desert fathers who, for the most, were Egyptian peasants (some of them, including Antony the Great himself, could not even speak Greek),[7] several of these are preserved under the names of notable theologians, such as St Basil the Great, St Gregory the Theologian, St Athanasius the Great, and St Ephrem the Syrian.[8] In some Greek manuscripts and editions of the Systematic Collection of the *Sayings*, one apothegm is attributed to St John Chrysostom. I shall quote here that short text according to the Greek bilingual (Ancient and Modern Greek) edition of *Τὸ Μέγα Γεροντικόν*:[9]

> Εἶπεν ὁ μακάριος[10] Ἰωάννης ὁ Χρυσόστομος· Καθεζομένου σου εἰς ἀνάγνωσιν λογίων Θεοῦ, πρῶτον ἐπικάλεσαι αὐτόν, ἵνα διανοίξῃ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τῆς καρδίας σου εἰς τὸ μὴ μόνον ἀναγινώσκειν τὰ γεγραμμένα, ἀλλὰ καὶ ποιεῖν,

material," and argues for the existence of authentic stories, biblical interpretations, and exhortations among the sayings. See Graham Gould, 'A Note on the *Apophthegmata Patrum*' *Journal of Theological Studies* 37 (1986) 133–38. See also Michal Bar-Asher Siegal, *Early Christian Monastic Literature and the Babylonian Talmud* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013) 38–40.

[6] Lucien Regnault, 'Apophthegmata Patrum' in *The Coptic Encyclopedia* (*CE*), vol. 1 (Macmillan: 1991) 177a. The same online in *Claremont Coptic Encyclopedia* (*CCE*): http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/cdm/ref/collection/cce/id/174 (last accessed 15/7/2017).

[7] Palladius, *Historia Lausaica* 21.15: τοῦ μακαρίου Ἀντωνίου ἑλληνιστὶ μὴ εἰδότος. *Palladios: La storia Lausaica*, ed. G. J. M. Bartelink (Verona: Fondazione Lorenzo Valla, 1974). Retrieved via TLG. See also Georges Florovsky, *Vizantijskie Otcy V–VIII* (Paris: YMCA Press, 1933) 144 [in Russian].

[8] Cf. Andrew Louth, 'The literature of the monastic movement' in *The Cambridge History of Early Christian Literature*, ed. Frances Young, Lewis Ayres, and Andrew Louth (Cambridge University Press, 2008) 379.

[9] *Τὸ Μέγα Γεροντικόν.* Τόμος Α' (Θεσσαλονίκη: Γυν. Ἱερὸν Ἡσυχαστήριον «Τὸ Γενέσιον τῆς Θεοτόκου», [1994] 2011) 78–79. This edition was published by the Convent of the Nativity of the Virgin Mary in Panorama, Thessaloniki. According to the preface of the second volume (T. Β' 12), it is based on three Greek codices, Coislin 108 (11th c.), Coislin 127 (12th c.), and Sinaiticus 454 (18th c.). I communicated with the persons responsible for the publications of the monastery (nun Photini, nun Lydia), but they could not answer in which of these the saying under consideration was attested.

[10] The word μακάριος ("blessed") indicates that Chrysostom was, at that time, already reposed. Cf. Εἶπεν ὁ *μακάριος* Γρηγόριος [ὁ Θεολόγος] (I, 3) and Εἶπεν ὁ *ἅγιος* Γρηγόριος [ὁ Θεολόγος] (VII, 6). Jean-Claude Guy, *Les Apophtegmes des Pères: Collection systématique I–IX* (Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1993) 102, 338. On this meaning of μακάριος, see G. W. H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (London: Oxford University Press, 1961) s.v. B.3.

ἵνα μὴ εἰς κρῖμα ἑαυτῶν τοὺς τῶν ἁγίων βίους καὶ λόγους διεξερχόμεθα. (A' 43)

The blessed John Chrysostom said, "When you sit at reading the sayings of God, pray to Him first that He would open the eyes of your heart so that you will not only read what is written, but also practice it, lest we read the lives and the words of the saints to our condemnation."

The same saying is included in Codex Vatopedinus 48 (end of 17th – beginning of 18th c.), under the heading τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου.[11] There is another, far more developed, version of the saying:

Εἶπεν ὁ μακάριος Ἰωάννης ὁ Χρυσόστομος· Καθεζομένου σου εἰς ἀνάγνωσιν λογίων Θεοῦ, δεήθητι πρῶτον [ἵνα διανοίξῃ] *τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τῆς καρδίας*[12] σου. Ὅταν δὲ ἀναγινώσκεις (sic), ἐπιμελῶς καὶ ἐπιπόνως ἀναγίνωσκε, ἐν πολλῇ καταστάσει ἀνακρινόμενος τὸν στίχον· καὶ μὴ σπούδασον τὰ φύλλα μόνον διέρχεσθαι, ἀλλ' ἐὰν χρεία ἐστὶν (sic) μὴ ὀκνήσῃς καὶ δὺς (sic) καὶ τρεῖς (sic) διελθεῖν τὸν στιχὸν (sic) ὅπως νοήσῃς τὴν δύναμιν αὐτοῦ. Ὅταν δὲ μέλλῃς καθεστῆναι (sic) καὶ ἀναγινώσκειν ἢ ἀκοῦσαι ἄλλου ἀναγινώσκοντος, δεήθητι οὕτως λέγων· Κύριε Ἰησοῦ Χριστέ, ἄνοιξον τὰ ὦτα καὶ *τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τῆς καρδίας* μου[13] τοῦ ἀκοῦσαί με τὸν λόγον σου καὶ συνιέναι καὶ ποιῆσαι τὸ θέλημά σου, ὅτι *πάροικός εἰμι ἐγὼ ἐν τῇ γῇ· μὴ ἀποκρίψῃς ἀπ' ἐμοῦ τὰς ἐντολάς σου*[14], ἀλλὰ *ἀποκάλυψον τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς μου καὶ κατανοήσω τὰ θαυμάσια ἐκ τοῦ νόμου σου*[15]· δήλωσόν μοι *τὰ ἄδηλα καὶ τὰ κρύφια τῆς σοφίας σου*[16]· *ἐπὶ σοὶ γὰρ ἐλπίζω, ὁ Θεός μου*[17], ἵνα σύ μου φωτίζῃς τὴν διάνοιαν[18].[19]

The blessed John Chrysostom said, "When you sit at reading the sayings of God, pray to Him first [that He would open] *the eyes of your heart*.[20] Now when you read, read diligently with all your heart, and read the verses with much application, and do not endeavour only to turn the leaves, but if need be do not be loath and read the verses even two times and three times so that you understand their meaning. When you will sit down to read or to listen to

[11] The only difference is in the grammatical form of the last word—διεξέρχῃ instead of διεξερχόμεθα (Vat. gr. 48 f. 8r).
[12] Eph. 1:18.
[13] Eph. 1:18.
[14] Ps. 118:19. The numbering of the Psalms is according to the Septuagint.
[15] Ps. 118:18.
[16] Ps. 50:8.
[17] Ps. 24:2.
[18] Cf. Ps. 118:130.
[19] Johannes G. van der Tak and William R. Veder, *Patericon Sceticum*, Pegasus Oost-Europese Studies 13 (Amsterdam: Uitgeversij Pegasus, 2012) 88–89.
[20] Eph. 1:18.

another reading, pray thus, saying, 'Lord Jesus Christ, open the ears and *eyes of my heart*[21] to hear Your word, and to understand it, and to do Your will, for *I am a sojourner on earth. Do not hide Your commandments from me*,[22] but *open my eyes, and I will understand wonderful things out of Your law*.[23] Teach me *the unknown secrets of Your wisdom*,[24] because *in You I trust, my God*,[25] in order that You would enlighten my mind'[26]."[27]

The exhortation, in its short version, is included also in the Russian translation of the Systematic Collection by St Theophan the Recluse (1815–94).[28] The larger version was translated into Slavonic and included in the *textus receptus* of the *Scete Paterikon* (the Slavonic translation of the Systematic Collection).[29]

The saying is not included in the critical edition of the Greek Systematic Collection, although, as we saw, it is attested in various manuscripts, editions, and translations of that collection. Its larger version, however, can be found in the digital library of Greek literature, *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* (TLG). It occurs there in three works, two of them ascribed to St Ephrem the Syrian, namely, *De panoplia, ad monachos* (Περὶ πανοπλίας, πρὸς τοὺς μοναχούς)[30] and *De patientia et consummatione huius saeculi, ac de secundo aduentu; necnon de meditatione diuinarum scripturarum; et quae quantaque sit quietis silentiique utilitas* (Περὶ ὑπομονῆς καὶ συντελείας καὶ τῆς δευτέρας παρουσίας. Καὶ περὶ μελέτης τῶν θείων Γραφῶν. Καὶ τί τὸ τῆς ἡσυχίας ὠφέλιμον),[31] and one ascribed to St John Chrysostom, namely, *De patientia et de consummatione huius saeculi* (Περὶ ὑπομονῆς, καὶ περὶ συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, καὶ δευτέρας παρουσίας, ἀδιαδόχου τε τῶν δικαίων βασιλείας, καὶ ἀτελευτήτου τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν κολάσεως· ὑπόθεσίς τε ἐξομολογήσεως, καὶ πρὸς τὴν τῶν θείων Γραφῶν μελέτην προτροπὴ, τίνες τε αἱ μεθοδεῖαι τοῦ Ἐχθροῦ, καὶ

---

[21] Eph. 1:18.

[22] Ps. 118:19.

[23] Ps. 118:18.

[24] Ps. 50:8.

[25] Ps. 24:2.

[26] Cf. Ps. 118:130.

[27] The English translation is borrowed from van der Tak and Veder, slightly adjusted.

[28] *Drevniy Paterik* I, 42 (Holy Mount Athos: St Panteleimon Monastery, 2009) 28 [in Russian].

[29] William Veder (ed.), *Skitskij Paterik*, Pegasus Oost-Europese Studies 14 (Amsterdam: Uitgeversij Pegasus, 2012) 101–2.

[30] *Ὁσίου Ἐφραίμ τοῦ Σύρου ἔργα*, vol. 6 (Thessalonica: Το περιβόλι της Παναγίας, 1995) 9–41. [= J. S. Assemani, *Sancti patris nostri Ephraem Syri opera Omnia*, vol. 3. (Rome, 1732) 219b–234b] ed. Konstantinos G. Phrantzoles.

[31] *Ὁσίου Ἐφραίμ τοῦ Σύρου ἔργα*, vol. 4 (Thessalonica: Το περιβόλι της Παναγίας, 1992) 155–79. [= Assemani, *Sancti patris nostri Ephraem Syri opera Omnia*, vol. 3: 93–104d] ed. Konstantinos G. Phrantzoles.

τί τὸ τῆς ἡσυχίας ὠφέλιμον).[32] There are only slight differences between these three texts (undoubtedly due to copyist errors). The table below makes obvious the extent to which the three texts from TLG are related with the one from *Patericon Sceticum*.

De panoplia 39.6–40.2	**De patientia 173.8–74.3**	**De patientia 63.940.52–63.940.66**	**Patericon Sceticum ch. G:1+G:2**
			Καθεζομένου σου εἰς ἀνάγνωσιν λογίων Θεοῦ, δεήθητι πρῶτον [ἵνα διανοίξῃ] τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τῆς καρδίας σου.
Ὅταν δὲ ἀναγινώσκῃς, ἐπιμελῶς καὶ ἐπιπόνως ἀναγίνωσκε, ἐν πολλῇ καταστάσει ἀνακρινόμενος τὸν στίχον, εἴτε δεύτερον, εἴτε τρίτον· καὶ μὴ σπούδαζε τὰ φύλλα τοῦ βιβλίου μόνον διέρχεσθαι, ἀλλ' οὗ ἂν χρεία, καὶ δεύτερον καὶ τρίτον ἢ καὶ πλεῖστον διέρχεσθαι τὸν στίχον, ὅπως νοήσῃς τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ στίχου.	Ὅταν δὲ ἀναγινώσκεις, ἐπιμελῶς καὶ ἐμπόνως ἀναγίνωσκε, ἐν πολλῇ καταστάσει διερχόμενος τὸν στίχον· καὶ μὴ σπούδασον τὰ φύλλα μόνον διέρχεσθαι, ἀλλ' ἐὰν χρεία ἐστί, μὴ ὀκνήσῃς καὶ δὶς καὶ τρὶς καὶ πλειστάκις τὸν στίχον διελθεῖν, ὅπως νοήσῃς τὴν δύναμιν αὐτοῦ.	Ὅταν δὲ ἀναγινώσκῃς, ἐπιμελῶς καὶ ἐμπόνως ἀναγίνωσκε, ἐν πολλῇ καταστάσει διερχόμενος τὸν στίχον, καὶ μὴ σπούδαζε τὰ φύλλα μόνον διέρχεσθαι, ἀλλὰ ἐὰν χρεία, μὴ ὀκνήσῃς δὶς καὶ τρὶς καὶ πλειστάκις διελθεῖν τὸν στίχον, ὅπως νοήσῃς τὴν δύναμιν αὐτοῦ.	Ὅταν δὲ ἀναγινώσκεις, ἐπιμελῶς καὶ ἐπιπόνως ἀναγίνωσκε, ἐν πολλῇ καταστάσει ἀνακρινόμενος τὸν στίχον· καὶ μὴ σπούδασον τὰ φύλλα μόνον διέρχεσθαι, ἀλλ' ἐὰν χρεία ἐστὶν μὴ ὀκνήσῃς καὶ δὺς καὶ τρεῖς διελθεῖν τὸν στιχὸν ὅπως νοήσῃς τὴν δύναμιν αὐτοῦ.

[32] Joannes Chrysostomus, *De patientia et de consummatione huius saeculi* [Sp.] *MPG* 63, 937–42.

Ὅταν δὲ μέλλῃς καθεσθῆναι καὶ ἀναγινώσκειν, ἢ δὲ καὶ πάλιν ἄλλου ἀκοῦσαι ἀναγινώσκοντος, δεήθητι τοῦ Κυρίου πρῶτον λέγων· Κύριε Ἰησοῦ Χριστέ, ἄνοιξον τὰ ὦτα καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς μου, τουτέστι τῆς καρδίας μου, τοῦ ἀκοῦσαί με καὶ συνιέναι <καὶ> ποιῆσαι τὸ θέλημά σου, Κύριε, ὅτι πάροικός εἰμι ἐγὼ ἐν τῇ γῇ. Μὴ ἀποκρύψῃς ἀπ᾽ ἐμοῦ τὰς ἐντολάς σου, ἀλλὰ ἀποκάλυψον τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς μου, καὶ κατανοήσω τὰ θαυμάσια ἐν τῷ νόμῳ σου. Δήλωσόν μου τὰ ἄδηλα καὶ τὰ κρυφὰ τῆς καρδίας μου καὶ τῆς σῆς σοφίας. Ἐπὶ σὲ γὰρ ἐλπίζω, ὁ Θεός μου, ἵνα σύ μου φωτίσῃς τὴν διάνοιαν.	Ὅταν δὲ μέλλῃς καθεσθῆναι καὶ ἀναγνῶναι, ἢ ἀναγινώσκοντος ἀκοῦσαι, δεήθητι πρῶτον τοῦ Θεοῦ λέγων· Κύριε Ἰησοῦ Χριστέ, ἄνοιξον τὰ ὦτα καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τῆς καρδίας μου τοῦ ἀκοῦσαί με τῶν λόγων σου, καὶ συνιέναι, καὶ ποιῆσαι τὸ θέλημά σου· ὅτι πάροικος ἐγώ εἰμι ἐν τῇ γῇ. Κύριε, μὴ ἀποκρύψῃς ἀπ᾽ ἐμοῦ τὰς ἐντολάς σου, ἀλλὰ ἀποκάλυψον τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς μου, καὶ κατανοήσω τὰ θαυμάσια ἐκ τοῦ νόμου σου. Ἐπὶ σοὶ γὰρ ἐλπίζω, ὁ Θεός μου, ἵνα σύ μου φωτίζῃς τὴν καρδίαν.	Ὅταν δὲ μέλλῃς καθεσθῆναι καὶ ἀναγνῶναι, ἢ καὶ πάλιν ἄλλου ἀναγινώσκοντος ἀκοῦσαι, δεήθητι πρῶτον τοῦ Θεοῦ λέγων· Κύριε Ἰησοῦ Χριστὲ, ἄνοιξον τὰ ὦτα καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τῆς καρδίας μου, τοῦ ἀκοῦσαί με τὸν λόγον σου, καὶ συνιέναι, καὶ ποιῆσαι τὸ θέλημά σου, Κύριε, ὅτι πάροικος ἐγώ εἰμι ἐν τῇ γῇ. Μὴ ἀποκρύψῃς ἀπ᾽ ἐμοῦ τὰς ἐντολάς σου, ἀλλ᾽ ἀποκάλυψον τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς μου, καὶ κατανοήσω τὰ θαυμάσια ἐκ τοῦ νόμου σου· ἐπὶ σοὶ γὰρ ἤλπισα, ὁ Θεός μου, ἵνα σύ μου φωτίσῃς τὴν καρδίαν.	Ὅταν δὲ μέλλῃς καθεστῆναι καὶ ἀναγινώσκειν ἢ ἀκοῦσαι ἄλλου ἀναγινώσκοντος, δεήθητι οὕτως λέγων· Κύριε Ἰησοῦ Χριστέ, ἄνοιξον τὰ ὦτα καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τῆς καρδίας μου τοῦ ἀκοῦσαί με τὸν λόγον σου καὶ συνιέναι καὶ ποιῆσαι τὸ θέλημά σου, ὅτι πάροικός εἰμι ἐγὼ ἐν τῇ γῇ· μὴ ἀποκρίψῃς ἀπ᾽ ἐμοῦ τὰς ἐντολάς σου, ἀλλὰ ἀποκάλυψον τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς μου καὶ κατανοήσω τὰ θαυμάσια ἐκ τοῦ νόμου σου· δήλωσόν μοι τὰ ἄδηλα καὶ τὰ κρύφια τῆς σοφίας σου· ἐπὶ σοὶ γὰρ ἐλπίζω, ὁ Θεός μου, ἵνα σύ μου φωτίζῃς τὴν διάνοιαν.

In what follows, I shall attempt to trace the origin of this saying ascribed to St John Chrysostom and its transmission to the Systematic Collection, while also examine the question of its authenticity.

A glance at the three writings in TLG will indicate that two of them, *De patientia* (ascribed to St Ephrem the Syrian) and *De patientia* (among the spurious works of St John Chrysostom), besides having similar titles in Greek, in fact are one and the same work. The only difference is that a piece from another spurious work of St John Chrysostom, *In evangelii dictum et de virginitate*,[33] is interpolated in *De patientia*. There is so much common material between the four treatises that it would not be wrong to say that they come from the pen of the same author.[34] The following table shows the correspondences between these works (the words in Greek are the incipits of each section).

De panoplia 9.1–41.6	**De patientia 155.1–79.13**	**De patientia 63.937.65–63.942.53**	**In evangelii 64.37.42–64.44.22**
Τοιαύτην πανοπλίαν 9.1–23.14	—	—	—
Ἀντὶ ῥομφαίας σπάσαι 24.1–41.5(6)	Σπάσαι οὖν ἀντὶ ῥομφαίας 158.12–68.11	—	Σπάσαι οὖν ἀντὶ ῥομφαίας 64.40.75–64.44.22
—	ἐπιφέρει ὁ Ἐχθρὸς 168.12–75.7	Ἐπιφέρει ὁ Ἐχθρὸς 63.939.29–63.941.13	—

[33] Joannes Chrysostomus, *In evangelii dictum et de virginitate* [Sp.] *MPG* 64, 37–44.

[34] Only between the first part of *De panoplia* (9.1–23.14) and the other three works there are no matches. However, in fact, both the supposedly Chrysostomian *De patientia* and the supposedly Ephremian *De patientia* are dealing with the "whole armour" (πανοπλία) of the monk. Both of them close with the exhortation: ἀναλάβωμεν τὴν πανοπλίαν τῶν προειρημένων (*De patientia* 179.6–7; *De patientia* 63.942.42–43). The original treatise *De panoplia* obviously ends up at 23.14, with doxology and "Amen." In time, pieces from other homilies have been added to it. In fact, none of the four works has reached us in its original form, as made obvious by the too many contaminations and/or interpolations in all of them. Evidence for this is the repeated change of singular and plural forms (e.g. Ναί, ἀδελφέ, κτῆσαι τὴν ἡσυχίαν μετὰ φόβου τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ ὁ Θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης ἔσται μετὰ σοῦ. Παρακαλῶ οὖν ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί μου πνευματικοὶ καὶ ἠγαπημένοι ὑπὸ Κυρίου, σπουδάζειν καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν τὴν τούτων μνείαν ποιεῖσθαι… in two adjacent sentences, *De patientia et consummatione huius saeculi* 178.4–78.8), as well as the logical conclusion of certain sections of the work, with doxology and "Amen."

—	Κτῆσαι δὲ καὶ τὴν ἡσυχίαν 175.8–79.13	Κτῆσαι δὲ καὶ τὴν ἡσυχίαν 63.941.13–63.942.53	—
—	Λαμπρὸς ὁ βίος 155.1–58.2	Λαμπρὸς ὁ βίος 63.937.65–63.939.28	—
—	Ἀλλὰ νῆφε ἐν πᾶσι 158.2–58.11	ἀλλὰ νῆφε ἐν πᾶσι 63.939.28	Ἀλλὰ νῆφε ἐν πᾶσι 64.40.61–64.40.75

There is another matter. The piece, constituting *De patientia* 175.8–76.15 (= *De patientia* 63.941.20–63.941.41), which is a kind of praise of *hēsychia*, is also attested in the *Sayings*, though as an anonymous saying (*Ἀδελφὸς ἠρώτησε γέροντα λέγων· Τί ἐστιν ἡσυχία … Ὁ δὲ γέρων εἶπεν αὐτῷ…*).[35] It is legitimate therefore to raise the matter of the actual source of the passage of interest within the *Sayings*; is it the supposed Ephremian *De patientia* or the supposed Chrysostomic *De patientia*?

Here is the place to consider the issue of the Greek translations of St Ephrem the Syrian's works. In the patristic period, St Ephrem had already obtained the fame of notable theologian-defender of the faith against heresies and paganism alike, prolific hymnographer, sacred poet (known as the "Harp of the Holy Spirit"), teacher (*rnalpānâ*), and commentator on the Scriptures.[36] Furthermore, after Ephrem's death, both in the East and the West, the historical figure and author came to be replaced by the ideal of a Christian ascetic holy man, the exemplar par excellence of monasticism. The image of the "monk" Ephrem[37] came not only from his later *vitae*, but also

[35] *Les Apophtegmes* II, 35. The same in: *Τὸ Μέγα Γεροντικόν* Β' 78.

[36] Sidney Griffith, 'St. Ephraem the Syrian, a Spiritual Teacher for Today' *The Harp* 16 (2003) 172. The same at: http://www.lectio-divina.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=feature.display&feature_id=31 (last accessed 16/7/2017).

[37] St Ephrem was not formally a monk in today's sense, but rather a member of the "sons of the covenant"—an urban community of Christians that had "covenanted" themselves to Church service and refrained from sexual activity. See Trevor Fiske Crowell, 'The Biblical Homilies of Ephraem Graecus' [diss., The Catholic University of America, School of Theology and Religious Studies, 2016] 9. Available at http://cuislandora.wrlc.org/islandora/object/cuislandora%3A40876/datastream/PDF/view (last accessed 17/7/2017). See also Jung Kim, 'Catechesis and Mystagogy in St. Ephrem the Syrian: The Liturgy of Baptism and the Madrashe' [diss., Boston University, School of Theology, 2013] 63 n. 3. Available at https://open.bu.edu/bitstream/handle/2144/8464/kim_jung_thd_2013.pdf?sequence=1(last

from a number of writings on monastic topics, many of them in Greek but some in Syriac, attributed to him.[38] A famous name, as Ephrem's, ascribed to a work by a lesser-known author often helped ensure that work was copied and thus survived.[39] Many of these texts, known as the corpus of Ephraem Graecus, discuss forms of monasticism that did not exist in Ephrem's time, and quote the Christological formulation of the Council of Chalcedon, which took place nearly a century after his death.[40] The corpus is in fact far from homogenous. Homilies of Ephraem Graecus can also be found in collections of works attributed to other Church fathers (among them Ps.-Macarius, Palladius, Isaac of Nineveh, and John Chrysostom).[41] Sebastian Brock divides the Greek writings attributed to St Ephrem the Syrian into three different categories: (1) translations of genuine Ephremian works; (2) translations of Syriac works not by Ephrem; and (3) a large body of material, itself disparate in character, for which Greek is the original language. Some of the Greek texts employ a syllabic metre; these may belong to any one of the three categories.[42] I agree in this case with Philip Michael Forness that, "All of the homilies attributed to Ephrem the Syrian in Greek may have some relationship to Syriac writings by Ephrem. This must be analyzed on a case-by-case basis."[43] Given that there seems to be no correspondent of Ephraem Graecus' *De patientia* in the Syriac, thus authentic, works of St Ephrem, this does not seem to be the source of the passage attributed to Chrysostom in the *Sayings*.

But let us go back to the saying under consideration, from the Systematic Collection. Before I attempt to answer more confidently the question of the origin of the words attributed to St John Chrysostom, I shall address the

---

accessed 16/7/2017).

[38] Crowell, *The Biblical Homilies* 2, 111. The number of Greek texts attributed to Ephrem in *Clavis Patrum Graecorum* (*CPG*) (CPG 3905–4175, 366–468) is exceeded only by those attributed to John Chrysostom (CPG 4305–5197, 491–672). Sebastian P. Brock, *St. Ephrem: A Brief Guide to the Main Editions and Translations*. Available at http://syri.ac/brock/ephrem (last accessed 16/7/2017).

[39] Crowell, *The Biblical Homilies* 116.

[40] Ibid. 111–12.

[41] Ibid. 12–13. "So not only is Ephrem not the author of these texts, but perhaps we also have the wrong pseudonym. It is possible that *Pseudo-Chrysostom is the more proper pseudonym for the texts than the Greek Pseudo-Ephrem, Ephraem Graecus*." (ibid. 45, emphasis mine).

[42] Brock, *St. Ephrem.*

[43] Philip Michael Forness, *A Brief Guide to Syriac Homilies* (Version 3, updated 4 March 2016) 13. Available at http://syri.ac/sites/default/files/A_Brief_Guide_to_Syriac_Homilies_-_Versi.pdf (last accessed 16/7/2017). The same author had noted therein all the homilies attributed to Ephrem in Greek that have been connected to Syriac homilies, whether they are actually by Ephrem or pseudonymous. *De panoplia, ad monachos* and *De patientia et consummatione huius saeculi* are not among them.

matter in two steps. The first step will deal with the larger version of the saying, while the second with the short one.

Within the above-mentioned three works, by Ephraem Graecus and (Pseudo-) John Chrysostom, the extended version of the saying is attested almost verbatim. No matter who is the real author of these writings, essentially there are four versions of the same apophthegm, thus pointing to one author. This evidence leads to the conclusion that in this case it is a matter of direct borrowing/quotation by the compiler of the Systematic Collection from one of these writings. The word εἶπεν ("said") in the *initium* of the saying (Εἶπεν ὁ μακάριος Ἰωάννης ὁ Χρυσόστομος), is not necessarily an indication that it was handed down orally. Let me offer two examples of how the editors of the *Apophthegmata* worked. In the Alphabetical Collection, we read the following words ascribed to St Gregory the Theologian:

> Εἶπε πάλιν [ὁ Ἀββᾶς Γρηγόριος]· ὅλος ὁ βίος ἀνθρώπου, ἡμέρα μία, τοῖς πόθῳ κάμνουσιν.[44]
>
> He also said, "The whole life of a man is but one single day for those who are working hard with longing."[45]

We find the same words in two of his works, namely, *In laudem Cypriani* 35.1172: καὶ βίος ὅλος ἡμέρα μία τοῖς πόθῳ κάμνουσιν,[46] and *In seipsum, cum rure rediisset, post ea quae a Maximo perpet* 35.1229: Ὄντως ἡμέρα μία, βίος ὅλος ἀνθρώπου, τοῖς πόθῳ κάμνουσιν.[47] The other example is from the Systematic Collection, again with an apophthegm attributed to St Gregory:

> Εἶπεν ὁ ἅγιος Γρηγόριος· Εἰ μηδέν σοι ἠλπίζετο δυσχερὲς ἠνίκα προσβαίνειν τῇ φιλοσοφίᾳ ἔμελλες, ἀφιλόσοφος ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ τοὺς πλάστας μεμφόμενος. Εἰ γὰρ προσεδοκᾶτο καὶ οὐκ ἀπήντησε, χάρις [τῷ Θεῷ][48]· εἰ δὲ ἀπήντησεν, ἢ καρτέρει πάσχων ἢ ἴσθι ψευδόμενος τὴν ὑπόσχεσιν.[49]
>
> Saint Gregory [the Theologian] said, "If you were hoping [to encounter] nothing difficult when you were about to embark on philosophy [i.e. the monastic profession], the commencement was unphilosophical and the instructors

---

[44] *Τὸ Γεροντικόν, ἤτοι Ἀποφθέγματα Ἁγίων Γερόντων*, ἐκδ. Π. Β. Πάσχος (Ἀθῆναι: «Ἀστήρ» Ἀλ. & Ἐ. Παπαδημητρίου, 21970) 24.

[45] *The Sayings of the Desert Fathers: The Alphabetical Collection*, trans. Benedicta Ward (Kalamazoo, Michigan: Cistercian Publication, 1984) 38.

[46] St Gregory the Theologian, *In laudem Cypriani* (orat. 24) 35.1172.44 in PG 35, 1172 (retrieved via TLG).

[47] St Gregory the Theologian, *In seipsum, cum rure rediisset, post ea quae a Maximo perpet* (orat. 26) 35.1229.15 in *MPG* 35, 1229 (retrieved via TLG).

[48] The words in square brackets are attested in some manuscripts only.

[49] *Les Apophtegmes*, VII, 6.

culpable. If [difficulty] was expected but not encountered, that was a blessing; but if it was encountered, either suffer and bear it or be aware that you are deceiving yourself."[50]

We find almost the same words in his *Epistulae* 213.1–2:

Εἴ σοι μηδὲν ἠλπίζετο δυσχερές, ἠνίκα φιλοσοφίᾳ προσέβαινες, ἀφιλόσοφος ἡ ἀρχὴ καὶ τοὺς πλάστας μέμφομαι. Εἰ δὲ ἠλπίζετο, εἰ μὲν οὐκ ἀπήντησε, τῷ Θεῷ χάρις· εἰ δὲ ἀπήντησεν, ἢ καρτέρει πάσχων ἢ ἴσθι ψευδόμενος τὴν ὑπόσχεσιν.[51]

These examples show that, first, the two quotations from writings of St Gregory the Theologian are found almost in the same form in the *Sayings*, as apophthegms, and, second, despite the use of the verb εἶπε, the words quoted are drawn from a written rather than an oral source. However, a firm answer to the question of the authorship of the extended version of the supposed Chrysostomian saying may only be given after careful comparison of as many as possible early manuscripts containing this text.

As for the short version of the saying, it is noticeable that it is quite different from the expanded formulation. Of course, the initial thought is the same, but it is more than obvious that the author(s) or compiler(s) of the Systematic Collection have not been content with a mere citation from a written source. Is the short version, therefore, the core around which the extended version later developed? Several more questions regarding the authenticity of the short version are in order. Does this saying ascribed to St John Chrysostom really go back to the historical Chrysostom? How was it preserved and transmitted to the ancient writer(s) and compiler(s) of the *Sayings*? And when did that happen? Furthermore, what source—oral or written—did he/they draw on? Has the wording of this individual saying been altered over time? If so, to what extent?

The question concerning the authenticity of the short saying is closely related to and depends on the authenticity—the origins, transmission, and assembling—of the various collections of *Sayings*. However, this matter, too complex,[52] lies beyond the scope of this chapter. What matters is the possibility that this supposed Chrysostomic saying followed a certain

[50] *The Book of the Elders. Sayings of the Desert Fathers: The Systematic Collection*, trans. John Wortley (Collegeville, MN: Cistercian Publication & Liturgical Press, 2012) 99.

[51] St Gregory the Theologian, *Epistulae* 213.1–2 in *Saint Grégoire de Nazianze: Lettres*, vol. 2, ed. P. Gallay (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1967) (retrieved via TLG).

[52] A number of scholars during the last century—Theodor Hopfner, Wilhelm Bousset, Jean-Claude Guy, Derwas Chitty, Antoine Guillaumont, Lucien Regnault, William Harmless, and Samuel Rubenson, to name some of the most prominent—have undertaken to trace the authenticity of the various collections of *Sayings*.

historical trajectory before it reached the author(s) and/or compiler(s) of the Systematic Collection. Theoretically, no one of the following three possibilities is excluded:

1. These are genuine words of St John Chrysostom passed on in oral or written form.
2. This saying is just a summary of the extended version, which the author(s) and/or compiler(s) of the Systematic Collection had read in some of the writings containing it, same or similar to those mentioned above.
3. These words belong to a completely different author and are misattributed to St John (in order to gain more popularity).

However, if we look closely at the two versions of the saying—the extended (decorated with numerous biblical quotations and allusions) and the short one (its concise and clear style, in which there is no hint of that biblical material)—we would conclude that the former has been developed on the basis of the latter rather than the opposite.

Although theoretically option 3 cannot be totally excluded, I consider it unlikely for the following simple reason. Despite the undoubtedly great popularity of St John Chrysostom, his presence in the *Sayings* is more than symbolic.[53] In fact, this is also a major argument in favour of the authenticity of the saying: if these words do not really belong to the archbishop of Constantinople, it would hardly encourage the author(s) and/or compiler(s) of the Systematic Collection to attach his name to an anonymous saying. Let us recall that the praise of *hēsychia* is cited in the *Sayings* under no name, although it occurs in the supposedly Chrysostomian *De patientia* as well as in the supposedly Ephremian *De patientia*. Another fact that cannot be overlooked is that this saying is not attributed to St Ephrem the Syrian in any of the editions and manuscripts of the *Sayings* in which I found it included.[54]

The linguistic analysis does not give a definite answer to the question of authenticity. No word, grammatical construction, or expression in the saying seems to be foreign or unusual to the linguistic features of Chrysostom's writings. Furthermore, it is difficult to ascertain whether we are dealing with a direct quotation from Chrysostom's works or an initially oral transmission of his words, written in time. Neither are we aware of the extent to which the supposed nucleus of the saying was later developed into the form it has come down to us. Nevertheless, the content of the saying, both in its short

[53] For example, no one saying of Chrysostom is included either in the critical edition of the Greek Systematic Collection, or in the Alphabetical Collection.

[54] The presence of St Ephrem the Syrian in the main collections of *Sayings* is modest, yet stable: there are three stories connected with him respectively in the Alphabetical Collection, the critical, and the Greek bilingual edition of the Systematic Collection.

recension and the longer one, matches the overall teaching of Chrysostom about the need to confirm in deed what one believed.[55]

I shall attempt now to trace the origin and transmission of these supposed Chrysostomic words to the desert fathers, respectively to the author(s) or compiler(s) of the *Sayings*. In what way have they been preserved and transmitted? One possible way is through contacts of Chrysostom's adherents with Egyptian monks or foreign ascetics that at the time happened to visit the Egyptian deserts. One of them was Palladius, the author of *Historia Lausiaca*. He spent more than a decade as a monk in Alexandria and in the monastic communities of Nitria and Kellia, before he left Egypt and went to Constantinople in 399 or at the beginning of 400.[56] There he became disciple of Chrysostom and was ordained by him as priest and probably also as bishop.[57] He remained in close contact with St John until the expulsion of the latter in 404. His faithfulness to him resulted in his own exile to Syene in Upper Egypt, then to Antinoopolis, at which time he visited the monasteries of this region.[58] Thus, the desert fathers, as well as the compiler(s) of the Systematic Collection, could learn about the teachings of St John Chrysostom from one of his devoted disciples.[59]

Leading to Chrysostom's demise and Palladius' exile, the anthropomorphite controversy,[60] combined with the persecution of the "Origenist" monks of Nitria and Kellia, was another occasion when the archbishop of Constantinople and the Egyptian monks came into contact. At the end of 401 or in 402, about fifty Egyptian monks, led by the famous "Tall Brothers" and abba Isidorus the Priest, ended up in Constantinople. They escaped Egypt to flee from the persecution they suffered under the archbishop of Alexandria, Theophilus,

---

[55] See for instance *Homilies on Genesis* 2 (PG 53, 26CD, 31D–32A).

[56] Antoine Guillaumont, 'Palladius' *CE* vol. 6 (Macmillan: 1991) 1876b. Online in *CCE*: http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cce/id/1506/rec/2 (last accessed 15/7/2017). David Brakke, *Demons and the Making of the Monk: Spiritual Combat in Early Christianity* (Cambridge, MA and London, England: Harvard University Press, 2006) 134.

[57] Robert T. Meyer, 'Historical Reliability of Palladius' in Palladius (Bishop of Aspuna), *Dialogue on the Life of St. John Chrysostom*, ed. Robert T. Meyer (The Newman Press, 1985) 6.

[58] Guillaumont, 'Palladius' 1876b. Brakke, *Demons and the Making of the Monk* 135.

[59] Palladius was also, in all probability, the author of the *Dialogue on the Life of John Chrysostom* (*Dialogus de vita Joannis Chrysostomi*). There are many passages in this work where he quotes, accurately and reliably, from Chrystostom's works and homilies. Meyer, 'Historical Reliability of Palladius' 6.

[60] On this controversy, see Paul A. Patterson, *Visions of Christ: The anthropomorphite controversy of 399 CE*, Studies and Texts in Antiquity and Christianity 68 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), and Mark DelCogliano, 'Situating Sarapion's Sorrow: The Anthropomorphite Controversy as the Historical and Theological Context of Cassian's Tenth Conference on Pure Prayer' *Cistercian Studies Quarterly* 38:4 (2003) 377–421.

for espousing the Origenian teaching of the incorporeality of divine vision.[61] The refugees appealed to John Chrysostom to intercede on their behalf with their pope. Chrysostom supported the monks and appointed many of them to church offices.[62] They later reconciled with Theophilus, and it can be assumed that at least some of them, or their entourage, returned to Egypt.[63]

Furthermore, there is a story, in both the Alphabetical and the Systematic Collections, of a certain priest Eulogius,[64] follower of Chrysostom, who visited abba Joseph of Panephis together with his disciples.[65] Last but not least, it is not impossible that the saying under consideration drew on one of Chrysostom's many lost writings, which the desert fathers might have read or heard about.[66]

---

[61] Palladius, *Dialogue on the Life of St. John Chrysostom* 44–46. Kenneth G. Holum, *Theodosian Empresses: Women and Imperial Dominion in Late Antiquity* (University of California Press, 1989) 73. Robert Morgan, *History of the Coptic Orthodox People and the Church of Egypt* (Friesen Press, 2016) 97–99. David Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy: The Coherence of his Theology and Preaching* (Oxford University Press, 2014) 59. Donald B. Spanel, 'Theophilus' in *CE*, vol. 7 (Macmillan: 1991) 2249b–2250b. Online in *CCE*: http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cce/id/1881 (last accessed 15/7/2017). Brakke, *Demons and the Making of the Monk* 127, 135.

[62] Palladius, *Dialogue on the Life of St. John Chrysostom* 46–47. Steven D. Driver, *John Cassian and the Reading of Egyptian Monastic Culture* (Routledge, 2013) 16–17.

[63] DelCogliano, 'Situating Sarapion's Sorrow' 392. Among these monks was John Cassian who remained in Constantinople for some time and was ordained a deacon by Chrysostom. Driver, *John Cassian* 13, 16. While there is no evidence about Cassian's arrival in Egypt after his leaving Constantinople, it is quite possible that he was in Palestine when another controversy over Origen arose, this time under the guise of Pelagianism and its supporters. Driver, *John Cassian* 11. And it is in Palestine where the *Sayings of the Desert Fathers* were first compiled in the 5th and the 6th centuries. Jonathan L. Zecher, *The Role of Death in the Ladder of Divine Ascent and the Greek Ascetic Tradition* (Oxford University Press, 2015) 25. Regnault, 'Apophthegmata Patrum' 177a. Guy, *Les Apophtegmes* 83–84.

[64] On Eulogius see: L. V. Luchovitzkiy and T. A. Artuychova, 'Evlogiy' in *Pravoslavnaja Enciklopedija*, vol. 17 (Moscow, 2008) 157–58. The same online at: http://www.pravenc.ru/text/187175.html (last accessed 15/7/2017) [in Russian].

[65] Εὐλόγιός τις ὀνόματι μαθητὴς γενόμενος τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰωάννου τοῦ ἀρχιεπισκόπου (*Les Apophtegmes* VIII, 4). Εὐλόγιός τις, μαθητὴς γενόμενος τοῦ μακαριωτάτου Ἰωάννου ἐπισκόπου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως (*Τὸ Μέγα Γεροντικόν* Η 6). Εὐλόγιός τις μαθητὴς γενόμενος τοῦ μακαρίου Ἰωάννου τοῦ Ἀρχιεπισκόπου (*Τὸ Γεροντικόν* 32). Note the use of the word μακάριος in the sense of ἅγιος. See the English translations of these stories in *The Book of the Elders* 124 and in *The Sayings of the Desert Fathers* 60–61.

[66] At the presentation of the paper at the Seventh St Andrew's Patristic Symposium (Sydney, 2016), Dr Graham Lovell (Macquarie alumnus) pointed out that there are several patristic antecedents of oral teaching of an earlier father, which survived together with works of the same, and being written down at a later stage by another father. He gave an example (drawing on his doctoral research) of the oral teachings of St Gregory the Wonderworker of Neocaesarea, which have been handed on in the family of St Basil the Great, being written down by St Gregory of Nyssa. He supposed that nothing stands against my argument, and that the text I discuss is from either a lost Chrysostomic work or an oral saying transmitted

To conclude, in several Greek manuscripts and editions of the Systematic Collection of the *Sayings of the Desert Fathers*, one saying is attributed to St John Chrysostom. The same saying, in a much more extended form, filled with numerous biblical quotations and allusions, occurs in three writings, two of them ascribed to St Ephrem the Syrian and one among the *spuria* of St John Chrysostom. In fact, there is so much common material between these three writings, that one can suppose that they are the work of the same author (but not St Ephrem). However, the question of their authorship and authenticity—as well as the authorship and authenticity of the extended version of these (supposed) Chrysostomic words—can be finally resolved only after a thorough study of their manuscript tradition. In any case, it is clear that the compiler(s) of the Systematic Collection borrowed it directly from one of the works in which it occurs.

As for the short version, things are a bit more complicated here. On the one hand, it is quite different from the larger version to accept direct quotation. Its concise and clear style fully matches the meaning of an apophthegm. Moreover, there is no striking difference between its linguistic features and the linguistic features of other Chrysostomic works, or evidence against the authenticity of that saying (in its better attested short version). It is most probable that these are genuine words of St John Chrysostom, heard or read by the author(s) and/or compiler(s) of the Systematic Collection. In addition, the wisdom of Chrysostom, at least through some of his disciples, like Palladius or Eulogius the Priest, was well known to the desert fathers and eventually to the compiler(s) of the *Sayings*. In my opinion, the saying in question should be considered genuine and included in future editions of the Systematic Collection of the *Sayings*. On the other hand, if we have genuine words of St John Chrysostom, attested (though in altered form) in one work ascribed to him (and misattributed to St Ephrem), maybe then it is time to reconsider our idea of the Chrysostom *spuria* as containing some, albeit a small, nucleus of genuine Chrysostomic material—and not reject them as totally inauthentic and pseudepigraphical?

Select Bibliography

Antoine Guillaumont, 'Palladius' *CE* vol. 6 (Macmillan: 1991): 1876b-77b. Online in *CCE*: http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/cdm/singleitem/collection/cce/id/1506/rec/2 (last accessed 15/7/2017).

by disciples of Chrysostom.

Brakke, David. *Demons and the Making of the Monk: Spiritual Combat in Early Christianity*. Cambridge, MA and London, England: Harvard University Press, 2006.
Brock, Sebastian P. *St. Ephrem: A Brief Guide to the Main Editions and Translations*. Available at http://syri.ac/brock/ephrem (last accessed 16/7/2017).
Crowell, Trevor Fiske. *The Biblical Homilies of Ephraem Graecus* [diss., The Catholic University of America, School of Theology and Religious Studies, 2016]. Available at http://cuislandora.wrlc.org/islandora/object/cuislandora%3A40876/datastream/PDF/view (last accessed 17/7/2017).
Driver, Steven D. *John Cassian and the Reading of Egyptian Monastic Culture*. New York and London: Routledge, 2013.
Forness, Philip Michael. *A Brief Guide to Syriac Homilies* (Version 3, updated 4 March 2016) 13. Available at http://syri.ac/sites/default/files/A_Brief_Guide_to_Syriac_Homilies_-_Versi.pdf (last accessed 16/7/2017).
Gould, Graham. 'A Note on the *Apophthegmata Patrum*' *Journal of Theological Studies* 37 (1986) 133–38.
Griffith, Sidney. 'St. Ephraem the Syrian, a Spiritual Teacher for Today.' *The Harp* 16 (2003) 171–94. The same at: http://www.lectio-divina.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=feature.display&feature_id=31 (last accessed 16/7/2017).
Guy, Jean-Claude. 'Remarques sur le texte des *Apophthegmata Patrum*' *Recherches de science religieuse* 43 (1959) 252–58.
Harmless, William. *Desert Christians: An Introduction to the Literature of Early Monasticism*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.
Kim, Jung. *Catechesis and Mystagogy in St. Ephrem the Syrian: The Liturgy of Baptism and the Madrashe* [diss., Boston University, School of Theology, 2013]. Available at https://open.bu.edu/bitstream/handle/2144/8464/kim_jung_thd_2013.pdf?sequence=1 (last accessed 16/7/2017).
Meyer, Robert T. 'Historical Reliability of Palladius.' In Palladius (Bishop of Aspuna), *Dialogue on the Life of St. John Chrysostom*. Edited by Meyer, 6-10. The Newman Press, 1985.
Regnault, Lucien. 'Apophthegmata Patrum.' In *The Coptic Encyclopedia* (*CE*), vol. 1 (Macmillan: 1991) 177a-78a. The same online in *Claremont Coptic Encyclopedia* (*CCE*): http://ccdl.libraries.claremont.edu/cdm/ref/collection/cce/id/174 (last accessed 19/7/2017).
Rubenson, Samuel. *The Letters of St. Antony: Monasticism and the Making of a Saint*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995.
Siegal, Michal Bar-Asher. *Early Christian Monastic Literature and the Babylonian Talmud*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013.

Theologian, exegete, rhetor

Chapter Five

Volition in Christ
Would Chrysostom and Maximus Have Agreed?

Adam G. Cooper

At the Lateran Synod of 649, the public reading of a lengthy patristic Florilegium in the fifth and final session brought the dyothelete case to its culmination. The recruitment of Church Fathers as authorities augmenting the Church's conciliar and biblical tradition had been practiced long before by Cyril of Alexandria, and the Council of Chalcedon had similarly iterated its fidelity to previous patristic authorities. In 553 at the Fifth Ecumenical Council, this tactic received formal ratification. At the Lateran Council, in the new context of the controversy over Christ's volition and activity, the participants believed that existing scriptural and conciliar pronouncements were sufficient to decide the debate at hand. Nevertheless, they felt impelled to clinch their case by adducing supporting statements compiled from personal authorities widely considered orthodox by all stakeholders in the debate.[1]

[1] On the emergence of the Florilegia genre as an instance of polemico-controversialist patristic developments, see Lorenzo Perrone, 'The Impact of the Dogma of Chalcedon on Theological Thought between the Fourth and Fifth Ecumenical Councils' in Angelo Di Berardino and Basil Studer (eds), *History of Theology: The Patristic Period* vol. 1, trans. Matthew J. O'Connell (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1996) 414–60; Aloys Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition* vol. 2 part 1, trans. Pauline Allen and John Cawte (London: Mowbrays, 1987) 55–77.

Among the twenty or so Fathers featured in the Florilegium appears the figure of John Chrysostom.

Chrysostom's importance for the dyothelete agenda must have been thought quite considerable. A fresco commissioned for the church of Maria Antiqua in Rome just after the Synod ranks him alongside no lesser figures than Basil the Great, Gregory the Theologian, and Pope Leo as an authoritative proponent of the doctrine of two wills in Christ.[2] At the Lateran Synod, the passages quoted from Chrysostom's writings account for only four of the 123 passages presented in support of the dyothelete case. Of these, one has since proved to be inauthentic. Another appears in the section on the 'two energies' doctrine. The remaining two, however, feature within what has been considered "the most important" section "for the purposes of the synod," namely, the third section 'On the natural wills of Christ our God.'[3] Herein lay the crux of the issue. What had originally begun as an unsettled discussion over how best to account for Christ's activity (or *energeia*) had developed into the more pointed and politically charged debate over Christ's volitional activity, that is, the question of his "natural wills." It was in relation to this question in particular, and perhaps in reaction to the increasing intrusion of the state into this sensitive yet sophisticated theological controversy, that Maximus the Confessor had decisively entered the fray and allied himself with the "hard-line dyotheletism" that had been developing in Sicily and Italy.[4] His contribution to the Lateran Synod can hardly be exaggerated. In fact most of the passages in the Florilegium, including the four attributed to John Chrysostom, were drawn directly from the Confessor's *Opusculum* 15, composed a year or two before the synod.[5]

The task Maximus and his dyothelete confreres set for themselves was first of all to show that the 'one will' formulation preferred by the imperially sponsored theologians was a distorting innovation in Christological tradition.

---

[2] See Eileen Rubery, 'Papal Opposition to Imperial Heresies: Text and Image in the Church of Santa Maria Antiqua in the Time of Pope Martin I' *Studia Patristica* 50 (2011) 3–30. The fresco depicts the four figures each holding up a scroll with a (supposed) anti-monothelete quotation from their respective works. The quote presented by Chrysostom has since been shown to be spurious. See also Phil Booth, *Crisis of Empire: Doctrine and Dissent at the End of Late Antiquity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2014) 189–90.

[3] Richard Price, Phil Booth, and Catherine Cubitt, *The Acts of the Lateran Synod of 649* (Translated Texts for Historians vol. 61, Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2014) 291.

[4] Demetrios Bathrellos, *The Byzantine Christ: Person, Nature, and Will in the Christology of St Maximus the Confessor* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004) 200.

[5] Marek Jankowiak and Phil Booth, 'A New Date-List of the Works of Maximus the Confessor' in Pauline Allen and Bronwen Neil (eds), *The Oxford Handbook of Maximus the Confessor* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015) 19–83 at 65–66; Price, Booth and Cubitt, *The Acts of the Lateran Synod* 288–89.

Second, and just as importantly, they wanted to present a positive case for the 'two activities' and 'two wills' Christology, by demonstrating that activity and will, in congruence with their signification in Trinitarian theology, properly denote ontological powers and constitutive manifestations of an intelligent being's nature. And since Christ, as all good Chalcedonians affirmed, is 'from' and 'in' two natures, activity and will in him are also necessarily twofold.

Yet however coherent and correct this position may be, the dyotheletes struggled to overcome an important difficulty. Not only had Maximus himself in his earlier theology readily used the 'one activity' and 'one will' formulations, but, as recent studies on the monothelete crisis have argued, there appeared to be at least as much support in conventional doctrinal tradition for the monothelete Christological position as there was for dyotheletism. Indeed, it could be argued that Maximus's dyothelete Christology is only fully appreciated when it is understood as a polemically induced, philosophically dependent, politically charged, and historically expedient doctrinal development running somewhat against the tide of more traditional Cyrillian Chalcedonianism.

A critical issue on which the resolution of this difficulty partly turned was how best to interpret the apparent conflict of wills expressed in Christ's prayer to his heavenly Father in the Garden of Gethsemane, as recounted in the Gospels. It was on this question that both parties looked to the exegesis of earlier Fathers, including John Chrysostom.[6] Chrysostom was a master of biblical exposition. Some have gone so far as to hail his commentaries and homilies as the richest exegetical legacy of the entire Greek patristic tradition.[7] But to what extent did his own treatment of the Gethsemane prayer support Maximus' dyothelete Christology? Of course, with so many centuries separating the two figures, and with the passage of such tumultuous Christological crises and developments during that time, we should not expect anything like a direct doctrinal correspondence. We should also note the emphasis in John's Christology upon soteriological and moral factors. John shows little interest in the kind of erudite metaphysical questions that were commonplace in later Christology. He made almost no reference to issues related to the Apollinarian crisis, and, with his life over well before

[6] Traditional interpretations of the Gethsemane prayer are covered briefly by Bathrellos, *Byzantine Christ* 140–47. For an extensive study on the role of Gregory Nazianzen's exegesis of Gethsemane in the context of the monothelete controversy, see François-Marie Léthel, *Théologie de l'Agonie du Christ: la liberté humaine di fils de Dieu et son importance sotériologique mises en lumière par Saint Maxime le Confesseur* (Paris: Beauchesne, 1979).

[7] Chrysostomus Baur, *John Chrysostom and His Time* vol. 1, part 1 (Westminster, MD: Newman Press, 1959) 322.

the Nestorian controversy, as both Aloys Grillmeier and Rowan Greer have concurred, the "typically Antiochene difficulties in the interpretation of the unity of Christ" simply do not exist for him.[8] Having said that, not a few Chrysostom scholars believe that he held a basically dyothelete Christology, albeit in a more primitive, implicit, and unsophisticated form. Joseph Juzek, for example, in his seminal 1912 thesis on Chrysostom's Christology, argued on the basis of John's exposition of the Gethsemane prayer for a two wills Christology, one divine will and one human, and believed that Chrysostom's reference to the "unequal blending" (κρᾶσις ἄνισος) of activities in Christ signals neither monenergism nor subordinationism, but rather anticipates the Dionysian and Maximian doctrine of Christ's "theandric activity."[9] Chrysostomus Baur similarly claimed that Chrysostom "indirectly" taught two wills in Christ.[10] And most recently Margaret A. Schatkin has argued that Chrysostom "clearly" taught a two wills Christology like that of the Sixth Ecumenical Council, albeit with several lacunae.[11]

First Passage

Maximus concurs with all these modern scholars, and his selection of the two key passages for the Florilegium is guided by his determination to prove that the great Antiochene exegete was a full-blown 4th century dyothelete. Yet only one of the two passages has John directly expounding the Gethsemane prayer. The first of these, taken from Chrysostom's homilies *Against the Anomoeans*, concerns Christ's words "Not as I will but as you will." It reads as follows:

> For if this statement were about the divinity, a contradiction would result, and many bizarre consequences would follow therefrom. But if these words are about the flesh, no criticism need follow. For the flesh not wishing to die is no reason for condemnation; for this is natural, and he displayed all the characteristics of nature apart from sin, and this in abundance, to stop the mouths of the heretics. So when he said, 'If this is possible, let this cup pass from me' and 'Not as I will but as you will,' this simply showed that he was

[8] Rowan A. Greer, *The Captain of Our Salvation: A Study in the Patristic Exegesis of Hebrews*, Beitraege zur Geschichte der Biblischen Exegese 15 (Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1973) 276–77; Aloys Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition* vol. 1*: From the Apostolic Age to Chalcedon*, trans. J. S. Bowden (London: A. R. Mowbray, 1965) 338.

[9] Joseph Hermenegild Juzek, *Die Christologie des hl. Johannes Chrysostomus: Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Dogmatik der Antiochener* (Breslau, 1912) 46–51.

[10] Baur, *John Chrysostom and His Time* 358.

[11] Margaret A. Schatkin, 'New Perspectives on the Christology of St. John Chrysostom' in Pier Franco Beatrice and Bernard Pouderon (eds), *Pascha Nostrum Christus: Essays in Honour of Raniero Cantalamessa* (Théologie Historique 123, Paris: Beauchesne, 2016) 213–32.

> truly encompassed by flesh that feared death; for fearing and shunning death and being in anguish pertain to it.[12]

At first glance, it is difficult to see how this passage supports the dyothelete position. The key point seems to lie in its rejection of the idea that the prayer of Christ to avoid the cross arises from his divine will, and its proposal that it instead arises from the natural instinct of his human nature to shun death. But was this not also precisely the same doctrine taught by the monotheletes? Their opposition to dyothelete doctrine stemmed from their conviction that the formula 'two wills' necessarily implies two *opposed* wills, or even two volitional agents.[13] Their Christological pronouncements indicate that, like Chrysostom in this passage, they acknowledged the presence in Christ of instinctive, natural human motions in the form of desires, inclinations, and feelings, which in the Gethsemane event manifested themselves as a shrinking away from death. But far from opposing the divine will or operating independently or on their own initiative, the monothelete teachers taught that these instinctive motions were wholly subordinated by the incarnate Logos to his personal divine mission. The statement of the Imperial *Ekthesis* from 636[14] along these lines is entirely traditional:

> We confess one will of our Lord Jesus Christ, true God, such that at no time did his rationally ensouled flesh separately and on its own initiative perform its natural movement in a manner contrary to the command of God the Word hypostatically united to it, but God the Word himself decided when and how and to what extent.[15]

---

[12] *De consubstantiali* [= Contra Anomoeos VII] (PG 48, 765–66); Price et al. 326–77 (modified by me). In some commentators this work is also known as *On the Incomprehensible Nature of God*.

[13] "In a similar way the expression 'the two activities' scandalizes many, on the grounds that it was uttered by none of the holy and select spiritual leaders of the church, and certainly to follow it is to uphold also two wills at variance with one another, such that while God the Word wished to fulfil the salvific suffering, his humanity resisted and opposed him with its own will, and as a result two persons with conflicting wills are introduced, which is impious and foreign to Christian teaching." *Ekthesis* in Pauline Allen (trans.), *Sophronius of Jerusalem and Seventh-Century Heresy: The Synodical Letter and Other Documents* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009) 215. See further Marek Jankowiak, 'The Invention of Dyothelitism' *Studia Patristica* 63 (2013) 335–42; Booth, *Crisis of Empire*; Richard Price, 'Monotheletism: A Heresy or a Form of Words?' *Studia Patristica* 48 (2013) 221–32; Price, Booth and Cubitt, *The Acts of the Lateran Synod* 1–108.

[14] Traditional dating is 638. But here we follow Jankowiak's revised dating, cited by Pauline Allen, 'Life and Times of Maximus the Confessor' in *The Oxford Handbook of Maximus the Confessor*, eds. Pauline Allen and Bronwen Neil (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015) 3–18 at 5.

[15] *Ekthesis* in Allen, *Sophronius* 215 (trans. slightly altered by me). A later discussion (August 656) between Maximus and the monothelete Bishop Theodosius during the former's exile

Furthermore, exactly the same rationale was employed by the dyotheletes themselves in their earlier writings. In the great Synodical Letter of Sophronius of Jerusalem (who was Maximus' spiritual master and quite possibly the person most responsible for propelling the Confessor into the public arena),[16] we find Sophronius explaining various scriptural references to Christ's experiences of hunger, thirst, tiredness and pain as the Son's orchestrated and carefully controlled demonstrations of his true humanity.

> For when he [one and the same Christ and Son] wished he gave his human nature the occasion to activate and suffer what was proper to it, lest his far-famed incarnation be judged some kind of illusion and a hollow spectacle. For he did not take these things upon himself against his will or under necessity … But sometimes the same one decided to suffer and operate and act in a human fashion, and resolved to help those who were watching, on whose account he had in truth become a human being, and not when natural and fleshly movements wished to be moved naturally to activity…[17]

For Sophronius here, as for his monothelete opponents and earlier also for Chrysostom, Christ's human volitional activity is thought of as limited to the level of instinctive physiological and emotional dynamisms. Any decisive agency and ruling determination is exercised solely by the enfleshed Logos. So far then, it appears, the Lateran Synod's invocation of Chrysostom's exegesis of Gethsemane has added nothing of substance to the dyothelete case.

There is however another possible reason this excerpt was used, which only comes to light when you compare its reproduction here in the Lateran Florilegium to its earlier appearance in Maximus's Florilegium in *Opusculum* 15. The comparison shows that the excerpt has undergone significant editorial redaction, a slicing away of the earlier portion of Chrysostom's exegesis where he had explicitly used the formula 'two wills,' which the dyotheletes would have liked, but in the same breath regarded those two wills as "at odds with one another" (δύο θελήματα … ἐναντία ἀλλήλοις), which of course they would not have liked. An analysis of the entire passage in its original setting in fact uncovers quite a complicated rhetorical train of thought.[18]

---

in Bizya confirms the monotheletes' anxiety over the word "two," even while they accepted a "twofold or double will" (*thelesin diplen*, *ditten*). Theodosius says: "We confess that his divinity has a will, and his humanity has a will … But we do not speak of two (*dyo*), lest we introduce him as being at war with himself." See Pauline Allen and Bronwen Neil (eds), *Maximus the Confessor and Companions: Documents from Exile* (Oxford Early Christian Texts, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002) 96–97.

[16] On the leading role of Sophronius in the anti-monothelete coalition, see Booth, *Crisis of Empire*.

[17] Sophronius of Jerusalem, *Synodical Letter* 2.3.13 (Allen 107).

[18] PG 48, 765–66. Both portions of the passage are translated and analysed by Melvin E.

John has been trying to respond to those who find Christ's expression of fear and hesitation in the face of death unworthy of God. And at one level John concedes this point. But that is because he believes that Christ in Gethsemane is not simply praying "as God." That is, we are not dealing with an unqualified divine expression here, but one through which the incarnate Son gives voice to a truly human instinct, which belongs to him on account of the economy. The tension expressed in the words, "Not my will but your will be done," indicates a struggle, says John, between "two wills opposed to one another." Moreover, he even attributes those opposed wills to the Son and the Father respectively: "one is the Son's," he says, "while the other is the Father's" (ἓν μὲν Υἱοῦ, ἓν δὲ Πατρὸς). However, the opposition between them arises not out of any difference between the Father and the Son as divine persons, for the will and purpose of the godhead is one. Rather it arises inasmuch as the Son here, being incarnate, is giving expression to the natural inclination of his flesh to avoid death. It is indeed the incarnate Son's will that here stands opposed to the Father's will, but by the Son's will Chrysostom means neither the will of the Son as God, nor even the rational or higher volitional power of human nature, but the lower instinctive physiological and emotional inclination which is Christ's by virtue of the incarnate economy.

It was Chrysostom's use of the "two wills opposed to one another" formula here that the scholars Juzek and Baur cited in support of their claim that Chrysostom taught a two wills Christology.[19] And that was possibly also Maximus' thought when he included the longer excerpt in his *Opusculum* 15 Florilegium. By the time of the Lateran Synod, however, it must have become evident that John's two wills formula did little to support the dyothelete case, and may in fact have severely undermined it. The Lateran Fathers therefore found themselves having to limit themselves to quoting the shorter, more apposite exposition that affirms the Son's divine will on the one hand and the natural inclination of his human constitution on the other. Which in the end, as we have just indicated, says nothing beyond what the monotheletes themselves wanted to say.

Lawrenz III, *The Christology of John Chrysostom* (Lewiston: Mellen University Press, 1996) 69–70 and 78–80. Lawrenz's conclusions concur with my own as well as those of Camillus Hay, 'St John Chrysostom and the Integrity of the Human Nature of Christ' *Franciscan Studies* 19:3–4 (1959) 298–317.

[19] Chrysostom also uses the "two wills opposed to one another" formula in *In illud: Pater si possibile est* 3 (PG 51, 36; NPNF 9, 204–5), with more or less the same explanation of the Gethsemane prayer as here. See further Lawrenz, *The Christology of John Chrysostom* 81–82.

Second Passage

The second passage selected by Maximus and the Lateran Florilegium treats Jesus' words in John 12:27–28, in which, with troubled heart the Lord asks: "What shall I say? Father save me from this hour? No, it was for this very reason that I came to this hour. Father, glorify your name." In his *Homilies on John*, Chrysostom comments as follows:

> This greatly reveals what was human and the nature that did not want to die but clung to the present life, showing that he was not without human emotions. For just as hunger is not an offence and nor is sleeping, so neither is attachment to the present life. Christ had a body free of sins, but not sundered from the necessities of nature. Otherwise, it would not have been a body.[20]

Once again Chrysostom here limits the human volitional activity in the scenario to the physiological, emotional, and instinctive level. Christ's attachment to temporal life is classified along with hunger and the desire for sleep as a blameless natural emotion and a necessary corollary of physical existence. John does not go as far as Maximus and the dyotheletes who interpret such scriptural data as expressing an innate but non-divisive tension *within* Christ's humanity between his sub-rational desires and his rational will. The proposal of a rational human volitional movement to explain the two-sided character of Christ's prayer, instead of the traditional interpretations which find in it rather a tension between Christ's divinity and his physical and emotional instincts, appears for the first time only in Maximus' dyothelete exegesis.

With this excerpt, the invocation of Chrysostom by Maximus and the Lateran Synod Fathers to bolster their specifically dyothelete Christology ends. Why did they limit themselves to just these two passages in the massive Chrysostomian corpus? Quite possibly it had to do with what was available to them in the manuscript tradition. However it could also have been due to the fact that the relevant exegetical commentary in John's works further confirms, rather than contradicts, the monothelete reading of Scripture. Two additional examples, both of which were famously analysed by Camillus Hay for their bearing upon Chrysostom's doctrine of Christ's volitional activity, directly support this suggestion.[21]

[20] *Hom. in Joan*. 67.2 (PG 59, 371); Price, Booth and Cubitt, *The Acts of the Lateran Synod* 327.
[21] Hay, 'St John Chrysostom and the Integrity of the Human Nature of Christ.'

Third Passage

The first of these comes from Homily 83 on Matthew 26:36–38. John here engages in what might seem like a more Nestorian form of exegesis of Gethsemane, in which the differing parts of Christ's prayer appear to be attributed to one or the other nature. David Rylaarsdam, however, has cautioned against such a conclusion, pointing out that like any other anti-Arian theologians of his time, Chrysostom commonly distinguishes between "lofty statements and actions that refer to Christ's divinity and lowly ones that refer to the οἰκονομία," without this distinction in any way indicating "a definition of Christ's essential being."22 Quite unlike Nestorius, argues Rylaarsdam, Chrysostom never regards Christ's human nature as an agent or subject of attribution in its own right. But let us hear what John himself has to say:

> By saying then, "If it be possible, let it pass from me," he showed his humanity; but by saying, "Nevertheless not as I will, but as you will," he showed his virtue and self-command, teaching us even when nature pulls us back, to follow God.

Again, Chrysostom discerns in the two parts of the prayer a double movement within Christ: one characterised by the natural repugnance of the human constitution towards death, the other by an assertive and decisive determination to fulfil the divine will.[23] The former movement is explained primarily in terms of the accommodation or concession motif, common to many patristic writers. The display of emotion serves to confirm the reality of the Son's incarnation and passion in the face of all docetising doubts. But what about the second part of the prayer? Here, manifesting "his virtue and self-command," the Son teaches us how to overcome any physiological or emotional resistance to the divine will. This prompts the question how Christ can model moral strength and self-command for us if it does not arise from his human volition. On this score Schatkin and others argue that John at the very least implies here the presence of rational human volitional activity in Christ. But no support can be found here for the dyothelete proposal of a double movement *within* Christ's humanity, that is, between his sub-rational drives and rational human volition. For Chrysostom, that would be to introduce major confusion as to the identity of the 'I' in the second part

---

[22] David Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy: The Coherence of his Theology and Preaching* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014) 143–44.

[23] NPNF 10 at 497.

of the prayer, since, as far as John is concerned, "The ultimate subject of all Christ's human words and action is the Son of God."[24]

Fourth Passage

The other passage in Chrysostom's writings examined by Hay is not expressly Christological, but rather expounds the pericope at the end of John's Gospel (John 21:18) in which Jesus reveals to the Apostle Peter what kind of death he will die.[25] According to Chrysostom's exegesis, the words of Jesus bring to light a tension within Peter's volitional experience. Throughout the Gospels, the Apostle repeatedly declares his desire to suffer and die for Christ. And yet here Jesus refers to Peter's future death as an object he would rather avoid: "When you are old, you shall stretch forth your hands, and someone else shall gird you and lead you where you would not go." How can one reconcile this contrariety of wills in Peter, the will to die, and the will not to die? The answer, writes Chrysostom, lies in distinguishing between the natural "tendency to self-preservation on the part of the flesh," and the will with which we make concrete determinations and choices that, in many cases, over-ride our physical and emotional instincts. In John's words:

> [Christ] was referring to the feelings of our human nature, and the tendency to self-preservation on the part of the flesh, and meant that the soul unwillingly becomes separated from the body. So that, even if the will is firm, the flesh is weak nevertheless. For no one lays his body aside without a struggle, since God has ordained this in order to minimise the number of self-inflicted deaths.

Here we find a psychological distinction between two levels of human volitional or appetitive motion that Maximus will later apply to the humanity of Christ. In so doing Maximus inaugurates a new move in Christology. When other authors prior to the 7th century make Christological use of this anthropological distinction, they apply it not to Christ's humanity, so as to demonstrate its correspondence to ours, but rather to his entire divine and human composition, with the rational will (and its ability to embrace suffering and death for some higher good) representing Christ's divine volitional activity, and the physical drives (which include the natural repugnance towards death) representing his human flesh. As an aside, it is somewhat ironic to note that a century before Maximus, it was the great

[24] Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy* 143–44.
[25] *In Joan*. 88.1 (PG 59, 479).

Oriental Bishop Severus of Antioch, writing against what he considered to be the all-too-dualistic Christology of the Chalcedonian John the Grammarian, who used the analogy in just this way. "Do we not see in the human being," he wrote, "how he can now spontaneously demand nourishment … but then also reflect on that and despise the material food, and in its place surrender himself to heavenly thoughts in desiring likeness to God? Thus there are two wills in a human being: one wills what is of the flesh, the other what is of the soul created according to the image of God."[26] Here, just as Maximus does later, Severus clearly affirms the presence of two kinds of intentional motion within the one, unified human being: a lower-order instinctive drive, and a higher-order conscious and rational resolve. On this score, at least, Maximus and Severus are at one. Where the two differ however is the use they make of this anthropological insight. For Severus, the distinction functions as no more than an analogy illustrating the presence in Christ of two salvific wills, one divine and the other human.

Turning back to Chrysostom, however, we must ask whether, like Maximus, he applies this intra-human volitional distinction to Christ's humanity. It seems quite clear that he does not. For Camillus Hay, Chrysostom's exposition of this Johannine passage conclusively confirms that one may not credit him with a two wills Christology. Even less can we accept Juzek's, Baur's, and Schatkin's versions according to which those two wills are at odds.[27] Hay concludes that Chrysostom

> emphatically affirms the reality of the emotional and physical actions and passions of Christ, which are to be attributed to the flesh and not to the divine nature. However, the flesh acts and suffers only when permitted to do so by the Divine Person, and then for the purpose of proving its reality.[28]

Fifth Passage

Before we come to our concluding comments, there is one final passage in Chrysostom's work which we should consider. It appears in his *Homily on John*

---

[26] Quoted in Grillmeier, *Christ in Christian Tradition* vol. 2 part 2: *The Church of Constantinople in the Sixth Century,* trans. Pauline Allen and John Cawte (London: Mowbray, 1995) 167.

[27] Hay, 'St John Chrysostom and the Integrity of the Human Nature of Christ' 309.

[28] Hay, 'St John Chrysostom and the Integrity of the Human Nature of Christ' 313. Hay is followed by Grillmeier, who concludes: "In effect, Chrysostom nowhere affirms an intellectual or volitional activity of Christ, nor does he ever explicitly indicate the presence of a human intellect and will in Christ." *Christ in Christian Tradition* vol. 1 (1965) 338.

10:17–18 concerning Jesus' voluntary fulfilment of his Father's command to lay down his life. The relevant verses in the Gospel read:

> The reason my Father loves me is that I lay down my life, only to take it up again. No one takes it from me, but I lay it down of my own accord… This command I received from my Father.

Challenging Hay's confident denial of a two wills Christology in Chrysostom, Rowan Greer finds in the Goldenmouth's exposition of this text "a full statement of Christ's human will."[29] According to Greer, Chrysostom's commentary on these words requires us to understand Christ's human nature as a real subject of volitional action. What John wants to say, says Greer, is that "the human nature died not to pay the penalty for its own sin, but voluntarily; and this power, as well as the power to be raised again, was conferred upon it by the Word."[30]

But is this in fact what Chrysostom either says or intends? Consider the following sentences from Chrysostom's homily. With these words, he says, Christ wanted "to establish the point that it was not unwillingly (οὐκ ἄκων) that he went to his death. Yet," John asks, "who does not have the power to lay down his own life? For anyone who wants to can take his own life." But that is not what Jesus meant. Rather—and here is a crucial phrase—he was referring to a power and freedom unique to himself "that is not possible in the case of any human being" (ὅπερ ἐπὶ ἀνθρώπων οὐκ ἔνι), for in our case anyone can kill us against our will. "He was making it clear that he willed the attack on his life and was removing the suspicion of his coming in opposition to the Father." The command mentioned here in no way indicates any kind of resistance on Christ's part or need for external compulsion, but serves "as proof of his complete harmony with the Father." Indeed, the very reason he did not avoid his passion and death was precisely because "he is the Son of God."[31]

These representative excerpts hardly support Greer's claim. On the contrary, they make it clear that Chrysostom understands the subject of the volitional disposition and acts in question to be the divine Son. Greer believes this passage requires us at least to qualify the denial of a two wills Christology in Chrysostom. He agrees that while Chrysostom "nowhere explicitly states that Christ has a fully autonomous human will" and that

---

[29] Greer, *Captain of our Salvation* 278.

[30] Ibid. 279.

[31] *Hom. in Joan*. 60 in *Saint John Chrysostom: Commentary on Saint John the Apostle and Evangelist Homilies 48–88*, trans. Sister Thomas Aquinas Goggin [Fathers of the Church vol. 41, Washington D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1959] 138–40 (PG 59, 330–31).

his emphasis "is rather upon the divine activity in Christ," this is to be explained by John's alleged "reluctance to become embroiled in controversy and presumptuous prying into mysteries that cannot be explained by human reason."[32] Whatever one makes of this rationale, it seems to me that in none of the homiletical expositions that we have examined concerning Christ's volitional action does Chrysostom extend and apply to Christ's humanity his own two-dimensional, instinctive/rational anthropological distinction. In every case, conscious and decisive volitional action in Christ is singular and divine. This finding accords more widely with Chrysostom's general reluctance explicitly to attribute to Christ's humanity a whole complex of psychological dimensions and moral categories which normally characterise his anthropology, as represented by such terms as *gnome*, *nous*, *boulesis*, *proairesis*, and so on.[33]

Conclusion

Having now examined five key texts in Chrysostom's writings, including the two which were included in the Florilegium used by Maximus and the Lateran Synod to support their dyothelete Christology, we can now at last come back to the question posed in the title of this study on volition in Christ: would Chrysostom and Maximus have agreed?

On the basis of our analysis, and despite the dissent of several venerable Chrysostom scholars who have argued in support of a two-wills Christology in Chrysostom, we would have to answer with a resolute 'no.' Both Maximus and John discerned two levels of volitional motion in human experience, one conscious and rational and the other emotional and physical, but of the two only Maximus used this distinction to explain the evident tension within Christ's humanity between his desire on the one hand to avoid death, and

[32] Greer, *Captain of our Salvation* 279–80.

[33] See Raymond Laird, *Mindset, Moral Choice and Sin in the Anthropology of John Chrysostom* (Strathfield: St Pauls, 2012). There is no doubt, of course, that Chrysostom explicitly attributes a human soul and body to Christ, and therewith implies Christ's possession of powers and activities proper to soul and body. The question remains however whether John adequately accounts for a distinctly human volitional activity in Christ's actions and redemptive mission. I find Schatkin's defence of Juzek's original thesis on this score unconvincing, not least on account of its rather anachronistic appeal to the findings of modern brain science to argue that since volitional activity is located [sic] in the brain, and Christ had a brain, therefore he had volitional activity, and this is what Chrysostom correctly (!) believed. The main salient point in Schatkin's article lies in her insistence—along with Ashish J. Naidu and others—on Chrysostom's understanding of Christ as an exemplar for our imitation, which of course presupposes and implies certain common anthropological powers and activities.

his determination to fulfil the Father's will on the other. For Chrysostom, by contrast, Christ's express determination to fulfil the Father's will issues from his personal, divine agency as the Son, who freely gives voice to the natural proclivities of his flesh only in order to prove the veracity of his humanisation and to exemplify moral excellence for us.[34]

As noted earlier, Chrysostom's importance for the dyothelete case must have been thought considerable. Yet John's Christology possessed a remarkably Alexandrine ring, rendering it unsuitable for combatting the monothelete agenda without substantial interpretative gymnastics. Where it could have been more useful was in wanting to affirm Christ's unique theandric agency and in accounting for his actions and sufferings without compromising the inseparable yet unconfused union of his divine and human natures. This at an earlier time at least had been a common concern for all pro-Chalcedonians alike. As Maximus himself had written in the early 640s in sympathetic explanation of the 'one activity' Christology: "Nothing divine or human is accomplished separately, but they proceed simultaneously, connaturally and unitedly from one and the same [subject] by virtue of the single *perichoresis* between them."[35]

Maximus' subsequent shift from this earlier, more dynamically phrased Christology to the more schematic, albeit conceptually precise and consistent Christology of the mid to late 640s, signalled a shift away from the conventional Christology of such orthodox figures as John Chrysostom into new territory. It mirrors the shift in Maximus' career from his monastic formation within the Moschus-Sophronius network to public leadership within the papally-supported, dissenting ecclesial coalition of Palestinian monastic refugees in Rome.[36] The intrusion of the state into the Church's doctrinal affairs, symbolised by various Heraclian-sponsored doctrinal censures over a twenty-year period, must surely rank among key precipitating factors for this shift.[37] But the uncovering of more detailed theological factors, not least of which must include the systematic extension of the Confessor's sophisticated

---

[34] Herein lies the weakness in John's Christology, typical of its time: Christ is presented as our moral exemplar, yet he regulates the emotional and sub-rational elements of his humanity by means of his innate divine energy. It may be that his human mind and will could still play a distinct and active role within this dynamic, but John never explicitly indicates if or how.

[35] *Opusculum* 20 (PG 91, 232A). Dated around 641.

[36] See Paul M. Blowers, *Maximus the Confessor: Jesus Christ and the Transfiguration of the World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016) 332. Booth offers a more detailed and nuanced analysis of this shift in *Crisis of Empire*.

[37] See Blowers, *Maximus the Confessor* 15–16; Booth, *Crisis of Empire*. The tension was surely exacerbated by the fact that Emperor Heraclius was hailed by 7th century poet George Pisidius as Christ's cosmic vice-regent.

ontology of unity and difference to the sphere of Christological psychology, a move for which Chrysostom by all accounts would unlikely have entertained much interest or instinct, remains a task for another day.

Select Bibliography

Allen, Pauline and Bronwen Neil, eds. *Maximus the Confessor and Companions: Documents from Exile*. Oxford Early Christian Texts. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

—. *The Oxford Handbook of Maximus the Confessor*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.

Allen, Pauline, ed. and trans. *Sophronius of Jerusalem and Seventh-Century Heresy: The Synodical Letter and Other Documents*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Bathrellos, Demetrios. *The Byzantine Christ: Person, Nature, and Will in the Christology of St Maximus the Confessor*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Booth, Phil. *Crisis of Empire: Doctrine and Dissent at the End of Late Antiquity*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2014.

Greer, Rowan A. *The Captain of Our Salvation: A Study in the Patristic Exegesis of Hebrews*. Beitraege zur Geschichte der Biblischen Exegese 15. Tuebingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1973.

Grillmeier, Aloys. *Christ in Christian Tradition*, Vol. 2:1. Translated by Pauline Allen and John Cawte. London: Mowbrays, 1987.

Hay, Camillus. 'St John Chrysostom and the Integrity of the Human Nature of Christ.' *Franciscan Studies* 19:3–4 (1959) 298–317.

Marek Jankowiak, 'The Invention of Dyothelitism.' *Studia Patristica* 63 (2013) 335–42.

Lawrenz III, Melvin E. *The Christology of John* Chrysostom. Lewiston: Mellen University Press, 1996.

Pelikan, Jaroslav. *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine,* vol. 2: *The Spirit of Eastern Christendom (600–1700)*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1974.

Perrone, Lorenzo. 'The Impact of the Dogma of Chalcedon on Theological Thought between the Fourth and Fifth Ecumenical Councils.' In *History of Theology: The Patristic Period*, Vol. 1. Edited by Angelo Di Berardino and Basil Studer, 414–60. Translated by Matthew J. O'Connell. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1996.

Price, Richard, Phil Booth and Catherine Cubitt, *The Acts of the Lateran Synod of 649*. Translated Texts for Historians, Vol. 61. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2014.

Rubery, Eileen. 'Papal Opposition to Imperial Heresies: Text and Image in the Church of Santa Maria Antiqua in the Time of Pope Martin I.' *Studia Patristica* 50 (2011) 3–30.

Rylaarsdam, David. *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy: The Coherence of his Theology and Preaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Chapter Six

Chrysostom among the pro-Nicenes
Proof-texts and Problem-texts

Seumas Macdonald

When thinking of authors considered pro-Nicene, John Chrysostom is not the first to mind. Indeed, in treatments of pro-Nicene theology, Chrysostom figures but scarcely.[1] Furthermore, while his considerable body of homilies has long-been esteemed, and his general theological tenor treated as orthodox, there has nevertheless been little attention given to Chrysostom as a theologian per se. This is almost undoubtedly the consequence of the fact that Chrysostom's writings rarely engage in abstract or polemical theological discourse.[2]

In this chapter, I argue that Chrysostom has an operational trinitarian theology, and the shape of that theology is pro-Nicene precisely because its

[1] Of authors treating pro-Nicenism as a phenomenon, only Ayres directs any attention to Chrysostom, with reference to the latter's Homilies on John, 1 Corinthians, baptismal lectures, and *On the Incomprehensibility of God*, all framed as anti-Heteroousian articulations of pro-Nicene trinitarianism. (Ayres, *Nicaea and its Legacy: an Approach to Fourth-Century Trinitarian Theology* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004) 267–68.) John Behr barely refers to him in *The Nicene Faith*; Anatolios appears to make no mention; Hanson refers to him but twice, and not for this.

[2] They certainly do engage in polemic, but that polemic is embedded in the rhetoric of his sermons, and does not usually take the form of doctrinal polemic, as for example, the exchange between Basil of Caesarea and Eunomius.

exegetical contours are pro-Nicene.[3] This is demonstrated by a consideration of how Chrysostom exegetes Scriptural passages that were sites of contention in the fourth century debates. As he preaches on these passages, Chrysostom exhibits common patterns. He employs hermeneutical strategies or relies upon doctrinal principles that are common to pro-Nicenes in relation to the same text. He also utilises features that are characteristic of his own exegesis, but in service of a pro-Nicene doctrinal formulation.

The treatment of rhetorical devices here is not focused on the rhetoric of Chrysostom's sermons per se.[4] Rather, my concern is on how rhetorically-literate interpretive practices shape Chrysostom's readings.[5] In this respect, Chrysostom's writings very often lack technical terminology in either identifying rhetorical technique in his source texts (that is, the biblical texts he is commenting on), or even in his own analysis of those.[6] In the passages treated in this chapter, I highlight particularly how precision, condescension, contextualisation, attention to grammatical details, and *Homerum ex Homero* function in these respects.[7]

In respect of pro-Nicene hermeneutics, the perspective taken here particularises theological strategies down to a level of techniques, shared across pro-Nicene authors, for reading certain texts or types of texts, which either support a pro-Nicene position or else defuse a text's 'value' for supporting a non-Nicene doctrinal position. In the texts treated in this chapter, I primarily discuss principles of partitive exegesis, the relationship of δύναμις to οὐσία, and source/origin readings.

---

[3] While in general I treat "pro-Nicene" as an ecclesio-political label for figures advocating for Nicaea and its creed as an idealised solution, when speaking of a general "pro-Nicene trinitarianism," as I do in this chapter, I adopt a theologised definition derivative from Ayres, centred on person/nature distinction, eternal (and internal) generation of the Son, and inseparability of works. Ayres, *Nicaea* 236.

[4] Chrysostom is very often studied in light of the first phenomenon—how he utilises rhetoric in his own oratory. This is, for example, one of the leading concerns in the classic study by T. E. Ameringer, *The Stylistic Influence of the Second Sophistic on the panegyrical Sermons of St. John Chrysostom* (Washington, DC: CUA, 1921); or in Harry M. Hubbell, 'Chrysostom and Rhetoric' *Classical Philology* 19:3 (1924) 261–76.

[5] On this, see Lauri Thurén, 'John Chrysostom as a Rhetorical Critic: The Hermeneutic of an Early Father' *Biblical Interpretation* 9:2 (2001) 180–218.

[6] Again, see Thurén, 'Chrysostom as a Rhetorical Critic' 188–92.

[7] *Homerum ex Homero* is traditionally ascribed to Aristarchus, but by Porphyry. The label is not uncontested, however the practice and the principle appear repeatedly in classical criticism. See Jaap Mansfeld, *Prolegomena: Questions to Be Settled before the Study of an Author or a Text* (Leiden: Brill, 1994) 204; Christoph Schäublin, 'Homerum ex Homero' *Museum Helveticum* 34:4 (1977) 221–27.

Method

The study that follows considers eleven texts that are disputed passages in the trinitarian debates of the fourth century. The range of verses considered was compiled by considering those listed in Hanson and Vaggione, cross-referenced with verses which Chrysostom actually comments on.[8] In general, Chrysostom shows awareness of opposing views and interpretations, though he rarely names contemporary figures or movements, instead relying upon the well-worn tactic of associating present errors with past heretics. This is seen, for instance, in his two homilies on Philippians 2:6 and following, where he invokes the names of Marcion, Paul of Samosata, Arius, Apollinarius, and others.[9] Otherwise, he speaks of "those who say […]," "the heretics," "our enemies," and the like.

I present the texts below in three sections, grouped around their prima facie support for either unity of being on the one hand, and the inferiority of the Son on the other.[10] In the first group, I consider two passages that represent what could have been a site for Chrysostom to discuss trinitarian theology in a pro-Nicene theme, but which he passes over without such engagement.

Missed Opportunities?

Chrysostom's corpus provides homilies which cover two passages which were sites of discussion and generally of use to pro-Nicene exegetes, where he declines to take what might seem an obvious opportunity to comment on fourth century concerns.

The first of these is 1 Corinthians 1:24, where the language of Christ as "[the] power of God" and "[the] wisdom of God" figured prominently in determining readings of other texts. Besides a long history of not merely configuring σοφία and δύναμις as titles of Christ, but using them as primary categories for understanding the relationship of Christ to God the Father, this verse figures prominently in foregrounding Christological readings of wisdom

---

[8] R. P. C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God: the Arian Controversy 318–81* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1988) 832–38. R. Vaggione, *Eunomius of Cyzicus and the Nicene Revolution*, Oxford Early Christian Studies (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000) 383–95. No 'master list' of disputed texts exists, though it would not be difficult to compile. Chrysostom also preaches *through* some texts without commenting on their (trinitarian) doctrinal import. Below I consider two texts where it is somewhat surprising that he does not offer a doctrinally-directed comment.

[9] Apollinarius being the closest to a contemporary figure.

[10] Historically it is not accurate to speak of two sides in the debates, but there are some fundamental dichotomies, and this is what I reflect here.

passages in the Old Testament, as well as the relationship of works to power to essence.11 The latter element is certainly present in other passages of Chrysostom, but the former is relatively absent. This may in turn be connected to Chrysostom's pointed disavowal of Proverbs 8 being a reference to Christ (though he does seem to make Wisdom into a personified existent, heading in a distinct hypostatic direction).12

The second major text which appears to be a missed opportunity, is Philippians 2:5–11. Among other pro-Nicene figures this passage forms either an occasion, or the basis for, formulating a practice of partitive exegesis. Partitive exegesis is a strategy of referring the sense to Christ, but Christ as understood theologically in respect of his eternal divinity, or else understood economically and in reference to his assumed humanity.[13] This technique takes on new importance in the fourth century debates, and appears to have its proximate origin in Marcellus of Ancyra's precision,[14] before being subsequently adopted and widely used by Athanasius.[15] Examples are found across the pro-Nicene spectrum, including all three Cappadocians, Hilary, and Augustine.[16] The omission, then, seems significant because the *forma Dei, forma servi* pattern is so prominent here, and it looms relatively larger in pro-Nicene articulations of partitive exegesis. We might thus have expected Chrysostom to do something of that sort. Although he addresses the text over two sermons, Homily 7 and 8, he does not.[17]

---

[11] I discuss the importance of δύναμις in this regard below, in relation to John 10.

[12] John Chrysostom, *Commentarium in Proverbia*. The text is presented in Guillaume Bady, "Le Commentaire inédit sur les Proverbes attribué a Jean Chrysostome: introduction, édition critique et traduction" (PhD diss., Université Lumière, Lyon, 2003), which is found in English translation in *Commentaries on the Sages*, trans. Robert Charles Hill, vol. 2 (Brookline, Massachusetts: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 2006) 100–103.

[13] For an initial definition and treatment, see John Behr, *The Nicene Faith*, 2 vols (Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2004) 14. See also Ayres, *Nicaea* 106. The earliest use of the term in secondary literature appears to be Lars Koen, 'Partitive Exegesis in Cyril of Alexandria's Commentary on the Gospel according to St. John' *Studia Patristica* 25 (1993) 115–21.

[14] Matthew Crawford, *Cyril of Alexandria's Trinitarian Theology of Scripture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014) 14. Andrew Radde-Gallwitz, 'Contra Eunomium III 3' in *Gregory of Nyssa: Contra Eunomium III. An English Translation with Commentary and Supporting Studies* (Leuven: Brill, 2014) 298–99.

[15] For example, *Contra Arianos* 1.41, and *Ad Serapion* 2.8.

[16] Basil, in *Contra Eunomium* 2.3 applies it to Acts 2:36; Gregory of Nazianzus, in *Oratio* 29.17–18; Gregory of Nyssa *De Deitate Filii et Spiritus Sancti et in Abraham* (PG 20, 563). Hilary, *De Trinitate* 9.5–6 and then 9.38 are very clear; Augustine, *De Trinitate* 1.11.22, 2.1.3, 6.9.10, and *Contra Maximinum* 2.14.8.

[17] Numbered seventh and eighth in Allen's translation, but sixth and seventh in Migne. These two may be sequential, even if the series as a whole is not. See Pauline Allen, 'Introduction' to John Chrysostom, *Homilies on Philippians* (Atlanta: SBL, 2013) xiv. See also Pauline Allen and

There are, however, two broad features of his treatment that do call for comment. Firstly, in these sermons he outlines heretical views typified by Arius, Paul of Samosata, Marcellus, Sabellius, Marcion, Valentinus, Apollinarius, Photinus, and Sophronius. He gives actual space to outlining some of their positions. This is more space and more prominence to heretical views than any of the other passages considered below. Secondly, Chrysostom integrates his doctrinal points very tightly, and repeatedly, with the call for humility in 2:5. Indeed, it offers him a way to advance his reading at certain points, by arguing that if a non-Nicene position were true, it would not be able to function as an example and exhortation to humility.

Also prominent here is Chrysostom's attention to detail.[18] He is aware, for example, of the argument that because the word "god" lacks the article in the expression τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ (verse 6) it does not refer to God the Father. His rebuttal is that in many instances the lack of an article occurs while the text still refers clearly to God the Father. Likewise, he argues that μορφή in these passages must be understood to mean "nature." He goes on to tackle the "likeness" language of verse 7, demonstrating with cross-references, particularly to Romans 8:3, that "likeness" here must mean "exact similarity" not "mere resemblance."

Throughout his treatment, Chrysostom employs techniques typical of a rhetorical education, such as grammatical analysis, and comparison with other structures and usages (*Homerum ex Homero*). These support his articulation of a pro-Nicene position over against heterodox theologies—both those named historically, and those unnamed but implicated by association. As for partitive exegesis, although he does not employ it here, he certainly does in other passages.

Proof Texts

It might seem that John 10:30, "I and the Father are one," would be an argument-clincher for the pro-Nicene case in favour of divine unity of the Father and Son. The verse is rarely used, however, as a direct proof-text for such a position, and is instead more often coupled with an argument about power and nature.[19]

Wendy Mayer, 'Chrysostom and the Preaching of Homilies in Series: A Re-examination of the Fifteen Homilies *In epistulam ad Philippenses* (CPG 4432)' *Vigiliae christianae* 49 (1995) 278–79

[18] See discussion below, in connection to John 1:1.

[19] Perhaps ironically, in the third century this verse is a problem-text because it was appealed to in support of Monarchian theologies, and figures such a Tertullian and Origen have to

This connection of power and nature has a long history, explored in depth in Barnes' monograph, *The Power of God*.[20] Barnes identified the principle that in pre-Socratics there is an intrinsic relationship, in that a unique power is a unique identifier of a nature.[21] Barnes furthermore argues that in the second-stage of the fourth century debates, pro-Nicenes specifically argued that where the power is the same, the essence must also be the same.[22] This, coupled with exegetical arguments for the oneness or sameness of the power of the Son and the power of the Father, undergirds the argument for the unity of the Godhead.

John 10:30

Chrysostom addresses the text in *In Iohannem* 61. He treats v30 as the summation of a line of logic that begins back in v27, and his argument focuses on the parallel structure in vv28 and 29, Jesus speaking first of his own hand, then the Father's hand. The contextual argument is important because v29, by itself, seems to suggest the superiority of the Father in terms of authority. Chrysostom makes much of the fact that it does not say "because the Father is greater no one can pluck them out of my hand." That is, the Son's power here does not depend upon the Father's superiority. Rather, the parallelism sets up that the *power* is the same. Here we see the importance of the δύναμις—οὐσία relationship, which Chrysostom states very plainly:

> He speaks here concerning power; for all his speech was about this. And if the power is the same, clearly the essence is also.[23]

The unity of the essence is revealed by the unity of δύναμις. Chrysostom's analysis thus exhibits not only the δύναμις—οὐσία relationship, but he does so in expositing a passage where pro-Nicenes utilise the same approach.

John 5:18–20

The δύναμις—οὐσία relation is also prominent in pro-Nicene accounts of John 5:18–20, especially in explaining "the Son cannot do anything from

---

argue that it, in fact, upholds *distinction*, not unity per se. It is unclear whether this factors into fourth century reticence to directly deploy it as a proof text of unity of being. See Tertullian, *Adv. Prax* 20, and Origen, *Contra Celsum* 8.12. For a clear pro-Nicene connection of power and nature, see Hilary, *De Trinitate* 7.22–32.

[20] Michel René Barnes, *The Power of God: Dunamis in Gregory of Nyssa's Trinitarian Theology* (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America, 2001).

[21] Barnes, *Power* 54–92.

[22] Barnes, *Power* 119.

[23] *In Iohannem* 61. (PG 59, 338.50–53) κατὰ τὴν δύναμιν ἐνταῦθα λέγων· καὶ γὰρ περὶ ταύτης ἦν ὁ λόγος ἅπας αὐτῷ. Εἰ δὲ ἡ δύναμις ἡ αὐτὴ, εὔδηλον ὅτι καὶ ἡ οὐσία.

himself," in terms of the shared works demonstrated through the passage.[24] Chrysostom does not immediately invoke δύναμις, but rather context—verse 17, to show that the Father and the Son's working is the same.[25] He exploits logic, showing the chain of events that must be the case for the charge of the Jews in verse 18 to be true, that calling God his Father was equivalent to claiming equality. He also utilises a counterfactual hypothetical argument, that either Jesus, or John the author, would have corrected us if there were a "misleading" claim of Jesus' equality.[26]

Chrysostom also demonstrates his ability to explain the sense of a construction by reference to other passages. For example, the "he can do nothing of himself" in v19, he explains by reference to Hebrews 6:18, where God cannot lie, and 2 Timothy 2:12–13, where God cannot deny himself. This supports his explanation that "cannot" means "the nature does not admit such a thing" rather than a "deficiency of power."[27]

These manoeuvres are all within the range of contextualisation and rhetorically-schooled reading, but they contribute to a pro-Nicene orthodoxy, that the Son does everything in equality, and agreement, with the Father. There is equality of the power, and "the unvarying resemblance of his power and will."[28]

John 1:1

In many ways, the most interesting proof-text in the collection, is John 1:1 and Chrysostom's treatment of it in his third homily on John. This is in part because it displays Chrysostom's typical concern for ἀκρίβεια, "precision" or "exactitude," which is also demonstrated in his handling of these passages of Scripture.[29] He does this by drawing attention to fine details—to what

---

[24] The passage is prominent especially in the later parts of the debate from 359 onwards. See Barnes, *Power of God* 163. For other pro-Nicene readings of the text, see Basil, *Contra Eunomium* 1.23–24; Hilary, *De Trinitate* 7.16–21; Gregory of Nazianzus, *Oratio* 30.10.

[25] PG 59, 215.41–42. Καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἔμπροσθεν δὲ εἰρημένων τοῦτο σαφέστερον ἔστιν ἰδεῖν.

[26] This applies to John 10:30 as well. Here, PG 59, 215.41–42 Καὶ ὁ εὐαγγελιστὴς δὲ οὐκ ἂν αὐτὸ παρεσιώπησεν, ἀλλ' εἶπεν ἂν φανερῶς.

[27] PG 59, 216.54–58. Then PG 59, 216.58–61. Καὶ οὐ δήπου τοῦτο τὸ, *Ἀδύνατον,* δηλωτικὸν ἀσθενείας, ἀλλὰ δυνάμεώς ἐστι, καὶ δυνάμεως ἀφάτου. Ὃ οὖν λέγει, τοῦτό ἐστι· Πάντων ἀνεπίδεκτος ἡ οὐσία ἐκείνη τῶν τοιούτων ἐστίν.

[28] PG 59, 218.21–22. τὸ ἀπαράλλακτον τῆς δυνάμεως καὶ τοῦ θελήματος.

[29] On ἀκρίβεια, see David Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy: The Coherence of His Theology and Teaching* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014) 113–15; R. C. Hill, 'Akribeia: A Principle of Chrysostom's Exegesis' *Colloquium* 14:1 (1981) 32–36. See also Mary W. Tse, 'συγκατάβασις and ἀκρίβεια—the warp and woof of Chrysostom's hermeneutic: A study based on Chrysostom's Genesis homilies' *Jian Dao: A Journal of Bible and Theology* 15 (2001) 6–13. I am not convinced by Tse that ἀκρίβεια "compels Chrysostom to adopt what we called a

is said, to what is not said, to the logic of the passage, and to the details of the text. These features of his exegesis have already been evident in the texts considered above. Chrysostom's conviction that the Scriptures were written with precision by God, calls forth in turn a precision on the part of the interpreter.[30] And, in turn, Chrysostom's ἀκρίβεια is employed in favour of a pro-Nicene type trinitarianism.

At other points, Chrysostom relies upon contextualisation, the location of a text in situ and arguing on this basis that it can or cannot mean certain things. This is likely another product of his rhetorical approach.[31] It is coupled, in some places, with Chrysostom's application of a principle of accommodation (συγκατάβασις)—that the Scripture, or Christ in the Scriptures, sometimes speaks in a lowlier way to accommodate to human understanding, but with the intention of leading the reader/hearer "upwards" to a loftier understanding.[32]

These features are evident in his treatment of John 1:1, as he engages with a Heteroousian form of exegesis, according to which v1a does not refer to absolute eternity, since the same phrasing of "in the beginning" is found also in Genesis 1:1–2 speaking of the heavens and the earth, that is the created universe, which are not from eternity. The opponents' argument rests on a kind of straight-faced grammatical literalism: where the same form of words is found, they are meant in the same way. So "in the beginning … was" must refer in the case of Christ to a temporal beginning, since in Genesis 1:1–2 it refers to a temporal beginning. Chrysostom also brings forward a second proof text of theirs, the beginning of 1 Samuel 1:1: Ἦν ἄνθρωπος ἐξ Ἁρμαθαὶμ

'grammatical-historical approach' to Scripture" (7); rather, the tools of the rhetorical schools are those at hand to express Chrysostom's understanding and implementation of ἀκίβεια. Tse and Hill disagree fundamentally about the relationship between συγκατάβασις and ἀκρίβεια, Tse putting them almost in opposition (Tse 13–17), Hill seeing ἀκρίβεια as "*one particular manifestation of synkatabasis*" (Hill 32; emphasis his). Rylaarsdam furthers Hill's treatment, in treating ἀκρίβεια as both dependent upon, and yet standing in a balancing antithesis with, συγκατάβασις. Adaptation of God's speech is precise because it is adapted, and needs to be precise because it is adapted.

[30] Hill, 'Akribeia' 35.

[31] Frances Young, *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture* (Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997) 171–72. For an exposition of a default exegetical method from the rhetorical tradition as seen in Origen, see also Peter Martens, *Origen and Scripture: the Contours of the Exegetical Life* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012) 42–62.

[32] On συγκατάβασις in Chrysostom, see R. C. Hill, 'On Looking Again at *Sunkatabasis*' *Prudentia* 13:1 (1981) 3–12. I follow Hill's treatment for the most part. Tse's more recent treatment is helpful, but reverting to "condescension" as a translation still runs the risk of connoting "patronising"; furthermore, συγατάβασις is arguably more than simply "that God has chosen to communicate with man through human language". Tse, 'συγκατάβασις and ἀκρίβεια' 2.

Σιφᾶ … "A man was" or better "there was a man from Armathaim-Sipha." Chrysostom's refutation of their exegesis is principled, as the following shows:

> Why do you mix the unmixed, and confuse things distinct, and make the things above the things below? For in that place "was" does not show the eternity alone, but also "in the beginning was" and "the Word was." Just as then "being," whenever said of a man, clarifies only present time; but whenever concerning God, shows eternity; thus also "was," spoken concerning our nature, signifies past time to us, and this itself having been limited; but whenever concerning God, manifests eternity.[33]

Chrysostom's line of argument, then, is to ensure that distinctions are observed, so that we ask not only about what was said, but that we take our line of meaning from reference to the thing spoken of. Then, he goes on to explain that when we speak of the earth or of a man, our concept of those entities already determines what we should understand about them, if we read that the earth "was" or that the man "was." He likewise points out that both the statements in Genesis 1:1–2 and 1 Samuel 1:1 predicate something of the subject. Of the former that it was formless and void, of the latter that he was from Armathaim-Sipha. In John 1:1a though, the statement is absolute, so as to lead us to understand the absoluteness, or the eternity, of the Son's existence.[34]

Here, too, Chrysostom's overarching concern that one should investigate Scripture with precision (μετὰ ἀκριβείας) is demonstrated. For Chrysostom, the words of scriptures are spoken and inspired with all due care and precision of meaning, and his introductory exhortations in the homilies are replete with the call for us to attend to Scripture with exactitude, so that we will get at the right meaning. This exactitude is further demonstrated as he comes to v1b:

> What, then, do I say? That this "was," concerning the Word, is indicative only of eternal being; for he says, "in the beginning was the Word"; the second "was," indicates his being relative to someone. For since this is especially proper of God, eternal and without beginning, he places this first. Then, so

---

[33] Chrysostom, *In Iohannem* 3. (PG 59, 39–44). Τί τὰ ἄμικτα μιγνύεις, καὶ συγχεῖς τὰ διαιρούμενα, καὶ τὰ ἄνω τὰ κάτω ποιεῖς; Ἐνταῦθα γὰρ τὸ, Ἦν, οὐ δείκνυσι τὸ ἀΐδιον μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ, Ἐν ἀρχῇ ἦν, καὶ τὸ, Ο Λόγος ἦν. Ὥσπερ οὖν τὸ, ὢν, ὅταν μὲν περὶ ἀνθρώπου λέγηται, τὸν ἐνεστῶτα χρόνον δηλοῖ μόνον· ὅταν δὲ περὶ Θεοῦ, τὸ ἀΐδιον δείκνυσιν·

[34] Cf. Basil's argument in *Contra Eunomium* 2.14. There is a dearth of references to 1 Samuel 1:1 across the patristic literature, and these are the only two passages that appear to utilise the text in relation to 'was' and existence. This suggests that either Basil and Chrysostom are responding to a common non-Nicene use of the verse, or that Chrysostom draws his argument directly or indirectly, from Basil. Chrysostom, even more than Basil, seems to regard these texts as those utilised by his opponents, but his argument strongly suggests reliance on Basil.

> that when someone hears "was in the beginning" and will also say that he was unbegotten, he immediately assuages it, and so before saying what he was, he says that he was "with God." And thus, so that no one supposes the Word to be simply an uttered or conceived word,[35] he prefixed the article, just as I said, and through this second expression he takes up the same point. For he did not say, "he was in God" but "he was with God," revealing to us his eternity according to his person.[36]

There is a second element to Chrysostom's treatment of John 1:1, which we will examine in connection to Acts 2:36 below. It is enough for now to note the precision Chrysostom applies here, in reference to the presence of the article, the use of the prepositional phrase, and the distinction between "was" said absolutely or relatively.

Across these "proof texts," then, Chrysostom utilises a range of interpretive techniques, supporting his articulation of a pro-Nicene type of trinitarian orthodoxy. We turn now to examine the other side of this coin, those problem texts which appear predisposed to support non-Nicene theologies. Here it is that we will see Chrysostom spend more time, and greater technique, in ensuring a "correct" understanding of these scriptures.

Problem Texts

In contrast to John 10:30's strong apparent case for unity of being, John 14:28 appears to be a clear proof of a subordinationist position. Among pro-Nicene authors there are two strategies to deal with this verse. The first is to understand the "greater" to relate to the Father as cause, source, or origin of the Son. This is the approach adopted by Basil, Hilary, and Gregory of Nazianzus.[37] The second strategy is to refer it to the economy and the incarnation, so that the Father is greater in respect of the humanity of the incarnate Son. This is the approach adopted by Gregory of Nyssa and

---

[35] προφορικὸν ἢ ἐνδιάθετον. With the theological associations tied to those concepts in earlier authors.

[36] Chrysostom, *In Iohannem* 3 (PG 59, 40.42–54) Τί οὖν φημι; Ὅτι τοῦτο τὸ, Ἦν, ἐπὶ τοῦ Λόγου, τοῦ εἶναι ἀϊδίως μόνον ἑστὶ δηλωτικόν· Ἐν ἀρχῇ γὰρ ἦν, φησὶν, ὁ Λόγος· τὸ δεύτερον δὲ ἦν, τοῦ πρός τινα εἶναι. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ μάλιστα τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦτό ἑστιν ἴδιον, τὸ ἀΐδιον καὶ ἄναρχον, τοῦτο πρῶτον τέθεικεν. Εἶτα, ἵνα μή τις ἀκούων τὸ, ἦν ἐν ἀρχῇ, καὶ ἀγέννητον αὐτὸν εἴπῃ, εὐθέως αὐτὸ παρεμυθήσατο, πρὸ τοῦ εἰπεῖν τί ἦν, εἰπὼν ὅτι Πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν ἦν. Καὶ ἵνα μὴ Λόγον αὐτὸν ἁπλῶς νομίσῃ τις εἶναι προφορικὸν ἢ ἐνδιάθετον, τῇ τοῦ ἄρθρου προσθήκῃ, καθάπερ ἔφθην εἰπὼν, καὶ διὰ τῆς δευτέρας ταύτης τοῦτο ἀνεῖλε ῥήσεως. Οὐ γὰρ εἶπεν, Ἐν Θεῷ ἦν, ἀλλὰ, Πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν ἦν, τὴν καθ' ὑπόστασιν αὐτοῦ ἀϊδιότητα ἐμφαίνων ἡμῖν.

[37] See Basil, *Contra Eunomium* 1.24–25; Hilary, *De Trinitate*, 9.51–55; Gregory of Nazianzus, *Oratio* 29.18; 30.7. Athanasius seems to indicate a causal reading, in *Contra Arianos* 1.58.

Augustine.[38] Chrysostom, in tackling this verse, almost doesn't make mention of the issue at all. His comments focus on the first part of the verse:

> You heard I said to you, "I am going away to the Father, and I am coming back to you." If you loved me, you would be glad that I am going to the Father.[39]

He only offers, seemingly as an aside, and after having already moved on in his sermon, this comment:

> But if someone should say that the Father is greater, inasmuch as he is cause of the Son, we will not contradict this. However, this certainly does not make the Son to be of a different essence.[40]

Thus, Chrysostom appears to be aware of the difficulty of the verse, and offers a solution, but almost begrudgingly. He makes clear that it should not contradict the received orthodoxy, i.e. it does not make the Son "to be of a different essence"; and in this case, he adopts the causal reading, in line with other pro-Nicenes. He does not, however, spend any more time developing a case for this. Despite the brevity of his comment, it is evidence that supports both that Chrysostom articulates a pro-Nicene theology, and that he does so utilising common exegeses of relevant texts.

Hebrews 1:3–4

When we turn to Hebrews, we find that the two elements of Hebrews 1:3 appear prima facie to lend support to opposite sides of the fourth century debates, with the language of "radiance of his glory and express image of his substance" buttressing pro-Nicene positions, "becoming better than the angels" non-Nicene positions. Chrysostom addresses the first text in Homily 2, but we will focus on his treatment of the second text, in Homily 1.[41]

---

[38] Gregory, *De Deitate* (PG 46, 561.13–564.38); Augustine, *De Trinitate* 1.11.22; 2.1.3; 6.9.10.

[39] John Chrysostom, *In Ioannem* 75 (PG 59, 407.56–58), citing John 14:28. Ἠκούσατε ὅτι ἐγὼ εἶπον ὑμῖν, ὅτι Ὑπάγω πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα, καὶ ἔρχομαι πρὸς ὑμᾶς. Εἰ ἠγαπᾶτέ με, ἐχάρητε ἂν ὅτι πορεύομαι πρὸς τὸν Πατέρα.

[40] John Chrysostom, *In Ioannem* 75 (PG 59, 408.22–24). Εἰ δὲ λέγοι τις μείζονα εἶναι τὸν Πατέρα καθ' ὃ αἴτιος τοῦ Υἱοῦ, οὐδὲ τοῦτο ἀντεροῦμεν. Ἀλλ' οὐ μὴν τοῦτο ἑτέρας εἶναι τὸν Υἱὸν οὐσίας ποιεῖ.

[41] Homily 2 begins with a doctrinal focus on the phrase in verse 3, and places it in a polemical doctrinal context. It deserves a fuller treatment. That homily also covers verse 4, but much more briefly than Homily 1. This may offer some evidence that Homilies 1 and 2 are not sequential. That the whole 'series' on Hebrews is not a series, and is a composition of both Constantinopolitan and Antiochene sermons is the argument of Mayer and Allen, see Pauline Allen and Wendy Mayer, 'The thirty-four homilies on Hebrews: the last series delivered by Chrysostom in Constantinople?' *Byzantion* 65:2 (1995) 309–348.

He firstly exhibits his principle of accommodation, comparing Paul[42] to someone leading a child to a lofty height, doing so by taking him up, then down a little, then up again, and so on.[43] This, Chrysostom says, Paul does here and elsewhere, "having learnt this from his master."[44]

This accommodation, in turn, is applied in terms of partitive exegesis, with alternating statements of Paul taken as "higher" (referring to the divinity), others as "humbler", by way of accommodation or in reference to the economy. The phrase "whom he appointed as heir of all things" is an example of the latter. This becomes more explicit partitive exegesis when turning to the phrase "being made better." He writes:

> For from this point on he is discussing the economy according to the flesh. For, "being made better" is not revelatory of his essence according to the Father:[45] for *that* did not come into being, but was begotten: rather it is about his essence according to the flesh: for this came into being. But his discourse here is not about coming-into-being, rather it is as John says, "The one who comes after me, because he existed before me, he is ranked before me," [John 1:15] that is, more honoured and distinguished. In the same way, Paul says here, "to such a degree being made better than the angels"; that is he shows him to be better and more honoured, "as the degree by which he has inherited a name more distinguished than they." Do you see that his argument is about that which pertains to the flesh? For God the Word always possessed this name, and did not inherit it later in time, nor at that point in time did he "become better than the angels, when he had made purification of our sins," but he was always better, and incomparably better. This statement then was spoken concerning the flesh.[46]

---

[42] Chrysostom considers Paul the author of the epistle. For conciseness, I refer to the author as Paul through this section just as Chrysostom does.

[43] Chrysostom, *In epistulam ad Hebraeos* 1 (PG 63, 16.9–23).

[44] Chrysostom, *In epistulam ad Hebraeos* 1 (PG 63, 16.20) παρὰ τοῦ διδασκάλου τοῦτο μαθών. Rylaarsdam discusses variation as an example of God's adaptable pedagogy, including mixing "lowly and lofty teachings." He explores this particularly in reference to the *In Iohannem*. *Divine Pedagogy* 75; 80–82. This is then applied to Paul, whose pedagogy Chrysostom identifies as modeled on God's. Again, Rylaarsdam, *Divine Pedagogy* 174; 188–93.

[45] Field offers κατὰ πνεῦμα as an emendation, but without any textual support. See F. Field, *Sancti patris nostri Joannis Chrysostomi archiepiscopo Constantinopolitani interpretatio omnium epistularum Paulinarum homilias facta*, vol. 7 (Oxford: Bibliotheca Patrum, 1862) 12, note l. Gardner refers Field's reading to a catena compiled by Nicetas of Heraklea. NPNF 1:14, 368 note 1. The reading πνεῦμα would make more sense, if taken to refer to the Son's divinity, and contrasting with κατὰ σάρκα, which would be an argument in favour of retaining the *lectio difficilior*. To follow the reading of κατὰ πνεῦμα found in a catena seems ill-supported, the rest of the MSS and editions supporting κατὰ πατέρα.

[46] Chrysostom, *In epistulam ad Hebraeos* 1 (PG 63,16.52–17.5) Ἐνταῦθα γὰρ καὶ περὶ τῆς κατὰ σάρκα οἰκονομίας διαλέγεται· τὸ γὰρ, Κρείττων γενόμενος, οὐκ οὐσίας δηλωτικόν ἐστι τῆς κατὰ Πατέρα· ἐκείνη γὰρ οὐκ ἐγένετο, ἀλλὰ γεγέννηται· ἀλλὰ τῆς κατὰ σάρκα· αὕτη γὰρ

Chrysostom repeatedly states that the topic of the discourse is about the flesh, that is the human nature assumed in the economy. His reference to John 1:15 combines both a distinction in honour, with a statement about pre-existence, and so is particularly appropriate to adduce here. At the same time, Chrysostom relies on the assumption of these distinctions, rather than necessarily proving them from the passage at hand. He goes on in the following passage to explain that even in respect of humanity, we speak in a similar way, using both high and low expressions to refer to the whole of humanity. Likewise, he says, Paul speaks of Christ "at times from the lesser and at times from the better."[47]

John 17:3 // Matthew 19:16 // 1 Corinthians 8:6

Turning then to those passages which seem to say that the Father alone is God, or is God in a way exclusive of the Son, these form a discrete set of texts problematic to pro-Nicene trinitarianism. Their similarity to each other warrants treating them together, as the three below demonstrate.

In the first of these, John 17:3, the issue is the description of the Father as "the only true God," which is placed into contrast with the Son to suggest that the latter is not "true god" but "god" in some other sense.[48] Chrysostom initially explains that this "is said for a distinction from those that are not gods. For he was about to send them to the Gentiles."[49] The contrast of "only" distinguishes God and idols, not Father and Son. He is not, however, unaware that such an explanation is insufficient for some. So, he offers five additional points to bolster his position.

1. If they object that the Son is not "true God," then to be consistent they must deny that he is "God" in any sense, on the basis of John 5:44. But if he is both "God" and "Son of the Father," then he must be "true God."

ἐγένετο. Ἀλλ' οὐ περὶ οὐσιώσεως νῦν ὁ λόγος αὐτῷ· ἀλλ' ὥσπερ Ἰωάννης λέγων· Ὁ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος, ἔμπροσθέν μου γέγονεν, ὅτι πρῶτός μου ἦν, τοῦτο δηλοῖ, ὅτι ἐντιμότερος καὶ λαμπρότερος· οὕτω καὶ ἐνταῦθα Παῦλος εἰπών· Τοσούτῳ κρείττων γενόμενος ἀγγέλων, ὅτι βελτίων ἐδήλωσε καὶ εὐδοκιμώτερος, ὅσῳ διαφορώτερον παρ' αὐτοὺς κεκληρονόμηκεν ὄνομα. Ὁρᾷς ὅτι περὶ τοῦ κατὰ σάρκα ὁ λόγος ἦν; τοῦτο γὰρ τὸ ὄνομα, ὁ Θεὸς Λόγος, ἀεὶ εἶχεν, οὐχ ὕστερον ἐκληρονόμησεν, οὐδὲ τότε τῶν ἀγγέλων κρείττων ἐγένετο, ὅτε καθαρισμὸν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν ἐποιήσατο, ἀλλ' ἀεὶ κρείττων ἦν, καὶ κρείττων ἀσυγκρίτως. Περὶ δὲ τοῦ κατὰ σάρκα τοῦτο εἴρηται.

[47] Chrysostom, *In epistulam ad Hebraeos* 1 (PG 63, 17.12–13) ποτὲ μὲν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐλάττονος, ποτὲ δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ κρείττονος.

[48] See, of course, Athanasius, *C. Ar.* 2.7–9.

[49] Chrysostom, *In Ioannem* 80 (PG 59, 435.6–7) πρὸς ἀντιδιαστολὴν τῶν οὐκ ὄντων θεῶν φησι. Καὶ γὰρ εἰς τὰ ἔθνη αὐτοὺς πέμπειν ἔμελλεν.

2. 1 Corinthians 9:6 also contains an "only" construction, where Paul says, "or I only and Barnabas." The μόνος there does not exclude Barnabas, but distinguishes Paul (with Barnabas) from others.[50]

3. If the Son is not *true* God, then how can he be *Truth* (John 14:6)?

4. If he is not *true* God, then he is not god at all, on the analogy that if someone is not "true" human, they are not human at all.

5. If he is not Son or God, how does he make us to be "sons" and "gods"?[51]

This last point echoes arguments elsewhere in which the Son's ability to grant sonship to believers depends (a) upon his being true Son in a unique sense, and (b) that the sonship granted is of a derivative kind dependent upon (a). Similarly for the term "god," which is understood to apply in a "proper" sense to the Son, but in a derivative sense when used of people in the Scriptures.[52]

Matthew 19:16 shares a similar exegetical conundrum with John 17:3, in that it appears to exclude Jesus from the categories of "goodness" and "deity," when Jesus says, "No one is good except God alone." As such, it is prone to being used as a proof-text for a non-Nicene Christology. Chrysostom does not major on the theological issue occasioned by such usage, but when he treats the passage, he does address the issue in brief.[53] He does so with a combination of accommodation, partitive exegesis, recourse to the economy, and attention to what is not said.

> For what reason, then, does the Messiah answer him like this and say, "No one is good"? Because he [the rich young ruler] approached him as a mere man, as one of the many, and as a Jewish teacher; for this reason, Jesus, as a man, converses with him.[54]

Here is demonstrated the accommodation and an implied partitive exegesis. Chrysostom subsequently suggests that the contrast is not between God as

---

[50] It is thus better translated, "or only Barnabas and I," or some other construction in which the sense of the "alone" applies to the two together.

[51] Chrysostom, *In Ioannem* 80 (PG 59, 435.7–21).

[52] Cf. John 10:34, citing Psalm 82:6.

[53] Chrysostom, *In Matthaeum* 63.

[54] Chrysostom, *In Matthaeum* 63 (PG 58, 603.30–34) Διατί οὖν οὕτω πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀπεκρίνατο ὁ Χριστὸς, λέγων· *Οὐδεὶς ἀγαθός;* Ἐπειδὴ ὡς ἀνθρώπῳ προσῆλθε ψιλῷ, καὶ ἐνὶ τῶν πολλῶν, καὶ διδασκάλῳ Ἰουδαϊκῷ· διὰ δὴ τοῦτο ὡς ἄνθρωπος αὐτῷ διαλέγεται. The attachment of descriptive phrases to pronouns is difficult to clarify in English, but the initial subject is the rich young ruler, while the dative phrases describe Jesus. In the final sentence, however, the subject has shifted to Jesus.

good, and Christ as not, but rather that "no one good" means "no human."[55] This is a similar resolution to the contrast found in John 17:3.

The third text with a similar pattern of understanding solitude to imply exclusion, is 1 Corinthians 8:5–6.[56] Chrysostom's handling of this text gives evidence of the same techniques we have already seen in play above: understanding the solitude to not apply in the sense of excluding Christ, showing the logical fallacy that results from the exclusionary reading, and contextualisation of the key verse. The first is seen as Chrysostom interprets verses five and six as being written to exclude "so-called gods," and thus interpret the "one God" as excluding idols.[57] To this is subjoined an argument that the unique divinity of God the Father is upheld on the basis of the "from whom are all things" (ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα). That is, that cosmic creation is a unique identifier of divinity.[58]

His second point demonstrates that if "God" is an exclusive attribute of the Father alone, then "Lord" is an exclusive attribute of the Son, and so the Father is excluded from being Lord.[59] In contrast, immediately prior to this point Chrysostom has demonstrated the interchangeability of such names in Scriptural texts (Psalm 110:1, 45:8; Romans 9:5).[60] The element of contextualisation pertains to why the Spirit is not mentioned here.

> But since his speech at that time was directed towards the Greeks, and the weaker converts from among them—for this reason he regulates it to such a degree. For the Prophets do the same thing in the case of the Son, not mentioning him plainly anywhere, because of the weakness of their audience.[61]

In the paragraph prior to this quotation, Chrysostom repeats his point about Paul's argument being with idolaters, and this explaining the shape that it has, its contents and absences. This thesis is repeated with reference to the Spirit, with further recourse to a principle of accommodation, and even of

---

[55] Chrysostom, *In Matthaeum* 63 (PG 58, 603.41–42) οὐδεὶς ἀνθρώπων.

[56] Chrysostom, *In epistulam i ad Corinthios* 20.

[57] Chrysostom, *In epistulam i ad Corinthios* 20 (PG 61, 163.34–47).

[58] For which Chrysostom refers to Jeremiah 10:11. (PG 61, 163.49–51) Τοῦτο γὰρ δείκνυσι κἀκείνους οὐκ ὄντας θεούς. Θεοὶ γὰρ, φησὶν, οἳ τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν οὐκ ἐποίησαν, ἀπολέσθωσαν.

[59] Chrysostom, *In epistulam i ad Corinthios* 20 (PG 61, 164.26–37).

[60] Chrysostom, *In epistulam i ad Corinthios* 20 (PG 61, 164.13–20).

[61] Chrysostom, *In epistulam i ad Corinthios* 20 (PG 61, 165.14–19). Ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ νῦν πρὸς Ἕλληνας ὁ λόγος ἦν αὐτῷ καὶ τοὺς ἐξ Ἑλλήνων ἀσθενεστέρους, διὰ τοῦτο ταμιεύεται τέως· ὅπερ οὖν καὶ οἱ προφῆται ποιοῦσιν ἐπὶ τοῦ Υἱοῦ, οὐδαμοῦ σαφῶς αὐτοῦ μεμνημένοι διὰ τὴν ἀσθένειαν τῶν ἀκουόντων.

progressive revelation of the same sort seen in relation to the Son and the Old Testament.

Acts 2:36 and a return to John 1:1

As a last category of texts, there are those passages which speak of the Son as "made" in some way or other. Most prominently, Proverbs 8:22 falls into this category, but as mentioned above Chrysostom does not read that verse Christologically, so it is not such an issue. However, in many ways Acts 2:36 is the New Testament equivalent—an apparently clear statement that God "made" (ἐποιήσε) Jesus.[62] The verse is treated by a number of pro-Nicenes in response to non-Nicene usage as a proof-text.[63] Chrysostom treats the verse in two different sermons. In Homily 6 on Acts, he explains:

> "He made," that is "he ordained." Consequently, there is nothing about communication of substance here, but the whole statement concerns what has been mentioned. "This Jesus, whom you crucified." He speaks well at this point, stirring up their understanding.[64]

This rendering of "made" as "appointed" in reminiscent of Athanasius' treatment of the verse.[65] He does not elaborate at this juncture.

Chrysostom's other treatment of the verse occurs in the context of his exposition of John 1:1 in Homily 3 on that Gospel, returning to our earlier exposition of the same. In that context, Chrysostom shows awareness of his opponents' position that they are willing to grant the Son's being with God, provided it is likewise affirmed "yet created."[66] Chrysostom replies that this would have been perfectly clear if the Evangelist had written "In the beginning God made the Word," which he certainly could have. In turn, this opens up the objection that Peter has made this precise statement by his use of "made" in Acts 2:36.

> "Yes," they say, "but Peter says this clearly and explicitly." Where and when? "When conversing with the Jews he says, 'God made him Lord and Christ.' Why then do you not add that which follows, "this Jesus whom you crucified"? Or are you ignorant that of the things spoken, some are of his unmixed

---

[62] Therefore let the entire house of Israel know with certainty that God has made him both Lord and Messiah, this Jesus whom you crucified. (NRSV).

[63] See Eunomius, *Apologia* 12, 26; *Apologia Apologiae* 3; Athanasius, *Contra Arianos* 2.11–16; Basil, *Contra Eunomium* 2.2–3; Gregory of Nyssa, *Contra Eunomium* 3.3.

[64] Chrysostom In Acta apostolorum 6 (PG 60, 59.61–60.1). Ἐποίησε, τουτέστι, Κατέστησεν. Ὥστε οὐδὲν περὶ οὐσιώσεως ἐνταῦθα, ἀλλὰ πᾶν φησι περὶ τούτου. Τοῦτον τὸν Ἰησοῦν, ὃν ὑμεῖς ἐσταυρώσατε. Καλῶς ἐνταῦθα ἔληξε, διασείων αὐτῶν τὴν διάνοιαν.

[65] Athanasius, *Contra Arianos* 2.11–16.

[66] Chrysostom, *In Ioannem* 3 (PG 59, 40.56) Ἀλλὰ πεποιημένος, φησί.

> nature, others of the economy? But if it is not so, and you will rather take it all absolutely concerning the Godhead, then you will introduce a passible Divinity. But if not passible, then neither created … Besides, both "Lord" and "Christ" refer not to essence, but to dignity.[67]

Here, again Chrysostom demonstrates a clear form of partitive exegesis, in taking Acts 2:36 to refer not to the "unmixed nature" (i.e. the pre-incarnate divine Son), but to the economy and the incarnate Son. Secondly, he understands the titles or terms "Lord" and "Christ" to be descriptors of dignity, not nature, so that "made" signifies "to make X (a pre-existent entity) to be Y (an additional attribution), rather than absolutely." This accords with his treatment in the Acts homily, and more broadly with pro-Nicene treatments on the verse.[68]

Conclusion

Theology, for patristic authors, is an exegetical endeavour precisely in that theology arises from the biblical revelation, not in the first instance the abstract conceptualisations with which it is sometimes caricatured. For this same reason, neither should we accept the picture of Chrysostom as preacher, pastor, and commentator, if by these emphases we somehow suppose that he is not being "theological."

In the ranging across texts considered here, Chrysostom shows himself as preacher and exegete. We see his characteristic emphasis on ἀκρίβεια, as both a feature of the biblical text itself, and a demand upon the reader. This is seen throughout our studied passages, but particularly manifests itself in Chrysostom's use of the tools of the rhetorical schools, including contextualisation, grammatical precision, rendering the sense of a construction by reference to other instances, expositing the argumentative logic of a passage, arguing from what a text does not say, and so on. Furthermore, we see the operational principle of συγκατάβασις at work, most prominently in his comments on Hebrews.

---

[67] Chrysostom, *In Ioannem* 3 (PG 59, 41.14–23; 29–31) Ναὶ, φησίν· ἀλλ' ὁ Πέτρος τοῦτο εἶπε σαφῶς καὶ διαῤῥήδην. Ποῦ καὶ πότε; Ὅτε Ἰουδαίοις διαλεγόμενος ἔλεγεν, Ὅτι Κύριον αὐτὸν καὶ Χριστὸν ὁ Θεὸς ἐποίησε. Τί οὖν καὶ τὸ ἐξῆς οὐ προσέθηκας, ὅτι Τοῦτον τὸν Ἰησοῦν ὃν ὑμεῖς ἐσταυρώσατε; Ἢ ἀγνοεῖς ὅτι τῶν λεγομένων τὰ μὲν τῆς ἀκηράτου φύσεως, τὰ δὲ τῆς οἰκονομίας ἐστίν; Εἰ δὲ μή ἐστιν, ἀλλὰ πάντα ἁπλῶς ἐπὶ τῆς θεότητος ἐκδέξῃ, καὶ παθητὸν εἰσάξεις τὸ Θεῖον· εἰ δὲ μὴ παθητὸν, οὐδὲ ποιητόν […] Ἄλλως τε τὸ Κύριος καὶ τὸ Χριστὸς, οὐκ ἔστιν οὐσίας, ἀλλ' ἀξιώματος.

[68] See references above in note 59.

All of these, however, are put to use to argue for a dogmatic position which aligns with pro-Nicene trinitarian formulations. For Chrysostom, opponents in view are primarily of a Heteroousian stripe, given his context, and time period.[69] Consequently, the majority of his arguments, when they come, are on securing the fundamental unity of Father and Son. He spends little time asserting their distinction, except in the context of "historical" heresies (e.g. his Philippians sermons). Rather, the nexus between theology and exegesis is found in refuting interpretations of texts that render the Son inferior and created.

So it is that when Chrysostom attends to the scriptures that are "flash-points" in the controversy, he also has recourse to distinctively pro-Nicene reading strategies. In particular, as we have seen, he employs a form of partitive exegesis (John 1:1, Hebrews 1, Matthew 19:16, Acts 2:36), and to a lesser degree, a theology of power as revelatory of essence (prominently in John 10, more implicitly in John 5).

It is the combination of these two factors that should lead us to place Chrysostom among the pro-Nicenes. Although he did not author treatises on the Trinity, at every point in his expositions of the scriptures, he upholds the fundamental points of trinitarian theology as it had come to be formulated by other pro-Nicene proponents in the second half of the fourth century; at each point of contested interpretation, he deploys both his own tools and distinctive pro-Nicene strategies, to refute non-Nicene doctrine from those texts. For these reasons, Chrysostom truly is among the pro-Nicenes.

Select Bibliography

Allen, Pauline and Wendy Mayer. 'Chrysostom and the Preaching of Homilies in Series: A Re-examination of the Fifteen Homilies *In epistulam ad Philippenses* (CPG 4432).' *Vigiliae christianae* 49 (1995) 270–289.

—. 'The thirty-four homilies on Hebrews: the last series delivered by Chrysostom in Constantinople?' *Byzantion* 65:2 (1995) 309–48.

Allen, Pauline. *Homilies on Philippians.* Atlanta: SBL, 2013.

[69] Given that the bulk of his preaching context occurs in Antioch, Chrysostom's 'live' concern of heretics are Heteroousians throughout. This is seen, for example, in the situation of Meletius, John's bishop (see Thomas Karmann, *Meletius von Antiochien: Studien zur Geschichte des trinitätstheologischen Streits in den Jahren 360–364 n. Chr.* (Frankfurt a.M.: Peter Lang, 2009). In Chrysostom's own preaching, there is evidence that Heteroousians are not only targets of his, but present in his audience. Chrysostom, *Incomprehens* 1.39, 3.23. See also *Adversus Judeaos*, where he rhetorically aligns Judaizers with Heteroousians. These texts are highlighted by Rylaarsdam, *Divine Pedagogy* 13–14, 281–82.

Ameringer, T. E. *The Stylistic Influence of the Second Sophistic on the panegyrical Sermons of St. John Chrysostom*. Washington, DC: CUA, 1921.
Barnes, Michel René. *The Power of God: Dunamis in Gregory of Nyssa's Trinitarian Theology*. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America, 2001.
Hill, R. C. 'Akribeia: A Principle of Chrysostom's Exegesis.' *Colloquium* 14:1 (1981) 32–36.
—. 'On Looking Again at *Sunkatabasis*.' *Prudentia* 13:1 (1981) 3–12.
Hubbell, Harry M. 'Chrysostom and Rhetoric.' *Classical Philology* 19:3 (1924) 261–76.
Karmann, Thomas. *Meletius von Antiochien: Studien zur Geschichte des trinitätstheologischen Streits in den Jahren 360–364 n. Chr*.. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 2009.
Koen, Lars. 'Partitive Exegesis in Cyril of Alexandria's Commentary on the Gospel according to St. John.' *SP* 25 (1993) 115–21.
Mansfeld, Jaap. *Prolegomena: Questions to Be Settled before the Study of an Author or a Text.* Leiden: Brill, 1994.
Rylaarsdam, David. *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy: the coherence of his theology and teaching.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
Schäublin, Christoph. 'Homerum ex Homero.' *Museum Helveticum* 34:4 (1977) 221–27.
Thurén, Lauri. 'John Chrysostom as a Rhetorical Critic: The Hermeneutic of an Early Father.' *Biblical Interpretation* 9:2 (2001) 180–218.
Tse, Mary W. 'συγκατάβασις and ἀκρίβεια—the warp and woof of Chrysostom's hermeneutic: A study based on Chrysostom's Genesis homilies.' *Jian Dao: A Journal of Bible and Theology* 15 (2001) 1–17.
Young, Frances. *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture*. Cambridge, New York: CUP, 1997.

Chapter Seven

The Stylistic Influence of the Second Sophistic on the Exegetical Homilies of St John Chrysostom

Chris Baghos

In his survey of ancient Greek literature, Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff asserted that St John Chrysostom (c. 347–407): "is an almost pure Atticist … who merits a higher rating than Aristides, and in point of style can be compared with Demosthenes. In [his] Homilies … pure Attic Greek dominates everywhere."[1] Similarly, in a comprehensive assessment of the use of the optative mood in St John's works, Frederick Walter Augustine Dickinson—a near contemporary of Wilamowitz-Moellendorff—contested the prevalent

Acknowledgements: I am indebted to Associate Professor John A. L. Lee, FAHA, for his invaluable guidance in relation to the research essay—submitted in partial fulfillment of a Master of Arts degree—on which this chapter is based (especially the grammatical analysis and the translations). I am also grateful to Protopresbyter Dr Doru Costache for his vital comments on Chrysostom's *De sacerdotio* 5. Lastly, I wish to thank the examiners of the abovementioned essay, Professor Pauline Allen, FAHA, FBA, and Associate Professor Trevor Evans, for their generous feedback and suggestions.

[1] Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, 'Die griechische Literatur des Altertums' in *Die Kultur der Gegenwart, ihre Entwicklung und ihre Ziele*, Teil 1 Abteilung 8, ed. Paul Hinneberg (Leipzig: Druck und Verlag von B. G. Teubner, 1912) 296, quoted in Chrysostomus Baur, *John Chrysostom and His Time*, vol. 1: Antioch, trans. M. Gonzaga (Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1959) 305.

opinion that the Classical literary constructions had become "mutilated" by the fourth century. Dickinson concluded that Chrysostom's use of the optative "adds one more grain of evidence to the fact that the inexpressible delicacy and beauty of the Greek language persist throughout its history."[2]

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff and Dickinson's complementary perception of Chrysostom's literary proficiency remains undisputed. Consequently, there have been numerous studies exploring the relation between Chrysostom's rhetorical training and exposition of the New Testament, which originally took the form of sermons, delivered in Antioch and Constantinople. Yet these have not adequately identified his pastoral incentive for imitating the Attic authors. It is apparent that Lewis J. Patsavos was the first to discern the saint's motivations in this regard. However, the scholar did not dwell on them at length, since the purpose of his study was to point out the traits that St John considered essential for entry into the clergy. In short, whilst appealing to *De sacerdotio* 5, Patsavos highlighted St John's conviction that "someone who is at the same time humble and eloquent will communicate to the faithful that which is really indispensable and profitable in the appropriate form."[3]

In this chapter I hope to contribute to the available scholarship by determining the saint's pastoral motivations for using Attic syntax and Second Sophistic literary devices in his exegetical works. To this end, I will examine the *argumenta* (i.e. opening arguments or summaries) found in his homilies in 1 Co, Eph, 1 Ti, and Phm. These have gained little attention from scholars despite the strong interest in Chrysostom's exposition of the Pauline corpus. Analysis of the *argumentum* featured within *In epistulam ad Hebraeos hom. 1–34* has been deferred due to space constraints. Moreover, the *argumentum* within *In epistulam ad Philippenses hom. 1–15* falls outside the scope of this chapter given that it is actually a fully developed homily, as demonstrated by Pauline Allen and Wendy Mayer.[4]

I will first attempt to determine whether there is sufficient evidence in the Chrysostomian corpus demonstrating that the Church Father consistently adopted an elaborate rhetorical style in his writings, and whether this was for pastoral reasons. More precisely, I will attempt to verify whether Chrysostom

---

[2] Frederick Walter Augustine Dickinson, 'The Use of the Optative Mood in the Works of St. John Chrysostom' (Washington, DC: PhD Diss., Catholic University of America, 1926) v, 174–75.

[3] Lewis J. Patsavos, *A Noble Task: Entry Into the Clergy in the First Five Centuries*, trans. Norman Russell (Brookline, Massachusetts: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 2007) 140–41.

[4] Pauline Allen, trans., 'Introduction' to John Chrysostom, *Homilies on Paul's Letter to the Philippians* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013) xv–xvi. Pauline Allen & Wendy Mayer, 'Chrysostom and the Preaching of Homilies in Series: A Re-Examination of the Fifteen Homilies *In epistulam ad Philippenses* (CPG 4432)' *Vigiliae christianae* 49:3 (1995) 277–78, 284.

believed that the adoption of Attic syntax and Second Sophistic figures and tropes was appropriate when recording biblical exegesis. I will then provide a sketch of the humanistic education that he received before highlighting the Attic and Second Sophistic features of the abovementioned *argumenta*; features overlooked by scholars even in relation to other Chrysostomian works. These include: enclitic pronouns within the 'clause-second position,' *clausulae*, Attic spelling of verbs, nouns, and adjectives, obsolete particles and crases, optative constructions, and the rhetorical figure *hyperbaton*.

Caveat in Relation to the Grammatical Analysis of the *Argumenta*

A number of scholars have examined the scribal revision of Chrysostom's exegetical homilies, including Blake Goodall, Jutta Tloka, Francis T. Gignac, and Maria Konstantinidou.[5] Goodall's assessment is particularly relevant to this study since it concerns *In epistulam ad Philemon hom. 1–3*. Having systematically explored the affiliations of the numerous manuscripts of *In Philmn hom. 1–3*, Goodall determined that they fall into two major categories. These categories may be distinguished by deliberate alterations on the part of scribes of later centuries. Goodall labeled these two branches of manuscripts 'α' and 'β(γ),' the latter having served as the basis of Frederick Field's edition (discussed below).[6] What matters for the purposes of this chapter is that the scholar subsequently proposed that the two branches point to a common source, namely a tachygraphic original.[7]

In short, Goodall contested the idea that the homilies on the Pauline corpus attributed to Chrysostom were recorded by the Church Father, whether before or after their delivery. According to Goodall, this is because there are numerous grammatical shortcomings in these exegetical works that are not featured in Chrysostom's early treatises, which are widely recognised

---

[5] Blake Goodall, *The Homilies of St. John Chrysostom on the Letters of St. Paul to Titus and Philemon: Prolegomena to an Edition* (California: California University Press, 1979). Francis T. Gignac, 'Evidence for Deliberate Scribal Revision in Chrysostom's Homilies on the Acts of the Apostles' in *Nova & Vetera: Patristic Studies in Honor of Thomas Patrick Halton*, ed. John Petruccione (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1998) 209–25. Jutta Tloka, *Griechische Christen—christliche Griechen: Plausibilierungsstrategien des antiken Christentums bei Origenes und Johannes Chrysostomos*, Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 30 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005). Maria Konstantinidou, 'Opting for a Biblical Text Type: Scribal Interference in Chrysostom's Homilies on the Letter to Titus' in *Textual Variation: Theological and Social Tendencies?* ed. H. A. G. Houghton & D. C. Parker (Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2008) 133–48.

[6] Goodall, *The Homilies of St. John Chrysostom* 49–50.

[7] Ibid. 62–78 esp. 74, 78.

as being authentic.[8] Acknowledging that there is no direct evidence for tachygraphic activity in relation to the Chrysostomian corpus—with the exception of *In epistulam I ad Corinthios hom. 1–44* and *In Heb. hom. 1–34*—Goodall subsequently explored internal signs of this within *In epistulam ad Titum hom. 1–6* and *In Philmn hom. 1–3*.[9] Moreover, Goodall cited a number of passages from Chrysostom's other homilies and medieval biographies of the Church Father suggesting that he delivered his sermons extempore.[10] The scholar subsequently affirmed that the homilies on Tts and Phm, when cleared of later accretions, should reveal "a very close approximation to the live oratory of the master preacher."[11] However, the scholar neglected to ask who had the capacity to read the transcriptions of Chrysostom's homilies, whether polished or otherwise. Moreover, Goodall did not consider why Chrysostom would have permitted the transmission of these texts (including those that are stylistically flawed), even if he did not record or edit all of them himself. A major purpose of this chapter, therefore, is to determine the intended audience of Chrysostom's homilies generally in their written form. It will subsequently examine if Attic syntax and Second Sophistic rhetorical figures and tropes feature in the *argumenta* to the homilies on the Pauline corpus. This will help determine the validity of Goodall's assertion concerning the grammatical shortcomings of the homilies, and what these reveal about their authorship.

It must be noted that Goodall produced only *prolegomena* to a critical edition of the homilies on Tts and Phm.[12] Hence the formidable tasks of identifying and erasing later additions to Chrysostom's homilies on the Pauline corpus, on the one hand, and of determining the original sources of these texts and their forms of delivery, on the other, have not been undertaken. I have therefore been obliged to base my analysis of the *argumenta* on Frederick Field's editions of the homilies on 1 Co, Eph, 1 Ti and Phm, published between 1847 and 1861.[13] Even though Field's editions are not considered 'critical' in the strict sense of the term, they are superior to the other major

[8] Ibid. 62–66.

[9] Ibid. 70–78.

[10] Ibid. 66–70.

[11] Ibid. 78.

[12] Mayer anticipates that Wendy Fick's version of *In Philmn hom. 1–3* will replace that of Field once it is published. See Wendy Mayer, 'The Biography of John Chrysostom and the Chronology of his Works' (unpublished article), accessed June 10, 2016, https://www.academia.edu/6448810/The_Biography_of_John_Chrysostom_and_the_Chronology_of_his_Works, 15–16 esp. 16 n. 129.

[13] *Joannis Chrysostomi interpretatio omnium epistolarum Paulinarum*, vols. 2, 4 & 6, ed. Frederick Field (Oxford: J. H. Parker, 1847, 1852 & 1861). Hereafter referred to as Field 2, 4 & 6.

versions produced in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries by Henry Savile and Bernard de Montfaucon, respectively.[14] This is because Field observed important differences between two recensions of the homilies on the Pauline corpus that had been conflated by his predecessors, namely the *editio Veronensis* and the *Codex Augustanus*.[15]

Compounding the issues of tachygraphy and scribal revision in relation to the Chrysostomian corpus is that of preacher-audience interaction during Late Antiquity.[16] In 1998 Mayer indicated that the extant literature pertaining to Chrysostom's congregations was mostly "selective or superficial"—a major exception being Ramsey McMullen's article, 'The preacher's audience (AD 350–400).' However, Mayer noted that McMullen failed to distinguish between Chrysostom's regular audience in a given location and that which attended the liturgy on special occasions.[17] She rightly argued that there are multiple perspectives from which the relation between Chrysostom and his audience might be viewed in the light of the homilies, namely liturgical, ecclesiastical, rhetorical, political, and social.[18] In this chapter I am strictly concerned with how the Second Sophistic renaissance conditioned the writing style of Chrysostom and his stenographers, and the expectations of his literary audience. Determining who exactly attended his liturgical services is beyond the scope of my study.

In addition to the multiple issues surrounding who constituted Chrysostom's live audience and where he preached, Mayer masterfully outlined those concerning: (i) the occasions on which he and his audience interacted; (ii) the manner in which they interacted; and (iii) the reasons why they were in a position to interact.[19] I am interested in the manner in which Chrysostom's

---

[14] Goodall, *The Homilies of St. John Chrysostom* 2–4. Mayer, 'The Biography of John Chrysostom' 15.

[15] As outlined by Goodall, there are various other merits and flaws of Field's work; these, however, do not need to be reiterated here. See Goodall, *The Homilies of St. John Chrysostom* 4–5. Allen used his text of 1885 for her translation of *In Phil. hom. 1–15* (Allen, trans., 'Introduction' to John Chrysostom, *Homilies on Paul's Letter to the Philippians* xxxi–xxxiii).

[16] For comprehensive discussions of preacher-audience interaction throughout the history of Byzantium, see *Preacher and Audience: Studies in Early Christian and Byzantine Homiletics*, A New History of the Sermon 1, ed. Mary B. Cunningham and Pauline Allen (Leiden: Brill, 1998). For an analysis of how Latin preachers engaged the attention of their audiences during Late Antiquity, see Philip Rousseau, 'The Preacher's Audience—a More Optimistic View' in *Ancient History in a Modern University, vol. 2: Early Christianity, Late Antiquity and Beyond*, ed. T. W. Hillard, R. A. Kearsley, C. E. V. Nixon, and A. M. Nobbs (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998) 391–400.

[17] Wendy Mayer, 'John Chrysostom: Extraordinary Preacher, Ordinary Audience' in *Preacher and Audience* 113–14.

[18] Ibid. 114–22.

[19] Ibid. 122–34.

preaching was recorded and stylised; not what occasioned his sermons on specific occasions, neither their location. Mayer subsequently indicated that the Church Father's preaching style and rhetorical techniques pertain to the topic of 'communication,' whilst his audience's level of comprehension concerns that of 'language.'[20] It is precisely these two topics that I will discuss below with regard to his literary, rather than liturgical, audience.

In their comprehensive assessments of Chrysostom's exegetical homilies, Allen and Mayer indicated that it is difficult to determine exactly when and where each was composed.[21] With regard to the series on Col and Php, they contested the notion that these were delivered sequentially at the same location. Allen and Mayer also underscored the importance of judging the homilies within a given series on a case-by-case basis. Bearing this in mind, Goodall's sweeping assertion that the series on Tts and Phm were not written or edited by St John on the basis of grammatical inconsistencies found in certain passages of specific homilies should be questioned. A grammatical analysis of each homily and *argumentum* is in order before such conclusions can be reached.

Mayer reiterated in 2014 that the prevailing practice of assigning dates to Chrysostom's exegetical homilies on the basis of internal evidence is erroneous since—as mentioned above—it is uncertain which remain unaltered by editors of later centuries.[22] Consequently, until critical editions of Chrysostom's homilies on the Pauline corpus are produced, my findings should be considered tentative. If such critical editions should demonstrate a high degree of later scribal revision, my analysis of the *argumenta* sheds light on the literary expectations of the Byzantines during the Middle Ages. If these editions should prove minimal interference of this kind, my assessment illuminates an important aspect of Chrysostom's pastoral strategy. I proceed with my grammatical analysis on the assumption that Chrysostom composed or at least edited the transcriptions of the *argumenta*, and that these received little or no further revision from scribes. I propose that the remaining homilies on Eph and 1 Ti, and a number on 1 Co and Phm, were likewise edited by

[20] Ibid. 131.

[21] Pauline Allen and Wendy Mayer, 'Chrysostom and the Preaching of Homilies in Series: A New Approach to the Twelve Homilies *In epistulam ad Colossenses* (CPG 4433)' *Orientalia christiana periodica* 60:1 (1994) 38–39. Allen and Mayer, 'Chrysostom and the Preaching of Homilies in Series: A Re-Examination of the Fifteen Homilies *In epistulam ad Philippenses* (CPG 4432)' 284. For a comprehensive study of the problems surrounding the provenance and dating of St John's homilies, see: Wendy Mayer, *The Homilies of St John Chrysostom—Provenance: Reshaping the Foundations* (Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 2005).

[22] Mayer, 'The Biography of John Chrysostom' 14, 16–17.

the Church Father at some stage. I contend that he otherwise approved their transmission, whether tacitly or explicitly.

The Stylistic Influence of the Second Sophistic on Chrysostom's Writings

The purpose of this section is to clarify why Chrysostom recorded the *argumenta* to his homilies on the Pauline corpus using the syntax and style promoted by the Second Sophistic authors, whom he repeatedly criticised. I will outline how the Second Sophistic renaissance conditioned the education of the Church Father and his contemporaries, as well as the rhetorical expectations of their literary audiences. I will highlight how Chrysostom's simultaneous censure and use of the Second Sophistic style constituted a deliberate pastoral strategy given his understanding of divine *synkatabasis*. Lastly, this section will account for the figures and tropes employed throughout the Chrysostomian corpus via an assessment of the literary-rhetorical curriculum that the Church Father proceeded through under the guidance of Libanius the Sophist.

An Overview of the Second Sophistic

Before discussing St John's adoption of an Atticised style it is necessary to examine the literary and cultural renaissance that conditioned his education, namely the Second Sophistic. This movement lasted from the first century BC to the fourth century AD and continued to influence the rhetorical curriculum of the Roman Empire until the later Byzantine period.[23] Its proponents, who consisted of the empire's educated elite, attempted to revive by imitation the forms of rhetoric that had been developed by the Classical authors, especially Demosthenes, Isocrates, Thucydides, Herodotus, Xenophon, and Plato. The probable motives behind the renaissance are beyond the scope of this chapter. It may suffice to state that the aforementioned imitation entailed the revival of Attic within the Greco-Roman schools and the broader society.

[23] On the general character of the Second Sophistic and the rhetorical devices that shaped its style, see Thomas E. Ameringer, 'The Stylistic Influence of the Second Sophistic on the Panegyrical Sermons of St. John Chrysostom: A Study in Greek Rhetoric' (Washington, DC: PhD Diss., Catholic University of America, 1921) 11–17. For a succinct summary of the modern debates over the movement, such as the divergent characterisations of its relation to Rome and Greece, see Tim Whitmarsh, *The Second Sophistic* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005) 4–22. Cribiore cites numerous scholars who have discussed the survival of the sophistical rhetorical education system in late Byzantium. Raffaella Cribiore, *The School of Libanius in Late Antique Antioch* (Princeton & Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2007) 196 n. 120.

This contributed to the social advancement of the sophists, who had long since been entrusted with the education of the empire and the delivery of its public announcements and celebratory speeches.[24]

Interestingly, Geoffrey Horrocks indicated that the sophists were unable to adopt a consistent Attic style due to the differences prevalent amongst their literary prototypes.[25] Moreover, Robert Browning argued that the sophists had imperfect knowledge of Attic, as demonstrated by the 'hypercorrect' forms of the language they employed in their attempts to overcompensate.[26] Yet Browning and Horrocks admitted the fundamental importance that the society's upper classes attached to the practice of Atticising. They also highlighted the resulting dichotomy that was established between an idealised literary language, on the one hand, and the otherwise pervasive, heterogeneous Koine, on the other. Browning and Horrocks pointed out that many sophists accepted within their writings Koine forms despite having generally denounced them, much like the grammarians.[27] To be sure, Horrocks affirmed that "a more realistic Atticism" began to prevail by the third century, allowing for neoclassical constructions and the use of "well-established features of the higher-level Koine."[28] Nonetheless, according to these scholars, the *diglossia* that was introduced by the Second Sophistic gradually became more pronounced.

It is noteworthy that Browning expressed his disappointment that the Christian intellectual authorities from the second century onwards—whose predecessors had exclusively adopted the spoken Greek within their writings—conceded to the expectations of the cultivated upper class. He asserted that the Fathers of the fourth century, particularly Chrysostom, entirely ignored the spoken language within their treatises and sermons, having adopted instead the Atticised literary style for the purpose of conversion.[29] He went on to state that:

> These writers dealt with the charismatic prestige of the N.T. and the Septuagint by embodying words and expressions from these texts like techni-

[24] Robert Browning, *Medieval and Modern Greek* (Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1983) 44–45. Geoffrey Horrocks, *Greek: A History of the Language and its Speakers* (Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010) 133–34.

[25] Horrocks, *Greek* 135.

[26] Browning, *Medieval and Modern Greek* 47.

[27] Browning, *Medieval and Modern Greek* 44–50. Horrocks, *Greek* 133–37.

[28] Horrocks, *Greek* 137.

[29] Browning, *Medieval and Modern Greek* 49–50.

> cal terms from a foreign tongue, i.e. at a purely lexical level, while rejecting the morphological and syntactical features of the Greek Bible.[30]

Browning therefore did not consider the possibility that Chrysostom's exegetical homilies have been altered since their delivery in Antioch and/or Constantinople. This point will be considered in due course. For the moment, it is important to point out that Jaclyn L. Maxwell contradicted Browning and Horrocks, contending that the general population of the Roman Empire had become accustomed to the eloquence of the sophists by the fourth century.[31] More precisely, she described how the Antiochene crowds were taught within a variety of contexts to value the elevated Greek style by the sophists, as well as by the public speakers and performers who graduated from their schools.[32] According to Maxwell, high-status events included imperial announcements and birthday celebrations, *adventus* ceremonies, athletic contests, religious festivals, building dedications, and theatrical performances, in addition to legal trials.[33] Less prestigious occasions included family weddings, birthdays and funerals.[34]

Maxwell further posited that the less educated members of the public sometimes responded to the speeches that were delivered at the aforementioned events, and that they could therefore generally understand what was being said.[35] Hence, whilst Maxwell—in a manner reminiscent of Browning—indicated that notable personalities (including Lucian, Plutarch, Dio Chrysostom and Themistius) censured the sophists' use of complex and obscure language,[36] she also argued that:

> Second Sophistic writers were aware of the difference between Attic and contemporary Greek, but many of their comments indicate that the old dialect, or at least the way it was used in speeches, was comprehensible to ordinary

---

[30] Ibid. 50.

[31] Maxwell's study ultimately intends to reveal the gradual, interactive process of Christianisation that occurred in Antioch.

[32] Jaclyn L. Maxwell, *Christianization and Communication in Late Antiquity: John Chrysostom and His Congregation in Antioch* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006) 11–64.

[33] Maxwell, *Christianization and Communication* 42–64. Ameringer, 'The Stylistic Influence of the Second Sophistic' 11–12.

[34] Maxwell, *Christianization and Communication* 46.

[35] Maxwell, *Christianization and Communication* 43. Ameringer, 'The Stylistic Influence of the Second Sophistic' 13.

[36] Maxwell, *Christianization and Communication* 20–22. On the negative reactions of Lucian, Plutarch, Galen, and Marcus Aurelius to the practice of Atticising, see Browning, *Medieval and Modern Greek* 46–47.

> Greek speakers. Indeed, people apparently enjoyed listening to speeches that were slightly over their heads.[37]

Many scholars, including George Alexander Kennedy, David Rylaarsdam, and Patsavos, have displayed a similar understanding as a result of Chrysostom's *De sacerdotio*; a collection of six books on the joys, difficulties, and general demands of the priesthood.[38] Indeed, in *De sac.* 5.1 the saint asserts that many people who attend the liturgy "assume [the status] of spectators who take their seats in pagan places of contest."[39] Chrysostom goes on to state that "the art of oration … is becoming so excessively desired here [i.e. in the church]; [it is] not even thus with the sophists, whenever they might be compelled to contend against one another."[40] Similarly, at the end of the chapter, he poses the following question to his interlocutor, Basil, and/or a broader audience:

> do you not know how much love for orations has now invaded the souls of Christians and that most of all those who practise these [are held] in honour, not only by the pagans, but also by those who belong to the household of faith?[41]

Subsequently, two mutually exclusive reasons for St John's adherence to the Second Sophistic literary convention prevail amongst scholars. On the one hand, there is Browning's contention that the Church Father was so preoccupied with converting the aristocracy that he exclusively adopted Attic syntax and style whilst preaching, entirely at the expense of the uneducated. On the other hand, there is Maxwell's argument that most people during Chrysostom's time, whether Christian or pagan, expected preachers to adopt an Atticised style owing to four centuries worth of eloquent speeches at most public events. It is the contention of this chapter that the same

---

[37] Maxwell, *Christianization and Communication* 19–20.

[38] Patsavos, *A Noble Task* 137–41. George Alexander Kennedy, *Greek Rhetoric Under Christian Emperors* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1983) 243–46. David Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy: The Coherence of His Theology and Preaching* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014) 208–10. Certain authors maintain that this collection also has an apologetic function, as the saint attempts in the opening chapters to justify his initial avoidance of ordination and dishonest treatment of a close friend named Basil. Graham Neville, trans., 'Introduction' to John Chrysostom, *Six Books on the Priesthood* (Crestwood, New York: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1977) 20–24. Others doubt the genuineness of the dramatic setting, arguing that the aforesaid justification constitutes a sophistic defence of the thesis that "it is also possible to use the force of deception for good" (ἔστι καὶ ἐπὶ καλῷ τῇ τῆς ἀπάτης κεχρῆσθαι δυνάμει). John Chrysostom, *Sur le sacerdoce* (i.e. *De sacerdotio*) 2.1, Sources chrétiennes 252, ed. Anne-Marie Malingrey (Paris: Cerf, 1980) 100. Kennedy, *Greek Rhetoric* 243–44.

[39] *Sur le sacerdoce* 5.1, 282.

[40] *Sur le sacerdoce* 5.1, 284.

[41] *Sur le sacerdoce* 5.8, 302.

methodological flaw is apparent in both cases since Browning and Maxwell each presume that most Christian homilies and pagan philosophical discourses are precise transcriptions of speeches that were either prepared in advance or delivered extempore. The scholars fail to consider the possibility that the Christian sermons that have been transmitted to posterity were recorded by stenographers then modified by them or the speakers themselves so that they might appeal to those who were conditioned by the Second Sophistic curriculum. Furthermore, it should be highlighted that Browning's assertion that Chrysostom rejected the spoken language whilst preaching was partly dependent upon an anecdote featured in Cosmas Vestitor's *Life of St John Chrysostom*. This anecdote centres on an objection raised to the Church Father's eloquent style.[42]

In short, Vestitor relates within the *Life* that a woman interrupted Chrysostom during one of his sermons, complaining that his speech was so elaborate that she could hardly understand him. According to Vestitor, this compelled Chrysostom to adopt the common tongue for the remainder of the homily. It is significant that Palladius, Socrates, and Sozomen—the earliest sources of the saint's biography (namely, the fifth century)—do not mention this encounter.[43] With regard to Chrysostom's style, Sozomen praises the Church Father for having proceeded in his vocation as a bishop "with clear diction in dialogue together with splendour" (φράσει δὲ λόγου σαφεῖ μετὰ λαμπρότητος),[44] recounting how his natural eloquence enabled him to gain the trust of the general populace.[45] The less sympathetic Socrates concedes that "whilst teaching he was a man of great service to the morals of those who were listening."[46] Palladius expectedly states that St John was "distinguished

---

[42] *Vie de Saint Jean Chrysostome par Cosme Vestitor* in *Douze récits sur Saint Jean Chrysostome*, ed. François Halkin (Bruxelles: Société des Bollandistes, 1977) 433. Browning, *Medieval and Modern Greek* 50. In his study of the ascetic-psychological fragment attributed to Vestitor (*CPG* 8163), Tomás Fernandez weighed the findings of numerous scholars and concluded that this author was active between 730 and 850 at the latest. Tomás Fernández, 'Cosmas Vestitor's Ascetic-Physiological Fragment (*CPG* 8163)' *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 104:2 (2011) 633, 633–34 n. 5.

[43] For a comprehensive discussion of the relationship between these sources and their respective motives, see Mayer, 'The Biography of John Chrysostom' 5–12.

[44] *Sozomenus: Kirchengeschichte* (i.e. *Historia Ecclesiastica*) 8.2, Die Griechischen Christlischen Schriftsteller, N. F. 4, ed. Jospeh Bidez (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1995) 350. Sozomen argued that Chrysostom convinced his audiences to think similar to him without employing "some system and art of oration" (τέχνῃ τινὶ καὶ δυνάμει λόγου). Whilst this was likely the case with the uneducated people who comprised his flock, it certainly was not with the elite who expected him to adopt an elevated style.

[45] As well as convince Theodore of Mopsuestia to return to the ascetic life. *Sozomenus: Kirchengeschichte* 8.2, 350–51.

[46] *Sokrates: Kirchengeschichte* (i.e. *Historia Ecclesiastica*) 6.3, Die Griechischen Christlischen

by a cleverer mind" and therefore "trained by means of orations for service in the imperial pronouncements."[47]

Subsequently, Browning neglected to consider the possibility that Vestitor's account might be fictitious. This is also suggested by the poetic (and fairly sophistic) analogies that the homilist attributes to the anonymous parishioner. It is possible that this story contains an element of truth and therefore reflects linguistic estrangement that existed between the erudite bishop, on the one hand, and uneducated laypeople, on the other. Nevertheless, it should not be considered in any assessment of the former's preaching until further evidence is brought to light. At any rate, determining Vestitor's purpose in describing such an encounter in what Mayer has rightly dubbed a "highly encomiastic" work remains beyond the scope of this chapter.[48]

Returning to *De sac.* 5, the chapter gives the impression that the Church Father felt that a significant percentage of those who attended the Greek liturgy expected him and his fellow preachers to imitate the pagan orators. However, it is also possible that Chrysostom refers solely here to the educated elite that comprise his congregation; or that the chapter serves as something of an apology for occasional regressions into the Second Sophistic style in which he was trained; or that he is exaggerating in order to underscore the need for oratorical perfection on the part of his fellow clergymen so that they might effectively interact with people from all walks of life. When considering the rationale behind Chrysostom's adoption of the Second Sophistic style in his exegetical works, scholars therefore need to be mindful that the available manuscripts might differ in terms of syntax and style from the speeches on which they are based.

It is certain that Chrysostom could have delivered a sermon in an elevated style impromptu, particularly if Libanius was his teacher (an important point which will be examined later). From a pastoral perspective, however—assuming that his congregations also consisted of the illiterate—it is debatable whether he would have done so in the context of the liturgy. At present it is not possible to determine who exactly attended the services that Chrysostom held in Antioch and Constantinople, let alone what their respective levels of education were.[49] Consequently, his homilies must not be

---

Schriftsteller, N. F. 1, ed. Günther Christian Hansen (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1995) 315.

[47] *Palladios: Dialogue sur la vie de Jean Chrysostome* 5, tome 1, Sources chrétiennes 341, ed. Anne-Marie Malingrey (Paris: Cerf, 1988) 106.

[48] Wendy Mayer, 'John Chrysostom' in *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Patristics*, ed. Ken Parry (West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons, 2015) 148.

[49] Wendy Mayer, 'Who Came to Hear John Chrysostom Preach? Recovering a Late Fourth-century Preacher's Audience' *Ephemerides theologicae Lovanienses* 76:1 (2000) 73–87.

included in any assessment of Greek *diglossia*. They do not shed light on the rhetorical expectations of all Christians during Late Antiquity; Chrysostom naturally did not publish them for the members of his flock who could not read. Subsequently, the homilies recorded by Chrysostom and his scribes illuminate the literary expectations of Christians who proceeded through the Second Sophistic curriculum to a considerable extent, and therefore valued the practice of Atticising. As mentioned above, a major objective of this chapter is to clarify why Chrysostom's exegesis was finally recorded for such people using Attic syntax and numerous figures and tropes despite his frequent censure of oratory.

Chrysostom's Estimation of Rhetoric

As indicated above, a number of scholars have examined the passages on rhetoric within *De sac.*, most notably Patsavos, Kennedy, and Rylaarsdam.[50] Kennedy and Rylaarsdam related these to Chrysostom's assessments of oratory and the imperial education system within *In I Cor. hom.* 4 and the apologetic work, *Adversus oppugnatores vitae monasticae*.[51] As indicated by Rylaarsdam and Hunter, St John employs the ancient commonplace of philosophy versus rhetoric within *Adv. opp. vit. mon.* 3.11 whilst denying the latter any spiritually formative value.[52] He explicitly states that whilst "virtue [that stems] from [certain] habits" (τῆς ἀπὸ τῶν τρόπων ἐπιεικείας) is a prerequisite for the acquisition of rhetorical skill, the reverse is not true.[53] Chrysostom argues that the pursuit of rhetoric under the guidance of secular teachers will likely compromise "all the strength and good health of the soul" (τῆς ψυχῆς τὴν ἰσχὺν καὶ τὴν εὐεξίαν ἅπασαν).[54] Moreover, the saint asserts that the philosophers Anacharsis, Crates, and Diogenes focused on ethical philosophy instead of rhetoric, and that Plato and Socrates likewise depreciated the latter, as evidenced by the censure of it within *Apology* 17.[55] The Church Father subsequently likens what he considers to

---

[50] See n. 38.

[51] According to D. G. Hunter, the latter text is not only a defence of the ascetic life but of Christianity more broadly, in which St John contends that the faithful—not their pagan contemporaries—possess the virtues defined by Socrates and other Classical philosophers. David G. Hunter, 'Libanius and John Chrysostom: New Thoughts on an Old Problem' in *Studia Patristica XXII*, ed. Elizabeth A. Livingstone (Leuven: Peeters, 1989) 131–32.

[52] Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy* 208–9. Hunter, 'Libanius and John Chrysostom' 133.

[53] *Adversus oppugnatores vitae monasticae* 3.11 (PG 47, 367).

[54] *Adv. opp. vit. mon.* 3.11 (PG 47, 367).

[55] Ibid. (PG 47, 367–68).

be the "glibness" (εὐγλωττία) of the sophists with the "ambitious display" of "playing adolescents" (μειρακίων δὲ παιζόντων ἡ φιλοτιμία).[56]

This assessment of Greek learning is largely consistent with that featured in *In 1 Cor. hom.* 4. The key difference in the homily is that Chrysostom also contrasts the wisdom of the pagan philosophers to that of the apostles. Interestingly, he uses common rhetorical forms (repetition and pleonasm) to describe how God "even expelled Plato, not via another, wiser, philosopher, but via an unlearned fisherman."[57] In fact, Chrysostom states within the homily that God's unfathomable power is being demonstrated by the humble manner in which the pagans are being converted, that is, not by "an eloquence characteristic of orations and a cleverness characteristic of sophisms" (ῥητορείαν λόγων καὶ δεινότητα σοφισμάτων) but by hearing "things opposite from those they desire" (τὰ ἐναντία ὧν ἐπιθυμοῦσιν).[58] Indeed, within *De sac.* 4.6, the Church Father rejects "the smoothness of Isocrates, and the loftiness of Demosthenes, and the majesty of Thucydides, and the sublimity of Plato" (τὴν λειότητα Ἰσοκράτους … καὶ τὸν Δημοσθένους ὄγκον καὶ τὴν Θουκιδίδου σεμνότητα καὶ τὸ Πλάτωνος ὕψος).[59] Hunter was therefore justified in affirming that St John's positive references to the philosophers in *Adv. opp. vit. mon.* are unique.[60] Subsequently, an attempt must be made to account for St John's censure, use, and permitted transmission of an Atticised style.

---

[56] Ibid. (PG 47, 368).

[57] *In epistulam I ad Corinthios hom*. 4 (Field 2, 35D–36E). Kennedy, *Greek Rhetoric* 251–52.

[58] That is to say, simple, honest preaching. *In 1 Cor. hom*. 4 (Field 2, 36B).

[59] *Sur le sacerdoce* 4.6, 268, 270. In *De sac.* 4.6–7, Chrysostom methodically examines the Pauline corpus so as to demonstrate that the Apostle took great pains to be eloquent in his proclamation and defence of the Gospel, despite his admission that he had been not trained in sophistic rhetoric (2 Co 11:6). See *Sur le sacerdoce* 4.6–7, 262–75.

[60] More precisely, that they were intended to refute Libanius' defence of paganism and support for Julian the Apostate. Hunter indicated that Libanius' orations addressed to this opponent of Christianity contributed to Chrysostom's censure of rhetoric in *Adv. opp. vit. mon* (discussed above). The scholar argued that St John contradicted the sophist's implication within his orations and *Apologia Socratis* that the acquisition of virtue was dependent upon the study of pagan literature. Whilst drawing upon the research of Caius Fabricius, Hunter revealed that Chrysostom repeatedly quotes the sophist to this end in his earliest treatise, *Comparatio regis et monachi*. See Hunter, 'Libanius and John Chrysostom' 129–34. On account of these citations, as well as St John's strict adherence to the rules of the *synkrisis*, J. N. D. Kelly contended that he composed the treatise on leaving Libanius' school. J. N. D. Kelly, *Golden Mouth: The Story of John Chrysostom—Ascetic, Preacher, Bishop* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1995) 20–22. For more on the sophist and the emperor's admiration for one another, see Cribiore, *The School of Libanius* 142–44. On Libanius' defence of Julian, see Maxwell, *Christianization and Communication* 47.

Various scholars have highlighted the influence that Second Sophistic rhetoric had upon Chrysostom. In a study published in 1921, Thomas E. Ameringer systematically evaluated how the saint made use of numerous rhetorical figures and tropes that had been adopted and developed by the sophists within his panegyrical sermons. These included alliteration, oxymoron, hyperbole, pleonasm, *arsis*, *epanaphora*, *antistrophe*, *symploke*, *climax*, *cyclos*, *hyperbaton*, and *paronomasia*. The scholar also examined St John's use of Gorgianic figures (*parison*, *antithesis*, and *homoioteleuton*) in the abovementioned works, in addition to his metaphors and comparisons. Finally, he systematically recounted each instance of the *progymnasmatic* form known as the *ekphrasis*.[61]

Kennedy likewise noted the *ekphraseis* that Chrysostom incorporated in *De statuis hom.* 1–21, as well as the following rhetorical devices: vivacity, pleonasm, *epanaphora*, and *paranomasia*. Moreover, he highlighted the *progymnasmatic psogos* that St John ascribes to Basil in *De sac.* 1.7, and—whilst appealing to Harry M. Hubbel, E. Amand de Mendieta, and A. Cioffi—the *synkriseis* and techniques of Stoic diatribe the Church Father employs within *De laudibus s. Pauli hom.* 1–7.[62]

Interestingly, Ameringer's contemporary, Dickinson, methodically examined the frequent occurrences of the optative mood within the Chrysostomian corpus. It is widely known that the Second Sophistic authors revived this mood, which had largely been replaced by the subjunctive with the emergence of Koine (this will be discussed further in the grammatical analysis of the *argumenta*).[63] Dickinson indicated that Chrysostom's optative constructions are for the most part in accordance with the Classical models. In short, he counted seven hundred and seventy-nine instances of the 'optative of wish,' two thousand, seven hundred and three of the 'potential optative,' and one thousand, eight hundred and eight of the 'conditional optative.' This was in addition to numerous other uses of the mood often featured in Classical and Second Sophistic works, such as with the words τάχ'ἄν or ταχέως ἄν to denote the sense of 'perhaps.'[64]

Ameringer and Dickinson's analyses built upon those of Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, A. and M. Croiset, and Aenotheus Eduardus Leo, all of whom

---

[61] Ameringer, 'The Stylistic Influence' 29–100.

[62] Kennedy, *Greek Rhetoric* 248–49.

[63] On the Second Sophistic revival of the optative mood, see Whitmarsh, *The Second Sophistic* 42. Joy Connolly, 'The Problems of the Past in Imperial Greek Education' in *Education in Greek and Roman Antiquity*, ed. Yun Lee Too (Leiden: Brill, 2001) 349. John A. L. Lee, 'Why Didn't St Basil Write in New Testament Greek?' *Phronema* 25 (2010) 3.

[64] Dickinson, 'The Use of the Optative Mood' 165–67, 169–75.

praised St John's Attic style. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff considered St John an Atticist of the highest calibre—greater than Aristides, and similar to Demosthenes in terms of style—whilst Leo likened Chrysostom's eloquence to that of Plato and Xenophon. As indicated above, Wilamowitz-Moellendorff further asserted that Attic Greek especially pervades the Church Father's exegetical homilies.[65] St John's biographer, Chrysostomus Baur, openly agreed with these philologists, attributing the Church Father's refined style to diligent study of the classics. Baur maintained that such study is evidenced by his references to the aforesaid philosophers, as well as his citations and/or mentions of Homer, Sophocles, Euripides, Aristophanes, Pindar, Zeno, Diagoras, Pythagoras, Aristotle, and Apollonius of Tyana.[66]

Whilst examining the various traits that the early Church expected in its candidates for the bishopric, priesthood, and diaconate, Patsavos identified how Chrysostom stressed the need for eloquence and erudition, accompanied by humility. Drawing upon *De sac.* 5, he argued that St John considered the adoption of an elaborate style essential for instructing the crowds and pacifying their secular expectations, as well as refuting/redeeming heterodox preachers.[67] This is ostensibly demonstrated in *De sac.* 5.5:

> For even when a person may have much ability in the art of speaking (but one can find this amongst few people), not even in this way have they been freed from perpetual toil. For since the art of speaking [stems] not from nature, but from education, even if someone should attain a high [standard] in it, if he does not cultivate this ability by frequent effort and training, then it leaves him destitute … But if [Christian preachers] cannot constantly present things greater in splendour, which all people consider with reference to them, many reproaches follow from everyone.[68]

Kennedy and Rylaarsdam arrived at similar conclusions via their respective assessments of the treatise.[69] In fact, whilst appealing to Ameringer, the former also highlighted St John's justification of the use of multiple rhetorical devices by means of an analogy pertaining to the care of the sick within *De*

---

[65] Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, 'Die griechische Literatur des Altertums' 296. Aenotheus Eduardus Leo, ed., 'Praefatio' to *Iohannis Chrysostomi de sacerdotio libri VI* (Leipzig: Schuman, 1834) ix. A. Croiset et M. Croiset, *Historie de la littérature grecque* (Paris: Ancienne Librairie Thorin et Fils, 1899) 966–68.

[66] Baur, *John Chrysostom and His Time* 1: 305–6, 312 ns 4–5. Ameringer outlined the instances in which St John: praised the classics; presupposed his audience's familiarity with the texts; advised his audience to scrutinise them; and congratulated people for having already done so. Ameringer, 'The Stylistic Influence' 21–24.

[67] Patsavos, *A Noble Task* 137–41.

[68] *Sur le sacerdoce* 5.5, 290.

[69] Kennedy, *Greek Rhetoric* 243–46. Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy* 210.

prophetiarum obscuritate hom. 1–2.[70] The Church Father asserted in *De proph. obsc. hom.* 1.1 that:

> the sermon ought to be made elaborate and diverse—containing comparisons and proofs from example, *kataskeuas*, and periods, and many other such things—in order that, out of everything [featured in the Scriptures], the acquisition of those things profitable to us might become easy.[71]

Moreover, Ameringer and Hunter both drew attention to *Adv. opp. vit. mon.* 3.12, wherein the saint compares rhetorical education and Christian moral formation to the whitewashing and foundations of a house, respectively.[72] In short, Chrysostom likens the prohibition of profane learning in the case of those who have attained virtue to the obstruction of the whitewashing of a building whose walls stand firm. In both instances, any opposition should naturally be considered unreasonable.[73]

As emphasised earlier, St John's promotion of Second Sophistic rhetoric does not necessarily prove that he employed it even whilst preaching to average laypeople. Given the available evidence, however, it can be argued with confidence that these passages vindicate the use of rhetorical figures and tropes in works that presuppose a certain level of education on the part of the responder, and a resulting appreciation for complex literary devices.

Amongst the scholars who assessed St John's simultaneous censure and recommendation of the Second Sophistic style, Ameringer presented a problem that ought to be addressed here. First, it must be noted that he ascribed to the saint his own contempt for the abovementioned literary convention, despite having recognised that the Church Father was not opposed to it so long as it was coupled with moral instruction.[74] Ameringer therefore concluded that St John contradicted his own homiletic theories whilst attempting to excuse what he perceived to be the "bad taste and the mannerisms of sophistic rhetoric" featured in the latter's works, particularly "the jingle of rhyme, and monotonous parallelism of structure…"[75] He claimed that Chrysostom's contradictions were in fact unconscious; that he could not altogether eradicate the rhetorical habits that he had developed as a

---

[70] George Alexander Kennedy, *Classical Rhetoric and Its Christian and Secular Tradition* (Chapel Hill, North Carolina: The University of North Carolina Press, 1999) 166, 309 n. 29. Ameringer, 'The Stylistic Influence of the Second Sophistic' 28.

[71] *De prophetiarum obscuritate hom.* 1.1 (PG 56, 165).

[72] Ameringer, 'The Stylistic Influence of the Second Sophistic' 21–22. Hunter, 'Libanius and John Chrysostom' 133 n. 19.

[73] *Adv. opp. vit. mon.* 3.12 (PG 47, 368).

[74] Ameringer, 'The Stylistic Influence of the Second Sophistic' 24–27.

[75] Ibid. 102.

student.[76] It is the contention of this chapter, however, that St John's alleged 'contradictions' must be considered in the light of his understanding of divine *synkatabasis*.

In his translation of Chrysostom's *Hom. 1–67 in Gen.*, Robert C. Hill censured those who rendered the Church Father's exegetical term *synkatabasis* into English as 'condescension,' arguing that he did not intend it to have such a 'patronising' connotation. The scholar maintained that it should instead be interpreted 'considerateness,' since it refers to God's gracious acceptance of human limitations both "eminently in the Incarnation, and derivatively in that other incarnation of the Word in Scripture."[77] Whilst drawing upon Frederic Henry Chase, Hill highlighted St John's conviction that "the Scriptures exemplify God's 'considerateness' … because in them God speaks to human beings in language, and primarily in speech."[78] As indicated by Hill, this accounts for Chrysostom's assertions within the homilies that the Holy Spirit spoke through Moses.[79] Truly, Chrysostom's teaching that divine mysteries are graciously communicated to humanity via language—despite its limitations—can be found in his homilies on Gen 2:21 and Gen 8:1; verses in which the transcendent God is said to have 'taken' (ἔλαβεν) and 'remembered' (ἐμνήσθη), just like his creatures.[80] With regard to Gen 2:21, the Church Father offers the following instruction:

> Do not receive the things being said in human fashion, but reckon the earthliness of the phrases for [the sake of] human weakness. For if he had not used these words, how would we have been able to learn these ineffable mysteries? Therefore, let us not be content with the words alone, but let us consider everything in a manner worthy of God, as concerning God. For the [expression], "He took," and those such as this, have been said on account of our weakness.[81]

St John provides very similar instruction in his commentary on Gen 8:1.[82] Whilst the Church Father's exegesis is beyond the scope of this chapter, it

---

[76] Ibid.

[77] Robert C. Hill, trans., 'Introduction' to John Chrysostom, *Homilies on Genesis 1–17*, Fathers of the Church 74 (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1986) 17.

[78] Ibid. 17–18.

[79] Ibid. 18 n. 68.

[80] *Septuaginta: Id est Vetus Testamentum Graece Iuxta LXX Interpretes, Duo Volumina in Uno*, Editio Altera, ed. Alfred Rahlfs and Robert Hanhart (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006) 4, 16.

[81] *In Gen. hom.* 15.2 (PG 53, 121). For an assessment of this passage and others related to it, see Frederic Henry Chase, *Chrysostom, A Study in the History of Biblical Interpretation* (Cambridge, UK: Deighton, Bell, and Co., 1887) 42–50.

[82] *In Gen. hom.* 26.3 (PG 53, 232). Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy* 212–13.

must be noted that Rylaarsdam sagaciously drew a connection between his perception of divine *synkatabasis* (which the scholar termed 'adaptation'), on the one hand, and sophistic rhetoric, on the other. In brief, whilst appealing to Geoffrey Wainwright, Rylaarsdam contended that Chrysostom viewed the use of Greek rhetoric as an accommodation to a particular weakness of the flock. More precisely, owing to his belief that God adopted human language—despite its flaws and limitations—towards redemptive ends, St John felt justified in conceding to the rhetorical expectations of his audiences in order to proclaim the Gospel.

Assuming that the transcriptions of Chrysostom's exegetical homilies were polished for the sake of an educated audience, Rylaarsdam's argument helps clear the former of any charges of ignorance/inconsistency. Indeed, it becomes apparent that his simultaneous censure and adoption of Second Sophistic rhetoric constitutes a deliberate pastoral strategy. More precisely, Chrysostom's censures of oratory were intended to curb the preference for style over content displayed by the more cultured members of the Greek-speaking laity. Yet the Church Father had to first acquire and maintain the respect of such people for reasons that he was not altogether content with. Chrysostom therefore appeased their literary tastes via an Atticised style and the full rhetorical arsenal they had all been required to learn at school. Rylaarsdam's affirmation that St John adopted and transformed such rhetoric "in order to lead people to salvation" is therefore appropriate, insofar as it refers to the educated elite, especially his literary audience.[83]

To reiterate, Chrysostom's understanding of divine *synkatabasis* obligated him to communicate the message of the Gospel in the manner most expected by his audience. I contend that he felt that he could not afford to limit his writings to Koine vocabulary and syntax at the risk of his own reputation and, in consequence, the receptivity and spiritual welfare of his literary audience. Determining whether he managed to do so consistently, however, warrants a separate investigation.[84]

Chrysostom's Education

Baur attributed Socrates and Sozomen's assertions that St John was a pupil of Libanius to an anecdote featured in his letter *Ad viduam iuniorem*.[85] In

[83] Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy* 213.

[84] Subsequently, for the reasons highlighted above, it is likely that Chrysostom eschewed Attic syntax and multiple figures and tropes when preaching to average laypeople. The alternative is to accept Maxwell's forced argument that the latter demanded to hear speeches they did not comprehend.

[85] *Sokrates: Kirchengeschichte* 6.3, 313. *Sozomenus: Kirchengeschichte* 8.2, 350.

brief, Chrysostom states in *Ad vid. iun.* 2 that during his youth his highly superstitious teacher expressed amazement upon learning that his mother had remained an unmarried widow twenty years after her husband's death.[86] Whilst citing W. von Christ's description of Libanius' penchant for superstitions, Baur contended that the medieval historians instinctively associated him with the instructor described by Chrysostom.[87] J. N. D. Kelly, whilst appealing to A. J. Festugière, similarly argued that the term δεισιδαίμων ('God-fearing'/'superstitious') used to describe the sophist confirms the witness of Socrates given Libanius' frequent consultation of the gods in relation to his health and other matters.[88] Indeed, the latter's vocal defence of the pagan cults also validates this association.[89] Thus most scholars take it for granted that Chrysostom was a student of Libanius despite the fact that they never mentioned each other by name.[90] Moreover, it is unlikely that Chrysostom would have neglected the opportunity during his youth to study under the empire's most renowned orator given the latter's close proximity and his own professional aspiration (which was either to become a legal advocate or an imperial clerk).[91] Consequently, their student-teacher relation is presupposed here.

---

[86] *Ad viduam iuniorem* 2 (PG 48, 601).

[87] Baur, *John Chrysostom and His Time* 1: 22. Libanius likewise related that his mother had remained an unmarried widow for such a period of time following her husband's death. Baur suggested that Libanius probably plagiarised St John, noting another instance in which the sophist thus deceived his audience. Baur, *John Chrysostom and His Time* 1: 26 n. 4.

[88] Kelly, *Golden Mouth* 7. On the duration and degree of the sophist's rapport with Asclepius, the Greek god of healing, see Raffaella Cribiore, *Libanius the Sophist: Rhetoric, Reality, and Religion in the Fourth Century* (New York: Cornell Press, 2013) 146–49, 212–27.

[89] See n. 60.

[90] Although, in addition to Hunter, Cribiore, M. A. Schatkin, and P. W. Harkins have noted St John's polemical citations of, and allusions to, his former teacher. Cribiore, *The School of Libanius* 1 n. 2. M. Schatkin and P. Harkins, trans., 'Introduction' to John Chrysostom, 'Discourse on Blessed Babylas and Against the Greeks' in *John Chrysostom: Apologist*, Fathers of the Church 73 (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1985) 33.

[91] Kelly contested Socrates and Sozomen's assertions that St John desired to become a lawyer. Kelly, *Golden Mouth* 15–16. *Sokrates: Kirchengeschichte* 6.3, 313. *Sozomenus: Kirchengeschichte* 8.2, 350. The scholar argued that they misinterpreted *De sac*. 1, wherein the Church Father affirms that he excitedly attended the law courts during his youth (this having been common practice amongst the students of rhetoric). Furthermore, Kelly pointed out the scholarly consensus surrounding Palladius' affirmation that Chrysostom studied rhetoric with a view to attaining a position in the service concerning τῶν θείων λογίων. The scholar contended that this phrase should be rendered 'imperial pronouncements' given the context (Palladius contrasts Chrysostom's initial worldly aspirations with those he developed upon his spiritual awakening), and since the term θεῖος often carried this mundane meaning. According to Kelly, St John therefore aspired to become a clerk of the *sacra scrinia*, a particular branch of civil service. Whilst rejecting the other common translation of the above Greek phrase ('divine oracles'), Kelly, like Baur, stated that the early Christians did not consider rhetorical

Two things may be said about the Church Father's education on the basis of the primary sources, namely *De sac.* 1.2 and Palladius' *Dialogus* 5. Firstly, his mother Anthusa paid for it from her dowry in order to preserve his patrimony.[92] Secondly, at the age of eighteen "he rebelled against the empty expressions of the sophist" (ἀφηνίασεν τοῦ σοφιστοῦ τῶν λεξυδρίων) and devoted himself to the study of "sacred doctrines" (τῶν ἱερῶν μαθημάτων).[93] Regarding *Dial.*, Kelly noted what he considered to be the superiority of its 'G group' of manuscripts. The scholar took their reference to a sole 'professor' as further evidence that St John was a pupil of Libanius.[94] In any case, Baur and Kelly deduced that Chrysostom must have followed the literary-rhetorical curriculum that the Roman Empire had inherited from the Greeks of the Hellenistic period.[95] Drawing upon H. I. Marrou, Robert J. Penella recently reiterated that whilst this curriculum's content, length, and methods of delivery differed throughout the Greco-Roman world, it generally consisted of three stages.[96] To be sure, Penella's summary of these stages is largely consistent with those of Baur, Kelly, and John A. L. Lee (who considered them in relation to the formation of another major ecclesial figure of the fourth century, St Basil the Great).[97] These stages are summarised as follows.

Children were first enrolled into what has been dubbed the 'elementary school.' Here they learnt how to perform basic arithmetic, and to read and write whilst being exposed to fragments of the classics.[98] After a few years they proceeded to the second stage of education under the direction of the grammarian, who expounded upon syntax, vocabulary, and etymology via analyses of the poets (Homer, Hesiod, Euripides, and Menander), in addition to certain historians and orators (e.g. Demosthenes). Amongst the major literary skills they acquired at this level were those of memorisation and

education essential for ministry. Kelly, *Golden Mouth* 15–16. Baur, *John Chrysostom and His Time* 1: 10. *Palladios: Dialogue* 5, 106. As indicated above, Chrysostom clearly thought otherwise.

[92] *Sur le sacerdoce* 1.2, 68.

[93] *Palladios: Dialogue* 5, 106.

[94] Kelly, *Golden Mouth* 16 n. 7.

[95] Kelly, *Golden Mouth* 5–6. Baur, *John Chrysostom and His Time* 1: 8.

[96] Robert J. Penella, 'The Progymnasmata in Imperial Greek Education' *Classical World* 105:1 (2011) 77.

[97] Penella, 'The Progymnasmata' 77. Kelly, *Golden Mouth* 5–8. Baur, *John Chrysostom and His Time* 1: 8–11. Lee, 'Why Didn't St Basil Write in New Testament Greek?' 10–13.

[98] Penella, 'The Progymnasmata' 77. Kelly, *Golden Mouth* 6. Baur, *John Chrysostom and His Time* 1: 10–11. Lee, 'Why Didn't St Basil Write in New Testament Greek?' 10.

letter writing.[99] Finally, those with the talent, enthusiasm, and financial means advanced to the school of the sophist, normally in their mid-teenage years.[100]

The students of the sophists worked through a series of compositional exercises known as *progymnasmata*. It is worth noting that Libanius and his pupil, Aphthonius, are two major sources of these exercises, which they list as follows: *mythos*, *diegema*, *chreia*, *gnome*, *anaskeue*, *kataskeue*, *koinos topos*, *enkomion*, *psogos*, *synkrisis*, *ethopoiia*, *ekphrasis*, *thesis*, and *nomou eisphora*. These exercises in turn enabled the students to compose and deliver declamations (*gymnasmata/meletai*).[101] For instance, they learnt how to systematically describe actions, times, places, and living things (*ekphrasis*), compare anyone with anything (*synkrisis*), as well as praise and vilify activities, ideas, objects, persons, and places (*enkomion* and *psogos*).[102] Truly, the *synkriseis*, *ekphraseis*, and *psogoi* featured in Chrysostom's writings testify to the abiding influence of Libanius' training.[103]

Declamations constituted the final component of the curriculum. These were practice orations, which could be either deliberative/political or forensic/judicial. By means of the former, students learnt how to persuade individuals and assemblies to perform and abstain from particular actions, whilst via the latter they ascertained the best ways to prosecute and defend all manner of accused at legal trials. However, in the school context both categories of declaration were based on imaginary (and for the most part Classical historical or mythological) themes, often requiring the students to impersonate specific characters.[104] Subsequently, having completed numerous

---

[99] Penella, 'The Progymnasmata' 77. Kelly, *Golden Mouth* 6. Baur, *John Chrysostom and His Time* 1: 11. Lee, 'Why Didn't St Basil Write in New Testament Greek?' 10–11.

[100] Penella, 'The Progymnasmata' 77. Kelly, *Golden Mouth* 6. Baur, *John Chrysostom and His Time* 1: 11. Lee, 'Why Didn't St Basil Write in New Testament Greek?' 11. Only approximate information is available with regard to the age of Libanius' students. Drawing upon J. W. H. Walden, Cribiore indicated that: "The traditional starting age of fourteen or fifteen can probably be maintained on average, while keeping in mind that some flexibility is needed." Cribiore, *The School of Libanius* 31. The scholar also demonstrated that Libanius' letters do not reveal enough information about the complete length of his course. However, she was able to verify from these sources that the majority of those who attended his school settled for "the shorter path to rhetoric." This was largely due to their families, who often planned a short attendance for them from the outset so that they might sooner become legal advocates or imperial administrators, or who suddenly recalled them on account of emergencies. Cribiore, *The School of Libanius* 178–81.

[101] Penella, 'The Progymnasmata' 77–87, 80 n.17. See also, Kennedy, *Greek Rhetoric* 54–73.

[102] Penella, 'The Progymnasmata' 81–82. Kennedy, *Greek Rhetoric* 63–65.

[103] See ns 61–62.

[104] Penella, 'The Progymnasmata' 77–78. James J. Murphy, 'Roman Writing Instruction as Described by Quintilian' in *A Short History of Writings Instruction*, ed. James J. Murphy (New York: Routledge, 2012) 68. Kennedy, *Greek Rhetoric* 81.

practice declamations, they became experts in Attic syntax and style, as well as in weaving together the many *progymnasmatic* forms.[105] To be sure, Kennedy affirmed that via these orations the students exercised skills "in all the parts of rhetorical theory: invention, arrangement, style, memory, and delivery."[106] The third of these, which has been systematically evaluated by Galen O. Rowe, warrants some discussion.

In short, the ancient authorities judged style on the basis of four criteria/virtues: correctness, clarity, ornamentation, and propriety.[107] Ornamentation is particularly relevant to this study since it was believed that archaisms, neologisms, tropes, and figures had a pleasing effect on audiences that secured both their attention and trust.[108] According to Rowe, such tropes altered and expanded the meaning of individual terms for the purpose of amusement and persuasion, whilst the figures modified groups of words.[109] Whilst drawing upon H. Lausberg, Rowe listed fourteen tropes that were especially valued by the Greco-Roman orators.[110] Appealing to a wide range of Christian and pagan rhetorical authorities, the scholar gave examples of over fifty figures, subdivided into various categories.[111] The figures *climax*, *cyclos*, *epanaphora*, *antistrophe*, *paranomasia*, *hyperbaton*, and *oxymoron* described by Rowe are amongst those that Ameringer and Kennedy identified in relation to the Chrysostomian corpus, whilst hyperbole is one of the major tropes.[112] What is more, Rowe cited St John's use of the rhetorical figure *homoeoptoton* in *De laud. Paul. hom.* 3 as a prime example.[113]

Via a comprehensive assessment of Libanius' orations and letters, A. F. Norman determined that his literary sources and those of his curriculum were more limited than had been commonly presumed. For instance, he noted that Libanius' references to major poets and dramatists are minimal when compared to those of Himerius of Athens and Sidonius Apollinaris.[114]

---

[105] Penella, 'The Progymnasmata' 78. On the basis of *Oration* 34.27–28, Cribiore revealed that Libanius required his advanced students to deliver their orations in front of the entire school at the end of the day. Moreover, he would personally observe and correct these. Cribiore, *The School of Libanius* 154.

[106] George Alexander Kennedy, 'The Genres of Rhetoric' in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period, 330 B.C–A.D. 400*, ed. Stanley E. Porter (Boston & Leiden, Brill, 2001) 49.

[107] Galen O. Rowe, 'Style' in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period* 121.

[108] Rowe, 'Style' 124.

[109] Ibid. 124–25, 129, 138.

[110] Ibid. 126–29.

[111] Ibid. 129–50.

[112] Rowe, 'Style' 128, 130–32, 136, 143. Ameringer, 'The Stylistic Influence' 30–39.

[113] Rowe, 'Style' 138.

[114] A. F. Norman, 'The Library of Libanius' *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 107 (1964) 161–68 esp. 163, 167.

Furthermore, Norman indicated that many of the sophist's citations from the Classical exemplars stem from lexicons, encyclopedias, and popular proverbs, as well as later authors and their commentators.[115] However, the scholar also acknowledged that Libanius had expert knowledge of numerous Attic orators (Demosthenes, Lysias, Isocrates, Aeschines, Isaeus, Hypereides, Deinarchus, Lycurgus, and Antiphon).[116] This was in addition to certain poets (Homer, Hesiod, Aesop, and Theognis), dramatists (Euripides and Sophocles), prose writers/historians (Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon), and philosophers (Plato and Pythagoras).[117] In fact, he was also familiar with multiple Second Sophistic authors (Aristides, Philostratus, and Polemo).[118] Furthermore, whilst drawing upon a letter of Libanius to Hesychius (a father of one of his students), Cribiore revealed that the readings from the ancient and recent authors at his school varied from month to month. More precisely, there was a cycle in which the former were scrutinised together with Libanius' own works, then studied independently.[119] At any rate, it has been shown that St John retained knowledge of at least nine of these authors, many of whom he imitated in terms of style.[120] There is little doubt that Chrysostom studied the authors with Libanius.

It is difficult to determine from Palladius' statement that St John 'rebelled' against his professor/s whether he abandoned his studies at the age of eighteen, or if he simply decided not to pursue a career in rhetoric after having graduated. Nevertheless, given the multiple correlations between the saint's writings and Libanius' literary-rhetorical curriculum, it is clear that the latter had a lasting influence on him. To be sure, Chrysostom adopted a number of the *progymnasmatic* forms and literary-rhetorical figures and tropes that he had learnt from the sophist in order to celebrate the paragons of Christianity and demonstrate the superiority of his faith over paganism. Moreover, as has already been demonstrated, the eloquent style that he developed via diligent study of the classics was integral to the literary aspect of his pastoral strategy. However, the actual extent to which St John Atticised whilst expounding upon the New Testament in writing must be clarified. This will be the aim of the subsequent section of this chapter, which will

[115] Ibid. 160–64, 166, 168.
[116] Ibid. 169.
[117] Ibid. 161, 163, 168, 170.
[118] Ibid. 171. Cribiore also noted Libanius' contemporary, Themistius. Cribiore, *The School of Libanius* 152.
[119] Cribiore, *The School of Libanius* 152.
[120] Namely, Demosthenes, Isocrates, Euripides, Sophocles, Homer, Thucydides, Plato, Pythagoras, and Libanius.

consist in an analysis of the *argumenta* featured in Chrysostom's homilies on 1 Co, Eph, 1 Ti, and Phm.

Chrysostom's Estimation and Use of Second Sophistic Rhetoric

The above assessment has clarified the context in which Chrysostom felt justified in Atticising. In summary, scholars agree that St John was one of the last representatives of the Second Sophistic School in terms of his syntax and style. This is definitely true in relation to Chrysostom the writer who, for the purposes of conversion and catechism, had to acquire the attention and admiration of those who proceeded through the same advanced literary-rhetorical curriculum. Evidently, these people were accustomed to moral-philosophical discourses that were highly refined in terms of style. To ensure their receptivity to the Gospel and, in turn, their spiritual welfare, Chrysostom had to employ the Attic syntax and Second Sophistic figures and tropes that he learnt from Libanius. He also had to permit their use amongst his stenographers and contemporary editors. Yet the Church Father also repeatedly censured rhetoric to gradually curb his literary audience's preference for style over content.

Grammatical Analysis of the *Argumenta* of the Homilies on 1 Co, Eph, 1 Ti, and Phm

The purpose of this section is to verify the extent to which Chrysostom adopted the Second Sophistic style within the *argumenta* to his homilies on the Pauline corpus. It will focus on the basic Second Sophistic features that have hitherto been overlooked in the philological assessments of the Chrysostomian corpus, namely: enclitic pronouns within the 'clause-second position,' *clausulae*, Attic spelling of verbs, nouns, and adjectives, in addition to obsolete particles and crases. Moreover, it will expand on Dickinson's assessment of Chrysostom's usage of the optative, which did not include the *argumenta*. It will also shed light on Chrysostom's use of the rhetorical figure *hyperbaton*, which was only considered briefly by Ameringer in relation to other works.

Enclitic Pronouns

Whilst Attic Greek has often been identified as 'free' with respect to its word order, numerous scholars have pointed out that certain words occur only in fixed positions of their respective syntactic units. These units might be sentences, clauses, verb phrases, or noun phrases. Following Jacob

Wackernagel, scholars agree that clitics tend to occur in the 'clause-second position' in Greek and other ancient languages; that is, after an article, relative pronoun, preposition, conjunction, negative, or connective particle.[121] In Greek clitics are divided into two broad categories, namely: enclitics and proclitics. The former consist of oblique cases of singular personal pronouns, indefinite pronouns, adverbs, and adverbial and conjunctive grammatical particles, as well as the verbs ἐστί(ν) and φησί(ν). The latter include monosyllabic forms of the article beginning with a vowel, as well as specific conjunctions and prepositions.[122]

Horrocks and Raija Sallamo noted that many authors between the last centuries BC and first centuries AD disregarded the abovementioned practice due to the influence of Koine. More precisely, for reasons that are beyond the scope of this chapter, personal enclitic pronouns were placed more frequently after their respective nominal heads, even at the end of clauses and sentences.[123] Subsequently, Chrysostom's placement of enclitic pronouns generally within the *argumenta* must be examined in order to determine how intent he was on imitating the Attic and Second Sophistic masters. Furthermore, the order of the postpositives within the clause-second positions should be studied so as to verify whether Chrysostom adhered to the Classical patterns found as early as Homer. C. J. Ruijgh has summarised this canonical order as follows: (i) περ, γε; (ii) μέν, τε; (iii) δέ, γάρ, τε, μέν (in the sense of 'however'); (iv)ἄρα/ῥα, νυ, τε, κε(ν), ἄν, θην, οὖν, δή, αὖ(τε); (v) one or two indefinite adverbs; and (vi) enclitic pronouns.[124]

Of the thirty-nine enclitic pronouns that Chrysostom employs within the *argumenta*, thirteen are featured in the clause-second position.[125] Of these thirteen pronouns, two follow the postpositive δέ, in the *argumenta* to the

[121] Evert van Emde Boas and Luuk Huitink, 'Syntax' in *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language*, ed. Egbert J. Bakker (West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010) 148. David Goldstein, *Classical Greek Syntax: Wackernagel's Law in Herodotus* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2016) 4–5. Raija Sollamo, 'The Place of Enclitic Personal Pronouns in the Old Greek Psalter' in *XII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*, ed. Melvin K. H. Peters (Leiden: Brill, 2006) 158.

[122] Roger D. Woodard, 'Attic Greek' in *The Ancient Languages of Europe*, ed. Roger D. Woodard (Cambridge University Press, 2008) 45. Van Emde Boas and Huitink, 'Syntax' 148.

[123] Horrocks, *Greek* 108–9. Sollamo, 'The Place of Enclitic Personal Pronouns' 158–59.

[124] C. J. Ruijgh, 'La place des enclitiques dans l'ordre des mots chez Homère d'après la loi de Wackernagel' in *Sprachwissenschaft und Philologie: Jacob Wackernagel und die Indogermanistik heute*, ed. Heiner Eichner and Helmut Rix (Wiesbaden: Dr Ludwig Reichert Verlag, 1990) 223–24.

[125] Field 2, 1B, 2D; Field 4, 105B; Field 6, 2C (twice), 325A–B, 326B (twice), 327B, 328F (twice), 328B.

homilies on 1 Ti and Phm, respectively.[126] Another pronoun follows the postpositive γε in the latter *argumentum*.[127] Of the remaining ten scattered throughout the texts, three immediately follow typical prepositives (the conjunctions καί and ἵνα, and the negative μή);[128] two succeed verbs (ἦν and εἶπω);[129] one follows an adverb (οὕτω);[130] and four succeed nouns and adjectives (μηδείς, ἀνήρ, παῖδα and περιττόν).[131] Given that the 'Verb-clitic-Subject-Object' order is a feature of Koine Greek—the clause-first position having been reserved in Attic for the prepositives mentioned above—there are only seven instances in which Chrysostom is consistent with the Classical authors in his use of enclitic pronouns (once whilst citing St Paul).[132] Yet, when using these in the clause-second position together with other postpositives, he adheres to the order that the Classical authors would have expected, with the exception of the citation from Phm 18–19 featured in the *argumentum* to the homilies on 1 Ti.[133]

Clausulae

Henry B. Dewing maintained that the influential sophists of the fourth century, Himerius and Themistius, were the first to employ a well-developed accentual (rather than quantitative) rhythmic scheme in Greek prose. In short, this was achieved through the careful arrangement of word accents at the ends of clauses, namely the separation of the last two accents by either two or four unstressed syllables.[134] It is noteworthy that Dewing methodically examined the development of this accentual rhythm, which was initially related to syllabic quantity. More precisely, he argued that Himerius and Themistius derived the scheme from their Latin counterparts. He pointed out how the early Roman orators had been influenced by the Asianic Greek rhetorical school of the third century BC in their selection and use of certain metrical forms as closing cadences of commata and cola. Drawing upon Louis

---

[126] Field 6, 2C, 326B. The latter features in a sentence that consists in an amalgamation of Phm 18 & 19: Εἰ δέ τι ἠδίκησέ σε, ἢ ὀφείλει, ἐγὼ ἀποτίσω. According to the Classical convention, the second enclitic σε should be placed before the verb in this instance.

[127] Field 6, 327B.

[128] Field 2, 1B; Field 4, 105B; Field 6, 328F. The latter features in a quotation from 1 Co 7:21: Δοῦλος ἐκλήθης; μή σοι μελέτω· ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ δύνασαι ἐλεύθερος γενέσθαι, μᾶλλον χρῆσαι.

[129] Field 2, 2D; Field 6, 328F.

[130] Field 6, 325B.

[131] Field 6, 2C, 325A, 326B, 328B.

[132] Horrocks, *Greek* 108–9. See n. 128 for the citation from St Paul.

[133] See n. 126.

[134] Henry B. Dewing, 'The Origin of Accentual Prose Rhythm in Greek' *American Journal of Philology* 31:3 (1910) 312.

Havet and Wilhelm Meyer, Dewing indicated that by the third century AD, however, the Latin orators had become more concerned with the arrangement of word accents in traditional types of *clausula*, whilst largely neglecting that of syllabic quantities.[135] Subsequently, whilst noting that the aforementioned accentual scheme features in Latin works of the third century AD (such as those of St Cyprian of Carthage and Arnobius of Sicca) and not in any Hellenic prose prior to then, Dewing concluded that "the Greek writers took over the accentual scheme from the Latin…"[136]

In the course of his study, Dewing speculated how the Greek-speaking Christians developed an appreciation for the accentual rhythm.[137] In short, he posited that the influential Cappadocian Fathers, Sts Basil the Great and Gregory the Theologian, first incorporated *clausulae* into Christian works, having learnt the rules of accentual rhythm at the school of Himerius in Athens.[138] Dewing noted that Basil's brother, St Gregory of Nyssa, also made use of the accentual rhythm, before contrasting the Cappadocians' style to that of Libanius and his two most famous students, Julian and Chrysostom. According to Dewing, whilst Libanius and Julian never employed accentual rhythm, St John did, albeit "in such a half-hearted way that he must have regarded it as incidental."[139] He then suggested that Chrysostom learnt *clausulae* from his contemporary Christian writers. If the accentual rhythmic scheme did not in fact feature in the writings that comprised Libanius' rhetorical curriculum, it is fair to assume that Chrysostom inherited an appreciation for *clausulae* from his cultivated Christian predecessors. In any case, no matter where he learnt the accentual rhythmic scheme, it ultimately derives from the Second Sophistic and so remains relevant to this study. Of course, it is possible that Chrysostom was aware of its origins.

Dewing's assertion that Chrysostom was fairly indifferent with regard to the use of *clausulae* when compared to the Cappadocians is contradicted by the evidence of the *argumenta*. In fact, there are one hundred and thirty instances in which Chrysostom employs an accentual rhythm at the end of a clause to produce smoothness and balance, separating the last two stressed syllables by an even number of unaccented syllables, mostly two, sometimes four.[140] The best example of this scheme features in the *argumentum* to the

[135] Ibid. 312–14.

[136] Ibid. 315–28 esp. 328.

[137] Ibid. 323–24.

[138] It is possible that St Gregory also learnt these from the writings of Themistius. Ibid. 323.

[139] Ibid. 324.

[140] Field 2, 1A (twice), 1B (three times), 1–2C (seven times), 2B (three times), 2C (six times) 2–3D (seven times), 3E (ten times), 3B (seven times), 4C (three times); Field 4, 104A (three

homilies on 1 Co, where he employs three *clausulae* in succession within a single sentence:

> Καὶ ὁ περὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως δὲ λόγος ἐχώλευ(1)ε(2) παρ'(3) αύ(4)τοῖς· ἔνιοι γὰρ αὐτῶν οὐ σφόδρα ἐπίστευον ἀνάστασιν εἶναι(1) σω(2)μάτων, τὰ τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς μωρίας ἔτι(1) νο(2)σοῦντες.[141]

No matter his rhetorical skill, it is unlikely that St John had the capacity to deliver so many *clausulae* extempore within the context of the liturgy. Indeed, the accentual rhythmic scheme of the *argumenta* suggests that the Church Father himself either prepared them in advance for live delivery or subsequently revised them for a literary audience; for those educated enough to be able to consistently identify this feature. I maintain that his scribes, as well as editors of later centuries, would not have risked compromising the content of Chrysostom's homilies by rearranging his words to create such rhythm.

The Rhetorical Figure Hyperbaton

The rhetorical figure *hyperbaton* is achieved through the separation of two words that belong together syntactically through the insertion of an unrelated word or phrase. According to Herbert Wier Smyth, *hyperbaton* is less common in Greek prose than it is in poetry, although the figure still occurs frequently in the former where it mostly assures emphasis on an integral notion by situating it at either end of the sentence. *Hyperbaton* is also regularly intended to mark excitement or gain rhythmical effect.[142] Rudolph Pfeiffer determined that the grammarians and sophists derived the name of the figure from Plato's *Protagoras*, namely the analysis of the complex Simonidean ode featured in 339A–347A.[143] Horrocks indicated that this stylistic feature became typical of the writings of the Atticists whilst examining Aelius Aristides' *To Plato: In Defence of Oratory* 78–79 (25D). According to Horrocks, it was even used

---

times), 104–5B (eight times), 105C (once); Field 6, 1A (once), 1B–2B (seven times), 2C (eight times), 2B (six times), 2C (once), 325A (five times), 325–26B (three times), 326C (three times), 326D (four times), 327B (six times), 327C (three times), 327D (four times), 327–28E (six times), 328F (five times), 328B (eight times).

[141] Field 2, 3D–E.

[142] Herbert Weir Smyth, *A Greek Grammar for Colleges*, revised by Gordon M. Messing (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1956) 679. Rowe, 'Style' 136.

[143] Rudolph Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship: From the Beginnings to the End of the Hellenistic Age* (Oxford University Press, 1998) 33–34. Andrew Ford, *The Origins of Criticism: Literary Culture and Poetic Theory in Classical Greece* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2002) 154.

by early Christian intellectuals who favoured higher-level Koine, especially Eusebius of Caesarea, as demonstrated in his *Ecclesiastical History*.[144]

In his aforementioned analysis of select Chrysostomian works, Ameringer identified the following major varieties of *hyperbaton* contained therein: (i) separation of an article from its noun by a long interval; (ii) separation of a noun from its possessive or explanatory modifier; and (iii) interposition of a phrase or verb between a noun and its adjective.[145] Within the *argumenta*, there are in fact six instances of the first kind,[146] fourteen of the third,[147] but none of the second. Examples of types one and three are provided below.

> Καὶ γὰρ ἅπαντα ταῦτα ἀπὸ τῆς κατὰ τὴν φιλοσοφίαν τὴν ἔξωθεν ἀνοίας ἐτίκτετο.[148]

> Καὶ πολλοὺς ἔτι καὶ νῦν εὕροι τις ἄν φιλοσόφους ἔκει.[149]

Attic Spelling of Verbs, Nouns, and Adjectives

In his assessment of Atticism, Horrocks listed twelve major features of the refined style. The first and eleventh are relevant to this study, namely the -ττ- and -ρρ- spelling of verbs, nouns, and adjectives (instead of the Ionic and Koine -σσ- and -ρσ-), and use of the full range of optative forms.[150]

Browning and Olga Tribulato have outlined the two different forms of Attic that prevailed during the fourth century BC. In short, certain Attic authors, especially Thucydides, deliberately replaced their local -ττ- and -ρρ- spelling of verbs, nouns, and adjectives with the Ionic -σσ- and -ρσ- in order to appeal to a wider Hellenic audience. Their successors, however, mostly retained the local spelling, which eventually became prominent in the administrative and literary circles of the Hellenic world.[151] This was largely thanks to Phillip II of Macedonia, on the one hand, and the Second Sophistic orators, on the other. At any rate, by Chrysostom's time, various authors—whether consciously or unconsciously—often replaced the Attic -ττ- and -ρρ- spelling with the Ionic -σσ- and -ρσ-. This was due to the influence of Koine, which almost

---

[144] Horrocks, *Greek* 140.

[145] Ameringer, 'The Stylistic Influence of the Second Sophistic' 32–33.

[146] Field 2, 3D, 3E (twice), 3B; Field 6, 326C, 328B.

[147] Field 2, 1A, 2C, 3E (twice), 3C, 4C; Field 4, 104A, 105B (three times), Field 6, 2B, 326C, 327C, 327D.

[148] Field 2, 3E.

[149] Field 4, 105B.

[150] Horrocks, *Greek* 137–38.

[151] Browning, *Medieval and Modern Greek* 21–22. Olga Tribulato, 'Literary Dialects' in *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language* 399.

exclusively adopted the latter.[152] Subsequently, the sophists from the second century onwards attempted to remedy this via their grammatical handbooks and lexicons.[153]

It is no surprise that Chrysostom adopts the Attic spelling of verbs, nouns, and adjectives fairly consistently throughout the *argumenta*. For instance, the *argumentum* to the homilies on 1 Co features the participle αἰνιττόμενος and the infinitive ἐπιπλήττεσθαι;[154] that to the homilies on 1 Ti includes the adjective περιττά;[155] and that to the homilies on Phm contains the adjective περιττόν, the present verb πράττει, as well as the participle θαρρῶν.[156] It is worth noting that there is only one instance in which Chrysostom opts for Koine spelling where Attic would be possible, namely with the participle κηρύσσοντος featured in the *argumentum* to the homilies on 1 Ti.[157] Given Chrysostom's otherwise consistent Attic usage, this is likely an unintentional regression into the common tongue.[158]

Uses of the Optative

T. V. Evans outlined how the optative mood declined in the Koine vernacular, noting the complications surrounding the nature, pace, and cause of this development. Evans pointed out that from the second century onwards the Second Sophistic authors contributed to the revival of the mood (which, as evidenced by the New Testament, nevertheless persisted to a certain extent in Koine, especially in stereotyped phrases).[159] Subsequently, Christian intellectuals of the fourth century knew the three major functions of the optative in Classical Greek, using it within primary clauses to express potential value and volition, and in subordinate clauses to mark historic sequence. Dickinson demonstrated that this was certainly the case with Chrysostom whilst recording each occurrence of the mood in his homilies on the Pauline corpus, with the exception of the *argumenta*.[160] He neglected

[152] Browning, *Medieval and Modern Greek* 24–25.
[153] Horrocks, *Greek* 137–38.
[154] Field 2, 2B–C.
[155] Field 6, 2C.
[156] Field 6, 326C, 327B, 327D.
[157] Field 6, 2A.
[158] It could also be a scribal error.
[159] T. V. Evans, *Verbal Syntax in the Greek Pentateuch: Natural Greek Usage and Hebrew Interference* (Oxford University Press, 2001) 175–78. Friedrich Blass, *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, trans. Henry St. John Thackeray (London: Macmillan and Co., 1905) 219–21.
[160] The scholar based his analysis on Bernard de Montfaucon's editions of the homilies. Dickinson, 'The Use of the Optative Mood' vi.

to mention his rationale for omitting these texts from his analysis. At any rate, the findings of this study mostly complement those of Dickinson.

Within the *argumenta* to the homilies on Eph and 1 Ti, Chrysostom uses aorist optatives (εὕροι and γένοιτο) with the particle ἄν in order to express future possibilities.[161] This is widely recognised as a typical feature of Attic.[162] In the *argumentum* to his homilies on Phm, Chrysostom employs a present optative (εἴη) with the abovementioned particle in a rhetorical question. Having pointed out how much the epistle has to teach free Christians in relation to the proper treatment of slaves, Chrysostom rebukes those who have condemned its inclusion within the New Testament, asking: Καὶ πῶς οὐκ ἐσχάτης ἀνοίας ἄν εἴη;[163] As indicated by Smyth, the potential optative mood was regularly used in Attic to pose direct questions, together with the indicative and the subjunctive.[164]

In the introductions to his sermons on 1 Ti and Phm, St John makes use of present and aorist optatives in a number of conditional sentences. In the *argumentum* to the homilies on 1 Ti, he uses the particle εἰ with present optatives in the protases of certain sentences (λέγοι and ἐξετάζοι), followed by indicatives in their apodoses (γράφει and φησιν).[165] According to Dickinson, this construction is characteristic of Classical Greek. These particular usages, however, differ from those he highlighted in relation to the Chrysostomian corpus, since they do not carry a sense of futurity together with a general present meaning.[166] For example, in the first instance the optative is used to raise the following question in relation to St Paul. It is quite specific and clearly has no future connotation: Εἰ δέ τις ἐξετάζοι… τίνος οὖν ἕνεκεν Τίτῳ καὶ Τιμοθέῳ γράφει μόνοις;

Within the abovementioned *argumentum* Chrysostom uses εἰ with an aorist optative in the protasis of a sentence (συμβαίη), followed by a present subjunctive in its apodosis (ᾖσιν), whilst clarifying what St Paul means in 1 Ti 3:2–5.[167] Dickinson recorded twenty instances in which Chrysostom uses εἰ with a present optative followed by an aorist or present subjunctive, and seventeen where he employs an aorist optative instead. He emphasised that whilst such combinations of the optative and subjunctive are ultimately

[161] Field 4, 105B; Field 6, 2C.
[162] Dickinson, 'The Use of the Optative Mood' 41. Smyth, *A Greek Grammar for Colleges* 407.
[163] Field 6, 328B.
[164] Smyth, *A Greek Grammar for Colleges* 600.
[165] Field 6, 2C.
[166] Dickinson, 'The Use of the Optative Mood' 87–91.
[167] Field 6, 2B.

quite rare in Greek literature, they were in fact used by the Attic authors and should therefore be considered Classical.[168]

Furthermore, in the same text, Chrysostom uses εἰ with a present optative in the protasis of sentence (εἴη) followed by ἄν and a present optative in its apodosis (ἐμπιστευθείη), whilst expressing his conviction that a person who has failed as a husband and father should not be elevated to the episcopal office.[169] As indicated by Dickinson, this is a standard way of expressing the 'should-would' condition in Attic. To be sure, the aforementioned construction features in the remainder of the Chrysostomian corpus a total of nineteen times.[170]

Lastly, in the introduction to the homilies on Phm, Chrysostom uses εἰ with a present optative in the protasis of a sentence (εἶεν) with an infinitive in its apodosis (ἐπαισχύνεσθαι), whilst affirming that Christians should not be ashamed of righteous slaves.[171] Dickinson detected six instances of this construction, which he considered unusual.[172] It is the contention of this chapter that it nonetheless constitutes an attempt to imitate the Attic masters.

Concluding Remarks on the Grammatical Analysis of the Argumenta

The above assessment sheds light on the extent to which St John adopted the Second Sophistic style when expounding upon the New Testament in writing. Judging from the *argumenta*—taken here as authentic—it is apparent that he recorded his exegesis in the Second Sophistic style fairly consistently to ensure the attention and receptivity of the well-educated within his flock. This is best demonstrated by his frequent use of the accentual rhythmic scheme and the rhetorical figure *hyperbaton*. It is also evidenced by his numerous optative constructions, most of which are in accordance with the Classical models. Granted, Chrysostom unintentionally reverts to the spoken language of his time in these writings, as demonstrated by his casual use of enclitic pronouns and inconsistent spelling of verbs, nouns, and adjectives. Yet even with respect to such features there is enough evidence to demonstrate that he was intent on imitating the Classical prototypes. This is also attested to

[168] Dickinson, 'The Use of the Optative Mood' 109–11.

[169] Field 6, 2B.

[170] In fact, Dickinson counted one hundred and sixty-four instances of the 'Future Less Vivid Condition,' expressed by different combinations of present, aorist, and future optatives. Dickinson, 'The Use of the Optative Mood' 70–77.

[171] Field 6, 328F–B.

[172] The scholar also recorded nine instances in which Chrysostom uses the aorist optative instead. Dickinson, 'The Use of the Optative Mood' 115.

by his occasional use of obsolete particles, namely δή, μήν, and γε,[173] as well as the crasis κἄν for καὶ ἄν or καὶ ἐάν ('even if').[174]

If stenographers recorded Chrysostom's *argumenta* on the basis of live homilies without his assistance, it is likely that they had his permission to incorporate Attic syntax and Second Sophistic figures and tropes within their transcriptions. This permission might have been obtained directly, provided that they constituted part of the Church Father's inner circle, or indirectly, depending on their familiarity with his works. At any rate, it is apparent that my findings challenge Goodall's hypothesis that the exegetical homilies attributed to Chrysostom are entirely inconsistent with his authentic works in terms of their literary quality, and are therefore the products of scribes. A similar grammatical analysis of each panegyrical and exegetical homily is in order before anything definitive can be stated in relation to authorship.

General Conclusion

In summary, Chrysostom's understanding of divine *synkatabasis* compelled him to communicate the message of the Gospel using the type of syntax and style most appreciated by his audience. Following this line of reasoning, it is no surprise that the Church Father incorporated the Attic syntax and literary figures and tropes that he learnt from Libanius in his works, including the published transcriptions of his homilies. His intention was to ensure the receptivity and spiritual wellbeing of those who had acquired a similar education and were therefore accustomed to the same Second Sophistic literary conventions. Whether he had the opportunity to edit and stylise every transcription, however, is another matter. His vocation as a bishop and concern for other writings likely prevented him from devoting the same amount of time to the revision of his exegetical homilies. This would no doubt account for Goodall's findings. At any rate, the *argumenta* featured in the homilies on the Pauline corpus are in fact composed in the Second Sophistic style, which testifies to their authenticity. For the Church Father (and possibly his scribes) this style included (but was not limited to) the occasional use of obsolete particles, on the one hand, and the frequent employment of *clausulae*, various optative constructions, and the rhetorical figure *hyperbaton*, on the other. It

[173] Field 2, 1B, 2B, 3E, 3B (twice); Field 6, 325B. He makes far less use of these particles than St Basil the Great. See: Lee, 'Why Didn't St Basil Write in New Testament Greek?' 5.

[174] Field 6, 327C. Liddell and Scott identified this as an Attic feature whilst appealing to Sophocles and Plato. *An Intermediate Greek-English Lexicon Founded Upon the Seventh Edition of Liddell and Scott's Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1889) 399.

also involved the use of enclitic pronouns within the clause-second position and the Attic spelling of verbs, nouns, and adjectives (although, admittedly, there is some inconsistency with respect to such features). Whilst scholars might be justified in hailing St John as an Atticist *par excellence*, it is clear that his purpose in using and allowing the transmission of elevated syntax and style was primarily pastoral.

Appendix

Testimonia to Chrysostom's Education and Estimation of Rhetoric

The following original translations of *testimonia* to Chrysostom's training, understanding of divine *synkatabasis*, and estimation and use of rhetoric incorporate verbatim definitions from the authoritative LSJ.[175] Where this has failed to provide adequate definitions, one of the following dictionaries has been appealed to: BDAG, Lampe, Brill, or Sophocles.[176] Their definitions have been noted for the benefit of the reader, along with those featured in LSJ that might otherwise seem obscure.

St John Chrysostom

De sac. 4.6

Malingrey, 268, 270: Ἐγὼ δὲ εἰ μὲν τὴν λειότητα Ἰσοκράτους ἀπῄτουν καὶ τὸν Δημοσθένους ὄγκον καὶ τὴν Θουκιδίδου σεμνότητα καὶ τὸ Πλάτωνος ὕψος, ἔδει φέρειν εἰς μέσον ταύτην τοῦ Παύλου τὴν μαρτυρίαν· νῦν δὲ ἐκεῖνα μὲν πάντα ἀφίημι καὶ τὸν περίεργον τῶν ἔξωθεν καλλωπισμὸν καὶ οὐδέν μοι φράσεως, οὐδὲ ἀπαγγελίας μέλει.

If I were indeed demanding the smoothness of Isocrates, and the loftiness of Demosthenes, and the majesty of Thucydides, and the sublimity of Plato, one ought to bring forward this testimony of Paul; but as it is, I give up all

[175] *A Greek-English Lexicon*, ed. Henry George Liddell, Robert Scott, and Henry Stuart Jones (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), hereafter referred to as LSJ.

[176] *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature, Third Edition (BDAG)*, ed. Frederick William Danker (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2000), hereafter referred to as BDAG; *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, ed. G. W. H. Lampe (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961), hereafter referred to as Lampe; Franco Montanari, *The Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek*, ed. Madeline Goh and Chad Schroeder (Leiden: Brill, 2015), hereafter referred to as Montanari; *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods (From B. C. 146 to A. D. 1100)* ed. E. A. Sophocles (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1900), hereafter referred to as Sophocles.

those things and the superfluous embellishment of the pagans and nothing concerning[177] style, nor concerning diction,[178] is of interest to[179] me.

De sac. 5.1

Malingrey, 282: ἀλλὰ τὴν τῶν μαθητῶν τάξιν ὑπερβάντες ἀντιλαμβάνουσι τὴν τῶν θεατῶν τῶν ἐν τοῖς ἔξωθεν καθεζομένων ἀγῶσι.

but having passed beyond the rank of learners, they [i.e. most parishioners] assume instead that of spectators who take their seats in pagan places of contest.

Malingrey, 284: καὶ ἡ τοῦ λόγου δύναμις ἣν ἐξεβάλομεν νῦν, οὕτως ἐνταῦθα γίνεται ποθεινὴ ὡς οὐδὲ τοῖς σοφισταῖς ὅταν πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἀγωνίζεσθαι ἀναγκάζωνται.

and the art[180] of oration, which we just now rejected, is becoming so excessively desired here [i.e. in the church]; [it is] not even thus with the sophists, whenever they might be compelled to contend against one another.

De sac. 5.5

Malingrey, 290: Καὶ γὰρ ὅταν πολλὴν ἐν τῷ λέγειν δύναμιν ἔχῃ—τοῦτο δὲ ἐν ὀλίγοις εὕροι τις ἄν—, οὐδὲ οὕτω τοῦ πονεῖσθαι διηνεκῶς ἀπήλλακται· ἐπειδὴ γὰρ οὐ φύσεως ἀλλὰ μαθήσεως τὸ λέγειν, κἂν εἰς ἄκρον αὐτοῦ τις ἀφίκηται, τότε αὐτὸν ἀφίησιν ἔρημον, ἂν μὴ συνεχεῖ σπουδῇ καὶ γυμνασίᾳ ταύτην θεραπεύῃ τὴν δύναμιν…

For even when a person may have much ability in the art of speaking—but one can find this amongst few people—not even in this way have they been freed from perpetual toil; for since the art of speaking [stems] not from nature but from education, even if someone should attain a high [standard] in it, if he does not cultivate this ability by frequent effort and training, then it leaves him destitute…

Malingrey, 292: οὗτοι δέ, εἰ μὴ μείζονα τῆς δόξης ἧς ἅπαντες ἔχουσι περὶ αὑτῶν ἀεὶ προφέροιεν, πολλὰ παρὰ πάντων ἔπεται τὰ ἐγκλήματα.

---

[177] Objective genitive construction. Lit. 'of style.'
[178] Objective genitive construction. Lit. 'of diction.'
[179] BDAG s.v. μέλει (1) 626.
[180] LSJ s.v. δύναμις (3) 452; Sophocles s.v. δύναμις (2) 397.

but if these men [i.e. clergymen required to preach] cannot constantly present things greater in splendour,[181] which all people consider with reference to them, many reproaches follow from everyone.

De sac. 5.8

Malingrey, 302: Ἢ οὐκ οἶδας ὅσος ταῖς τῶν χριστιανῶν ψυχαῖς λόγων ἔρως εἰσεκώμασε νῦν καὶ ὅτι μάλιστα πάντων οἱ τούτους ἀσκοῦντες ἐν τιμῇ, οὐ παρὰ τοῖς ἔξωθεν μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ παρὰ τοῖς τῆς πίστεως οἰκείοις;

Or do you not know how much love for orations has now invaded[182] the souls of Christians and that most of all those who practise these [are held] in honour, not only by the pagans, but also by those who belong to the household of faith?

Adv. opp. vit. mon. 3.11

PG 47, 367: τί τὸ ὄφελος πέμπειν εἰς διδασκάλους, ἔνθα πρὸ τῶν λόγων κακίαν εἴσονται, καὶ τὸ ἔλαττον βουλόμενοι λαβεῖν, τὸ μεῖζον ἀπολέσουσι, τῆς ψυχῆς τὴν ἰσχὺν καὶ τὴν εὐεξίαν ἅπασαν;

What help is it to send [young men] to [pagan] teachers, where they will know[183] evil before literature,[184] and, whilst wishing to attain[185] the lesser thing, will lose the greater—all the strength and good health of the soul?

PG 47, 367: Ὅτι ἡ μὲν τῶν λόγων σπουδὴ τῆς ἀπὸ τῶν τρόπων ἐπιεικείας δεῖται, ἡ δὲ τῶν τρόπων ἐπιείκεια οὐκέτι τῆς ἀπὸ τῶν λόγων προσθήκης. Σωφροσύνην μὲν γὰρ καὶ χωρὶς τῆς παιδεύσεως ταύτης κατορθῶσαι ἔνι, λόγων δὲ δύναμιν χωρὶς τρόπων χρηστῶν οὐδεὶς ἂν προσλάβοι ποτέ, παντὸς τοῦ χρόνου εἰς κακίαν καὶ ἀσέλγειαν ἀναλισκομένου.

Because serious engagement in orations requires virtue[186] [that stems] from [certain] habits, but virtue that is characteristic of [these][187] habits no longer [requires] the aid of orations. For it is possible to attain to[188] self-control even without this instruction in rhetoric, but no one could ever acquire[189]

---

[181] BDAG s.v. δόξα (1) 257.
[182] Lampe s.v. εἰσκωμάζω 423.
[183] Montanari, s.v. εἴδω (3A) 598.
[184] LSJ s.v. λόγος (VI 3e) 1059.
[185] Ibid. s.v. λαμβάνω (II 1) 1027.
[186] Lampe s.v. ἐπιείκεια (ἐπιεικία) (C) 523.
[187] Lit. 'the habits.'
[188] Lampe s.v. κατορθόω (A3c) 735.
[189] Ibid. s.v. προσλαμβάνω (2) 1178.

ability in orations without good habits, when all time is consumed in evil and licentiousness.

PG 47, 368: Οὐκ οὖν φιλοσόφων μὲν ἡ εὐγλωττία, καὶ ἀνδρῶν δὲ ἁπλῶς, μειρακίων δὲ παιζόντων ἡ φιλοτιμία, ὡς καὶ αὐτοῖς τοῖς φιλοσόφοις δοκεῖ, οὐ τοῖς ἄλλοις μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῷ πάντων μάλιστα ἐν τούτῳ κεκρατηκότι…

Therefore glibness is not characteristic of philosophers, but simply also of men, and ambitious display is of playing adolescents,[190] as it seems even to the philosophers themselves; not only to the others, but also to the one who has especially[191] surpassed[192] all men in this [field] [i.e. Plato]…

Adv. opp. vit. mon. 3.12

PG 47, 368: Καὶ μή μέ τις νομιζέτω νομοθετεῖν ἀμαθεῖς τοὺς παῖδας γίνεσθαι· ἀλλ᾽ εἴ τις ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀναγκαίων παρέχοι θαῤῥεῖν, οὐκ ἄν ἐλοίμην κωλῦσαι καὶ τοῦτο ἐκ περιουσίας γενέσθαι. Ὥσπερ γάρ, τῶν θεμελίων σαλευομένων, καὶ πάσης τῆς οἰκίας καὶ τῆς οἰκοδομῆς κινδυνευούσης καταπεσεῖν, ἐσχάτης ἀνοίας καὶ παραπληξίας ἐστὶ πρὸς τοὺς κονιῶντας, ἀλλὰ μὴ πρὸς τοὺς οἰκοδομοῦντας τρέχειν· οὕτω πάλιν ἀκαίρου φιλονεικίας, τῶν τοίχων ἐστώτων ἀσφαλῶς καὶ βεβαίως, κωλύειν τὸν βουλόμενον κονιᾷν.

And let no one[193] think[194] me ordaining[195] [that] the children [are] to be ignorant! But if someone should promise to be of good courage with reference to[196] the [spiritual] necessities, I would not choose to prevent even this thing that is born of wealth[197] [i.e. rhetorical training]. For just as it is characteristic of extreme folly and madness, when the foundation-stones are being shaken to and fro, to run to those who whitewash[198] and not to those who build houses—and the entire household and building[199] is in danger of falling[200]—so, conversely,[201] it is characteristic of ill-suited love of strife, when the walls of

---

[190] Loose rendering of 'lad/stripling.' LSJ s.v. μειράκιον 1093.
[191] BDAG s.v. μάλιστα (1) 613.
[192] Lampe s.v. κρατέω (2) 775.
[193] Lit. 'not anyone.'
[194] BDAG s.v. νομίζω (2) 675.
[195] Ibid. s.v. νομοθέτω (2) 676.
[196] Ibid. s.v. ὑπέρ (3) 1031.
[197] Lampe s.v. περιουσία (3) 1068.
[198] BDAG s.v. κονιάω 558.
[199] Ibid. s.v. οἰκοδομή (2) 696.
[200] Lit. 'to fall.'
[201] Loose rendering of 'contrariwise.' LSJ s.v. πάλιν (2) 1292.

a house stand securely[202] and reliably,[203] to prevent the person who wishes to whitewash.

In 1 Cor. hom. 4

Field 2, 35D-36E: Μωρὰν τοίνυν αὐτὴν ἔδειξεν ὁ θεὸς, καὶ εὐδόκησε διὰ τῆς μωρίας τοῦ κηρύγματος σῶσαι, μωρίας δὲ οὐχὶ τῆς οὔσης, ἀλλὰ τῆς εἶναι δοκούσης. Τὸ γὰρ μεῖζον τοῦτό ἐστιν, ὅτι οὐχ ἑτέραν σοφίαν τοιαύτην ἐκείνης πλείονα εἰσαγαγών, ἀλλὰ τὴν δοκοῦσαν εἶναι μωρίαν, οὕτω περιγέγονε. Καὶ γὰρ Πλάτωνα ἐξέβαλεν, οὐχὶ δι᾽ ἑτέρου φιλοσόφου σοφωτέρου, ἀλλὰ διὰ ἁλιέως ἀμαθοῦς. Οὕτω γὰρ γέγονεν ἡ ἧττα μείζων, καὶ λαμπροτέρα ἡ νίκη.

God therefore proved it [i.e. the wisdom of the world] foolish, and was content to save through the foolishness[204] of the gospel[205] (but not real foolishness, but that which seems to be). For this is the more striking thing, that, not having introduced another wisdom of such a kind,[206] greater than that [which preceded], but that which seems to be foolishness, he thus prevailed. For he even expelled Plato, not via[207] another, wiser, philosopher, but via an unlearned fisherman. For in this manner the defeat [of paganism] has become greater, and the victory [of Christianity] more brilliant.

Field 2, 36B: Πάλιν Ἕλληνες ἀπαιτοῦσιν ἡμᾶς ῥητορείαν λόγων καὶ δεινότητα σοφισμάτων … ὅταν οὖν οἱ σημεῖα καὶ σοφίαν ζητοῦντες μὴ μόνον μὴ λαμβάνωσιν ἅπερ αἰτοῦσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ ἐναντία ὧν ἐπιθυμοῦσιν ἀκούωσιν, εἶτα διὰ τῶν ἐναντίων πείθωνται, πῶς οὐκ ἄφατός ἐστιν ἡ τοῦ κηρυττομένου δύναμις;

Again, Greeks demand of us an eloquence[208] characteristic of orations and a cleverness characteristic of sophisms … Therefore, when those who seek signs and wisdom not only do not receive those things[209] they ask for, but hear the things opposite from those they desire, and are then persuaded through the contraries[210]—how is the power of the One being preached not beyond words?[211]

---

[202] BDAG s.v. ἀσφαλώς (1) 147.
[203] Ibid. s.v. βεβαίως (1) 173.
[204] Ibid. s.v. μωρός 663.
[205] Lampe s.v. κήρυγμα (4) 751.
[206] BDAG s.v. τοιοῦτος 1009.
[207] Ibid. s.v. δία (A1) 223.
[208] Montanari s.v. ῥητορεία 1878.
[209] Ibid. s.v. ὅσπερ (A) 1494.
[210] Lit. 'the opposite/contrary things.'
[211] Lampe s.v. ἄφατος 273.

De proph. obsc. hom. 1.1

PG 56, 165: Ὅταν ἀσθενεῖς ὦμεν, πολὺν παρασκευάσασθαι χρὴ τὸν λόγον καὶ ποικίλον, παραβολὰς καὶ παραδείγματα ἔχοντα, κατασκευὰς, καὶ περιόδους, καὶ ἕτερα πολλὰ τοιαῦτα, ἵνα ἐκ πάντων ῥᾳδία γένηται ἡμῖν τῶν συμφερόντων ἡ αἵρεσις.

Since[212] we are weak, the sermon[213] ought[214] to be made elaborate[215] and diverse[216]—containing comparisons and proofs from example, *kataskeuas*, and periods, and many other such things—in order that, out of everything [featured in the Scriptures], the acquisition of those things profitable to us might become easy.

In Gen. hom. 15.2

PG 53, 121: Μὴ ἀνθρωπίνως δέχου τὰ λεγόμενα, ἀλλὰ τὴν παχύτητα τῶν λέξεων τῇ ἀσθενίᾳ λογίζου τῇ ἀνθρωπίνῃ. Εἰ γὰρ μὴ τούτοις τοῖς ῥήμασιν ἐχρήσατο, πῶς ἂν μαθεῖν ἠδυνήθημεν ταῦτα τὰ ἀπόῤῥητα μυστήρια; Μὴ τοῖς ῥήμασιν οὖν μόνοις ἐναπομείνωμεν, ἀλλὰ θεοπρεπῶς ἅπαντα νοῶμεν ὡς ἐπὶ Θεοῦ. Τὸ γὰρ, *Ἔλαβε*, καὶ ὅσα τοιαῦτα, διὰ τὴν ἀσθένειαν τὴν ἡμετέραν εἴρηται.

Do not receive the things being said in human fashion,[217] but reckon the earthliness[218] of the phrases for [the sake of] human weakness. For if he had not used these words, how would[219] we have been able to learn these ineffable mysteries? Therefore, let us not be content with[220] the words alone, but let us consider everything[221] in a manner worthy of God,[222] as concerning God. For the [expression], "He took," and those such as this, have been said on account of our weakness.

---

[212] LSJ s.v. ὅταν (1b) 1264.
[213] Lampe s.v. λόγος (8) 807.
[214] BDAG s.v. χρή 1089.
[215] Loose rendering of 'plentiful.' BDAG s.v. πολύς (2) 848.
[216] Loose rendering of 'diversified.' LSJ s.v. ποικίλος (4) 1430.
[217] Lampe s.v. ἀνθρωπίνως (A) 139.
[218] Ibid. s.v. παχύτης 1054. Lexicographer cites Chrysostom's *In Gen. hom.* 42.4.
[219] LSJ s.v. ἄν (IV 1b) 97.
[220] Lampe s.v. ἐναπομένω (2) 465.
[221] BDAG s.v. ἅπας (2) 98.
[222] Lampe s.v. θεοπρεπῶς (A) 632.

In Gen. hom. 26.3

PG 53, 232: Θέα μοι πάλιν τῆς θείας Γραφῆς τὴν συγκατάβασιν. *Καὶ ἐμνήσθη*, φησίν, *ὁ Θεός*. Θεοπρεπῶς νοῶμεν, ἀγαπητοὶ, τὰ λεγόμενα, καὶ μὴ τῇ ἀσθενείᾳ τῆς ἡμετέρας φύσεως λογιζώμεθα τῶν λέξεων τὴν παχύτητα. Ὅσον γὰρ πρὸς τὴν ἄῤῥητον φύσιν ἐκείνην, ἀνάξιον τὸ ῥῆμα· ὅσον δὲ πρὸς τὴν ἡμετέραν ἀσθένειαν, ἀκολούθως εἴρηται.

Contemplate[223] for me again the condescension/considerateness of the Holy Scripture. It asserts, "And God remembered." Beloved, let us consider the things being said in a manner worthy of God, and not reckon by the weakness of our nature the earthliness of the phrases. For inasmuch as [it is] in reference to that ineffable[224] nature, the word is unworthy; but inasmuch as [it is] in view of[225] our weakness, it has fittingly[226] been spoken.

Ad vid. iun. 2

PG 48, 601: Καὶ γὰρ ἐγώ ποτε νέος ἔτι ὤν, τὸν σοφιστὴν τὸν ἐμὸν (πάντων δὲ ἀνδρῶν δεισιδαιμονέστερος ἐκεῖνος ἦν) οἶδα ἐπὶ πολλῶν τὴν μητέρα τὴν ἐμὴν θαυμάζοντα. Τῶν γὰρ παρακαθημένων αὐτῷ πυνθανόμενος, οἷα εἴωθε, τίς εἴην ἐγὼ, καὶ τίνος εἰπόντος, ὅτι χήρας γυναικὸς, ἐμάνθανε παρ' ἐμοῦ τήν τε ἡλικίαν τῆς μητρὸς καὶ τῆς χηρείας τὸν χρόνον· ὡς δὲ εἶπον, ὅτι ἑτῶν τεσσαράκοντα γεγονυῖα εἴκοσιν ἔχει λοιπὸν, ἐξ οὗ τὸν πατέρα ἀπέβαλε τὸν ἐμόν, ἐξεπλάγη, καὶ ἀνεβόησε μέγα, καὶ πρὸς τοὺς παρόντας ἰδών· Βαβαὶ, ἔφη, οἷαι παρὰ Χριστιανοῖς γυναῖκές εἰσι.

For I also recall[227]—once, whilst still being a youth—my professor of rhetoric (that person was more superstitious[228] than all men) marvelling at my mother before many. For, inquiring from those sitting beside him—as he was accustomed—who I was, and after someone said that [I was the son] of[229] a widowed lady, he learnt[230] from me both mother's age and period of widowhood. When I said that, "being forty years of age, she already[231] has spent twenty since she lost my father," he was astounded. And he cried loudly,

---

[223] LSJ s.v. θεάομαι (2) 786. Lampe s.v. θεάω 617.
[224] Lampe s.v. ἄρρητος (2) 230.
[225] LSJ s.v. πρός (III 5) 1498.
[226] Lampe s.v. ἀκόλουθος (1) 63.
[227] BDAG s.v. οἶδα (5) 694.
[228] Lampe s.v. δεισιδαίμων 335.
[229] Possessive genitive construction. Lit. 'of/from a widowed lady.'
[230] Lit. 'was learning.'
[231] LSJ s.v. λοιπός (4) 1060.

and looking towards those present, he said:[232] "Oh,[233] what sort of women there are amongst[234] Christians!"

Cosmas Vestitor

Vie de Saint Jean Chrysostome

Halkin, 433: Ἐν μιᾷ τοίνυν διδάσκοντος αὐτοῦ καὶ προσομιλοῦντος τὰ πρὸς σωτηρίαν τῷ λαῷ καὶ τῇ τῆς λέξεως ὑψηλοτέρᾳ θεωρίᾳ τὸν λόγον προχέοντος, ἐπάρασά τις γυνὴ φωνὴν ἐκ τοῦ ὄχλου εἶπεν·

Therefore on one [occasion]—whilst he was teaching and speaking[235] to the people the things with reference to[236] salvation, and pouring forth the sermon with a higher consideration for style—a certain woman, having raised a voice from the crowd, said:

«Μακαρία μέν, πάτερ, ἡ τοῦ στόματός σου φωνὴ καὶ νοῦς ὃν ἐξήσκησας· μενοῦνγε πάλιν μακάριοι καὶ οἱ τοὺς σοὺς ἐξισχύοντες νοῆσαι λόγους.

"The sound of your mouth and [the] mind which you have trained, Father, are blessed; indeed,[237] in turn,[238] blessed also [are] those who are able to understand[239] your words.

Ἀλλὰ γνώρισον καὶ ταῖς ἡμετέραις τῶν ἀσθενῶν διανοίαις τὴν δύναμιν τῶν σῶν θεοχαρίτων διδαγμάτων·

But make known to our minds[240] characterised by[241] weaknesses the meaning[242] of your teachings graced by God.[243]

ἰδοὺ γὰρ ἐγὼ καταλιποῦσα πάντα μου τῶν οἰκιακῶν τὰ ἔργα, ἔδραμον ὡς εἴτις ἔκδιψος ἔλαφος ἐπὶ τὸν χειμάρρουν τῆς τρυφῆς σου τῶν λόγων·

---

[232] Lit. 'was saying.'
[233] Lampe s.v. βαβαί 281.
[234] BDAG s.v. παρά (5) 757.
[235] Ibid. s.v. προσομιλέω 883.
[236] Ibid. s.v. πρός (3) 875.
[237] Ibid. s.v. μενοῦν 630.
[238] Ibid. s.v. πάλιν (4) 753.
[239] Ibid. s.v. νοέω (1) 674.
[240] Ibid. s.v. διάνοια (1) 234.
[241] Descriptive genitive construction. Lit. 'of weaknesses.'
[242] LSJ s.v. δύναμις (II 2d) 452.
[243] Lampe s.v. θεοχάριτος 643.

For behold I, having left behind all my domestic[244] tasks,[245] ran as if some very thirsty[246] deer towards the winter torrent[247] of delight[248] of your words;

καὶ ἀπὸ μὲν φωνῶν ῥημάτων ὡς ὑδάτων πολλῶν τοὺς μετεωρισμοὺς τῆς διδασκαλίας σου ἀκούσω·

[that] I might also hear the waves[249] of your teaching by utterances of words like mighty waters.

σταγόνα δὲ ἐξ αὐτῶν λαβεῖν μὴ ἐπιγνοῦσα ἀπέρχομαι, πρὸς τῇ τῆς ψυχικῆς δίψης ζημίᾳ καὶ τὸ πολὺ τῆς ἡμέρας τοῦ οἴκου μου φροντίσιν ἀνωφελῶς προσκτησαμένη.»

But I go away, not having discovered a drop to take out of them, unprofitably having acquired in addition[250] the loss of spiritual thirst and for the most part[251] anxiety concerning the day[252] of my family."[253]

Τούτων ἀκούσας ὁ θεόφρων μετέτρεψεν τὴν ἀκρότομον τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ πέτραν εἰς λίμνας ἐξαντλουμένης σοφίας.

Having heard these things, the one of godly mind[254] changed the sharp stone of his mouth into lakes[255] of drawn from[256] wisdom.

Καὶ λοιπὸν μετὰ πλείονος τῆς παρρησίας τὸν τῆς διδασκαλίας σπόρον κατέβαλλεν, κατάλληλα φάρμακα τοῖς τραύμασιν ἐπιτιθείς.

And then with more plainness[257] [of speech] he sowed the seed of his teaching, putting[258] appropriate medicines on the wounds.

---

[244] Montanari s.v. οἰκιακός 1431.
[245] BDAG s.v. ἔργον (2) 391.
[246] LSJ s.v. ἔκδιψος 504.
[247] BDAG s.v. χείμαρρος/χειμάρρους 1082.
[248] Lampe s.v. τρυφή (4) 1417.
[249] Montanari s.v. μετεωρισμός 1333.
[250] Ibid. s.v. προσκτάομαι (1) 1816.
[251] Ibid. s.v. πολύς (2C) 1713.
[252] Objective genitive construction. Lit. 'of the day.'
[253] BDAG s.v. οἶκος (2) 699.
[254] Lampe s.v. θεόφρων 643.
[255] BDAG s.v. λίμνη (1) 596.
[256] Montanari s.v. ἐξαντλέω (2) 714.
[257] BDAG s.v. παρρησία (1) 781.
[258] Montanari s.v. ἐπιτίθημι (col. 2, line 16, 1A) 798.

Sozomen

Historia Ecclesiastica 8.2

Bidez, 350: ὡς οὐ τέχνῃ τινὶ καὶ δυνάμει λόγου βιάζεται παραπλήσια δοξάζειν αὐτῷ, ἀλλ᾽ ὡς ἔχει ἀληθείας εἰλικρινῶς τὰς ἱερὰς ἐξηγεῖτο βίβλους. λόγος γὰρ ὑπὸ τῶν ἔργων κοσμούμενος πίστεως ἄξιος εἰκότως φαίνεται,

not as with some system[259] and art of oration does he easily constrain[260] [his listeners] to think similar[261] to him, but as he used to give way[262] to the truth he sincerely[263] explained[264] the holy books. For a speech embellished by[265] deeds is suitably recognised[266] as worthy of trust.

ἄνευ δὲ τούτων εἴρωνα καὶ τῶν οἰκείων λόγων κατήγορον ἀποφαίνει τὸν λέγοντα, κἂν σπουδάζῃ διδάσκων. τῷ δὲ κατ᾽ ἀμφότερα εὐδοκιμεῖν προσῆν·

Without these it shows forth the one who speaks a dissembler and accuser of his own assertions, even if he might be earnest about teaching. But to him [i.e. Chrysostom] it belonged[267] to be esteemed in both [word and deed].

ἀγωγῇ μὲν γὰρ βίου σώφρονι καὶ πολιτείᾳ ἀκριβεῖ ἐχρῆτο, φράσει δὲ λόγου σαφεῖ μετὰ λαμπρότητος· φύσεώς τε γὰρ εὖ ἔσχε, διδασκάλους δὲ τῆς μὲν περὶ τοὺς ῥήτορας ἀσκήσεως Λιβάνιον, Ἀνδραγάθιον δέ τῶν περὶ φιλοσοφίας λόγων.

For with prudent conduct[268] in life and with scrupulous[269] behaviour[270] he proceeded,[271] and with clear diction in dialogue together with splendour; for he acquired[272] [these abilities] well even[273] from nature. [He also had] teachers: on the one hand, for the training concerning the rhetoricians, Libanius; Andragathius, on the other, for the principles concerning philosophy.

---

[259] LSJ s.v. τέχνη (III) 1785.
[260] BDAG s.v. βιάζω (4) 176.
[261] Lit. 'similar things.' Ibid. s.v. παραπλήσιος 770.
[262] 3rd person singular imperfect indicative active of χάω, which is equivalent to χωρέω. LSJ s.v. χάω 1982, s.v. χωρέω (A) 2015.
[263] Lampe s.v. εἰλικρινής (4) 416.
[264] Lit. 'used to explain.'
[265] BDAG s.v. ὑπό (Aβ) 1035–36.
[266] Ibid. s.v. φαίνω (3) 1047.
[267] Lit. 'was belonging.'
[268] Lampe s.v. ἀγωγή (1) 25.
[269] Ibid. s.v. ἀκριβής (1) 64.
[270] Ibid. s.v. πολιτεία (F3) 1113.
[271] BDAG s.v. χράομαι (2) 1088.
[272] LSJ s.v. ἔχω (A1) 749.
[273] BDAG s.v. τέ (3) 993.

Bidez, 351: ὥστε μοι δοκεῖ κάκ τούτου ῥᾴδιον εἶναι συμβαλεῖν ὡς δεινή τις ἐπήνθει πειθὼ τοῖς Ἰωάννου λόγοις. ἐκράτει γὰρ ταύτῃ καὶ τῶν ὁμοίως λέγειν καὶ πείθειν δυναμένων. ἐντεῦθεν καὶ τὸ πλῆθος ᾖρει…

Therefore it seems to me[274] to be easy to infer also from this [i.e. Chrysostom's petition to Theodore of Mopsuestia], that a certain marvellously strong persuasiveness[275] used to bloom via the words of John. For he conquered[276] by this those who were similarly[277] able to both speak and persuade. Hence he also won[278] the population…

Socrates Scholasticus

Historia Ecclesiastica 6.3

Hansen, 313: Ἰωάννης Ἀντιοχεὺς μὲν ἦν τῆς Κοίλης Συρίας, υἱὸς δὲ Σεκούνδου καὶ μητρὸς Ἀνθούσης, ἐξ εὐπατριδῶν τῶν ἐκεῖ, μαθητὴς δὲ ἐγένετο Λιβανίου τοῦ σοφιστοῦ καὶ ἀκροατὴς Ἀνδραγαθίου τοῦ φιλοσόφου. μέλλων δὲ ἐπὶ δικανικὴν ὀρμᾷν καὶ συνιδὼν τὸν ἐν τοῖς δικαστηρίοις μοχθηρὸν καὶ ἄδικον βίον, ἐπὶ τὸν ἡσύχιον μᾶλλον ἐτρέπετο…

John the Antiochene was from Coele-Syria, and from the noble families there, a son of Secundus and Mother Anthusa. He became a student of Libanius the sophist and a disciple of Andragathius the philosopher. Whilst about to set out on [a career in] forensic oratory and after he had become aware of the wretched and unjust life among the law-courts,[279] he turned rather to the peaceful life…

Hansen, 315: καὶ ἐν μὲν τῷ διδάσκειν πολὺς ἦν ὠφελῆσαι τὰ τῶν ἀκουόντων ἤθη, ἐν δὲ ταῖς συντυχίαις ἀλαζονικὸς τοῖς ἀγνοοῦσιν αὐτὸν ἐνομίζετο.

And whilst teaching he was a man of great service to the morals[280] of those who were listening. But in conversations[281] he was considered boastful by those who did not know[282] him.

---

[274] Ibid. s.v. δοκέω (2) 255.
[275] Lampe s.v. πειθώ (1) 1055.
[276] Lit. 'used to conquer/was conquering.'
[277] BDAG s.v. ὁμοίως 707.
[278] Lit. 'used to win/was winning.' LSJ s.v. αἱρέω (A II 3) 41.
[279] Lampe s.v. δικαστήριον (1) 372.
[280] Ibid. s.v. ἦθος (2d) 603.
[281] Ibid. s.v. συντυχία (2d) 1343.
[282] BDAG s.v. ἀγνοέω (1) 12–13.

Palladius

Dialogus 5

Malingrey, 106: Δεξιωτέρας δὲ ὑπάρχων γνώμης ἐξησκήθη τοῖς λόγοις πρὸς διακονίαν τῶν θείων λογίων. Ἐκεῖθεν ὀκτωκαιδέκατον ἔτος ἄγων τὴν τοῦ σώματος ἡλικίαν, ἀφηνίασεν τοῦ σοφιστοῦ τῶν λεξυδρίων·[283] ἀνδρυνθεὶς δὲ τὴν φρένα, ἥρα τῶν ἱερῶν μαθημάτων.

Being distinguished by[284] a cleverer mind he was trained[285] by means of orations for service in the imperial pronouncements.[286] Thenceforward, whilst celebrating[287] [the] eighteenth year in age of his body he rebelled against the empty expressions[288] of the sophist; having matured[289] [in] understanding,[290] he was longing for[291] the sacred doctrines.[292]

Select Bibliography

Ameringer, Thomas E. 'The Stylistic Influence of the Second Sophistic on the Panegyrical Sermons of St. John Chrysostom. A Study in Greek Rhetoric.' Washington, D.C.: PhD Diss., Catholic University of America, 1921.

Baur, Chrysostomus. *John Chrysostom and His Time*, Vol. 1: *Antioch*. Translated by M. Gonzaga. Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1959.

Browning, Robert. *Medieval and Modern Greek*. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Cribiore, Raffaella. *The School of Libanius in Late Antique Antioch*. Princeton & Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2007.

Dewing, Henry B. 'The Origin of Accentual Prose Rhythm in Greek.' *American Journal of Philology* 31:3 (1910) 312–28.

Dickinson, Frederick Walter Augustine. 'The Use of the Optative Mood in the Works of St. John Chrysostom.' Washington, D.C.: PhD Diss., Catholic University of America, 1926.

---

283 Genitive plural of λεξύδριον, a variant form of λεξίδριον, itself a rare construction of λεξίδιον (-είδιον). LSJ s.v. λεξίδριον 1038. Lampe s.v. λεξείδιον 796–97.

284 Descriptive genitive construction. Lit., 'Being of a cleverer mind.'

285 Lampe s.v. ἐξασκέω (B), 493.

286 Derived from *sacra oracula*, the Latin appellation for "rescripts, letters and constitutions emanating from the imperial chancellery" (Kelly, *Golden Mouth* 15).

287 LSJ s.v. ἄγω (IV) 18.

288 Lampe s.v. λεξείδιον (IV) 796–97.

289 3rd person singular aorist passive participle of ἀνδρύνω, a rare form of ἀνδρόω. Ibid. s.v. ἀνδρύνω 130.

290 The article has been omitted from the translation for the sake of legibility. BDAG s.v. φρήν 1065.

291 Ibid. s.v. ἐράω 389.

292 Lampe s.v. μάθημα (B) 819.

Goodall, Blake. *The Homilies of St. John Chrysostom on the Letters of St. Paul to Titus and Philemon: Prolegomena to an Edition*. California: California University Press, 1979.
Horrocks, Geoffrey. *Greek: A History of the Language and its Speakers*. Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.
Hunter, David G. 'Libanius and John Chrysostom: New Thoughts on an Old Problem.' In *Studia Patristica XXII*. Edited by Elizabeth A. Livingstone, 129–135. Leuven: Peeters, 1989.
Kelly, J. N. D. *Golden Mouth: The Story of John Chrysostom—Ascetic, Preacher, Bishop*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1995.
Kennedy, George Alexander. *Greek Rhetoric Under Christian Emperors*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1983.
Maxwell, Jaclyn L. *Christianization and Communication in Late Antiquity. John Chrysostom and His Congregation in Antioch.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
Penella, Robert J. 'The Progymnasmata in Imperial Greek Education.' *Classical World* 105:1 (2011) 77–90.
Rowe, Galen O. 'Style.' In *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period, 330 B.C–A.D. 400*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter, 121–157. Boston & Leiden: Brill, 2001.
Rylaarsdam, David. *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy: The Coherence of His Theology and Preaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Present and future avenues

Chapter Eight

John Chrysostom
Moral Philosopher and Physician of the Soul

Wendy Mayer

If within western scholarship the twentieth century did not serve John Chrysostom well,[1] the twenty-first century is witnessing a resurgence in Chrysostom studies. Since the year 2000 some sixty-four doctoral and masters dissertations with a substantial focus on Chrysostom's life, works or *Nachleben* have successfully been completed. To these can be added a further twenty-two that explore some aspect, but in which the interest in Chrysostom is less central or more diffuse.[2] At a minimum, a further eleven doctoral

[1] Within eastern Christian scholarship John for the most part continued to be revered as one of the three hierarchs. See e.g. George D. Dragas, 'Perceptions of Chrysostom in Contemporary Greek Orthodoxy' in *Chrysostomosbilder in 1600 Jahren: Facetten der Wirkungsgeschichte eines Kirchenvaters*, ed. Martin Wallraff and Rudolf Brändle (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008) 373–409; and the bibliography of Romanian scholarship collated by Daniel Popa, *Opera & Bibliographia Sfântului Ioan Gura de Aur / Of Saint John Chrysostom* (Cluj-Napoca: Editura Renasterea, 2002). Within western scholarship, both Christian and secular, he was dismissed variously as an anti-intellectual, not much of a philosopher or thinker, a mere moraliser rather than serious theologian, and his exegesis was deemed superficial and deficient. For a survey of these views see David Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy: The Coherence of his Theology and Preaching* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014) 2–3, who cites the Orthodox scholar Georges Florovsky as contributing to this negative perspective.

[2] Details for all eighty-six, including those mentioned in n. 4, can be found by searching *Chrysostomica: An Online Bibliography of Scholarship on John Chrysostom and Attributed*

dissertations in these same categories are in process or nearing completion.[3] Of the eighty-six plus completed dissertations, twelve have been defended or examined in just the past eighteen months.[4] In this same sixteen-year period more conferences and seminars with a focus on Chrysostom have been organised globally than during the course of the entire twentieth century.[5] This has been prompted in part by the celebration of the 1600th anniversary of his death in 2007, but the latter is not exclusively responsible. The 2016 St Andrew's Patristic Symposium, convened in Sydney, is an example of the burgeoning interest, as is the 2016 conference in Leuven, *John Chrysostom and Severian of Gabala: Homilists, Exegetes and Theologians*. In a special issue of the *Journal of Late Antiquity* in 2015 dedicated to the topic of medicine, of the eight main articles three (that is, almost half) focused on Chrysostom.[6] He was the only author whose works were the subject of multiple contributions. Between 2015 and 2017 in the *Journal of Early Christian Studies* alone five articles on John Chrysostom will have appeared,[7] as many as were published

Writings, www.cecs.acu.edu.au/chrysostombibliography.html (last accessed 27/9/16).

[3] This chapter sums up the state of the field as of October 2016. The students of whose work I am aware are: Jeanette Kreijkes-van Esch (University of Groningen); Junghun Bae and Justin Piggott (Australian Catholic University); Esther Verwold (Johannes Gutenberg Universität Mainz); Pierre Molinié (Université Paris-Sorbonne and Centre Sèvres); Marie-Eve Geiger (Université Lyon 2); Samuel Pomeroy (Katholieke Universiteit Leuven); Sam Kennerley (University of Cambridge); Becky Walker (St Louis University); Paschalis Gkortsilas (University of Exeter); George Mukuka (University of South Africa).

[4] Maria Verhoeff (Evangelische Theologische Fakulteit Leuven, 2016); James Cook (University of Oxford, 2016); Samantha Miller (Marquette University, 2016); Jessica Wright (Princeton University, 2016); Lamprini Papadimitriou (Lund University, 2016); Jonathan Stanfill (Fordham University, 2015); Courtney Wilson VanVeller (Boston University, 2015); Aleksander Dziadowicz (Université de Strasbourg, 2015), Rosa Maria Hunt (Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam, 2015); Gary Raczka (University of Notre Dame, 2015); Rebecca Pawloski (Pontificia Universitas Lateranensis, 2015); Ivan Petrović (University of Zagreb, 2015).

[5] 1900-1999: Rome (1907), Thessaloniki (1972), Chantilly (1974). The first two conferences/symposia were focused solely on Chrysostom; the last, on Chrysostom and Augustine. 2000–2015: Rome (2004), Paris (2004), Basel (2007), Sibiu (2007), Istanbul (2007), Saintes (2015), Sydney (2016), Leuven (2016). To these can be added the series of seminars held in late 2016 at Université Lyon 3 and Institut Sources Chrétiennes (on Chrysostom's *Homélies nouvelles* and *Homélies sur Jean*). Regarding the latter see the newly established blog chrysostom.hypotheses.org (last accessed 27/9/16).

[6] See Wendy Mayer, 'The Persistence in Late Antiquity of Medico-Philosophical Psychic Therapy,' Jessica Wright, 'Between Despondency and the Demon: Treating Spiritual Disorders in John Chrysostom's *Letter to Stageirios*,' and Blake Leyerle, 'The Etiology of Sorrow and its Therapeutic Benefits in the Preaching of John Chrysostom' in *Journal of Late Antiquity* 8 (2015) 337–51, 352–67, and 368–85, respectively.

[7] Benjamin H. Dunning, 'Chrysostom's Serpent: Animality and Gender in the *Homilies on Genesis*' *JECS* 23 (2015) 71–95; Jan R. Stenger, 'Where to Find Christian Philosophy? Spatiality in John Chrysostom's Counter to Greek *Paideia*' *JECS* 24:2 (2016) 173–98; Jennifer Barry, 'Diagnosing Heresy: Ps.-Martyrius's *Funerary Speech for John Chrysostom*' *JECS* 24:3 (2016)

in that journal over the preceding fifteen years. This period will also have witnessed the publication of the first non-conference-generated volume of essays dedicated solely to the study of Chrysostom to appear in more than a century.[8] This is a markedly different scenario from that which I described at the Augustinianum Incontro in Rome in 2004, when, in my survey of the previous twenty years of Chrysostom scholarship I pointed out that at the 1995 Oxford Conference out of some 700 papers just seventeen were devoted to Chrysostom studies compared to some sixty-two on Augustine; declining by the 2003 Oxford Conference to a mere nine on Chrysostom, whereas the number of papers on Augustine continued to increase.[9] It is noteworthy that at that time very few of the scant papers delivered focused on Chrysostom's theology.

These observations prompt us to ask: why? What is driving this recent upsurge in interest? Behind this renewal we can discern a number of factors. One is the elevation since the mid 1990s of early Christian homilies and preaching as subjects worthy of their own study, and the related acknowledgement of the homily as a significant component within Christian liturgy.[10] As we are aware, the bulk of Chrysostom's works are homiletic in nature rather than explicitly theological. Another is a subtle change in our view of the development over the first four centuries CE of an authoritative body of Christian scriptures and what it meant to interpret them. A significant proportion of Chrysostom's works are primarily exegetical. With questions now asked about the degree to which the Antiochene-Alexandrian dichotomy that dominated twentieth-century views was an emic construct of the fourth and fifth centuries,[11] we are now free to view his works through an altered lens and to ask a different range of questions. A third factor is the recent expansion

395–418; Chris L. de Wet, 'Grumpy Old Men: Gender, Gerontology, and the Geriatrics of Soul in John Chrysostom' *JECS* 24:4 (2016) 491–521; Xueying Wang, 'John Chrysostom on the Premature Death of Children and Parental Grief' *JECS*, forthcoming.

[8] *Revisioning John Chrysostom: New Perspectives, Theories and Approaches*, ed. Chris L. de Wet and Wendy Mayer (Leiden: Brill, forthcoming).

[9] Wendy Mayer, 'Progress in the Field of Chrysostom Studies (1984–2004)' in *Giovanni Crisostomo: Oriente e Occidente tra IV e V secolo* (Roma: Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum, 2005) 9–35, 9–10 n. 5.

[10] The work of Alexandre Olivar on the specifics of patristic preaching and of Pauline Allen and others on the preacher's audience have been foundational in this regard. For an overview see Wendy Mayer, 'Homiletics' in *Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Studies*, ed. Susan Ashbrook Harvey and David Hunter (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008) 565–83.

[11] See e.g. Donald Fairbairn, 'Patristic Exegesis and Theology: The Cart and the Horse' *Westminster Theological Journal* 69 (2007) 1–19; and Hagit Amirav, 'The Christian Appropriation of the Jewish Scriptures: Allegory, Pauline Exegesis, and the Negotiation of Religious Identities' *Annali di Storia dell'esegesi* 28:2 (2011) 39–55.

of research into John's contemporary in Antioch, the orator Libanius, and the mutual situation of both John and Libanius within debates about the existence of a third, in addition to second, sophistic.[12] All of Chrysostom's works are rhetorical in character. To acknowledge this is to acknowledge his formation within the *paideia*—the elite male educational and social system—of his time. This aligns with a related push within Late-Antique studies to explore the continuities and discontinuities between this period and the classical Greek and Roman past, often through the lens of transformation and adaptation. A fourth factor is the recent upswell of interest, originating in Mediaeval and Classical Studies, now moving into Late Antique and Patristic Studies, in the emotions. This is aligned with a re-privileging in the late twentieth century within the academy under the leadership of Martha Nussbaum and Pierre Hadot of Graeco-Roman moral philosophy, previously dismissed as popular.[13] By the time of Chrysostom, Stoic-Cynic thought and practice had exerted significant influence on early Christian preaching.[14] When we understand "emotions" as *pathē* that disorder the soul, and consider his strong interest in moral formation, Chrysostom's homilies, treatises and letters prove to be rich sources. A fifth, not unrelated factor is the recent turn towards exploration of the history of Greek and Roman medicine and its reception in Late Antiquity. This introduces a framework in which rhetoric, philosophy and medicine intersect, with rich implications for both written and oral communication (treatises, letters and preaching) as logotherapy.[15]

For Chrysostom the implications of these developments have been profound. From a twentieth-century framework in which patristic theology was privileged and in which patristic authors were assigned to discrete schools with a limited set of defining characteristics (a framework in which Chrysostom frequently came up short), in the twenty-first century we have moved toward a paradigm in which his works and thought now emerge as

---

[12] See e.g. Lieve Van Hoof, 'Greek Rhetoric and the Later Roman Empire. The Bubble of the "Third Sophistic"' *Antiquité Tardive* 18 (2010) 211–24.

[13] See Martha Nussbaum, *The Therapy of Desire: Theory and Practice in Hellenistic Ethics* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994) and the essays collected and translated in Pierre Hadot, *Philosophy as a Way of Life. Spiritual Exercises from Socrates to Foucault*, ed. Arnold I. Davidson, trans. Michael Chase (Malden-Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 1995). Richard Sorabji, *Emotion and Peace of Mind: From Stoic Agitation to Christian Temptation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000) has also been influential.

[14] See Jaclyn L. Maxwell, *Christianization and Communication in Late Antiquity: John Chrysostom and his Congregation in Antioch* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006) 11–64.

[15] See Mayer, 'Persistence in Late Antiquity,' and ead., 'Shaping the Sick Soul: Reshaping the Identity of John Chrysostom' in *Christians Shaping Identity from the Roman Empire to Byzantium: Studies inspired by Pauline Allen*, ed. Geoffrey D. Dunn and Wendy Mayer (Leiden: Brill, 2015) 140–64.

much more significant—perhaps even *sui generis* or unique in a number of respects—and for a multitude of previously un- or under-appreciated reasons. What we will do in this chapter is to outline some of the main threads in this still emerging perspective, arguing that one of the keys to appreciating Chrysostom not just on his own terms, but as a contributor to the development of core concepts in eastern Christian theology, lies with precisely the reason for which he has been written off as a theological light-weight—namely, his emphasis on virtue and the moral health of the human person. In order to make this case we will divide the chapter into three parts. First, we will set out what happens when we explore Chrysostom first and foremost within his local historical context. This leads to a view of Chrysostom as primarily an elite male and an Antiochene citizen, responding to continuing admiration in Antioch for the emperor Julian as an ascetic philosopher and to his own lingering fear for neo-Nicene Christianity in the wake of the anti-Christian policies of that same emperor. Second, we will survey some recent research that restores balance to this picture by locating Chrysostom, his exegesis and thought within emerging trends in eastern Christianity. This allows us to see how his conception of Christianity as a superior philosophy is shaped not just by Graeco-Roman classical, but also Judeo-Christian traditions. It also permits us to assess better how and in what particular areas he contributes to later eastern Christian theology. Third, we will discuss in brief the implications of these findings for the salvation of all human beings. Within the constraints of his medico-philosophical therapy and soteriology who could be healed? That is, what limits are imposed and what did this mean for those not considered part of the neo-Nicene Christian community, namely, heretics, Jews, and Greeks?

Son of Hellenism, Son of Antioch[16]

In this first section we explore the picture that emerges when we refocus attention on how in his thought and approach Chrysostom was shaped by the Greek-speaking eastern Roman world into which he was born. In the early decades of the twentieth century there was considerable, if somewhat narrow, interest in the influence on his work of Greek rhetorical traditions. For the most part, however, scholars who explored this aspect, along with his debt

[16] The label "son of Hellenism" owes a debt to Susanna Elm, *Sons of Hellenism, Fathers of the Church: Emperor Julian, Gregory of Nazianzus, and the Vision of Rome* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2012). There are significant parallels between her reading of Gregory of Nazianzus' conception of the priesthood and the influence on him of the emperor Julian and recent readings of both of these factors in relation to John Chrysostom.

to philosophy and to classical Greek literature and mythology, accepted with little question Chrysostom's insistent, even harsh, critique of the failure of Greek philosophy, as well as the superficiality of Greek oratory.[17] The latter, as he not infrequently claimed, was self-oriented and concerned exclusively with seeking respect and praise.[18] In the twenty-first century we are now able to recognise that this dualistic unilaterally biased approach is itself native to the agonistic climate that drove Greek philosophy, medicine, and politics in which the conceptualisations "mine v. theirs" and "mine is superior to theirs" are both inevitable and required.[19] As I argue in the article just cited,[20] in fact, when we read through Chrysostom's own self-representation and claims for the superiority of Christianity as the true philosophy, the conclusion we come to is that he is operating within precisely the same set of constraints. That is, in many respects what Chrysostom is doing and what the pagan orator Libanius is doing are not that different. Both are performing in accord with the same set of cultural and societal norms. This is similar to the finding of Peter Van Nuffelen in a recent article in which he concludes that as a preacher Chrysostom and his contemporaries participated in the same social system, the Second Sophistic nexus of rhetorical performance, social status, patronage, and material benefits.[21] What Chrysostom does is not to deny this nexus or require that it be changed, but to demand that the preacher instead disengage from it. As Van Nuffelen asserts, for Chrysostom

> …rhetoric should be directed towards moral aims, that is, instruction, …[while] …the preacher should avoid giving in to his desire for success. Strikingly, thus, John leaves the nexus of rhetoric, popular acclaim, and social status intact. He asks the preacher to disengage mentally but not in praxis.[22]

---

[17] This is discussed in detail in Wendy Mayer, 'A Son of Hellenism: Viewing John Chrysostom's Anti-Intellectualism Through the Lens of Antiochene *Paideia*' in *Intellectual Exchange and Religious Diversity in Antioch (CE 350-450)*, ed. Silke-Petra Bergjan and Susanna Elm (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, forthcoming).

[18] This stance is analysed by Jutta Tloka, *Griechische Christen – christliche Griechen. Plausibilierungsstrategien des antiken Christentums bei Origenes und Johannes Chrysostomos* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005) 125–246.

[19] See Geoffrey E. R. Lloyd, *Adversaries and Authorities: Investigations into Ancient Greek and Chinese Science* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996) 121–30. I am indebted to Pak-Wah Lai, 'Comparing Patristic and Chinese Medical Anthropologies' *Studia Patristica*, forthcoming, for alerting me to this reference.

[20] See n. 17.

[21] Peter Van Nuffelen, 'A War of Words: Sermons and Social Status in Constantinople under the Theodosian Dynasty' in *Literature and Society in the Fourth Century A.D.: Performing Paideia, Constructing the Present, Presenting the Self*, ed. Lieve Van Hoof and Peter Van Nuffelen (Leiden: Brill, 2014) 201–17.

[22] Ibid. 208.

This conclusion aligns with my own to the effect that even the differentiating motive Chrysostom ascribes to Christian oratory—the salvation of others—is not unique to Christianity. That is, that the purpose John ascribes to Christian rhetoric and which he claims makes it distinct—the soul-health of the listener—is as much a part of Hellenistic secular *paideia* and a subject of debate within it as what he frames as the latter's defining characteristic—rhetoric aimed at enhancing the social status of the orator.[23] Ultimately, what I proceed to do in that article is to show how John's conception of the role of the Christian preacher is at heart that of a psychagogue or medico-philosophical psychic therapist, how this permeates his work across all genres, and how in doing so, far from rejecting long-standing Hellenistic intellectual tradition (as he would have us believe), he in fact embraces it within a Christian framework. Furthermore, in opposing the alleged aims of the First Sophistic (moral progress) to those of the Second Sophistic (vain praise), he exploits a number of equally long-standing debates and deliberately misleading distinctions and tropes within this same tradition, those of rhetoric versus philosophy (sophists v. philosophers), and of philosophy versus medicine. I argue that in deriding secular philosophy and sophistry, his explicit anti-intellectualist stance is part of a rhetorical sleight of hand common within intellectual circles that obscures the commonality of the goals of what are in reality less distinct categories, as well as the depth of his debt to this same intellectual tradition. At heart, in promoting protreptic (the medium of psychagogy or moral guidance) over and above epideictic rhetoric, what he is doing, I argue, is claiming exclusively for Christianity continuity with an older, "superior" intellectual tradition (the First Sophistic),[24] that may have become overshadowed by the Second Sophistic within the Antiochene schools of rhetoric in Late Antiquity, but which in reality had never died out.

This finding, that Chrysostom conceives of himself as a Christian philosopher and psychagogue—that is, as a philosopher in the Graeco-Roman moral philosophical tradition, an orator, and not just an orator, but specifically

[23] Mayer, 'Son of Hellenism.' The conceptual nexus between errors of thought, health of the soul and *sōtēria* is exemplified in Galen, *De propriorum animi cuiuslibet affectuum dignotione et curatione*, where he twice (*aff. dig.* 5.8, 10.10, CMG V.4,1,1.18, 37) refers to the "desire to be saved" (τῶν σωθῆναι βουλομένων). Throughout this and its twin treatise (*De animi cuiuslibet peccatorum dignotione et curatione*) the language that is taken up in Christian discourse as "sin" (ἁμάρτημα)—referring here and frequently in Chrysostom to a cognitive error—is prevalent throughout.

[24] On the First Sophistic as philosophical rhetoric see Philostratus, *Vitae sophistorum* 1 (LCL Wright, 4–7). On Plato and Aristotle as models of the First Sophistic see Van Hoof, 'Greek Rhetoric' 214.

an iatrosophist[25]—whose role as a philosophical guide and physician is to correct errors of thought, with the therapeutic objective of the healing of the person's diseased soul, aligns with the recent work of Ray Laird and Peter Moore on the centrality of the mindset for Chrysostom in regard to moral choice and sin,[26] and of David Rylaarsdam regarding the centrality of psychagogy to his conception of Christian pedagogy as modelled on divine instruction and exemplified in the apostle Paul.[27] In fact, the more that this way of viewing Chrysostom's self-conceptualisation and motives is being pursued in current research, the more so many previously un- and under-appreciated aspects of his works are coming together into an integrated whole. His emphasis on *synkatabasis*, adaptability or accommodation, is a fundamental aspect of a psychagogy that draws on classical tradition, and in which the role of the orator is to identify the condition of the listener's soul and to adapt his teaching to that condition.[28] The homily itself is a therapeutic medium within this same set of traditions, a tool in the vein of letters of consolation and secular medico-philosophical treatises, deployed to correct a disordered mindset and to restore the listener's mind/soul to the correct set of beliefs.[29] Sin is primarily a sickness of the soul—a disordering of the passions or an error in rational thought.[30] Health is the balance of humours in the body-brain and between the passions (*pathē*), *thumos*, and reason in the mind-soul, the influence of the body upon the mind-soul and vice versa being largely mutual and sympathetic.[31] Employing the long-standing Platonic

---

[25] This point is made by Chris L. de Wet, 'Gluttony and the Preacher's Diet: Obesity, Regimen, and Psycho-Somatic Health in John Chrysostom' in *Revisioning John Chrysostom*, forthcoming.

[26] Raymond J. Laird, *Mindset, Moral Choice and Sin in the Anthropology of John Chrysostom* (Strathfield: St Paul's Publications, 2012); and Peter Moore, 'Chrysostom's Concept of γνώμη: How "*Chosen* Life's Orientation" Undergirds Chrysostom's Strategy in Preaching' *Studia Patristica* 54 (2013) 351–8.

[27] Rylaarsdam, *Divine Pedagogy* (n. 1).

[28] Ibid. 18–30.

[29] In hellenistic moral philosophy the *logos* in logotherapy carried with it the dual connotation *logos*=word and *logos*=reason. In logotherapy words are used to target errors in reason. Logotherapy bears similarities to modern cognitive therapy. On this point and on the history and characteristic features of logotherapy see Christopher Gill, 'Philosophical Therapy as Preventive Psychological Medicine' in *Mental Disorders in the Classical World*, ed. W. V. Harris (Leiden: Brill, 2013) 339–60.

[30] See in addition to Laird, *Mindset*, Claire E. Salem, 'Sanity, Insanity, and Man's Being as Understood by St. John Chrysostom' PhD diss., University of Durham, 2010. This is in line with Graeco-Roman philosophical-medical as well as moral-philosophical thought. On the former see n. 23, on the latter see Gill, 'Philosophical Therapy.'

[31] On health as balance see Peter N. Singer, 'The Fight for Health: Tradition, Competition, Subdivision and Philosophy in Galen's Hygienic Writings' *British Journal for the History of Philosophy* 22:5 (2014) 974–95, 979–81. On the principle of *sympatheia* see Brooke Holmes, 'Disturbing Connections: Sympathetic Affections, Mental Disorder, and the Elusive Soul in

image of the charioteer, for Chrysostom *pathē* need to be reined in by the hegemonic part of the soul and kept in balance.[32] Moderation (self-restraint or *sōphrosynē*) is the key, whether in the use of human goods, like clothing, food, and possessions, or in the expression of sorrow.[33] Fixing on what is the correct mindset towards pain, grief, fear, and other affects is central to his teaching. This is not just moral theology—a label used by twentieth-century scholars to dismiss his thought—nor simply pastoral care in a modern sense, but Christian moral philosophy as an all-encompassing way of life and literal cure of the human soul. What emerges from this re-oriented perspective of Chrysostom's works is the importance of exploring not his christology or trinitarian theology—although, he does have things to say on these topics—but his anthropology. This interest is explicit in the treatise of his contemporary, Nemesius of Emesa, *De natura hominis*, and had been a concern of medical writers in the Greek tradition for almost a thousand years.[34] It is no surprise then that Samantha Miller in a recently defended dissertation argues that for Chrysostom demonology, specifically the agency of demons in relation to human responsibility, is intimately connected with morality and the will in his thought,[35] just as Jessica Wright in another 2016 dissertation argues persuasively for anxiety about damage to the brain as another key concern, with implications for the health of the soul with regard to self-governance and thought and the overall health of not just the individual, but the wider community.[36]

Galen' in *Mental Disorders*, ed. Harris, 147–76. For Galen's view of the tripartite soul, which Chrysostom for the most part follows, see Marcus Schiefsky, 'Galen and the Tripartite Soul' in *Plato and the Divided Self*, ed. Rachel Barney, Tad Brennan and Charles Brittain (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012) 331–49.

[32] See Constantine Bosinis, 'Two Platonic Images in the Rhetoric of John Chrysostom: "The Wings of Love" and "the Charioteer of the Soul"' *Studia Patristica* 41 (2006) 433–8.

[33] Leyerle, 'Etiology of Sorrow' 369–73. Regarding the prevalence of the language of sobriety and self-control in Chrysostom's writings see Maximilijan Žitnik, *ΝΗΨΙΣ: Christliche Nüchternheit nach Johannes Chrysostomus* (Roma: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 2011). On the tradition from which Chrysostom draws in this respect see Adriaan Rademaker, *Sophrosyne and the Rhetoric of Self-Restraint: Polysemy and Persuasive Use of an Ancient Greek Value Term* (Leiden: Brill, 2005). That this concept underlies the promotion of moderate asceticism in Chrysostom and other eastern authors of this period is argued in Wend Mayer, 'Medicine in Transition: Christian Adaptation in the Later Fourth-Century East' in *Shifting Genres in Late Antiquit*y, ed. Geoffrey Greatrex and Hugh Elton (Farnham: Ashgate, 2015) 11–26.

[34] On natural philosophy and human anthropology as essential components of the medical *technē* of regimen as early as Hippocrates see Hynek Bartoš, *Philosophy and Dietetics in the Hippocratic* On Regimen*: A Delicate Balance of Health* (Leiden: Brill, 2015) 111–64.

[35] Samantha Miller, 'No Sympathy for the Devil: The Significance of Demons in John Chrysostom's Soteriology' PhD diss., Marquette University, Wisconsin, 2016.

[36] Jessica Wright, 'Brain and Soul in Late Antiquity' PhD diss., Princeton University, 2016. Discussion of Chrysostom on the brain occurs in chapter 3.

There is, of course, more to his interest in the restoration and maintenance of full psychosomatic health than the human person as human person—a point to which we will return in a moment—but as we move towards the question of how this relates to the divine, it is fruitful to turn to one further emerging insight in regard to how Chrysostom is not just a son of Hellenism, as is becoming increasingly clear, but more specifically a son of Antioch.

It has long been recognised that the short reign of the emperor Julian cast a long shadow in the East in the second half of the fourth century.[37] What is now becoming clearer is that the anxiety his reign generated for John Chrysostom, who lived through the impact of Julian's residency in Antioch at first-hand, is expressed in far more pervasive and subtle ways than the few explicit anti-Julian statements that appear in his homilies *Adversus Iudaeos* or in both his sermon and treatise *De s. Babyla*.[38] Throughout his homilies, as Rylaarsdam progressively sets out, John adapts his instruction to the condition of his hearers' souls, employing now harsh, now gentle tones, now lofty, now low teachings, and making ethical concessions for the sake of more fundamental progress in virtue. This approach, that of the preacher as philosopher-physician of the soul who uses variable techniques for the soul's therapy is set out clearly in John's own manifesto *De sacerdotio*.[39] Key to this program, as is increasingly being pointed out by Pak-Wah Lai and Demetrios Tonias, among others, are the numerous virtue exemplars he adduces, drawn from both the Old and New Testament.[40] Chief among

---

[37] For Julian's reign as responsible for the renewal of the long-standing debate about the relationship between rhetoric and philosophy, for instance, see, in addition to Elm, *Sons of Hellenism*, ead., 'Family Men: Masculinity and Philosophy in Late Antiquity' in *Transformations of Late Antiquity: Essays for Peter Brown*, ed. Philip Rousseau and Emmanuel Papoutsakis (Farnham: Ashgate, 2009) 2:279–302 esp. 283; Maxwell, *Christianization and Communication* 32-41; and Rylaarsdam, *Divine Pedagogy* 31–37.

[38] For discussion of these see Johannes Hahn, 'Die jüdische Gemeinde im spätantiken Antiochia: Leben im Spannungsfeld von sozialer Einbindung, religiösem Wettbewerb und gewaltsamem Konflikt' in *Jüdische Gemeinden und Organisationsformen von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart*, ed. Robert Jütte and Abraham P. Kustermann (Wien: Böhlau Verlag, 1996) 57–89, 81–2; idem, 'Kaiser Julian und ein dritter Tempel? Idee, Wirklichkeit und Wirkung eines gescheiterten Projektes' in *Zerstörungen des Jerusalemer Tempels. Geschehen – Wahrnehmung – Bewältigung*, ed. Johannes Hahn with Christian Ronning (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002) 238–62; and Rudolf Brändle, 'Der steinerne Beweis. Geschichtstheologische Überlegungen zur Zerstörung des Jerusalemer Tempels in den Reden gegen die Juden von Johannes Chrysostomus' *Theologische Zeitschrift* 69 (2013) 548–62.

[39] Rylaarsdam, *Divine Pedagogy*. See also Courtney Wilson VanVeller, 'Paul's Therapy of the Soul: A New Approach to John Chrysostom and Anti-Judaism' PhD diss. (Boston University, 2015) passim, and Tloka, *Griechische Christen* 226–44.

[40] Pak-Wah Lai, 'John Chrysostom and the Hermeneutics of Exemplar Portraits' PhD diss., Durham University, 2010; Demetrios Tonias, *Abraham in the Works of John Chrysostom* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2014).

these is the apostle Paul.[41] The adduction of virtue exemplars is yet another technique that owes a major debt to the norms of both Hellenistic moral philosophy and late-antique rhetoric.[42] It is in this light that we should view recent recognition of Libanius' adduction and promotion, in response to concern about the encroachment of Christianity, of the emperor Julian as an ideal ascetic philosophical and therapeutic model.[43] This insight, coupled with the new scholarship on Chrysostom as a medico-philosophical therapist, raises the suspicion that it is in response that Chrysostom, concerned for his part with the continuing influence at Antioch of Hellenic religion and culture, placed such great emphasis on Christianity as the true philosophy and held up the apostle Paul as a Christian therapeutic philosophical counter-exemplar. That is, his overwhelming admiration for Paul and the particular way in which he depicts and deploys Paul is a direct response to Libanius' admiration for, depiction and deployment as pro-Hellenic religious exemplar of the philosopher-emperor Julian. Andreas Heiser's recent lengthy study of the epithets Chrysostom applies to Paul, which ultimately construct Paul as an ascetic;[44] Rylaarsdam's explication of how Chrysostom constructs Paul as

---

[41] The study of Chrysostom's portraits of Paul by Margaret M. Mitchell, *The Heavenly Trumpet: John Chrysostom and the Art of Pauline Interpretation* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000) is foundational. See now also Rylaarsdam, *Divine Pedagogy* 157–93.

[42] As James Cook points out in section 3 of '"Hear and Shudder!": John Chrysostom's Therapy of the Soul' in *Revisioning John Chrysostom*, forthcoming, in relation to Chrysostom's use of medical language John does not, of course, rely solely on Hellenistic and moral philosophy in his role as a therapist of the soul, but draws also on Judeo-Christian tradition. In this case also John would have been familiar with the way in which Jewish writings and the New Testament drew on Old Testament figures as moral exemplars both positive and negative, e.g. Rom 4:1–21, 1 Cor 10: 1–11, Gal 3:6–9. For the possible influence of the *Testament of Job* see Angela K. Harkins, 'Job in the Ancient Versions and the Pseudepigrapha' in *A Companion to Job in the Middle Ages*, ed. Franklin T. Harkins and Aaron Canty (Leiden: Brill, 2017) 15–16 esp. n.6.

[43] See Arthur P. Urbano, *The Philosophical Life: Biography and the Crafting of Intellectual Identity in Late Antiquity* (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 2013) 199, who points out that Libanius held up the emperor Julian as a wise and virtuous philosopher, whose virtues were temperance and piety, including regulation of food, drink, and sexual relations. See also Alberto Quiroga Puertas, 'Demosthenes' Moral and Legal Arguments in Libanius' Declamations' in *Law and Ethics in Greek and Roman Declamation*, ed. Eugenio Amato, Francesco Citti, and Bart Huelsenbeck (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2015) 287–306 on Libanius' rhetorical engagement with *rathumia* as a social disease that "Socrates" (Julian) was obliged to deal with in response to the advancement of Christianity. Chrysostom is constantly concerned with the same psychic disease, which is similarly best corrected by temperance/sobriety. See e.g. Chrys., *In Genesim hom.* 30 (PG 53, 279–80) and *De statuis hom.* 4 (PG 49, 61).

[44] Andreas Heiser, *Die Paulusinszenierung des Johannes Chrysostomus. Epitheta und ihre Vorgeschichte* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck 2012).

a model psychagogue or philosophical teacher;[45] and Courtney VanVeller's 2015 dissertation, in which she shows how Chrysostom constructs Paul as a deceptive Jew, a model psychagogue, and an exemplar of Christian orthodoxy,[46] all point in this direction. This insight, it seems to me, offers a key to understanding John's explicit antipathy to Hellenism and its *paideia*, yet firm grounding of Christianity and its goals within that same culture, and helps to explain why he so consistently frames Christianity as a moral philosophical way of life and is at pains to construct the Christian God, the apostle Paul, and himself, as superior teachers, therapists, and philosophers. In this sense, far more effectively than any consideration of him within the framework of a putative Antiochene school of exegesis or theology, Chrysostom is a son of Antioch as much as a son of Hellenism. What shapes his thought, in addition to his formation within Antiochene secular *paideia*, is the shadow of Julian's residency in Antioch and the lingering fear that at any moment another Julian could succeed to the imperial throne and overturn the gains and privileges attached to not just the Christian religion, but his own sect within it, neo-Nicene Christianity.

Soteriology and the Divine

To focus attention on how in his thought and approach Chrysostom was shaped by the Greek-speaking eastern Roman world into which he was born, however, is to present only one side of the picture. As a number of scholars have recently pointed out in response to the emergent picture of Chrysostom as a Christian philosopher and physician of the soul, the conceptualisations of the divine and objectives of a Christian and secular philosopher/soul-therapist are distinctively different. If viewing Chrysostom solely from the perspective of theology has in the past led to a decidedly negative view of his contribution to the development of Christian doctrine, while emphasis on his debt to his secular education and his local environment is opening up significant new vistas, the current challenge, they would argue, is to marry together the two—theology and his moral-philosophical soul-therapy. That is, obvious as it may be, Chrysostom owes a debt, too, to the Judeo-Christian tradition.[47] Where the future lies is in assessing in what ways the two strands

[45] Rylaarsdam, *Divine Pedagogy*.

[46] VanVeller, 'Paul's Therapy of the Soul.'

[47] See e.g. Raymond J. Laird, 'John Chrysostom and the Anomoeans: Shaping an Antiochene Perspective on Christology' in *Religious Conflict from Early Christianity to the Rise of Islam*, ed. Wendy Mayer and Bronwen Neil (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2013) 129–49, 141 on Chrysostom's

of influence—Graeco-Roman and Judeo-Christian[48]—come into dialogue with each other in his thought and precisely how and to what degree the former is transformed by the latter. What is emerging from this approach is acknowledgement that Chrysostom did contribute to the development of eastern Christian thought in a number of not insignificant ways, with the potential that more contributions will in the future be acknowledged. Much of this research is in its infancy, is being undertaken by scholars other than myself, and is, at the time of writing this chapter, unpublished. What I will do in this section is discuss in brief some of this work and its insights.

The key difference between secular moral philosophy, with its attendant emphasis on therapy of the *pathē*/emotions, and Christianised versions of it, as Andrew Mellas, Pak-Wah Lai, James Cook, and David Rylaarsdam all point out, is that the first is oriented towards happiness and health in this life, the orientation of the second is eschatological.[49] Nonetheless, this does not mean that Chrysostom is concerned only with salvation and the fate of the human person after death, but rather with the tension between restoration of the soul-health of the human person in this life and restoration of an individual's relationship with God, both of which have soteriological consequences. It is in this light that James Cook talks about the role in Chrysostom's thought and preaching of the emotion of fear, which both is deployed therapeutically (in the case of fear of Gehenna/Hell) and is itself a *pathē* that requires therapeutic correction (in the case of fear of the Devil).[50] The latter is an unhealthy fear that, like fear of loss, can be addressed successfully through logotherapy. This approach is consistent across medico-philosophical therapeutic literature as exemplified in, for instance, Galen's treatise *On the avoidance of distress*.[51] The former (fear of Hell) is a prophylactic adduction of a fear that is rational and genuine. Chrysostom, for instance, draws the analogy of how in secular life fear of authority typically causes a person to submit to insult by such

mistrust of human reason and the latter's dependence on the Holy Spirit for the discovery of divine reality.

[48] Because of his location within the Greek-speaking East and Chrysostom's debt to Hellenistic moral philosophy, we should perhaps look in particular to the influence of Hellenistic Judaism via thinkers like Philo and Origen.

[49] Andrew Mellas, 'Tears of Compunction in John Chrysostom's *On Eutropius*' *Studia Patristica*, forthcoming; Lai, 'Hermeneutics of Exemplar Portraits' 130–72; James Cook, 'Preaching and Christianization: Reading the Sermons of John Chrysostom' PhD diss., Christ Church, University of Oxford, 2016; Rylaarsdam, *Divine Pedagogy* 100–51.

[50] Cook, '"Hear and Shudder!"' Leyerle, 'Etiology of Sorrow' similarly points out that for Chrysostom sorrow can be both pathological and therapeutic.

[51] Gill, 'Philosophical Therapy' 343–45. On Galen in particular see Sophia Xenophontos, 'Psychotherapy and Moralising Rhetoric in Galen's Newly Discovered *Avoiding Distress* (*Peri Alypias*)' *Medical History* 58:4 (2014) 585–603.

individuals without retaliation, since that fear neutralises their own otherwise automatic incontinent anger.[52] Fear of God, the ultimate authority, is thus adduced as a natural powerful restraint and therapeutic psychic corrective.

Similarly, Chrysostom's concept of sin sits naturally between the two traditions. As Fr Panayiotis Papageorgiou argued some two decades ago, for Chrysostom "the transgression of Adam" is the cause of the present human condition, to which we are condemned, but that condemnation by God is not so much a punishment but rather an act of mercy, "in order to save us from sinning eternally and bring us back to his love and sanctification."[53] The human condition is in fact beneficial in that it has become for us a school for virtue, "so that we can become capable of receiving the future gifts of God." Not only are we not responsible for Adam's sin, but are responsible and will receive punishment only for those sins that we commit of our own volition.[54] More recently Claire Salem has argued that this again comes back to the larger question of anthropology and the conception of sin as a mental or psychic illness,[55] a point that Ray Laird develops independently in his work on the *gnōmē* or mindset as the faculty responsible for moral choice and sin.[56] Adam's fall caused universal damage to the human soul and its faculties. While sin is not inevitable, in the post-fallen human condition the distorted human *gnōmē* leads to a propensity for making bad moral choices.[57] As Laird points out in his article on a series of biblical exemplars, for Chrysostom virtue, that is, the avoidance of sin, is all about the correct mindset.[58] A related angle is explored in a forthcoming article by Xueying Wang on the premature death of children and parental grief, in which she argues that Chrysostom's approach influenced later discussion of the eschatological status of the dead infant by authors such as Timothy of Alexandria, Jacob of Serugh, and Severus of Antioch.[59] In one respect, Wang shows that Chrysostom blends traditional

---

[52] John Chrysostom, *In Iohannem hom*. 4/3 (PG 59, 52).

[53] Panayiotis Papageorgiou, 'Chrysostom and Augustine on the sin of Adam and its consequences' *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 39 (1995) 361–78, 376. See also Panayiotis Nellas, *Deification in Christ: Orthodox Perspectives on the Nature of the Human Person*, trans. Norman Russell (Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1987) 64–66; first original edn 1979. I am indebted to Doru Costache for this reference.

[54] Papageorgiou, 'Chrysostom and Augustine' 376.

[55] Salem, 'Sanity, Insanity, and Man's Being.'

[56] Laird, *Mindset*.

[57] Ibid. 232–5.

[58] Raymond J. Laird, 'It's All in the Mindset: John Chrysostom and the Great Moments of Personal Destiny' in *Men and Women in the Early Christian Centuries*, ed. Wendy Mayer and Ian J. Elmer (Strathfield, NSW: St Pauls Publications, 2014) 195–210.

[59] Wang, 'Premature Death' (see n. 7).

therapeutic approaches to the tempering of grief with theological arguments. The latter include the continuing status of the child as a member of the family, via membership in the household of God, and that intemperate grief displays a lack of trust in the resurrection and shows that greater value is placed on the child than God. In another respect, Wang shows that Chrysostom's esteem for the moral innocence of infants, which guarantees them entry into heaven, and his conferral of semi-martyrial status on the parent who deals with their loss patiently, led to the privileging of his approach over that of his contemporaries in later theological discussion. Similarly, Laird argues that in his concept of the *gnōmē* Chrysostom anticipates by several centuries the teaching on this same concept of Maximus the Confessor.[60]

The theology of divinisation or deification is another area where, as a result of exploring together his debt to classical Graeco-Roman and Judeo-Christian thought, the character of Chrysostom's contribution to later Byzantine theology is currently coming to the fore. Pak-Wah Lai's exploration of Chrysostom's prolific adduction of exemplar portraits exemplifies the benefits of this approach. As a consequence he is able to show, on the one hand, that analysis of the exemplar portraits demonstrates the considerable debt of "Chrysostom's ethical framework … to the Graeco-Roman tradition of virtue ethics."[61] That is, the exemplar portraits are natural to a moral-philosophical strategy, just as his deployment and shaping of them owes much to late-antique biographical and rhetorical traditions.[62] At the same time, the forms that the

> exemplar portraits take are also distinctively Christian because they declare powerfully Chrysostom's soteriological convictions, namely, that Christian salvation is nothing less than the transcendence of one's human limitations by the power of the Holy Spirit, so that one can participate in Christ's deified life in the human body and live a life that is not dissimilar to the angels.[63]

David Rylaarsdam develops this further in his reading of Chrysostom as a psychagogue, who leads people's souls out of sin, in imitation of God's adaptive pedagogy. When read in this light, Chrysostom's emphasis on the

---

[60] Raymond J. Laird, 'Mindset (γνώμη) in John Chrysostom' in *The Oxford Handbook of Maximus the Confessor*, ed. Pauline Allen and Bronwen Neil (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015) 194–211.

[61] Lai, 'Hermeneutics of Exemplar Portraits' i (abstract).

[62] Ibid. and cf. 282, where he references as four of the five streams of traditions that dictated exemplar discourse in Late Antiquity Graeco-Roman *paideia*, philosophical ethics, and biographical and rhetorical traditions. The fifth is "the Christian heritage to which Chrysostom belonged."

[63] Ibid. i.

human response to divine adaptation is not simply a matter of his pastoral rigour and moralism, but instead a natural consequence of his theology, which informs and drives his pedagogy.[64] As Rylaarsdam puts it:

> Since our flesh has been raised to heaven with Christ, we are expected to participate in a heavenly way of life. Just as we must respond to God's συγκατάβασις in the words of Scripture with ἀκρίβεια in our study of them, so too if the purposes of God's accommodation through the saving work of Christ and the Spirit are to be fulfilled, the proper human response must be precision of life, a willing participation in the way of life made possible for us. When Chrysostom urges his listeners to ethical improvement in the latter part of his biblical homilies, he assumes that they are already clear about the narrative of redemption, for he taught this narrative in the first part of his homilies by commenting on Scripture verse-by-verse. After this teaching of biblical theology, he tries to persuade people that they have the capability and responsibility to respond to the grace of the divine economy.[65]

That is, just as the exemplar portraits serve a particular strategy, Chrysostom's entire homiletical method, scriptural exegesis included, is directed towards the same end—teaching individuals to live a deified life in response to God's gracious adaptation in Christ and in response to the transformation that has already taken place in baptism. This Rylaarsdam sees as central to Chrysostom's coherent theology and pedagogy, in which scriptural exegesis forms a core part of his strategy. That Chysostom sits within and not outside the trajectory of the theology of deification that was developing in the East at this time is further argued by Maria Verhoeff in her recent doctoral dissertation.[66] There she maintains that, by bringing together his exploitation of classical notions of friendship with his teleological reading of friendship as redemptive, friendship with God emerges as a key concept in Chrysostom's thought. As she proposes:

> To include the notion of friendship, in line with that of οἰκείωσις πρὸς θέον as belonging to patristic deification discourse, would imply that deification is not limited to an intellectual or contemplative attainment/activity. Instead, deification involves the whole person,—virtuous action as well as

---

[64] Rylaarsdam, *Divine Pedagogy* 100–55.

[65] Ibid. 148–9.

[66] Maria Verhoeff, 'More Desirable than Light Itself. Friendship Discourse in John Chrysostom's Soteriology' PhD diss., Evangelische Theologische Faculteit, Leuven, 2016. See especially 165-166 where she details the opinions of earlier scholars concerning John's understanding of deification, including that of Norman Russell (*The Doctrine of Deification in the Greek Patristic Tradition* [Oxford University Press, 2004]). Most view his contribution as nonexistant or marginal. In ch. 2 (22–71) she further demonstrates the centrality to Chrysostom's thought of exemplar portraits.

contemplation—, and the whole society,—persons in relationship to God and to one another.[67]

More could be said on these points, but this is sufficient to demonstrate the benefit of re-appraising Chrysostom's theological contribution through the lens of his mutual debt to classical Graeco-Roman oratorical, philosophical, and medical traditions, on the one hand, and developments in Judeo-Christian thought, on the other. What the bodies of work that I have described in these two sections point toward is the centrality in Chrysostom's thought of the moral formation and soul-health of the human being in relation to soteriology, deification, and anthropology.

Who Can be Healed?

This brings us to the final section and the question of the implications of Chrysostom's psychagogic-therapeutic approach and anthropology for the salvation of all human beings. That is, within the constraints of his medico-philosophical therapy and soteriology who could be healed/saved?[68] This is an area in which we at this point have more questions than we have answers. On the one hand, Wang argues that for Chrysostom the innocence of infants guarantees that children, through their incapacity to make moral judgments, are exempt from striving for the life of the angels—they already live it—and are thus automatically saved.[69] If she is correct in her conclusion, then with regard to soul-healing/salvation we are thus talking about human beings whose *gnōmē* is sufficiently developed that they can be held responsible for the moral choices that they make. As I argue in a recent article, however, even in the case of adults, individuals who suffer from mental illness that

[67] Ibid. 193. That a similarly social and charitable understanding of deification or divine likeness is to be found in earlier Greek writings, e.g. *Letter to Diognetus* 10, confirms that John is working within and not at the edges of or outside of these discussions. Again, I am indebted to Doru Costache for this point.

[68] As is the case with Galen (see n. 23), we would argue that within Chrysostom's thought there is a strong conceptual link between being "saved" and healed. See e.g. Chrys., *In principium Actorum hom*. 1 (PG 51, 70 last 3 lines), where he admonishes the audience to "heal" (θεραπεύετε) the mindset of their brothers and sisters and states that while he is accountable for the salvation (σωτηρίας) of those present, they are accountable for the salvation of those who failed to attend. For the same idea in Clement of Alexandria who owes a similar debt to Hellenistic moral philosophy see Doru Costache, 'Being, Well-being, Being Forever: Creation's Existential Trajectory in Patristic Tradition' in *Well-being, Personal Wholeness and the Social Fabric*, ed. Doru Costache, Darren Cronshaw, and James R. Harrison (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2017) 57–64 esp. 61.

[69] Wang, 'Premature Death.'

is physical in origin are also held incapable of rational choice and are thus, while suffering an episodic bout of mania, epilepsy or phrenitis, deemed innocent of any crimes or sins they might commit.[70] This raises the question of whether the salvation of an adult who died during such an episode was similarly automatic or whether the sins they had committed during previous periods of lucidity, when they were capable of rational thought and moral choice, counted against them. Within his soteriology does Chrysostom factor in the fact that, in accord with his anthropology, an individual incapable of rational choice is also incapable of repentance? We should also point out that in the liturgy of that period baptised mentally ill Christians were passively present and routinely prayed for at the beginning of the eucharistic liturgy but then dismissed.[71] That is, despite their baptismal status they were excluded from participation in the Eucharist. Rylaarsdam, however, argues that the transforming rite of baptism and participation in the Eucharist are essential for the Christian life. "In the Eucharist, God continues to unite us to Christ and make a virtuous life possible. The Eucharist actualizes the fellowship initiated in our baptism."[72] By virtue of their exclusion, was a virtuous life and fellowship with God thus unattainable for the baptised person during a bout of mental illness? Moreover, if Rylaarsdam is correct, then very few people within Chrysostom's community or audience, whether in Antioch or Constantinople, could have been deemed capable of achieving a virtuous life. At the time, baptism was frequently delayed until the point of death, with the number qualified to attend the Eucharist consequently proportionally small.[73] Even among those who were baptised, eucharistic participation was infrequent.[74]

---

[70] Wendy Mayer, 'Madness in the Works of John Chrysostom: A Snapshot from Late Antiquity' in *The Concept of Madness from Homer to Byzantium: Manifestations and Aspects of Mental Illness and Disorder*, ed. Hélène Perdicoyianni-Paléologou (Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert Editore, 2016) 349–73.

[71] See the discussion at ibid. 364–65. The prayer prayed on their behalf ("Lord, have mercy!") may in fact have been an acknowledgement of their incapacity for repentance, requiring the clergy to seek God's absolution on their behalf.

[72] Rylaarsdam, *Divine Pedagogy* 146.

[73] See Chrysostom's attempts to persuade his audience of the error of deferred baptism in *In Acta apost. hom*. 1 (PG 60, 22–24).

[74] So e.g. in *De baptismo Christi* (PG 49, 369) Chrysostom complains that the baptised associate attendance at the Eucharist solely with major festivals (in this case, Epiphany) and *In princ. Act. hom*. 1 (PG 51, 65–71) complains about the dramatic decline in attendance from the previous Sunday (Easter). In *In Eph. hom*. 11 (PG 62, 88) he claims that some Christians never turn up at all, others only once a year, some more frequently. Attendance at synaxis, let alone the Eucharist, was highly variable.

If we consider the question through the lens of friendship with God, then ideally God pursues friendship with human beings and works to turn all enemies into friends, both of himself and of each other.[75] Responsibility for loss of this relationship rests, then, with the human being who wilfully rejects it. In certain ways this aligns with the findings of Courtney VanVeller, whose analysis of this question in relation to the Jews leads to a somewhat negative conclusion. Seen through the lens of psychagogy and adaptable pedagogy, the state of the soul of the person whom God, Paul or Chrysostom is trying to instruct is central.[76] Instruction is harsh or gentle and incremental, depending on the status of the soul in question. Excluding the homilies *Adversus Iudaeos* from her analysis, VanVeller highlights the centrality of the *gnōmē* to this question in Chrysostom's thought and concludes that in the homilies on Acts and on the Pauline letters the Jews are characterised as chronically diseased. Chrysostom's is a differentiated anthropology, she argues, in which the *gnōmē* of Christians, Jews and the apostle Paul differ, the former capable of healing, that of the Jews inferior. The boundaries he draws, she reluctantly concludes, effectively exclude the Jews from divine therapy.[77] This finding is supported by my own recent work on the homilies *Adversus Iudaeos*, in which Christians who are sick with the Jewish disease (that is, judaizers) can be shown to have been conceptualised by Chrysostom not as half-Christians (his own label) but rather as half-Jews.[78] This leads him to talk variably about their capacity for healing, on some occasions conceiving of them as gangrenous and in need of amputation, on others as suffering a less permanent disorder that would appear to be curable.

The question of heretics is another complex issue. In his article on Chrysostom's approach to the Anomoeans Ray Laird argues that

> [f]or him, the healing of the soul sick from false doctrine was … another aspect of ministering to the 'security of the household of faith' … and repelling 'the attacks from without.'[79]

This suggests that Chrysostom's therapeutic focus is on the "orthodox" or Christian insiders. While Laird would argue that Chrysostom's love reaches

---

[75] See Verhoeff, 'More Desirable than Light' 73–86.

[76] VanVeller, 'Paul's Therapy.'

[77] Ibid. 162–63. Cf. Laird, 'Chrysostom and the Anomoeans' 133–34; and Panayiotis E. Papageorgiou, 'A Theological Analysis of Selected Themes in the Homilies of St. John Chrysostom on the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans' PhD diss., Catholic University of America, 1995, 185–91.

[78] Wendy Mayer, 'Preaching Hatred? John Chrysostom, Neuroscience, and the Jews' in *Revisioning John Chrysostom,* forthcoming.

[79] Laird, 'Chrysostom and the Anomoeans' 130.

out to heretics, he maintains that his primary concern is his flock, their protection, growth, maturity, and fruitfulness.[80] On the other hand, he proposes, since the Anomoeans "had accepted Jesus as the Christ, however deficient their understanding of his deity may have been," even though his diagnosis of their *gnōmē* is similar to that of the Jews, Chrysostom's therapeutic approach is different.[81] That is, as Laird argues, even though Chrysostom suggests that the weakness of their soul is incurable, this is part of his larger therapeutic strategy, which is first to bring Anomoeans harshly and unavoidably to recognition of their personal responsibility for their soul's condition, so that they can then move subsequently towards the correct mindset.

If heretics require, as it were, tough love and are, in the end, amenable to healing, while the Jews, in spite of centuries of therapy are, ultimately, not,[82] the status of Greeks ("pagans") within Chrysostom's soteriology, when viewed through a psycho-therapeutic lens, is yet again different. This is perhaps because, whereas the Jews were God's chosen people and received his revelation through his incarnate Son and the preaching of the apostles and Paul, but wilfully chose to reject it, while heretics are Christians whose souls are sick, but who as a result of that sickness fail to recognise this, the Greeks (i.e. gentiles), as the target of sustained evangelisation, had over the previous centuries proven to be not entirely resistant. In this regard we need to distinguish in his thought the philosophy of the Greeks (their *politeia* or way of life), which still maintained a privileged status within the social and educational systems of the Greek-speaking East at this period and with which the "true philosophy" of Christianity was in direct competition, from the Greeks as human beings within his anthropology and their capacity for correction. That is, while Chrysostom frequently derides Greek philosophy and cultic practices, he argues at times that, along with heretics, Greeks fall within God's plan for salvation.[83] On one occasion he implies that Greeks are

[80] Ibid. 131.

[81] Ibid. 134–35.

[82] While Chrysostom does admit that some few Jews were saved at the beginning, he focuses on the majority, whose mindset was and is too hardened. See Papageorgiou, 'Theological Analysis' 186. For an alternative reading of how he therapeutically approaches both Jews and heretics see Chris L. de Wet, 'Of Monsters and Men: Religious Conflict, Radicalism, and Sexual Exceptionalism in the Works of John Chrysostom' *Journal of Early Christian History* 6 (2016) 1–17.

[83] This is made explicit in Chrys., *In 1 Tim. hom*. 7 (PG 62, 533–38) where he emphasises that true harm comes only to those human beings whose body is at war with their souls (that is, who voluntarily embrace excess desires and *pathē*; cf. his treatise *Quod nemo laeditur nisi a seipso* [SC 103]), while salvation derives from the alignment between a healthy mindset/soul and belief in the true God incarnate, Christ (neo-Nicene Christianity). Jews, of course, fall

already close in terms of understanding both the divine and the importance of the health of the soul.[84] Whether these views are consistent across his works, however, is a matter for further investigation.[85]

While there is much work to be done in this area, what emerges here is that assessing the question of who, in Chrysostom's thought, is amenable to cognitive healing or is innocent of cognitive error (sin) and thus automatically saved is less than straightforward. At the very least, despite a single therapeutic agenda (salvation), two sets of diagnosis and their consequent therapeutic strategies need to be brought into consideration. God's plan for the salvation/healing of all human beings—as read by Chrysostom—functions at one level.[86] It drives what Chrysostom interprets as God's adaptive soul-therapy. Chrysostom's own diagnosis of the mindset and capacity for healing/salvation of different categories of human beings operates at another. His reading of his exemplar Paul's diagnosis and therapeutics adds yet another layer. Teasing out in Chrysostom's thought the tension between God's plan and human response, on the one hand, and the relationship between his own, God's and Paul's diagnoses and treatments of human souls, on the other, let alone coming to grips with precisely how he views the variability of the condition of human souls, is a particular challenge. In the end the question that we posed in this section is perhaps the wrong question to ask. The real question for Chrysostom is, it would appear, not who *can* be healed—everyone has the capacity—but rather, who *will* be healed? It is to what he has to say on that question that we can most fruitfully direct our attention.

Conclusion

Ultimately what all of this suggests is that while, like many philosophers before him, Chrysostom conceives of his school—the church—as a medical

within God's plan for salvation too. The difference between them and Greeks lies in their mindset. On this point see Papageorgiou, 'Theological Analysis' 186–87, who also notes that Chrysostom argues that God favoured the Greeks over the Jews not just because they were less intractable, but as a psychagogical tactic directed at the Jews. That is, God hoped by this to arouse the Jews to jealousy, thereby saving both (ibid. 190–91).

[84] See Chrys., *In 1 Tim. hom*. 1 (PG 62, 507) where he points out that many of their teachings about the divine are similar, but are human in derivation. Cf. *In 1 Tim. hom*. 10 (PG 62, 551–52) where he argues that there would be no Greeks left, if his audience were genuinely Christian, i.e. persuasive living exemplars for them of the heavenly *politeia*.

[85] To what degree the mindset of contemporary rather than historical Greeks comes under the same diagnosis as that of contemporary Jews, for instance, is at issue.

[86] So e.g. in *In 1 Cor. hom*. 33 (PG 61, 283–84) Chrysostom indicates that Judas suffered an incurable sickness, yet God did not give up on treating him.

clinic (*iatreion*)[87] and, as a philosopher-teacher-priest, the guidance and healing of sick souls as fundamental to his job description, he viewed the types of sickness of the soul that he encountered among his students and the wider community and the capacity of those souls for correction as variable. Now that the medico-philosophical framework within which he approaches these questions has been brought to the fore, significantly more work needs to be done before we can understand just how all-encompassing or limited his theological propositions prove to be concerning the salvation of human beings and their capacity for living a transformed virtuous (deified) life. As this particular mode of research continues, however, what is becoming ever clearer is that this conceptualisation of the church as clinic and the priest as physician is firmly rooted in the oratorical-medical-philosophical traditions of the past, in which he was formed in Antioch. Preaching is philosophical therapy; neo-Nicene Christianity is the one true philosophy; and the sicknesses of the soul that he perpetually strives to heal as physician are not metaphoric or analogous, but literal and genuine.

Select Bibliography

Gill, Christopher. 'Philosophical Therapy as Preventive Psychological Medicine.' In *Mental Disorders in the Classical World*. Edited by W. V. Harris, 339–60. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

Heiser, Andreas. *Die Paulusinszenierung des Johannes Chrysostomus. Epitheta und ihre Vorgeschichte.* Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.

Lai, Pak-Wah. 'John Chrysostom and the Hermeneutics of Exemplar Portraits' PhD diss., Durham University, 2010.

Laird, Raymond J. *Mindset, Moral Choice and Sin in the Anthropology of John Chrysostom*. Strathfield: St Paul's Publications, 2012.

Leyerle, Blake. 'The Etiology of Sorrow and its Therapeutic Benefits in the Preaching of John Chrysostom.' *Journal of Late Antiquity* 8 (2015) 368–85.

Mitchell, Margaret M. *The Heavenly Trumpet: John Chrysostom and the Art of Pauline Interpretation*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.

Papageorgiou, Panayiotis E. 'A Theological Analysis of Selected Themes in the Homilies of St. John Chrysostom on the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans' PhD diss., Catholic University of America, 1995.

Rylaarsdam, David. *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy: The Coherence of his Theology and Preaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.

Tonias, Demetrios *Abraham in the Works of John Chrysostom*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2014.

Van Nuffelen, Peter. 'A War of Words: Sermons and Social Status in Constantinople under the Theodosian Dynasty.' In *Literature and Society in the Fourth Century*

[87] Chrys., *In Ioh. hom*. 2/1 (PG 59, 36).

A.D.: Performing Paideia, Constructing the Present, Presenting the Self. Edited by Lieve Van Hoof and Peter Van Nuffelen, 201–17. Leiden: Brill, 2014.
Wright, Jessica. 'Between Despondency and the Demon: Treating Spiritual Disorders in John Chrysostom's *Letter to Stageirios*.' *Journal of Late Antiquity* 8 (2015) 352–67.
Žitnik, Maximilijan. *ΝΗΨΙΣ: Christliche Nüchternheit nach Johannes Chrysostomus*. Roma: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 2011.

Chapter Nine

Reading *On the Priesthood* as Dialogue Perspectives on John Chrysostom's Ascetic Vision

Pak-Wah Lai

John's *On the Priesthood* and Its Ascetic Readers

While scholars commonly agree that John was an ascetic, they often differ as to how his views on asceticism changed, especially after he became a priest.[1]

[1] The traditional account of John's early ascetic experience takes its cue from Palladius, Socrates, and John's *On the Priesthood*. According to these sources, John became interested in "divine learning" soon after his rhetorical education, and joined the Meletian community. After his baptism (c. 367–68), he was made a reader by his bishop and mentor, Meletius of Antioch (d. 381) and also became a student at the *asketerion* run by Diodore of Tarsus (d. 390). John's studies at the *asketerion* would have lasted no more than five years, because his mentor and teacher were exiled in 372 and returned only in 378. As to what happened to John during the intervening years, scholars have often relied on Palladius and assumed that John went on to live a life of solitude on the Syrian mountains, and returned only when his harsh asceticism broke down his health. In recent years, however, this consensus has been questioned by Martin Illert, whose studies on Syriac asceticism led him to conclude instead that John most likely remained an urban ascetic, and that his mountain stint was but a fictitious projection of Palladius' own Egyptian experience. Understandably, Illert's proposal has not been left unchallenged. Liebeschuetz, for example, contends for the traditional view

Generally speaking, there are two approaches to this question. The first takes his earlier monastic treatises as expressions of his initial enthusiasm for asceticism, whereas his later criticisms of the monks are viewed as an indication of his growing disillusionment with the monastic detachment from Church and society.[2] The second approach assumes that John never changed his mind, but had always understood asceticism as the primary means of preparing Christians for the priesthood. Regardless of the positions that they take, scholars usually cull the bulk of John's ascetic ideas from his early monastic treatises and augment them with his later, occasional, discussions about the subject, particularly in his homilies.[3] Within this interpretative scheme, John's *On the Priesthood* (thereafter, *OP*) often features as an example of his scepticism about the monastic project as being "so heavenly minded that it has no earthly good."[4] For the most part, the work itself is regarded as a treatise on the priesthood, rather than asceticism. Indeed, it is counted as one of the three patristic writings most well-known for the subject, the other two being Gregory of Nazianzus' *On the Flight* (or *Oration* 2) and Gregory the Great's *Pastoral Rule*.

While concurring with the above consensus, I also believe that the *OP* is an ascetic treatise that should be counted among John's ascetic *oeuvres*. This becomes clear when we consider the genre that John chose for his treatise: the dialogue. In what follows, I shall argue that *OP* is a complex and demanding work that requires intellectual finesse and patience on the part of its readers. Seen from this perspective, well-educated ascetics fit the bill

---

by arguing that the ascetic scene in mid fourth century Antioch was quite diverse, and it was possible for John to have moved from one form of ascetic practice to another. While Illert's case is not watertight, its plausibility should caution us that John's early monastic life is not as transparent as we might suppose. This, in turn, calls into question the extent to which we can assume his personal familiarity with rural Syriac monasticism when we interpret his references to these practices. Palladius, *Dial.* 5. Socrates, *Historia* 6.3. Martin Illert, *Johannes Chrysostomus und das antiochenisch-syrische Mönchtum: Studien zu Theologie, Rhetorik und Kirchenpolitik im antiochenischen Schrifttum des Johannes Chrysostomus* (Zürich: Pano-Verl., 2000) 95–105. J. H. W. G Liebeschuetz, *Ambrose and John Chrysostom: Clerics between Desert and Empire* (Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2011) Loc 1047, 1069–84, 1148–1264. Kindle Edition. Wendy Mayer, 'What Does It Mean to Say That John Chrysostom Was a Monk?' *Studia Patristica* 41 (2006) 451–55.

[2] For John's early praises of monasticism, see his *Adversus oppugnatores vitae monasticae*, *comparatio regis et monachi*, *adhortationes ad Thedorum lapsum* and *De Virginitate*. For his later criticism of the same, see *De Sacerdotio* III.15–18 and *De Compunctione* 1.16. For a discussion on the early dating of these monastic treatises, see Liebeschuetz, *Ambrose and John Chrysostom* Loc 1343–701.

[3] See, for example, Elizabeth A. Clark, 'Theory and Practice in Late Ancient Asceticism: Jerome, Chrysostom, and Augustine' *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion* 5:2 (1989) 25–46.

[4] John's criticism of asceticism does not resolve the question we have posed. Both approaches mentioned above can well incorporate such comments.

rather well. Once we assume the implied readers to be ascetics, the treatise's twofold aim then becomes clear, which is to persuade its ascetic readers to prepare themselves for the priesthood and to help them discern whether they qualify for it or not.

Modern Receptions of *On the Priesthood*: A Survey

Traditionally, *OP* has been regarded as an early work of John, composed around 381 to 386, just before his ordination as a priest. The underlying rationale here being that John, as a priest, would never have presented himself as such an inapt character to his flock, since this would be tantamount to no less than vocational suicide.[5] In recent decades, however, this consensus has shifted, with the majority of scholars now dating the treatise from 386 to 393, that is, the immediate years after John' ordination.[6] This dating accounts for the fact that the treatise demonstrates an intimate understanding of the requirements and challenges of the priesthood, which are privy only to those who have had much experience in this ministry.[7] Stephen Black even suggests that John was groomed to be the successor of his bishop, Flavian, and the treatise was composed as a demonstration of his credentials and familiarity with the demands on the priest.[8]

Another aspect of the treatise that is regularly debated is its historicity—whether it is an autobiography or just historicised fiction. Generally speaking, most scholars and biographers have assumed the former, particularly the sections on John's conversion to the ascetic life, and his sense of his own unworthiness as a priest.[9] This is despite the fact that, as early as the 1960s, Robert Carter had already raised concerns about the text's reliability as a source for John's life.

> Of Chrysostom's own works, the *De Sacerdotio* is the most important autobiographical source we have, if it is not a literary fiction. Since its his-

[5] Liebeschuetz, *Ambrose and John Chrysostom* Loc 1739–45.

[6] The *terminus ante quem* for the work is 393 since this was when the treatise was first mentioned by Jerome in his *De viris illustribus* 3.129.

[7] Andrew Hofer, 'The Reordering of Relationships in John Chrysostom's "De Sacerdotio"' *Augustinianum* 51:2 (2011) 456, n. 19.

[8] Stephen K. Black, 'Paideia, Power and Episcopacy: John Chrysostom and the Formation of the Late Antique Bishop' (doctoral dissertation, Graduate Theological Union, 2005) 184, 190.

[9] See, for example, J. N. D. Kelly, *Golden Mouth: The Story of John Chrysostom—Ascetic, Preacher, Bishop* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1995) 5 and Ellen T. Charry, 'Christian Witness to Contemporary Culture Regarding Sex' *Anglican Theological Review* 86:2 (2004) 285.

torical value is doubtful, its testimony should be accepted only after careful consideration.[10]

Unfortunately, it is not quite clear which aspects of *OP* can be assumed as historically reliable, even after "careful consideration." As we shall see shortly, this problem only becomes more pronounced when *OP*'s genre as a dialogue is considered.

By and large, scholars have regarded *OP* as the most important source for John's teachings on the ordained priesthood. To date, the most extensive treatment of this treatise remains Manfred Lochbrunner's *Über das Priestertum*, which posits *OP* as John's call and program for the personal reform of both priest and bishop. This program primarily referred to deterring the unqualified from ordination and inspiring those already ordained to persevere in their own purification.[11] Indeed, both David Davis and Kenneth Stevenson have hailed *OP* as a spiritual classic, which has still much to say and teach about pastoral ministry in the contemporary age, whether it is in the discernment of one's call to ministry, the rigours of pastoral care, or the challenges and temptations of preaching.[12] Maria McDowell likewise appropriates the text for her reflections on the contemporary priesthood, and concludes that it provides ample justification for the ordination of women as Orthodox priests.[13] For some scholars, *OP* is also an exercise in reconceptualising the anthropology of the priesthood. According to Richard Valantasis, the treatise is a "significant theological reappraisal of the offices of the Church," as it "elevate[s] the anthropology of the ecclesiastical authorities in the hierarchy of being" by placing the priest on a level on par with the virgins and monks, and above the rest of humanity."[14] Applying Foucault's discourse of power, Chris de Wet concludes similarly that John's comparison of the priest with the monks and the angels, and his redefinition of the priest as the spiritual *paterfamilias*, invested with the power to discipline, teach

[10] Robert E. Carter, 'The Chronology of St. John Chrysostom's Early Life' *Tradition* 18 (1962) 358.

[11] Manfred Lochbrunner, *Über das Priestertum: historische und systematische Untersuchung zum Priesterbild des Johannes Chrysostomus* (Bonn: Borengässer, 1993).

[12] David A. Davis, 'St John Chrysostom on Ministry, Discernment, and Call' *Theology Today* 62 (2005) 408–13. Kenneth Stevenson, 'Patristics and Bishops: What Four Fathers Might Say about Episcopacy Today' *Theology* 114:2 (2011) 91–100.

[13] Maria Gwyn McDowell, 'The Iconicity of Priesthood: Male Bodies or Embodied Virtue?' *Studies in Christian Ethics* 26:3 (2013) 364–77.

[14] Richard Valantasis, 'Body, Hierarchy and Leadership in Chrysostom's *On The Priesthood*' *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 30:4 (1985) 455–71.

and condemn the heretics, all serve to exalt the priest's status above the rest of the Church.[15]

Other than a source book for John's teachings on the priesthood, *OP* has also become for many scholars a rich mine for excavating all sorts of insights on Late Antique Christianity and society. The treatise has been consulted for the popular sentiments and expectations in terms of public speaking and preaching in the late fourth century.[16] Its extensive treatment of the Pauline epistles also renders it an important source for John's interpretation of the apostle's teachings.[17] According to Jan Stenger, *OP*'s portrayal of the priest as a "worldly ascetic" also sheds much light on John's strategies for developing a Christian philosophy of life that will counter the norms of Greek *paideia*.[18] Finally, Elizabeth Clark, Andrew Hofer and David Konstan all regard the dialogue between John and Basil in *OP* as providing not only a unique window into Late Antique social relationships, but also insights as to how John sought to redefine or subvert these relations.[19]

At this point, two observations may be made about the above studies. First of all, despite their extensive analysis of *OP*, the majority of the scholars have not considered in any detail the writing's implied readers. This is surprising since whoever John intended to communicate with, whether these were aspiring or ordained priests, ascetics or even the congregation that he was ministering to in Antioch, must have influenced his objectives for the treatise, and the dialogue's rhetorical dynamics. This brings us to the second point. While *OP* is generally recognised as a dialogue, it has never been read as such. In most cases, it is treated simply as a didactic text, where its ideas can be readily distilled, without the need to account for the genre's literary complexity. As we shall see, this is a problematic assumption since it fails to account for the rich ideological interplay between the author, his interlocutors and his implied readers, and how this, in turn, impinges on the ideas conveyed by way of dialogue. For this reason, it is necessary to consider *OP* on its own terms, that is, as a dialogue.

---

[15] Chris de Wet, 'The Priestly Body: Power-Discourse and Identity in John Chrysostom's *De Sacerdotio*' *Religion & Theology* 18 (2011) 351–79.

[16] Jaclyn Maxwell, *Christianization and Communication in Late Antiquity: John Chrysostom and His Congregation in Antioch* (Cambridge University Press, 2006) 62.

[17] Courtney Wilson VanVeller, 'Paul's Therapy of the Soul: A New Approach to John Chrysostom and Anti-Judaism' (doctoral dissertation, Boston University, 2015) 24.

[18] Jan R. Stenger, 'Where to Find Christian Philosophy? Spatiality in John Chrysostom's Counter to Greek Paideia' *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 24:2 (2016) 173–98.

[19] David Konstan, 'Problems in the History of Christian Friendship' *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 4:1 (1996) 87–113.

Interpreting Late Antique Dialogues

That *OP* was never interpreted as a dialogue is not exactly the fault of Chrysostom scholars. Rather, as Averil Cameron observes, Late Antique dialogues have been a neglected field up until recently.[20] The roots of the genre dates back to the fourth century BC, with the earliest forms being Plato's dialogues and those composed by his Socratic associates.[21] In contemporary scholarship, dialectics have often been regarded as the ideal genre for philosophical discourse, best suited for "the discovery of truth, the construction of arguments, and the clarification of minds."[22] Simon Goldhill even argues that dialogical discourses are central to the "political theory and practice of democracy," and that a disappearance of this genre can only mean a corresponding demise in democratic ideals. This, he believes, was exactly what happened from the fifth century AD onwards, when the growing hegemony of Christianity coincided with a decline in the composition of dialogues. Christianity, as he sees it, simply had little place for dialogues when it was "moving towards hierarchy, with a commitment to certainty and the repression of difference ('heresy') as it increase[d] its power as the religion of Empire."[23]

Not all concur with these views, however. In his analysis of Plato's dialogues, Alex Long observes that while Plato was doing different things in his dialogues, such as communicating his findings or trying to persuade others to believe in them, he rarely used dialectics as a means of philosophical inquiry. He thus concludes, contra Goldhill, that there are no obvious links between dialectics and ideology, let alone democracy.[24] As to the reasons for the so-called decline in the use of dialogues among the fathers, Gillian Clark and Richard Lim helpfully remind us that dialectical discourse, in the first place, requires intellectual finesse on the part of the readers. Consequently, they can only be appreciated by the cultural elite, who not only shared a common *paideia*, but also had the resources and time to engage in such literary pursuits. In contrast, most Late Antique Christians were uneducated. Faced with such

---

[20] Averil Cameron, *Dialoguing in Late Antiquity*, Hellenic Studies 65 (Washington, DC: Center for Hellenic Studies, 2014) http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:hul.ebook:CHS_CameronA.Dialoguing_in_Late_Antiquity.2014., Introduction.

[21] Andrew Ford, 'The Beginnings of Dialogue: Socratic Discourses and Fourth-Century Prose' in *The End of Dialogue in Antiquity*, ed. Simon Goldhill (Cambridge University Press, 2008) 29–30.

[22] Tullio Maranhão, *The Interpretation of Dialogue* (University of Chicago Press, 1990) 27.

[23] Simon Goldhill, *The End of Dialogue* 1, 7.

[24] Alex Long, 'Plato's Dialogues and a Common Rationale for Dialogue Form' in *The End of Dialogue* 45–59.

an audience, Christian bishops had to give priority instead to clear teaching and direct communication. The dialogue, with its inherent ambiguity and potential for misinterpretation, was simply an unsuitable genre for their pedagogical purposes.[25]

Notwithstanding this pastoral concern, vibrant dialogical exchanges did continue in Late Antiquity and persisted throughout the Byzantine period. Often, these were conducted through the epistolary genre, which was favoured by both Christians and pagans alike.[26] Debates between Christians, heretics, Jews, pagans and, in later centuries, Muslims, were also commonplace.[27] Contrary to Goldhill's claims, Christians did continue to compose numerous and diverse dialogues. Where they differed from their Platonic antecedents was their concern for defending, expounding and even exploring Christian truths.[28]

> Their purpose was to influence thought, and in many cases also to demonstrate the weakness of opposing arguments, whether those of imaginary Jews, doctrinal rivals or, later, Muslims, and while still casting their own arguments in dialogue form they used all possible techniques of polemic, classification, proof texts and appeals to authority and hierarchy, …[so as to assert their] authority in a highly competitive situation.[29]

Given these pedagogical aims, some Christian dialogues were understandably less open-ended. These include apologetic dialogues, such as Justin Martyr's (100–165) *Dialogue with Trypho*, Minucius Felix's (d. 250) *Octavius* and Theodoret's (393–466) *Eranistes*.[30] To these, we may add Palladius' (363–420) *Dialogue on the Life of Chrysostom*, where the literary form was chosen to enact "the dynamics of a courtroom." While this dialogical setting allows for "opposing viewpoints [to be] presented and contested," these different views are also structured for the singular aim of exonerating the exiled Bishop of Constantinople.[31]

---

[25] Gillian Clark, 'Can We Talk? Augustine and the Possibility of Dialogue' in *The End of Dialogue* 132. Richard Lim, 'Christians, Dialogues and Patterns of Sociability in Late Antiquity' in *The End of Dialogue* 160.

[26] Lim, 'Christians, Dialogues and Patterns of Sociability' 170.

[27] In 392, for example, Augustine was actually urged by both Catholics and Donatists to hold a public debate with the Manichaean Fortunatus. The event took place over two days in the public baths and drew a significant crowd. Cameron, *Dialoguing in Late Antiquity*, Chapter 2.

[28] Cameron, *Dialoguing in Late Antiquity*, Chapter 1.

[29] Cameron, *Dialoguing in Late Antiquity*, Chapter 3.

[30] Theodoret's target, Cyril of Alexandria, likewise composed seven dialogues in defence of the Trinity and two on Christology. Cameron, *Dialoguing in Late Antiquity*, Chapter 3.

[31] Katos argues further that this literary setting allows Palladius to extensively employ judicial rhetoric to defend his friend. More recently, Van Nuffelen has argued that the primary

On the other hand, some Christian writers are quite deliberate in their appropriation of the Platonic genre and motifs for their discourse. For example, Methodius of Olympius' (d. 311) *Symposium on Virginity* not only imitates Plato's *Symposium*, but also coopts the genre to explore a new range of Christian topics, such as scriptural exegesis, eschatology and the defence of virginity.[32] Gregory of Nyssa's (335–394) *On the Resurrection* is an even more ambitious project. His *De Anima*, as Susan Wessel explains, not only alludes to the *Phaedrus* and other Platonic dialogues, but transforms the literary form into a new kind of Christian discourse that allows him to explore "seemingly contradictory" pagan and Christian ideas, and synthesise them into "paradoxical and meaningful tensions."[33] The inherent complexity of the dialogue, adds Cameron, often means that what are otherwise close-ended dialogues can still yield alternative and meaningful voices.[34] This is certainly the case for Justin Martyr's *Dialogue with Trypho*. Although its primary concern is the defence of Christianity, its incorporation of a Jewish interlocutor, as Andrew Jacobs argues, inadvertently preserves for us "some authentic Jewish point of critique or belief" that is not "elided or eliminated" by Justin's polemics.[35]

In view of the above, what can we say about Late Antique Christian dialogues in general? It seems to me that, while Christians employed dialogues in diverse ways, they all recognised that the genre had an inherent ability to bring into conversation or, at the very least, contrast different or even opposing points of view. At the same time, the concerns of these dialogists were not merely pedagogical. Rather, they were also writing out of a genuine appreciation, even love, of the dialogue form as a literary art, and an eagerness to explore how this genre may be adapted for Christian discourse. This amounted to the Christian elite's attempt at Christianising dialogues, if you will. This was certainly the case for Basil of Caesarea (329–379) and John's teacher, Diodore of Tarsus. In a letter written by Basil to Diodore, the bishop of Caesarea mentions two dialogues that Diodore sent him (unfortunately, none

purpose of Palladius' *Dialogue* was to defend himself before Rome, rather than to exonerate Chrysostom. Demetrios S. Katos, 'Socratic Dialogue or Courtroom Debate? Judicial Rhetoric and Stasis Theory in the Dialogue on the Life of St. John Chrysostom' *Vigiliae Christianae* 61 (2007) 42–69; Peter Van Nuffelen, 'Palladius and the Johannite Schism' *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 64 (2013) 1–19.

[32] Cameron, *Dialoguing in Late Antiquity*, Chapter 3.

[33] Susan Wessel, 'Memory and Individuality in Gregory of Nyssa's *Dialogus de Anima et Resurrectione*' *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 18:3 (2010) 380 n. 47, 388, 391.

[34] Cameron, *Dialoguing in Late Antiquity*, Chapter 3.

[35] Andrew S. Jacobs, 'Dialogical Differences: (De-)Judaising Jesus' Circumcision' *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 15:3 (2007) 332.

have survived). Not surprisingly, Basil begins by evaluating the pedagogical merits of the two dialogues.

> I have really enjoyed the second one very much, not only because of its brevity … but because it is at one and the same time close-packed with ideas and explicit as to the objections of opponents and answers to them. Moreover, the simplicity of the style and the absence of elaboration seemed to me to be proper to the purpose of a Christian, who writes more for the general good than for show. But the first one, which has the same importance of subject matter but which is polished off with more extravagant style, varied figures of speech, and charming dialogue, seemed to me to require not only a long time for the reading but also much mental labor for gathering the ideas and keeping them in memory.[36]

At the same time, it is also clear that Basil had read both works out of an enjoyment of the literary art itself. For him, the dialogist *par excellence* is none other than Plato, whose "literary graces" far surpass those of the other "heathen philosophers," such as Aristotle and Theophrastus. As he explains to Diodore,

> Plato with his power of eloquence both assails the opinions and at the same time satirises incidentally the persons, attacking the rashness and recklessness of Thrasymachus, the levity of mind and frivolity of Hippias, and the boastfulness and pompousness of Protagoras. But, when he introduces indefinite characters into his dialogues, he uses the speakers in order to clarify his points, and he brings nothing else from the characters into the arguments. This is particularly what he did in the *Laws*.[37]

What we can conclude about Basil and Diodore, I believe, may also be assumed about John and his reasons for choosing the dialogical genre for *OP*. While John's intention was clearly pedagogical, he was also writing to delight and to please his implied readers. Given the inherent complexity of the dialogue form, his audience was most certainly *not* the general Christian community that he ministered to, but well-educated Antiochenes, who had the ability and also the time to engage with such intricate discourses. To be sure, ordained priests and those aspiring for the priesthood were good candidates here. Nevertheless, there is another group that would also fit the bill quite well, that is, ascetics with a classical education. Furthermore, if dialogues were appreciated more as a literary art than a biographical narrative, it is unlikely then that John's implied readers would have taken seriously the so-called

---

[36] *Ep*. 135 in *Basil of Caesarea: Letters Vol. 1 (1–368)*, trans. Agnes Clare Way, Fathers of the Church 13 (Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 1965) 276.
[37] Ibid. (FC13, 276–77).

autobiographical sections of *OP*.[38] As a matter of fact, they could well have been amused rather than offended by how he satirised himself in the work. Unfortunately for his biographers, they must now avoid, as Cameron puts it, the "ever-present temptation of reading off social realities" from *OP*.[39] All these, of course, give further credence to a later dating of the text itself.

Reading *On the Priesthood*: Hermeneutical Considerations

This brings us to the question of interpreting *OP* as a dialogue. How then should we proceed? This is where Russian literary theorist, Mikhail Bakhtin's (1895–1975) theory of the dialogic comes in. Bakhtin's study of dialogic discourses began with his analysis of Fyodor Dostoyevsky's (1821–1881) novels. According to Bakhtin, traditional European novels were monologic, in the sense that the ideas articulated by a novel's hero were meant mostly to characterise the author's objectified image of the hero. The hero himself was never regarded as an autonomous ideologist per se, but treated simply as a mouth piece for the author's ideologies and viewpoints.[40] In a monologic novel, explains Bakhtin,

> all confirmed ideas are merged in the unity of the author's seeing and representing consciousness; the unconfirmed ideas are distributed among the heroes, no longer as signifying ideas, but rather as socially typical or individually characteristic manifestations of thought. … The author … alone is an ideologist.[41]

Dostoevsky's novels, however, ushered in a new era of European literature by creating, what Bakhtin coins as, the polyphonic novel. In Dostoevsky's stories, observes Bakhtin,

> *a plurality of independent and unmerged voices and consciousnesses, a genuine polyphony of fully valid voices … a plurality of consciousnesses, with equal rights and each with its own world*, combine but are not merged in the unity of the event.[42]

---

[38] In his study of Plato's dialogues, Andrew Ford observes that a "degree of literariness and fictionality attends [the] Socratic portraits." Such "evasion of historicity," he believes, is "a feature not just of some writers but of the genre itself." Ford, 'Beginnings of Dialogue' 32.

[39] Cameron, *Dialoguing in Late Antiquity*, Chapter 1.

[40] M. M. Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, ed. and trans. Caryl Emerson (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984) 7, 79.

[41] Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* 82.

[42] Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* 6 (the *italics* are part of the original text).

The consequence of this is that each character in the novel becomes an ideologist in his own right, where his life and dialogic discourses now confirm, supplement or contradict those of the other characters, and even that of the author himself.

For the purposes of our present study, three aspects of Bakhtin's literary theory are helpful. The first is his concept of the "dialogic nature of the idea."[43] Commenting on how an idea is conveyed in Dostoevsky's novels, Bakhtin notes:

> The idea lives not in one person's isolated individual consciousness—if it remains there only, it degenerates and dies. The idea begins to live, that is, to take shape, to develop, to find and renew its verbal expression, to give birth to new ideas, only when it enters into genuine dialogic relationships with other ideas, with the ideas of others. Human thought becomes genuine thought, that is, an idea, only under conditions of living contact with another and alien thought, a thought embodied in someone else's voice, that is, in someone else's consciousness expressed in discourse. At that point of contact between voice-consciousnesses the idea is born and lives. … The idea is [thus] inter-individual and inter-subjective—the realm of its existence is not individual consciousness but dialogic communion between consciousnesses.[44]

For Bakhtin, therefore, an idea is not merely a didactic statement, or a descriptive claim. Rather, its multi-faceted dimensions and richness emerge only when it is vocalised within a complex network of conversations between different and full bodied human subjects (or as he puts it, the "man in man").[45]

Secondly, dialogical truths involve not only the discourses presented by the novel's characters, but also how these characters bring their own lives and experiences to bear on the perspectives they convey. The collective of this is what Bakhtin calls the "image of an idea."

> It is given to all of Dostoevsky's characters to "think and seek higher things"; in each of them there is a "great and unresolved thought"; all of them must, before all else, "get a thought straight." And in this resolution of a thought (an idea) lies their entire real life and their own personal unfinalisability. If one were to think away the idea in which they live, their image would be totally destroyed. In other words, the image of the hero is inseparably linked with the image of an idea and cannot be detached from it. We see the hero in the idea and through the idea, and we see the idea in him and through him.[46]

---

[43] Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* 87.
[44] Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* 87–88.
[45] Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* 85–86.
[46] Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* 87.

Thirdly, a character of contingency subsists in the dialogic ideas presented in Dostoevsky's novels. A dialogic truth, explains Bakhtin, is "by its very nature full of event potential and is born [only] at a point of contact among various consciousnesses." Furthermore, whenever a character expresses his point of view, his discourse is always "double-voiced." Operating in a "twofold direction," it is "directed both toward the referential object of speech, as in ordinary discourse, and [also] toward another's discourse, toward someone else's speech."[47] What readers encounter, therefore, in Dostoevsky's novels is often a complex of dialogical ideas that are not only varied but often at odds or in conflict with one another. Such tensions are rarely resolved, but held as unfinalised and an intrinsic aspect of the "image of an idea."

In recent decades, Bakhtin's literary theory has been applied, quite fruitfully, to different fields of literary disciplines, such as biblical studies.[48] Its value in the interpretation of Late Antique dialogues has also been acknowledged in the recent studies by Simon Goldhill and Averil Cameron.[49] While John's *OP* is not a novel, the polyphonic characteristics described by Bakhtin are quite evident in this work. This, I shall demonstrate by exploring the themes in *OP*, particularly how its dialogical twists and turns end up presenting a multi-faceted and unfinalised image of the relationship between asceticism and the priesthood. In the course of this reading, I shall also assume the implied readers to be well-educated ascetics. This will allow me to point out the unique resonances that the dialogue would have with the ascetics, and, hopefully, corroborate my claims that *OP* was, indeed, composed for such an audience.

On the Priesthood: Discernment and Persuasion for the Priesthood

OP begins with an account of John's friendship with Basil and how the latter became an ascetic, while John was still mesmerised by the world. Later, when Basil convinced John to join him in his ascetic practice, the two friends caught wind of plans to ordain them. Basil, on his part, was ready to follow John's lead "whether to escape or let [them]selves be taken." John, however, "knew

[47] Elsewhere, Bakhtin speaks of this phenomenon as the character giving a "sideward glance" at someone else's speech in his response. Bakhtin, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* 185, 196.

[48] For the use of Bakhtinian literary theory in biblical studies, for example, see Carol A. Newsom, 'Bakhtin, the Bible, and Dialogic Truth' *The Journal of Religion* 76:2 (1996) 290–306. Barbara Green, *Mikhail Bakhtin and Biblical Scholarship: An Introduction* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000).

[49] Goldhill, *The End of Dialogue in Antiquity* 1. Cameron, *Dialoguing in Late Antiquity*, Chapter 1.

[of Basil's] keenness" and thought it wrong "if through [his] own weakness [he] should deprive the flock of Christ of a young man [Basil] so good and so well fitted to govern." So, he agreed that they should submit themselves to ordination, but hid himself when the time came. Understandably, Basil was upset with John and demanded his reasons.[50]

A few observations can be made at this point. From the outset, it is clear that John held in high regard ascetics, such as Basil, who were "keen" to be ordained, but also recognised that some monks, such as himself, did not qualify at all. To ensure that the one was ordained and the other was not, he was prepared even to resort to deceit, and to contravene the laws of friendship.[51] His reason, as he explained later, is that the priesthood is a vocation highly valued by Christ since it serves no less than "the flock for whom Christ died." This is a demanding task as it requires, on the part of the priest, "great wisdom … to examine the soul's condition from every angle," so as to detect and treat spiritual diseases.[52] John's present claims operate at two levels, or, as Bakhtin would have it, are "double-voiced." The first is familiar to us, namely, his definition of the work of the priesthood. The second, I suggest, is more subtle. He seems to have addressed his ascetic readers here. Given that they also have spent much time discerning their soul's condition and learning how to overcome their vices, surely they would have understood that only an ascetic can qualify for the priesthood. It is no coincidence then that, at this point, John made a 'marketing pitch' to challenge his ascetic readers:

> The man who practises asceticism helps no one but himself. But the advantage of a shepherd's skill extends to the whole people. … It is not surprising, then, that the Lord said concern for his sheep was a sign of love for himself.[53]

In other words, if a monk takes seriously his love for God, he must regard the priesthood as a natural progression in his *askesis*.

For John's implied readers, his satirical portrayal of himself as a deserter seems problematic. If the priesthood is such a lofty vocation, why did he avoid ordination then? This question is aptly posed by Basil, who now represents, not so much so the exemplary monk, but the implied ascetic readers. At this point, John introduces a new theme into the discussion: the qualifications for

---

[50] *OP* 1.1–7. Quotations will be drawn from *St John Chrysostom: Six Books On the Priesthood*, trans. T. A. Moxon, intro. Graham Neville (Crestwood, New York: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2002).

[51] Hofer has argued, quite persuasively, that *OP* is also a deliberate attempt to reorder classical ideals of friendship and social laws, by asserting the primacy of the priest's relationship with Christ above that with his friends and family. Hofer, 'Reordering of Relationships' 460–61.

[52] *OP* 2.1–4.

[53] *OP* 2.4 (Moxon 58–59).

a priest. What he is doing here, however, is not just outlining the criteria for the priesthood. Rather, this is again a "double-voiced" strategy whereby he addresses the apprehensions his ascetic readers were likely to have, including questions such as, 'how does an ascetic know whether he qualifies?' and 'why should he hazard himself in the first place?' That is to say, apprehensions that might have discouraged them from ordination in the first place. These fears are well encapsulated in Basil's retort that John's deceit has now exposed him to much danger!

John's response is extensive, taking up most of Books 2–6. He begins by asserting that Basil qualifies for the priesthood because he has a deep love for Christ, quite unlike those who have only spent time on secular studies and leisure. John evidently counts himself among these, since he has "only just abandoned worldly pursuits" and begun his *askesis*.[54] In other words, spiritual progress, as evidenced by a well-honed love for Christ, is an important prerequisite for the priesthood. John then returns briefly to his earlier assertion—that the priesthood is a form of ascetic progress—by declaring that this work "is ranked among heavenly ordinances" and a "ministry of angels" in the flesh. Indeed, when priests administer the Eucharist, they act in an authority greater than even the angels or archangels. Again, the parallels between the priests and the angels drawn here would have resonated well with his Syriac ascetic readers. This is because, to their minds, the very goal of ascetic practice is to become like the angels.[55] Given what John says then, is this not more reason for them to take seriously the priesthood?

Following this, John returns to the subject of qualification by using himself as a negative example. If a priest is to be a good spiritual physician, he "needs great wisdom, the grace of God in good measure, and an upright character and a pure life, and more than human goodness." Comparing himself to this benchmark, John declares that he does not qualify since he still struggles with three serious spiritual flaws: vainglory (which leads him to a multitude of other sins, such as anger, dejection and envy), ambition (which makes him susceptible to power struggles) and anger (which can drag him and others into ruin). John speaks extensively, and in vivid detail, on the manifold dangers that these vices present. Vainglory, for example, is depicted as a "dreadful rock" inhabited by a whole host of "wild beasts."

> And what are those beasts? Anger, dejection, envy, strife, slanders, accusations, lying, hypocrisy, intrigue, imprecations against those who have done

[54] *OP* 2.4–8.

[55] *OP* 3.4–6. See also Pak-Wah Lai, 'John Chrysostom and the Hermeneutics of Exemplar Portraits' (doctoral dissertation, Durham University, Theology and Religion, 2010) 62–68.

> no harm, delight at disgraceful behaviour in fellow priests, sorrow at their successes, love of praise, greed for preferment …, teaching meant to please, slavish wheedling, ignoble flattery, contempt for the poor, fawning on the rich, absurd honours, and harmful favours which endanger giver and receiver alike. … All these wild beasts and more are bred upon that rock.[56]

For those who are still sceptical about John's claims, they need only look at how "far short" he is at his ascetic disciplines to realise that he is inapt even at the care of his own soul. All these are a far cry from the ideal priest, who "must be sober and clear-sighted and possess a thousand eyes looking in every direction, for he lives, not for himself alone, but for a greater multitude."[57]

Paradoxically, John's extensive *ekphraseis*, or vivid descriptions, of how the three spiritual flaws give rise to a whole host of other sins actually reveal much ascetic astuteness on his part. It is a mark of a mature ascetic, rather than a mere novice. Surely, his ascetic readers would have recognised this as well. More importantly, these vivid rhetorical portraits, I think, constitute powerful mental images by which his readers can discern the level of their ascetic progress, and whether they qualify for the priesthood. Also noteworthy is the fact that, time and again, John intersperses his discourse by lamenting how the church is now plagued with disorder because priests have been chosen for all sorts of wrong reasons, such as their fortune, family lineage, intelligence or seniority of age. By saying all these, it appears that John is challenging his ascetic readers yet again by underscoring the point that if they do not step up and embrace the priesthood, they would be contributing inadvertently to this disorder as well![58]

Midway through John's self-deprecation, Basil corrects him by pointing out that he is already free from anger. This allows John to introduce a new focus in his discussion, that is, the limited benefits of ascetic practice. His freedom, explains John, is "due, not to [his] innate goodness, but to [his] love of retirement (or *askesis*)." If he becomes a priest, he would not only falter but also lead others astray.[59] Later, he goes further by arguing that even when a monk is well-advanced in his *askesis*, he may not have the manifold virtues needed to cope with the demands of the priesthood. These include an ability to bear with verbal abuses, the long-suffering needed to care for the widows, the wisdom required to nurture the virgins, and the ability for arbitration. Speaking candidly about the difficulties of handling verbal abuses,

---

[56] *OP* 2.7 (Moxon 77–78).
[57] *OP* 2.6–7, 10–14.
[58] *OP* 3.6–10, 15.
[59] *OP* 3.13–14.

as an example, John observes that "men who are valiant in ascetic practices … [have lost] their heads at these [abuses] that they become wilder than savage beasts."[60] Furthermore, should a priest fail in his duties, he will be faulted by God even if he had embraced the priesthood without ill intention.[61]

John's views about the limits of asceticism are ironical. If *askesis* is a necessary qualification for the priesthood, why demean its value? If he believes that ascetics should prepare themselves for the priesthood, why raise the bar so high that aspiring ascetics would be scared off? Basil, for one, became quite disheartened and frightened by his words. This open-endedness or unfinalisability in John's ascetic discourse is deliberate, I think. While John believes that asceticism is necessary for the priesthood, he also recognises that not all ascetics are well-suited for the job. By presenting ascetics a very detailed picture of what is involved in the priesthood, he then provides for them a concrete basis, or an "image of an idea," to evaluate themselves.

In Books 4 to 5 that follow, John expounds a further qualification that he believes to be even more important than being an exemplary ascetic. This is the priest's ability to teach. The priest who is entrusted with the Church, he declares "must train it to perfect health and incredible beauty" and "must make it worthy, as far as lies within human power, of that pure and blessed Head to which it is subjected."[62] Not only must he avoid heretical extremes and expound a balanced orthodoxy, but he must also be able to overcome the various temptations associated with the teacher, be it pride or jealousy.[63] Two insights may be derived here. The first is the fact that, by requiring the priest to be an astute theologian, John must be assuming that only well-educated ascetics may qualify for the job. The second should be familiar to John's ascetic readers by now. Once again, he is giving his readers another vivid image of the priesthood, this time round as a teacher, so that they can further discern their suitability for the work.

As if he has not made things hard for his ascetic readers—by first challenging them to embrace the priesthood and then making the vocation sound impossible to attain, John goes on to paint asceticism in a rather unfavourable light. A priest, he elaborates, must possess "angelic virtues" and the aid of the Holy Spirit, so much so that even when he

[60] *OP* 3.11–12, 16–18.
[61] *OP* 4.1–2.
[62] *OP* 4.2 (Moxon 114).
[63] *OP* 4.2–5.8.

> has devoted himself to the whole community and has been forced to endure the sins of all, … [he] still remains firm and unwavering, piloting his soul through the tempest as in a calm.[64]

In comparison, a monk who leads a "solitary life" is, at best, "a paradigm of patient endurance, but not sufficient proof of all-round spiritual prowess."[65] Citing himself as an example, John sees his own "inactivity and detachment" as "useless for church government." In truth, his solitude is but "a veil for [his] own worthlessness," and a "cloak [for] most of [his] failings."[66] Clearly then, if his ascetic reader insists on leading a solitary life, he would be choosing a Christian life that is less than ideal. Such a withdrawal can only be taken as a sign of weakness, since no one can really be saved if he has "never work[ed] for the salvation of his neighbour."[67]

Conclusion

By the time we reach the conclusion of *OP*, we find a very intriguing picture. Basil now despairs for his own sins and new responsibilities, while John promises to support and encourage Basil whenever he can. The irony here cannot be missed. The priest now becomes the repentant, while the monk a priest-like mentor. What does this suggest then? That a monk in seclusion still has a role to play in the Church by providing moral support for the priest? Or that this is how he takes his first steps towards the priesthood? And what shall we do with Basil, who now fears and doubts about what he has gotten himself into? John's dialogue leaves his readers with more questions than answers. Nevertheless, he does not put them in the lurch, since he has already provided them rich images of how asceticism may relate to the priesthood. Should his ascetic readers continue to dialogue with these images, they will find themselves becoming fellow interlocutors with John and Basil. Hopefully, they will arrive at their own conclusions about their ascetic goals and suitability for the priesthood, and bring their own resolution to this discussion.

To conclude, we return to the question posed in the introduction: whether John changed his views about asceticism in his later life. While our dialogical reading of *OP* does not quite resolve this question, it does reveal that John's ascetic views, at least when he composed *OP*, were actually far more intricate

[64] *OP* 6.5 (Moxon 144).
[65] Ibid.
[66] *OP* 6.7 (Moxon 145).
[67] *OP* 6.12 (Moxon 150).

than we imagine. While John clearly believes that ascetics should seriously consider and prepare themselves for the priesthood, he also recognises that not all will qualify. Indeed, it is better off for the Church if those who are unsuitable avoid ordination. But even if this is the case, there are still roles for the ascetics to play. This could be, for instance, supporting the priests or becoming icons of virtue for all. It is an open question, however, as to who would become what. For this reason, these somewhat opposing ideas about the ascetic life must always be held in dynamic tension for the readers' consideration. This is also why, I believe, John chose the dialogue as his literary form for his subject in the first place.

Select Bibliography

Bakhtin, M. M, and Caryl Emerson. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984.

Cameron, Averil. *Dialoguing in Late Antiquity*. Hellenic Studies 65. Washington D.C.: Center for Hellenic Studies, 2014. http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:hul.ebook:CHS_CameronA.Dialoguing_in_Late_Antiquity.2014.

Goldhill, Simon. *The End of Dialogue in Antiquity*. Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Green, Barbara. *Mikhail Bakhtin and Biblical Scholarship: An Introduction*. Atlanta Ga.: Society of Biblical Literature, 2000.

Hofer, Andrew. 'The Reordering of Relationships in John Chrysostom's "De Sacerdotio"'. *Augustinianum* 51:2 (2011) 451–71.

Illert, Martin. *Johannes Chrysostomus und das antiochenisch-syrische Mönchtum: Studien zu Theologie, Rhetorik und Kirchenpolitik im antiochenischen Schrifttum des Johannes Chrysostomus*. Zürich: Pano-Verl., 2000.

Jacobs, Andrew S. 'Dialogical Differences: (De-)Judaising Jesus' Circumcision.' *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 15:3 (2007) 291–335.

Katos, Demetrios S. 'Socratic Dialogue or Courtroom Debate? Judicial Rhetoric and Stasis Theory in the Dialogue on the Life of St. John Chrysostom.' *Vigiliae Christianae* 61 (2007) 42–69.

Liebeschuetz, J. H. W. G. *Ambrose and John Chrysostom: Clerics between Desert and Empire*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Lochbrunner, Manfred. *Über das Priestertum: historische und systematische Untersuchung zum Priesterbild des Johannes Chrysostomus*. Bonn: Borengässer, 1993.

Mayer, Wendy. 'What Does It Mean to Say That John Chrysostom Was a Monk?' *Studia Patristica* 41 (2006) 451–55.

Wessel, Susan. 'Memory and Individuality in Gregory of Nyssa's *Dialogus de Anima et Resurrectione*.' *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 18:3 (2010) 369–92.

Wet, Chris de. 'The Priestly Body: Power-Discourse and Identity in John Chrysostom's De Sacerdotio.' *Religion & Theology* 18 (2011) 351–379.

Wilson VanVeller, Courtney. 'Paul's Therapy of the Soul: A New Approach to John Chrysostom and Anti-Judaism.' PhD Thesis, Boston University, 2015.

Chapter Ten

The King, the Palace, and the Kingdom Anthropic Thinking in Gregory of Nyssa, John Chrysostom, and Other Witnesses

Doru Costache

The anthropic cosmological principle is a contemporary theoretical construct, which, together with being rooted in various sciences, such as physics, cosmology, biology, and anthropology, has a distinct philosophical perfume about it. Proposed by Brandon Carter in the early 1970s, the anthropic principle has been further developed by a number of cosmologists, like John Barrow, Frank Tipler, Roger Penrose, and Henry Stapp, to name a few, in order to give account for the strange correspondences between the universe and the existence of humankind. Pointers to anthropic thinking were already present in Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, where the principle, grounded in a holistic worldview, was charged with profound philosophical, teleological, and theological overtones. Irrespective of where one traces the modern roots of the anthropic principle—whether to the contributions of Teilhard de Chardin or its more recent articulation in Carter and his successors—it is obvious that, as an attempt to sketch a comprehensive framework, this way of thinking bridges various fields of knowledge and raises questions about the place of humankind within the universe. Such questions are largely philosophical, although the contemporary proponents of the principle affirm its scientific legitimacy. That said, herein I am not concerned with the scientific

soundness of the anthropic principle. Neither am I interested in mapping in detail its various formulations, namely, the 'weak' version, which refers to the inextricable connection between humanity's existence and the parameters of the universe; the 'strong' version, which goes as far as proposing that the structure of the universe is conditioned by the presence of our species; and the 'final' version, which postulates that in the far future humankind will fully control the matrix of reality by way of advanced technology.[1] Instead, I am interested in pointing out that the kind of thinking illustrated by the anthropic principle challenges entrenched prejudices of modern times—for instance the division between cosmology and anthropology together with its trivial outcome, the separation of the natural sciences and the humanities, and its far more terrible consequence, namely, an anthropocentrism which is largely responsible for the irrational exploitation of the earth's ecosystem. The anthropic principle proposes a different paradigm, wholly opposite to the modern culture of divisions and exploitation, a holistic framework within which humankind's existence is no longer seen as a random and meaningless byproduct of the universe's evolution—and a factor of the senseless disruption of nature.

In this chapter I work with the assumption that signs of anthropic thinking have emerged long ago, within various ancient traditions,[2] including in the early Christian tradition, being yet ignored by the scientific milieus. For instance, very likely building on the Pauline perception of the catastrophic impact of humankind's sins upon the natural world,[3] samples of anthropic thinking feature in a second century work, Theophilus of Antioch's *To Autolycus*. Theophilus represented the ripples of the fall by way of an image, namely, of a household in which the servants mimicked the behaviour of the

[1] Henry P. Stapp, *Mindful Universe: Quantum Mechanics and the Participating Observer* (Berlin and Heidelberg, 2011) 6–7, 11–2. John D. Barrow, *The Constants of Nature: From Alpha to Omega—the Numbers that Encode the Deepest Secrets of the Universe* (New York: Pantheon Books, 2002) 141–76. John D. Barrow, *Between Inner Space and Outer Space: Essays On Science, Art, and Philosophy* (Oxford University Press, 1999) 19–30. Roger Penrose, *The Emperor's New Mind: Concerning Computers, Minds, and the Laws of Physics* (Penguin Books, 1991) 354, 433–44. Trinh Xuan Thuan, *La mélodie secrète: Et L'Homme créa l'Universe* (France: Fayard, 1988) 287–88, 292–96. John D. Barrow and Frank J. Tipler, *The Anthropic Cosmological Principle* (Oxford and New York: Clarendon Press and Oxford University Press, 1986) 15–26. Brandon Carter, 'Large Number Coincidences and the Anthropic Principle in Cosmology' in *Confrontation of Cosmological Theories with Observational Data*, ed. M. S. Longair (Dordrecht and Boston: D. Reidel Publishing Company, 1974) 291–98. Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, *Le phénomène humain* (Paris: Seuil, 1970).

[2] This conviction is shared by Barrow and Tipler, *The Anthropic Cosmological Principle* 27–46.

[3] See Paul M. Blowers, *Drama of the Divine Economy: Creator and Creation in Early Christian Theology and Piety*, Oxford Early Christian Studies (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012) 212.

master.[4] He proposed that terrestrial animals emulated the disobedience of Adam and Eve toward God by becoming disobedient to their masters. The same perception was reiterated at the end of the fourth century by John Chrysostom, one of the main witnesses of the tradition here considered. Both John and his immediate forebear, Gregory of Nyssa, found inspiration, however, in an older source, Philo the Alexandrian. It is from Philo that they borrowed an expanded form of the household image as the analogy of the king, the palace, and the kingdom. Philo had used the analogy to illustrate one in a series of possible answers to the problem of humankind's creation after the rest of the universe.[5] Of relevance is his fourth answer,[6] in which he rendered the narrative of creation in Genesis 1 as the story of a royal palace prepared for the arrival of its king. We shall see below that Gregory and John rehearsed the analogy, in slightly different settings and forms, to address various concerns related to the same scriptural evidence of humankind's late arrival on the scene of the cosmos.

In what follows I focus on the Chrysostomian rendition of this analogy and, before it, its Nyssenian source of inspiration. Tangentially, I refer to relevant works by other early Christian authors, such as Theophilus of Antioch, Nemesius of Emesa, and Theodoret of Cyrus. My goal is to show that, alongside the straightforward narrative of human uniqueness and superiority, the early Christian tradition proposed a wealth of ideas pertaining to the place of humankind within the earth's ecosystem and the universe. Rather than anthropocentric, unecological, and acosmistic, the early Christian tradition established a way of thinking that anticipated by centuries the holistic framework of contemporary anthropic cosmology.

Gregory of Nyssa

Sharing in the mindset of most premodern thinkers, Gregory of Nyssa has drawn the contours of a holistic, comprehensive worldview, which collected together what, despite the integrative framework of the anthropic cosmological principle and the "big history" narrative,[7] our culture still addresses under

---

[4] *To Autolycus* 2.17 in *Theophilus of Antioch: Ad Autolycum*, ed. and trans. Robert M. Grant, Oxford Early Christian Texts (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970) 54.14–23. Throughout this chapter, all translations from the Greek are mine.

[5] Philo, *On the Creation* (= *Creat.*) 25.77–29.88 in *Philo*, vol. 1, The Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press and William Heinemann Ltd, 1981) 60–72.

[6] *Creat.* 28.83–86 (Loeb 66–70).

[7] Cynthia Stokes Brown, *Big History: From the Big Bang to the Present* (New York and London:

the separate headings of cosmology and anthropology. The mutual ignorance of contemporary cosmologists and anthropologists was inconceivable during Gregory's time. Equally inconceivable were such attempts, like those of contemporary scholars, to make sense of the anthropological and cosmological dimensions of his thought, anachronistically, as separate items. Jean Laplace[8] and recently Johannes Zachhuber[9] have aptly pointed out that the Nyssen peered into the mystery of human nature within the framework of cosmology. It should not come as a surprise therefore that, before any rigorous anthropological consideration, his *On the Constitution of the Human Being* (= *Const*.)[10] commences, as the title[11] of its first chapter reads, by sketching "the discourse on the nature of the cosmos" and on the natural phenomena that "preceded the creation of the human being." And in fact he discoursed on the human mystery only after laying out a thick and dynamic depiction of the cosmic harmony that, together with being conditioned by God's wisdom and power, resulted from the maelstrom of the elements. Without stating it, Gregory must have understood this cosmological outline as a necessary prolegomenon to the "mystical anthropogony"[12] of the first chapters of Genesis. A clarification as to how this cosmological introduction prepared an anthropological discourse would have been useful, of course, but here Gregory offered none. He put forward an indirect answer only in the eighth chapter by observing that within the human constitution were recapitulated all the strands of the created reality, mineral, vegetal, animal, and rational.[13] This was to say that the human being cannot be considered outside the ensemble of the creation. Less compellingly, Gregory advanced an explanation of the reasons for so proceeding at the end of the very first chapter, by commenting

---

The New Press, 2008).

[8] Jean Laplace, SJ, 'Introduction' to *Grégoire de Nysse: La création de l'homme*, Sources Chrétiennes 6 (Paris and Lyon: Éditions du Cerf and Éditions de l'Abeille, 1944) 5–77 esp. 38.

[9] Johannes Zachhuber, *Human Nature in Gregory of Nyssa: Philosophical Background and Theological Significance* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2014) 146–47, 158–59, 186, 203–4, 208.

[10] PG 44, 124–256. The work is confusingly known as *On the Making of Man* or *On the Creation of Humankind*, which reiterates the mistranslation of the original Greek title, Περὶ κατασκευῆς ἀνθρώπου, into Latin, *De opificio hominis*. The version of the original text is that of Thesaurus Linguae Graecae (TLG). The references indicate the chapter and the column as found in PG, followed by the lines found in TLG.

[11] *Const*. 1 (PG 44, 128.29–31). Conditioned by the modern dissociation of cosmology and anthropology, currently the musings of Gregory on the universe within the work of interest are ignored. See the summary of the work in Giorgio Maturi, 'Op Hom' in *The Brill Dictionary of Gregory of Nyssa*, ed. Lucas Francisco Mateo-Seco and Giulio Maspero, revised and expanded English edition, trans. by Seth Cherney (Leiden: Brill, 2010) 543–55.

[12] τὴν μυστικὴν τοῦ Μωϋσέως ἀνθρωπογονίαν. *Const*. 30 (PG 44, 256.28–29).

[13] *Const*. 8 (PG 44, 144–48).

that "the whole of the creation was rich … yet the one [meant] to share in it was not [there]."[14] The sentence signifies the incomplete harmony of the universe in the absence of humankind, the imperfection of a wonderfully crafted world which had no one to delight in it. Apart from the very Greek as well as scriptural connotation that the beauty of the creation was meant to be enjoyed, the sentence discloses Gregory's conviction that a nonhuman cosmos was unthinkable. But the statement agrees with the meaning of the eighth chapter and, albeit in a weak sense, satisfies the anthropic cosmological principle. The agreement of the two passages is confirmed by their common suggestion that a certain degree of cosmological awareness was needed in order to make sense of human existence.

Gregory's anthropic mindset transpires, however, in various ways within the treatise under consideration. In what follows I bring to the fore a range of aspects pertaining to the rapports between humankind and the cosmos, to end with an analysis of the image of the king, the palace, and the kingdom, of interest herein, which seems to have functioned as an overarching narrative for the author's anthropocosmic thinking.[15] I propose that this image lends further substance to the Nyssenian construal of the rapports between the human being and the universe.

The anthropocosmic continuum

I have already mentioned chapter eight in relation to Gregory's encompassing view that presented humankind and the cosmos as inextricably linked. The chapter is typical for what scholars have identified as a fixture pertaining to Nyssenian methodology, namely, the notion of succession, order or connection of things, ἀκολουθία.[16] The order of creation[17] followed a pattern that led from the inanimate to the conscious, progressing through the stages of mineral, vegetal, animal, and intellectual existence. Each new level possessed the qualities of the previous one, to which it added other features.[18] Furthermore,

---

[14] ἅπας ὁ κατὰ τὴν κτίσιν πλοῦτος … ἀλλ' ὁ μετέχων οὐκ ἦν. *Const*. 1 (PG 44, 132.32–34).

[15] Although Nemesius of Emesa has further developed the insights of the Nyssen about the multiple connections between humankind and the cosmos, I have not allocated to his thinking a special analysis because I could not find there the image of the king, the palace, and the kingdom. Below I refer to the insights of this younger contemporary of Gregory only when his views complement the Nyssen's.

[16] See Juan Antonio Gil-Tamayo, 'akolouthia' in *The Brill Dictionary of Gregory of Nyssa* 14–20. The concept features literally in *Const*. 2 and 8 (PG 44, 133.40, 145.24, 148.20), both of immediate interest herein.

[17] *Const*. 8 (PG 44, 144.55–145.23).

[18] Nemesius has summarised the Nyssenian perception, to which he added an important detail. He proposed that the leap from one level to the next was not performed suddenly. God showed patience in handling the creation—one step at a time—and so moulded even the

the last three types of existence represented as many kinds of soul or indeed lifeforms. Gregory explained that, arriving last in the order of existence, the human being recapitulated and therefore reconfigured within itself the three types of soul into a higher organisation: "The human being, this rational animal, mixes within itself all those forms of soul."[19] The undisclosed assumption behind this view was, as Laplace has shown, that to recapitulate the previous orders of existence within itself the human being had to be potentially present within those very orders.[20] Conversely, and building on the insight of Eric Perl,[21] the fact that the human being could recapitulate these forms of soul shows that there was a potential for humanity in all of them. Either way, it appears that for the Nyssen there was no dichotomy between humankind and the rest of the creation, which signifies an anthropic way of thinking.

Several paragraphs later, Gregory offered the same understanding as though in a mirror.[22] On the one hand, it was the order of things that the human being appeared last, at the end of an evolutionary ascent of nature[23] "as though through the rungs of a ladder." On the other hand, within this superior form of existence one could have contemplated, summarised, all the other strands of being. Granted, in both cases it was a matter of stating the obvious, that there was a connection between human existence and other lifeforms and levels of being. Gregory's attempt to produce a natural explanation, namely, that things *had* to advance from simplicity to complexity, remains unconvincing albeit it signifies a hierarchically ordered universe.[24] Equally unconvincing was his teleological explanation that lower strands of

---

human being out of a preexistent biological material. Nemesius of Emesa, *On Human Nature* 1 in *Nemesii Emeseni de natura hominis*, ed. M. Morani, Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana (Leipzig: Teubner, 1987) (= BT) 3.13–4.16. The text is retrieved from TLG.

[19] Διὰ πάσης γὰρ ἰδέας τῶν ψυχῶν κατακιρνᾶται τὸ λογικὸν τοῦτο ζῶον ὁ ἄνθρωπος. *Const*. 8 (PG 44, 145.31–33).

[20] Laplace, 'Introduction' 37.

[21] Eric D. Perl, '"Every Life Is a Thought": The Analogy of Personhood in Neoplatonism' *Philosophy & Theology* 18:1 (2006) 143–67 esp. 160–63. I am grateful to Adam Cooper for alerting me with reference to this article and his attentive reading of my chapter.

[22] *Const*. 8 (PG 44, 148.15–24). Nemesius was clearer and more comprehensive on this matter, stating that within human nature—this central link of the whole of the cosmos—were comprised all the levels of the created reality, including the fundamental elements. It is within the human being that the universe manifested its profound unity as one creation of visible and invisible dimensions. See *On Human Nature* 1 (BT 2.13–3.5; 4.16–24; 5.4–8).

[23] On Gregory's evolutionary views, avant la lettre, see Elena Ene D-Vasilescu, 'How Would Gregory of Nyssa Have Understood Evolutionism?' *Studia Patristica* 67:15 (2013) 151–69.

[24] See on this Torstein Tollefsen, 'Cosmology' in *The Brill Dictionary of Gregory of Nyssa* 175–79 esp. 178–79.

reality were meant to serve higher forms of existence.[25] For him, the minerals did not just exist, they had been made because of their usefulness to plants. Similarly, the plants were made because they were useful to the animals, and the animals to humankind. It is as though Gregory worked with a modified version, highly teleological, of Fermat's principle: just as the light seeks the best path to its target,[26] so for him the great chain of creation's functionality pointed from one level to the next and all toward humankind as their final target. The incapacity of this ordered worldview to offer a satisfactory explanation notwithstanding, one cannot miss that something significant was outlined here—the interconnectivity of the created beings, including humankind, within the frame of reference of a universe that evolved in the parameters of divine wisdom.

Nevertheless, Gregory acknowledged a tension within the anthropocosmic continuum,[27] which was caused by humankind's complex condition as naturally constituted and divinely shaped. Of one essence with the various strands of the created reality, humankind was ultimately irreducible to this connection. Paulos Gregorios[28] has pointed out that the Nyssen discussed this inner tension with reference to the scriptural theme of being made in the image of God. The starting point of the discussion was another mention of the aspect of recapitulation, in chapter sixteen, where he considered the ancient motif of the microcosm or "small world." He referred to certain "outside" philosophers, very likely the Stoics, who praised the human being's rapport of interiority with the cosmos: "They say that the human being is a small world, consisting of the very elements of the universe."[29] Gregory conceded that human nature was indeed microcosmic and as such encapsulated all the layers of created existence,[30] but so did also a mosquito or a mouse. Concerned with identifying the qualities that made the human being a superior one, ultimately he could not agree that the cosmic connection was humankind's title of glory. He prepared his answer by way of rhetorical questions.

---

[25] *Const*. 8 (PG 44, 144.36–49).

[26] Michal Křížek, Florian Luca, and Lawrence Somer, *17 Lectures on Fermat Numbers: From Number Theory to Geometry* (New York: Springer, 2001) xvi.

[27] Laplace, 'Introduction' 36–37. Zachhuber, *Human Nature* 170–72.

[28] Paulos Mar Gregorios, *Cosmic Man—The Divine Presence: The Theology of St. Gregory of Nyssa* (New York: Paragon House, 1988) 224.

[29] Φασὶ γὰρ μικρὸν εἶναι κόσμον τὸν ἄνθρωπον, ἐκ τῶν αὐτῶν τῷ παντὶ στοιχείων συνεστηκότα. *Const*. 16 (PG 44, 177.50–52).

[30] Scholars agree that Gregory has not rejected the ancient theory of the microcosm. Elizabeth Theokritoff, *Living in God's Creation: Orthodox Perspectives on Ecology* (Foundations 4; Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2009) 66–67. Blowers, *Drama of the Divine Economy* 357–58. Against the tide, Gregorios, *Cosmic Man* 15–17, 223–24.

> Τί οὖν μέγα, κόσμου χαρακτῆρα καὶ ὁμοίωμα νομισθῆναι τὸν ἄνθρωπον; οὐρανοῦ τοῦ περιερχομένου, γῆς τῆς ἀλλοιουμένης, πάντων τῶν ἐν τούτοις περικρατουμένων τῇ παρόδῳ τοῦ περιέχοντος συμπαρερχομένων; Ἀλλ' ἐν τίνι κατὰ τὸν ἐκκλησιαστικὸν λόγον τὸ ἀνθρώπινον μέγεθος; Οὐκ ἐν τῇ πρὸς τὸν κτιστὸν κόσμον ὁμοιότητι, ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ κατ' εἰκόνα γενέσθαι τῆς τοῦ κτίσαντος φύσεως.[31]
>
> What is so great in considering the human being an imprint and likeness of the cosmos, since the sky keeps circling, the earth changes, and everything which these contain pass away together with the movement of what encompasses them? But, then, what is the human greatness according to the ecclesiastical teaching? It is not to be in the likeness of the created cosmos. It is to be made after the image of the creator's nature.

Gregory did not say that the human being was not a microcosm that recapitulated the universe—sky, earth, and everything within these. We have seen already how in chapter eight he affirmed that the previous layers of existence were recapitulated within human nature. Instead, and echoing once again chapter eight, he pointed to an interiorised hierarchy pertaining to the human being, in whose constitution was preeminent the transcendent dimension signified by the divine image (see ἐν τῷ κατ' εἰκόνα γενέσθαι τῆς τοῦ κτίσαντος φύσεως). It is likely that Gregory identified within the human being the very layers of reality which the cosmography of his time, Aristotelian and Ptolemaic, observed in the macrocosm that extended beyond the moon's orbit and as high as the divine sphere.[32] It was its stretching to that divine sphere which distinguished humankind from any other microcosmic structure, be it that of a mosquito or a mouse. Furthermore, and as Panayiotis Nellas has suggested, within this context the Nyssen defended humanity's eschatological glory, anticipated in the here and now by the divine image,[33] not its natural makeup and cosmic dimension (see κόσμου χαρακτῆρα καὶ ὁμοίωμα). The point on the irreducibility of the human being to its microcosmic status must have been another taxonomical exercise of the Cappadocian saint, namely, of ordering the various levels of being which

---

[31] *Const*. 16 (PG 44, 180.8–15).

[32] See for instance his *An Apology for the Hexaemeron* 65 in *Gregorii Nysseni In Hexaemeron: Opera Exegetica in Genesim*, part I, ed. Hubertus R. Drobner (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2009) 72.20. On the adherence of Gregory to the classical model of the cosmos, see Doru Costache, 'Making Sense of the World: Theology and Science in St Gregory of Nyssa's *An Apology for the Hexaemeron*' *Phronema* 28:1 (2013) 1–28 esp. 9 and Efthymios Nicolaidis, *Science and Eastern Orthodoxy: From the Greek Fathers to the Age of Globalization*, trans. S. Emanuel (Baltimore, 2011) 9–11.

[33] Panayiotis Nellas, *Deification in Christ: Orthodox Perspectives on the Nature of the Human Person*, trans. Norman Russell (Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1987) 30.

constituted human nature and which culminated with the divine imprint. What matters is that this complex inner architecture, which encompassed creatureliness and uncreated features—which reminds one of similar discussions in Philo the Alexandrian[34] and Gregory the Theologian[35]—was the source of the aforementioned tension. The whole chapter sixteen grapples with related matters. So does, likewise, chapter eighteen, where Gregory maintained that, given humankind's recapitulation of other lifeforms, within its nature there were brutish impulses which in no way could have been associated with the divine image.[36] And whereas sin, as a form of conscious acquiescing with the brute side, accentuated the animal and therefore the created dimension of the human constitution, virtue, which represented the rational transformation of the base instincts into elevated drives, manifested the human being's noble relation with the divine.[37]

The tension caused by the human being's relation with the created and the uncreated revealed its continuity as well as its discontinuity with the cosmos. Gregory found here the source of an entire dialectic of humankind's rapports with the rest of the creation, which he interpreted, at least in what concerns their normal interactions, with reference to the sovereignty pertaining to being in God's image.

Human sovereignty

I have shown above that the Nyssen refused to reduce human dignity to our race's microcosmic dimension or in fact its natural relationship with the universe. Being made of stardust was not the actual glory of humankind. On that occasion we have discovered that Gregory's preferred affirmation of human dignity was in relation to the divine image. Although he had much to say about the divine image with reference to human nature, in what follows I focus on a narrow significance of the topic, namely, the equation of image and sovereignty or royalty.

When, in chapter three, he continued the argument for the superiority of the human being to the rest of the creation, the saint observed with reference to Genesis 1:26 that the divine counsel alluded to therein predetermined the making of the human being in God's image and as a sovereign (ἡγεμονεύς) of

[34] Philo, *Creat*. 27.82 (Loeb 66).

[35] *Oration* 38.11 (PG 36, 321.37–324.17). For an analysis of the text, see Doru Costache, 'Seeking Out the Antecedents of the Maximian Theory of Everything: St Gregory the Theologian's *Oration* 38' in *Cappadocian Legacy: A Critical Appraisal*, ed. Doru Costache and Philip Kariatlis (Sydney: St Andrew's Orthodox Press, 2013) 225–41 esp. 235–39.

[36] *Const*. 18 (PG 44, 192.1–27).

[37] *Const*. 18 (PG 44, 193.10–48).

the earth's ecosystem.[38] From then on and for a number of chapters (ending with the twelfth), the topics of superiority and sovereignty continued to intersect. Whereas in chapter three, and in the parameters of the scriptural account, Gregory drew a line between humankind, whose creation was preceded by a divine counsel that defined its mode of existence and activity, and the broad array of the cosmos, which did not include such a definition, afterwards he outlined a series of proofs of human sovereignty. In chapter four he mentioned the erect posture or "the bearing of the body" as signifying royalty[39]—perhaps as an extension of the inner sovereignty which was much more obvious to the eyes of the Nyssen, namely, the nobility of the soul, the ruler of the body which in turn, being free, had no one to rule over it.[40] Being "made in the image of the nature that lords over all"[41] and being endowed with "likeness to the king of the universe"[42] the human person was royal, too. It manifested this status by being "clothed in virtue" and "embellished with the crown of righteousness," which anticipated the "beatitude of immortality."[43] In sum, Gregory articulated human sovereignty with reference to the divine archetype, the autarchy of the soul, the bipedal posture of the body, and the ethical and existential aspects of virtue, righteousness, and immortality. He

[38] *Const*. 3 (PG 44, 133.37–54). On the human hegemony over the earthly ecosystem, see Hans Boersma, *Embodiment and Virtue in Gregory of Nyssa: An Anagogical Approach*, The Oxford Early Christian Studies (Oxford University Press, 2013) 102, 153–55. See also Peter Harrison, *The Bible, Protestantism, and the Rise of Natural Science* (Cambridge University Press, 1998) 49.

[39] ἐπιτηδείως πρὸς βασιλείαν ἔχειν ("being serviceable to royalty"). *Const*. 4 (PG 44, 136.22). Gregory has returned to the uprightness of the human body as marking nobility and dignity in the beginning of *Const*. 8 (PG 44, 144.14–27).

[40] For Gregory, human hegemony did not refer only to a capacity to rule over the earth ecosystem. It meant, first and foremost, a capacity to rule itself, to be free of all necessity and instinctiveness, which amounted to living virtuously. Boersma, *Embodiment and Virtue* 153. Blowers, *Drama of the Divine Economy* 358. Nellas, *Deification in Christ* 26. Theokritoff, *Living in God's Creation* 70–71. Cyril Hovorun, 'Two Meanings of Freedom in Eastern Patristic Tradition' in *Quests for Freedom: Biblical—Historical—Contemporary*, ed. Michael Welker (Göttingen: Neukirchener Theologie, 2015) 133–44 esp. 137–38, 143. Morwenna Ludlow, *Gregory of Nyssa, Ancient and (Post)modern* (Oxford University Press, 2007) 173, 187. In the context of interest, the Nyssen has not established however a link between self-control and the capacity to rule over the animals. We shall discover below that Chrysostom focused on precisely that link.

[41] τὸ τῆς δυναστευούσης τῶν πάντων φύσεως εἰκόνα γενέσθαι. *Const*. 4 (PG 44, 136.28–29). On the connection between being in the image and human royalty, see Ilaria Ramelli, 'Good / Beauty' in *The Brill Dictionary of Gregory of Nyssa* 356–63 esp. 360.

[42] διὰ τῆς πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα τοῦ παντὸς ὁμοιότητος. *Const*. 4 (PG 44, 136.37–38).

[43] *Const*. 4 (PG 44, 136.40–49). So understood, much like the divine image in the interpretation of Nellas, earlier mentioned, sovereignty appeared as a foretaste of the eschatological perfection. Ilaria Ramelli, 'Methodius' in *The Brill Dictionary of Gregory of Nyssa* 494–96 esp. 495. Harrison, *The Bible* 209.

has developed some of these particulars pertaining to human sovereignty in chapter five. There Gregory highlighted a range of similarities between God and God's created reflection, the human being. On the one hand, there was the ethical component of sovereignty, secured by the creator who, like a painter, added to the human being the most godlike colours, namely, virtues such as "purity, dispassion, beatitude, and separation from all evil."[44] On the other hand, there was the broader existential correspondence. God was mind, people could think; God was word, people could speak; God was omniscient, people enquired in order to know; God was love, the disciples of the Lord were called to love, too.[45]

The evidence in favour of human sovereignty and superiority notwithstanding, Gregory had to grapple with a difficulty. The foregoing proofs were contradicted by the ostensible natural weakness of humankind, compared to the qualities of many other living beings. To defend human superiority, after listing the mighty features of various animals—such as speed, physical force, acuity of sense, quickness of instinct, and weapons of defence—the Nyssen has suggested that sovereignty transpired in humankind's capacity to use many animals for its own good. Humankind did not rule as an absolute monarch. Its sovereignty worked through cooperating with its subjects, by taming them, and through industriously making use of the qualities of the animals, plants, and the mineral world.[46]

So far we have discovered that for Gregory human sovereignty emerged at the very core of the anthropological tension earlier signalled, signified by humankind's complex relation with both the divine and the created realm. Being created in God's image, the human being remained irreducible to its own nature and the universe to which that nature belonged. Furthermore, at least within the group of chapters analysed above, the divine image was tantamount to humankind's sovereignty, which signified both its superiority to the created domain and its way of interacting with that domain. Given this evidence, the tension mentioned above did not result in the isolation of the human being from the rest of the created world. Instead, and in all likelihood, Gregory's points on this tension served to articulating a hierarchical schema within which, whilst remaining a part of the created whole, the human being represented its topmost strand. The anthropocosmic continuum was not

[44] *Const*. 5 (PG 44, 137.1–23).

[45] *Const*. 5 (PG 44, 137.25–44).

[46] *Const*. 7 (PG 44, 140.49–144.9). Theokritoff, *Living in God's Creation* 77–78. Jame Schaefer, *Patristics and Environmental Ethics: Reconstructing Patristic and Medieval Concepts* (Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2009) 197. Less developed, the usefulness of the various beings to humankind features also in Nemesius, *On Human Nature* 1 (BT 4.24–5.4).

broken by the affirmation of human sovereignty; it was structured. And although this part of the argument could not have contributed directly to the construal of an anthropic cosmology, its input is not altogether negligible. In fact, the topic of sovereignty is directly connected with the Nyssen's anthropic worldview rendered by way of an image—that of the king, the palace, and the kingdom.

The king, the palace, and the kingdom

Ever concerned with the affirmation of human superiority within the broad array of the creation, in chapter two (and in the footsteps of Philo)[47] Gregory addressed the challenging matter of humankind's late arrival. His reasons for adopting this approach remain concealed. He may have intended to rule out doubts concerning the authority of Scripture since, according to Genesis 1, humankind was brought into existence after all the other creations. It is likely that the difficulty consisted in the interpretation of the scriptural account, by some, through the logic of the ancients, espoused in the Hesiodic myth of the golden age,[48] which prescribed that the noblest things came first and were followed by the increasingly worse. In earlier centuries, this logic was customarily invoked by the pagan critics of the historical recentness of Christianity, seen as lacking nobility and wisdom.[49] Thus, was humanity's later making not a sign of inferiority to the previously created beings? To affirm human superiority Gregory offered in the chapter of interest two analogies—of the guest at a banquet and of the king, the palace, and the kingdom. Both analogies were meant to convey the same message, namely, that propitious conditions were set before the arrival of humankind in the world whereas the late introduction of our species indicated its dignity.

The analogy of the banquet and the guest[50] brings this message to the fore by outlining how a good and generous host first embellishes the hall, then provides the food and the drinks, and then welcomes the guest of honour. In like manner, first of all God has brought the world into being, making it a

---

[47] See Philo, *Creat.* 25.77–29.88 (Loeb 60–72). Laplace pointed to the broader Platonic roots of this approach. Laplace, 'Introduction' 38–39.

[48] Hesiod, *Works and Days* 106–201 in *Hesiod: Theogony, Works and Days, Testimonia*, ed. and trans. Glenn W. Most, Loeb Classical Library 57 (Cambridge, MA and London, England: Harvard University Press, 2006) 94–104.

[49] Doru Costache, 'Meaningful Cosmos: Logos and Nature in Clement the Alexandrian's *Exhortation to the Gentiles*' *Phronema* 28:2 (2013) 107–30 esp. 124–26. Richard A. Norris, 'The Apologists' in *The Cambridge History of Early Christian Literature*, ed. Frances Young, Lewis Ayres and Andrew Louth (Cambridge University Press, 2004) 36–44 esp. 36, 39.

[50] *Const*. 2 (PG 44, 133.16–33). Gregory reiterated a motif already used for this purpose by Philo, *Creat.* 25.78 (Loeb 62), the latter together with the image of the athletic contest.

pleasant abode, a genuine cornucopia (already suggested by the designation of God as a "rich and extravagant host"),[51] and only after that was humanity brought into the world. Viewed through the lens of the anthropic principle, the image signifies that the creator conditioned the world for the arrival of humankind, that all things have been shaped to be serviceable to our species. At the end of the analogy Gregory mentioned again the duality of the human constitution, its divine and created coordinates, by which the human being could enjoy the best of the two realms.[52] Here, the tension inbuilt to the human constitution, earlier discussed, was bypassed in an attempt to show that all the layers of reality, created and uncreated, welcomed humankind in a homely fashion.

The analogy with which the second chapter begins, of the king, the palace, and the kingdom, is the most relevant to my purposes. Here is the passage in its full length.

> Οὕπω γὰρ τὸ μέγα τοῦτο καὶ τίμιον χρῆμα ὁ ἄνθρωπος τῷ κόσμῳ τῶν ὄντων ἐπεχωρίαζεν. Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἦν εἰκὸς τὸν ἄρχοντα πρὸ τῶν ἀρχομένων ἀναφανῆναι, ἀλλὰ τῆς ἀρχῆς πρότερον ἑτοιμασθείσης, ἀκόλουθον ἦν ἀναδειχθῆναι τὸν βασιλεύοντα, ἐπειδὴ τοίνυν οἷόν τινα βασίλειον καταγωγὴν τῷ μέλλοντι βασιλεύειν ὁ τοῦ παντὸς ποιητὴς προηυτρέπισεν. Αὕτη δὲ ἦν γῆ τε καὶ νῆσοι, καὶ θάλαττα, καὶ οὐρανὸς ὑπὲρ τούτων ὁρόφου δίκην ἐπικυρτούμενος· πλοῦτος δὲ παντοδαπὸς τοῖς βασιλείοις τούτοις ἐναπετέθη. Πλοῦτον δὲ λέγω πᾶσαν τὴν κτίσιν, ὅσον ἐν φυτοῖς καὶ βλαστήμασι, καὶ ὅσον αἰσθητικόν τε καὶ ἔμπνουν καὶ ἔμψυχον. Εἰ δὲ χρὴ καὶ τὰς ὕλας εἰς πλοῦτον καταριθμήσασθαι, ὅσαι διά τινος εὐχροίας τίμιαι τοῖς ἀνθρωπίνοις ὀφθαλμοῖς ἐνομίσθησαν, οἷον χρυσίον τε καὶ ἀργύριον, καὶ τῶν λίθων δὴ τούτων ἃς ἀγαπῶσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι· καὶ τούτων πάντων τὴν ἀφθονίαν καθάπερ τισὶ βασιλικοῖς θησαυροῖς τοῖς τῆς γῆς κόλποις ἐγκατακρύψας, οὕτως ἀναδείκνυσιν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ τὸν ἄνθρωπον, τῶν ἐν τούτῳ θαυμάτων, τῶν μὲν θεατὴν ἐσόμενον, τῶν δὲ κύριον, ὡς διὰ μὲν τῆς ἀπολαύσεως τὴν σύνεσιν τοῦ χορηγοῦντος ἔχειν, διὰ δὲ τοῦ κάλλους τε καὶ μεγέθους τῶν ὀρωμένων τὴν ἄῤῥητόν τε καὶ ὑπὲρ λόγον τοῦ πεποιηκότος δύναμιν ἀνιχνεύειν. Διὰ ταῦτα τελευταῖος μετὰ τὴν κτίσιν εἰσήχθη ὁ ἄνθρωπος, οὐχ ὡς ἀπόβλητος ἐν ἐσχάτοις ἀπορῥιφεὶς, ἀλλ' ὡς ἅμα τῇ γενέσει βασιλεὺς εἶναι τῶν ὑποχειρίων προσήκων.[53]

---

[51] ὁ πλούσιός τε καὶ πολυτελὴς … ἐστιάτωρ. *Const*. 2 (PG 44, 133.22–23).

[52] *Const*. 2 (PG 44, 133.26–33).

[53] *Const*. 2 (PG 44, 132.37–133.16). Here the Nyssen has drawn on Philo, *Creat.* 28.83–86 (Loeb 66–70). The difference rests with Gregory's homelier depiction of the universe, which included a familiarity between the sovereign and the beings over which he ruled, whereas Philo preferred a rigorous cosmographical approach, which stated upfront that the human being was appointed as sovereign of the sublunar domain (see τών υπό σελήνην απάντων βασιλέα) (*Creat.* 28.84; Loeb 68).

> The human being, that great and honourable thing, had not yet arrived into the world of the [created] beings. It was not befitting for the ruler to be shown forth before those that were to be ruled. However, since the creator of the universe prepared beforehand a royal palace of sorts for the one who would be king in the future—the royal domain being now established—it was orderly that the ruler be revealed. This [royal domain] consisted of the earth, the islands, the sea, and the sky arched, after a manner, like a roof over all these. Great wealth was stored in the treasuries [of the palace]. By wealth I mean the whole of the creation, such as plants and their offshoots, together with many animals endowed with sense, breath, and life. And if we must count as wealth material things, [we have to include] the pleasing things which seem worthwhile to the human eyes, such as gold, silver, and those gems that people love. All these have been discretely stored, with generosity, in the bosom of the earth as though in royal treasuries. Only then was the human being revealed within the world—to be the beholder of the wonders therein and their lord, who, by enjoying them may make sense of the giver and, through the beauty and majesty of the visible things may grasp the ineffable power of the creator who transcends all intellection. It is for this reason that the human being was introduced last, after the [whole of the] creation, not thrown away to the end like a worthless thing, but as one to whom it belonged by birth to be the king of his subjects.

The passage summarises and redrafts the first two chapters of Genesis, representing the universe—sky and earth—as the kingdom, the royal domain, and the palace, the royal abode, of humanity and its courtiers. That the Nyssen understood here the universe in its entirety is made clear just several paragraphs later, where there are listed the various layers of the creation—"every thing and all things that have been brought into being through the word, namely, ether, stars, the air in between, the sea, the earth, animals, and plants,"[54] together with the one creation whose making was preceded by the divine counsel, namely, the human, sovereign being.[55] In terms of how Gregory synthesised the two scriptural narratives, possibly he has taken the cosmological outlines of Genesis 1 to represent an ecosystemic process which culminated with the paradisal project of Genesis 2; in turn, he must have interpreted the paradise as a royal palace in the light of humankind's sovereignty, which derived both from the Genesis 1 making in the image of God and the Genesis 2 exercise of naming or taming the living beings. In other words, the synthesis of the two narratives within the analogy of the king, the palace, and the royal domain was facilitated by the complementarity of the

[54] τὰ καθ' ἕκαστον πάντα, αἰθὴρ, ἀστέρες, ὁ διὰ μέσου ἀὴρ, θάλαττα, γῆ, ζῶα, φυτὰ, πάντα λόγῳ πρὸς γένεσιν ἄγεται. *Const*. 3 (PG 44, 136.3–5).
[55] *Const*. 3 (PG 44, 133.41–42, 47–50).

scriptural accounts within the one Scripture. There is discernible, likewise, a touch of homeliness, particularly in that for Gregory the sky arched above the heads of the king and his subjects like a roof of a house which welcomed all.[56] This was tantamount to saying that, all hierarchy aside, both ruler and ruled belonged to one God's creation. The anthropocosmic continuum was therefore affirmed once again, albeit not as intensely as elsewhere.

Indeed, the anthropic connections detected elsewhere are no longer obvious within this otherwise beautiful passage. No word here about the recapitulation of the creation in its entirety within the human microcosm or the ontological unity of humankind's natural side and the rest of the creation. It seems that here the earthly ecosystem and the heavenly roof constituted only the backdrop against which the theological journey of humankind was supposed to unfold. True, an anthropic suggestion is still traceable in that all things were made in view of humanity's emergence at some point within the history of the creation. Gregory's focus on the consubstantiality of humankind and the universe, discussed in the foregoing, was replaced here however by a double interest, namely, in the universe's connection with God, and the link between humankind and God. Thus, whereas all things were created for the human being, these "subjects" were serviceable not only in that they secured humankind's livelihood; they were also pointers to God which invited humankind to look up, beyond the visible.[57] Therefore, humankind was not meant to simply enjoy the order and beauty of the cosmos, and make use of everything within it; it was supposed to seek the traces of God's power and wisdom in the infrastructure of that order. That said, despite the weak representation of the anthropocosmic connection within this context, the image of the king, the palace, and the kingdom appears to have played an important role in the economy of the saint's discourse. More specifically, it highlighted the superiority of humankind within the broad array of the cosmos, a consistent concern of the author, and made room for further developments with reference to the inner link between humankind and the universe. In short, by using the analogy of the king, the palace, and the kingdom, the Nyssen brought to further complexity the ontological relation between humankind and the rest of the creation. The cosmos was a dignified home and a meaningful context for a humankind which was supposed to exercise its royalty both in the wise management of

[56] The view of the sky as a roof of the world features also in Theophilus, *To Autolycus* 2.13.8–10 (Grant 46). See a brief reference to this passage in Blowers, *Drama of the Divine Economy* 111.
[57] The matter is emphasised by Theokritoff, *Living in God's Creation* 69.

the house/palace/kingdom and by a capacity to interpret the whole array of the creation as a symbol of the creator.

I must now turn to the views of John Chrysostom, who seems to have rehearsed most of these stances in a creative fashion and whose interpretive commitment to Genesis led to a better articulation of the anthropic principle. Before that, to the question of what kind of anthropic principle would Gregory's worldview illustrate, I would assert that, by and large, that would be the weak formulation of the principle, which establishes a connection between the human existence and the parameters of the universe, with a touch of final anthropism, denoted by the saint's intuition that the arrival of humankind was anticipated by the lower ranks of the universe's ontological hierarchy, ranks whose existence was in turn conditioned by the human event.

John Chrysostom

My analysis focuses on three of Chrysostom's *Homilies on Genesis* (= *Gen*.), the eighth, the ninth, and the tenth, all of which deal chiefly with the topic of humankind's making in the image of God. It is within this context that his iteration of the anthropic analogy of the king and the palace features. For this reason, the Chrysostomian representation of the divine image in the aforementioned homilies must be discussed as a necessary framework for the analogy proper. But, before that, a brief introduction to the text is in order. Currently it is believed that John offered most of the sixty-seven *Homilies on Genesis* during the lenten season of one year.[58] And whereas scholars disagree as to what year that may have been,[59] they concur in that

[58] A. M. Malingrey and S. Zincone, 'Giovanni Crisostomo' in *Nuovo Dizionario Patristico e di Antichità Cristiane F–O,* ed. Angelo Di Berardino, second edn (Genova and Milano: Marietti, 2007) 2216–24 esp. 2220. Robert C. Hill, 'Introduction' to *Saint John Chrysostom: Homilies on Genesis 1–17*, trans. R. C. Hill, The Fathers of the Church 74 (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1999) 1–19 esp. 8.

[59] Stylianos Papadopoulos, Πατρολογία, τόμος Γ' Ὁ πέμπτος αἰώνας *(*Ἀνατολὴ καὶ Δύση*)* (Ἀθήνα: Ἐκδόσεις Γρηγόρη, 2010) 153, located the sermons in 386 and the homilies in 389. The year 388 is ascertained as a date for the publication of the homilies by Malingrey and Zincone, 'Giovanni Crisostomo' 2220. Charles Kannengiesser, *Handbook of Patristic Exegesis: The Bible in Ancient Christianity* (Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2006) 278, suggested 386 for the sermons and 388 for the homilies. In turn, Johannes Quasten, *Patrology*, vol. 3 (Westminster: Christian Classics Inc., 1986) 434, referred to 386 as the year of the homilies' delivery. Otto Bardenhewer, *Patrology*, trans. Thomas J. Shahan (Freiburg im Breisgau and St. Louis, MO: Herder, 1908) 329, placed the homilies and the sermons in 388. Hill, 'Introduction' 5–6, placed the homilies between 385 and 387; at 8 he allowed for the years in Antioch, before 398. Recently, Isabella Sandwell, 'How to Teach Genesis 1.1–19: John Chrysostom and Basil of Caesarea on the Creation of the World' *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 19:4 (2011) 539–64,

the homilies represent a development of the earlier series of nine *Sermons on Genesis*.[60] Relevant to my purposes is the scholarly consensus on the delivery of the homilies in Lent[61]—a consensus based on the evidence of the author's innumerable references to fasting throughout most of this series. The lenten framework may have led him to discern implications of the analogy of interest, which escaped Gregory of Nyssa, such as the import of the ascetically achieved virtue for the construal of human sovereignty.

The divine image as sovereignty

When he addressed, very likely in the footsteps of Philo[62] and Gregory,[63] humankind's making in the image and likeness of God, Chrysostom referred to an aptitude for control, command or sovereignty. Within the ascetic framework of Lent however, he associated this aptitude, interiorised, with the practice of abstinence or restraint which, when properly handled, led to an inner transformation whose outcome was gentleness. The latter, in turn, was the very purpose of Lent. John pointed this out metaphorically in *Gen.* 8.14, "it is for this reason that one undertakes abstinence from food: to bridle the spirited mood of the flesh and so bring the [inner] horse to tameness."[64] So construed, gentleness and tameness were the concrete translation of human sovereignty. But the lenten experience was theologically contextualised and so one's ascetic transformation unfolded between the scriptural termini

---

affirmed, at 540 and 541, n. 4, that the attribution of the homilies to 388 is uncertain, allowing for a late delivery, in Constantinople. Given the discussion of anthropomorphism and the implicit endorsement of the position of the Tall Brothers, exiled from Egypt, in *Homilies on Genesis* 8.6–8, I believe that in their present form the homilies have been either offered or redacted in Constantinople, after 401, when the Tall Brothers sought Chrysostom's protection there. See on this my note, 'Revisiting the Date of Chrysostom's *Homilies on Genesis*' (forthcoming in *The Journal of Theological Studies*).

[60] Walter A. Markowicz, 'Chrysostom's Sermons on Genesis: A Problem' *Theological Studies* 24:4 (1963) 652–64 esp. 654–55. In turn, Kannengiesser, *Handbook of Patristic Exegesis* 784, pointed out that the two series have different objectives. Whereas the sermons focus on Genesis 1–3, the homilies address the entire book of Genesis. Here, Kannengiesser seems to have rehashed the observation of Quasten, *Patrology* 434. See also Hill, 'Introduction' 1, 4–5.

[61] Rosa Hunt, 'Reading Genesis with the Church Fathers: metaphors of creation in John Chrysostom's *Homilies on Genesis*' *Journal of European Baptist Studies* 12:2 (2012) 21–33 esp. 22–23. Sandwell, 'How to Teach Genesis' 540. Hill, 'Introduction' 5, 11. Quasten, *Patrology* 434, acknowledged the lenten framework only for the sermons, not the homilies.

[62] *Creat.* 23.69, 29.88 (Loeb 54, 72).

[63] *Const*. 3 (PG 44, 133.37–54).

[64] See Καὶ γὰρ ἡ τῶν βρωμάτων ἀποχὴ διὰ τοῦτο παρείληπται, ἵνα τὸν τόνον τῆς σαρκὸς χαλινώσῃ, καὶ εὐήνιον ἡμῖν τὸν ἵππον ἐργάσηται. PG 53, 74.25–27. Later, in *Gen*. 9.14, he has shown that Christians were called to keep the wild passions under control and that fasting was an excellent opportunity to do so.

of image and likeness. For instance, in *Gen.* 9.7,[65] Chrysostom noted that "image" corresponded to the divine aptitude of sovereignty (ἀρχή), whereas "likeness" amounted to human beings having to resemble God in virtue and gentleness. In his words,

> Ὥσπερ Εἰκόνα εἶπε τὴν τῆς ἀρχῆς δηλῶν εἰκόνα, οὕτω καὶ Ὁμοίωσιν, ὥστε κατὰ δύναμιν ἀνθρωπίνην ὁμοίους ἡμᾶς γίνεσθαι Θεῷ, κατὰ τὸ ἥμερον λέγω καὶ πρᾷον ἐξομοιοῦσθαι αὐτῷ, καὶ κατὰ τὸν τῆς ἀρετῆς λόγον.[66]
>
> The way 'image' refers to a similar [to God's own] power to rule, 'likeness' is to become like God as much as humanly possible, namely, to be assimilated to God in tameness and gentleness, and in regard to the principle of virtue.

Taken at face value, the excerpt points to a distinction between image and likeness,[67] which translates to a difference regarding their respective contents. More specifically, John associated the call to a remoulding of life with being "like God" rather than "in the image of God." We have seen above that, by contrast, Gregory of Nyssa has consistently interpreted the divine image as the person's potential freedom from the irrationality of the passions, actualised through living the virtuous life. The difference resides in their understanding of image and likeness: whereas in the Nyssen they overlapped, for Chrysostom they suggested a distinction according to which the content of the image, sovereignty, reached concreteness as likeness or by way of an ascetically earned serenity. Apart from this difference, their teachings coincided in that both fathers believed that the divine stamp entailed the human being's call to ascesis and virtue. Furthermore, although at times he stated this indirectly, as one reads in *Gen*. 9.6, discussed below, Chrysostom considered the capacity for sovereignty pertaining to the image an aptitude for ascetic restraint, which was paramount for attaining tameness or gentleness in likeness to God. So understood, his view of image and likeness did not significantly differ from Gregory's. For this reason, it is not unwarranted to present his teaching, simply, as regarding the divine image taken in terms of sovereignty over one's own being—thus gentleness. Until recently, this understanding remained unfamiliar to a modern western reader. Peter Harrison has pointed out that John's construal of sovereignty as human gentleness was diametrically opposite to its modern connotation as a divine

---

[65] For the in-text references I adopt the subdivisions of Hill. When I deal with the original text, I refer, in footnotes, to the columns in PG 53 and the lines in TLG.

[66] PG 53, 78.21–24.

[67] On this distinction, see Pak-Wah Lai, 'The *Imago Dei* and Salvation among the Antiochenes: A Comparison of John Chrysostom with Theodore of Mopsuestia' *Studia Patristica* 67:15 (2013) 393–402 esp. 396.

right to exploit the world.[68] Interested in highlighting this contrast, Harrison passed over in silence any other nuance of sovereignty in John. As we shall see below, gentleness was not the only meaning of sovereignty in *Gen*.

Chrysostom was aware of the difficulties that this interiorised interpretation of sovereignty may have posed to a less able reader of his own time. And so, in *Gen.* 9.7 he discussed the topic by comparing the spiritual sense which refers to mildness and the literal meaning of reigning over the animals. He maintained that just as on earth there lived many animals, of which some remained wild and others were domesticated through human agency, so within the inner recesses of the soul there were wild impulses which strenuous people could tame. In his words, human beings must "control and tame these [wild thoughts and impulses] and subject them to the rule of reason."[69] By pointing out a rapport between the rational and irrational dimensions pertaining to human nature, John was definitely not for the modern dichotomy between reason/mind and nature/body.[70] He returned to the topic several lines below by pointing out that as people subdue lions by taming their soul, they should be able to transform their own wild thinking into gentleness.[71] It is within this context that he bridged the inner and the outer universes by stating that the human being was appointed ruler of both worlds.[72] On this note, I must move to the next step of the analysis, namely, the understanding of the "image of God" as empowerment of the human being to control the environment. Before I move any further, I have to mention however that, possibly because of not speaking to an ascetically minded audience, in attempting to prove the aptitude for inner control from the external achievement of taming nature Chrysostom adopted a different

---

[68] Peter Harrison, 'Having Dominion: Genesis and the Mastery of Nature' in *Environmental Stewardship: Critical Perspectives—Past and Present*, ed. R. J. Berry (London and New York: T & T Clark International, 2006) 17–31 esp. 19–20.

[69] PG 53, 78.26–31. The text reads, Ὥσπερ γὰρ ἐν τῇ πλατείᾳ ταύτῃ γῇ καὶ εὐρυχώρῳ τῶν ζώων τὰ μέν ἐστιν ἡμερώτερα, τὰ δὲ θηριωδέστερα, οὕτω καὶ ἐν τῷ πλάτει τῆς ψυχῆς τῆς ἡμετέρας τῶν λογισμῶν οἱ μέν εἰσιν ἀλογώτεροι καὶ κτηνώδεις, οἱ δὲ θηριωδέστεροι καὶ ἀγριώτεροι. Here, John displayed an adherence to Platonic anthropology and ethics. For Chrysostom's Platonic likings, see Constantine Bosinis, 'Two Platonic Images in the Rhetoric of John Chrysostom: 'The Wings of Love' and 'the Charioteer of the Soul'' *Studia Patristica* 41 (2006) 433–38.

[70] For a very useful radiography of this modern dichotomy in modern culture, beginning with Descartes and Kant, see Perl, 'The Analogy of Personhood' 144–45.

[71] See Λεόντων περιγινόμεθα, καὶ τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν ἠμεροῦμεν, καὶ ἀμφιβάλλεις εἰ λογισμοῦ θηριωδίαν πρὸς ἡμερότητα μεταβαλεῖν δυνήσῃ. PG 53, 78.34–36.

[72] It is very likely that at this juncture Chrysostom paraphrased for his, presumably, less philosophically inclined reader the better known paragraph in *Oration* 38.11 of Gregory the Theologian, mentioned above, which presents the human being as a mixed world within whose being converge the two aspects of created reality, the intelligible and the sensible.

strategy from that of the monastic milieus of the time. For the latter, one could tame the environment only after taming one's own nature.[73]

The divine image as overlordship

In *Gen*. 9.6, John reiterated the conclusions of his previous homily, namely, that the scriptural phrase "in the image" does not mean a divine form (see κατὰ τὴν τῆς μορφῆς εἰκόνα) and that it refers to a likeness to God in relation to the principle of, or capacity to, command (see κατὰ τὸν τῆς ἀρχῆς λόγον), as clarified by the postscript, "so that they rule over the fish of the sea" etc. (Genesis 1:26).[74] Here, sovereignty no longer refers to abstinence and its outcome, gentleness; it signifies overlordship. Several paragraphs later, in *Gen*. 9.8 (and more detailed in *Gen*. 14.19–21 and 15.4–5), he affirmed that the naming of the animals in Genesis 2:18–20 proved that human authority was real, being analogous to the naming of the slaves by their masters. Later still, in *Gen*. 10.7, he asserted that the second reference to the capacity of ruling over the animal kingdom, in Genesis 1:28, confirmed that this was indeed the content of the divine image and humanity's call. What matters is the conclusion, drawn in *Gen*. 10.8, that the author of the creation narrative "used the term 'image' to signify that [humankind] has control and that all beings that are made are its subjects."[75] This conclusion was redrafted several paragraphs later, in *Gen*. 10.9, where being "in the image" marked the specific difference between humankind and animals: whilst they shared in the biological imperative to increase and multiply, it was humankind, not the animals, that was blessed with authority and control.

One may wonder why the saint returned time and again to the theme of human overlordship. The reason transpires in his reference, in *Gen*. 9.7, to the criticism levelled at Scripture by some who maintained the opposite

---

[73] See Doru Costache, 'Adam's Holiness in the Alexandrine and Athonite Traditions' in *Alexandrian Legacy: A Critical Appraisal*, ed. D. Costache, P. Kariatlis, and M. Baghos (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2015) 322–68 esp. 337–39. Idem, 'John Moschus on Asceticism and the Environment' *Colloquium* 48:1 (2016) 21–34. The ascetic tradition offers therefore the solution to the "*ontological revolution*" demanded by Perl. Perl, 'The Analogy of Personhood' 162–63.

[74] PG 53, 78.2–7. Theodoret borrowed the approach of Chrysostom. See *Questions on Genesis* (= *Qu.Gen.*) 20.44–50 in *Theodoret of Cyrus: The Questions on the Octateuch*, vol. 1: *On Genesis and Exodus*, Greek text revised by John E. Petruccione, English trans. with intro. and commentary by Robert C. Hill, The Library of Early Christianity 1 (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 2007) 52. Whereas Theodoret appears to have approached Genesis 1 in the footsteps of Chrysostom, in what follows I shall point out, when necessary, what he added to the teaching of his master. That said, I shall not allocate special space for him because he did not refer to the analogy of the king and the palace.

[75] …ὅτι κατὰ τὸ ἄρχειν καὶ ὑποτεταγμένα ἔχειν ἅπαντα τὰ δημιουργήματα, κατὰ τοῦτο τῷ τῆς εἰκόνος ὀνόματι ἐχρήσατο. PG 53, 85.53–55.

view, namely, that it was humankind which, because it had no power over the animals, feared them. John's unusual identification of the "image" with the capacity to rule was therefore, like in Gregory of Nyssa, conditioned by challenges pertaining to the immediate context.

The theoretical articulation of the divine image as a capacity to rule, command or control the animals—and indeed "everything on earth" (*Gen*. 8.9)[76]—was not the only way in which Chrysostom counteracted the above criticism. He offered, likewise, an indirect confirmation of human overlordship by addressing the ramifications of sin. For him, as iterated, for instance, in *Gen*. 9.10, whereas human rule was a divine given, it was sin that overturned the order of things. More precisely, it was sin that caused the loss of "both esteem and authority"[77] for humankind, leading to its fear of animals. This was a well rehearsed stance in the ascetic literature.[78] John qualified sin further, in *Gen*. 10.7, by stating that it consisted in disobedience to God.[79] Possibly echoing Theophilus' *To Autolycus* 2.17,[80] already in *Gen*. 9.8 he seems to have suggested that the reversal experienced in the rapports between humankind and the animals illustrated a *tantum-quantum* principle. The animals obeyed people as long as humankind remained obedient to God, but have become disobedient to humankind because humankind disobeyed God. Walter Markowicz has shown that this Chrysostomian stance was soon after referred to by Augustine.[81] It has been likewise rehearsed by Theodoret.[82] Human conduct had therefore an impact on the environment, particularly animal behaviour. Even so, continued John, neither the loss of command on the part of humankind nor the corresponding disobedience of the animals

---

[76] PG 53, 72.58. πάντων τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἄρχοντα.

[77] PG 53, 79.26. καὶ τὰ τῆς τιμῆς, καὶ τὰ τῆς ἐξουσίας. Lai, 'The *Imago Dei*' 401.

[78] Costache, 'Adam's Holiness' 339–40. Idem, 'John Moschus' 28–31. Robert M. Grant, *Early Christians and Animals* (London: Routledge, 1999) 17–19, 20, 167. Theodoret has adopted the same stance, very likely borrowing from Chrysostom. For instance, in *Qu.Gen.* 18.17–18 he stated that the lions did not touch prophet Daniel in the pit due to seeing in him "the deiform mark of the divine image" (Petruccione 40). In turn, in *Qu.Gen.* 18.22–23 he maintained that "we fear the wild beasts because of our lacking in the practice of the virtues" (Petruccione 40).

[79] PG 53, 84.42. διὰ τὴν τῆς παρακοῆς ἁμαρτίαν.

[80] For Theophilus, the animals have not been made dangerous, evil. They have become so because of human sin—"they disobeyed together with the disobedient human being" (τοῦ γὰρ ἀνθρώπου παραβάντος καὶ αὐτὰ συμπαρέβη). "Similarly, should the human being revert to its natural state of not doing evil, [animals] will be restored to their original tameness" (ὀπόταν οὖν πάλιν ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἀναδράμῃ είς τὸ κατὰ φύσιν μηκέτι κακοποιῶν, κάκεῖνα ἀποκατασταθήσεται είς τὴν ἀρχῆθεν ἡμερότητα). *To Autolycus* 2.17.14–23 (Grant 54). The idea was rehearsed by Theodoret, *Qu.Gen.* 18.69–72 (Petruccione 42–44).

[81] See Markowicz, 'Chrysostom's Sermons' 652–53, referring to Augustine's *Contra Iulianum Pelagianum* 1.25 (PL 44, 657).

[82] See *Qu.Gen.* 18.67–69 (Petruccione 42).

were total and definitive. Being kind, we read in *Gen*. 9.11, God maintained in subjection to humankind the more serviceable animals, whilst allowing the rest to manifest their opposition to the fallen human race. We retain the anthropic overtones of this negative account, namely, the fact that human behaviour has an impact on at least parts of the creation, such as the 'psyche' of wild animals.

John's approach was not without problems. It seems that, by pointing to human sin as causing the animal rebellion, Chrysostom contradicted his own views espoused in *On the Providence of God.* According to Christopher Hall, in the latter work and faithful to the Genesis narrative of creation, John maintained that God has made from the outset wild and tame animals.[83] But the tension is only on the surface. Like in *On the Providence of God*, in *Gen*. 10.12 John has shown that God made "very good" both tame animals and the wild ones, as well as helpful and dangerous natural phenomena etc. It is this balance in nature that is "good."[84] The two Chrysostomian works agree in that both refer to wild animals as made so by God, before humankind disobeyed. The tension remains therefore between *Gen*. 10.12, which takes the wild side of the creation as divinely given, and such passages as those in *Gen*. 9.8 and 9.11, referred to above, for which the fall is what diminished humankind's rule over the wild parts of the animal kingdom. The saint did not acknowledge this tension. It is likely that he represented the situation, coherently, in terms of the natural wildness of certain animals having become dangerous to, and partially uncontrolled by, humankind because of the fall. Thus, despite the evidence that pointed to the contrary, he taught that wildness should not have been taken as either naturally threatening or totally dangerous to human beings. It was ignorance that made people suspect that God has not created a "good" world for the human beings to rule. Chrysostom actually showed, in *Gen*. 10.13, that the people of his time failed to grasp the divine purpose concerning the things which they construed as dangerous—the way they ignored the existence of a balance in nature. Hall commented that by reporting on people's ignorance Chrysostom suggested a way to clarify how the wild aspects of nature can be good. More precisely, he has shown that

[83] Christopher A. Hall, 'Nature Wild & Tame in St. John Chrysostom's *On the Providence of God*' in *Ancient & Postmodern Christianity: Paleo-Orthodoxy in the 21st Century—Essays in Honor of Thomas C. Oden*, ed. Kenneth Tanner and Christopher A. Hall (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2002) 23–37 esp. 31–32, pointed out that in *On the Providence of God* Chrysostom stated realistically that God's creation contained light and darkness, wild and tamed animals, even before the fall. "Nature in its pre-Fall state demonstrates a wildness that God considers good, an untamed face that can be dangerous."

[84] Hall, 'Nature Wild & Tame' 29.

for John things wrongly seen as useless or dangerous were ultimately, due to the divine layout of the creation, useful and good.[85] Ignorance veiled the fact that although not perceived as such, the wild and dangerous aspects of the creation were neither pointless nor outside human rule. The saint kept repeating that the whole of nature was created for humankind. It is within this context that the analogy of the king and the palace came into play. But before I turn to the relevant passages, consideration should be given to its anthropic setting.

Anthropic perspectives

Human sovereignty and its exercise as overlordship or control are possible not only given humankind's configuration in the image of God; they are likewise facilitated by God's design of the creation, particularly the anthropic conditioning of the earth's ecosystem and the universe as a whole. The saint has repeatedly affirmed that God made the earth and the broader cosmic array for the benefit of humankind. For instance, in *Gen*. 9.4 he offered, lyrically, that the earth…

> ἐπειδὴ αὕτη καὶ μήτηρ καὶ τροφὸς ἡμῖν γεγένηται, καὶ ἐξ αὐτῆς καὶ τρεφόμεθα, καὶ πάντων τῶν ἄλλων ἀπολαύομεν, καὶ πρὸς αὐτὴν πάλιν ἐπάνιμεν· αὕτη γὰρ ἡμῖν καὶ πατρὶς καὶ τάφος ἐστίν·[86]
>
> has become mother and nurse for us. It is from it that we receive nourishment and find enjoyment in all other things, and to it we shall return, since for us it is both homeland and tomb.

Chrysostom represented humankind as profoundly intimate with the earth and all that it contained, from the geographical features of the ecosystem

---

[85] Hall, 'Nature Wild & Tame' 32. Although he approached the matter from a slightly different angle, Theodoret must have borrowed once again from Chrysostom his appraisal of the creation as useful to human beings. Thus, *Qu.Gen.* 10 (Petruccione 26) stated that Genesis repeats the divine assessment of the creation as "good" to prevent "the ungrateful" from doubting the goodness of the universe. In turn, *Qu.Gen.* 13 (Petruccione 32–34) dismissed the question that there are useless plants by pointing out that some of the supposed inedible ones were food for certain animals and that the latter were useful to human beings; thus, indirectly such plants were useful to humankind. Nevertheless, such plants were useful in other ways, for instance for medicinal purposes. Either way, there were no useless plants and, once again, the anthropic principle was satisfied. Theodoret rehearsed the same argument with reference to the usefulness of the wild beasts, whose various parts were employed for obtaining healing substances. See *Qu.Gen.* 18.36–38 (Petruccione 40). Further down in the same chapter, Theodoret has shown that there was an ambivalence in nature, pertaining to elements that can both do good and cause to humankind, such as water and fire; however, all things were ultimately useful within the overall functionality of the creation. *Qu.Gen.* 18.52–66 (Petruccione 42).

[86] PG 53, 77.26–30.

to the biosphere. The earth was humanity's womb and tomb—the two extremities of our transition—and nothing on earth was foreign, pointless or dangerous. Here, once again, John assured the audience that God's creation was there for humanity's use and enjoyment. The sense of belonging with the earthly ecosystem is the dominant note of the sentence (see the phrases μήτηρ καὶ τροφός and πατρὶς καὶ τάφος), but one can discern a more profound message. Given that the world was designed to be our abode, made for us, it was anthropically conditioned, as iterated by the phrase ἡμῖν γεγένηται. The latter nuance is more emphatic in a passage from *Gen*. 8.4, which incidentally connects the anthropic condition of nature and the hierarchical status of humankind, its uniqueness within the natural environment, which includes the earth's ecosystem and the cosmos as a whole. In John's words,

> Τὸ γὰρ τιμιώτερον ἁπάντων τῶν ὁρωμένων ζώων ἐστὶν ὁ ἄνθρωπος, δι' ὃν καὶ ταῦτα ἅπαντα παρήχθη, οὐρανὸς, γῆ, θάλαττα, ἥλιος, σελήνη, ἀστέρες, τὰ ἑρπετὰ, τὰ κτήνη, πάντα τὰ ἄλογα ζῶα.[87]
>
> Worthier than all of the visible living beings is the human being, for whom all these [other beings] have been brought about—sky, earth, the sea, the sun, the moon, the stars, the reptiles, domestic animals, and all the unreasoning animals.

Alongside the very hylozoist standpoint, namely, that all that exists in the universe is animated (see ἁπάντων τῶν ὁρωμένων ζώων and the ensuing list of beings that belong in this category),[88] Chrysostom introduced here two main ideas. First, in stating that the human being was τιμιώτερον ἁπάντων, "worthier" or "more honourable than all," he affirmed, along the lines of the Nyssen's hierarchical ontology,[89] the superiority of our race to the universe in its entirety. The statement rehashes the theme of humankind's sovereignty and lends it even more force. Second, in saying δι' ὃν καὶ ταῦτα ἅπαντα παρήχθη, "for whom all of the other [creations] are brought into existence," he pointed out that this whole array of beings existed *for* humankind and was therefore—albeit in a weak or minimal sense—teleologically and anthropically conditioned. This is a teaching which Chrysostom shared with the same bishop of Nyssa[90] and also his Antiochene colleague, Theodore of

[87] PG 53, 71.15–19. The passage summarise the universe contemplated by Chrysostom, which included life. For a summary of his worldview in *Gen*., see Nicolaidis, *Science and Eastern Orthodoxy* 25–26.

[88] The phrase echoes the Nyssen's different kinds of soul recapitulated within the human being. *Const*. 8 (PG 44, 145.31–33).

[89] See my notes above on *Const*. 16 (PG 44, 180.8–15).

[90] See my comments above on *Const*. 8 (PG 44, 144.36–49).

Mopsuestia.[91] I qualify the anthropic conditioning of the universe as minimal because here the saint referred to the purposefulness of the creation or rather its usefulness to humankind,[92] but not to an impact of the human being on the matrix of reality. Obviously, the two ideas iterated in this excerpt recapitulate all that we have discovered so far in Chrysostom, namely, that the human being was endowed with a special power and ranked the highest within the order of things created, and that the cosmos—including the tame and wild animals on earth—was designed to serve humankind.[93] In so doing, the above passage offers an indirect solution to the foregoing tension in the Chrysostomian musings on human rule and the existence of wild animals.

Very significant is that right after the above passage, in *Gen*. 8.5, John undertook to preempt the objection that since this supposed superior being, our very species, was created after all the others,[94] his earlier statements on humankind's dignity could not stand. It is at this juncture that he introduced his version of the analogy of the king, the procession, the palace, and the city. Here is the text:

> Καθάπερ γὰρ βασιλέως μέλλοντος εἰς πόλιν εἰσελαύνειν, τοὺς δορυφόρους ἀνάγκη προηγεῖσθαι, καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ἅπαντας, ἵνα εὐτρεπισμένων τῶν βασιλείων, οὕτως ὁ βασιλεὺς εἰς τὰ βασίλεια παραγίνηται· τὸν αὐτὸν δὴ τρόπον καὶ νῦν, καθάπερ βασιλέα τινὰ καὶ ἄρχοντα μέλλων ἐφιστᾷν πᾶσι τοῖς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, πᾶσαν ταύτην τὴν διακόσμησιν πρότερον ἑτεκτήνατο, καὶ τότε τὸν μέλλοντα ἐφίστασθαι παρήγαγε, δεικνὺς ἡμῖν δι' αὐτῶν τῶν πραγμάτων ὅσον τιμᾶται τουτὶ τὸ ζῶον.[95]

---

[91] Nellas referred to Theodoret's *On Genesis* 20, where can be found a passage from Theodore of Mopsuestia on the same analogy (see PG 80, 109B). "Last in order, He brought forth man in His own image, as if the whole of creation were to appear to have been put together for the use of man" (*Deification in Christ* 26 n. 21).

[92] Hall, 'Nature Wild & Tame' 35–36, noted that this conviction pervades the Chrysostomian corpus.

[93] This conclusion coincides with the message of *On the Providence of God*. See Hall, 'Nature Wild & Tame' 31–33.

[94] PG 53, 71.19–20. Echoes from Philo's *Creat*. 25.77–29.88 and Gregory of Nyssa's *Const*. 2 (PG 44, 132.37–133.33) are distinct here.

[95] PG 53, 71.21–29. Theodoret referred to a version of this representation of all the layers of creation as converging toward the human being, its ruler in the image of God, but he did not favour royal imagery. See *Qu.Gen.* 20.29–37 (Petruccione 50). It is likely that here Theodoret combined the Chrysostomian anthropic procession of the universe with Gregory the Theologian's outline of the converging aspects of the creation within the composite human microcosm. See *Oration* 38.11. However, Gregory spoke of the noetic, not angelic, aspect of the creation. Both terms, noetic and angelic, are missing from Chrysostom's rendition, which refers primarily to the visible cosmos.

> Think of a king who is about to enter a city, who is necessarily preceded by spearmen and all the other [courtiers appointed] to ready the royal palace [for his arrival]. Only then [i.e. when all is ready] does the king approach the palace. In our case, likewise, the whole order [of the universe] has been founded before this king and ruler of sorts [i.e. the human being] was about to be installed [as master of] the entire earth. Then [i.e. after the making of the cosmos] was the established [overlord] meant to be introduced. Through [all] these deeds is made known to us how honoured is this [last created] animal.

Possibly drawing on Philo and Gregory, whom he has not quoted, Chrysostom's analogy abridges the narrative of creation, its very sequence, by suggestively likening the making of the universe to a royal procession. In so doing, John reiterated a customary image of humankind as culmination of the entire work of creation, but with a particular twist. In accord with the passages earlier discussed, the human race was not only the crown of the creative process—it was the appointed ruler of the universe or, according to Robert Hill's note on another passage, a deputy deity entrusted with a responsibility for God's creation.[96] Indeed, this "king and ruler of sorts," humankind, was divinely mandated, noted Chrysostom later, in *Gen*. 14.9, to till the garden and watch over it, and so acknowledge its own master, God. That said, the analogy of the king, the procession, and the palace fits well in the overall schema of homilies 8–10, specifically the representation of the divine image in terms of human sovereignty in passages such as *Gen*. 8.4, 8.9, 9.6, 9.8, and 10.9. The consistency of the analogy with its context is not jeopardised even when, by ignoring the aspect of self-mastery, the image offered here does not do justice to the complex understanding of sovereignty in Chrysostom. Of immediate interest is that, similar to what we have found in Philo and Gregory, the analogy renders truthfully the notion of humankind being destined to rule over the creation, together with our race's uniqueness and dignity.

Interesting as an illustration of the Chrysostomian worldview, the analogy suggests a universe conditioned to facilitate human flourishing[97]—a task which the creation as a whole fulfilled in subjection to humankind. One

---

[96] See *Homilies on Genesis* 110 n. 13. See also his comment on Theodoret, *Qu.Gen.* 20 at 53 n. 5.

[97] According to Hall, 'Nature Wild & Tame' 32, throughout his *Homilies on Genesis* Chrysostom referred to a holistic flourishing. In his words, "God has created the world that is most appropriate for the spiritual and material well-being of humanity." He returned to this matter at 33, but in relation to another Chrysostomian work, *Homilies on the Statues* 10. In his words, "Creation's goodness then is a functional goodness, one that reflects God's infinite love for humanity and God's desire to create an environment purposely designed to nurture a human being's awareness of and love for God. The natural world is given to humanity as a gift, filled with grace, in the sense that it is the ideal natural environment for human beings as created in the image of God to grow, develop and exercise the responsibilities given to them by God." This appraisal is equally relevant for *Gen*.

should not rush, however, to take the universe's subjection as denoting a divinely prescribed, ruthless human dominion of the world. Harrison has shown that, as much as Genesis remains free of its modern, anthropocentric and exploitative, interpretations, in approaching the narrative of creation Chrysostom and other early Christian theologians have never asserted the right of our species to selfishly take advantage of the environment.[98] Never has the ecclesial tradition encouraged a behaviour that justified George Orwell's characterisation, "Man serves the interests of no creature except himself."[99] One should consider the Chrysostomian loci on human sovereignty, including the analogy of interest, together with the passages that address the rapports between humankind and the cosmos in a more nuanced fashion—particularly those which allow the interpretation of royal dignity as the virtue of gentleness, ascetically achieved. Like in the previously analysed excerpt, from *Gen*. 9.4, the universe was here humankind's abode, and since its supreme inhabitant was a king, the home was royal, too, much like the city wherein the palace was built. Granted, the sense of familiarity between humankind and the earth, of *Gen*. 9.4, does not appear in the analogy under consideration. But even so, the latter suggests a respectful perception of the world—likened to a royal palace and a capital city—in which the king and its retinue—"sky, earth, the sea, the sun, the moon, the stars, the reptiles, domestic animals, and all the unreasoning animals" of *Gen*. 8.4—shared in the dignity of the ruler, albeit, one may assume, in various degrees. The very image of a royal procession towards the palace alludes to a hierarchical structure of that kingdom, God's creation, without establishing, however, a list of things of which some matter more and others less. Since the world was a royal palace and a capital city, everything within it shared in the royal condition. And whereas the same can be said about Gregory of Nyssa's corresponding analogy—which, we have seen, included together with the king and his palace, the royal domain or the kingdom—John's deployment of the image of a royal procession emphasised both the notion of a hierarchical universe and that the entire order of creation participated in one royal procession.

To summarise, within his construal of the divine image the saint highlighted the aspect of human dignity or sovereignty. Whilst at times sovereignty meant for him moderation or self-control, throughout the relevant homilies

---

[98] Harrison, 'Having Dominion' 18–20. This point corrects the accepted view that affirming human uniqueness amounts to supporting the selfish use of the environment—an understanding present even in the thought of scholars who oppose the legitimacy of this conclusion. Perl, 'The Analogy of Personhood' 146.

[99] George Orwell, *Animal Farm: A Fairy Story* in the complete and unabridged edition of Orwell's novels (London: Seeker & Warburg/Octopus, 1976) 15.

he discussed human dignity in its ecosystemic exercise, namely, as rule over God's creation. Even when he has not connected the two meanings explicitly, such as in the royal analogy, the context of the analysed homilies demands that this connection is understood. He offered, however, a complex depiction of the rapports between ruler and ruled, enriched with endearing nuances—such as the acknowledgment of the earth as mother, nurse, and tomb for the human race. But his universe was not totally comprehended by humankind, as revealed by the earthly ecosystem, where, all around human beings, unfolded phenomena which they did not understand. Some aspects of nature were endowed with destructive force and a whole array of wildlife remained outside of human control. Having to grapple with such issues, Chrysostom pointed out that the unexplained and uncontrolled phenomena challenged neither God's goodness nor the goodness of the world nor humankind's sovereignty over the creation. What people may have construed as dangerous was just another aspect of the natural world which they did not comprehend. In fact, such phenomena were no less designed by the creator to serve—in various ways—the wellbeing of humankind. All things had therefore a use and a purpose. That said, and echoing Theophilus, Chrysostom maintained that the existence of wild, untamed species on earth was largely the outcome of human disobedience, since things in nature, particularly animals, were affected by human misbehaviour. One may legitimately surmise that had humankind progressed in gentleness and the understanding of nature, increasingly more things and beings would have become its royal subjects. A modern reader may take this as resonating with the anthropic conditioning of the universe. Furthermore, most of the above facets of the Chrysostomian worldview—from the affirmation of human sovereignty to the anthropic conditioning of God's creation—seem to have been bridged within the analogy of the king, the procession, the palace, and the city. Although John, like Philo and Gregory, employed this analogy for a narrower purpose, namely, to explain why humankind was created after the other beings, the image of the creation's royal procession appears to have built against the backdrop of an anthropic worldview. In the foregoing we have discovered that this analogy affirmed the unity of created nature as a kingly palace and city where there was room for the entire royal procession, namely, everything within the universe, the human race being pictured as reigning over a royal domain. Assessed from the viewpoint of contemporary game theory, this worldview was not about two or more competing parties interested in defeating each other, illustrated by Orwell's *Animal Farm*; it was

about a world whose participants were engaged in a non-zero-sum game,[100] where all were either winners or losers.

Was this an anthropic depiction of reality? Definitely, yes. But what kind of anthropic worldview did Chrysostom observe? I would contend that, overall, his worldview satisfied the criteria of the weak anthropic principle, which affirms a connection between humankind and the cosmic array. That said, Chrysostom's representation of human overlordship as affecting the creation both negatively, in that it stirred the wildness of some beings, and positively, in that its presence made the whole of the creation a royal palace, suggests a modified version of the final anthropic principle. For him, it was not by way of technology only that humankind transformed the universe.[101] It achieved that goal by the spin, to use a quantum metaphor, or the quality of its presence in the world. The way a disobedient humanity, which signified an inner universe of confusion and disarray, stirred the wildlife to increase its wildness, an ascetically-tamed humankind made the whole of the universe a structured, meaningful, and worthwhile royal abode.

Conclusion

The early Christian authors whose relevant works have been reviewed above, particularly Gregory of Nyssa and John Chrysostom, but also Theophilus of Antioch, Nemesius of Emesa, and Theodoret of Cyrus, shared with Philo a perception of God's creation that was both comprehensive and hierarchically organised. None of these authors had any doubt that humanity represented the apogee of God's creation, made in God's image and likeness, yet none of them ventured to assert that the uniqueness of our species came together with a selfish right to exploit the animals, the earth's ecosystem, and the cosmos which was made for us and over which we have been divinely appointed to rule. The situation they addressed was not a case of hypocritical egalitarianism misused for oligarchic purposes through acquisition of power, like in the Orwellian narrative universe.[102] For all these early Christian authors,

[100] See Robert Wright, *Nonzero: The Logic of Human Destiny* (New York: Vintage Books, 2001) 5, 252–57.

[101] Theodoret, in turn, praised human creativity, including manufacturing, as part and parcel of our resembling God. In his words, "even creating in this fashion [out of other things and with toil], the human being imitates the creator to some extent, like an image its archetype" (ἀλλὰ καὶ οὕτω δημιουργῶν ὁ ἄνθρωπος, μιμεῖται ἀμῆ γέ πῃ τὸν ποιητήν, ὡς εἰκὼν τὸ ἀρχέτυπον). *Qu.Gen.* 20.66–67 (Petruccione 52).

[102] See the famous slogan in *Animal Farm* 63, "All animals are equal but some animals are more equal than others," which corresponds to the fictional underground manifesto bearing the

sovereignty and overlordship had to be exercised only as an externalisation of the inner achievements of serenity, moderation, and dispassion. Virtue, therefore, was the true measure of human dignity and ecosystemic agency. It is in this light that the hierarchical views of these authors and particularly the analogy of the king or the master of a household, signifying humankind, should be assessed. The early Christian authors mentioned above have not upheld anthropocentric views even when they proclaimed the uniqueness, superiority, and overlordship of our race. Their respective musings have highlighted how humanity was supposed to exercise rule in fellowship with the other parts of God's creation. Above all, the Chrysostomian imagery of the kingly procession made obvious that the cosmos as a whole and all its components participated in the royal condition of God's creation. This participation was variously addressed by these authors—as solidarity between humankind and the cosmic house seen as maternal womb, shelter, and tomb; ontological continuity between human nature and the other strands of being, animal, vegetal, and mineral; reciprocity between human and animal behaviours. All these indicate an ecological awareness, more, a cosmic mindset. That said, these authors have not facilely levelled the various strands of being. They have consistently operated within a hierarchical framework where solidarity, functionality, and cooperation did not rule out axiology. And although their qualitative approach may not withstand the quantitative scale of the contemporary scientific method, these authors have nevertheless sketched the contours of a worldview that in many respects anticipated the anthropic cosmological principle. More specifically, they pointed out the ontological solidarity between humankind and the universe, the structure of nature conditioned to support and nurture the existence of our race, and the impact of human presence and activity upon living things, the earthly ecosystem, and the cosmos. In so doing, they have made obvious the encompassing and nuanced character of the Christian worldview, which, theologically grounded, articulated the anthropocosmic continuum and thus precluded the division of the fields, namely, anthropology and cosmology, largely responsible for issues of our civilisation such as anthropocentrism and the senseless exploitation of nature. It would be remiss of us to continue ignoring the contributions of Gregory, John, and their traditional confrères to the formation of an early Christian worldview that can still inspire.

implausible title, 'The Theory and Practice of Oligarchical Collectivism' of Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (London: Seeker & Warburg/Octopus, 1976) 853.

Select Bibliography

Barrow, John D. and Frank J. Tipler. *The Anthropic Cosmological Principle*. Oxford and New York: Clarendon Press and Oxford University Press, 1986.

Blowers, Paul M. *Drama of the Divine Economy: Creator and Creation in Early Christian Theology and Piety*, Oxford Early Christian Studies. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Boersma, Hans. *Embodiment and Virtue in Gregory of Nyssa: An Anagogical Approach*, The Oxford Early Christian Studies. Oxford University Press, 2013.

Costache, Doru and Philip Kariatlis (eds). *Cappadocian Legacy: A Critical Appraisal*. Sydney: St Andrew's Orthodox Press, 2013.

Costache, Doru. 'Meaningful Cosmos: Logos and Nature in Clement the Alexandrian's *Exhortation to the Gentiles*.' *Phronema* 28:2 (2013) 107–30.

Hall, Christopher A. 'Nature Wild & Tame in St. John Chrysostom's *On the Providence of God*.' In Kenneth Tanner and Christopher A. Hall (eds). *Ancient & Postmodern Christianity: Paleo-Orthodoxy in the 21st Century—Essays in Honor of Thomas C. Oden*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2002: 23–37.

Harrison, Peter. 'Having Dominion: Genesis and the Mastery of Nature.' In R. J. Berry (ed.). *Environmental Stewardship: Critical Perspectives—Past and Present*. London and New York: T & T Clark International, 2006: 17–31.

Hunt, Rosa. 'Reading Genesis with the Church Fathers: metaphors of creation in John Chrysostom's *Homilies on Genesis*.' *Journal of European Baptist Studies* 12:2 (2012) 21–33.

Ludlow, Morwenna. *Gregory of Nyssa, Ancient and (Post)modern*. Oxford University Press, 2007.

Mar Gregorios, Paulos. *Cosmic Man—The Divine Presence: The Theology of St. Gregory of Nyssa*. New York: Paragon House, 1988.

Markowicz, Walter A. 'Chrysostom's Sermons on Genesis: A Problem.' *Theological Studies* 24:4 (1963) 652–64.

Mateo-Seco, Lucas Francisco and Giulio Maspero, eds. *The Brill Dictionary of Gregory of Nyssa*. Revised and expanded English edition, translated by Seth Cherney. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

Nicolaidis, Efthymios. *Science and Eastern Orthodoxy: From the Greek Fathers to the Age of Globalization*. Translated by S. Emanuel. Baltimore, 2011.

Lai, Pak-Wah. 'The *Imago Dei* and Salvation among the Antiochenes: A Comparison of John Chrysostom with Theodore of Mopsuestia.' *Studia Patristica* 67:15 (2013) 393–402.

Zachhuber, Johannes. *Human Nature in Gregory of Nyssa: Philosophical Background and Theological Significance.* Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2014.

Index

Contributors

Pauline Allen studied in Australia, UK, and Belgium before teaching at the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam and subsequently at Australian Catholic University, where she became the foundation director of the Centre for Early Christian Studies. She is a Fellow of the Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung and of the Australian Academy of the Humanities. In 2016 she was elected Corresponding Fellow of the British Academy. She is also a Research Fellow in the Department of Ancient Languages at the University of Pretoria and at the Sydney College of Divinity. Her publications include *Maximus the Confessor and His Companions* (with Bronwen Neil) OECT 2002, and *Sophronius of Jerusalem and Seventh-Century Heresy: The* Synodical Letter *and Other Documents*, OECT 2009. Her most recent translation of Chrysostom is *John Chrysostom: Homilies on Philippians* (Atlanta, 2013). She and Nathalie Rambault have in press with Sources Chrétiennes their first volume of John Chrysostom's martyr homilies.

Daniel Anlezark is Associate Professor in the English Department at the University of Sydney, and has also taught at the University of Oxford, Trinity College Dublin, and Durham University. His research interests include the vernacular and Latin literature of early medieval England, especially Old English biblical poetry in its social contexts, and religious writing for women. He also investigates the relationship between literature and science in the early Middle Ages, a project funded by an Australian Research Council Future Fellowship. A common objective of his research and publications is to overcome the limits imposed on our understanding of the past by disciplinary boundaries.

Chris Baghos is a founder of The Australian Institute for Orthodox Christian Studies and a PhD candidate at the University of Sydney. His current thesis explores the consistencies between the Byzantine and Insular Christian traditions from the fourth to tenth centuries, as reflected in hagiographies. In 2017 he obtained a Master of Arts with a specialisation in Theological Studies from the Sydney College of Divinity. He also received a Master of Arts (Research), which consisted in a thesis on 'Christian Identity, Hellenism, and *Romanitas* in the *Relatio motionis* and Its Patristic Antecedents,' from Sydney University in 2016.

Mario Baghos is a founder of The Australian Institute for Orthodox Christian Studies and holds a PhD in Studies in Religion from the University of Sydney. He is Adjunct Senior Lecturer in the School of Philosophy and Theology at the University of Notre Dame, Australia. His research interests—on which he has published many chapters and articles—include patristic eschatology and apocalypticism, the profiles of Christian saints, and the symbolic art and architecture of the city of Constantinople. His forthcoming book, entitled *The Founding of Constantinople as an Image and Centre of the World*, is to be published by AIOCS Press, of which he is the Director.

Adam G. Cooper is Associate Professor of Theology and Permanent Fellow at the John Paul II Institute in Melbourne. He holds a PhD from the University of Durham and an STD from the Pontifical John Paul II Institute, Rome. His books include *The Body in Saint Maximus the Confessor: Holy Flesh, Wholly Deified* (2005) and *Holy Eros: A Liturgical Theology of the Body* (2014).

Doru Costache (ThD, Bucharest) is a founder of The Australian Institute for Orthodox Christian Studies and Senior Lecturer in Patristic Studies at St Cyril's Coptic Orthodox Theological College, Sydney. He is Adjunct Senior Lecturer in the School of Philosophy and Theology at the University of Notre Dame, Australia, and Honorary Associate of the Department of Studies in Religion, the University of Sydney. He lectured in patristics and theology at various Romanian universities. He lectured in patristics at St Andrew's Greek Orthodox Theological College, Sydney. Participant in project Science and Orthodoxy around the World, Athens. Co-author of *Dreams, Virtue and Divine Knowledge in Early Christian Egypt* (forthcoming).

Pak-Wah Lai is Vice-Principal and Lecturer in Church History and Historical Theology at the Biblical Graduate School of Theology (BGST) in Singapore. A graduate of Regent College, Vancouver (MCS, ThM), and Durham University

(PhD), Pak-Wah's research interests include the hermeneutical significance of John Chrysostom's exemplar discourse and his Trinitarian teachings, comparative studies of patristic and Chinese philosophies, and the contextualisation of patristic spirituality for the workplace. He is currently working on *The Dao of Healing: Christian Perspectives on Chinese Medicine* (2018, forthcoming), where he engages in a theological dialogue with Chinese medical philosophy.

Seumas Macdonald was formerly Lecturer in Biblical Studies at Union Bible Theological College, Mongolia. His PhD (Macquarie University, 2017) examined pro-Nicene exegesis patterns in Basil of Caesarea and Hilary of Poitiers. His current research interests include patristic exegesis in theological perspective, and communicative language pedagogy applied to classical languages.

Wendy Mayer is Professor and Associate Dean for Research at Australian Lutheran College, University of Divinity, a Fellow of the Australian Academy of the Humanities, and also a Research Fellow in the Department of Biblical and Ancient Studies, University of South Africa. She has published extensively on the life and preaching of John Chrysostom, and has recently turned to exploration of the reception of Graeco-Roman medicine in late antiquity, and the agency of language in religious conflict. Her publications include two forthcoming books edited with Chris L. de Wet (*Reconceiving Religious Conflict*, Routledge; *Revisioning John Chrysostom*, Brill).

Alexey Stambolov studied theology, history, and Greek philology at Sofia University, Bulgaria. Currently, he is a PhD candidate in Medieval Greek language at the same university. His field of work is the linguistic characteristics of the Greek of *Apophthegmata Patrum*. His interests are in Byzantine studies in general with emphasis on Byzantine history, theology, language, and palaeography. Parallel with his studies, he works as a freelance translator and editor from Greek, English, and Russian.

This comprehensive and illuminating collection reintroduces us to the 'Golden-mouthed' orator who both enthralled and enraged Constantinople in the late fourth and early fifth century of our era. The editors have gathered many of the papers of the Australian and international scholars who presented at the St Andrew's Patristic Symposium of 2016 (Sydney). The splendidly broad range of interpretations demonstrates the breadth and depth of Chrysostom himself and of his ongoing (and hopefully) future influence.
— Professor **Alanna Nobbs**, Department of Ancient History, Macquarie University

A wonderful collection. John Chrysostom has truly come into his own for today. His career and huge volume of works amount to a rich mine for ongoing research, with this book's very intelligent assessments hopefully inspiring still more. Many important implications of his opus for different fields of studies have been covered here, the whole published result being rounded and balanced. We discover new principles and fascinating details for understanding Chrysostom as bishop, rhetor and educator, theologian and ecumenist, moralist and ascetic, as well as prophetic activist and victim in Byzantine politics.
— Emeritus Professor **Garry Trompf**, Department of Studies in Religion, The University of Sydney

This collection brings together not only fresh insights from established Chrysostom experts, but also from an international cast of patristic scholars drawn from across the Eastern and Western churches, each of whom brings a different ecclesial and disciplinary lens through which to examine Chrysostom, his writings, and his enduring legacy. This first volume published by AIOCS will prove an invaluable resource not only for scholars, but also for students and teachers in the churches and in the academy, as they seek a deeper understanding of both Chrysostom's work and the faith which he proclaimed in word and deed.
— Dr **Bernard Doherty**, St Mark's National Theological Centre, Charles Sturt University

Doru Costache is a founder of The Australian Institute for Orthodox Christian Studies and Senior Lecturer at St Cyril's Coptic Orthodox Theological College with the Sydney College of Divinity.

Mario Baghos is a founder of The Australian Institute for Orthodox Christian Studies and Adjunct Senior Lecturer in the School of Philosophy and Theology at the University of Notre Dame, Australia.

ISBN: 9780646975375