

JOHN CHRYSOSTOM ON PAUL

WRITINGS FROM THE GRECO-ROMAN WORLD

General Editors

John T. Fitzgerald and Clare K. Rothschild

Editorial Board

Theodore de Bruyn

Andrew Cain

Margaret M. Mitchell

Teresa Morgan

David T. Runia

Karin Schlapbach

Number 48

Volume Editor

Judith L. Kovacs

JOHN CHRYSOSTOM ON PAUL

Praises and Problem Passages

Introduction, translation, and notes by

Margaret M. Mitchell

Copyright © 2022 by SBL Press

All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying and recording, or by means of any information storage or retrieval system, except as may be expressly permitted by the 1976 Copyright Act or in writing from the publisher. Requests for permission should be addressed in writing to the Rights and Permissions Office, SBL Press, 825 Houston Mill Road, Atlanta, GA 30329 USA.

Library of Congress Control Number: 2022947312

For Rick



ΧΡΥΣΟΣΤΟΜΟΥ
ΕΙΣ ΔΙΑΦΟΡΟΥΣ ΤΩΝ
ΑΓΙΩΝ ΓΡΑΦΩΝ ΠΕΡΙΚΟΠΑΣ

λόγῳ γνήσιοι.

The frontispiece above is from Henry Savile, Τοῦ ἐν ἀγίοις πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἰωάννου ἀρχιεπισκόπου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου τῶν εὕρισκομένων τόμοι ὀκτώ (Eton: Ioannes Norton, 1611–1612), 5:1.

CONTENTS

Acknowledgments.....	ix
Abbreviations.....	xiii
Introduction.....	1
Pauline Problems, Pauline Praises	1
The Contents and Rationale for this Volume	3
The History of Publication of the “Occasional Homilies”	
on Pauline Passages	15
Henry Savile and the “Eton Chrysostom”	17
Fronto Ducaeus and, Later, the “Morel Edition”	28
Bernard de Montfaucon and, Later, the “Paris Edition”	32
Jacques-Paul Migne and the <i>Patrologia Graeca</i>	39
The Greek Texts Printed in the Present Volume	43
The Eighteen “Occasional Homilies” on Pauline Passages	43
The Authenticity of the Eighteen “Occasional Homilies”	45
Manuscript Witnesses of the Occasional Homilies	59
The Seven Homilies <i>De laudibus sancti Pauli apostoli</i>	62
Prior Translations of These Twenty-Five Homilies	66
Research Areas and Topics for the Future	69
Editorial and Translation Decisions for This Volume	72
Translation Goals, Principles, Style, and Format	72
An Oral Idiom	72
Gendered Language	74
Replicating Cultural Assumptions Embedded in	
the Texts and Their World	75
Scriptural Quotations and Allusions	76
Paragraphing	79
Titles of the Homilies	79
Notes Accompanying the Text and Translation	81
John Chrysostom on Paul	83

Text, Translation, and Notes	85
Part 1	
<i>Hom. Rom. 5:3 (CPG 4373)</i>	86
<i>Hom. Rom. 8:28 (CPG 4374)</i>	114
<i>Hom. Rom. 12:20 (CPG 4375)</i>	132
<i>Hom. Rom. 16:3 A (CPG 4376)</i>	180
<i>Hom. Rom. 16:3 B (CPG 4376)</i>	208
<i>Hom. 1 Cor. 7:2–4 (CPG 4377)</i>	246
<i>Hom. 1 Cor. 7:39–40 (CPG 4378)</i>	284
<i>Hom. 1 Cor. 10:1–11 (CPG 4380)</i>	310
<i>Hom. 1 Cor. 11:19 (CPG 4381)</i>	346
<i>Hom. 2 Cor. 4:13 A (CPG 4383)</i>	372
<i>Hom. 2 Cor. 4:13 B (CPG 4383)</i>	404
<i>Hom in 2 Cor. 4:13 Γ (CPG 4383)</i>	436
<i>Hom. 2 Cor. 11:1 (CPG 4384)</i>	470
<i>Hom. Gal. 2:11–14 (CPG 4391)</i>	498
<i>Hom. Phil. 1:18 (CPG 4385)</i>	554
<i>Hom. 1 Tim. 5:9–10 (CPG 4386)</i>	586
<i>Hom. 2 Tim. 3:1 (CPG 4423)</i>	636
<i>Hom. Tit. 2:11–12 (CPG 4456)</i>	666
Part 2	
<i>Hom. 1 De laudibus sancti Pauli apostoli (CPG 4344)</i>	698
<i>Hom. 2 De laudibus sancti Pauli apostoli (CPG 4344)</i>	714
<i>Hom. 3 De laudibus sancti Pauli apostoli (CPG 4344)</i>	726
<i>Hom. 4 De laudibus sancti Pauli apostoli (CPG 4344)</i>	738
<i>Hom. 5 De laudibus sancti Pauli apostoli (CPG 4344)</i>	764
<i>Hom. 6 De laudibus sancti Pauli apostoli (CPG 4344)</i>	782
<i>Hom. 7 De laudibus sancti Pauli apostoli (CPG 4344)</i>	800
Bibliography of Works Cited.....	817
Textual Editions and Translations	817
Reference Works	823
Secondary Literature	823
Index of Biblical Passages Cited	837

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This book has been with me a long time. I am most grateful for the intellectual, institutional, and personal assistance and encouragement that I have received from many sources along the way. First, I would like to thank the John Simon Guggenheim Foundation for the fellowship that allowed me a full year's leave in 2015–2016, that was timely in so many ways. And I thank the University of Chicago for a leave in 2020 to polish the apple and move this book into press, as well as to move ahead to other planned projects. Like all humanists, I am especially grateful to librarians for the indispensable resources they provide us. In this case, I thank librarians at the University of Chicago Libraries, Loyola University of Chicago, and the Bodleian Libraries, University of Oxford, in particular, for timely responses to inquiries and for granting gracious and accommodating access to their rare book collections. I am also the beneficiary of the work that so many persons have tirelessly done to digitize manuscripts and make them accessible for research, both in online formats, such as <https://gallica.bnf.fr> and <https://digitale-sammlungen.de>, and via acts of personal kindness such as by Father Justin at Saint Catherine's Monastery, who provided me with excellent digital images of folios from Sinai. gr. 491, and the staff at the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana who did the same for Vat. gr. 559.

Translation is both a technical craft and an art form, and it is truly one of the greatest joys of my work as a scholar of New Testament and Early Christian Literature. I find it fascinating to try to think my way inside an ancient text in its source language and deliberate hard about how the target language of English would correspond, both to the points the author seeks to make and to the diction and tone in which they are communicated. For me it has also meant enlisting as partners in this work, both in the classroom and in lectures and other presentations, those who would give me candid, keen and creative feedback on how my English for John's Greek worked or did not as I read my provisional translations aloud. I thank the

students in my research seminars on Early Christian Biblical Interpretation at the University of Chicago in 2019 (Emily Barnum, Michael Din-smore, Bradley Hansen, Elizabeth Knapp, Matthew Neumann, Jonathan Wegner, and Stephen Wunrow) and 2017 (Nathan Hardy, Elon Harvey, Kelly Holob, and Megan Meagher) for wonderful conversations about all aspects of this endeavor: the words, ideas, concepts, and arguments, and all manner of syntactical, text-critical, exegetical, rhetorical, philosophical, theological, aesthetic, and ideological issues. Their suggestions have made me think hard about specific points on all of these issues. They will recognize some things that are here only because of our common work late into the night in our seminar, even as at other times I've gone with other options than they have suggested, and perhaps disappointed them (sorry!).

I am also grateful for invitations to speak and for lively and thoughtful audiences, including for this book in particular: The Haskell Lectures at Oberlin College, The Parchman Lectures at Truett Seminary (Baylor University), Nils Alstrup Dahl Lecture, University of Oslo, Harriet Drake Kirkham-Hay Memorial Lecture, Drake University, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Candler School of Theology, Emory University, Princeton Theological Seminary, Saint Vladimir's Orthodox Theological Seminary, and Smith College, as well as conference and seminar presentations at the North American Patristics Society, The Society of Biblical Literature, and Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas. And I have also had the opportunity to present several of these translations in the University of Chicago Early Christian Studies Workshop, where I have received customarily terrific feedback. I am the grateful beneficiary of so many excellent conversation partners who embraced the issue of "problems and solutions" in biblical interpretation, and joined me in thinking with this particular set of inventive, quirky, curious, audacious, strained and Scripture-saturated homilies by John Chrysostom on Paul and Pauline problem texts.

I have been especially fortunate in having Professor Judith Kovacs (now of blessed memory), of the University of Virginia as volume editor. Judith's very detailed notes on my draft translations were a treasure trove of insights on the Greek, on how my proposed English worked (or did not), on the proper placement of qualifiers and commas (such a huge issue!), on the level of detail in the footnotes, and especially on the basic issue of "what exactly is John seeking to say here?" I thank Judith profusely for the ἀκριβεία and expertise that she lent to my project, which is I know all the better for having her eyes on it. I have also had the pleasure of serving with Judith and with Professor Wendy Mayer of Australian Lutheran

College for some years in founding the Chrysostom subseries of WGRW. I am honored to contribute to the series, and especially to have this volume appear alongside the first, excellent volumes by Professor Pauline Allen of Australian Catholic University on Chrysostom's homilies on Philippians and on Colossians. I am sure that the influence of the scholarship of all three of these remarkable scholars is evident throughout this volume.

I am immensely grateful to Professor John T. Fitzgerald of the University of Notre Dame for his leadership of the Writings from the Greco-Roman World series, for his collegial encouragement and patience with me in this process of finalizing the book, and for his specific and detailed comments on the manuscript. I would also like to take this chance to salute John for the fruits of his labors in what the series WGRW has become, thanks to his vision and his utterly tireless efforts on its behalf over the past decades. I am also tremendously grateful to the current series editor, Professor Clare K. Rothschild of Lewis University, for taking such an interest in this project and being willing to lend her expertise by offering suggestions on the manuscript in its final stages, as well as valiantly championing it through the production process.

In the process of putting this book to bed I have incurred further debts. I especially thank Dr. Justin Howell for doing such a careful editing of the penultimate version of this manuscript and Dr. Jeremy Thompson for expert work with the Greek texts and index. I also thank Mr. Paul Hosle for lending his careful eye to the final version. I am hugely grateful to Bob Buller, Director of SBL Press, and his staff, for handling a complex manuscript so competently and surely.

I would also like to express gratitude to Mohr Siebeck publishers for the generous permission to reprint my translation of the seven homilies *De laudibus sancti Pauli* in *The Heavenly Trumpet: John Chrysostom and the Art of Pauline Interpretation* (2000). I also thank Les Éditions du Cerf for the permission to print the Greek text of those homilies from the *Sources chrétiennes* volume by Auguste Piédagnel (1982).

Engaging the history of transmission, editing and publication of these homilies has been a compelling and illuminating part of this research for me, involving a set of encounters with monumental figures, most especially Henry Savile, the first to publish a Greek text of most of the homilies in this volume, and all his successors, such as Fronto Ducaeus, Bernard de Montfaucon and Jacques-Paul Migne, as I traced their efforts, decisions and interventions. There is nothing like this to impress upon one a proper perspective on the contingent nature of all of our scholarly efforts,

their value and limitations, as well as their fallibility. That is one reason it has been hard to let this book manuscript leave my hands, since one can always fine-tune, correct, learn more and reconsider decisions. But now it is time to let this book go, and it is my earnest hope that this volume of texts and translations of these twenty-five late antique works may (despite the shortcomings that I fear remain) make a contribution to research projects and teaching on any number of topics across the interacting set of disciplines we who study ancient Christianity share.

Many scholarly friends, too numerous to mention, have helped me along the way and make my life so wonderful, and this precious work so fulfilling. No one has been as influential a conversation partner, teacher and friend to me as Hans Dieter Betz, who has simply the most extraordinary mind and formidable spirit I've ever encountered. This book will be published in the year of his ninetieth birthday, and so I am especially honored to extend my profound gratitude to Dieter for all I continue to learn and enjoy in his company. Among other friends I would especially like to thank Professor Paula Fredriksen of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, for superb conversations in both the first and the fourth centuries, Professor David Moessner of Texas Christian University for such a great partnership in all aspects of New Testament studies and ancient hermeneutics, and Professor Paul Duff of George Washington University for highly prized conversations over decades now on all things Pauline.

I could never adequately express my gratitude for Rick, Nora, Katie, and all the Mitchells and Rosengartens, who are my joy and my strength. All my books are imbued with the spirit of my tremendous family and in so many ways are made possible by their love and companionship. But this one in particular is and always will be for Rick.

Margaret M. Mitchell
July 26, 2020
Chicago, Illinois

ABBREVIATIONS

Text Editions and Translations

- | | |
|-----|--|
| AP | Piédagnel, Auguste, ed. and trans. <i>Jean Chrysostome, "Panégryriques de Saint Paul."</i> SC 300. Paris: Cerf, 1982. |
| AW | Wenger, Antoine, ed. and trans. "Une homélie inédite de Jean Chrysostome sur l'épiphanie." <i>Revue des études byzantines</i> 29 (1971): 117–35. |
| CPG | Geerard, Maurice, ed. <i>Clavis Patrum Graecorum</i> . 6 vols. plus supplementum. Turnhout: Brepols, 1974–1998. |
| DMD | Mazzoni Dami, Daniela, ed. <i>Giovanni Crisostomo, prima omelia sul matrimonio: "In illud, Propter fornicationes uxorem."</i> Studi e testi 14. Florence: Università degli Studi di Firenze Dipartimento di Scienze dell'Antichità "Giorgio Pasquali," 1998. |
| FD | Ducaeus, Fronto, ed. and trans. <i>Sancti patris nostri Ioannis Chrysostomi archiepiscopi Constantino-politani: De diversis novi Testamenti locis Sermones LXXI; Nunc primum Graece et Latine coniunctim editi</i> . Paris: A. Estienne, 1616. |
| HS | Savile, Henry, ed. Τοῦ ἐν ἀγίοις πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἰωάννου ἀρχιεπισκόπου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου τῶν εὐρισκομένων τόμοι ὀκτώ. Eton: Ioannes Norton, 1611–1612. |
| HT | Mitchell, Margaret M. <i>The Heavenly Trumpet: John Chrysostom and the Art of Pauline Interpretation</i> . HUT 40. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2002. Appendix 1, "English translation of <i>De laudibus sancti Pauli</i> ." Pp. 442–87. |

JPM	Jacques-Paul Migne. See PG below
KJV	King James Version
ME	<i>Sancti patris nostri Ioannis Chrysostomi archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani explanationes in Novum Testamentum in sex tomos distributa</i> . Frankfurt am Main: Balthasar Christopher Wustius, 1697. Reprint of <i>Sancti patris nostri Ioannis Chrysostomi archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani opera omnia in 12 tomos distributa</i> . Paris: Morel, 1633.
Mf	Montfaucon, Bernard de, ed. <i>Sancti patris nostri Ioannis Chrysostomi archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani opera omnia quae exstant</i> . 13 vols. Paris: Sumtibus Ludovici Guerin, Caroli Robustel, Joannis and Josephi Barbou, Guillelmi Desprez, and Joannis Desessartz, 1718–1738.
NA ²⁸	Aland, Barbara, Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, and Bruce M. Metzger, eds. <i>Novum Testamentum Graece</i> . 28th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2012.
NETS	Pietersma, Albert, and Benjamin G. Wright, eds. <i>A New English Translation of the Septuagint and Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under That Title</i> . New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.
NIV	New International Version
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version
PE	Montfaucon, Bernard de, ed. <i>Sancti patris nostri Ioannis Chrysostomi archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani opera omnia quae exstant</i> . Editio parisina altera, emendata et aucta. Paris: Gaume fratres, 1835–1839.
PG	<i>Patrologia Graeca</i> [= <i>Patrologiae Cursus Completus: Series Graeca</i>]. Edited by Jacques-Paul Migne. 161 vols. Paris: Migne, 1857–1886.
Rahlfs	Rahlfs, Alfred, ed. <i>Septuaginta</i> . Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1935.
RP	Robinson, Maurice A., and William G. Pierpont, compilers and arrangers. <i>The New Testament in the Original Greek: Byzantine Textform 2018</i> . Nürnberg: VTR, 2018.

RSV	Revised Standard Version
SBLGNT	Holmes, Michael W. ed. <i>The Greek New Testament: SBL Edition</i> . Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature; Bellingham, WA: Logos Bible Software, 2010.
TLG	Thesaurus Linguae Graecae. A Digital Library of Greek Literature. Project Director Maria Pantelia. University of California, Irvine, 2013. Continually updated at stephanus.tlg.uci.edu .

Manuscripts: General

Athous Lavra	Greece, Mount Athos, Great Lavra Monastery
Athous Pant.	Greece, Mount Athos, Panteleimon Monastery
Bodl. Auctarium	Oxford, Bodleian Libraries, Auctarium
Cantab. Trin. Coll.	Cambridge, Trinity College
Cod. Eton Coll.	Eton, Eton College Codex
Laurentianus	Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana
Marc. gr.	Venice, Biblioteca Marciana, Codices graeci
Mon. Leimonos	Greece, Lesbos, Leimonos Monastery
Monac. gr.	Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Codices graeci Monacenses
Mone Iberon	Greece, Mount Athos, Monastery of Iberon (Iveron)
Oxon. Coll. Nov.	Oxford, New College
Paris. gr.	Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Parisinus graecus
Patmiacus	Greece, Patmos, Monastery of St. John the Theologian
Sinait. gr.	Mount Sinai, Monastery of Saint Catherine
Sinod. gr.	Moscow, State Historical Museum, Synodal collection
Stavronikita	Greece, Mount Athos, Stavronikita Monastery
Vat. gr.	Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Vaticani graeci
Vat. Ottob. gr.	Vatican City, Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Ottoboniani graeci

Manuscripts: The Eighteen “Occasional Homilies”

See the tables on pages 19–26, 34–36, and the initial footnote on each translation.

Manuscripts: *De laudibus sancti Pauli apostoli*

A	Paris. gr. 755
B	Vat. gr. 1628
C	Marc. gr. 113
D	Marc. gr. 567
E	Patmiacus 164
F	Laurentianus pluteus IX codex 4
G	Athous Lavra B 94
H	Paris. gr. 728
L	Athous Lavra B 112
M	Athous Pant. 58
P	Stavronikita 22

Manuscripts: Biblical

Sigla for LXX manuscripts and recensions follow Rahlfs; those for New Testament manuscripts follow NA²⁸.

General Abbreviations

<i>app. crit.</i>	<i>apparatus criticus</i> (critical apparatus)
<i>des. mut.</i>	<i>desinit mutile</i> (ending cut off)
<i>inc. mut.</i>	<i>incipit mutile</i> (beginning cut off)
MS(S)	manuscript(s)
<i>v.l.</i>	<i>varia lectio</i> (variant reading)

Primary Sources

Add Dan	Additions to Daniel
<i>Adv. Jud</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>Adversus Judaeos</i>
<i>Ag.</i>	Aeschylus, <i>Agamemnon</i>
<i>A.J.</i>	Josephus, <i>Antiquitates judaicae</i>
<i>Anna</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>De Anna</i>
<i>Anom.</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>Contra Anomoeos</i> (<i>De incomprehensibili dei natura</i>)
<i>Ant. exsil.</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>Sermo antequam iret in exsilium</i>
<i>Apol.</i>	Tertullian, <i>Apologeticus</i>
<i>Bab.</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>De sancto hieromartyre Babyla</i>

<i>Bab. Jul.</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>De Babyla contra Julianum et gentiles</i>
<i>Bapt.</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>De baptismo Christi</i>
<i>Barl.</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>In sanctum Barlaam martyrem</i>
<i>Byz</i>	Byzantine text
<i>Catech. illum.</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>Catecheses ad illuminandos</i>
<i>Catech. ult.</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>Catechesis ultima ad baptizandos</i>
<i>Cod. Theod.</i>	Codex Theodosianus
<i>Comm. in Gal.</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>Commentarium in epistulam ad Galatas</i>
<i>Comm. Ps.</i>	Diodore of Tarsus, <i>Commentarius in Psalmos</i>
<i>Comm. Rom.</i>	Origen, <i>Commentarii in Romanos</i>
<i>Compunct. Dem.</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>Ad Demetrium de compunctione</i>
<i>Conj. Praec.</i>	Plutarch, <i>Conjugalia Praecepta</i>
<i>Corp. herm.</i>	Corpus hermeticum
<i>Dav.</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>De Davide et Saule</i>
<i>Delic.</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>De futurae vitae deliciis</i>
<i>Diab.</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>De diabolo tentatore</i>
<i>Diatr.</i>	Epictetus, <i>Diatribai</i> (<i>Dissertationes</i> of Arrian)
<i>El. vid.</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>In Eliam et viduam</i>
<i>Enn.</i>	Plotinus, <i>Enneades</i>
<i>Eth. Nic.</i>	Aristotle, <i>Ethica Nicomachea</i>
<i>Exp. Gal.</i>	Augustine, <i>Expositio in epistulam ad Galatas</i>
<i>Exp. Ps.</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>Expositiones in Psalmos</i>
<i>Ep.</i>	<i>Epistulae</i>
<i>Ep. Lugd.</i>	<i>Epistula ecclesiarum apud Lugdunum et Viennam</i>
<i>Ep. Olymp.</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>Epistulae ad Olympiadem</i>
<i>Epid.</i>	Menander Rhetor, <i>Peri Epideiktikōn</i>
<i>Exil.</i>	Plutarch, <i>De exilio</i>
<i>Hier.</i>	Eusebius, <i>Contra Hieroclem</i>
<i>Hist. eccl.</i>	Eusebius, <i>Historia ecclesiastica</i>
<i>Hom. Act.</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Acta apostolorum</i>
<i>Hom. Act. 9:1</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>De mutatione nominum</i>
<i>Hom. Col.</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in epistulam ad Colossenses</i>
<i>Hom. 1 Cor.</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in epistulam i ad Corinthios</i>
<i>Hom. 1 Cor. 7:2–4</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>In illud: Propter fornicationes autem unusquisque suam uxorem habeat</i>

<i>Hom. 1 Cor. 7:39–40</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>De libello repudii</i>
<i>Hom. 1 Cor. 10:1–11</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>In dictum Pauli: Nolo vos ignorare</i>
<i>Hom. 1 Cor. 11:19</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>In dictum Pauli: Oportet haereses esse</i>
<i>Hom. 2 Cor.</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in epistulam ii ad Corinthios</i>
<i>Hom. 2 Cor. 4:13</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>In illud: Habentes eundem spiritum</i>
<i>Hom. 2 Cor. 11:1</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>In illud: Utinam sustineretis modicum</i>
<i>Hom. Eph.</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in epistulam ad Ephesios</i>
<i>Hom. Gal 2:11–14</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>In illud: In faciem ei restiti</i>
<i>Hom. Gen.</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Genesim</i>
<i>Hom. Heb.</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in epistulam ad Hebraeos</i>
<i>Hom. Jo.</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Joannem</i>
<i>Hom. Jo. 5:17</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>In illud: Pater meus usque modo operatur</i>
<i>Hom. Jo. 5:19</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>In illud: Filius ex se nihil facit</i>
<i>Hom. Matt.</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in Matthaëum</i>
<i>Hom. Matt. 18:23</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>De decem millium talentorum debitore</i>
<i>Hom. Phil.</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in epistulam ad Philipenses</i>
<i>Hom. princ. Act.</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>In principium Actorum</i>
<i>Hom. Ps.</i>	Origen, <i>Homiliae in Psalmos</i>
<i>Hom. Rom.</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in epistulam ad Romanos</i>
<i>Hom. Rom. 5:3</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>De gloria in tribulationibus</i>
<i>Hom. Rom. 8:28</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>In illud: Diligentibus deum omnia cooperantur in bonum</i>
<i>Hom. Rom. 12:20</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>In illud: Si esurierit inimicus</i>
<i>Hom. Rom. 16:3</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>In illud: Salutate Priscillam et Aquilam</i>
<i>Hom. 1 Tim.</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in epistulam i ad Timotheum</i>
<i>Hom. 1 Tim. 5:9–10</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>In illud: Vidua eligatur</i>

<i>Hom. 2 Tim.</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in epistulam ii ad Timotheum</i>
<i>Hom. 2 Tim. 3:1</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>In illud: Hoc scitote quod in novissimis diebus</i>
<i>Hom. Tit.</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>Homiliae in epistulam ad Titum</i>
<i>Hom. Tit. 2:11–12</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>In illud: Apparuit gratia dei omnibus hominibus</i>
<i>Ign.</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>In sanctum Ignatium martyrem</i>
<i>Laed.</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>Quod nemo laeditur nisi a se ipso</i>
<i>Laud. Const.</i>	Eusebius, <i>De laudibus Constantini</i>
<i>Laud. Max.</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>Quales ducendae sint uxores</i> (=De laude Maximi)
<i>Laud. Paul.</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>De laudibus sancti Pauli apostoli</i>
<i>Laz.</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>De Lazaro</i>
LXX	Septuagint
ℳ	Majority Text
<i>Marc.</i>	Tertullian, <i>Adversus Marcionem</i>
<i>Mart.</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>De sanctis martyribus</i>
MT	Masoretic Text
<i>Math.</i>	Sextus Empiricus, <i>Adversus mathematicos</i>
<i>Mor.</i>	Plutarch, <i>Moralia</i>
<i>Mut.</i>	Philo, <i>De mutatione nominum</i>
<i>Nem.</i>	Pindar, <i>Nemeonikai</i>
<i>Non desp.</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>Non esse desperandum</i>
<i>Od.</i>	Homer, <i>Odyssea</i>
OG	Old Greek
<i>Paenit.</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>De paenitentia</i>
<i>Pecc.</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>Peccata fratrum non evulganda</i>
<i>Phaedr.</i>	Plato, <i>Phaedrus</i>
<i>Pomp.</i>	Dionysius of Halicarnassus, <i>Epistula ad Pompeium Geminum</i>
<i>Princ.</i>	Origen, <i>De principiis</i> (<i>Peri archōn</i>)
<i>Prog.</i>	Aphthonius, <i>Progymnasmata</i>
<i>Proph. obscurit.</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>De prophetarum obscuritate</i>
<i>Quaest.</i>	Theodoret, <i>Quaestiones in Libros Regnorum et Paralipomenon</i>
<i>Rer. nat.</i>	Lucretius, <i>De rerum natura</i>
<i>Res. Chr.</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>Adversus ebriosos et de resurrectione domini nostri Jesu Christi</i>

<i>Res. ges.</i>	Ammianus Marcellinus, <i>Res gestae</i>
<i>Resp.</i>	Plato, <i>Respublica</i>
<i>Rhet.</i>	Aristotle, <i>Rhetorica</i>
<i>Sac.</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>De sacerdotio</i>
<i>Sanct. Anast.</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>Homilia dicta in templo sanctae Anastasiae</i>
<i>Scand.</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>Ad eos qui scandalizati sunt</i>
<i>Stag.</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>Ad Stagirium a daemone vexatum</i>
<i>Stas.</i>	Hermogenes of Tarsus, <i>Peri staseōn</i>
<i>Stat.</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>Ad populum Antiochenum de staturis</i>
<i>Stud. praes.</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>De studio praesentium</i>
<i>Terr. mot.</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>De terrae motu</i>
<i>Theod. laps.</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>Ad Theodorum lapsum</i>
<i>Trin.</i>	Didymus the Blind, <i>De Trinitate</i>
<i>Tu. san.</i>	Plutarch, <i>De tuenda sanitate praecepta</i>
<i>Virginit.</i>	John Chrysostom, <i>De virginitate</i>
<i>Virt.</i>	Philo, <i>De virtutibus</i>
<i>Vit. Apoll.</i>	Philostratus, <i>Vita Apollonii</i>
<i>Vit. Const.</i>	Eusebius, <i>Vita Constantini</i>
<i>Vit. Greg.</i>	Pseudo-Gregentius, <i>Vita sancti Gregentii</i>
<i>Vit. phil.</i>	Diogenes Laertius, <i>Vitae philosophorum</i>

Secondary Sources

AB	Anchor Bible
AnBoll	Analecta Bollandiana
Aug	<i>Augustinianum</i>
BA	<i>Biblical Archaeologist</i>
BDAG	Danker, Frederick W., Walter Bauer, William F. Arndt, and F. Wilbur Gingrich. <i>Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> . 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.
BDF	Blass, Friedrich, Albert Debrunner, and Robert W. Funk. <i>A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> . Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

BGBE	Beiträge zur Geschichte der biblischen Exegese
BibInt	Biblical Interpretation Series
BNP	Cancik, Hubert, ed. <i>Brill's New Pauly: Encyclopaedia of the Ancient World</i> . 22 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2002–2011.
CBET	Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology
CCG 1	Aubineau, Michel. <i>Codices Chrysostomici Graeci I: Codices Britanniae et Hiberniae</i> . Documents, études et répertoires publiés par l'Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes 13. Paris: CNRS, 1968.
CCG 2	Carter, Robert E. <i>Codices Chrysostomici Graeci II: Codices Germaniae</i> . Documents, études et répertoires publiés par l'Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes XIV. Paris: CNRS, 1968.
CCG 5	Carter, Robert E. <i>Codices Chrysostomici Graeci V: Codicum Italiae partem priorem</i> . Paris: CNRS, 1983.
CCG 6	Voicu, Sever J. <i>Codices Chrysostomici Graeci VI: Codicum Civitatis Vaticanae, partem priorem</i> . Paris: CNRS, 1999.
CCG 7	Augustin, Pierre, with Jacques-Hubert Sautel. <i>Codices Chrysostomici Graeci VII: Codicum Parisinorum partem priorem</i> . Paris: CNRS, 2011.
CCSG	Corpus Christianorum, Series Graeca
CH	<i>Church History</i>
CSEL	Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum
ECF	Early Church Fathers
EECh	Berardino, Angelo di, ed. <i>Encyclopedia of the Early Church</i> . Translated by Adrian Walford. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.
GCS	Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte
HT	Mitchell, Margaret M. <i>The Heavenly Trumpet: John Chrysostom and the Art of Pauline Interpretation</i> . HUT 40. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2002.
HTR	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
HUT	Hermeneutische Untersuchungen zur Theologie
ICC	International Critical Commentary
ITQ	<i>Irish Theological Quarterly</i>

<i>JECS</i>	<i>Journal of Early Christian Studies</i>
<i>JJMJS</i>	<i>Journal of the Jesus Movement in its Jewish Setting</i>
<i>JR</i>	<i>Journal of Religion</i>
<i>JSJ</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Roman Period</i>
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
<i>LCL</i>	Loeb Classical Library
<i>LSJ</i>	Liddell, Henry George, Robert Scott, Henry Stuart Jones. <i>A Greek-English Lexicon</i> . 9th ed. with revised supplement. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.
<i>NovT</i>	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
<i>NovTSup</i>	Supplements to <i>Novum Testamentum</i>
<i>NPNF1</i>	<i>Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers</i> , Series 1
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
<i>OCT</i>	Oxford Classical Texts/ <i>Scriptorum classicorum bibliotheca oxoniensis</i>
<i>OrChrAn</i>	<i>Orientalia Christiana Analecta</i>
<i>PCBCH</i>	Mitchell, Margaret M. <i>Paul, the Corinthians and the Birth of Christian Hermeneutics</i> . Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
<i>PGL</i>	<i>Patristic Greek Lexicon</i> . Edited by Geoffrey W. H. Lampe. Oxford: Clarendon, 1961.
<i>Pinakes</i>	<i>Pinakes</i> , Base de données de l'Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes, Paris (irht.cnrs.fr).
<i>PW</i>	Wissowa, Georg, and Wilhelm Kroll, eds. <i>Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft</i> . 50 vols. in 84 parts. Stuttgart: Metzler and Druckenmüller, 1894–1980.
<i>RB</i>	<i>Revue Biblique</i>
<i>SC</i>	Sources chrétiennes
<i>SK</i>	<i>Skriften Kerk</i>
<i>Smyth</i>	Smyth, Herbert Weir. <i>Greek Grammar</i> . Revised by Gordon M. Messing. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1980.
<i>ST</i>	<i>Studia Theologica</i>
<i>StPatr</i>	<i>Studia Patristica</i>
<i>TK</i>	Texte und Kommentare
<i>VC</i>	<i>Vigiliae Christianae</i>

VTSup	Vetus Testamentum Supplements
WGRW	Writings from the Greco-Roman World
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament

INTRODUCTION

Pauline Problems, Pauline Praises

The letters of Paul are mines and fountains of the Spirit. They are mines, in that they provide us with a wealth that is more precious than any gold; fountains, in that they never run dry. No, as much as you empty out of them, all the more flows out again.¹

Such moments of exultation about the power, wisdom, sagacity, and beauty of the Pauline letters are, as is well known, neither rare in the oeuvre of John Chrysostom nor confined to his seven remarkable homilies *De laudibus sancti Pauli* ("In Praise of Saint Paul").² And yet, despite being regarded as such an unending treasury of gold and of life-giving water, in truth Paul's letters also provided Chrysostom and his congregants at Antioch and Constantinople with a steady stream of statements that were the cause of vexation, consternation, embarrassment, and puzzlement—less gold, apparently, than gall. As a late fourth-century Christian preacher and ecclesiastical leader, Chrysostom wished to make the case continually to his congregants that the entirety of the Scriptures should be the basis of their individual and communal Christian lives and of their civic polity and culture, and that these texts were completely authoritative, reliable, and trustworthy guides for those ends. And at the same time, the Scriptures also presented him and his audiences with considerable problems and quandaries of various kinds: literary, philological, theological, historical, ethical, logical, social, legal, practical, and aesthetic. Of course, for the Christian intellectuals and

1. John Chrysostom, *Hom. 2 Cor. 4:13* Γ §1 (PG 51:291).

2. For a full argument and collection of the evidence, see Margaret M. Mitchell, *The Heavenly Trumpet: John Chrysostom and the Art of Pauline Interpretation*, HUT 40 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2002).

orator-bishops and priests of the post-Constantinian period, all of Scripture, in part and as a whole, raised such issues in various ways, such as the lustiness of the Song of Songs, the apparent contradictions among the gospels,³ or the lack of complete concordance between the Old and the New Testaments—even, or perhaps especially, where continuity is claimed but hard to maintain.

Within this larger phenomenon of the need to defend the entirety of the Christian Scriptures as sacred text, the Pauline Epistles posed some particular problems: (1) their genre as letters directed to specific addressees handling their time-sensitive and local issues; (2) their treatment of shocking and unseemly subject matter, like “a man having his father’s wife” (1 Cor 5) or *πορνεία*, “sexual misconduct” (1 Cor 5–7); (3) their diverse treatments of major issues (e.g., the status of the scriptures of Israel or the mechanics of sin, belief, and salvation), which raised questions of whether Paul, in his own letters and in relation to the Acts of the Apostles, is or was consistent or self-contradictory;⁴ (4) the boasting and bombastic tone and tenor of some of Paul’s statements that seemed to contradict a saintly bearing and stature; (5) the attitude exhibited in them toward whether “heresies” are to be expected or are surprising aberrations; (6) the urgency of their eschatological visions and expectations still unmet now centuries later; (7) their ambiguous positions vis-à-vis Jews, “Judaism,” the law, and the Jewish tradition both in Paul’s time and later; (8) their ambiguous or conflicting ethical norms about women, slaves, social class, and other issues; (9) their testimony to internal conflicts in the apostolic age, including evidence of outright contestation and distrust of Paul’s own authority as an apostle (e.g., Gal 2; 2 Cor 10–13); (10) their hermeneutical malleability and hence ability to be drawn upon as warrant for views that some interpreters regard as

3. E.g., in the genealogies of Jesus, the birth narratives, the lists of the apostles, the wording of sayings, the date and circumstances of his death, and the tomb and resurrection narratives. All of these problems were well recognized already by ancient interpreters, who devised various strategies in turn (historical, text-critical, theological, philosophical, hermeneutical, etc.) to deal with them. For an entrée into these discussions, see Claudio Zamagni, *Eusèbe de Césarée, Questions évangéliques*, SC 523 (Paris: Cerf, 2008), 33–40, on the form of problems and solutions, and further bibliography in p. 7 n. 15 below.

4. A “problem” made all the more urgent because it was pointed out by non-Christian intellectuals such as Porphyry and Julian.

errant or scandalous. What is a preacher to do when faced with such challenges?

The Contents and Rationale for This Volume

Part 1 of the present volume contains the Greek texts and my English translations of eighteen homilies preached by John Chrysostom on individual passages in the *corpus Paulinum*.⁵ These eighteen homilies stand outside of Chrysostom's famous homily sets on the fourteen letters (including the Letter to the Hebrews, treated by John as Pauline) that have been widely available in English translation for more than a century and a half and that are very well known and well read, both among scholars of ancient Christianity and New Testament exegetes.⁶ In contrast, most of the eighteen "occasional homilies"⁷ in this volume have not been translated into English (either in part or in whole)⁸ and are much less well known and cited. Complementing these exegetical homilies, in part 2 of the volume are the SC text by Auguste Piédagnel (1982) of Chrysostom's seven homilies *De laudibus sancti Pauli* and my English translations of them. The primary goal of this volume is to make these twenty-five important oratorical and exegetical sources from the late fourth century better known and more readily accessible in a bilingual edition to scholars and students with interests in the New Testament, in early Christian studies generally, in patristic exegesis specifically, and in hermeneutics and literary criticism,

5. The Greek texts are in most cases from PG 51, but see below on the complicated history behind this Greek text and its associated notes, and their limitations.

6. These homilies are available in the English translation from the Oxford team, with a revised American edition of that translation (in some cases drawing upon the superior critical text of Frederick Field) in Phillip Schaff, ed., *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Series 1, vols. 11–14 (1886–1889; repr., Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994). On this project, see Elizabeth A. Clark, *Founding the Fathers: Early Church History and Protestant Professors in Nineteenth-Century America*, *Divinations: Rereading Late Ancient Religion* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011), 47–49.

7. The term "occasional" is sometimes used to distinguish these from the "serial" homilies on the Pauline letters, and I use it here for convenience. But note that all the Chrysostomic homilies are in some sense occasional (i.e., prepared for and most likely delivered at a particular liturgical synaxis or other meeting), including those in the serial homily sets on each of the Pauline letters. But these works have come down in the transmission history independent of the series on the Pauline letters.

8. See below (pp. 66–69) on modern-language translations of these homilies.

ancient and modern, with an English translation that reflects their style of live oratory, vivid imagery, rhetorical invention, detailed and complex argumentation, and thoroughly dialogical character. At a time when the study of ancient Christian biblical interpretation is in a heyday, it is hoped that these sources can be all the more a part of that scholarly conversation.

Although the eighteen homilies on individual passages in the Pauline epistolary that are collected here did not in Chrysostom's life,⁹ nor in the manuscript traditions stretching back to late antiquity that have preserved his voluminous writings, represent a whole, unified or continuous collection, the present volume is not based on a random selection, nor does it merely follow what has over time become a traditional clustering of these sources, as reflected in Migne's *Patrologia Graeca* volume 51.¹⁰ This collection is also based, as the opening to this introduction has indicated, upon the analytical conclusion to which I came as I worked with these texts over the years, that it is useful to study these eighteen homilies together because, in addition to their focus on isolated Pauline lemmata apart from the serial homilies on each letter, they all deal in some ways with "problem passages," or, if not self-evidently problematic at first glance, texts that John will make into problems in order—inventively—to solve them. While these homilies are by no means unique in this regard within Chrysostom's oeuvre, and while they are not the only homilies within Chrysostom's oeuvre apart from the homily sets on the fourteen letters that can be seen to have a chief focus on a Pauline text,¹¹ part of what further justifies this collection

9. With a few exceptions, most of the eighteen homilies in part 1 are very difficult to date, except in relation to some other homilies (see p. 48 n. 164 below, under "Authenticity"). The magisterial work on the dating of Chrysostom's homilies by Wendy Mayer, *The Homilies of St John Chrysostom—Provenance, Reshaping the Foundations*, *OrChrAn* 272 (Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 2005), has been essential to my study of these. In each translation the chief arguments for the place of the homily (in Antioch, 386–398, or Constantinople, 398–403) are provided in brief in the initial note. This is another area requiring further research.

10. See below on the publication history of these Greek texts.

11. One should note as well that Wendy Mayer and Pauline Allen, in a series of articles, have demonstrated that the original sequence of what were published as homily sets is not necessarily secure, as the sets in some cases may include sermons from both Antioch and Constantinople, and there are some overlaps in treatments of passages. See 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]," *OrChrAn* 60 (1994): 21–39; "The Thirty-Four Homilies on Hebrews: the Last

in the present volume is that these homilies provide a vibrant laboratory for investigating how a Christian orator-bishop in the late fourth century dealt with the ways his Bible was unmistakably a problem. And the seven homilies *De laudibus sancti Pauli* are included as well,¹² since they are an essential part of the overall project of resolving Pauline problems and problematics in that John praises Paul at times by celebrating precisely what his opponents and interlocutors, both Christian and non-Christian, find blameworthy: his apparent inconsistency, his boasting, or his bellicosity. In turn, the praiseworthy nature of Paul the author is the foundational assumption behind the homiletic engagement with the “problem passages,” because in the end John cannot and will not accept that his beloved and saintly apostle erred, left behind deficient texts, or did not foresee the later uses to which they would be put. For Chrysostom it is in the crucible of the character of his saintly author, Paul, and the always fully deliberate wording of the letters, that he gets down to the work of interpreting Paul.¹³ Hence the second goal of the present volume is to provide resources for further research into the problematics of Pauline interpretation as Chryso-

Series Delivered by Chrysostom in Constantinople?” *Byzantion* 65 (1995): 309–48; “Chrysostom and the Preaching of Homilies in Series: A Re-examination of the Fifteen Homilies *In epistulam ad Philippenses* [CPG 4432],” *VC* 49 (1995): 270–89). For a recent evaluation of their arguments, see James Daniel Cook, *Preaching and Popular Christianity*, Oxford Theology and Religion Monographs (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), 201–10: “Appendix: “The Use of *Lectio Continua*.” To the degree that there is some doubt about the coherence of any given series (though in some cases, it is clear that John is preaching through a biblical book and one sermon follows after another), the claim for these more isolated homilies is not meant to imply that they stand in complete distinction from the others in this regard. And yet, none of the eighteen homilies on Pauline lemmata presented here indicates that it follows a previous homily on that Pauline letter, with the exception of the homilies that are themselves clearly following in sequence from one another and comprise a miniseries; these are *Hom. 1 Cor. 7:2–4* and *Hom. 1 Cor. 7:39–40*; the two *Hom. Rom. 16:3*, and the three *Hom. 2 Cor. 4:13*. Beyond that, each of these homilies has its own argumentative structure and purpose and is often not working through large portions of the text seriatim in precisely the way the homilies within the sets often do.

12. For the first time since the Morel Edition of the seventeenth century, as noted below, p. 32.

13. A fuller argument for this thesis, which also contextualizes John’s interpretive work within late fourth-century literary, rhetorical, artistic, theological and philosophical culture, may be found in Mitchell, *Heavenly Trumpet*.

stom, the self-proclaimed most devoted expositor of Paul, practiced it in these lesser known and understudied homilies.

The first eighteen homilies by John Chrysostom translated here in part 1 include treatment of such vexing questions as these:

- ♦ How is it that Christian Scripture contains things that appear to be trivial and insignificant, such as the epistolary greeting to Priscilla and Aquila in Rom 16:3?
- ♦ If Christ commanded his disciples not to own sandals or a cloak (Matt 10:9–10), then why did his two chiefs, Peter and Paul, have sandals (cf. Acts 12:8) and cloaks (cf. 2 Tim 4:13), respectively?
- ♦ Did Paul really command one to feed or clothe one's enemies by appealing to the vengeful and mean-spirited expectation of "heaping burning coals on their heads" (Rom 12:20)?
- ♦ Is it possible to reconcile the apparent legal discrepancies in the legislation about divorce and marriage offered by Paul (1 Cor 7) with the laws given by Christ in the gospels (e.g., Matt 5:27–32; 19:3–9 and *parr.*) or Moses in the Pentateuch (e.g., Deut 24:1–4)?
- ♦ Did Paul endorse and even sanction the need for there to be "heresies" in the church (1 Cor 11:19) or a variety of gospel messages with divergent and even conflicting motives (Phil 1:18)?
- ♦ Do the Old Testament and the New really share "the same spirit of faith" (2 Cor 4:13) or even the same god?
- ♦ Do passages like Gal 4:22–24 on the two covenants give support to the Manichaean position that the god of the Old Testament is a different lawgiver from the god of the New Testament?
- ♦ How could Paul seem to allow for equality in marriage between husband and wife in 1 Cor 7:2–4, when Paul himself in 1 Tim 2:11–15 clearly emphasizes the husband's superiority and dominance?¹⁴
- ♦ Was Paul utterly inconsistent in saying or doing one thing in one context and another in a different one (cf. his bold claim to be "all things to all people" in 1 Cor 9:22b)?
- ♦ Does Gal 2:11–14 demonstrate that both of the founders of the Christian movement (Peter and Paul) were "hypocrites" who were unalterably opposed to one another and were exposed publicly at

14. Throughout this volume we are addressing Chrysostom's "Paul"; he regarded all fourteen of the letters in the canon (including Hebrews) to be equally and genuinely Pauline.

Antioch—Peter as cowering in fear before “the men from James” and under Pauline censure, and Paul as breaking the commandment of Matt 18:15 to rebuke a brother only in private?

- ♦ How can Paul describe the saving grace of God as παιδεύουσα ἡμᾶς (Titus 2:12), since that casts χάρις in a punitive role vis-à-vis humanity rather than a salvific one (ἡ σωτήριος)?

Throughout these eighteen homilies, one finds Chrysostom employing the language, logic, and rhetoric of the ancient pedagogical form known as ζητήματα καὶ λύσεις, or “problems and solutions.”¹⁵ Adoption of the *zetetic*¹⁶

15. Among important scholarly treatments see especially Claudio Zamagni, “Une introduction méthodologique à la littérature patristique des questions et réponses: Le cas d’Eusèbe de Césarée,” in *Erotopokriseis: Early Christian Question-and-Answer Literature in Context*, ed. Annelie Volgers and Claudio Zamagni, CBET 37 (Leuven: Peeters, 2004), 7–24, esp. 10, in which he distinguishes between “le genre littéraire” and “le procédé littéraire.” See also Marie-Pierre Bussières, ed., *La littérature des questions et réponses dans l’antiquité profane et chrétienne: De l’enseignement à l’exégèse*, Instrumenta patristica et mediaevalia 64 (Turnhout: Brepols, 2013), and in particular the essay in that volume by Claudio Zamagni, “Is the Question-and-Answer Literary Genre in Early Christian Literature a Homogenous Group?” (241–68), which repeats and slightly refines the earlier proposal to distinguish between “a literary genre and a literary pattern (or literary format, procedure)” (242, emphasis original); Yannis Papadoyannakis, “Instruction by Question and Answer: The Case of Late Antique and Byzantine Erotopokriseis,” in *Greek Literature in Late Antiquity: Dynamism, Didacticism, Classicism*, ed. Scott Fitzgerald Johnson (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2006), 91–106; and, most recently, Lorenzo Perrone, “Questions and Responses,” in *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Biblical Interpretation*, ed. Paul M. Blowers and Peter W. Martens (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019), 198–209. Still valuable is the earlier treatment of Gustave Bardy, “La littérature patristique des ‘quaestiones et responsiones’ sur l’écriture sainte,” *RB* 41 (1932): 210–36.

16. The lexicon for referring to the “problems” in ancient texts includes those that are properly “zetetic” (ζήτημα, ζήτησις, ζητεῖν) along with προβλήματα (“problems”), ἀπορίαι (“quandaries” or “perplexing issues”), and other words. For the translation of the zetetic terms as “problems” when dealing with exegetical discussions such as we find in these homilies of Chrysostom, see ζητέω, *PGL* 591: “2: inquire, seek ... hence pass. ptcpl neut., *problem* of exegesis or theology.” See also ζήτησις, *PGL* 591: “1. *question, inquiry*, in gen. ... esp. ref. exegetical problems” (emphasis original for the glosses). Chrysostom uses the participle and both the cognate nouns at key moments in many of these homilies to articulate his argument, as the notes within the translations will show. He does not use the term πρόβλημα, though he knows well of its connection in the Psalms with murky and enigmatic sayings that require interpretation. See, e.g., *Exp. Ps.* Ψ 49 §3 (*PG* 55:226) where, confronted by Ps 49:5 (κλινῶ εἰς

form of problems and solutions (often referred to in scholarship by the Byzantine neologism, *erōtapokriseis*), which was already traditional among Christian exegetes since at least Origen¹⁷ (and going back to Philo of Alexandria among Jewish readers of the Greek Bible), is one of the ways the Christian Scriptures were placed among the preeminent textual authorities of the culture, subject to scrutiny by believers and nonbelievers alike. This was both a strong bid for authority for these Scriptures (i.e., that they deserve such close and detailed study) and in turn a demand placed on them by the claims being made for their authoritative status as sources of philosophical and theological wisdom. But how exactly is the rather odd collection of literary sources contained within the biblical anthology, including the pedestrian form of the personal letter that predominates in the New Testament,¹⁸ suitably a sacred text, one that can claim not only to stand alongside but also to supersede the Homeric epics, for instance? And can these Christian Scriptures hold up under the very questions to which ancient philosophers and literary critics had subjected those and other works: are the things they say true? Are the things said and done in them evidence of virtue, or vice? Are there self-contradictions? Are things said that are impossible, or contrary to reason?¹⁹

παραβολὴν τὸ οὗς μου, ἀνοίξω ἐν ψαλτηρίῳ τὸ πρόβλημα μου [*sic*]), he says, *πρόβλημα δὲ ἐστὶ λόγος συνεσκιασμένος καὶ αἰνιγματώδης*; “a ‘problem’ is a statement that is shadowy and enigmatic in meaning.” John can also use the term *ἀπορία*, as in *Hom. Rom.* 12:20 §5 (PG 51:180), where the verse is said to contain “an apparent problem” (τὸ δοκοῦν ζήτημα), but not in the first half; rather, it is “the part that follows that contains a great quandary” (τὸ δὲ ἐντεῦθεν λοιπὸν πολλὴν ἔχει τὴν ἀπορίαν). He goes on to ask, “What then is the solution?” (Τίς οὖν ἐστὶν ἡ λύσις; PG 51:181). Among many other examples, see *Hom. Rom.* 16:3 B §2: “let’s proceed at last to the solution to these problems. What will the solution be?” (ἐπ’ αὐτὴν ἴωμεν λοιπὸν τῶν ζητουμένων τὴν λύσιν. Τίς οὖν ἡ λύσις ἔσται; PG 51:197).

17. Origen was certainly not the first. Bardy, “La littérature patristique,” discusses such second-century figures as Marcion, Apelles, and Tatian as exemplars of this form of question-and-answer literature. On Tatian, see more recently Matthew R. Crawford, “The *Problemata* of Tatian: Recovering the Fragments of a Second-Century Christian Intellectual,” *JTS* 67 (2016): 542–75.

18. Of the twenty-seven documents in the New Testament, arguably twenty-one are or were received as letters, and two other works (Acts and Revelation) contain letters within them.

19. Here I am paraphrasing the well-known ch. 25 of Aristotle’s *Poetica* (1460b), which begins, *Περὶ δὲ προβλημάτων καὶ λύσεων*, “Now concerning problems and solutions” (ed. Kassel, my translation). As Perrone, “Questions and Responses,” 201, notes,

By drawing upon the form of problems and solutions in these homilies on Pauline problem texts, Chrysostom situates his oratory at the nexus of schoolroom techniques for literary analysis and philosophical investigation, on the one hand, and of public rhetorical performance carefully poised between apologetics and entertainment, on the other.²⁰ Chrysostom seeks to make public study and talk about the Scriptures a competitor, not just to the study of Greek philosophy and its mythic, poetic, and epic sources of inspiration, but also to the conventional popular-entertainment vehicles of the late antique polis: the theater, the racetrack, athletic games, and oratorical competitions.²¹ Chrysostom himself foregrounds the comparison in one of our homilies:

we find the same “topics of *problemata*” in the discussion on scriptural interpretation in Origen, *Princ.* 4.1 (SC 268:256–92, ed. Crouzel and Simonetti), and throughout his oeuvre. By Chrysostom’s time, the form and procedure of *προβλήματα και λύσεις* were firmly established among Christian intellectuals charged with expounding and defending their Bible.

20. Attending to Chrysostom’s use of *ζητήματα και λύσεις* confounds attempts to impose dichotomies on his homiletics, such as that they are “essentially a scholastic activity” rather than “works of oratory”—so Cook, *Preaching and Popular Christianity*, 55–56, *passim*—or they are “a form of mass communication” and not “a form of dialogue”—so Isabella Sandwell, “Preaching and Christianisation: Communication, Cognition, and Audience Reception,” in *Revisioning John Chrysostom: New Approaches, New Perspectives*, ed. Chris L. de Wet and Wendy Mayer, *Critical Approaches to Early Christianity* 1 (Leiden: Brill, 2019), 137–74, esp. 157. The works translated in the present collection repeatedly demonstrate that Chrysostom’s homiletical practice involves *all* these things—pedagogy (including both instruction and correction), oratory (both conventional and innovative), dialogue (of various types and demeanors and with different partners), *and* mass communication (or, better, attempts at such). Rather than bifurcate, we do best to analyze how they come together in this particular, deliberately designed alchemy.

21. For the particular social spaces occupied by late fourth-century orator-bishops in relation to philosophical preaching and widespread forms of urban entertainment, see Jaclyn L. Maxwell, *Christianization and Communication in Late Antiquity: John Chrysostom and His Congregation in Antioch* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 11–64. On the physical spaces and attempts (material, political and rhetorical) to claim authority over them, see Christine Shephardson, *Controlling Contested Places: Late Antique Antioch and the Spatial Politics of Religious Controversy* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2014). On Chrysostom’s famous competitiveness with the theater, see Blake Leyerle, *Theatrical Shows and Ascetic Lives: John Chrysostom’s Attack on Spiritual Marriage* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001).

Those who are all aflutter over the spectacle of horse-racing can tell you the names, herd, ancestry, hometown, and upbringing of the horses with complete accuracy and detail,²² as well as how old they are, their performance on the track, and which horse, matched up in a heat with what other horse, will snatch up the win. And they can tell you what breed of horse, launched from a certain kind of starting gate and with what rider, will prevail in the race and run right past its rival. Likewise, those who devote their time to dance performances aren't inferior to the horse-racing enthusiasts, but they display even more madness about those who behave indecorously in the theater—the mimes and the dancing girls, I mean—and can recount in detail their ancestry, hometown, upbringing, and everything else. But when we're asked, "How many and what are the names of the letters of Paul?" we can't even tell their number! And even if there might be a few people who know their number, they're still at a loss when asked to provide an answer to the question of what cities received the letters. Yet a man who was a eunuch and a barbarian (cf. Acts 8:26–40), whose mind was pulled in many directions by countless business matters, was so devoted to the sacred books that he didn't even rest on the occasion of a journey but, when sitting in his chariot, was absorbed in the task of reading the divine Scriptures with complete attention. But in our case, although we don't have even a fraction of his occupational burden, we're like foreigners when it comes to the names of the letters. And that's the case even though we are assembled here every Lord's day and have the benefit of hearing the divine Scripture.²³

Using these analogies to other forms of cultural knowledge, to horse racing and the theater, John insists that valuation is demonstrated in quality of attention. A properly "Christian" public and private culture, in Chrysostom's eyes, is one that spends its time and places its intense focus on deep knowledge and scrutiny of the Scriptures. This is for him a catechetical and pedagogical commitment, as well as an apologetic one, that creates its own tensions, for John will use the "problems" in Scripture to capture his audience's attention, and yet he always wishes to leave them, not with unanswered questions, doubts, or concerns about Scripture, but with the full assurance provided by his solution to the problem he has brought

22. The term ἀκριβεία, enormously important for John, is used in this homily (as throughout his oeuvre) with all its senses: "attention," "detail," "care," "accuracy," and "rigor" (compare the entries in LSJ and PGL). I occasionally double-gloss it so the reader can see the full resonances within the argument.

23. *Hom. Rom. 16:3 A* §1 (PG 51:188).

to light. He wishes to teach them in a manner that piques their interest, but he does not wish to sully the scriptural record too much by allowing that it just *may* have “problems.” And Chrysostom eagerly (if unrealistically) wishes diligent study of the sacred Scriptures and keen knowledge of them to replace his congregants’ appetite for and interest in other forms of entertainment and enjoyment in the life of the late antique polis, including oratorical performances other than his own stylized and dramatic ones.

In another homily, John draws the contrast between these forms of public pursuits and entertainment with a striking gustatory image:

Again today I wish to lead you to fountains of honey, a honey of which one can never get enough. For such is the nature of Paul’s words, and all those who fill their hearts from these fountains speak forth in the Holy Spirit. And indeed, the pleasure of the divine utterances makes one lose sight of even the good taste of honey. The prophet shows this when he says: “*How sweet in my throat are your utterances, more than honey and honeycomb in my mouth*” (Ps 118:103).... For indeed, honey is destroyed in the digestive process, but the divine utterances when digested become sweeter and more useful, both to those who possess them and to many others. Now someone who has plentiful enjoyment from a physical meal and then belches from it is most unpleasant to their companion. But one who has belched forth utterances from the spiritual teaching shares the rich fragrance with their neighbor. Indeed, David, when he had continually enjoyed this kind of feasting, said, “*My heart belched out a good word*” (Ps 44:2). Yet it’s possible to belch forth a wicked word, too. In the case of a physical meal, the quality of the belching corresponds to the nature of the foods eaten. The same is true also with the power of words: many people belch forth things akin to what they eat. For example, if you go up to the theater and you listen to whorish hymns, then those are the kind of things you will surely belch forth in the presence of your neighbor. But if by coming to church you share in the hearing of spiritual things, then those are the kind of belches you’ll have, as well. That’s why the prophet said, “*My heart belched out a good word*” (Ps 44:2), showing us the nature of the meal he shared.²⁴

Biblical study, including careful consideration of things that “appear to be problems” should, on John’s gustatory metaphor, produce beneficent biblical belchings. The Golden Mouth’s sweet oratory is meant to handle the difficulties and stop bellies from roiling, resulting in the fresh breath of scriptural security.

24. *Hom. 1 Cor. 7:2–4* §1 (PG 51:208–9).

And, as Chrysostom often states, he wishes by his clever apologetic arguments of refutation (ἀπολογία, ἔλεγχος) of the apparent problems in the Pauline letters as Scripture, not just to entertain, but to arm his congregants with ammunition against the opponents of Paul and the church that await them “outside.”²⁵

Chrysostom employs some consistent techniques across these homilies, techniques that are found also elsewhere in his extensive corpus of homilies and other writings. As we have noted, the “problem” (τὸ ζήτημα, τὸ ζητούμενον) for which one seeks a solution is often introduced as an “apparent” (δοκοῦν) one, a formulation that simultaneously grants the problem and raises doubt about its reality. Often after bringing forward the “apparent problem,” Chrysostom will first use the rhetorical form of αὔξεις, “amplification,”²⁶ to make the problem even more dire before he eventually—after deliberately building dramatic tension and suspense—reveals the solution (λύσις). He appears to do this for several reasons. First, John wants to get his audience interested in the problem and all the more eager for the satisfactory solution to it that his homily will provide. Second, in the way he defines and aggrandizes the problem, Chrysostom often seeds key elements of the solution he will later offer via his argumentation. Third, amplifying or exaggerating the problem is a kind of high-wire act by which the preacher deliberately increases the degree of difficulty of the task so that when he does produce the solution, his achievement is all the more impressive.²⁷ In some cases, John is addressing famous “problem texts”

25. See *Hom. Rom. 16:3 B* §1 (PG 51:197); *Hom. 1 Cor. 11:19* §5 (PG 51:260); *Hom. 2 Cor. 4:13 B* §4 (PG 51:284); *Laud. Paul. 6.5* (AP 272), all using ἐπιστομίζειν (“muzzle them”); or *Hom. 2 Cor. 4:13 B* §4 (PG 51:284), ἀπορράπτειν (“zip their lips”).

26. For references to this term and the forms of instruction in rhetorical school, see R. Dean Anderson Jr., *Glossary of Greek Rhetorical Terms*, CBET 24 (Leuven: Peeters, 2000), 26–29. John would have learned this in his rhetorical education, whether under the famous rhetor, Libanius (so Socrates, *HE* 6.3, followed by many scholars even today), or another, if not Libanius. See the critical case against made by Pierre-Louis Malosse, “Jean Chrysostome a-t-il été l’élève de Libanios?” *Phoenix* 62 (2008): 273–80, who agrees nonetheless that “il est évident que Jean Chrysostome a reçu une solide formation rhétorique” (275).

27. In one of our homilies, *Hom. Gal. 2:11–14* §2 (PG 51:374), John quite explicitly names what he is doing: Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ παρακαλῶ προσέχειν. Καὶ γὰρ αὔξω τὴν κατηγορίαν, καὶ μείζονα ποιῶ, ἵνα ἐπιτείνω ὑμῶν τὴν σπουδὴν (“that’s why I’m urging you to pay close attention, for I’m going to amplify the accusation and make it worse, so I might heighten your attention”). That John is aware of this dynamic is shown also in the way he regards *Paul himself* as having used this very procedure, as, e.g., in his skilled argumentative move from *Rom 9:14–15*: Καὶ πάλιν αὔξει τὴν ἀντίθεσιν διὰ

that have become traditional by his time and require attention (such as the Antioch incident in Gal 2:11–14); in others, he takes a text that might appear to be innocuous or unproblematic (such as the epistolary greeting to Priscilla and Aquila in Rom 16:3), and he will find a way to turn it into a “problem” only in order—voilà!—to “solve” it.²⁸

And yet in turn, often the solution to one “problem” engenders further problems, in a kind of whack-a-mole dynamic that starts the whole process over again. For example, when treating Rom 16:3, John asks why it is that in his greeting Paul names the wife, Priscilla, before her husband, Aquila. Refusing the explanation that Paul did this casually or without purpose (ἀπλῶς), John concludes, “it seems to me (ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ) this was in recognition of the fact that her piety (εὐλάβεια) was superior to her husband’s.”²⁹ John then defends this solution as more than a mere conjecture (στοχασμός) of his own, by appealing to Acts 18:24–26, where Priscilla provides remedial catechesis to Apollos from Alexandria. But this solution then leads to another set of problems: (1) does this mean that women of Chrysostom’s day also can teach and hold positions superior to their husbands? (2) And didn’t Paul himself in 1 Tim 2:12 forbid a woman to teach? Not surprisingly, John will find a solution to these problems, too. In both of these cases, he will constrain, rather than universalize, the authority and example of the past, setting a time limit or other restriction on the apostle’s words. To question (1) comes solution (1): no, it was just back in the time of the apostles that women displayed such fervor for the gospel and were allowed to play more “manly roles,” and, to question (2), solution (2): women’s instruction, even back in the day, was only of a very particular kind—leading others to faith by good example. Even in Paul’s praise of Priscilla in Rom 16:3, as set alongside the apparently contradictory injunctions of 1 Tim 2:9–15, one should be able to see that what the apostle was strictly forbidding was for women to teach from the pulpit, engaging in

μέσου διακόπτων αὐτήν, καὶ λύων, καὶ ἐτέραν πάλιν ἀπορίαν ποιῶν (“and again Paul amplifies the contradiction, cutting it off in midstream and solving it, and in turn fashioning yet another quandary”). See *Hom. Rom.* 16.7 (PG 60:558).

28. That is, as pronounced by himself. We cannot assume the audiences, in whole or in part, were actually convinced. And indeed, in various homilies in miniseries we have evidence that in fact they were not, or at least some members of the congregation challenged his answers with what he considers to be new “problems.” See, e.g., *Hom. Rom.* 16:3 B §§1–2 (PG 51:195–200).

29. *Hom. Rom.* 16:3 A §3 (PG 51:191).

“public speaking, and the oratory that is proper to the priesthood.”³⁰ That the apostle didn’t speak about pulpits at all does not bother John! The problems, both of his text and of his own context, are pronounced solved. And yet we certainly cannot assume that his audiences always were persuaded, even as the very form of *ζητήματα καὶ λύσεις* presumes an acknowledged degree of disagreement or anxiety about the text and its possible meanings that the preacher seeks to confront.

It is especially fascinating to watch in these homilies how John can deal with material that is deadly serious, such as engaging some “problems” that have been hurled by outsiders against the Christ-believers, or readings promulgated by those John designates “heretics” (such as Marcionites and Manichaeans), and yet accept that challenge in a way that is part apologist, part bravado, part purposeful catechist, part public theologian, and part performance artist. These homilies provide an excellent opportunity to study the relationship in late antique oratory between problem and opportunity; between deadly serious and entertaining; between problems imposed and problems fashioned for the sake of argument. And looking at ancient Christian biblical interpretation according to this approach of “problems and solutions” allows us to see many things that do not fit any traditional divide between a “literal” or an “allegorical” interpretation of the biblical text and that certainly contest simple declarations that the Antiochenes uniformly practiced the former.³¹ Watching a skilled public orator like Chrysostom engage with his biblical text’s “apparent problems” enables us to see that textual meaning is not simply a given, by either “literal” or “allegorical” reading—or the great volume of biblical interpretation that operates in the middle—but is fashioned in each moment of interpretive contestation.³²

30. *Hom. Rom. 16:3 A* §3 (PG 51:192).

31. As just one example of this, see John’s clever treatment of “surface” and “deep” meanings of the text of Gal 2:11–14 in *Hom. Gal. 2:11–14* (passim). On the issue, see Perrone, “Questions and Responses,” 200, who recognizes that, although the procedure can be thought to be a way of avoiding allegory, “yet, the method is not tied to literalism.” And, indeed, the form can equally be a vehicle of “allegorical interpretation,” as can be seen, e.g., in Donald A. Russell and David Konstan, eds. and trans., *Heraclitus, Homeric Problems*, Writings from the Greco-Roman World 14 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005). On how Chrysostom confounds the claim about Antiochene literalism, see Mitchell, *Heavenly Trumpet*, esp. 389–94.

32. In this regard Chrysostom is but one example of what I have termed “the agonistic paradigm” that pervades ancient Christian biblical interpretation (see below, 84 n. 267).

The History of Publication of the “Occasional Homilies” on Pauline Passages

The present volume stands within, and is fully indebted to, the long and involved process by which Chrysostom's homilies have been transcribed, edited,³³ collected, and then separated and recombined, from his own lifetime forward to the present. Having been preserved in manuscripts from late antiquity forward, the earliest print publication of these eighteen homilies was embroiled in the complex and conflicted history of the publication of Chrysostom's works in the early modern (Reformation and post-Reformation) period.³⁴ A signally important moment toward the modern publication of this collection of varied homilies by Chrysostom on individual Pauline passages was an intervention by a young Jesuit in the 1580s who remained “anonymous” yet was to become known to history as the famous Fronto Ducaeus.³⁵ He designed for the *Opera omnia* in Latin translation what would become the usual mode of presentation of Chrysostom's homilies on biblical texts: five volumes, with the first four containing the large homily sets on biblical books in the Old Testament

33. On the combination of stenographic notes and later editing that can be detected in some of the homilies, see the important study of Blake Goodall, *The Homilies of St. John Chrysostom on the Letters of St. Paul to Titus and Philemon* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979). This issue deserves continual attention as we work with texts of what were once oral performances, and yet have likely been subjected to various forms of editing toward publication in written form. See also p. 72 n. 243 below.

34. A concise general introduction to major editions of all of Chrysostom's works (in Greek and in Latin) up until the end of the nineteenth century may be found in W. R. W. Stephens, *Saint John Chrysostom: His Life and Time: A Sketch of the Church and the Empire in the Fourth Century* (London: Murray, 1883), viii–xii; a fuller treatment with bibliographic catalogue may be found in Chrysostomos Baur, *Jean Chrysostome et ses oeuvres dans l'histoire littéraire*, Université de Louvain Recueil de Travaux 18 (Louvain: Bureaux du Recueil; Paris: Fontemoing, 1907).

35. So Jean-Louis Quantin, “Du Chrysostome latin au Chrysostome grec: Une histoire européenne (1588–1613),” in *Chrysostomosbilder in 1600 Jahren: Facetten der Wirkungsgeschichte eines Kirchenvaters*, ed. Martin Wallraff and Rudolf Brändle, *Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte* 105 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008), 267–346, esp. 269: “Le responsable de cette révision était délibérément resté anonyme, mais il s'agissait d'un jeune jésuite, alors étudiant « en Theologie dans le Collège de sa Compagnie à Paris » (le Collège de Clermont), le P. Fronton du Duc. Il inaugurerait ainsi son œuvre d'éditeur des Pères grecs : le fait, capital pour comprendre la suite de son travail chrysostomien, ne semble pas avoir été relevé jusqu'ici.”

(Genesis and Psalms) and the New Testament (Matthew, John, and the Pauline Letters),³⁶ arranged according to canonical order, and the fifth volume consisting of a *fourre-tout* (“grab bag”) “pour les sermons isolés, les traités et les lettres.”³⁷ This reflects also the circumstances of continual discovery of manuscripts and of print publication of further works, as the “*Opera omnia*” of Chrysostom were expanded, often without a clear arrangement, into the fifth (and subsequent) volumes, including exegetical homilies among them, but not exclusively or as separated out. In the multiple editions to follow in the early seventeenth century, homilies on individual Pauline passages become included in this category of “les sermons isolés,” in the rush by both Protestant and Catholic scholars to locate, edit, translate, publish, and disseminate the works of Chrysostom. The story of collaboration and competition across national and confessional lines in the quest to discover manuscripts, transcribe previously unpublished works, share findings, and publish Chrysostom’s writings is a fascinating one.³⁸ The idea of a Chrysostomic “miscellany” was, however, not new, since many medieval manuscripts of Chrysostom’s works contain assortments of various homilies, often without any clear overriding scheme or thematic arrangement, even if sometimes there appear to be clusters or groupings of like sermons in parts. Even the Byzantine *Catalogus Augustanus* (preserved

36. Earlier, the *editio princeps* of the Greek text of Chrysostom’s homily sets, the 1529 edition published at Verona, had four volumes just for the serial homilies on the Pauline Letters. See Bernardino Donato, ed., *Divi Ioannis Chrysostomi in omnes Pauli apostoli epistolas accuratissima, vereque aurea, et divina interpretatio* (Verona: Stephanus et fratres, 1529).

37. Quotation from Quantin, “Du Chrysostome latin au Chrysostome grec,” 269. Quantin contrasts the 1530 edition of Erasmus, which was “marquée par le plus grand désordre ... les homélies sur Paul étant même dispersées entre le t. I (imprimé après les autres) et le t. IV, à cause de l’arrivée tardive de textes nouveaux qu’il avait fallu traduire” (“Du Chrysostome latin au Chrysostome grec,” 269 n. 5).

38. See the analysis of Quantin, “Du Chrysostome latin au Chrysostome grec,” 325: “Même si cette collaboration interconfessionnelle n’était pas tout à fait sans précédents ... elle était unique par son ampleur et sa durée.” Quantin’s article (especially pp. 311–25) documents this history beautifully, including in the correspondence of the key figures on the continent and beyond who assisted Henry Savile and his assistants in their pursuit of manuscripts and corrected readings. At the same time, this was no easy ecumenism: “Rien, pourtant, n’en transparaît dans le Chrysostome, où les notes sont purement philologiques, sans aucune incursion dans la théologie” (326). Fuller documentation may be found there as well as in his earlier study; see Jean-Louis Quantin, “Les jésuites et l’érudition anglicane,” *Dix-septième siècle* 237 (2007): 691–711.

in Monac. gr. 478 [XII]), which listed individual homilies by Chrysostom thought to be authentic, although including ten of our homilies, did not place them together or in any ordered pattern.³⁹ One of the reasons for this is that the line between exegetical and ethical or theological or ascetic writings by Chrysostom is not so firm, and hence different classifications of the same homilies were—and remain—possible.

Henry Savile and the “Eton Chrysostom”

It was the Oxonian Henry Savile who, in his splendid eight-volume edition of the works of Chrysostom in Greek (published in full at Eton in 1611–1612),⁴⁰ was largely responsible for shaping a modern collection of “isolated homilies” on Pauline passages.⁴¹ While for the homily sets on all fourteen Pauline letters Savile depended upon the 1529 Verona edition as the basis for his Greek text,⁴² he relied on fresh research in manuscripts from all over Europe, by himself and his team, as well as other collaborators, for his fifth volume (published in 1611), which, likely inspired by Ducaeus’s precedent, was devoted to *Χρυσοστόμου εἰς διαφοροὺς τῶν ἁγίων γραφῶν περικοπὰς γνήσιοι λόγοι* (“genuine homilies of Chrysostom on various passages of the Holy Scriptures”).⁴³ Within this volume, Savile

39. **3** *Hom. 2 Cor* 11:1; **14** *Hom. Rom.* 5:3; **16, 17** *Hom. Rom.* 16:3 A, B; **18, 19, 20** *Hom. 2 Cor.* 4:13 A, B, F; **27** *Hom. 1 Tim.* 5:9–10; **35** *Hom. Gal.* 2:11–14; **93** *Hom. 1 Cor.* 10:1–11. See discussion of this catalogue below, under *Authenticity*.

40. See Henry Savile, ed., *Τοῦ ἐν ἁγίοις πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἰωάννου ἀρχιεπισκόπου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου τῶν εὐρισκομένων τόμοι ὀκτώ* (Eton: Ioannes Norton, 1611–1612); volume 5 bears the date 1611 and volume 8, 1612. Baur, *Jean Chrysostome et ses oeuvres dans l’histoire littéraire*, 106, explains that after the publication of the whole, in 1613 Savile added “en tête une magnifique gravure, portant la date de 1613” (so in some scholarly references the date is given as 1611–1613).

41. Savile’s dependence upon his precursors is well documented by Quantin, “Du Chrysostome latin au Chrysostom grec,” *passim*.

42. One can see this in Savile’s own printer’s copy for these volumes, which consisted of the Verona edition plus his corrections. See Oxford, Bodl. Auctarium E.3.5 [olim Miscell. 51⁵] and E.3.6 [olim Miscell. 51⁶], in CCG 1.140 and 141, pp. 118–20, with helpful description by S. L. Greenslade, “A Printer’s Copy for the Eton Chrysostom,” *StPatr* 7 (1966): 60–64. On the textual basis of the Verona edition in a single manuscript, see Goodall, *The Homilies of St. John Chrysostom on the Letters of St. Paul to Titus and Philemon*, 2–3.

43. Savile’s decision to publish only the Greek text and not a Latin translation with it can be seen as both a practical matter (in terms of the size and time to production

collected eighteen homilies on Pauline passages, arranged in canonical order by book.⁴⁴ These followed miscellaneous homilies on Old Testament passages first, then New Testament passages from the gospels and Acts. The homilies on Pauline lemmata appear in the canonical order of the letters, but they are not set apart or separately numbered from among these other biblical homilies. As the notes to the fifth volume indicate, in only one case was Savile able to rely on a previously published edition for the Greek text of these homilies, that of *Hom. Rom. 5:3* published by Fronto Ducaeus (Fronton du Duc) in 1604.⁴⁵ In all of the other cases, Savile edited the Greek text from transcriptions of one or more manuscripts. The page proofs (*exemplaria Savilii*) that Savile sent to the printer, held now at the Bodleian, consist of transcriptions made by himself or various assistants or colleagues that he used as his base text, together with his own editorial interventions.⁴⁶ These include adding new, standardized titles at the beginning (such as εἰς τὸ, plus abbreviated lemma⁴⁷), making his own enumeration of the homilies for his edition, capitalizing of proper names, marking paragraph breaks, making textual emendations,⁴⁸ adding notations of variant or conjectural readings to be printed in the margins, and

of his edition) and a theological one vis-à-vis Protestant-Catholic polemics and contestations: “Mais s’en tenir à l’original permettait aussi d’échapper aux soupçons et aux polémiques qu’auraient fatalement suscités des traductions” (Quantin, “Du Chrysostome latin au Chrysostome grec,” 327). See Quantin’s astute discussion of the issue, and the degree to which for the Catholic editions it was the Latin translation that stood as the crucial authority for theological debate: “C’est dans celles-ci [sc. les traductions Latins], on l’a vu, beaucoup plus que dans les éditions grecques, que théologiens et érudits de la Contre-Réforme avaient coutume de repérer et de dénoncer des alterations.”

44. See HS 5:292–437. In HS 8:30–59, Savile included the seven homilies *De laudibus sancti Pauli apostoli*, from transcriptions made by his assistant, Samuel Slade, in Constantinople and Mount Athos.

45. See HS 5:729–33. Savile drew upon Fronto Ducaeus, ed., *Sancti patris nostri Ioannis Chrysostomi tractatum decas de diversis Novi Testamenti locis, nunc primum graece et latine in lucem edita, opera* (Bordeaux: apud Franciscum Buderium, 1604), 434, as confirmed in Savile’s printer’s copy: Oxford, Bodl. Auctarium E.4.4 (olim Miscell. 51²⁰). See CCG 1.155, p. 155.

46. See CCG 1:xv–xvii, 116–58. Savile donated them to the Bodleian in 1620.

47. E.g., at R.58, p. 610, he crosses out τοῦ αὐτοῦ ✠^{οῦ} ὁμιλία (“a sermon by the same author, Chrysostom”).

48. For one such example, in *Hom. 1 Cor. 7:39–40* Savile adopted the conjectural reading of κοιμηθῆ in the lemma within the title to the homily, but his marginal note says that his manuscript (Monac. gr. 352, fol. 63) reads ἀποθάνῃ (HS 5:337, line 14).

supplying marginal biblical references (in Greek abbreviations) to passages Chrysostom has quoted.

In creating his edition of the Greek text of the homilies on individual Pauline passages, Savile did not follow any single Greek manuscript, for no manuscript now in existence, let alone the limited number available to Savile, contains all the eighteen homilies he printed, and never in a complete canonical sequence. For Savile's miscellaneous Pauline homilies, as we know from his printer's pages and notebooks and the "*Notae*" in volume 8, he relied upon transcriptions of manuscripts at Augsburg,⁴⁹ Munich, Oxford, Paris, Venice, and Constantinople, as shown in the following list. Each entry provides the following information: (1) the homily title and CPG number; (2) the manuscript(s) drawn upon by Savile;⁵⁰ (3) the pages of Savile's printer's copy;⁵¹ and (4) the pages in Savile's published edition.

Hom. Rom. 5:3 (CPG 4373)

Manuscript: Monac. gr. 6, fols. 278–86,⁵² from Ducaeus (print edition, 1604)⁵³

49. Savile thanks David Hoeschel, the Lutheran rector of Saint Anna's gymnasium and the librarian of the manuscript collection at Augsburg, among others, in 8:1. Hoeschel is the only scholar he commends in HS 8:707–8 specifically for his assistance with the miscellaneous sermons in HS 5. See also Greenslade, "Printer's Copy for the Eton Chrysostom," 61. For Savile's connections with the vibrant scholarly and ecumenical patristics scholarship led by Hoeschel at Augsburg, see Quantin, "Du Chrysostome latin au Chrysostome grec," 289–300, under the subtitle, "La paix patristique d'Augsbourg? David Hoeschel et ses correspondants" (the latter including Greek Orthodox as well as Roman Catholics).

50. This represents my inferences based on the information Savile gives in his "*Notae in Tomum Quintum*" (HS 8:729–33, including notes from one of his assistants, John Bois), as cross-referenced with the information provided in CCG, the Pinakes website, and older collection catalogues, as necessary.

51. From CCG 1:125–56 (Oxford, Bodleian, Auctarium), with our homilies represented in codices K, L, O, P, Q, R, and X (CCG 1.144, 145, 148, 149, 150, 151, 155).

52. The Munich codices are in the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek (BSB) and are now accessible at Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, "Münchener Digitalisierungszentrum: Digitale Bibliothek," <https://digitale-sammlungen.de>.

53. As noted above, Savile used the print edition of this homily from Fronto Ducaeus, *Sancti patris nostri Ioannis Chrysostomi* (1604), 259–60, as found in Auctarium E.4.4 in the Bodleian collection, *exemplaria Saulii*, codex X. In his proofs to the printer, Savile included the pages of Ducaeus's printed edition where Ducaeus says the Greek text of this homily came from a manuscript in the Augustana bibliotheca, as transcribed for him by the humanist and man of letters Marcus Velserus. See Fronto

Exemplarium Sauilii Codex X.5 (pp. 257–97)

Savile (1611): 5:292–98

Hom. Rom. 8:28 (CPG 4374)

Manuscript: Monac. gr. 352,⁵⁴ fols. 1–7^v

Exemplarium Sauilii Codex L.1 (pp. 1–9)

Savile (1611): 5:299–303

Hom. Rom. 12:20 (CPG 4375)

Manuscript: Oxon. Coll. Nov. 80,⁵⁵ fols. 220–33^v

Exemplarium Sauilii Codex K.14 (pp. 153–68)

Savile (1611): 5:304–14

Hom. Rom. 16:3 A (CPG 4376)

Manuscripts

(1) Monac. gr. 6, fols. 229–36⁵⁶

Ducaeus, *Sancti patris nostri Ioannis Chrysostomi*, 412. This must be Monac. gr. 6 (see CCG 2.40, pp. 40–42), the only Munich manuscript that contains this homily, on fols. 278–86; see also the evidence of mutilation at the end of *Hom. Rom.* 16:3 B, as discussed below. However, this manuscript was not at that time in Augsburg (as Ducaeus says) but in the Bavarian Library in Munich. Savile did make some corrections and conjectural emendations to Ducaeus's text (8:729: "*quam editionem perpaucis in locis emendatam sequuti sumus*") but does not mention having any other manuscript witnesses. The Bodleian Auctarium T.1.1 is a transcription from Ducaeus that includes this homily (CCG 1.163, p. 161, with this homily on pp. 142–45 bis).

54. Greenslade, "Printer's Copy for the Eton Chrysostom," 61: "L is from the Augsburg manuscripts. Later moved to Munich" (but note that it also contains manuscripts that were already in Munich, such as Monac. gr. 6). This is the only manuscript in Germany containing this homily (CCG 2.72, p. 61). Indeed, Pinakes lists only one other manuscript known to contain it: Mon. Leimonos 42 (Lesbos), fols. 71–78* (X).

The famous Augsburg Library codices were moved to Munich in 1806 and hold the numbers 348–574, among which is this manuscript, Monac. gr. 352. On the history, see Donald F. Jackson, "Augsburg Manuscript Acquisitions 1545–1600," *Codices manuscripti* 29 (2000): 1–10.

55. CCG 1.98: "*Nostro codice Harmarius ... deinde Sauilius pro editione sua usi sunt.*" In HS 8:730, Savile says he used the transcription of the New College manuscript, which was in a few places not satisfactorily corrected ("*aliquot in locis non satis emendata, quod dolendum est*"), and, lacking the help of any other codex, he could not be sure of the readings; he then gives seven disputed readings with his conjectures. Pinakes to date lists just three manuscripts that contain this homily: Athens, Ethnike Bibliothekē tes Hellados 375 (XIII); Genova, Biblioteca Franzoniana, Urbani 13 (XI); and Moscow, Gosudarstvennyj Istoričeskij Muzej 128 (X).

56. Savile mentions two codices containing both homilies, "*quorum unus Archi-*

(2) codex in Venice, not yet identified⁵⁷

Exemplarium Sauilii Codices

(1) L.27 (pp. 507–19)

(2) P.7 (pp. 88–99)

Savile (1611): 5:314–20

Hom. Rom. 16:3 B (CPG 4376)

Manuscripts

(1) Monac. gr. 6, fols. 236–46^v

(2) codex in Venice, not yet identified

Exemplarium Sauilii Codices

(1) L.27 (pp. 519–36)

(2) P.7 (pp. 100–118)

Savile (1611): 5:321–29

Hom. 1 Cor. 7:2–4 (CPG 4377)

Manuscript: Monac. gr. 352,⁵⁸ fols. 54–63

Exemplarium Sauilii Codex L.4 (pp. 24–37)

Savile (1611): 5:330–37

Hom. 1 Cor. 7:39–40 (CPG 4378)

Manuscript: Monac. gr. 352,⁵⁹ fols. 63–70^v

Exemplarium Sauilii Codex L.4 (pp. 37–47)

Savile (1611): 5:337–43

Hom. 1 Cor. 10:1–11 (CPG 4380)

Manuscripts

(1) Oxon. Coll. Nov. 80,⁶⁰ fols. 164–74

episcopi Philadelphae Venetijs, alter Bauaricus” (HS 8:730). On this archbishop and how Savile learned of his manuscript holdings, see Quantin, “Du Chrysostome latin au Chrysostome grec,” 320–21; Greenslade, “Printer’s Copy for the Eton Chrysostom,” 62. That the Bavarian manuscript that was the source of L.27 is Monac. gr. 6 is confirmed by the mutilation at the end of *Hom. Rom. 16:3 B* at πεπλημμε[λημένων] (PG 51:206, 51; CCG 2.40, pp. 40–42, conforms with CCG 1.145, p. 132).

57. A good candidate may be Genova, Biblioteca Franzoniana Urbani 12 (X) (= CCG 5.21, pp. 18–19), fols. 119–26, 126–37.

58. HS 8:730: “*Nos tamen ita, uti in codice Augustano reperimus.*” That this manuscript is Monac. gr. 352 is confirmed also by Daniela Mazzoni Dami, *Giovanni Crisostomo, prima omelia sul matrimonio: “In illud, Propter fornicationes uxorem,”* Studi e testi 14 (Florence: Università degli Studi di Firenze, 1998), 55.

59. Savile treats this homily as from the same source as the prior (HS 8:730–31).

60. Elsewhere Savile relied upon the transcription of six homilies from this codex

(2) Monac. gr. 6, fols. 259^v–270⁶¹
Exemplarium Sauilii Codex O.12 (pp. 429–54)⁶²
 Savile (1611): 5:343–55

Hom. 1 Cor. 11:19 (CPG 4381)

Manuscripts

(1) Monac. gr. 352, fols. 99^v–107
 (2) Monac. gr. 6, fols. 212A^v–220⁶³
Exemplarium Sauilii Codex L.7 (pp. 75–86)
 Savile (1611): 5:362–68

Hom. 2 Cor. 4:13 A (CPG 4383)

Manuscripts

(1) Oxon. Coll. Nov. 80, fols. 4–13
 (2) Monac. gr. 352, fols. 7^v–17⁶⁴
Exemplarium Sauilii Codices
 (1) K.4 (pp. 35–44)
 (2) O.16 (pp. 521–39)
 Savile (1611): 5:368–75

Hom. 2 Cor. 4:13 B (CPG 4383)

Manuscripts

(1) Oxon. Coll. Nov. 80, fols. 13^v–22
 (2) Monac. gr. 352, fols. 17–25

published earlier by John Harmar. See Ioannis Harmari, *D. Ioannis Chrysostomi ... Homiliae sex, ex manuscriptis Codicibus Novi Collegii* (Oxford: J. Barnes, 1586). See CCG 1:98 and further comments by Quantin, “Du Chrysostome latin au Chrysostome grec,” 272. However, none of the six homilies transcribed and published by Harmar correspond to our Pauline homilies. Quantin notes that Harmar had promised to publish a Chrysostomic “miscellanea,” but that never saw the light of day (“Du Chrysostome latin au Chrysostome grec,” 311 with n. 189).

61. HS 8:731: “*quam ex codice in bibliotheca Collegii Novi Oxon. descriptam, ex manuscripto Bauarico emendauimus.*”

62. Greenslade, “Printer’s Copy for the Eton Chrysostom,” 61: “O is more complex but mostly from Oxford.”

63. HS 8:731: “*ex Augustana bibliotheca descriptam emendauimus ex. ms. in bibliotheca Bauarica.*” Monac. gr. 6 has *inc. mut.* before ὥστε τὸν θρῆνον (PG 51:253,2).

64. HS 8:732: “*Porro eas [sc. has tres orationes] ex biblioth. Collegii Novi Oxon. descriptas castigauimus ex codice Augustano.*” The version in Codex O represents a transcription from one of his assistants, in a different hand, and without any printing markups.

Exemplarium Sauilii Codices

- (1) K.4 (pp. 45–54)
- (2) O.16 (pp. 540–58)

Savile (1611): 5:375–82

Hom. 2 Cor. 4:13 Γ (CPG 4383)

Manuscripts

- (1) Oxon. Coll. Nov. 80, fols. 22^v–33
- (2) Monac. gr. 352, fols. 25–35

Exemplarium Sauilii Codices

- (1) K.4 (pp. 55–66)
- (2) O.16 (pp. 558–81)

Savile (1611): 5:382–91

Hom. 2 Cor. 11:1 (CPG 4384)Manuscripts⁶⁵

- (1) Monac. gr. 352, fols. 197–205
- (2) Monac. gr. 6, fols. 199^v–212^v

Exemplarium Sauilii Codex L.12 (152–64)

Savile (1611): 5:392–97

Hom. Gal. 2:11–14 (CPG 4391)

Manuscripts

- (1) Paris. gr. 759, fols. 337–49 (transcribed by Fronto Ducaeus⁶⁶)
- (2) codex not yet identified, perhaps from Paris⁶⁷
- (3) Monac. gr. 6, fols. 247–259^v, *inc. mut.*⁶⁸

65. HS 8:732: “*descriptam ex Augustana bibliotheca emendauimus ex Bauarica.*”

66. In further investigation more can be done on Ducaeus’s contribution toward the publication of this homily, including the relationship between the transcription of Paris. gr. 759 in L.22 and that preserved in Auctarium T.1.1 (CCG 1.163, p. 161), which includes this homily on pp. 127–35.

67. Greenslade, “Printer’s Copy of the Eton Chrysostom,” 61: “the bulk of R [comes from manuscripts] in Paris.”

68. In his “*Notae*” (HS 8:732) Savile says he recognized in a transcription made by John Bois of a codex from Bavaria (“*in codice Bauarico*”) that a homily without an incipit (ἀρχέφαλον) was Chrysostom’s *Hom. Gal. 2:11–14*, which he termed “*inter praecipuas Chrysostomi facile*” (“certainly among the most distinguished of Chrysostom’s homilies”). This mutilated opening (such that the text begins at πρὸς ἀλλήλους [PG 51:374,24]) corresponds with Monac. gr. 6 (CCG 2.40, p. 41). This transcription is L.28 among Savile’s *exemplaria*. Savile says he supplied the missing parts and corrected the Bavarian codex’s readings against another manuscript whose transcription came to him from “*doctissimus*” Fronto Ducaeus (“*expleuimus et accurate castigauimus*”).

- (4) codex from Constantinople,⁶⁹ not yet identified⁷⁰ (transcribed by Samuel Slade)

mus ex manuscripto doctissimi Frontonis Ducae”). That second manuscript can be securely identified as Paris. gr. 759 (X), the transcription for which is Savile’s R.58. This is confirmed by comparing the retained page heading (referring to the feast on January 16, εἰς τὴν προσκύνησιν τῆς ἀλύσεως τοῦ ἁγίου ἀποστόλου Πέτρου), the wording of the heading to the homily, the use of the orthographic symbol Ϡ^{ov} for Χρυσοστόμου, and the text, all replicated in R.58, pp. 610–611. It is also indicated by the fact that the lacuna mid-page on R.58, p. 611, lines 12–13, μετὰ] τοσαύτης φυλακῆς ... αὐτῶν τῇ ὑποκρίσει [Ἀλλ’ ὅτε εἶδον] (PG 51:373,9–52; the lacuna is not noted in CCG 1.151, p. 147) corresponds to the full page text of Paris. gr. 759 fol. 337^v. Savile must have filled this lacuna from R.84 (because this part of the homily does not appear in the extant text of Monac. gr. 6). The source of Savile’s R.84 remains uncertain. At its incipit on R.84, p. 756, we see a different heading for the homily than in R.58 (reading τὰ γενόμενα σοφωτάτω for τὰ γίνομενα) and some variant readings, such as an added ἡμῖν after γινομένην and before ἀπεῖργε (PG 51:371,16), indicating it was not another copy of Paris. gr. 759. However, there is a note by the transcriber, saying, “*Ex eodem cod.: ibidem: descripsi conferendi causâ cū exemplari parisiensi*,” dated April 20, which likely refers to Paris. gr. 759 as the *comparandum* mentioned. Of the Paris manuscripts in CCG 7 (*pars prior*), only one contains the homily preceding this one (R.83, *Paenit.* hom. 9), and that is Paris. gr. 660 (CCG 7.120), but it does not contain *Hom. Gal. 2:11–14*, so that cannot be it (sc. “*Ex eodem cod*”). Further research into Savile’s *exemplaria* should be able to resolve this question. In any case, the two principal witnesses used for this homily are the Bavarian and Paris codices identified above. From Savile’s editorial directions on his *exemplaria* at L.28 and R.58, we can reconstruct a sequence of four blocks he used to reconstruct the full text of this homily. At L.28, p. 537 he tells the printer to take the incipit of this homily “only lacking the beginning,” and pointing to pages 610 (=R.58, p. 610) and 756 (=R.84, p. 756). The printer took **block α** (PG 51:371.1–51:372.9 to μετὰ [τοσαύτης φυλακῆς]) from R.58, pp. 610–611, 12. Because R.58, p. 611 has a lacuna, they then were to take **block β** (PG 51:373.9–52, μετὰ] τοσαύτης φυλακῆς ... αὐτῶν τῇ ὑποκρίσει [Ἀλλ’ ὅτε εἶδον]) from R.84, p. 757. Then they were to take **block γ** (PG 51:373.52–374.24) from R.58, p. 611, lines 13–36: Ἀλλ’ ὅτε εἶδον to πρὸς [ἀλλήλους—the final line of text on that page. There we find a note from Savile pointing the printer to Bois’s “*Bavarica booke*, which here forward is to be followed” (i.e., L.28, starting with p. 537 = Monac. gr. 6, fol. 247). For **block δ**, the rest of the homily (PG 51:374.24–388.47), Savile drew upon the Munich codex, his base text.

69. Savile says it was only after he had compiled and corrected the transcriptions that he had of this homily that he received another one from his assistant, Samuel Slade, from a manuscript he had copied in Constantinople (HS 8:732). Slade’s transcriptions from Constantinople are collected in Auct. E.3.15 (codex Q). See Greenslade, “Printer’s Copy of the Eton Chrysostom,” 63; Quantin, “Du Chrysostome latin au Chrysostome grec,” 315, n. 205. Savile was not able to incorporate readings from the Constantinopolitan

Exemplarium Sauilii Codices

- (1) R.58 (pp. 610–21)
- (2) R.84 (pp. 756–67, *inc. mut. and des. mut.*)⁷¹
- (3) L.28 (pp. 537–57)
- (4) Q.20 (pp. 112^v–123^v)

Savile (1611): 5:398–410

Hom. Phil. 1:18 (CPG 4385)

Manuscripts

- (1) Monac. gr. 352, fols. 90–99^v
- (2) Monac. gr. 6, fols. 220–28⁷²

Exemplarium Sauilii Codex L.6 (pp. 61–74)

Savile (1611): 5:410–17

Hom. 1 Tim. 5:9–10 (CPG 4386)

Manuscripts

- (1) Oxon. Coll. Nov. 80, fols. 101^v–116^v
- (2) Monac. gr. 6, fols. 93^v–108⁷³

Exemplarium Sauilii Codex K.5 (pp. 67–84)

manuscript (which he pronounced a “*non contemnendum apographum*”) within his reconstructed text of this homily that went to the printer (see the previous note), but he did include a record and assessments of fifty-seven readings from that manuscript in his “*Notae*” (8:732–33), some of which he thought preferable to his own text that had gone into press before Slade’s transcription of this manuscript had arrived. Many of those readings were later adopted by Montfaucon (1721) and hence are represented in the text now in PG (more on this history below).

70. Pinakes lists only one manuscript currently in Istanbul that contains this homily, but it is lacunate, missing 4 folios (= PG 51:372.10–379.37). Savile’s “*Notae*” (HS 8:732–33) include references to the text on these folios and list no lacunae for Q.20, so (unless the damage to the manuscript occurred later) it is not the source of Slade’s transcription. For Slade’s itinerary on his two voyages, and his death in Zakynthos (ca. 1612), see Greenslade, “Printer’s Copy for the Eton Chrysostom,” 63; Quantin, “Du Chrysostom latin au Chrysostome grec,” 319–20.

71. These indications of mutilated text in CCG 1.151, p. 149 do not refer to missing parts of manuscripts but to text that Savile marked with an X because he wanted the printer to use a different transcription of the homily for those sections. In the first instance, he probably used R.58, and in the second, L.28 (see n. 68 for the procedure Savile used).

72. HS 8:733: “*Hanc orationem ... ex August. Biblioth. descriptam, & ex cod. Bauarico emendatam damus.*”

73. HS 8:734: “*Eam ex biblioth. Collegii Novi Oxon. descriptam, ex codice Ms. in bibliotheca Bauarica emendauimus.*”

Savile (1611): 5:425–37

Hom. 2 Tim. 3:1 (CPG 4423)

Not in Savile

Hom. Tit. 2:11–12 (CPG 4456)

Not in Savile

This list may not be comprehensive of all the manuscripts consulted by Savile in producing his edition of these homilies, either based on his own transcriptions or those from the work of his team who traveled throughout Europe and the eastern Mediterranean looking at manuscripts or from his correspondence with scholars abroad. But it does demonstrate that one needs to have only three manuscripts to which we are certain he had access—Oxon. Coll. Novi 80 (X–XI), Monac. gr. 6 (X), and Monac. gr. 352 (XI)—to account for all sixteen of the homilies in his collection of homilies on miscellaneous Pauline texts that we include in the present volume.⁷⁴ Most importantly, it was perhaps Savile’s knowledge of these three codices, which contain, respectively, six, twelve, and eight miscellaneous homilies dedicated to Pauline passages, that led him to the idea of creating a continuous subcollection of homilies on individual Pauline passages.⁷⁵ And, in turn, it appears to have been Savile’s own scholarly discipline that led him to place them—as the codices decidedly do not—in canonical order.

In particular, Monac. gr. 6 contains twenty-nine works (at least four of which comprise multiple homilies). Miscellaneous Pauline homilies are **2** (*Hom. 2 Cor. 4:13 A, B, Γ*); **9** (*Hom. 1 Tim. 5:9–10*); **19** (*Hom. 2 Cor. 11:1*); **20** (*Hom. 1 Cor. 11:19*); **21** (*Hom. Phil. 1:18*); **22** (*Hom. Rom. 16:3 A, B*); **23** (*Hom. Gal. 2:11–14*); **24** (*Hom. 1 Cor. 10:1–11*) and **26** (*Hom. Rom. 5:3*). As we can see, this manuscript contains a Pauline cluster in **19–24** (though not following canonical order), even as the rest of the codex includes such

74. The source for one of Savile’s two other homilies, *In kalendas* (which is not included in the present volume for reasons explained below), must also have been Monac. gr. 6, fols. 108–16^v.

75. Indeed, perhaps Savile was influenced in this by the print edition of the catalogue of the Greek manuscripts in Augsburg published by David Hoeschel, which lists the contents of Monac. gr. 352 (his MS XIX, containing thirty-five homilies by Chrysostom) and prints the citations to the corresponding biblical passages conspicuously in the margins. See David Hoeschel, *Catalogus Graecorum codicum qui sunt in bibliotheca reip. Augustanae Vindelicæ* (Augsburg: Augustae Vindelicorum, 1595), 14–17.

diverse homilies as *De diabolo tentatore* (4, homilies 1–3); *In illud Isaiae, Ego Dominus Deus feci lumen* (5); *De beato Philogonio* (6); *Voluntarie enim peccantibus* (7, which Savile regarded as a fragment of another homily);⁷⁶ *In Genesim sermo* 9 (11); *In principium Actorum* (13, homilies 1 and 2); *De baptismo Christi* (25); and *De Dauide et Saule* (29, homilies 1–3). Hence this tenth-century manuscript represents a *fourre-tout* of its own, even before the insightful young Jesuit Ducaeus. But it was Savile's decision to make the order of the (Western) biblical canon his principle of arrangement for the entire section of volume 5, *Sermones in loca S. Scripturae*, from the Old Testament first, and then from the New Testament, with homilies from Matthew, Luke, John, and Acts (in succession of passages within those books), before he placed our homilies, beginning with *Hom. Rom* 5:3 and finishing with *Hom. 1 Tim* 5:9–10.

Savile's list contains sixteen of the homilies collected and translated in the present volume, but not the other two, *Hom. 2 Tim.* 3:1 and *Hom. Tit.* 2:11–12, which were not known to him.⁷⁷ Following the precedent Savile set, for ease of reference, I print the homilies here in the canonical order of their focal passages in the *corpus Paulinum*, from Romans through Titus. However, three of Savile's homilies on diverse passages within Paul's letters (as found within HS 5) are not included here. One of these, *Quod stantem non superbire et lapsus non desperare oportet* (TLG canon #405), was included by Savile because he regarded it as a homily on 1 Cor 10:12, which is where it fits in the canonical ordering he employs (5:355–62). But, as he notes, this work is an excerpt from one of the homilies in the series on Matthew (CPG 4424).⁷⁸ The other is the homily *In kalendas* (CPG 4328) preached at Antioch, which Savile regarded as a homily based on 1 Cor 10:31. And the last is *De Lazaro* hom. 5 (CPG 4329; PG 48:1017–27), which has as its focal text 1 Thess 4:13 (and thus appears in that place in Savile's arrangement). Savile's entire edition, and the fifth volume on mis-

76. See HS 8:4, "Catalogus tomi quinti": "et haec etiam oratio Apanthisma est."

77. More information on these two homilies will be given below.

78. The corresponding work is *Hom. Matt.* 26.5–8 (PG 57:340–43; HS 8:731). As I argued in *Heavenly Trumpet*, 2–5, there are homiletic treatments of Pauline passages throughout John's oeuvre (for example, the sustained discussion of 1 Tim 5:23 in *Stat.* hom. 1). But for this volume I have concentrated on previously untranslated homilies that seem to be dedicated to and focused on individual Pauline passages and stand outside of existing homiletical series (rather than culling out from homilies that have a largely different overarching purpose).

cellaneous sermons within it, was a magnificent achievement, the major step toward bringing these homilies into wider scholarly attention in the modern period.

Fronto Ducaeus and, Later, the “Morel Edition”

Savile’s contemporary in France, the Jesuit Fronto Ducaeus mentioned earlier, had dedicated himself from 1583 on to the production of editions and translations of miscellaneous homilies by Chrysostom, both panegyric and exegetical.⁷⁹ Ducaeus’s *Opera omnia* edition grew along with the new discoveries, both his own and those of others. In these and later years, Ducaeus and Savile were in close contact and cooperation, as well as rivalry.⁸⁰ The edition of *S. Ioannis Chrysostomi archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani opera* by Ducaeus that appeared in 1614 (nearly contemporaneously with the Englishman’s monumental edition), like Savile’s, contained a grab bag in his fifth volume: *Quo miscellanea eius opera continentur, hoc est homiliae, quae in certa Scripturae loca non sunt habitae, sed de festis, de Sanctis, deque variis eiusmodi argumentis, itemque libri, & epistolae*.⁸¹ However, as the title shows, Ducaeus’s edition, likely already on its way into print when Savile’s appeared, did not evidence any organizing principle; it simply bundled the new editions of Chrysostomic works into an *Auctarium*, and it did not focus on exegetical homilies on Pauline letters or other scriptural works or subcorpora.⁸² The forty-eight works include festal orations, panegyrics, and doctrinal arguments. Among them are just three homilies

79. Baur, *Jean Chrysostome et ses oeuvres dans l’histoire littéraire*, 84; Quantin, “Du Chrysostome latin au Chrysostome grec,” 286, with n. 80.

80. Baur, *Jean Chrysostome et ses oeuvres dans l’histoire littéraire*, 82; for further details from the correspondence and a nuanced treatment, see Quantin, “Du Chrysostome latin au Chrysostome grec,” 323–25.

81. Fronto Ducaeus, ed., *Sancti patris nostri Ioannis Chrysostomi archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani opera* (Paris: Morel, 1614). The title page of the fifth volume reads, “*Operum S. Ioannis, quae seorsim edita, nunc primum ad reliquas eius lucubrationes quinque tomis comprehensas aggregantur*,” a claim reiterated on p. 4 of the catalogue prefacing the volume, where Ducaeus is clearly saying he is the first to include these miscellaneous works.

82. As shown by the volume’s subtitle: “Which contains miscellaneous works of his, that is, homilies that are not confined to fixed passages of Scripture, but on festivals, saints, various types of arguments, and also books and letters.”

treating Pauline passages: the three *Hom. 2 Cor. 4:13*,⁸³ for which Ducaeus was able to rely upon and reprint the Greek text and Latin translation of the Czech humanist Sigismund Gelenius that had been published in Basel in 1547.⁸⁴

By the 1616 edition, however, Ducaeus had, without mentioning it specifically, incorporated the other homilies on miscellaneous Pauline passages, the Greek text of which had been published for the first time by Saville (1611), into his own fifth volume, among seventy-one homilies on various New Testament passages, now comprising their own separate volume in both Greek and Latin, *De diversis novi Testamenti locis Sermones LXXI*.⁸⁵ Deflecting credit from Savile, Ducaeus insisted on the novel contribution of his edition in its bilingual nature, stating on the title page *nunc primum Graece et Latine coniunctim editi* ("now for the first time published in Greek and Latin together"). This was meant to make up for the deficiency that Savile's Greek-only edition represented for various publics whose primary scholarly (and ecclesiastical) language was Latin. Ducaeus's claim to novelty is accented all the more on the table of contents (*Catalogus operum*), which insists that for the works listed below "*in quo asterisco notantur ea, quae nunc primum Latinitate donata in lucem prodeunt*."⁸⁶ Then in the full volume, in bicolunar arrangement on each page, Ducaeus printed Latin translations of each homily alongside Savile's Greek text.⁸⁷ In seven cases

83. Listed as *De verbis Apostoli 2. Cor. 14 [sic] Habentes eundem spiritum sermo 1 [1391a], sermo 2 [1398b], and sermo 3 [1405b]*. The list is not numbered, but they stand as the ninth, tenth, and eleventh, framed by nine sermons *In ascensionem domini*, a revised translation of a work published in the third volume, and the panegyric *In sanctos Petrum et Eliam*. There is no discernible order to this list, as homilies follow later on passages in Genesis 1, Genesis 2, Luke 16:19–31, John 4, etc.

84. *Opera D. Ioannis Chrysostomi Archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani, quotquot per Graecorum exemplarium facultatem in Latinam linguam hactenus traduci potuerunt*, 5 vols. (Basel: Hieronymus Froben, 1547), on which see Quantin, "Du Chrysostome latin au Chrysostome grec," 314 ; Baur, *Jean Chrysostome et ses oeuvres dans l'histoire littéraire*, 163.

85. Fronto Ducaeus, ed., *Sancti patris nostri Ioannis Chrysostomi archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani: De diversis novi Testamenti locis Sermones LXXI, nunc primum Graece et Latine coniunctim editi* (Paris: A. Estienne, 1616), on which see also Quantin, "Du Chrysostome latin au Chrysostome grec," 346.

86. "Those marked with an asterisk are the ones that are now for the first time being made available in Latin."

87. Except for *Hom. Rom. 5:3*, which Savile had published from Ducaeus's own published version (as mentioned above).

these were his own Latin translations,⁸⁸ and in four cases those of Sigismund Gelenius published in 1547: *Hom. 2 Cor. 4:13 A, B, and Γ*,⁸⁹ as well as one by him on *Hom. Rom. 16:3 B*. Filling out the bilingual edition, Ducaeus printed five Latin translations from unknown sources (“*incerto interp.*”) for *Hom. 1 Cor. 7:39–40*, *Hom. 1 Cor. 10:1–11*, *Hom. 1 Cor. 11:19*, *Hom. 2 Cor. 11:1*, and *Hom. Phil. 1:18*.⁹⁰

Ducaeus’s Chrysostomic *Opera omnia* would have many subsequent editions and rearrangements, including in the year of his death, 1624, when the title page indicates the assistance of Sébastien Cramoisy. The later editions of Fronto’s work (1633, reprinted in 1636–1642 and thereafter), *Sancti patris nostri Ioannis Chrysostomi archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani opera omnia in 12 tomos distributa*, were called the “Morel Edition” after the work of Frederick and Claude Morel in editing and publication.⁹¹ The first six volumes of the *Opera* (confusingly presented as the second six) represent the

88. This includes his earlier published Latin translation of *Hom. Rom. 5:3* (from 1604, the one on which Savile had relied for the Greek text, to which he directs his reader: *edita primum Burdegalae An. 1604, Gr. & Lat.*; see Ducaeus 5:179), as well as new translations he had made of *Hom. Rom. 8:28*; *Hom. Rom. 12:20*; *Hom. Rom. 16:3 A*; *Hom. 1 Cor. 7:2–4*; *Hom. 1 Tim. 5:9–10*; and *Hom. Gal. 2:11–14* on the basis of Savile’s now published Greek texts.

89. “*Ex edit. Basiliensi operum S. Ioannis Chrysostomi à Sigismundo Gelenio recognitionum anno 1547 apud Frobenium*” (5:295), which Ducaeus had already published in 1614.

90. *Hom. 1 Cor. 11:19* might be the translation by the Basel Reformer Ioannes Oecolampadius, published in 1522. See Frank Hieronymus, “Griechischer Geist aus Basler Pressen” (Basel: Universitätsbibliothek, 1992), no. 390 (accessed online at <https://www.ub.unibas.ch>). *Hom. 2 Cor. 11:1*, too, might be the translation of Ioannes Oecolampadius (Hieronymus, “Griechischer Geist aus Basler Pressen,” no. 390), or that by Wolfgang Fabricius Capito, the Reformer from Strassbourg, published in 1519 (see Ueli Dill, “Johannes Chrysostomos im Baseler Buchdruck des 16. Jahrhunderts,” in *Chrysostomosbilder in 1600 Jahren*, 255–65, 260; Hieronymus, “Griechischer Geist aus Basler Pressen,” no. 388). *Hom. Phil. 1:18* is also perhaps from Oecolampadius, published in 1523, as edited with Andreas Cratander (Dill, “Johannes Chrysostomos im Baseler Buchdruck des 16. Jahrhunderts,” 261). Montfaucon would later reject this translation and make his own (as he announces in *Mf* 3:300).

91. For details on the various editions, see Augustin de Backer, Alois de Backer, and Charles Sommervogel, eds., *De tous les ouvrages publiés par les membres de la compagnie de Jésus depuis la fondation de l’ordre jusqu’à nos jours*, vol. 1 of *Bibliothèque des écrivains de la compagnie de Jésus, ou notices bibliographiques* (Liège: Alois de Backer; Paris: C. Sommervogel, 1869), cols. 1669–71.

work of Ducaeus and his own collaborators, and the later six volumes⁹² were carried out under the direction of the Morel brothers.⁹³ The fifth volume of this edition remains devoted to *De diversis Novi Testamenti locis sermones* (“Homilies on diverse passages of the New Testament”). The title page of the edition, while giving maximum credit to the Jesuit, now explicitly indicates its consultation of the “Anglican” edition—in other words, that of Savile.⁹⁴

In terms of arrangement, from the 1616 edition forward, the list of miscellaneous homilies in the Morel edition has been conformed to that of Savile, placing the miscellaneous Pauline homilies in canonical order, though with a few exceptions. Some are relatively minor. For instance, Ducaeus had removed *Quod stantem non superbire et lapsum non desperare oportet*, presumably because (as Savile had noted), it was from *Hom. Matt.* 26.5–8, and those homilies are already found in the first volume of his edition.⁹⁵ He also added *Laus Maximi et quales ducendae sint uxores* (CPG 4379) from Savile’s eighth volume⁹⁶ and placed it after *Hom. Phil.* 1:18. More significantly, Ducaeus removed *Hom. Gal.* 2:11–14 (*In illud: in faciem ei restiti, Gal 2, 12* [sic]) from where Savile had put it, in its place in the Pauline epistolary order (after *Hom. 2 Cor 11:1*), and moved it down some twenty-five places to near the end of the volume. It is tempting to speculate that the Jesuit did not want to forefront the problem of public apostolic

92. Baur, *Jean Chrysostome et ses oeuvres dans l’histoire littéraire*, 82 n. 1: “pour les quatres suivants [volumes] il utilisait Savile.” This applies to the part of the twelve-volume edition that was the work of Fronto Ducaeus. The later six volumes of the Morel edition were just a copy of the Hieronymus Commelin edition, which did not contain these miscellaneous homilies. See Hieronymus Commelin, *Expositio perpetua in Nouum Jesu Christi Testamentum*, 4 vols. (Heidelberg: Commelin, 1603); Baur, *Jean Chrysostome et ses oeuvres dans l’histoire littéraire*, 109.

93. See Paul W. Harkins, “The Text Tradition of Chrysostom’s Commentary on John,” *Theological Studies* 19 (1958): 404–12, esp. 405 n. 3. I have had access to the 1697 edition, *Sancti patris nostri Ioannis Chrysostomi archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani explanationes in Novum Testamentum in sex tomos distributa* (Frankfurt am Main: Balthasar Christopher Wustius), held by Loyola University, Chicago.

94. *Graecè & Latinè elaborata, locis pene innumeris, ex collatione variorum Editio-num, & Recensione R. P. Frontonis Ducae Societ. Jesu recognita, suppleta, & ad Exemplar Authenticum Anglicanae editionis correctata*. The catalogue of Jesuit writings replicates some of the back-and-forth drama—in Ducaeus’s time and after—about whether he had had recourse to the edition of Savile or not. See de Backer, de Backer, and Sommervogel, *Bibliothèque des écrivains de la Compagnie de Jésus*, 1:1671–73.

95. See n. 78 above.

96. HS 8:80–93.

conflict that Chrysostom addresses in that homily, but we cannot be certain of the reason for this change (even as the result of this repositioning may indeed have had the effect of drawing the eye away from this homily). The Morel edition also moved the seven homilies *De laudibus sancti Pauli* from Savile's eighth volume to join the miscellaneous homilies in volume five, coming some ten homilies down from those on Pauline passages,⁹⁷ thus presaging the present volume's combination of these sources.⁹⁸

In terms of format, in the bilingual edition Ducaeus's volumes were bicolunar, with Greek and Latin facing each other on a single page, with letters A, B, C, D down the middle of the two columns demarcating sections for reference. They also separated the homilies into enumerated sections, placed only on the Latin side. The earlier edition of the Latin texts of the occasional homilies (1614) in volume five had scriptural citations in the margins, but it was only in later editions that italics were added to the words on the Latin side to highlight what the editors (Ducaeus, the Morels) regarded as direct citations. Often those quotations had already been rendered from the Greek into Latin in accordance with the Vulgate by the translators of the homilies, a convenience that presumably also allowed the editors easier identification of scriptural passages for highlighting in this way (but also involved a circularity in procedure). However, the Greek text, the actual source of the quotations, in the Ducaeus editions did not distinguish scriptural quotations in any way typographically. (And the method of identification of such quotations, as noted, is highly torqued to the Latin, in any case.) This format, which deviated from Savile, who printed solely the Greek texts, with identifications of scriptural quotations in the margins, will prove significant for the interpretation of the homilies and of Chrysostom's scriptural interpretations within them.

Bernard de Montfaucon and, Later, the "Paris Edition"

The Benedictine Bernard de Montfaucon's edition of Chrysostom's *Opera omnia* in thirteen volumes (1718–1738) placed *Caeterae homiliae in loca*

97. ME 5:512–58, accompanied by the Latin translation of the fifth-century Pelagian deacon, Anianus of Celeda. However, after Morel, *De laudibus sancti Pauli apostoli* were always placed in a different volume from the miscellaneous homilies on Pauline passages (Mf 2:476–517, PG 50:473–514).

98. The present volume brings these works, so united in content and thematics, into a single volume for the first time since the seventeenth century.

Pauli (“various homilies on Pauline passages”) in volume 3 (1721).⁹⁹ His Greek text, and his list of the homilies, largely follows that in Morel (1636–1642, and multiple reeditions) but with a few alterations in the order of that volume. Montfaucon moved up *Quales ducendae sint uxores/De laude Maximi* (CPG 4379)¹⁰⁰ to follow directly after the previous two on marital topics—that is, *Hom. 1 Cor. 7:2–4 (Propter fornicationes ... uxorem, etc., CPG 4377)* and *Hom. 1 Cor. 7:39–40 (De libello repudii, CPG 4378)*—which, as he explained in his *Monitum* (and more briefly in his *Praefatio*), he thought constituted a series of sermons on marriage laws and practices that were delivered one after another.¹⁰¹ Montfaucon followed Ducaeus and the Morel Edition (rather than Savile)¹⁰² in placing *Hom. Gal. 2:11–14 (In faciem ei restiti)* outside the canonical order of the *corpus Paulinum*, but in his collection he brought it closer to the rest of the homilies on Pauline passages, that is, after *Hom. 1 Tim. 5:9–10* and just four other homilies.¹⁰³ Interestingly, Montfaucon changed the Morel order such that *Hom. Gal. 2:11–14 (In faciem ei restiti)* follows directly on *Peccata fratrum non evulganda* (a homily prominently featuring Matt 18:15). In this arrangement, the problem that *Hom. Gal. 2:11–14* addresses directly—why it is that Paul appears to violate Christ’s injunction (in Matt 18:15) not to point out a brother’s faults in public—is all the more pronounced and prepared for.¹⁰⁴ Montfaucon’s order of these occasional Pauline homilies would be replicated in volume 2 of the *Clavis Patrum Graecorum* (CPG), in which these homilies span numbers 4373 to 4391. And, as indicated above, Montfau-

99. Bernard de Montfaucon, ed., *Sancti patris nostri Joannis Chrysostomi archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani opera omnia quae exstant* (Paris: Sumtibus [sic] Charles Robustel et al., 1718–1738). Mf 3:vi refers to *Caeterae homiliae in loca Pauli*. Volume 3 includes thirty-four *Homiliae in quaedam loca Novi Testamenti* as well as *Opuscula de motibus Constantinopolitanis, Epistolae Joannis Chrysostomi et aliquot aliae, and spuria*.

100. In the Morel Edition this homily was placed after *Hom. Phil. 1:18 (De profectu evangelii)* and before *De dormientibus nolo vos ignorare (1 Thess 4,13) (=De Lazaro, hom. 5)*.

101. Mf 3:vi, 231. In this he appears to depend on Louis-Sébastien Le Nain de Tillemont, *Mémoires pour servir à l’histoire ecclésiastique des premiers siècles*, vol. 11 (Paris: Robustel, 1701), 381–82, but he does not mention it (so Mayer, *Provenance*, 65).

102. HS 5:398–410.

103. Mf 3:361–78. The four homilies that he added to those on Pauline passages are *In Heliam et viduam* (CPG 4386); *De futurae vitae deliciis* (CPG 4388); *Peccata fratrum non evulganda* (CPG 4389); and *Non esse desperandum* (CPG 4390).

104. See *Hom. Gal. 2:11–14* §3 (PG 51:374).

con did not follow Morel in placing the seven homilies *De laudibus sancti Pauli* (CPG 4344) in the same volume as those on diverse passages of Scripture (volume 5), but instead he put them in his volume 2 (1718), among “*Sermones Panegyrici in Solemnitates*.”¹⁰⁵

Of particular significance for the present collection, Montfaucon added a new homily, *Hom. 2 Tim. 3:1* (CPG 4423), which he considered manifestly authentic,¹⁰⁶ from his own transcription of Vatic. gr. 559 (X), fols. 98–105.¹⁰⁷ However, this was not published in his volume 3 in its place in the Pauline order, but in his later volume 6 (1835) on pages 278–87. We include that homily in our collection as well but place it in its canonical order, following Savile’s original move toward such an organizing principle for a collection of Chrysostom’s homilies on diverse passages from the Pauline epistolary.

For the rest of the homilies on various Pauline passages, Montfaucon took the Morel Edition as his base text, in consultation with its precursor Savile, including also the latter’s “*Notae*.” But also, as he indicates in the prefatory remark (*Monitum*) to each homily, in all but four of our homilies he supplemented with readings from manuscripts that he had consulted or of which he had received transcriptions. Montfaucon’s manuscripts, mostly from Paris but also Rome, are identified in the following table.¹⁰⁸

Manuscripts collated by Montfaucon (1721) with Morel and Savile		
Homily Title CPG number	Current Designation	Montfaucon’s Designation
<i>Hom. Rom. 5:3</i> CPG 4373	Paris. gr. 759 (X), fols. 118–23 ^v Paris. gr. 660 (XII), fols. 138–47 ^v	<i>Regius</i> 2343 <i>Colbertinus</i> 49

105. See n. 97 above as well as Mf 2:476–517.
106. Mf 6:278; see full discussion below under “Authenticity.”
107. See CCG 6.73, p. 79.
108. For background on Montfaucon’s manuscripts and the papers now held at the Bibliothèque nationale de France, see F. J. Leroy, “Les manuscrits de Montfaucon et l’édition de S. Jean Chrysostome : Notes sur quelques manuscrits du Supplément Grec, Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris,” *Traditio* 20 (1964): 411–18.

<i>Hom. Rom. 8:28</i> CPG 4374	Paris. gr. 764 (X), fols. 285 ^v –94 ^v	<i>Regius</i> 1974
<i>Hom. Rom. 12:20</i> CPG 4375	none	none
<i>Hom. Rom. 16:3 A</i> CPG 4376	none	none
<i>Hom. Rom. 16:3 B</i> CPG 4376	Coislin. 243 (XV), fols. 245–53 Vat. Ottob. gr. 431 (XI), fols. 53–63 ^{v109}	<i>Coislinianus</i> 243 “ <i>Vaticanus unus</i> ”
<i>Hom. 1 Cor. 7:2–4</i> CPG 4377	Paris. gr. 748 (XI), fols. 142 ^v –52 Paris. gr. 768 (XIII), fols. 102 ^v –9	<i>Colbertinus</i> 970 <i>Colbertinus</i> 1030
<i>Hom. 1 Cor. 7:39–40</i> CPG 4378	Paris. gr. 748 (XI), fols. 152–59 ^v Paris. gr. 768 (XIII), fols. 109–15 ^v	<i>Colbertinus</i> 970 <i>Colbertinus</i> 1030
<i>Hom. 1 Cor. 10:1–11</i> CPG 4380	Paris. gr. 748 (XI), fols. 23–33 ^v Paris. gr. 730 (XI), fols. 160–71	<i>Colbertinus</i> 970 <i>Colbertinus</i> 3058
<i>Hom. 1 Cor. 11:19</i> CPG 4381	none	none
<i>Hom. 2 Cor. 4:13 A</i> CPG 4383	Paris. gr. 748 (XI), fols. 69–78 ^v Paris. gr. 768 (XIII), fols. 1–9 ^v	<i>Colbertinus</i> 970 <i>Colbertinus</i> 1030

109. This manuscript is the likeliest candidate because it contains only the second homily on Rom 16:3. Pinakes lists also Vat. gr. 551 (X–XI), fols. 252^v–58, and Vat. gr. 568 (XI), fols. 164–80 (Voicu, *CCG* 6.65 and 82, respectively), but both contain also the first homily (hence, if they were the manuscripts Montfaucon had access to, it would be inexplicable that he did not incorporate their readings for the first homily as well).

<i>Hom. 2 Cor. 4:13 B</i> CPG 4383	Paris. gr. 748 (XI), fols. 78 ^v –86	<i>Colbertinus</i> 970
	Paris. gr. 768 (XIII), fols. 9 ^v –17	<i>Colbertinus</i> 1030
<i>Hom. 2 Cor. 4:13 Γ</i> CPG 4383	Paris. gr. 748 (XI), fols. 86–96 ^v	<i>Colbertinus</i> 970
	Paris. gr. 768 (XIII), fols. 17–27	<i>Colbertinus</i> 1030
<i>Hom. 2 Cor. 11:1</i> CPG 4384	none	none
<i>Hom. Gal. 2:11–14</i> CPG 4391	Paris. gr. 759 (X), fols. 337–48	<i>Regius</i> 2343
	Paris. gr. 748 (XI), fols. 113–27	<i>Colbertinus</i> 970
	Paris. gr. 768 (XIII), fols. 199 ^v –212 ^v	<i>Colbertinus</i> 1030
<i>Hom. Phil. 1:18</i> CPG 4385	Paris. gr. 748 (XI), fols. 181–90 ^v	<i>Colbertinus</i> 970
	Paris. gr. 730 (XI), fols. 224–36 ^v	<i>Colbertinus</i> 3058
<i>Hom. 1 Tim. 5:9–10</i> CPG 4386	Paris. gr. 765 (XII), fols. 117 ^v –34 ^{v110}	<i>Regius</i> 1975
	Paris. gr. 748 (XI), fols. 127 ^v –42 ^v	<i>Colbertinus</i> 970
	Paris. gr. 768 (XIII), fols. 88 ^v –102	<i>Colbertinus</i> 1030
<i>Hom. 2 Tim. 3:1</i> CPG 4423	Vat. gr. 559 (X), fols. 98–105	<i>Vaticanus</i> 559

Montfaucon's edition employs footnotes (rather than marginal notes, as in Savile) to indicate variant readings to the Greek text printed above on each page (with letters a, b, etc. placed within the Greek text at the variation-unit). These notes also include evaluative comments and sometimes

110. Because of missing folios, the text of this homily ends with the last line of text on 134^v, οὐδὲ ὑποῦ καὶ ἄερος καὶ (PG 51:334,8), at which point what is now 135^r begins in the midst of the text of Chrysostom's letter from exile, *Laed.* §2, line 51 (SC 103:66, ed. Malingrey), with ὑπο]γράφωμεν τί ποτέ ἐστιν.

indicate the manuscript number or collection-name (e.g., *Regius*, *Colbertinus*) and number of manuscripts in which the variant readings occur. At other times, the notes just contain vaguer expressions such as “*alii*” or “*unus ms.*” As noted above, for four of our homilies Montfaucon did not have access to any further manuscript readings; in such instances the notes only include conjectures, and in any case they are rare. But even where Montfaucon relied on the collations of his new manuscript readings with those in Morel and Savile, his notes rarely exceed more than one or two per page, if that. Parsimony was the rule.

Montfaucon’s textual notes to his 1721 edition, which also engage decisions made by Savile and Ducaeus, clearly come nowhere near the expectations of a modern critical text for these homilies.¹¹¹ But they are an important part of the history of publication of these homilies and provide some key variant readings and indications of scribal errors and possible or necessary emendations. Moreover, at the very least, they point to the enormity of the tasks of collating, text-critical analysis of the witnesses and identification of their *stemmata*, and editing of each text that remain to be done. For this reason, the present volume has included references to all of Montfaucon’s text-critical notes in the footnotes that accompany the translation. (See further below on the complexities of the historical development of these notes as they now appear in Migne.)

The page format for Montfaucon’s 1721 edition of each of these homilies was, like Ducaeus and Morel, bicolunar text arranged on a single page, with Greek and Latin facing each other; on each page, the inside column was the Greek text and the outside held the Latin translation. On the model of the Morel Edition, Montfaucon set what he regarded as direct quotations from Scripture made within Chrysostom’s homilies in italics on the Latin side, and also on that side he placed corresponding scriptural references in the margin, as had his predecessors all the way back to Savile. However, the Greek text itself bore no indications of quotations. And yet, although the Greek side did not contain such information, it was easily visible on the same page on the parallel Latin side. Each page also had A, B, C, D, E (in the middle) to demarcate sections, and each homily was broken up into the enumerated sections from Morel, which are indented on the Greek side and enumerated and indented on the

111. Noted well already by Baur, *Jean Chrysostome et ses oeuvres dans l’histoire littéraire*, 86.

Latin side. Montfaucon also included in the margin some brief descriptions in Latin of the main topics or movements in the homily that, in addition to giving an interpretive lens on the arguments of the homilies, facilitate ready reference.¹¹²

Montfaucon's work was to become best known not in the 1718–1738 original but from the Paris Edition (*Editio altera*) of 1835–1839,¹¹³ which contained revisions to the text and the critical notes by Louis de Sinner for volumes 1–7 and Theobald Fix for volumes 8–13, with the German classicist Friedrich Dübner serving as editor over the whole project. Volume 3 of this edition, in which most of our occasional homilies are found, was published in 1837.¹¹⁴ In fashioning the *Editio altera*, these scholars compared the original Montfaucon with the text and notes of Henry Savile, whom they held in higher esteem for philological skill than the Benedictine, and whose conjectural readings and judgments they often favored.¹¹⁵ They also included their own collation of Montfaucon's text and notes against the readings of other manuscripts available to them, especially Paris. gr. 748, sometimes with evaluative judgments (“*recte*”), and in a few places they emended Montfaucon's text in favor of them.¹¹⁶ In the Paris Edition they placed their contributions to the text-critical notes in brackets; these serve to signal either entirely new footnotes that they had added or insertions

112. For instance, at *Hom. Rom. 16:3 A* §5 (Mf 3:178), we read *epilogus sermonis & cohortatio moralis ad opus manuum* (“the conclusion to the sermon and a moral exhortation to manual labor”).

113. Bernard de Montfaucon, *Sancti patris nostri Joannis Chrysostomi archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani opera omnia quae exstant*, Editio parisina altera, emendata et aucta (Paris : Gaume fratres, 1835–1839).

114. The homilies are in PE 3:168–253, 273–97, 310–90, 430–51.

115. Pierre Augustin recounts in CCG 7:xxv n. 42 that Dübner, in a letter to his friend Emmanuel Miller, referred to the original Montfaucon edition as an “*opus senile*.” This letter, held in the Bibliothèque nationale de France, is cited from Paul and Victor Glachant, “Frédéric Dübner d’après sa correspondance inédite,” in *Papiers d’Autrefois* (Paris: Hachette et C^{ie}, 1899), 195–290, esp. 202: “Vous savez qu’aucune page bénédictine ne peut passer aujourd’hui sans recevoir quelques corrections, le Chrysostome de Montfaucon, *opus senile*, plus que tout autre.” As Guillaume Bady documents, Savile’s edition was highly prized by all the editorial hands on the *Editio altera*. See “*L’editio Parisina altera* des oeuvres de Jean Chrysostome et la *Patrologie Grecque* de Migne,” *Eruditio Antiqua* 4 (2012): 1–17, esp. 6–9, 16.

116. On the use of Paris. gr. 748 in the Paris Edition see Augustin, CCG 7:xxvi : “le Paris. gr. 748 ... déjà connu de Montfaucon, a été tantôt consulté, tantôt intégralement collationné par L. de Sinner.”

they made into Montfaucon's text or notes that either confirmed readings of Paris. gr. 748 or corrected what they regarded as problems or oversights in the 1721 edition of by Montfaucon himself.

This revised Paris Edition also reflected some changes in the identification and punctuation of scriptural references, still indicated, as with Montfaucon's original, with italics solely on the Latin side.¹¹⁷ The chief purpose of that work on Chrysostom's citations of Scripture was less a matter of textual criticism or a judgment in each case about allusion or paraphrase vis-à-vis quotation than it was the compiling of a comprehensive *Index locorum scripturae sacrae* for the thirteen volumes, all also carried out in Latin phrasing.¹¹⁸ This so-called Paris Edition of Montfaucon's *Sancti patris nostri Joannis Chrysostomi ... opera omnia quae exstant*, published by Alexis and Joseph Gaume,¹¹⁹ was widely distributed in the next decades.¹²⁰

Jacques-Paul Migne and the Patrologia Graeca

Jacques-Paul Migne, in volume 51 of his compendious Patrologia Graeca published in 1862,¹²¹ reprinted the Greek text of Montfaucon's volume 3,¹²²

117. Bady, "L'editio Parisina altera," 6. For the present volume, there has been no attempt made at an extensive comparison of the italics in the 1721 and 1837 Montfaucon editions. In, e.g., *Hom. 1 Cor. 11:19* §1 (PG 51:253) and *Hom. Phil. 1:18* §6 (PG 51:315), the 1837 editors included a note commenting on variances between Chrysostom's quotation and the biblical passage assumed to be in question. But these few occasions throw into relief that they hardly ever do this otherwise and hence in turn seem intended to give the impression of accuracy in the case of all the other identifications, which is hardly justified.

118. As found in volume 13, part 2, published in 1839.

119. See CCG 7:xxv–xxviii, which refers to this edition, accordingly, as "Gaume." Although it is known by these two names, we shall consistently refer to it as the "Paris Edition" here to avoid any confusion.

120. Bady, "L'editio Parisina altera," 5–6, observes that the gigantic size of the original Montfaucon edition was greatly reduced in the Paris Edition (presumably for portability, usability, and affordability).

121. *S[ancti] P[at]ri N[ostri] Joannis Chrysostomi archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani opera omnia quae exstant* (the title is taken from Montfaucon) in Jacques-Paul Migne, ed., *Patrologiae cursus completus, series graeca* prior [= PG], vols. 47–64 (Paris: Migne, 1859–1863). On Migne and his ambitions and procedures, see R. Howard Bloch, *God's Plagiarist: Being an Account of the Fabulous Industry and Irregular Commerce of the Abbe Migne* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994).

122. Along with Latin translations from various authors, also taken over from Montfaucon.

but—without acknowledgement—not from the 1721 original but from the *Editio altera* (i.e., the Paris Edition) of 1837.¹²³ The title page of Migne's volume 51 is quite clearly taken from the 1837 Paris Edition (which was itself dependent upon the 1721 edition, but revised).¹²⁴ However, precisely where it proclaimed *Editio Parisina Altera, Emendata et Aucta*, Migne replaces that with his own grandiose announcement of his volume as "*Editio Novissima*," and a long description of the text-critical work behind the volume, all ending in the following, written in large letters: *Accurante et Denuo Recognoscente J.-P. Migne*.¹²⁵ Then follows the "*Praefatio*" of Montfaucon's 1721 edition, volume 3 (PG 51:6–14),¹²⁶ and, within the texts printed in the volume itself, despite clearly drawing extensively upon the 1837 edition, Migne confusingly (and misleadingly) embeds the page enumeration of the 1721 Montfaucon edition.¹²⁷

In addition to the Greek and Latin texts of each homily provided in his volume 51,¹²⁸ Migne also reprinted most of the critical notes from the Paris Edition, which, as noted above, included both those of Montfaucon

123. As keenly demonstrated by Bady, "*L'editio Parisina altera*"; cf. Harkins, "The Text Tradition of Chrysostom's Commentary on John," 406. This may have been due (in part) to copyright issues. See Bloch, *God's Plagiarist*, 61 on the issues and legislation involved (though the Paris Edition of Montfaucon's *opera omnia* of Chrysostom is not included among the examples Bloch gives of more recent works from the 1830s to 1850s where Migne "was on much less solid legal ground"). The larger issue is the claims Migne makes for the fresh editing involved in his *Patrologia* volumes (on which see next note).

124. Each of the Chrysostom volumes (PG 47–64) has this same claim on the title page: "*Editio novissima iis omnibus illustrata quae recentius tum Romae, tum Oxonii, tum alibi, a diversis in lucem primum edita sunt, vel jam edita, ad manuscriptorum diligentiore crism revocata sunt, accurante et denuo recognoscente J.-P. Migne*" ("The newest edition, elucidated by all those manuscripts which were recently published, some in Rome, some in Oxford, some elsewhere, for the first time by diverse hands, or those having already been published, were given a thorough reexamination with an eye to the most careful adjudication of the manuscripts, as accurately and freshly reviewed by J.-P. Migne"). On these title pages and Migne's acknowledgements of his sources, see Bloch, *God's Plagiarist*, 62–63.

125. The size of letters here is two or even three times the size of Montfaucon's name, which Migne has significantly diminished from the Paris Edition.

126. With Montfaucon's page numbers changed to fit Migne's column numbers.

127. This is another way he tries to circumvent and occlude his dependence upon the Paris Edition.

128. Migne includes *Hom. 2 Tim. 3:1* in PG 56:271–80.

and the ones that were added by the *Editio altera* editors. In the homilies represented in our volume (despite the title page claim) Migne did not add any new manuscript readings to what were already present in the Paris Edition. Most significantly, however, in the notes that Migne brought over from the Paris Edition of Montfaucon (sometimes reworded), he did not retain the identification of the different layers of notes by diverse editors, as the *Editio altera* had clearly done by placing new notes added by de Sinner or Dübner in brackets. This choice by Migne amounted to an anonymizing of the composite apparatus he inherited into a single layer, and it also gives the impression—which Migne sought to foster¹²⁹—that all of these notes were from Migne himself.¹³⁰ The consequence is that the user of the Migne edition who wishes to engage the history of these text-critical notes needs to go back to Savile (1611), the original Montfaucon (1721), and the Paris Edition (1837) to discern the actual hand behind each of those notes.¹³¹ My footnotes in the present volume will clarify in each instance which hand is responsible for what information and judgments, both to provide information on specific text-critical issues and to remind the reader continually of the enormous text-critical task that awaits for these homilies.

In addition, the page format of the Migne edition differs from the Paris Edition in that each page, while still bicolumnar, contains only Greek or only Latin, now in alternating pages; to see and compare both, one needs a full page-opening in the printed volume. But, presumably realizing that this put the identification of scriptural passages further away from the Greek text, Migne instructed the typesetter to place what he regarded as the Greek equivalent of Montfaucon's italicized Latin into italic Greek

129. Many of the notes that he takes over from the Paris Edition he slightly rewords and punctuates at the end with "EDIT."

130. See Bloch, *God's Plagiarist*, esp. 58–77, the chapter on "Piracy and Patrology." "A good proportion of the *Patrologie Latine* and the *Patrologie Grecque* was pirated; and the rest, with the exception of a couple of volumes, was either reproduced from other editions or reproduced along with a critical apparatus, which was in some instances also pirated and included only minor additions or changes" (65). This is very much the case with the homilies on individual Pauline passages that are the subject of our volume, as we shall see.

131. A rare exception is *Hom. Rom. 12:20* §4 (PG 51:177), where Migne refers directly to the Paris Edition editors. But this only throws into relief the many other instances in which he appropriates their work without attribution.

font.¹³² This allowed for easier reference, but it was apparently not done in each case on the basis of the Greek text being quoted, because it was largely replicating the Latin; nor was it done with precision about which words are or are not a part of the quotation of the Greek Bible.¹³³ This means that every single one of these decisions about what is taken to be a quotation needs to be rechecked on the basis of the Greek, and that each is open to reconsideration. The present volume has made a beginning on that major task of identification and delineation of Chrysostom's copious scriptural quotations within these homilies, and it has challenged the Migne edition's decisions at innumerable points, both small and large (and far too many to document comprehensively).¹³⁴ Readers can see for themselves the comparisons between Migne's italicization and the identification of quotations I have made in the English translation.

The Migne (PG) edition has been the most widely available text for one hundred and sixty years, far more accessible to many readers than Savile, Morel, Montfaucon's first edition, or the Paris Edition. This holds all the more so today because the Migne text is included in the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* database, including its italicization of the quotations as Migne had identified them on the Greek pages, but without any of the textual notes or identifications of the source of purported quotations. Despite its complex history and limitations, for all but one of the eighteen homilies on individual Pauline passages, the PG is currently the most widely known and cited text today and will have to be a starting point for work going forward,¹³⁵ even if, as the history we have recounted demonstrates, it has not come about through a thoroughly scientific or rigorous process of textual criticism and editing.

132. See Bady, "*L'editio Parisina altera*," 5–9 (on the format), 7–14 (on the text-critical notes and their history).

133. Both LXX and NT. It also meant that the book, chapter, and verse references for the quotations were found only on the Latin pages and not within or alongside the Greek (and hence a long way from the directly visible display of these in Savile's edition).

134. See below for more on the editorial decisions and policies that have governed the present volume.

135. For instance, essential tools such as CCG 1–7 and other catalogues cross-reference to the PG volume, column, and line numbers in their cataloguing of Greek manuscripts containing Chrysostom's works.

The Greek Texts Printed in the Present Volume

The Eighteen “Occasional Homilies” on Pauline Passages

In the present volume, the Greek text of seventeen of the eighteen homilies on Pauline problem passages has been reprinted from Migne’s PG edition (which follows Montfaucon as known in the Paris Edition of 1837), with sixteen of the seventeen found in PG 51 (1862), and, as mentioned, *Hom. 2 Tim. 3:1* in PG 56 (1859). Typographical errors in the Migne edition (some of which replicate Montfaucon, others of which Migne introduced) have in some cases been silently corrected, or as noted in some other cases. Migne’s own textual emendations, either his own (rare) or, more often, replicated from Montfaucon’s own or those added in the Paris Edition, have been engaged in my notes and the translation, but the text itself on the left-hand pages remains largely unamended from PG, including, for example, capitalization. That includes the italicization in the Greek text of purported scriptural quotations, as previously mentioned. While the enumerations of the text have been retained from Migne throughout, the paragraphing has been adjusted to conform to my English translation, for easier reference for the reader.

For one of the seventeen homilies that were published by Montfaucon, *Hom. 1 Cor. 7:2–4* (*In illud: Propter fornicationes ... uxorem, etc.*), a critical edition has been published in 1998 by Daniela Mazzoni Dami.¹³⁶ This valuable study has been drawn upon extensively in the present volume, and many of its readings, including some significant lacunae now restored, have been adopted in the translation, as indicated at each point in the notes. Due to copyright issues, however, the printed text remains that of Migne/Montfaucon (which remains the text that is most available to scholars).

The eighteenth homily in part 1, *Hom. Tit. 2:11–12* (*In illud: Apparuit gratia dei omnibus hominibus; CPG 4456*), was first published in 1971 by Antoine Wenger, who initially saw the work in a microfilm of Sinait. gr. 491 (VIII–IX), a homiletical miscellany of some twenty-two works by Chrysostom and other authors, such as Sevarian of Gabala, Proclus, and John of Damascus.¹³⁷ Later, in 1970, Wenger paid a trip to Saint Catherine’s Mon-

136. Mazzoni Dami, *Giovanni Crisostomo, prima omelia sul matrimonio*.

137. An introduction, text, and translation of the homily is in Antoine Wenger, “Une homélie inédite de Jean Chrysostome sur l’épiphanie,” *Revue des études byzantines* 29 (1971): 117–35.

astery and was able to view the manuscript and to restore one recto page that had inadvertently been left out of the photographic replica.¹³⁸ Wenger was fully convinced of the genuineness of this homily and, once he ascertained it had not been published before, set out to do so. For his publication of this previously unedited homily that appeared in the following year, Wenger used Sinait. gr. 491 as his base text, as collated with readings from Paris. gr. 700 (IX–X). Sometimes he adopted the latter’s readings, and in other cases he listed them as variant readings in the notes that accompany the text as a kind of apparatus criticus. However, Wenger’s apparatus was far from complete, and, as I worked with his article, I discovered that the text and notes include a host of errors and many omissions. The Greek text of *Hom. Tit. 2:11–12* printed in the present volume is based on Wenger’s, but I have corrected it at more than thirty points against my reading of the two manuscripts via digital images of the former supplied by Fr. Justin from Saint Catherine’s Monastery¹³⁹ and images online at the Bibliothèque nationale de France (<https://gallica.bnf.fr>) of the latter.¹⁴⁰ I have also made some different text-critical decisions, all of which are documented within the notes. In addition, because I was reworking Wenger’s text rather substantially, in the case of this homily (only) I corrected and supplemented his identification of quotations from Scripture as placed in italics within the Greek text.¹⁴¹ Hence the text of this homily published here is a new

138. On the microfilm and his transcription of a missing recto side of one folio, see Wenger, “Une homélie inédite de Jean Chrysostome sur l’épiphanie,” 118 n. 8. The microfilm that Wenger used was from “la mission américaine du Sinaï de 1948”—actually, in 1949–1950, as recounted by Kenneth W. Clark, “Exploring the Manuscripts of Sinai and Jerusalem,” *BA* 16.2 (1953): 21–43, with reference to Sinait. gr. 491 on p. 31.

139. Received in November 2016, with abundant thanks to Fr. Justin for making and sharing these digital photographs with me. There is also a microfilm made available in 1952 that is held by the Library of Congress, Microfilm 5010, <https://www.loc.gov/resource/amedmonastery.00279382341-ms/?sp=115&r=-0.072,0.036,1.127,0.54,0>.

140. Pinakes lists only two manuscripts containing this homily, Sinait. gr. 491 and Athos, Iberon 255 (XIV) (= Lambros 4375). On the latter, see Michel Aubineau, “Soixante-six textes, attribués à Jean Chrysostome, découverts dans le codex Athos, Ivrons 255,” *VC* 29 (1975): 55–64, esp. 58. The Iberon codex (not known to Wenger) includes among its sixty-six works six other occasional homilies on Pauline passages in our collection (*Hom. 1 Cor. 10:1–11*; *Hom. 2 Cor. 4:13 A, B, Γ*; *Hom. Gal. 2:11–14*; *Hom. 1 Cor. 7:39–40*). The third manuscript containing this homily (known to Wenger) is Paris. gr. 700.

141. These decisions are all documented in my notes.

version, though based upon the important work of Wenger in publishing the *editio princeps*.

The Authenticity of the Eighteen “Occasional Homilies”

As recounted in the history of publication above, fifteen of the eighteen homilies translated in this volume were published for the first time by Henry Savile as λόγοι γνήσιοι, “genuine homilies” of Chrysostom on individual passages of Scripture.¹⁴² In making his assessment of what to include, Savile was heavily influenced by both the title and the contents of the Byzantine *Catalogus Augustanus*, known to him from a twelfth-century manuscript (Monac. gr. 478, fols. 287–288^v), in the Augsburg Library presided over by David Hoeschel.¹⁴³ This catalogue, entitled οἱ ἀληθῶς τοῦ χρυσοστόμου γνήσιοι λόγοι (“the truly genuine homilies by Chrysostom”), contains an enumerated list of 102 sermons judged authentic, with short titles and incipits for each. The presence of this catalogue itself attests the widespread awareness already in the medieval period that the Chrysostomic corpus contained many works that were not actually his. Savile had drawn upon the *Catalogus Augustanus* in issuing requests for transcriptions of unpublished homilies that his assistants were making for him in libraries and collections abroad, and then in turn he used inclusion in that catalogue as a criterion for genuineness in his “*Notae*” (8:729–33); he was able to do so for ten of the sixteen homilies.¹⁴⁴ In the other six cases,

142. As noted above, the one exception is that the Greek text of *Hom. Rom. 5:3* was first published by Fronto Ducaeus.

143. Montfaucon was also influenced by the catalogue and provides cross-references to it, describing the list as “*Catalog[us] antiqu[us] incerti auctoris homiliarum singularum quae antiquitus pro genuinis habitae sunt*” (Mf 13:406–8). This is reprinted in PG 64:141–46. This list was first published in the 1601 volume by Fronto Ducaeus, *Panegyrici Tractatus XVII sanctis apostolis, martyribus et patriarchis dicti* (Bordeaux: Simon Millanges, 1601), 411–12, and was also influential on him; for further on the Catalogue see Baur, *Jean Chrysostome et ses oeuvres dans l’histoire littéraire*, 103; Quantin, “Du Chrysostom latin au Chrysostom grec,” 310–311.

144. *Hom. Rom. 5:3*; *Hom. Rom. 16:3 A, B*; *Hom. 1 Cor. 10:1–11*; *Hom. 2 Cor. 4:13 A, B, F*; *Hom. 2 Cor 11:1*; *Hom. Gal. 2:11–14*; *Hom. 1 Tim. 5:9–10*. On Savile’s use of the catalogue, see Quantin, “Du Chrysostom latin au Chrysostom grec,” 321: “La moins précieuse [des ressources d’Augsbourg] ne fut pas le *Catalogue Augustanus*: Slade s’y référa systématiquement pour identifier les textes qu’il trouvait dans les bibliothèques, et Savile pour trier les transcriptions qu’il recevait.”

Savile included very brief notes on authenticity criteria pertaining to style or contents, but by no means comprehensive arguments. For three of the homilies, Savile pointed to the style and elegance of the written text as a sign of Chrysostomic authorship, pronouncing one “*oratio perelegans certe*,” another “*elegans ... et auctore Chrysostomo dignissima*,” and a third an “*oratio melioris notae*.”¹⁴⁵ In the first of these, despite a shared recognition of the “elegance” of the homily, Savile included a possible doubt expressed by one of his colleagues, John Hales (“*Haec Halesius*”), that, by the criterion of close literary relationship to another homily, at least the *prooimion* of this one might possibly be the work of an epigone (“*imitator*”).¹⁴⁶ But Savile’s overall view was that Chrysostom is fully capable of self-repetition in *prooimia*, especially on the topic of his health.¹⁴⁷ Thus Savile justified the inclusion of this homily in his volume, although he does register Hales’s concern in his “*Notae*.”¹⁴⁸ In another case, the similarity to a homily within the series on 1 Corinthians was used by Savile instead as an argument for the authenticity of the occasional homily.¹⁴⁹ Savile treated the remaining

145. The homilies were *Hom. Rom. 8:28* (HS 8:729), *Hom. Rom. 12:20* (HS 8:730), and *Hom. Phil. 1:18* (HS 8:733), respectively. “*Notae*” here could be a reference to “excellent quality” or “characteristic mark,” or possibly be a more specific reference to the renown of this homily, which is why Savile states next, “*quamvis in catalogo August. non memoratum*” (the only one of the six cases where Savile points out a homily was lacking in the *Catalogus Augustanus*).

146. HS 8:729–30. In both *Hom. Rom. 8:28* and *Hom. Matt. 18:23* (CPG 4368), Chrysostom expresses with some similar wording the sentiment of relief at being reunited with his congregants after separation due to illness. Savile represents Hales’s view as follows: “*oratio perelegans certe, prooemium tamen videtur imitatore aliquem sapere*” (“Surely an elegant homily, but nevertheless the *prooimion* seems to smack of some epigone”; HS 8:729).

147. “*fortasse non dubitavit Iohannes noster ex consimili occasione valetudinis eodem proemio saepius uti*” (“perhaps our John did not hesitate to use the same exordium again for a similar and not infrequent instance concerning his health”), which is certainly true.

148. Montfaucon would later praise Savile for not being persuaded by Hales’s doubt about authorship: “*Haec Savilius, qui ut sagax erat, scrupulum Halesii temere injectum nihil moratur*” (“so says Savile, who, in as much as he was intellectually astute, doesn’t show any regard for the doubt so rashly suggested by Hales”; Mf 3:830). In his notes Montfaucon engaged in dispute about the provenance of the homily, but expressed no doubt about its authenticity.

149. *Hom. 1 Cor. 11:19*: “*Multa habita communia cum homilia 28 Chrysostomi in priorem ad Corinthios, ut ab eodem fonte projectas ambas dubium non sit*” (8:733) (“Because this homily has much in common with the twenty-eighth homily of Chryso-

two homilies, *Hom. 1 Cor. 7:2–4* and *Hom. 1 Cor. 7:39–40*, as a pair. He declared them authentic: “*non dubito, quin γνήσιον sit*” (“I do not doubt that it is genuine”).¹⁵⁰

Henry Savile’s sparse notes from 1611 to 1612 on the genuineness of these sixteen homilies were carried forward by Montfaucon (1721), who printed Savile’s notes with his own annotations and comments, but he never questioned the authenticity of any of these sixteen homilies,¹⁵¹ which were in turn reprinted by Migne (1862).¹⁵² Hence Savile’s judgments, based both on the *Catalogus Augustanus* and on his own scholarly discipline, have reverberated down through the centuries and into contemporary scholarship, where none of those sixteen homilies is listed among the large number of *spuria* or *dubia* that have come down under the name of John Chrysostom, either by pseudepigraphic composition or false attribution.¹⁵³

The criteria for assessing genuine Chrysostomic homilies remain much the same as those that were used by Savile: vocabulary, diction, style, forms of argument, theological and ecclesiastical positions, and a historical setting plausibly located within Chrysostom’s life and ministry in Antioch and Constantinople. On the basis of my work with these occasional homilies (in the context of John’s extensive corpus of work, including the serial homilies on the Pauline letters), I concur that the case is very strong for all sixteen of the homilies that Savile had included in his edition. In addition to Chrysostom’s characteristic voice, dialogical approach, mode of working with the biblical text (and the Pauline letters in particular, and

stom’s on the first Letter to the Corinthians, there is no doubt that both emanate from the same source”).

150. Savile said that because of the general applicability of their subject matter—on marriage practices—they could have been preached in either Antioch or Constantinople. He did, however (quite briefly), open the literary-historical possibility that the texts as we have them are either fragmentary or have been edited together. And then he goes on to say it remains to be seen (“*videndum*”) if each of the two homilies is a separate piece (“*ἀπάνθισμα*”) or they have been stitched together (“*consutum*”) because of the same moral concerns (“*ex ethicis*”). See HS 8:730.

151. See Mf 3:830–31.

152. “*Selecta ex notis Henrici Savilii et Frontonis Ducae*” (PG 52:847–49), which Migne repaginated to refer to his own edition.

153. See José A. de Aldama, *Repertorium Pseudochrysostomicum*, Documents, études et répertoires publiés par l’Institut de Recherche et d’Histoire des Textes 10 (Paris: CNRS, 1965).

their author), and of constructing arguments and exhortations within each homily, these sixteen ring true to me on the level of vocabulary, style, parallelism in clauses, customary exempla (maritime, agricultural, social, about life in the *polis*), exhortations to stay with the homilist, and dilation on pet topics (e.g., almsgiving, anger and other moral failings, resistance to critique from outsiders, Jews and heretics, the need for men not to show themselves weaker than women, etc.). Beyond that, as has been emphasized above, their consistent and recognizable use of the form of *ζητήματα καὶ λύσεις* in ways both conventional and creative in my view adds yet another argument on behalf of authenticity. These homilies are harder, however, to judge in terms of the criterion of precisely determined historical context, since many of them could have been preached in either Antioch or Constantinople.¹⁵⁴ And yet that is not in itself a clear counterargument, since establishing the provenance and date of Chrysostom's homilies is acutely difficult across the board, as Wendy Mayer has so well demonstrated.¹⁵⁵ But one of the purposes of the present volume is to make these texts better known, and hence, as with all ancient sources, to invite further scrutiny on all historical questions, including authenticity, where or if future scholarship deems it warranted.

One line of testing for authentication that future research will be able to develop further is the comparison of each of these homilies with the treatments of these Pauline passages within the homily sets on the letters or in other places within Chrysostom's oeuvre. None of these homilies repeats exactly what is in the homily sets on these passages, but there are various kinds of convergence and agreement, even as the determination of the

154. See the initial notes on each of the translations of the homilies below. In particular, relying upon the invaluable study of Wendy Mayer, *Provenance*, it is clear that in only a few cases is certainty about where John may have preached these sermons possible, due to their paucity of city-specific references. Among our homilies, Mayer regards only *Hom. Gal. 2:11–14* and *Laud. Paul. hom. 4* as placeable with certainty, in Antioch (*Provenance*, 511–12). Beyond certainty, a reasonably strong case may be made for the Antiochene setting of *Hom. 1 Cor. 10:1–11*; *Hom. Phil. 1:18* and *Hom. 1 Tim. 5:9–10*, and a possible one for the same location for *Hom. 2 Cor. 4:13 A, B, Γ* and *Hom. 2 Tim. 3:1*. For the possible correspondence of this with Chrysostom's role in preaching the Pauline lection at liturgy during his earlier years of ministry in Antioch, see below, p. 49 n. 158. This subject will deserve much careful further research.

155. Mayer, *Provenance*, testing some four hundred and fifty homilies by Chrysostom, of a range of types, was able to determine a certain location for only fifty-one of them (*Provenance*, 30–31, 510–13).

sequence, or of which homily is or might be an abbreviated or expanded version of the argument in the other, is a large task that must be undertaken on each individually.

It is likely that the origins of these homilies are to be found in the practice of Chrysostom to engage the Pauline letters continually and repeatedly in his sermons, both as they appear in the lectionary¹⁵⁶ (as, often in our homilies, it is mentioned that the text had been read that day) and sometimes because he repitched the homilies on other years or occasions, or perhaps even more than once on a single day.¹⁵⁷ The concentration on Pauline passages that these homilies represent may well be due to the practice of having multiple homilists at a *synaxis* (liturgical assembly), for which there is evidence that, at Antioch at least (that is, earlier in his career), the Pauline lection was often given to Chrysostom.¹⁵⁸ So sermons dedicated to the Pauline passage that was read that day, or even repeated on several days running,¹⁵⁹ are plausibly rooted in the liturgical context, even if in many cases we are not able to ascertain a more specific date or location within Chrysostom's decades-long preaching ministry. In any case, the judgment

156. The Pauline letters were read in order continuously from Pentecost to Lent each year. See Gary Philippe Raczka, "The Lectionary at the Time of Saint John Chrysostom," (PhD diss., University of Notre Dame, 2015), 246–47, with further literature.

157. See Baur, *Jean Chrysostome et ses oeuvres dans l'histoire littéraire*, 87: "D'après Savile, les éditeurs admettent en principe que Chrysostome a prononcé plusieurs fois les mêmes sermons." See also Hans Lietzmann, "Johannes Chrysostomos," PW 9:1816: "sondern daß die Predigten tatsächlich zweimal gehalten sind; ob in zwei aufeinander folgenden Jahren oder an demselben Tage in zwei verschiedenen Kirchen, steht noch dahin." This has recently been suggested anew by Cook, *Preaching and Popular Christianity*, 206–10, but apparently without recognizing it had not in fact been the assumption of previous scholarship that "Chrysostom only ever delivered his sermons once" (206). Nonetheless, the point Cook derives from this is a reasonable one in regard to the constitution of the homily sets: "There is, then, some limited evidence for the suggestion that Chrysostom repeated sermons during his preaching career, a suggestion which could help to explain the presence of sermons from different locations existing within a single series, without having to dispense with the practice of *lectio continua*" (p. 208). This could also in turn be an important factor in explaining why we have these miscellaneous or occasional homilies on Pauline texts that are not set within the homily series.

158. See the argument of Raczka, "The Lectionary at the Time of Saint John Chrysostom," 190–93, with assembled evidence.

159. Such as *Hom. Rom. 16:3 A and B* and *Hom. 2 Cor. 4:13 A, B, and I*, which are clearly miniseries preached on successive liturgies (either on Sundays or in some cases perhaps weekdays).

of authenticity of each of these sixteen homilies published by Savile rests on some firm grounds cumulatively and, as mentioned, has not been challenged heretofore.

Beyond these sixteen homilies, it was Bernard de Montfaucon who first published *Hom. 2 Tim. 3:1*, the text of which he knew from a single manuscript (Vat. gr. 559), and who urged that it was authentic on the basis of diction and form of argument.¹⁶⁰ That judgment has been carried forward in later discussions, and the work has not been listed among the Pseudo-Chrysostomica.¹⁶¹ I tend to agree that there is much here of style, argumentation, and approach to the Pauline text and the work of homiletics that seems vintage Chrysostom, including the focus on the attentivity of the audience (and the memorable image of them as baby sparrows with their necks peeping out of the nest to gain nourishment from the sermon),¹⁶² forms of interactive questioning of Paul¹⁶³ and Paul's scripted responses, the insistence upon Paul having had in mind both his historical audiences and those of the future, the defense of Peter against the charge of cowardice, and, in terms of the diction, the customary vocabulary and continual use of correlative and comparative clauses and then-and-now and lesser-to-greater comparisons.¹⁶⁴ However, the text as published is quite rough and in places seems to be lacunate.¹⁶⁵ This may be due to the manuscript, Vat. gr. 559 (or its exemplar), or to this having been a transcript of a live homily that had been only lightly and perhaps imperfectly edited.¹⁶⁶ Further study of the other four manuscripts that contain this

160. "*Hanc homiliam ... veram et authenticam esse nemo non fatebitur, nisi sit in Chrysostomi scriptis hospes. Omnes enim styli, dictionis inventionisque notae concurrunt, nulla desideratur*" ("no one will fail to grant that this homily ... is genuine and authentic, even if it is unknown among Chrysostom's writings. For all the features of style, diction, and form of argument agree with his distinctive character, with nothing lacking") (Mf 6:278).

161. Aldama, *Repertorium Pseudochrysostomicum*.

162. See pp. 637–39 with n. 6 within that translation.

163. E.g., §2 (PG 56:272): *Τί λέγεις, ὦ μακάριε Παῦλε* (see p. 640 n. 11 in that translation).

164. Some of these are indicated in the notes to that translation.

165. See the notes on the translation. In several cases, this is just at a point where the preacher is drawing comparisons across time using deliberately repeated phrases (something John is wont to do), and hence that may have led to parablepsis errors in scribal transmission.

166. One may also wish to compare it with other sermons from Chrysostom's

homily is obviously called for.¹⁶⁷ It is also possible that a contributing factor to the roughness of this homily is that the preacher was not at his best due to poor health, as he complains at the outset and the conclusion, and hence the transcript preserves part of the realia of its initial halting performance.¹⁶⁸ And yet such protestations (not rare in John's homilies) could as well be a topos. Nonetheless, there is at least a reasonable case to be made for the authenticity of *Hom. 2 Tim. 3:1* on the basis of the text we have, and, given that its genuineness has not previously been questioned, the inclusion of this homily in the present collection is justified with a view toward further study.

The case is more complicated in terms of the last of our occasional homilies, *Hom. Tit. 2:11–12*, and hence it will receive a more extensive treatment here. Antoine Wenger in the *editio princeps* had argued for the authenticity of this homily due to “le style limpide et élégant de la Bouche d’Or, son vocabulaire, sa méthode d’exégèse, ses procédés oratoires.”¹⁶⁹ But on some of the same grounds Mayer excluded this homily from her study, though she did not provide specific examples of incongruities.¹⁷⁰ Already in 1738 Montfaucon had included this homily among his list of *spuria et omissa* (Mf 13:324), but he did not give any supporting arguments, either. Consequently, any analysis of the genuineness of this homily must begin with an assessment of the case Wenger offered at its initial publication to support his judgment that “les connaisseurs de Chrysostome reconnaîtront le caractère authentique de l’homélie.”¹⁷¹

earliest years in Antioch to see whether some of the roughness is due to the inexperience that he claims in the *prooimion*, or whether that is mostly a matter of conventional rhetorical self-positioning.

167. This will have to include also attention to the closing doxology, which in Vat. gr. 559 contains a form not found exactly elsewhere in Chrysostom's homilies—*εἰς δόξαν τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι' οὗ καὶ μεθ' οὗ τῷ Πατρὶ δόξα, τιμὴ, κράτος*—which could possibly be a sign of inauthenticity. The closest to this in the authentic homilies is *Hom. Jo. 9.2* (PG 59:74).

168. *Hom. 2 Tim. 3:1* §§1, 7 (PG 56:271, 278).

169. Wenger, “Une homélie inédite de Jean Chrysostome sur l'épiphanie,” 120.

170. Mayer, *Provenance*, 26: “the style and vocabulary seem to me to be sufficiently alien to Chrysostom to raise doubts.”

171. Wenger, “Une homélie inédite de Jean Chrysostome sur l'épiphanie,” 120. Note that Wenger's article appeared after the publication of Aldama, *Repertorium Pseudochrysostomicum*, and hence this homily was not considered in that list one way or another.

Wenger's arguments (spanning just five pages of his journal article) were of mixed types, and unevenly executed, in particular because he conflated arguments for the homily being an Epiphany oration with arguments for its authenticity.¹⁷² Wenger found the close exegetical attention to Titus 2:11 in this homily well-suited to Chrysostom: "le nouveau texte est presque exclusivement un commentaire scripturaire."¹⁷³ Yet that also meant that he had to explain why it was rightly considered a festal oration, as he staunchly maintained: "La seule attache festive est la mention qui se trouve au n 9: 'saint Paul s'écrit *aujourd'hui*: la grâce de Dieu s'est manifestée.'"¹⁷⁴

But this is in fact not a clear argument that this was an Epiphany sermon.¹⁷⁵ As many examples, including several within the homilies on Pauline passages in the present collection, show,¹⁷⁶ Chrysostom could regard the

172. This is further complicated by Wenger's wish to demonstrate that this homily had not, in fact, been edited and published previously (see especially "Une homélie inédite de Jean Chrysostome sur l'épiphanie," 117–19). This leads him to see whether the homily might have fit, for instance, in the serial homily set on Titus, which, he concludes, it does not. Wenger states candidly that this was his main worry in publishing the text—"Le seule crainte que nous ayons longtemps gardée à son sujet, c'est qu'elle se trouve déjà publiée quelque part" (120)—rather than that he was publishing a Pseudo-Chrysostomic text.

173. Wenger, "Une homélie inédite de Jean Chrysostome sur l'épiphanie," 119. See also p. 118: "le deuxième texte se présente comme une homélie festive, bien qu'en réalité ce soit plutôt un commentaire scripturaire de la péripécopie de l'épître lue le jour de l'Epiphanie, Tite 2,11." And yet Wenger does not doubt that this was in fact an Epiphany sermon.

174. Wenger, "Une homélie inédite de Jean Chrysostome sur l'épiphanie," 119. He refers explicitly to *Bapt.* §2 (PG 49:365) as a parallel: καὶ περὶ ἑκατέρας αὐτῶν ἡκούσατε σήμερον Παύλου τίτω διαλεγομένου καὶ λέγοντος οὕτω· περὶ μὲν τῆς παρουσίας (sc. ἐπιφανίας), Ἐπεφάνη ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ χάρις ἡ σωτήριος.

175. Interestingly, when it comes to possible adaptations of this homily, Wenger, 119, acknowledges that a pseudepigraphical author in principle could have added "Paul says this to us *today*" ("L'on dira qu'il est facile à un faussaire d'insérer dans un texte ces mots: Paul nous dit *aujourd'hui*"), but exactly what kind of literary operation this would involve (into what existing text would they have inserted this?) is unclear, and, at any rate, this is presented as a strawman objection that Wenger wishes preemptively to overturn.

176. See *Hom. 1 Cor. 10:1–11* §1 (PG 51:242), Καὶ γὰρ ἡκούσατε σήμερον αὐτοῦ βοῶντος; *Hom. 2 Cor. 11:1* §2 (PG 51:303), μάθωμεν τί ποτέ ἐστὶν ὅπερ σήμερον ἐβόα λέγων; *Hom. Col. 8.1* (PG 62:351), ἡκούσατε τί σήμερον ὁ Παῦλος ἐβόα; *Laz. 5.1* (PG 48:1017), ἡκούσατε τοίνυν τοῦ Παύλου σήμερον βοῶντος καὶ λέγοντος; *Hom. 1 Cor.*

lectionary readings as declaimed by the anagnost or the preacher on *any synaxis* as constituting Paul speaking something “today”; hence this kind of statement is not solely used by him for the great liturgical feasts. Wenger’s second argument, which he regarded as decisive, was an appeal to Chrysostom’s exhortations to his audience to pay attention and stay awake to gain the full understanding of the sermon.¹⁷⁷ But, once more, while one can indeed find this in homilies from great liturgical feasts,¹⁷⁸ such exhortations are found throughout Chrysostom’s homilies, including in the sermons in the present volume that are focused on specific Pauline passages.¹⁷⁹ For both these supporting arguments Wenger has wrongly presumed features that are typical of Chrysostom’s homilies in general are specific to festal oratory.

So, it is possible, against Wenger, that the reason “le nouveau texte est presque exclusivement un commentaire scripturaire” is that it is a homily with an exegetical focus on this lemma that was not originally a festal oration.¹⁸⁰ Lending support to that view is the fact that, in stark contrast with other eastern Epiphany sermons, including Chrysostom’s own *De baptismo Christi et de epiphania* (PG 49:363–72),¹⁸¹ the text of this homily¹⁸² does not mention the feast itself and its meanings, nor the baptism of Jesus by John.¹⁸³ Yet, since Titus 2:11 was part of the lectionary for the Feast

7:39–40 §1 (PG 51:217), *σήμερον περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν ὁ αὐτὸς διαλέγεται Παῦλος*; *Hom. Rom.* 5:3 §1 (PG 51:157), without the word *σήμερον*, but it is implied, and many further examples.

177. See Wenger, “Une homélie inédite de Jean Chrysostome sur l’épiphanie,” 119: “Nous y trouvons un autre indice qui ne trompe pas et qui prouve que l’homélie a été effectivement prononcée le jour de l’Epiphanie au cours de la liturgie.”

178. E.g., *Natal.* §3 (PG 49:354), cited by Wenger, “Une homélie inédite de Jean Chrysostome sur l’épiphanie,” 120.

179. *Hom.* 2 *Cor.* 4:13 Γ §2 (PG 51:291); *Hom. Gal.* 2:11–14 §§1, 9 (PG 51:373, 379); *Hom. Eph.* 8.8 (PG 62:66); *Hom. Phil.* 6.1 (PG 62:218); *Hom. Jo.* 5.1; 11.1 (PG 59:53, 79); *Adv. Jud.* 7.2; 10.2 (PG 48:93, 113), etc.

180. Quotation from Wenger, “Une homélie inédite de Jean Chrysostome sur l’épiphanie,” 119: And yet the homily is not just a “commentary,” but rather a set of arguments about the text (and some other topics related to it).

181. See Everett Ferguson, “Preaching at Epiphany: Gregory of Nyssa and John Chrysostom on Baptism and the Church,” *CH* 66 (1997): 1–17, esp. 8–16, which provides an analysis of Chrysostom’s other Epiphany sermon, *De baptismo Christi et de epiphania* (CPG 4335).

182. I leave aside here the phrase *εἰς τὰ θεοφάνια* in the title, to which we shall return below (pp. 55–57).

183. There are two brief mentions of baptism in the homily, however. In §6 there

of the Epiphany, as Wenger argues and as is generally recognized,¹⁸⁴ we cannot completely exclude out of hand the possibility that this homily was originally designed for that occasion.¹⁸⁵ But it is not the only way to understand a homily devoted to a close reading and set of arguments about this Pauline passage, nor is it the unambiguous conclusion one can draw from the extant manuscript evidence.

Wenger observed that Sinai. gr. 491 contains no fewer than eight texts devoted to the Feast of the Epiphany, five of which are attributed to Chrysostom.¹⁸⁶ Hence the shaping of the Sinai codex as a collection of liturgical texts may have played a role in repurposing an occasional homily on a Pauline text as a presumed Epiphany sermon. As Wenger himself demonstrated, this is precisely what had happened with the twelfth *Homilia in Matthaeum* (PG 57:201–8), on Matt 3:13–17, the account of the baptism of Jesus, which is the gospel text in the lectionary for Epiphany. In this codex, that homily, presumably an occasional oration on the lemma, has been transformed into an Epiphany oration by the addition of the line, λαμπρά καὶ ἐπιδόξος, ἀγαπητοί, τῆς παρούσης ἐορτῆς ἡ πανήγυρις (“splendid and glorious is the celebratory assembly for the feast that is upon us, beloved!”), placed before its actual incipit.¹⁸⁷ Yet despite this conclusion,

is a quotation of Matt 3:12 (Luke 3:17) about the coming one: ἐκεῖνος ὁ βαπτίζων ὑμᾶς ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρί. But that passage (which precedes the pericope of Jesus’s own baptism in Matt 3:13–17) is nowhere quoted in *Bapt.* (the other Epiphany homily) and may not have been a part of the lectionary for Epiphany. (Raczka, “The Lectionary at the Time of Saint John Chrysostom,” 238–39, lists the gospel for Epiphany as Matt 3:13–17.) The second reference is to Matt 20:19–20 in §21 to exemplify that grace means the forgiveness of sins. While these passages are not amplified upon by the preacher here in relation to Christ’s own baptism by John and the attendant appearance of the Spirit (which is the subject of the feast), if the homily were for Epiphany, one might expect that they would have been all the more pronounced.

184. See Raczka, “The Lectionary at the Time of Saint John Chrysostom,” 238–39, with further literature.

185. In addition, if it could be shown that Isa 9:1, quoted by the preacher in §10, was the Old Testament lection of the day, that would add further to the case that this was originally an Epiphany sermon. However, Raczka concludes that although there is strong evidence for Matt 3:13–17 and Titus 2:11, there is no clear indication of the Old Testament and Psalm readings for Epiphany in Chrysostom’s time. (This is an area for ongoing research.) See Raczka, “The Lectionary at the Time of Saint John Chrysostom,” 239, 245.

186. Wenger, “Une homélie inédite de Jean Chrysostome sur l’épiphanie,” 117.

187. “En réalité, l’incipit est un piège car ces mots servent à déguiser en homélie

Wenger did not consider the equally likely possibility that the homily on Titus 2:11–12 has undergone the very same operation, performed by the title: *ὁμιλία εἰς τὸ Ἐπεφάνη ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ εἰς τὰ θεοφάνια*. Indeed, the sole overt sign that this is an Epiphany homily is not really that Paul cries out “today,” as Wenger had stated, but this title,¹⁸⁸ which appears to have been a major influence on Wenger’s argument and conclusions, even if it is not acknowledged as such. But how much weight can one place on the title,¹⁸⁹ and could it, like the incipit of *Hom. Matt. 12* in this codex, have been doctored for this purpose?

Several aspects of the Sinai codex point in this direction. First, the title of *Hom. Tit. 2:11–12* contains a quasi-redundant αὐτοῦ (“by the same”) preceding the proper name and epithets (τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἁγίου Ἰωάννου τοῦ Χρυσσοστόμου), which serves within this codex to link this homily with the previous, CPG 4882.¹⁹⁰ (Wenger had simply deleted the αὐτοῦ without comment from the text of his title in his edition, presumably because he regarded it as secondary.) The immediately preceding homily uses the

festale l’homélie 12 du commentaire de Chrysostome sur Matthieu, concernant le baptême de Jésus” (Wenger, “Une homélie inédite de Jean Chrysostome sur l’épiphanie,” 118). Of course, Chrysostom’s exegetical discourses on Matthew are also homilies and not, strictly speaking, a “commentary,” as though that were an utterly distinct genre. At the same time, it is striking that what Wenger imagines for this homily on Matthew he does not entertain for the one on Titus, chiefly on the grounds that the series *Hom. Tit.* does not much replicate what is here, and in fact “passe rapidement sur le texte” (119). But that is why studying this sermon along with our other homilies on individual Pauline lemmata is useful, for these other occasional homilies don’t merely replicate what is in the series, either.

188. Note also that the Greek title of the genuine Chrysostomic Epiphany sermon, *Bapt.*, for which Savile and Montfaucon have slightly different wording, in neither version contains εἰς τὰ θεοφάνια (PG 49:363). But the Pseudo-Chrysostomic *In sanctam theophaniam* (Aldama, *Repertorium Pseudochrysostomicum*, 162, pp. 59–60), bears the title εἰς τὰ ἄγια θεοφάνια (PG 50:805–8).

189. See Mayer, *Provenance*, 315–21, on the reasons for caution about accepting uncritically the historicity of information contained in homily titles, and for a methodological proposal for emphasizing the contents of the homily itself in cases where the title and contents do not fully square.

190. This post-Epiphany oration is falsely attributed to Chrysostom. Options proposed for authorship have included Severian of Gabala and Nestorius. See Timothy D. Barnes, “A Lost Prince in a Sermon of Nestorius,” *StPatr* 39 (2006): 3–6, with references to further literature on those debates, including Antoine Wenger, “Notes inédites sur les empereurs Théodose I, Arcadius, Théodose II, Léon I,” *Revue des études byzantines* 10 (1952): 47–59.

exact same language in the title hanging over its incipit, Ἰωάννου ἐπισκόπου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως εἰς τὰ θεοφάνια (fol. 103); and this title is copied in again as a *superscriptio* after the final ἀμήν on fol. 115^v: τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου εἰς τὰ θεοφάνια.¹⁹¹ Our homily begins on the first line of the next folio (fol. 116) with the title τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἁγίου Ἰωάννου τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου ὁμιλία εἰς τὸ Ἐπεφάνη ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ εἰς τὰ θεοφάνια. It seems reasonable to take seriously the possibility that *both* the αὐτοῦ and εἰς τὰ θεοφάνια were added by the scribe of the Sinai codex (or its precursor) to the title of *Hom. Tit. 2:11–12* to link it to the previous homily, in forming this collection of five Chrysostomic Epiphany texts.

Indeed, one need not merely surmise this, because of the fact—never mentioned by Wenger¹⁹²—that the title for this homily in Paris. gr. 700 lacks καὶ εἰς τὰ θεοφάνια entirely: τοῦ ἐν ἁγίοις πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἰωάννου ἀρχιεπισκόπου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου λόγος εἰς τὸ Ἐπεφάνη χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ σωτήριος παιδεύουσα ἡμᾶς.¹⁹³ Hence this other manuscript witness, along with the liturgical contents and shaping of Sinai. gr. 491 (which adds a *superscriptio* again to this effect at the end of our homily: τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου εἰς τὰ Θεοφάνια), adds strong support to the inference that the Sinai codex represents a liturgical adaptation, rather than that the scribe of Paris. gr. 700 for unexplained reasons removed εἰς τὰ θεοφάνια from the title.¹⁹⁴ This is all the more likely since

191. I cite the text from Antoine Wenger, “Une homélie inédite (de Sévérien de Gabala?) sur l’épiphanie,” *AnBoll* 95 (1977): 73–90, esp. 81 and 90.

192. Wenger’s apparatus criticus is misleading here, in representing the title in Paris. gr. 700 as “τοῦ ἐν ἁγίοις πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἰ. ἀρχιεπισκόπου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως τοῦ Χ. λόγος εἰς τὸ ...” because one would infer from the ellipsis that from εἰς τὸ forward the title is the same as his printed text from Sinai. gr. 491 (“Une homélie inédite de Jean Chrysostome sur l’épiphanie,” 116). But in fact, the Paris manuscript includes ἡ σωτήριος, παιδεύουσα ἡμᾶς after Ἐπεφάνη ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ, and, most importantly, it does not have καὶ εἰς τὰ θεοφάνια.)

193. I have written out the four *nomina sacra* here plene (πῑρς, ιῶ, θῡ, σῑριος). Note that this title also lacks αὐτοῦ.

194. Paris. gr. 700, fol. 166^v has no *superscriptio* for this homily. Beyond that, the codicological contents of Paris. gr. 700 are quite different from Sinai. gr. 491. Although it begins on fol. 163, *Hom. Tit. 2:11–12* is demarcated as the first (A') of twenty-two enumerated works that are a grab bag of types, including a few for liturgical festivals, such as (B') a sermon *Ad neophytos*; hom. 3, for Easter; or *Ad illuminandos catechesis*, hom. 1 (Lent); but also topical sermons such as *Paenit.* (Δ', ΙΓ'); and a variety of exegetical homilies, such as *Hom. Gen.*, hom. 1 (ΙΒ'); *Anna*, hom 2–3 (ΙΘ'–Κ'); and *Hom. princ. Act.*, hom. 3–4, 2 (ΚΙ'–ΚΕ'). But, in contrast to Sinai. gr. 491, there is no

the longer lemma as found in the title of the Paris codex—including ἡ σωτήριος ... παιδεύουσα ἡμᾶς (Titus 2:11–12)—also more accurately represents the actual contents of the homily.¹⁹⁵ So, Wenger’s argument that *Hom. Tit. 2:11–12* was an Epiphany sermon does not hold up well under scrutiny. But what about its authenticity?

Although the two criteria cited by Wenger (Paul speaking “today,” and Chrysostom exhorting his audiences to “stay awake”) cannot demonstrate that this is an Epiphany sermon, they do, as we have shown, cohere well with Chrysostom’s characteristic style within his homilies more broadly. A last criterion to which Wenger appealed was the concluding doxology of the homily: χάριτι καὶ φιланθρωπία τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, μεθ’ οὗ τῷ Πατρὶ ἡ δόξα σὺν ἀγίῳ πνεύματι, νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων· ἀμήν.¹⁹⁶ “Nous oserions presque dire qu’une homélie qui comporte cette conclusion a toute chance d’être authentique, sans que l’inverse dénote nécessairement un faux, Chrysostome usant de sa formule coutumière dans la proportion de sept sur dix.”¹⁹⁷ Here Wenger is on firmer ground, as this closing (with or without minor variations) is indeed found in over five-hundred and fifty genuine Chrysostomic homilies, including every homily in the present volume except one.¹⁹⁸ However, Wenger has not acknowledged that the reading of the final doxology in Paris. gr. 700 lacks the characteristic καὶ φιλανθρωπία and has a different version of the benediction itself, both in terms of syntax and terminology: ὃ ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας· ἀμήν. And yet, the formula in the Paris codex is not entirely alien to Chrysostom, either, as we do find variation on some consistent patterns across his works.¹⁹⁹ So on balance the final benediction remains an argument in favor of the authenticity of this homily.

concentrated focus on festal oratory in general or Epiphany in particular (see CCG 7.162, pp. 180–83).

195. See especially §§9, 14, 19–24.

196. I quote here the text of Sinai. gr. 491, the reading adopted by Wenger, “Une homélie inédite de Jean Chrysostome sur l’épiphanie,” 135.

197. Wenger, “Une homélie inédite de Jean Chrysostome sur l’épiphanie,” 121.

198. My results from searching via TLG. The homily without this closing is *Hom. 2 Tim. 3:1*. Wenger is not quite right that this form of the benediction is not found among falsely composed or attributed homilies, but the numbers are far less (some fifty).

199. Focusing just on the subjects of the final relative clause, the combination of ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος is not infrequently found in Chrysostom’s homilies, though there is a good amount of variety here—see, e.g., *Hom. Rom. 5:3* §4 (PG 51:1640); *Adv. Jud.*

Beyond these claims made by Wenger, my analysis of this homily confirms other correspondences with Chrysostom's genuine homilies in both diction and style, as well as in argumentation. As the notes to the translation show, this homily uses some favored Chrysostomic expressions that are rooted in his dialogical homiletical method, like βούλει μαθεῖν ("Do you want to learn?") and ἄκουσον Παύλου λέγοντος ("listen to Paul saying"). We find also a similar mode of dialogue between the orator, the audience, the text, and its author. The opening discussion of the eyes being like ferocious dogs who require the restraints of the law and reason, while not exactly replicated elsewhere in John's writings, has some parallel, and it strikes a genuine note consonant with his moralizing on sexual passions as found elsewhere. The closing exhortation to peer into the scriptural text like a mirror for examining one's soul, just as one does at the barber-shop after a haircut, has a precise correspondence with John's *Hom. Matt.* 4.8 (PG 57:49). There is another close convergence with other Chrysostomic works in terms of the comparison the preacher makes in this homily between Daniel killing the Dragon (Bel 23–27) and Christ killing Death (cf. 1 Cor 15:26, 54–56; 1 Pet 3:19, later traditions), which is both conceptually and linguistically very close. We can add to this the use in this homily of the ζητήματα καὶ λύσεις formula (§19), here less in an apologetic than a pedagogical mode, and the aggrandizing of the "problem" (of χάρις conferring punishment rather than forgiveness) before solving it, as we find elsewhere in John's writings. In terms of placing the homily within Chrysostom's life and works, I have also identified a strong candidate for the sermon that is being alluded to in the opening of this homily as having been preached πρώην:²⁰⁰ *De paenitentia*, *Hom.* 6, which fits the description περὶ σωφροσύνης and quotes as law the precise lemma the preacher mentions as such (*Matt* 5:28). For all of these reasons, the case for the genuineness of *Hom. Tit.* 2:11–12 is certainly strong enough for inclusion in this volume, along with a bid for other scholars to assess these new arguments (of a type and detail to which this homily has not been subjected previously) in ongoing research on Chrysostom's homilies and the Pseudo-Chrysostomica.

3.6; 4.7; 8.8 (PG 48:872, 882, 942); *Laz.* 5.5; 6.9 (PG 48:1026, 1044); *Stat.* 19.4; 21.4 (PG 49:198, 222).

200. This is itself a common Chrysostomic formula at the outset of a homily to refer to the one preached on the previous occasion (see p. 668 n. 3).

Manuscript Witnesses of the Occasional Homilies

In terms of attestation, it may bear noting that there is significant variation among these homilies in the numbers of manuscript witnesses known to date. While some come closer to the numbers of witnesses of the homily sets on the Pauline letters, such as *Hom. 1 Tim. 5:9–10* (thirty-six manuscripts)²⁰¹ or *Hom. 2 Cor. 4:13 A, B, Γ* (twenty-nine manuscripts for all three, twenty-seven for just the first two), others are found in only five or fewer manuscripts, such as *Hom. Rom. 8:28* (three manuscripts), *Hom. Tit. 2:11–12* (three manuscripts), *Hom. Rom. 12:20* (five manuscripts) or *Hom. 2 Tim. 3:1* (five manuscripts). While numbers of extant textual witnesses to any given homily of course do not demonstrate authenticity (either for Chrysostom specifically or for early Christian or other literary traditions from antiquity), they do give a general sense of the range of knowledge and circulation of these texts in the Byzantine era, even as, and most importantly, they provide yet another indication of the text-critical work still to be done.²⁰²

Manuscript Witnesses Identified to Date²⁰³

<i>Hom. Rom. 5:3</i> (CPG 4373)	15
<i>Hom. Rom. 8:28</i> (CPG 4374)	3
<i>Hom. Rom. 12:20</i> (CPG 4375)	5
<i>Hom. Rom. 16:3 A</i> (CPG 4376)	15
<i>Hom. Rom. 16:3 B</i> (CPG 4376)	22
<i>Hom. 1 Cor. 7:2–4</i> (CPG 4377)	18
<i>Hom. 1 Cor. 7:39–40</i> (CPG 4378)	15
<i>Hom. 1 Cor. 10:1–11</i> (CPG 4380)	22
<i>Hom. 1 Cor. 11:19</i> (CPG 4381)	10
<i>Hom. 2 Cor. 4:13 A</i> (CPG 4383)	29
<i>Hom. 2 Cor. 4:13 B</i> (CPG 4383)	29
<i>Hom. 2 Cor. 4:13 Γ</i> (CPG 4383)	27

201. As compared with thirty-nine manuscripts of *Hom. 1 Tim. 1–18*.

202. There is also a need for codicological analysis comparing the contents of each of the manuscripts with one another to analyze forms of Chrysostomic collections and subcollections, which is another substantial, ongoing avenue of research.

203. In Pinakes, CCG 1–7, and other sources; this list will most likely be expanded as the work of cataloguing and identifying manuscripts goes forward.

<i>Hom. 2 Cor. 11:1</i> (CPG 4384)	10
<i>Hom. Gal. 2:11–14</i> (CPG 4391)	22
<i>Hom. Phil. 1:11</i> (CPG 4385)	12
<i>Hom. 1 Tim. 5:9–10</i> (CPG 4386)	36
<i>Hom. 2 Tim. 3:1</i> (CPG 4423)	5
<i>Hom. Tit. 2:11–12</i> (CPG 4456)	3

We can note here a rough but not absolute correspondence between the most heavily attested homilies and the *Catalogus Augustanus*. But correlation could go in either or both directions: the author of the catalogue may have known of wider circulation and influence of these homilies and deemed that an index of authenticity, or, in turn, this catalogue or a precursor may have spurred the inclusion of these homilies in further manuscripts of assorted sermons by Chrysostom.

Having now recounted the history of the publication of these Greek texts as genuine Chrysostomica, for ease of cross-reference in ongoing research, the following table shows the location of each of the eighteen Greek texts in part 1 of this volume in the various published editions (cited by volume and column number):

Savile 1611	Morel ²⁰⁴ 1624	Montfaucon 1721	Montfaucon “Paris Edition” 1837 ²⁰⁵	Migne, PG 1862, 1859	Other Edition
<i>Hom. Rom. 5:3</i> (CPG 4373)					
5:292–98	5:180–90	3:140–49	3:168–79	51:155–64	
<i>Hom. Rom. 8:28</i> (CPG 4374)					
5:299–303	5:191–98	3:150–56	3:180–88	51:165–72	
<i>Hom. Rom. 12:20</i> (CPG 4375)					
5:304–14	5:199–215	3:157–71	3:188–206	51:172–86	

204. Page numbers are from the Morel Edition of 1697; see also the tables in the Paris Edition of Montfaucon, vol. 13 (1838), collating with Savile (Mf 13:394–96) and Morel (Mf 13:389–90).

205. Confusingly, the 1837 edition reprints the table of contents of the 1721 edition, despite the pagination within being substantially different.

Savile 1611	Morel 1624	Montfaucon 1721	Montfaucon “Paris Edition” 1837	Migne, PG 1862, 1859	Other Edition
<i>Hom. Rom. 16:3 A (CPG 4376)</i>					
5:314–20	5:216–25	3:171–80	3:206–16	51:187–96	
<i>Hom. Rom. 16:3 B (CPG 4376)</i>					
5:321–29	5:226–39	3:180–92	3:217–31	51:196–208	
<i>Hom. 1 Cor. 7:2–4 (CPG 4377)</i>					
5:330–37	5:240–50	3:193–202	3:232–43	51:207–18	Mazzoni Dami, 1998, 145–61
<i>Hom. 1 Cor. 7:39–40 (CPG 4378)</i>					
5:337–43	5:251–59	3:203–10	3:244–53	51:217–26	
<i>Hom. 1 Cor. 10:1–11 (CPG 4380)</i>					
5:343–55	5:260–72	3:228–39	3:273–86	51:241–52	
<i>Hom. 1 Cor. 11:19 (CPG 4381)</i>					
5:362–68	5:273–82	3:240–48	3:287–97	51:251–60	
<i>Hom. 2 Cor. 4:13 A (CPG 4383)</i>					
5:368–75	5:296–307	3:259–69	3:310–22	51:271–81	
<i>Hom. 2 Cor. 4:13 B (CPG 4383)</i>					
5:375–82	5:308–18	3:269–79	3:322–33	51:281–90	
<i>Hom. 2 Cor. 4:13 Γ (CPG 4383)</i>					
5:382–91	5:319–31	3:279–90	3:333–47	51:289–302	
<i>Hom. 2 Cor. 11:1 (CPG 4384)</i>					
5:392–97	5:332–42	3:291–99	3:347–57	51:301–10	
<i>Hom. Gal. 2:11–14 (CPG 4391)</i>					
5:398–410	5:715–34	3:362–78	3:430–51	51:371–88	
<i>Hom. Phil. 1:18 (CPG 4385)</i>					
5:410–17	5:343–54	3:300–310	3:358–70	51:311–20	

Savile 1611	Morel 1624	Montfaucon 1721	Montfaucon “Paris Edition” 1837	Migne, PG 1862, 1859	Other Edition
<i>Hom. 1 Tim. 5:9–10 (CPG 4386)</i>					
5:425–37	5:387–405	3:311–27	3:370–90	51:321–38	
<i>Hom. 2 Tim. 3:1 (CPG 4423)</i>					
		6:278–87	6:329–39	56:271–80	
<i>Hom. Tit. 2:11–12 (CPG 4456)</i>					
					Wenger, 1971, 117–35

The Seven Homilies *De laudibus sancti Pauli apostoli*

As with sixteen of the eighteen occasional homilies on Pauline “problem passages,” it was Henry Savile who published the *editio princeps* of the Greek text of Chrysostom’s seven homilies *De laudibus sancti Pauli* (CPG 4344) in 1612.²⁰⁶ Savile’s Greek text was taken up and reprinted without emendation by Fronto Ducaeus (1616),²⁰⁷ by Montfaucon (1718),²⁰⁸ by the Paris Edition (1838),²⁰⁹ and then by Migne in the *Patrologia Graeca*

206. They appear in HS 8:32–60.

207. “En effet, le text qu’il [Fronton du Duc] présente est le même que celui de Savile.... Il est donc très vraisemblable que pour ces panégyriques Fronton du Duc a connu l’édition de Savile, et qu’il l’a tout simplement reproduite” (Auguste Piédagnel, *Jean Chrysostome: Panégyriques de Saint Paul*, SC 300 [Paris: Cerf, 1982], 96). This is essentially true, but the Morel edition did remove the brackets from some of Savile’s readings in his text without comment or explanation, and hence readings regarded by Savile as more questionable were legitimated.

208. Montfaucon collated the first homily with *Regius* 1956 (=Paris. gr. 728, which contains only this one of the seven homilies); he listed three variant readings in his notes but adopted none of them in the text. (For a convenient list, see AP 97–98; all three are included in our notes below accompanying the text and translation.)

209. The Paris Edition editors made no emendations to the text, but (as they acknowledge in an addendum to Montfaucon’s “*In Pauli encomia Admonitio*,” 2:562) they added many lengthy notes on the Latin translation of Anianus of Celeda, its Greek Vorlage and literary parallels verbatim from *Ti. Hemsterhusii Orationes, quarum prima est de Paulo Apostolo. L. C. Valckenari tres orationes, quibus subjectum est schediasma, specimen exhibens adnotationum criticarum in loca quaedam librorum sacrorum novi foederis. Praefiguntur duae orationes Joannis Chrysostomi “In laudem Pauli Apostoli,”*

(1862) from the latter.²¹⁰ In 1982 a critical edition of *De laudibus sancti Pauli* was published in SC by Auguste Piédagnel.²¹¹ This edition was based upon a fresh collation of fourteen manuscripts, including the two that had been available to Henry Savile (Paris. gr. 755, his base text, and Lavra B 94), and one manuscript known to Montfaucon (Paris. gr. 728).²¹² Because the two manuscripts available to Savile represent different lines of the *stemma codicum* as Piédagnel established it, and since he to a very large degree agreed with Savile's choices among divergent readings and admired his text-critical acumen,²¹³ Piédagnel says of his volume: "L'édition que nous présentons ne différera pas, le plus souvent, du texte traditionnel."²¹⁴ Although Piédagnel does not provide a list of the places where his text diverges from that of Savile, the notes accompanying his translation point to only nine instances where the 1982 edition differs from Savile's of 1612. In three of these cases, the reading chosen by Piédagnel had been listed in the margin by Savile but not adopted in the text (*Laud. Paul.* 4.15, 16; 5.3). In two places, Piédagnel treated as a minus a reading that had been placed in brackets in Savile's edition (*Laud. Paul.* 3.6; 7.2). In two others Piédagnel rejected what appears to have been a conjectural reading by Savile (*Laud. Paul.* 1.14; 5.3). In only one case did Piédagnel adopt a manuscript reading not available to Savile (*Laud. Paul.* 5.7). The final (ninth) case involves word division and diacriticals (οἷδα μὲν for οἷδαμεν in *Laud. Paul.* 6.11).²¹⁵

cum veteri versione latina Aniani (Leiden: S. and J. Luchtmans/A. and J. Honkoop, 1784), i–lvi. These notes are also included in the reprinted edition of Migne, PG 50:473–514.

210. The Greek text of *De laudibus sancti Pauli* and accompanying Latin translation (from Anianus, as revised by Montfaucon) is also found in PG 50:473–514, retaining Montfaucon's placement of these homilies among "*Sermones Panegyrici in Solemnitates*."

211. *Jean Chrysostome: Panégyriques de Saint Paul*. The Pinakes website lists eighteen manuscripts for these homilies (four more than were included by Piédagnel). Of Piédagnel's manuscripts, eleven included all seven of the homilies *De laudibus sancti Pauli*, and three contained just one homily: *Hom.* 1 or *Hom.* 4 (AP 53–67).

212. AP 92 n. 1. This manuscript contains only the first of the seven homilies.

213. "Il faut à nouveau saluer la mémoire de ce très grand érudit en soulignant sa culture très étendue, son infatigable labeur et la sûreté de son discernement" (AP 106–7).

214. AP 106. The quotation continues, "Car celui de Savile, que Fronton du Duc et Montfaucon ont reproduit, a été établi d'après deux manuscrits, assez souvent dissemblables: notre *Parisinus* gr. 755, A, et le *Lavra* B 94, G, et lorsque Savile a dû choisir entre des variantes de ces deux manuscrits, la leçon qu'il a retenue nous a paru, la plupart du temps, très juste."

215. Each of the nine text-critical decisions mentioned in this paragraph as emen-

It is hard to see a consistent text-critical approach by Piédagnel in these nine instances of variance from Savile's text. In terms of manuscript attestation, of five cases where the manuscripts are split, in two instances Piédagnel adopted the reading of CFGP against AL BDM E (*Laud. Paul.* 4.16; 7.2); in two he accepted the reading of BDM AL or BDM AL E against CFGP; and in one more he conflated the two readings to create a wording attested in neither (*Laud. Paul.* 6.5).²¹⁶ In another case Piédagnel adopts a singular reading (of Paris. gr. 755, his MS H) over against the other nine manuscripts (whose reading he does not even discuss in the note).²¹⁷ Most of his arguments were contextual (based on internal criteria), rather than textual (based on the strength of the witnesses). In two cases he preferred the easier over the more difficult reading (as in the conflated reading of John 21:18 in *Laud. Paul.* 6.5, which is more likely a harmonizing correction of later scribes, or ἄδην over ἄρδην in *Laud. Paul.* 5.7). Nonetheless, even if his own text is not strikingly original, Piédagnel has provided scholarship with a full apparatus criticus and the most careful analysis of the full body of manuscript evidence to date.²¹⁸ Hence, all scholars interested in these seven homilies *De laudibus sancti Pauli* are indebted to his efforts.

With thanks to Les Éditions du Cerf for permission, we reprint the Piédagnel text here so it will be readily accessible to an English readership. However, due to the series requirements of the WGRW, and the permission from Cerf, the full *apparatus criticus* is not reprinted here; readers must consult the original for that, as well as for Piédagnel's valuable introduction, French translation, and notes. The present reprinting of that text is no substitute for consultation of the full critical edition.

We also republish here my English translation of these seven orations that was originally published in *The Heavenly Trumpet* (2000), in the hope of making these remarkable works more accessible to scholars and students.²¹⁹ Furthermore, as is demonstrated in the analyses of the arguments

dations of Savile's text by Piédagnel is discussed in the notes that accompany my translation.

216. See p. xvi for the manuscripts to which AP assigned these sigla.

217. AP 136–37 n. 2.

218. As Piédagnel acknowledges, the value of his edition lies in the fuller collation of manuscripts, which shows that some "traditional" readings are less well supported than one might have thought and in eliminating a few previous readings ("peu nombreuses il est vrai"); in his French translation; and in his informative notes (AP 107).

219. Appendix 1 in Mitchell, *Heavenly Trumpet*, 442–87. The translation here is essentially the same, reprinted by permission of Mohr Siebeck, but with some correc-

of each of these seven orations in that earlier monograph,²²⁰ they are also in many ways, like the homilies on Pauline “problem passages,” responding to perceived or actual accusations against Paul, which Chrysostom tackles head on by turning all perceived slights into reasons for even greater praise for his beloved apostle. The authenticity of these seven orations, pronounced γνήσιοι by Savile,²²¹ has not been questioned in subsequent scholarship.²²² They have a characteristic voice and diction as well as a pre-occupation with Chrysostom’s favored saint, Paul, as found throughout Chrysostom’s extensive oeuvre, including the eighteen homilies on Pauline passages in part 1 of this volume.²²³ So, it is reasonable and, I hope, profitable, for these twenty-five homilies to be read and studied together by those interested in the interpretation of Paul in the late fourth century (and beyond).

tions and some revisions mostly to conform them to the style of the rest of the present volume. I have also added (in addition to some text-critical notes) in line with the footnotes for the eighteen occasional homilies, notes about the Greek text of Chrysostom’s citations (or paraphrases) of New Testament passages, and some footnotes that emphasize for the reader the role of ζήτηματα καὶ λύσεις in these orations to tie them together with the first eighteen homilies in that regard. There has not been an attempt to replicate all textual variants as included in the apparatus of the Piédagnel edition (which, as noted above, readers are strongly encouraged to consult). The notes are sparser for those homilies, given the full-scale analyses of each of them in *Heavenly Trumpet* (see next note). The exception (at the encouragement of my WGRW editors) is *Laud. Paul.* 4.6, where I have added more extensive notes to identify the important historical referents and current literature for readers to enter into the significant discussions on the events of Julian’s imperium and residency at Antioch.

220. *Heavenly Trumpet*, 140–51; 152–59; 159–64; 212–26; 330–53; 166–72; 261–70, respectively.

221. Though Savile regarded the eighth homily *De laudibus sancti Pauli*, preserved in the Latin translations, as inauthentic: “*quae autem in Latinis octaua, mihi non videtur Chrysostomum referre*” (HS 8:936), attributing the longer discussion to his associate, John Hales.

222. Strikingly, the introduction to AP does not even address the question but presumes the authenticity of all seven discourses. Montfaucon in his “*Admonitio*” had proceeded from the same assumption.

223. Here echoing the judgment of Savile and Hales: “*quae enim sunt Chrysostomi, habent signa quaedam non obscura, & vim, & energiam, quae nulla possunt alterius idiomatis proprietate occultari*” (“For the orations that belong to Chrysostom have certain visible tell-tale marks, force and energy, none of which can be obscured by the distinctive quality of another style”).

Prior Translations of These Twenty-Five Homilies

While Chrysostom's *De laudibus sancti Pauli* were, famously, translated into Latin already in the fifth century by the Pelagian deacon Anianus of Celeda, it was only in the fifteenth to seventeenth centuries that the homilies on miscellaneous Pauline passages were first translated from Greek into Latin. As noted in our history of the published editions of these homilies, Fronto Ducaeus was responsible for the Latin translation of seven of the eighteen homilies on Pauline passages, and he reprinted those of the Basel humanist Sigismund Gelenius for *Hom. 2 Cor. 4:13 A, B, and Γ*, as well as five other translations by unidentified translators.²²⁴ These Latin translations are most widely available in Migne, which reprints them from Montfaucon, who had adopted them from Morel but also introduced corrections into them as he saw fit, including replacing them entirely where he regarded them as defective (as, e.g., in the case of *Hom. Phil. 1:18*). Montfaucon also provided his own Latin translation for the homily he added, *Hom. 2 Tim. 3:1*.

Only one of the eighteen homilies in the first part of this volume has previously been translated in full into English. Volume 9 of the *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers* series, edited by Philip Schaff (1889), contains a translation of *Hom. Rom. 12:20* by W. R. W. Stephens, under the title, "To Those Who Had Not Attended the Assembly: and On the Apostolic Saying, 'If Thine Enemy Hunger, Feed Him,' etc. (Rom. XII. 20) and Concerning Resentment of Injuries."²²⁵ However, Stephens's translation, for all its virtues, reflects now-dated English diction and style, and it does not highlight the ancient rhetorical and literary critical terms Chrysostom employs. It also has a lacuna that obscures the use of "problems and solutions" within the argument (as marked and discussed in the translation below).

Portions of two of our other homilies have been translated into English. The opening and closing paragraphs of the lengthy *Hom. Gal. 2:11–14*

224. See above, pp. 29–30.

225. *NPNF1* 9:305–21. The volume title is *Saint Chrysostom: On the Priesthood; Ascetic Treatises; Select Homilies and Letters; Homilies on the Statues*. I have not compared my translation closely on a line by line basis with it, but I did note a significant missing passage in that translation (as marked in the notes in the translation in this volume). Stephens was the author of *Saint John Chrysostom: His Life and Times* and Dean of Winchester.

were translated in Wendy Mayer and Pauline Allen, *John Chrysostom*.²²⁶ A partial translation of one other sermon, *Hom. 1 Cor. 7:2–4*, was included in Catharine P. Roth and David Anderson in their collection, *St. John Chrysostom on Marriage and Family Life*.²²⁷ Due to their purposes for that volume, Roth and Anderson omitted large parts of the first and last sections of the homily entirely, which means the reader is not able to follow the full argument line; in particular, by these choices they removed the continuous allusions to love magic and the dark threats it poses to marital fidelity throughout this homily.²²⁸ Further, that translation was made on the basis of the Migne, PG text, the only text available in 1986. The translation in the present volume has been able to include important emendations, including a whole new and important passage recovered from other manuscripts, from the more recent critical text of Daniela Mazzoni Dami.²²⁹ For the other sixteen homilies, no English translation exists. There are two French translations of Montfaucon's volume 3²³⁰ and translations of some indi-

226. Wendy Mayer and Pauline Allen, *John Chrysostom*, ECF (London: Routledge, 2000), 140–42.

227. Catharine P. Roth and David Anderson, *St. John Chrysostom on Marriage and Family Life* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1986), 81–88.

228. The contents include all of §2 (PG 51:210–12), parts of §3 (missing PG 51:212,25–60) and parts of §4 (missing PG 51:215,27–47); it lacks §1 and §5 entirely; ending on the positive note of “love brings innumerable blessings,” they rather euphemistically conclude “St John continues to exhort the husband to fidelity.” On the role of love magic in the homily, see the notes to the translation in this volume and Mitchell, “John Chrysostom on Christian Love Magic: A Spellbinding Moment in the History of Interpretation of 1 Cor 7:2–4,” *NTS* 68 (2022): 119–43.

229. See above, n. 58.

230. Both were made in the nineteenth century. The first was *Saint Jean Chrysostome, Oeuvres complètes traduites par la première fois en français*, ed. Jean-Baptiste Jeannin (professeur de rhétorique au collège de L'Immaculée-Conception de Saint-Dizier), with most of our homilies in vol. 4, *Homélies sur divers textes du Nouveau Testament...* (Bar-le-Duc: Guérin et Cie, 1864), though not including *Hom. 2 Cor 11:1* or *Hom. Gal. 2:11–14*. The other is Jean-François Bareille, *Oeuvres complètes de S. Jean Chrysostome: Traduction nouvelle* (Paris: Vivès, 1864–1878), with the same set of homilies in volume 3 (hence, fully sixteen of our eighteen occasional homilies). Those French translations (by various hands) are in many instances replicating not the Greek text so much as the Latin, as is shown, for instance, in places where the Latin translation lacked full sentences that are found in Montfaucon's Greek text. For just one example, see *Hom. 2 Cor. 4:13 A* §2 (PG 51:272), where *Τίς δὲ ἡ ῥῆσις*, lacking in the Latin translation of Sigismund Gelenius, is also missing in the French of Dom Rémy Ceillier in the Jeannin edition.

vidual homilies in Italian,²³¹ French,²³² German,²³³ and Polish.²³⁴ But no attempt has previously been made in any language to publish a collection of these homilies of Chrysostomic works on Paul, or provide an analysis of them as instances of the use of the form of *ζητήματα καὶ λύσεις*, as is the purpose and design of the present volume.

For *De laudibus sancti Pauli*, in addition to the most recent French translation by Piédagnel in SC,²³⁵ there is an earlier English translation by Thomas P. Halton from 1963.²³⁶ Although this translation is quite accessible and useful for a broad audience, it is not designed to provide a

231. Antonio Cataldo, *Giovanni Crisostomo, Mi opposi a lui a viso aperto* ("Hom. illud: In faciem ei restiti"): introduzione, testo, traduzione e commento, Testi e studi, Università degli studi di Lecce, Dipartimento di filologia classica e medioevale 16 (Galatina: Congedo, 2007). Cataldo reprints the text of Migne along with his own translation and notes.

232. As noted above, Wenger provided both a text and his own French translation of *Hom. Tit. 2:11–12*, "Une homélie inédite de Jean Chrysostome sur l'épiphanie."

233. The German translation of Chrysostom's homilies by Johann Andreas Cramer, *Des heiligen Kirchenlehrers Johannes Chrysostomus Erzbischofs und Patriarchen zu Constantinopel, Predigten, und kleine Schriften: Aus dem Griechischen übersetzt*, 10 vols. (Leipzig: Johann Gottfried Dyck, 1748–1751), in volume 6 contains translations of *Hom. Rom. 16:3 A and B* (pp. 159–220) and *Hom. Gal. 2:11–14* (pp. 221–94), as well as an extraordinary analysis of what Cramer regards as the flaws in Chrysostom's rhetorical eloquence ("Zwei Abhandlungen von den Fehlern der Beredsamkeit des Chrysostomus," 10:1–48). The occasional homilies were not included in the Bibliothek der Kirchenväter (Johann Chrysostomus Mitterrutzner, ed., *Des heiligen Kirchenlehrers Johannes Chrysostomus ausgewählte Schriften, aus dem Griechischen übersetzt*, 10 vols. [Kempten: Kösel, 1869–1884]), but the seven homilies *De laudibus sancti Pauli* are included in vol. 3, *Ausgewählte Reden* (1879), 298–387, translated by Mathias Schmitz (now in Reihe 3, Band 63).

234. T. Krynicka and S. Longosz, "Ze wzgledu na niebezpieczestwo rozpusty nalezy sie zenic," *Vox Patrum* 31 (2011): 579–95 (on *Hom. 1 Cor. 7:2–4*). I have not had access to this translation, but learned of it from the valuable Chrysostom bibliography held on the website of the Centre for Early Christian Studies, Australian Catholic University, Editions and Translations of Chrysostom's Works (http://www.cecs.acu.edu.au/onlineresources_editions.html).

235. This is in addition to French translations produced in the nineteenth century, such as in Jeannin, *Saint Jean Chrysostome, Oeuvres complètes*, 3:333–65 (1864, by M. C. Portelette) and Bareille, *Oeuvres complètes de S. Jean Chrysostome*, 4:129–88 (1866), as well as another in the nineteenth century by Patrice Soler, *Jean Chrysostome, Homélie sur saint Paul*, Les Pères dans la foi (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1980). For full details, see AP 102–5.

236. *In Praise of Saint Paul by John Chrysostom* (Washington, DC: Catholic Uni-

close analysis of the exegetical arguments, nor is it attuned to the rhetorical forms and terminology used by Chrysostom, including the *ζητήματα καὶ λύσεις* language and procedure that is our focus here. Also, Halton's translation was based upon the Migne text (PG 50:473–514), which is now superseded for scholarly research by Piédagnel's *Sources chrétiennes* edition (as printed and translated in the present volume).

Research Areas and Topics for the Future

In addition to providing access to these ingenious and convoluted Chrysostomic texts on Paul, a further goal of this volume is to resource and instigate further research. Just a few suggested topics for future scholarship include the following:

- ♦ Establishing critical texts for the majority of the occasional homilies.²³⁷ The present introduction, which traces the textual history that led to the Migne edition and the manuscripts upon which it was based, and the text-critical notes that accompany the translations are meant to assist in that effort and to keep constantly before the eye of the reader the fact that the text on the left side is not

versity of America Press, 1963). The Halton translation had been out of print for years but was reprinted in 2016 by Wipf & Stock.

237. As this book was in press, I learned that Marie-Ève Geiger had completed a critical edition of *Hom. Rom. 8:28* in her master's thesis, "La gloire et la patience dans les épreuves: Introduction, traduction et notes de commentaire de deux homélies (CPG 4373 et 4374) de Jean Chrysostome, avec édition critique de la seconde homélie" (master's thesis, École Normale Supérieure, 2012–2013). I thank the author for sending me a copy of her thesis, unfortunately too late in the process to incorporate readings into the translation of *Hom. Rom. 8:28*. I also learned (at the same conference, "Actualités chrysostomiennes," 16 June, 2021, sponsored by l'Institut des Sources chrétiennes), Magdaleine Nivault, doctoral student at l'Université de Lyon III, is preparing a critical edition of *Hom. Rom. 16:3 A and B*. Three other master's theses on individual homilies were done at Florence but were never published and were unfortunately not available to me: on *Hom. Rom. 5:3*: R. Coeli, "Per un'edizione critica dell'omelia *De gloria in tribulationibus* di S. Giovanni Crisostomo (PG 51, 155–164)" (master's thesis, Università degli studi di Firenze, 1996); on *Hom. 1 Cor. 11:19*: C. Bellucci, "Per l'edizione critica dell'omelia *In illud: 'Oportet et haereses esse'* di S. Giovanni Crisostomo" (master's thesis, Università degli studi di Firenze, 1989–1990); and on *Hom. Phil. 1:18*: G. Biagiotti, "Per un'edizione critica dell'omelia *'De profectu evangelii'* di San Giovanni Crisostomo" (master's thesis, Università degli studi di Firenze, 1992–1993).

based upon a full consideration and critical analysis of the extant evidence.²³⁸

- ♦ Examining the relationship between John's treatments of each of these specific Pauline passages in these homilies and in the homily series (as well as elsewhere in his oeuvre); this may include consideration of whether it is possible on the basis of these comparisons to establish temporal priority among the treatments and a better assurance about their respective dates and provenance.
- ♦ Offering close analyses of the arguments in each of these homilies as complex and often inventive oratorical, exegetical, theological, and rhetorical works and as repositories of valuable information on socio-cultural and other realities in John's world.²³⁹
- ♦ Examining how Chrysostom's use of the language, form, procedure and rhetoric of ζητήματα καὶ λύσεις within his homilies compares with that of Origen of Alexandria,²⁴⁰ on the one hand, and

238. The exceptions to that are *Hom. 1 Cor. 7:2–4*, because of the published work of Daniela Mazzoni Dami (as mentioned above) and the new emended critical text offered here for *Hom. Tit. 2:11–12*.

239. I have begun that work in articles on *Hom. Rom. 16:3 A and B*; *Hom. 2 Cor. 11:1*; *Hom. Gal. 2:11–14*; and *Hom. 1 Cor. 7:2–4* as well as in various places in my larger study, *Heavenly Trumpet*. But this is just a start; there is so much more to be done here. See Margaret M. Mitchell, "The Continuing Problem of Particularity and Universality within the *corpus Paulinum*: Chrysostom on Romans 16:3," *ST* 64 (2010): 127–37; "A Patristic Perspective on Pauline περιαιτολογία," *NTS* 47 (2001): 354–71; "A Variable and Many-Sorted Man: John Chrysostom's Treatment of Pauline Inconsistency," *J ECS* 6 (1998): 93–111, especially 104–9; "Peter's 'Hypocrisy' and Paul's: Two 'Hypocrites' at the Foundation of Earliest Christianity?" *NTS* 58 (2012): 312–34; "John Chrysostom on Christian Love Magic."

240. This includes in the newly discovered Greek homilies on the Psalms, such as homily 1 on Ps 77(78), which is formulated around the theme of προβλήματα καὶ λύσεις. I have analyzed this text in "Problems and Solutions in Early Christian Biblical Interpretation: A Telling Case from Origen's Newly Discovered Greek Homilies on the Psalms (*codex Monacensis Graecus* 314)," *Adamantius* 22 (2016): 40–55; see the text, and discussion of this issue, in Lorenzo Perrone, with Marina Molin Pradel, Emanuela Prinzivalli, and Antonio Cacciari, eds., *Origenes XIII, Die Neuen Psalmenhomilien: Eine kritische Edition des Codex Monacensis Graecus 314*, GCS NS 19 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2015), 9–11. A wholesale comparison on Alexandrines and Antiochenes on ζητήματα καὶ λύσεις is a desideratum of scholarship. Although not focused on ζητήματα καὶ λύσεις, and at various points overstating differences, see the invaluable foray into such a comparative study in Gilberte Astruc-Morize and Alain Le Boulluec, "Le sens caché des Écritures selon Jean Chrysostome et Origène," *St Patr* 25 (1993): 1–26.

others such as Theodore of Mopsuestia, the Cappadocians, and Theodoret of Cyrus,²⁴¹ on the other (to name just a few obvious comparanda).

- ♦ Studying how these homilies aid in the scholarly assessment of the various and multiple aspects of *ζητήματα καὶ λύσεις* as a genre, a pedagogical procedure, a method, a didactic form, a philosophical form, a rhetorical form, and a homiletic device as used by ancient authors.
- ♦ Exploring how the seven homilies *De laudibus sancti Pauli* relate to the genre of *ζητήματα καὶ λύσεις* and, in turn, how are they poised between apologetics, didactics, liturgical commemoration of saints' lives, entertainment, and other purposes.
- ♦ Continuing the task of remapping the world of ancient Christian biblical interpretation in a way that does not apply simplistic categories of "literal" and "allegorical" (in themselves or as mapped onto "Antiochene" or "Alexandrine") but instead generates analysis of the more varied and subtle strategies ancient interpreters used to generate and defend textual meanings.²⁴²

241. Who also employs the dedicated genre, as in his *Quaestiones in Octateuchum*.

242. Major steps forward on this were the studies of Christoph Schäublin, *Untersuchungen zu Methode und Herkunft der antiochenischen Exegese*, Theophania 23 (Bonn; Cologne: Hanstein, 1974); Frances M. Young, *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997); David Dawson, *Allegorical Readers and Cultural Revision in Ancient Alexandria* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992); John David Dawson, *Christian Figural Reading and the Fashioning of Identity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002) and Elizabeth A. Clark, *Reading Renunciation: Asceticism and Scripture in Early Christianity* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999), among other works. See further discussion of Chrysostom in particular on this point in Mitchell, *Heavenly Trumpet*, 409–39, and on the earlier Antiochene Eustathius in conversation with Origen in Margaret M. Mitchell, "Patristic Rhetoric on Allegory: Origen and Eustathius Put 1 Kingdoms 28 on Trial," in *The "Belly-Myther" of Endor: Interpretations of 1 Kingdoms 28 in the Early Church*, ed. and trans. Rowan A. Greer and Margaret M. Mitchell, WGRW 16 (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), lxxv–cxxiii, with further bibliography. Much of this scholarship is based on a historical awareness of the rootedness of ancient biblical interpretation in ancient literary criticism and *paideia*. In contrast, John C. Cavadini argues that this has the cart and horse backward, as he insists on there having been a theologically uniform basis in ancient interpretation of Scripture as Scripture. See "From Letter to Spirit," in *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Biblical Interpretation*, 126–48. This approach, however, unnecessarily bifurcates what we see patristic

Editorial and Translation Decisions for This Volume

Translation Goals, Principles, Style, and Format

An Oral Idiom

The main goal of the present translation is to render Chrysostom's Greek accurately (as John would aptly say, μετ' ἀκριβείας) into English in a way that captures as best as is possible the "live radio" oratorical performance behind the Greek texts.²⁴³ This includes attention to the regular cadences of the preacher, the lively wordplays, and especially the forms of dialogue and interaction he enacts with his congregants (both as a group and as individuals or segments of the group, including men and women, slaves and free, rich and poor, elites and artisans and laborers),²⁴⁴ with the biblical text, with the author (most often, Paul), and with other interlocutors, including "Greeks" (for John, meaning "pagans"), "Jews," and other hypothetical questioners or objectors. In producing the translation, I have first sought fidelity to the Greek, its lexical choices and resonances, and its syntax, as they together are the vehicle of the logical and rhetorical progression of the sermon, and then also to ensure that the English translation is fluid and smooth, to capture this oratory.

interpreters doing and, by a singularly phrased preexisting theological commitment, can obscure the varied and strategic ways that biblical meaning is produced.

243. As noted above, the written homilies were preserved by the work of stenographers and were subject to some editing, probably by the preacher himself but then perhaps by others later, and then they were preserved in a manuscript tradition that was subject to various forms of scribal variation. (For a good summary of "The State of the Evidence," see Cook, *Preaching and Popular Christianity*, 23–48.) Even if they surely are not an exact record, I would say that the texts of the homilies in this volume consistently have a vibrant and lifelike feel. Notes in the translations will point to some of these issues of tone and gesture in, for instance, prosopopoeia, to keep attention on these issues.

244. See Maxwell, *Christianization and Communication*, 65–87; Mayer-Allen, *John Chrysostom*, 34–40, on the various social strata present in the *synaxis* with references to further important articles by Wendy Mayer on 225–26. Connected, but not identical with this, is how rhetorically John chooses to characterize his audience and how he ostensibly directs parts or wholes of his sermons to one segment or another (with the others listening, of course). The notes in the translations draw attention to some moments where he overtly shifts from one addressee to another.

To try best to ensure this, for many of the homilies published here, I have read aloud significant sections of my translations to live audiences in lectures and in seminar presentations, and I have sought feedback from the faces and reactions of my own auditors on whether they are following the argument line, catching the puns and vivid imagery, anticipating where John is going, and at other times showing visible surprise when he defies expectation. I have no illusions that this exercise on my part replicates the late fourth-century Antiochene or Constantinopolitan context, but I wanted as much as possible to ensure that these homilies don't lose their vibrancy or punch when rendered onto a flat English written page. On a linguistic level, this means often the use of contractions ("let's," "we're," etc.) since that is how they come off the tongue when speaking, unless one is wishing to sound a bit solemn, which, in many instances (though not all), John is not. This also, on a larger conceptual level, involves some choices about how to render metaphors across cultural landscapes, though many of John's images of everyday life (e.g., on the farmer and the ship captain) translate rather well into modern imagination, even as their frequency in John's own oratory schools the hearer into expecting them. The reader of these texts in Greek or in English is in a real sense joining in the vibrant dialogue and disputes that live oratory entails.

In order to replicate on the printed page the dialogical character of what were originally oral performances, I include quotation marks²⁴⁵ to demarcate where Chrysostom is providing quotations from real or hypothetical interlocutors—which is quite common in the exercise of *ζητήματα καὶ λύσεις*, but also in homiletics generally—and also for when he turns and directly addresses a figure other than his congregation, such as Paul, or David, or an imagined interlocutor. And then in turn, when Paul or David speaks back (all of this, of course, in the voice of John himself), I have put those also into quotation marks. Naturally this procedure of *prosopopoeia* that Chrysostom uses so often in his homilies would have been much more unmistakable by shifts in voice or tone, body language, and gestures in the live homily, but with just the Greek text in hand the translator often has to make judgment calls based on the diction and the logic of the argument about where such direct speech begins and ends. Often (but by no means always), accompanying notes will highlight such points of decision I have

245. But not italics, which are reserved for direct quotations of Scripture (on which see below).

made, even as in many instances John may be deliberately blending his voice with Paul's, for instance. Readers should feel free to reconsider my decisions about the demarcation of the voices and speech partners as they work with these homilies.

In terms of translation on a clause or sentence level, because Chrysostom makes abundant and economical use of personal and demonstrative pronouns, I have at times rendered or clarified the antecedents to be sure the English reader can follow the argument. Some of the key terms of Chrysostom's lexicon (philosophical, theological, literary-critical, hermeneutical), such as φιλοσοφία, εὐλάβεια, ἀκρίβεια, παιδεία, ἀπλῶς, προαίρεσις, αἰνίττεσθαι, to name a few, have been given notes to ensure that the English reader can appreciate all the major nuances, and in various places where I felt it important, I have indicated some lexical support in the standard lexica and justification for translation choices that a reader may or may not expect.²⁴⁶ But the space for such notes is limited, and so it should be understood that these are only select cases and not intended to serve as a full set of commentarial-style notes. (See below on the design of the footnotes for the volume.)

Gendered Language

I have attempted to maintain gender-inclusive language in the target language of English, which in modern American idiom does not understand (if it ever did) “he who” or “men” as denoting all or a generic humanity. Yet it is the case that John assumes and largely (if not exclusively) directs his speech toward a predominantly masculine audience, and that he has a prevailingly androcentric view of humanity, with the male of the species being the norm and the female being either weaker or, in exceptional cases, surprisingly superior, but in a way that calls the men to task. In terms of generic statements that in the source language of late ancient Greek are grammatically masculine but may not be (and in some cases cannot be) only directed to men, I have not wanted in turn to distract by using “his or her” throughout. I also use the now more and more often used in English “their” for an indefinite pronoun in reference to a singular person of inde-

246. This includes crossover audiences who may especially know the biblical Greek (LXX and NT) vocabulary but not the patristic, or vice versa, and also those attuned to the vocabulary of ancient literary criticism and rhetoric, and those not.

terminate or nonrestrictive gender.²⁴⁷ At some other times, if possible, I have used the plural in English (for a singular masculine grammatical construction in Greek that is meant to be generic), but often John's paraenesis is rooted in individual exempla, and I did not always want to give that up. However, in places where the masculine gender seems important to the logic of his argument, such as on relations between fathers and their sons, or examples of farmers or ship captains, who John assumes are men and work so well as analogies for his hero Paul, I translate them as such, with masculine pronouns.

Replicating Cultural Assumptions Embedded in the Texts and Their World

This linguistic issue points to a larger one of John's world and his ideological assumptions and ours. My goal here is to translate these late fourth-century works, and at times that means replicating their misogyny, their anti-Judaism, their views on slavery, or other elements I and modern readers may rightly find offensive, as well as others that I can applaud, such as John's insistent concern for the poor and for economic justice.²⁴⁸ But following and understanding Chrysostom's compositions requires one to see why he argues as he does as a person of his time, with his temperament and his convictions. That also means translating insulting terms like πόρνη as "whore" or μαλακός as "pansy" because that is the intended, disparaging rhetorical effect and referent of those terms in the source text. I have added notes about lexical choices both to explain my reasoning and to invite the reader into the dilemmas we all face in translating the past into the present. At times, I have added notes that highlight these social and ideological aspects of John's thinking; but where such are not there, the reader should not assume that I am thereby condoning John's views or passing over such topics as unimportant. Chrysostom was a man of his age

247. So *Merriam-Webster*, "their": "used with an indefinite antecedent" (with a citation from W. H. Auden, "anyone in *their* senses," showing that this is not in fact just the diction of the twenty-first century). See *Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language, Unabridged* (Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster, 1993), continually updated, as *Merriam-Webster Unabridged*, at <https://www.merriam-webster.com>.

248. I am naming a few of my own ethical evaluations, not to legislate them for others but to invite the self-conscious critical conversation that historical work invites between the past and the present.

and his chosen commitments; he held assumptions I clearly do not, even as I still find reading him worthwhile, for a host of reasons of which he would—and certainly would not—approve. I invite the reader to join that complex cross-cultural conversation, and I hope the form of translation here provided can aid rather than occlude that goal.

Scriptural Quotations and Allusions

John thinks within a scriptural idiom, and part of the live engagement of these homilies is Chrysostom in conversation with his Bible. These sermons are replete with quotations from the Greek Old Testament and the New Testament as well as countless allusions to or echoes of his Scriptures. In order to understand what Chrysostom is doing and thinking, it is essential that one can identify and appreciate the dense array of citations and allusions. In this translation, I mark what I consider to be intended as *direct* quotations using *both quotation marks and italics* (and where quotations are not quite exact, significant differences remain in Roman type). As explained above, I have identified many scriptural quotations that are not so marked in the edition of Migne, and in many places I disagree on the identification or extent of a quotation that he had marked.²⁴⁹ But I do not indicate each case where I deviate from them because there are so many that it would overburden the notes. In the case of the seven homilies *De laudibus sancti Pauli* edited by Piédagnel, the Greek text itself, reprinted from that volume, did not include italics, but instead footnotes to biblical citations as either quotations or allusions (not always differentiated). The decisions in the English translation of where to mark quotations, and their beginnings and endings, are mine, as are determinations of which passages are in question.²⁵⁰ Hence the reader should be aware that all the decisions about the identification and demarcation of scriptural quotations in the English translations of the present volume reflect my decisions, rather than that of the respective Greek editions.

All *direct* quotations are followed in the text by the citation of the biblical book and verse(s) in parentheses. In the case of allusions or pos-

249. See the discussion above about the way Migne's italics represent the decisions made in the Latin printed editions, rather than an independent reading of the Greek.

250. As with Migne, I do not make an attempt to indicate in the notes all points of agreement or disagreement about these quotations, as these are so numerous. Readers are again encouraged to consult Piédagnel's edition.

sible allusions, the citations are marked “cf.” All quotations and citations of John’s Greek Old Testament (“the Septuagint”) follow its titles and its enumeration.²⁵¹ The accompanying notes show points of textual deviation from the LXX and especially the Lucianic (or so-called Antiochian) Recension,²⁵² or, for New Testament texts, from the Majority or Byzantine text.²⁵³ Note that where John follows \mathfrak{M} /Byz and thus is at variance with the standard modern eclectic text, the NA²⁸, which is generally less inclined to adopt Byzantine readings, I do not comment on that, since it is to be expected;²⁵⁴ notes mark deviations²⁵⁵ from the Majority Text.²⁵⁶

251. Chapter and verse numbers follow Alfred Rahlfs, *Septuaginta* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1935). And all are included in the index at the end of the volume for research and reference.

252. By comparison with Rahlfs, *Septuaginta*, and its *apparatus criticus* and in some cases Göttingen Septuagint volumes, where available, as consulted on significant textual variants. There are complex issues involved in reconstructing a Lucianic recension or a “proto-Lucianic” one and in analyses, by biblical book, of Chrysostom’s direct use of it and of other text-types. For one entrée into the issues and the considerable literature, see Mario Cimosá, “John Chrysostom and the Septuagint (Job and Psalms),” in *XII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Leiden, 2004*, ed. Melvin K. H. Peters (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), 117–30, with further bibliography. The notes given on readings in these homilies here are meant to give some data toward consideration of these issues and questions but cannot within the scope of this volume attempt to solve them.

253. For the readings of \mathfrak{M} , I have relied upon Maurice A. Robinson and William G. Pierpont, compilers and arrangers, *The New Testament in the Original Greek: Byzantine Textform 2018* (Nürnberg: VTR, 2018), and I have also been assisted in that task by Michael W. Holmes, ed., *The Greek New Testament, SBL Edition* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010), who includes the former’s readings (from the earlier 2005 imprint) with the siglum RP.

254. The lower apparatus of RP allows one to see major differences between \mathfrak{M} /Byz and NA²⁸ at a glance.

255. I do not include orthographic variations on the same term (for instance, by assimilation), or presence or absence of ν -moveable, or final sigma, e.g., on οὐτω/οὐτως, or crasis or word division.

256. As many of the notes indicate, John has some typical ways of integrating quotations into his homilies. For instance, not infrequently, the conjunctions found in the lemma will be dropped since he has already embedded the citation. But these minuses are included in the notes to be complete (and without thereby assuming that his own biblical text lacked those readings). That is for further text-critical study in each case to determine. The same is true of ellipses, which are marked in the text, but whether the preacher has intended that the audience be aware of that or is in a sense creating a new text by this means, is left open to the reader.

The format of the text-critical notes within the translations is deliberately minimalist, just indicating pluses, minuses, alternate wordings, and transpositions.²⁵⁷ Occasionally I will include some references to other instances of citation of a passage or variant readings within Chrysostom's oeuvre, but by no means in each case, as that would have encumbered an already full set of notes. Such instances as are indicated are meant to exemplify the enormous amount of work that needs to be done on Chrysostom's biblical text and his forms and habits of citation, allusion, and paraphrase.

However, it should be constantly kept in mind that deciding what is a quotation and what an allusion is not always easy, nor is it always indisputably clear where John is citing and where he is deliberately paraphrasing, quoting from memory, or interweaving the scriptural text into his own composition in such a way that moves it beyond a strict citation. What is represented here via quotation marks, or lack thereof, are my best judgments, but readers should feel free to reconsider them as well.

As a translator I have also faced the issue of how best to translate the biblical passages John quotes. In each case I have sought to do so in the way that seems to work best for the argument he is making, and the reason he appears to be citing the lemma in service of it.²⁵⁸ This seems to me essential to capturing his meaning and also to demonstrate to my contemporary audience that the biblical text's meaning was continually being negotiated and massaged in the very act of its use and invocation. At times, John's interpretations of lexemes or of syntax in the biblical text constitute a strained or even implausible reading, but my goal as translator is to replicate, rather than improve upon, his argument and exegesis.

257. Because for readability of these homilies I have not wanted to clutter the English translation of biblical quotations with brackets or other means of defining variation-units or individual footnotes, I have adopted what is I hope a more user-friendly approach that puts all information about any quotation in a single note hung upon the biblical reference, marked as "plus," "minus," "with x for y," or "transposition," with individual variant readings separated by semicolon.

258. This is why it just does not work in translating ancient Christian texts (as is still too often done) to use a single English Bible translation, such as NRSV, RSV, or NIV for NT or NETS for LXX, because each biblical passage needs to be rendered in the way that it seems to have been understood and employed by the ancient author for the argument at hand.

Paragraphing

Embedded within the translation are the paragraph numbers from Migne (which go back to Montfaucon, 1721) with the column numbers in bold, as also with SC pages for *De laudibus sancti Pauli*. I have at times made my own choices about paragraphing for the English translation that differ from Migne (Montfaucon) or Piédagnel in order best to capture the rhetorical and logical progression (Greek ἀκολουθία) of the homily as I see it. For the reader's clear reference, I have introduced new hard paragraphs into the Migne or Piédagnel text at times, to correspond with the paragraphs of my English translation. In this regard, as well, readers may wish to reconsider these choices and envision how the live preacher may have punctuated different movements along the way in his orations via pauses, changes in voice, gestures, and so forth.

Titles of the Homilies

The process of manuscript transmission, discovery, modern editing, and publication traced above has been responsible for the fact that there is no standard form of titles, either in Greek or Latin, for Chrysostom's homilies on isolated Pauline passages—but there are various subtypes. Our seventeen miscellaneous homilies in the Migne (Montfaucon) edition,²⁵⁹ and hence in *CPG*, have Latin titles of three different types:

In illud: + lemma (*diligentibus deum omnia cooperantur in bonum; si esurierit inimicus; salutate Priscillam et Aquilam; propter fornicationes ... uxorem, etc.; habentes eundem spiritum; utinam sustineretis modicum*;²⁶⁰ *in faciem ei restiti; vidua eligatur; hoc scitote quod in novissimis diebus*)

In dictum Pauli + lemma (*Nolo vos ignorare; Oportet haereses esse*)

De + lemma or paraphrase (*gloria in tribulationibus; libello repudii; profectu evangelii*)

259. This includes also some variance between the subheadings to the homily within the pages and the (sometimes abbreviated) titles on the tops of the Latin-side pages.

260. These last four are sometimes listed as *de verbis apostoli* + lemma.

Most of the formulae involve the citation of a lemma or a part of a lemma, even as the paraphrases *De gloria in tribulationibus* and *De profectu evangelii* (sc. Phil 1:12) are rooted closely in the language of the text itself in its broader context. In the case of *De libello repudii*, the wording is not in 1 Cor 7:39–40 but elsewhere in the Vulgate of the New Testament, as in Matt 5:31.²⁶¹

In the presence of such inconsistency generated through the various lines of influence in the history of publication of these homilies, the present volume employs shorthand titles by reference to the Pauline passage that is the central focus of the homily (i.e., by the citation of the lemma, such as *Hom. Rom. 5:3*). In some cases, this involves a decision of whether just to cite the first or main verse or the wider range of the passage treated in the homily. The advantage of this nomenclature is both standardization and ready reference.²⁶² It also accords with the principles on which this collection has been formed, which are exegetical and hermeneutical, in terms of Chrysostom as a Pauline interpreter and one who engages with problematic biblical passages or interpretations via the procedure and form of ζητήματα καὶ λύσεις. At the same time, it bears acknowledging—and repeating—that, as with most of the abundant homilies of John Chrysostom that are extant, the works collected in this volume are full and rich and contain all kinds of other types of materials beyond Pauline interpretation, of interest to readers past and present. Some of those can be seen

261. This homily also bears the name *Mulier alligata (est legi quanto tempore vixerit vir ejus)* (PG 51:217), which is slightly different from the Vulgate of 1 Cor 7:39: *est quanto tempore vir ejus vivit*.

262. I have used the short titles for all of Chrysostom's works from *The SBL Handbook of Style*, 2nd ed. (Atlanta, Society of Biblical Literature, 2014), which largely follows the principle I am using of identifying homilies by the lemmata. For the isolated homilies translated here, I have made a few modest changes to that list. In a few instances based on my analysis of the contents of a homily, I have enlarged the extent of the scriptural citation (e.g., *Hom. 1 Cor. 7:2–4* for *Hom. 1 Cor 7:2*; *Hom. 1 Cor 10:1–11* for *Hom. 1 Cor. 10:1*; *Hom. Gal. 2:11–14* for *Hom. Gal. 2:11*; *Hom. 1 Tim. 5:9–10* for *Hom. 1 Tim. 5:9*; *Hom. Tit. 2:11–12* for *Hom. Tit. 2:11*). In the case of the homilies the *SBL Handbook* abbreviates as *Lib. repud.* (= *De libello repudii*) and *Prof. evang.* (= *De profectu evangelii*), I have employed the abbreviations *Hom. 1 Cor. 7:39–40* and *Hom. Phil. 1:18*, respectively, to be consistent with the other homilies on Pauline lemmata. In the case of the homily sets *Hom. Rom. 16:3* and *Hom. 2 Cor. 4:13*, I have added the Greek letters Α, Β, and, in the case of the latter, Γ, in italics as a part of the title, to identify each of the individual homilies in such a way as not to confuse them with section numbering within the homilies.

in the translations of the subheadings to the homilies given in the Migne (Montfaucon) edition (which reflect some titles in the manuscript traditions) and are translated here at the incipit to each homily. The goal of the citation-form of titles adopted for this volume, therefore, is not to collapse Chrysostomic homiletics into exegetica but, as explained above, to see how John introduces (either voluntarily or as assigned to him via the lectionary) the Pauline texts and the “problems” he argues they pose, and then to see how he “solves” them.

Notes Accompanying the Text and Translation

In accordance with WGRW series design, there is a single set of footnotes.²⁶³ These are of four types:

- ♦ **Text-Critical, on the Greek Text of the Homilies.** Abbreviations used include: HS (Henry Savile, 1611–1612); FD (Fronto Ducaeus); ME (Morel Edition); Mf (Montfaucon, 1721); PE (Paris Edition of Montfaucon, 1837); JPM (Jacques-Paul Migne); PG (Patrologia Graeca, volume followed by column numbers); DMD (Daniela Mazzoni Dami, 1998, for *Hom. 1 Cor. 7:2–4*); AP (Auguste Piédagnel, *Jean Chrysostome, Panégyriques de S. Paul*, SC 300, 1982); AW (Antoine Wenger, “Une homélie inédite de Jean Chrysostome sur l’épiphanie”); CPG (*Clavis Patrum Graecorum*, vol. 2: *Ab Athanasio ad Chrysostomum*, 1974); CCG 1–7 (*Codices Chrysostomici Graeci*, vols. 1–7).
- ♦ **Text-Critical, on the Greek Text of Chrysostom’s Scripture Citations.** Abbreviations used include: Rahlfs (Alfred Rahlfs, ed., *Septuaginta*, 1935; all sigla for LXX manuscripts and recensions follow Rahlfs); RP (Maurice A. Robinson and William G. Pierpont, compilers and arrangers, *The New Testament in the Original Greek: Byzantine Textform 2018*); NA²⁸ (Barbara Aland, Kurt Aland, Johannes Karavidopoulos, Carlo M. Martini, and Bruce M. Metzger, eds., *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 28th rev. ed., 2012; all sigla for New Testament manuscripts follow NA²⁸); SBLGNT

263. With the single exception, as articulated above, of *Hom. Tit. 2:11–12*, which has an *apparatus criticus* for the Greek text.

(Michael W. Holmes, ed., *The Greek New Testament: SBL Edition*, 2010).

- ♦ **Explanatory, of Translation Decisions, Either Lexical, Syntactical, or Semantic.** Abbreviations used include: LSJ (Henry George Liddell, Robert Scott, and Henry Stuart Jones, *Greek-English Lexicon*, 1949);²⁶⁴ PGL (G. W. H. Lampe, ed., *Patristic Greek Lexicon*, 1961); BDAG (Frederick W. Danker, Walter Bauer, William F. Arndt, and F. Wilbur Gingrich, eds., *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, 2000); BDF (Friedrich Blass, Albert Debrunner, and Robert W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, 1961); Smyth (Herbert Weir Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, 1920); NETS (Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright, eds., *A New English Translation of the Septuagint*).
- ♦ **Clarifying and Analyzing.** This includes, for instance, disambiguating of referents, pointing out Chrysostom's exegetical and homiletical strategies, with an emphasis on the use of ζήτηματα καὶ λύσεις; explaining the rhetorical flow and sense of the argument, including cross-references within one homily or, in some cases, to other examples of the same phenomena within his oeuvre; and occasional bibliographic references on key content points (but no attempt has been made to be comprehensive, given the limited space).²⁶⁵ Abbreviations used include: *HT* (Margaret M. Mitchell, *The Heavenly Trumpet*, 2000); Mayer, *Provenance* (Wendy Mayer, *The Homilies of St John Chrysostom—Provenance, Reshaping the Foundations*, 2005); Kelly, *Golden Mouth* (J. N. D. Kelly, *Golden Mouth: The Story of John Chrysostom, Ascetic, Preacher, Bishop*,

264. For lexica I only use s.v. where there might be ambiguity about which term being discussed is referenced. Otherwise, I just give the lexicon by acronym, followed by the relevant sections.

265. The extent of annotation across the volume is admittedly somewhat uneven, because where I have already published analyses of these homilies, I have not felt the need to repeat those and instead refer the reader to the relevant studies. At the same time, the annotations on *Hom. 2 Tim. 3:1* and *Hom. Tit. 2:11–12* are more extensive than on the other sixteen homilies in part 1 in their documentation of parallels with other Chrysostomic works, in order to contribute to discussion about their authenticity. The seven homilies *De laudibus sancti Pauli* were originally translated without any notes at all (though each of them receives an analysis earlier in *Heavenly Trumpet*), and so they have more limited annotations, mostly on text-critical issues (see p. 64 n. 219).

1995); Mayer-Allen, *John Chrysostom* (Wendy Mayer and Pauline Allen, *John Chrysostom, The Early Church Fathers*, 2000); Mayer-Allen, *Churches of Syrian Antioch* (Wendy Mayer and Pauline Allen, *The Churches of Syrian Antioch [300–638 CE]*, 2012); Brändle, *John Chrysostom* (Rudolf Brändle, *John Chrysostom, Bishop, Reformer, Martyr*, Early Christian Studies 8, 2004; German original 1999); Ritter, *Studia Chrysostomica* (Adolf Martin Ritter, *Studia Chrysostomica*, 2012); Mitchell, *PCBCH* (Margaret M. Mitchell, *Paul, the Corinthians and the Birth of Christian Hermeneutics*, 2010).

John Chrysostom on Paul

I first encountered these twenty-five homilies when I was doing research for the book that was to become *The Heavenly Trumpet* back in the 1990s. The argument of that book, *in nuce*, was that Chrysostom—the author of the earliest and largest extant corpus of homiletic reflections on the Pauline corpus in Greek—made the audacious claim that he understood Paul so well because he loved him so intensely and that Chrysostom’s Pauline hermeneutic was a kind of necromantic one, seeking to make his beloved Paul alive by means of the revoicing of the apostolic voice in the lectionary readings of the *synaxis* and the re preaching and reenlivening of those words in the homily, so that his own audiences in Antioch and Constantinople would encounter Paul’s words, Paul’s letters, and Paul’s self as both astoundingly powerful relics of the past and living entities in the present.²⁶⁶ In particular, John sought through his homilies in a synaesthetic way to bring Paul to life before the eyes and ears of his congregants so that they could answer the call, *μιμηταί μου γίνεσθε*, “become my imitators,” i.e., copy me in your own lives, because Paul was—John believed—what he said he was, the true imitator of Christ (*καθὼς καὶ γὰρ Χριστοῦ*; 1 Cor 11:1). Chrysostom did this through fashioning verbal portraits, from epithets and small-scale depictions of specific features through full-size depictions of Paul’s body, his soul, and his deeds. I argue there that John’s interpretations of Paul were creative mosaic compositions compiled from the tesserae provided by the various letters (all fourteen of which he regarded as authentic, including Hebrews) and Acts, by later legends and lore about

266. The present book will not attempt replicate that argument, but cross-references are provided in the notes to the translations for some particular points of discussion that receive treatment there, and for further documentation.

Paul, and by all aspects of late antique culture, education, philosophy, etc. In each case these were newly recombined for the preacher's particular purposes, all carried out in skilled use of conventional rhetorical forms and features (such as epithet, encomiastic *topoi*, *ekphrasis* and *synkrisis*) meant to make Paul a worthy cultural icon and exemplar for the imperial Niceno-Constantinopolitan "orthodox" Christian world that was emerging amid still much competition and contestation. At the same time, Chrysostom's form of biblical interpretation, inclusive of the letters of Paul, was hardly explicable according to the traditional concept of "Antiochene literalism" (still repeated in too much scholarship) since Chrysostom quite often stretched the bounds of the wording of the text, in creative and even fanciful directions, while claiming fidelity to it. What we can see over and over again in these homilies is how what I have since come to call "the agonistic paradigm of interpretation" is at play,²⁶⁷ as Chrysostom's work of Pauline interpretation is a kind of arm wrestling, not only with the text itself and its author but also with other readers, both far and near, who are imagined to offer readings of these texts that the preacher finds problematic—for reasons theological, ethical, cultural, pedagogical, and so on. The art of Pauline interpretation, in other words, is both a creative and a martial art, a form of entertainment and of apologetics.

When I first read these twenty-five homilies over thirty years ago, I found them captivating, creative, provocative (on matters both of exegesis and method), strange, and in many ways arresting, so I have had in mind since that time to bring them more into scholarship on Paul, on Chrysostom, and on early Christian hermeneutics and biblical interpretation. I hope in turn that others will find them as fascinating as I have, and that this publication will stimulate further research into them and into how Paul was not only a saint worthy of lengthy encomia but also a source of significant problems for ancient Christian interpreters. The Pauline legacy was a tense one, with problems and praises in constant interchange, conversation, and continual contestation.

267. See Mitchell, *Paul, the Corinthians and the Birth of Christian Hermeneutics*, ix, 1–17, et passim.

TEXT, TRANSLATION, AND NOTES

Εἰς τὸ ἀποστολικὸν ῥητὸν τὸ λέγον, «Οὐ μόνον δὲ, ἀλλὰ καὶ καυχώμεθα ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσιν, εἰδότες ὅτι ἡ θλίψις ὑπομονὴν κατεργάζεται,» καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς.

α'. [155] Ἐπίπονον μὲν γηπόνῳ τὸ ζεῦξαι βόας, καὶ ἄροτρον ἐλκύσαι, καὶ αὔλακα ἀνατεμεῖν, καὶ σπέρματα καταβαλεῖν, καὶ ἀνασχέσθαι χειμῶνος, καὶ κρυμὸν ἐνεγκεῖν, καὶ περιελάσαι τάφρον, καὶ πλεονεξίαν ὑδάτων ἐπιοῦσαν τοῖς σπέρμασιν ἀποκρούσασθαι, καὶ ὄχθας ποταμῶν ὑψηλοτέρας ἐργάσασθαι, καὶ διὰ μέσης τῆς ἀρούρας βαθυτέρας αὔλακας ἀνατεμεῖν· ἀλλὰ τὰ ἐπίπονὰ ταῦτα, καὶ μόχθον ἔχοντα, κοῦφα γίνεται καὶ ῥᾶστα, ὅταν ταῖς ἐλπίσιν ὁ γεωργὸς ἴδῃ κομώντα τὰ λήϊα, καὶ τὴν δρεπάνην ἠκονημένην, καὶ τὴν ἄλωνα τῶν δραγμάτων ἐμπεπλησμένην, καὶ τὸν καρπὸν ὥριμον μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς εὐφροσύνης οἶκαδε εἰσκομιζόμενον. Οὕτω καὶ κυβερνήτης ἀγρίων κυμάτων κατατολμᾷ, καὶ χειμῶνος, καὶ μαινομένης θαλάττης πολλάκις καταφρονεῖ, καὶ πνευμάτων ἀστάτων, καὶ διαποντίους κλύδωνας καὶ μακρὰς οἶδε φέρειν ἀποδημίας, ὅταν τὰ φορτία ἀναλογίζηται, καὶ τοὺς τῆς ἐμπορίας λιμένας, καὶ τὸν ἐκ τούτων ἄπειρον πλοῦτον τικτόμενον ἴδῃ. Οὕτω καὶ στρατιώτης τραύματα φέρει, καὶ νέφη βελῶν ἀποδέχεται, καὶ λιμὸν ὑποφέρει, καὶ κρυμὸν, καὶ τὰς μακρὰς ἀποδημίας, καὶ τοὺς ἐπὶ τῆς παρατάξεως κινδύνους, ἐντεῦθεν τὰ τρόπαια καὶ τὰς νίκας καὶ τοὺς στεφάνους ἀναλογιζόμενος.

1. Provenance: only Mf seems to have addressed this homily's provenance, and he concluded that there are no clues in it about which city or date (either year or time in the year) (Mayer, *Provenance*, 85). I would agree, though see 106 n. 72 below on rhetorical proximity to a late sermon; this factor is, however, not determinative of the date of this homily. Space precludes a thorough analysis, but one may identify three key similarities with the much briefer treatment of the verse in *Hom. Rom.* 9.2 (PG 60:469), a homily that most (but not all) scholars place in Antioch (hence, before 398 CE), but Mayer regards the date as uncertain (*Provenance*, 179–81).

Text: Mf PE (1837) as reprinted by JPM in PG (1862), containing also Mf's origi-

Hom. Rom. 5:3
(De gloria in tribulationibus)
CPG 4373 (PG 51:155–64)¹

On the passage of the apostle that says, “*And not only that, but we even boast² in afflictions, because we know that affliction brings about endurance,*” etc. (Rom 5:3).

1. [155] It’s arduous labor for one who works the soil to yoke oxen, draw the plow, slice furrows, put down seed, endure storms, bear the bitter cold, dig a trench all around, divert the excess water that runs over the seeds, heighten the river banks, and slice even deeper furrows through the farmland. But these labors, even as they involve hardships, are light and easy when the farmer, full of hope,³ sees the standing grain waving, the sickle sharpened, the threshing floor full of sheaves, and the fruit brought home in its season with bountiful gladness. In the same way also, the ship captain braves wild waves and storms and often thinks nothing of the raging sea and changeable winds, even as he knows they’ll bring him rough ocean surf and long journeys far away from home. But these are light and easy when he considers the cargo and the harbors that are hubs of commerce and sees the boundless wealth that’s generated from these dangers. In the same way also a soldier bears wounds, withstands clouds of arrows, endures famine, bitter cold, long journeys away from home, and dangers in the line of battle. But these are light and easy when he considers the trophies, the victories, and the crowns that come from them.

nal text-critical notes (1721) on ME, based on his collation of two manuscripts, *Regius* 2343 (= Paris. gr. 759 [X]) and *Colbertinus* 49 (= Paris. gr. 660 [XII]), and one note by the editors of the PE. All are included in the footnotes below. Pinakes includes another thirteen manuscripts in Greece, Germany (including Monac. gr. 6, drawn upon by FD and HS), Italy, Russia, Sweden and England that contain this homily.

2. *καυχώμεθα* can be indicative or (hortatory) subjunctive (“let us boast”). John seems to regard it as indicative in the exposition that follows.

3. *ταῖς ἐλπίσιν*, a main theme of the homily and of the Pauline text that is the subject of this homily (cf. *ἐπ’ ἐλπίδι* in Rom 5:2; *ἡ δὲ ἐλπίς οὐ καταισχύνει* in 5:5).

Ἀλλὰ τίνος ἔνεκεν τούτων ἐμνήσθην; ἢ τί μοι βούλεται ταῦτα τὰ παραδείγματα; Παράκλησιν ὑμῖν ἐντεῦθεν πρὸς τὴν ἀκρόασιν εἰσαγαγεῖν βούλομαι, καὶ παραμυθίαν πρὸς τοὺς ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀρετῆς ἰδρῶτας. Εἰ γὰρ τῶν εἰρη-[156]μένων ἕκαστος τὸ ἐπίπονον κοῦφον ἡγείται διὰ τὴν τῶν μελλόντων ἐλπίδα, καὶ ταῦτα, εἰ καὶ τις αὐτῶν ἐπιτυχεῖν δυνηθείη, τῷ παρόντι συγκαταλυόμενα βίω, πολλῷ μᾶλλον ὑμᾶς τὴν ὑπὲρ τῆς πνευματικῆς διδασκαλίας ἀκρόασιν ἀνέχεσθαι χρῆ, καὶ τὴν ὑπὲρ τῆς αἰωνίου ζωῆς παράταξιν τε καὶ τοὺς ἰδρῶτας γενναίως φέρειν.

Τοῖς μὲν γὰρ ἄδηλα τὰ τῆς προσκαίρου ἐλπίδος ἐστὶ, καὶ ἐν προσδοκίᾳ μόνῃ τῶν χρηστῶν πολλάκις γενόμενοι, τὸν βίον οὕτω κατέλυσαν, ἐντρυφήσαντες μὲν ταῖς ἐλπίσιν, ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν ἔργων αὐτῶν οὐκ ἐγγίσαντες, καὶ δὴ διὰ ταῦτα τὰ χαλεπώτερα ὑπομείναντες. Οἷόν τι λέγω· Μετὰ τοὺς πολλοὺς ἐκείνους πολλάκις πόνους τε καὶ ἰδρῶτας ὁ γηπόνος ἐνίστε ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ τὴν δρεπάνην ἀκονᾶν, καὶ πρὸς τὸν ἄμητον παρασκευάζεσθαι, ἐρυσίβης κατενεχθείσης, ἢ πλήθους ἀκρίδων, ἢ πέρα τοῦ μέτρου τῆς ἐπομβρίας γενομένης, ἢ ἐτέρας τινὸς πληγῆς ἐπενεχθείσης ἐκ τῆς τῶν ἀέρων ἀνωμαλίας, ἀπῆλθε κεναῖς οἴκαδε χερσὶ, τὸν μὲν πόνον ἅπαντα ὑπομείνας, τοῦ δὲ καρποῦ τῆς ἐλπίδος ἐκπεσών. Καὶ ὁ κυβερνήτης δὲ ὁμοίως χαίρων τῷ πλήθει τῶν φορτίων, καὶ μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς ἡδονῆς τὰ ἰστία πετάσας, καὶ περάσας πολὺ ἐλάγος, ἐν αὐτῷ πολλάκις τῷ στόματι τοῦ λιμένος, ἢ σπιλάδος ἐμπεσοῦσης, ἢ ὑφάλω καὶ σκοπέλῳ τινὶ προσαράξας, ἢ ἄλλῃ τινὶ τοιαύτῃ ἀδοκίῳ περιστάσει πληγείς, πάντα τὸν φόρτον ἀπώλεσε, καὶ μόλις τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σῶμα γυμνὸν διέσωσε μετὰ τοὺς μυρίους κινδύνους [157] ἐκείνους. Οὕτω καὶ ὁ στρατιώτης μυρίοις πολλάκις παραταξάμενος πολέμοις, καὶ ἀποκρουσάμενος τοὺς ἐναντίους, καὶ τῶν ἐχθρῶν περιγενόμενος, καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ ὥν τῇ προσδοκίᾳ τῆς νίκης, τὴν ζωὴν μεταλλάξας ἀπῆλθεν, οὐδενὸς ὅλως ἐκ τῶν μόχθων καὶ τῶν κινδύνων ἀπολαύσας χρηστοῦ.

Τὰ δὲ ἡμέτερα οὐ τοιαῦτα· τάς τε γὰρ ἐλπίδας αἰωνίους ἔχει ἀκινήτους τε καὶ βεβαίας, καὶ οὐ τῷ προσκαίρῳ τούτῳ συγκαταλυόμενας βίω,

4. ἰδρῶτες, literally, “sweats.”

5. I.e., the farmer, the ship captain, and the soldier.

6. John introduces a σύγκρισις, rhetorical comparison, that will be important for the whole homily, between earthly and heavenly rewards.

7. τά, with a possible antecedent being τῶν μελλόντων in the phrase above, διὰ τὴν τῶν μελλόντων ἐλπίδα, or just the generic antecedent.

8. Cf. 2 Cor 4:18.

9. This homily does not use the language of προβλήματα/ζητούμενα καὶ λύσεις, per se, and the passage itself is not so much an obvious problem or quandary (as in other homilies in this volume). But the rationale of problems and solutions is at work in John's exegesis of Rom 5:3, which he presents as the apostle Paul's own response to

Why have I mentioned these things? Or what do I wish to accomplish with these examples? From them I wish to bring encouragement to your ear and consolation for your strenuous exertions⁴ on behalf of virtue. [156] For if each of the types of person I just mentioned⁵ considers their arduous labor light because of the hope for what the future will bring—and even if one is able to attain these results, they come to an end with the present life, after all!⁶—how much more should you lend your ears to spiritual instruction and nobly endure combat and strenuous exertions for the sake of eternal life?

Now, for some people, the objects⁷ of their transitory hope⁸ aren't clearly manifested, and they've often lived with only the anticipation of good things. So, when they came to the end of their life, despite having reveled in their hopes, they hadn't gotten any closer to them via their actions; indeed, they've even suffered worse things as a result.⁹ Consider, for example, the one who works the soil. Sometimes, after those continually arduous labors and strenuous exertions, in the very act of sharpening the sickle and preparing for the harvest, after rot descends on the crop or a swarm of locusts or an immoderately heavy rain comes, or some other scourge is inflicted by vagaries in the weather, the farmer has gone home empty-handed, having endured all that labor, but lost the hope of its fruit. Likewise, the ship captain, although he has rejoiced in the large holdings of his cargo, and with great pleasure let out the sails and crossed an expansive sea, often at the very mouth of the harbor a reef threatens, or, by dashing against an underwater crag or being struck by some other unexpected calamity, he has lost the whole load and hardly saved his own naked body after those countless dangers. [157] Thus also the soldier, after having been frequently on the battle lines in countless wars, and shaken off his adversaries and prevailed over his enemies, has often departed from this life in the very moment of expected victory, having enjoyed no benefit at all from his labors and dangers.

But our future is not like this.¹⁰ For it holds hopes that are eternal, unchangeable, and firm and do not come to an end with the present tran-

a pastoral problem of despondency among the new converts in the face of adversities, to which this text, understood as an appeal by Paul to eschatological hopes, is the solution. In turn, Chrysostom applies Paul's solution to that problem to his perception of that same potential problem of hopelessness in his own congregants.

10. τὰ δὲ ἡμέτερα οὐ τοιαῦτα answers Τοῖς μὲν γὰρ ἄδηλα τὰ τῆς προσκαιροῦ ἐλπίδος ἐστὶ above (PG 51:156) (before the series of examples John offered of the latter).

ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὴν ἀκήρατον καὶ μακαρίαν ἐκείνην καὶ διαιωνίζουσιν ζῶν, καὶ οὐ μόνον ἀνωμαλία ἀέρων καὶ ἀδοκῆτων πραγμάτων περιστάσει οὐκ ἐπιβουλευομένας, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ αὐτῷ τῷ θανάτῳ διαλυομένας. Ἀπὸ τῶν ἐλπίδων δὲ αὐτῶν ἴδοι τις ἂν καὶ ἐν αὐτοῖς τοῖς τυχοῦσι λάμποντα αὐτῶν τὸν καρπὸν, καὶ πολλὴν καὶ μεγάλην οὔσαν τὴν ἀμοιβήν. Διὰ τοῦτο ὁ μακάριος Παῦλος ἐβόα, λέγων· Οὐ μόνον δὲ, ἀλλὰ καὶ καυχώμεθα ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσι. Παρακαλῶ μὴ παραδράμωμεν τὸ εἰρημένον ἀπλῶς· ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ, οὐκ οἶδα πῶς, πάλιν ἡμᾶς ὁ λόγος εἰς τὸν τοῦ καλοῦ κυβερνήτου Παύλου λιμένα εἰσήγαγεν, ἐντρυφήσωμεν τῇ λέξει, βραχεῖα μὲν οὔση, πολλῇ δὲ ἡμᾶς παιδευούσῃ φιλοσοφία. Τί ποτ' οὖν ἐστὶν ἄρα τὸ εἰρημένον, καὶ τί τοῦτο εἰπὼν ἤνιξατο ἡμῖν, λέγων, Οὐ μόνον δὲ, ἀλλὰ καὶ καυχώμεθα ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσι; Μικρὸν, εἰ δοκεῖ, ἀνωτέρω τὸν τῆς διδασκαλίας λόγον ἀγάγωμεν, καὶ πολλὴν ὀψόμεθα τὴν σαφήνειαν, καὶ τὴν τῶν νοημάτων δύναμιν ἐκεῖθεν τικτομένην ἡμῖν. Ἀλλὰ μηδὲν τὸ σῶμα καταμαλακίζετω· ἀλλ' ἀντὶ δρόσου γενέσθω ἡ τῆς πνευματικῆς ἀκροάσεως ἐπιθυμία. Καὶ γὰρ περὶ θλίψεως ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος καὶ ἐπιθυμίας ἀγαθῶν αἰωνίων, καὶ ὑπομονῆς, καὶ τῆς ἐκ τούτων γινομένης ἀμοιβῆς τοῖς οὐκ ἀναπεπτωκόσι. Τί ποτ' οὖν ἐστὶ τὸ, Οὐ μόνον; Ὁ γὰρ τοῦτο εἰρηκῶς, εἰπεῖν ἡμῖν πολλὰ καὶ ἕτερα δείκνυσι προϋπηργμένα ἀγαθὰ· καὶ μετ' ἐκείνων καὶ τοῦτο προστίθῃσι, τὸ ἀπὸ τῆς θλίψεως· διὸ καὶ ἔλεγεν ὁ αὐτός· Οὐ μόνον δὲ, ἀλλὰ καὶ καυχώμεθα ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσιν. Ὡστε δὲ σαφέστερον γενέσθαι τὸ εἰρημένον, βραχεῖαν ὥραν ἀνάσχεσθε, μακροτέραν ἡμῶν ποιουμένων τὴν διδασκαλίαν τῷ λόγῳ.

Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ κατηγγέλη ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων τὸ θεῖον κήρυγμα, καὶ περιήεσαν πανταχοῦ τῆς οἰκουμένης σπεύροντες τῆς εὐσεβείας τὸν λόγον, καὶ πρόρριζον ἀνασπῶντες τὴν πλάνην, καὶ τοὺς πατρώους τῶν ἀσεβῶν καταλύοντες νόμους, καὶ παρανομίαν ἅπασαν ἐλαύνοντες, καὶ τὴν γῆν

11. A statement of self-irony by John, who, as his audiences know well, very often winds up being pulled toward his beloved Paul (see *HT*, esp. 69–70).

12. For Chrysostom, φιλοσοφία refers to the Christian life, including both its teachings and its ethical requirements and lifestyle. For the teachings of Jesus in the Sermon on the Mount as the Christian πολιτεία rivaling that of Plato or Zeno, see Margaret M. Mitchell, “John Chrysostom on the Sermon on the Mount: φιλοσοφία as the Basis for the Christian πολιτεία,” in *The Sermon on the Mount through the Centuries*, ed. Jeffrey P. Greenman, Timothy Larsen, and Stephen R. Spencer (Grand Rapids: Brazos, 2007), 19–42.

13. αἰνίττεσθαι, part of the vocabulary of the figurative sense.

14. Taking ἀνωτέρω in a temporal sense, anticipating the argument John will next make, as he explores the imagined historical context in which Paul wrote these words.

sitory life, but are directed toward that unfading, blessed, and perpetual life. Not only are they not overthrown by the vagaries in the weather or the calamity of unexpected events, but they're not even destroyed by death itself. Because of these very hopes, one can see even in ordinary events that the fruit coming from them is splendid, and their reward great and magnificent. This is why the blessed Paul was crying out saying, "*And not only that, but we even boast in afflictions*" (Rom 5:3). I beg you, let's not run past this statement heedlessly, but since—though I don't know how!¹¹—our homily has once again led us to the harbor of the good ship-captain, Paul, let's feast on this statement that, although brief, gives us a large dose of instruction in the philosophical life.¹² So then, what was it he stated back then, and what meaning for us was he hinting at¹³ when he said, "*And not only that, but we even boast in afflictions*"? Assuming you agree, let's bring this passage of Paul's teaching back in time¹⁴ a bit, and we'll see the sharp clarity and the power of the thoughts that are generated for us from it. However, let no one fail to be tough enough in body,¹⁵ but let the desire for spiritual listening serve as refreshing dew. For our homily is about affliction and the desire for eternal goods, about endurance and the reward that comes from these things for those who don't lose heart.¹⁶ What then does Paul mean by "*not only*" (Rom 5:3)? One who's said¹⁷ this indicates that he's told us about many things and shows that other goods are of higher value. And to these words he adds this—that they come from affliction. That's why the same apostle said, "*And not only that, but we even boast in afflictions*" (Rom 5:3). So then, bear with me a short time while I extend our homily's teaching further so that this statement might be made even more clear.

Now, when the divine gospel message was proclaimed by the apostles, they were circumnavigating the whole world, sowing the word of piety, pulling up error by the roots, abolishing the impious ancestral customs, driving out all lawlessness, purifying the earth, commanding people to

15. καταμαλακίζειν, the language of masculine invective against effeminacy. See Chris L. de Wet, "Virtue and the (Un)Making of Men in the Thought of John Chrysostom," in *Men and Women in the Early Christian Centuries*, ed. Wendy Mayer and Ian J. Elmer, Early Christian Studies 18 (Strathfield, NSW: St Paul's Publications, 2014), 227–50.

16. Chrysostom clearly states the focus of this homily. The word θλιψις, in the lemma, will be exemplified throughout, as will the rewards it will bring.

17. Mf notes that his two manuscripts read εύρηκώς ("one who has found this") for ειρηκώς in HS/ME.

ἐκκαθαίροντες, καὶ εἰδώλων μὲν καὶ ναῶν καὶ βωμῶν καὶ πανηγύρεων τῶν ἐκεῖθεν καὶ τελετῶν κελεύοντες ἀποπηδᾶν, ἐπιγινώσκειν δὲ τὸν τῶν ὅλων ἕνα καὶ μόνον Θεὸν, καὶ τὰς μελλούσας ἀναμένειν ἐλπίδας, καὶ περὶ Πατρὸς καὶ Υἱοῦ καὶ ἁγίου Πνεύματος διελέγοντο, καὶ περὶ ἀναστάσεως ἐφιλοσόφουν, καὶ περὶ βασιλείας οὐρανῶν διελέγοντο· διὰ ταῦτα πόλεμος ἀνήφθη χαλεπός, καὶ πολέμων ἀπάντων ὁ τυραννικώτατος, καὶ πάντα θορύβου καὶ ταραχῆς καὶ στάσεως ἔγεμε, καὶ πόλεις ἅπασαι, καὶ δῆμος ἅπας, καὶ οἰκία, καὶ οἰκουμένη καὶ ἀοίκητος, ἅτε δὴ τῶν παλαιῶν ἐθῶν διασαλευομένων, καὶ τῆς ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον κατασχούσης προλήψεως διασειομένης, καινῶν δὲ εἰσαγομένων δογμάτων, καὶ ὧν μηδεὶς μηδέποτε ἤκουσε· πρὸς ταῦτα βασι-**[158]**λεῖς ἡγρίαινον, καὶ ἄρχοντες ἐδυσχέραινον, καὶ ἰδιῶται ἐταράττοντο, καὶ ἀγοραὶ ἐθορυβοῦντο, καὶ δικαστήρια ἐχαλέπαινε, καὶ ξίφη ἐγυμνοῦτο, καὶ ὄπλα παρεσκευάζετο, καὶ νόμοι ἡγανάκουν. Ἐκεῖθεν τιμωρίαι καὶ κολάσεις καὶ ἀπειλαὶ καὶ πάντα συνεκινεῖτο τὰ ἐν ἀνθρώποις εἶναι δοκοῦντα δεινά. Ὡς περ θαλάττης μαινομένης καὶ χαλεπὰ ναυάγια ὠδινούσης, οὐδὲν ἄμεινον τὰ τῆς οἰκουμένης διέκειτο, πατὴρ παῖδα διὰ τὴν εὐσέβειαν τότε ἀποκηρύττοντος, καὶ νύμφης πρὸς πενθερὰν σχιζομένης, καὶ ἀδελφῶν διαιρουμένων, καὶ δεσποτῶν κατὰ τῶν οἰκετῶν ἀγανακτούντων, καὶ τῆς φύσεως σχεδὸν πρὸς ἑαυτὴν στασιαζούσης, καὶ οὐκ ἐμφυλίου μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ συγγενικοῦ διὰ πάσης οἰκίας διόντος πολέμου. Ὁ γὰρ λόγος μαχαίρας δίκην εἰσιῶν, καὶ τὸ νοσοῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὑγιαίνοντος τέμνων, πολλὴν ἐποίει πανταχοῦ τὴν στάσιν εἶναι, καὶ τὴν φιλονεικίαν, καὶ πανταχόθεν μυρίας αἵρεσθαι κατὰ τῶν πιστευόντων παρεσκεύασεν ἐπαχθείας καὶ μάχας. Ἐντεῦθεν οἱ μὲν εἰς δεσμωτήρια ἀπήγοντο, οἱ δὲ εἰς δικαστήρια, οἱ δὲ τὴν ἐπὶ θάνατον φέρουσιν ὁδόν· καὶ τῶν μὲν αἰ οὐσαὶ ἐδημεύοντο, οἱ δὲ καὶ τῆς πατρίδος καὶ τῆς ζωῆς αὐτῆς πολλάκις ἐξέπιπτον, καὶ πανταχόθεν νιφάδων πυκνότερα περιεστήκει τὰ κακά· ἔνδοθεν μάχαι, ἔξωθεν φόβοι, παρὰ τῶν φίλων, παρὰ τῶν ἄλλοτρίων, παρὰ αὐτῶν τῶν τῇ φύσει συνδεδεμένων ἀλλήλοις.

18. On Chrysostom's rhetorical construction of Greek religion as a foil for Christianity (which he applies both to the fourth and the first centuries, as here), see Isabella Sandwell, *Religious Identity in Late Antiquity: Greeks, Jews and Christians in Antioch* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), especially 75–82. For another example in this volume, see *Laud. Paul.* 4.18 (AP 222–24).

19. Cf. Luke 12:53; Mic 7:6.

20. Cf. Heb 4:12–13; Matt 10:34 // Luke 12:51–53. The word (λόγος) here is the “divine gospel message” (τὸ θεῖον κήρυγμα), mentioned at the start of this subargument in Chrysostom's appeal to the historical origins of Christianity.

turn away from idols, temples, altars, local festivals and rituals,¹⁸ to recognize the one and only God of all, and to await the hopes to come in the future. They spoke about the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, gave philosophical instruction about the resurrection, and spoke about the kingdom of heaven. As a result, a terrible battle was inflamed, a battle more oppressive than all other battles. All cities, every people, every house, both civilized and uncivilized, were filled with commotion, agitation, and discord. Indeed, nations with ancient roots were thrown into confusion, and the conventional ways of thinking that had held sway for so long were confounded as new teachings were introduced that no one had ever heard before. In the face of these events [158] kings were angry, leaders were indignant, the common folk stirred up, the marketplaces thrown into commotion, the law courts rendered harsh verdicts, swords were bared, weapons readied, and vexatious laws enacted. Accordingly, reprisals, punishments, threats, and all things people consider horrible were set in motion. As it is when the sea rages and spawns terrible shipwrecks, the circumstances on land were no better. Back then, a father renounced his son for the sake of piety, a bride was estranged from her mother-in-law, brothers were set in opposition,¹⁹ masters were angry with their slaves; nature was, as it were, rebelling against herself. And it wasn't only a civil war but also a domestic one that passed through every household. For the word, entering like a sword and severing the sick part from the healthy,²⁰ caused discord and contention to be found everywhere and countless enmities and battles to rise up against the believers from all directions. As a result, some were led off to jail, others to the judge,²¹ and others to the path that leads to death. Some had their belongings confiscated, while others often lost their ancestral land and their very livelihood;²² and bad things surrounded them from all directions, more thickly than a snowstorm. There were battles from within, fears from without (cf. 2 Cor 7:5),²³ at the hands of friends, those of strangers, those of the very people who have natural bonds with one another.

21. To capture the wordplay of *δεσμωτήρια/δικαστήρια* (the latter translated above as "law courts").

22. *ζωή* (LSJ A); of course, it could also mean losing one's life in death, but that would repeat the previous sentence; in context, losing land means losing one's livelihood.

23. But John has inverted the adverbs (2 Cor 7:5: *ἔξωθεν μάχαι, ἔσωθεν φόβοι*).

β'. Ταῦτ' οὖν ὁρῶν ὁ μακάριος Παῦλος, ὁ τῆς οἰκουμένης παιδοτρίβης, ὁ τῶν οὐρανίων δογμάτων διδάσκαλος, ἐπειδὴ τὰ μὲν δεινὰ ἐν χερσὶν ἦν καὶ πρὸ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν πραττόμενα, τὰ δὲ χρηστὰ ἐν ἐλπίσι μόνον καὶ ἐπαγγελίαις, βασιλεία οὐρανῶν, λέγω, καὶ ἀνάστασις, καὶ τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἐκείνων λῆξις τῶν πάντα νοῦν καὶ λόγον ὑπερβαινόντων· κάμινος δὲ καὶ τήγανον καὶ ξίφη καὶ τιμωρίαι καὶ παντοδαπαὶ κολάσεις καὶ θάνατοι οὐκ ἐν ἐλπίσιν, ἀλλ' ἐν πείρᾳ· οἱ δὲ πρὸς ταῦτα ἀγωνίζεσθαι μέλλοντες, ἀρτίως ἀπὸ βωμῶν καὶ εἰδώλων καὶ τρυφῆς καὶ ἀκολασίας καὶ μέθης εἰσποιηθέντες ἦσαν τῇ πίστει, οὐδὲν ὑψηλὸν περὶ τῆς αἰδίου ζωῆς τέως μεμελετηκότες ἐννοεῖν, ἀλλὰ τῶν παρόντων ἀντεχόμενοι μᾶλλον· καὶ εἰκὸς τούτων πολλοὺς μικροψυχεῖν καὶ ἐκλύεσθαι, καὶ ἀναπίπτειν καθ' ἐκάστην πολιορκουμένους ἡμέραν· ὅρα τί ποιεῖ ὁ τῶν ἀπορρήτων κοινωνός, καὶ πρόσεχε τῇ Παύλου σοφίᾳ. Συνεχῶς περὶ τῶν μελλόντων αὐτοῖς διαλέγεται, καὶ τὰ βραβεῖα ὑπ' ὅψιν ἄγει, καὶ δείκνυσι τοὺς στεφάνους, ἀλείφων αὐτοὺς καὶ παραμυθούμενος ταῖς τῶν αἰωνίων ἀγαθῶν ἐλπίσι. Καὶ τί φησι; Λογίζομεθα γάρ, ὅτι οὐκ ἄξια τὰ παθήματα τοῦ νῦν καιροῦ πρὸς τὴν μέλλουσαν δόξαν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι εἰς ἡμᾶς. Τί γάρ μοι λέγεις, φησί, τραύματα καὶ βωμοὺς καὶ δημίους καὶ τιμωρίας καὶ λιμοὺς καὶ δημεύσεις καὶ πενίαν καὶ δεσμὰ καὶ ἀλύσεις; πάντα ὅσα βούλει τίθει τὰ δοκοῦντα ἐν ἀνθρώποις δεινὰ, καὶ οὐδὲν ἄξιον λέγεις τῶν ἐπάθλων ἐκείνων καὶ τῶν στεφάνων καὶ τῶν ἀμοιβῶν. Τὰ μὲν γὰρ τῷ παρόντι συγκαταλύεται βίῳ, τὰ δὲ ἐν τῷ ἀπείρῳ αἰῶνι τέλος οὐκ ἔχει· καὶ τὰ μὲν παροδεύει πρόσκαιρα ὄντα, τὰ δὲ παραμένει διηνεκῶς ἀγήρατα συνυπάρχοντα. "Ὅπερ καὶ ἀλλαχοῦ τοῦτο αὐτὸ αἰνιττόμενος ἔλεγε· [159] Τὸ γὰρ παραντίκα ἐλαφρόν τῆς θλίψεως· τῇ ποσότητι τὴν ποιότητα ὑποτεμνόμενος, καὶ τῷ χρόνῳ τὸ φορτικὸν παραμυθούμενος. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ τῇ φύσει βαρέα καὶ φορτικά ἦν τὰ τότε συμβαίνοντα, τῷ προσκαίρῳ τὸ φορτικὸν αὐτῶν ὑποτέμνεται, λέγων·

24. On these epithets for Paul, see *HT* 75–76.

25. I.e., the eyes of the earliest converts, to whom Paul was writing at Rome.

26. Cf. Phil 4:7: ἡ εἰρήνη τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ ὑπερέχουσα πάντα νοῦν.

27. τήγανον, as found in martyrdom accounts such as 2 Macc 7:3–5, *Ep. Lugd.* (*apud* Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 5.1.56), etc., is an instrument of torture, a “frying pan” (see *PGL* for further references).

28. ὁ τῶν ἀπορρήτων κοινωνός (cf. 2 Cor 12:4); on the epithet for Paul, see *HT* 301 with n. 480.

29. Here John presents the apostle as a wise problem-solver.

30. ἀλείφειν: used of anointing the skin of athletes with oil before competition, and hence metaphorically “prepare as if for gymnastics, encourage, stimulate, instigate” (LSJ I.4).

31. With λογίζομεθα for λογίζομαι. Chrysostom has the latter reading (singular) in *Hom. Rom.* 14.4 (PG 63:529); *Hom. Eph.* 24.2 (PG 62:171).

2. The blessed Paul, the instructor of the world, the teacher of the heavenly doctrines,²⁴ perceived these realities. While terrible things were right at hand and carried out before their²⁵ eyes, the good things—that is, the kingdom of heaven, resurrection, and the attaining of those good things that surpass all understanding²⁶ and reason—resided solely in hopes and promises. But furnaces, roasting racks,²⁷ swords, reprisals, and all kinds of punishments and forms of death weren't part of their future hopes, but rather their present experience. And those who were going to contend with these realities had been newly adopted into the faith away from altars, idols, luxurious living, licentiousness and drunkenness; they had had no prior practice in higher contemplation about everlasting life, but instead they clung to the elements of the present life. So it makes sense that many of them were becoming fainthearted, losing their resolve, and giving up as a result of being besieged every day. Look at what the man who shared in the ineffable mysteries²⁸ does; attend to Paul's wisdom!²⁹ Over and over again he speaks to them about the future, and he brings the prizes before their eyes and shows them the crowns, thereby conditioning³⁰ and consoling them with hopes for eternal good things. And why does he say, "*For we consider that the sufferings of the present time are not worth comparing to the future glory that is going to be revealed to us*" (Rom 8:18)?³¹ "Why is it," he says, "that you speak to me about wounds, tribunals,³² public executioners, reprisals, starvation, public confiscation of property, poverty, bonds, and fetters? All the things people regard as terrible that you wish to add to these—not one of the things you mention is worth comparing to those prizes, crowns, and rewards. For the former come to an end with the present life, but the latter have no end in an age that is eternal. The former pass away because they're transitory, but the latter perpetually remain because they're ageless across all times."³³ Paul hinted at this very point also in another place when he said, [159] "*For the present lightness of affliction*" (2 Cor 4:17), thus forestalling the type of the affliction by reference to its extent and offering consolation for the burden in its limited duration. Because the things that were occurring at that time were by their nature weighty and burdensome, he forestalls the burden they impose by appeal

32. So LSJ 8, with Hesychius lexicographus, as equivalent to ἑμβολοί, which fits the sense here better than "altar" (as John had used it above in relation to traditional religious rituals).

33. John has given this long speech in the voice of Paul (by προσωποποιία), revoicing the meaning of his words in Rom 5.

Τὸ γὰρ παραυτίκα ἐλαφρόν τῆς θλίψεως ἡμῶν καθ' ὑπερβολὴν εἰς ὑπερβολὴν αἰώνιον βάρος δόξης κατεργάζεται ἡμῖν, μὴ σκοπούντων ἡμῶν τὰ βλεπόμενα, ἀλλὰ τὰ μὴ βλεπόμενα. Τὰ γὰρ βλεπόμενα, πρόσκαιρα· τὰ δὲ μὴ βλεπόμενα, αἰώνια.

Καὶ πάλιν ἀνάγων αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν ἔννοιαν τοῦ μεγέθους τῶν τότε ἀγαθῶν, αὐτὴν εἰσάγει τὴν κτίσιν ὀδυνωμένην καὶ συστενάζουσαν ἐπὶ τοῖς παροῦσι μοχθηροῖς, καὶ σφόδρα ἐπιθυμοῦσαν τὰ μέλλοντα, ὡς πάνυ ὄντα χρηστὰ, λέγων οὕτω· Καὶ γὰρ ἡ κτίσις συστενάζει καὶ συνωδίνει ἄχρι τοῦ νῦν. Τίνος ἔνεκεν στενάζει; τίνος ἔνεκεν ὠδίνει; Τὰ μέλλοντα ἐκεῖνα προσδοκῶσα ἀγαθὰ καὶ ἐπιθυμοῦσα τὴν ἐπὶ τὸ βέλτιον μεταβολήν. Καὶ γὰρ καὶ αὕτη, φησὶν, ἡ κτίσις ἐλευθερωθήσεται ἀπὸ τῆς δουλείας τῆς φθορᾶς εἰς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν τῆς δόξης τῶν τέκνων τοῦ Θεοῦ. Ὅταν δὲ ἀκούσης, ὅτι στενάζει καὶ ὠδίνει, μὴ λογικὴν εἶναι νόμιζε, ἀλλὰ μάθανε τῆς Γραφῆς τὸ εἶδος. Ὅταν γὰρ βούληται ὁ Θεὸς μέγα καὶ χρηστὸν ἀναγγεῖλαι τοῖς ἀνθρώποις διὰ τῶν προφητῶν, καὶ αὐτὰ τὰ ἄψυχα αἰσθάνεσθαι ποιεῖ τῶν γινομένων θαυμάτων τὸ μέγεθος· οὐκ ἐπειδὴ αἰσθάνεσθαι τὴν κτίσιν φαμέν, ἀλλ' ἵνα τῶν θαυμάτων τὸ μέγεθος παραστήσῃ δυνηθῇ ἐκ τῶν συμβαινόντων τοῖς ἀνθρώποις. Τοῦτο δὲ καὶ ἡμῖν ἔθος λέγειν, ὅταν τι τῶν ἀδοκῆτων συμβῇ, [ὅτι αὕτη ἡ πόλις ἐστύγνασεν, αὐτὸ τὸ ἔδαφος σκυθρωπὸν ἐγένετο·] καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν φοβερῶν δὲ ἀνθρώπων καὶ θηριώδη θυμὸν ἐχόντων τοῦτο αὐτὸ εἴποι τις ἄν· ὅτι αὐτὰ τὰ θεμέλια διέσεισεν, αὐτοὶ οἱ λίθοι αὐτὸν ἐτρόμαξαν· οὐκ ἐπειδὴ ὄντως οἱ λίθοι τοῦτον ἐτρόμαξαν, ἀλλ' ἵνα τὴν ὑπερβολὴν τῆς θηριώδους καρδίας αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸν θυμὸν παραστήσῃ δυνηθῶσι. Διὰ δὲ τοῦτο καὶ ὁ θαυμασῖος προφήτης Δαυὶδ

34. With καὶ γὰρ for γὰρ ὅτι before ἡ κτίσις.

35. κτίσις (as with φύσις, above) of course in English can be rendered with the pronoun “it,” but the gendered noun in Greek facilitates the issue of personification that John will take up below.

36. λογικὴν (sc. κτίσιν), “speaking” or “reasoning powers” (LSJ I or II); John likely has both in mind here, but what follows focuses on *προσωποποιία*, and hence speech.

37. Appealing to the customary usage of Scripture is a Christian form of the literary-critical rule of “Ὅμηρον ἐξ Ὁμήρου σαφηνίζειν,” “clarify Homer by way of Homer” (see Mitchell, *Paul, the Corinthians and the Birth of Christian Hermeneutics*, 56; Astruc-Morize-Le Boulluec, “Le sens caché des Écritures,” 23–25).

38. Or possibly “God” (the verb δυνηθῇ has no explicit subject). Throughout this argument both are implied, as John’s argument is that God speaks through Scripture and its style of expression (τῆς γραφῆς τὸ εἶδος); it can include the human author (such as David) as well.

39. A traditional example, as seen by the rhetorical school text of (Pseudo-)Herodianus, *Schematismi Homerici*, 101, in reference to Homer, *Od.* 4.290: Ὑπερνήμυχα·

to their temporary nature, saying, “For the present lightness of our affliction is bringing about for us an eternal weight of glory beyond all measure, as we focus our attention not on the things that are seen but those that are unseen. For the things that are seen are temporary, but those unseen are eternal” (2 Cor 4:17–18).

And once again, when he wishes to lift up their minds toward the contemplation of the magnitude of the good things to come, he brings forward creation herself in birth pangs and groaning over the present hardships, and fervently desiring the future things, since they’re the ones that are truly good. He puts it this way: “For even *creation groans and has birth pangs until this very moment*” (Rom 8:22).³⁴ Why does she³⁵ groan? Why does she suffer birth pangs? In the expectation of those future goods and in the desire for the transition to that which is better. For indeed, “*even creation herself*,” he says, “*will be set free from her enslavement to decay for the freedom of the glory of the children of God*” (Rom 8:21). Yet when you hear that creation groans and has birth pangs, don’t think she herself has speaking powers,³⁶ but learn that this is the style of Scripture.³⁷ When God wishes to tell people of something great and magnanimous through the prophets, he renders even inanimate things as perceiving the magnitude of the marvelous events. We don’t say creation has powers of perception because of this, but this was so Scripture³⁸ might be able to present the magnitude of the marvels by reference to things that happen to people. Even now we’re accustomed to say when something unexpected happens that “the city herself was in a downcast mood,”³⁹ or “the pavement itself was sullen.”⁴⁰ And in the case of people who inspire fear and have the wrath of a wild beast, one might say a thing like this: “he shook the very foundations; the stones themselves trembled before him.” Yet this wasn’t because the stones really trembled before him, but so that they can represent the extreme degree⁴¹ of his beastly heart and wrath. For this reason also David,

ἡμῶν ἡμῶσω· «τῷ κε τάχ’ ἡμύσειε πόλις Πριάμοιο ἄνακτος.» ἡμυκα, ἀναδιπλασιασμός ἐμήμυκα, ἐμήμυκα πλεονασμῶ, σημαίνει δὲ τὸ ἐστύγνασε καὶ κατηνέχθη.

40. ὅτι αὐτῇ ... σκυθρωπὸν ἐγένετο was added (to the text of HS/ME) by Mf, both from his two manuscripts and from the exemplar of the Latin translation made by FD that includes it. JPM put brackets around the sentence (which it did not contain in Mf) but deleted the note on the Greek page explaining the textual decision (retaining it only on the Latin translation). These brackets are not justified given the strong manuscript evidence for the plus reading, so they have not been retained in the translation.

41. Here and below, John is identifying the use of personification of inanimate beings with ὑπερβολή, “rhetorical exaggeration, hyperbole” (see references in LSJ I.6).

ἀπαγγέλλων τὰ ἀγαθὰ τὰ τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις συμβάντα, καὶ τὴν ἡδονὴν τὴν ἐκ τῆς ἐλευθερίας Αἰγύπτου ἐγγινομένην αὐτοῖς, ἔλεγεν· Ἐν ἐξόδῳ Ἰσραὴλ ἐξ Αἰγύπτου, οἴκου Ἰακώβ ἐκ λαοῦ βαρβάρου, ἐγενήθη Ἰουδαία ἀγίασμα αὐτοῦ, Ἰσραὴλ ἐξουσία αὐτοῦ· ἡ θάλασσα εἶδε, καὶ ἔφυγεν, ὁ Ἰορδάνης ἐστράφη εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω· τὰ ὄρη ἐσκίρτησαν ὥσει κριοὶ, καὶ οἱ βουνοὶ ὡς ἀρνία προβάτων, ἀπὸ προσώπου Κυρίου. Καὶ τοῦτο οὐδαμοῦ γενόμενον ἤκουσέ τις. Ἡ μὲν γὰρ θάλασσα, καὶ ὁ Ἰορδάνης ἀνестράφη εἰς τὰ ὀπίσω προστάγματι τοῦ Θεοῦ· τὰ δὲ ὄρη καὶ οἱ βουνοὶ οὐκ ἐσκίρτησαν· ἀλλ', ὅπερ ἔφθην εἰπὼν, τὴν ὑπερβολὴν τῆς ἡδονῆς παραστήσαι βουλόμενος, καὶ τὴν ἄνεσιν τὴν ἐκ τῆς τῶν Αἰγυπτίων κακώσεως ὑπηγμένην αὐτοῖς, καὶ αὐτὰ τὰ ἄψυχα σκιρτᾶν ἔλεγε καὶ πηδᾶν ἐπὶ τοῖς συμβεβηκόσιν αὐτοῖς χρηστοῖς· ὡς ὅταν τι καὶ λυπηρὸν ἀπαγγεῖλαι βούληται ἐξ ἡμετέρας ἁμαρτίας τικτόμενον, φησὶν· Πενθήσει οἶνος, πενήσσει καὶ ἄμπελος· καὶ ἀλλαχοῦ· Ὅδοι Σιών πενθοῦσιν· ἀλλὰ καὶ δακρύειν τὰ ἀναίσθητα λέγει· Τεῖχος γὰρ θυγατὶς Σιών, κατάγαγε δάκρυα, φησί· καὶ αὐτὴν δὲ τὴν γῆν, καὶ Ἰουδαίαν πενθεῖν λέγει καὶ μεθύειν τῇ λύπῃ οὐχ ὡς τῶν στοιχείων αἰσθανομένων τούτων, ἀλλ' ὅπερ ἔφθην εἰπὼν, ἕκαστος τῶν προφη- [160] τῶν τὴν ὑπερβολὴν τῶν ἐκ Θεοῦ χορηγουμένων ἡμῖν ἀγαθῶν, καὶ τῶν τιμωριῶν τῶν ἐκ τῆς ἡμετέρας κακίας ἐπαγομένων ἡμῖν παραστήσαι θέλων· διὸ δὴ καὶ ὁ μακάριος Παῦλος καὶ αὐτὸς τὴν κτίσιν εἰσάγει στενάζουσιν καὶ ὀδυνημένην, ἵνα τὸ μέγεθος τῶν δωρεῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ τῶν μετὰ ταῦτα διαδεχομένων ἡμᾶς παραστήσαι δυνήθῃ.

γ'. Ἀλλὰ ταῦτα πάντα, φησὶν, ἐν ἐλπίσιν· ὁ δὲ μικρόψυχος καὶ ταλαίπωρος ἄνθρωπος, καὶ νῦν τῆς εἰδωλολατρείας ἀπαλλαγείς, καὶ οὐκ εἰδὼς περὶ τῶν μελλόντων φιλοσοφεῖν, οὐ σφόδρα τούτοις διορθοῦται τοῖς λόγοις, ἀλλὰ ζητεῖ καὶ ἐν τῷ παρόντι καιρῷ εὐρέσθαι τινὰ παραμυθίαν. Διὰ δὴ τοῦτο καὶ ὁ σοφὸς οὗτος διδάσκαλος, καὶ πάντα εἰδὼς, οὐκ ἀπὸ τῶν μελλόντων μόνον

42. Probably David, introduced earlier as the author of the Psalms, but the subject continues into other prophetic passages, thus homogenizing with God, the author of Scripture.

43. Plus καί before ἄμπελος.

44. LXX Lam 2:18: Τεῖχη Σιων, καταγάγετε ὡς χειμάρρους δάκρυα ("O walls of Zion, bring down tears like rivers swollen by storms"). Chrysostom reads θυγατὶς with ⲛ* (as with MT) but has rendered Τεῖχη as τεῖχος and correspondingly made the imperative singular (κατάγαγε).

45. Cf. Jer 14:2: ἐπένθησεν ἡ Ἰουδαία.

46. On the land as drunk, cf. Isa 24:20, but there it is a simile, not a predication (ἡ γῆ ὡς ὁ μεθύων καὶ κραιπαλῶν), and the cause is more fear than lamentation.

47. As Mf notes, Paris. gr. 660 (fol. 142^v) inserts τὴν ὑπερβολὴν τῆς ἡδονῆς παραστήσαι βουλόμενος, καὶ τὴν ἄνεσιν τὴν ἐκ τῆς τῶν Αἰγυπτίων (from earlier in the

the marvelous prophet, when he was telling of the good things that happened to the Jews and the delight they had in their freedom from Egypt, said, “*In the exodus of Israel from Egypt, that of the house of Jacob from a barbarian people, Judea became his holy place, Israel his seat of authority. The sea saw, and it fled; the Jordan turned right around. The mountains skipped like rams and the hills like little lambs of the flock ... from the presence of the Lord*” (Ps 113:1–4, 7a). No one ever heard of this happening. For the sea and the Jordan turned around by the Lord’s command, but the mountains and the hills didn’t skip. Rather, as I said before, in wishing to present the extraordinary measure of delight and the relief the people had from the Egyptians’ abuse, he⁴² said that the inanimate things skipped and leaped at the magnanimous things that had happened to them. In the same way, when Scripture wishes to tell of something grievous that was born of our sin, it says, “*Wine will mourn; the vineyard, too, will mourn*” (Isa 24:7).⁴³ And in another place: “*the roads of Zion mourn*” (Lam 1:4). But it even says that insensate objects cry. For, Scripture says, “*O wall of the daughter of Zion, bring down tears*”⁴⁴ (Lam 2:18). And it says that the very land of Judea mourns⁴⁵ and is drunk in her grief,⁴⁶ although these elements aren’t capable of perception. Instead, as I have said before, each of [160] the prophets wishes to present us with the extraordinary measure⁴⁷ of good things provided us by God, as well as that of the punishments that come upon us because of our own wickedness. That’s why the blessed Paul himself also in turn introduces creation groaning and having birth pangs (cf. Rom 8:22), so he could represent the magnitude of the gifts of God that will come upon us after the present realities.

3. “And yet all these things,” someone says,⁴⁸ “are in our hopes.” But a fainthearted and distressed person⁴⁹ who’d just recently been freed of idolatry and didn’t know how to engage in philosophical reflection about future realities finds little remedy in these words, but seeks to find some consolation in the present time as well. That’s why this wise teacher, knowing all these things, not only offers consolation⁵⁰ from the good things to

paragraph; PG 51:159,51–53) before τὴν ὑπερβολὴν τῶν ἐκ θεοῦ χορηγουμένων, a ditto-graphy occasioned by the two instances of τὴν ὑπερβολήν.

48. An interlocutor gives voice to the problem.

49. This is John’s characterization of the Roman believers, and hence, the problem Paul faces of offering consolation to them in the present only by appealing to future hopes.

50. Reading παραμυθεῖται with Mf, who had adopted HS’s marginal reading (which he found confirmed in another manuscript) into his text, over against HS’s

παραμυθεῖται ἀγαθῶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν παρόντων ἀλείφει χρηστῶν. Καὶ πρῶτον μὲν τὰ ὑπὲρ γέγραμμένα προλέγει τῇ οἰκουμένη ἀγαθὰ, τὰ οὐκ ἐν ἐλπίσι καὶ προσδοκίᾳ, ἀλλ' ἐν πείρᾳ καὶ ἀπολαύσει γινόμενα (ἅπερ καὶ τῶν μελλόντων καὶ ἐλπιζομένων μεγίστη καὶ σαφειστάτη ἀπόδειξις ἐστὶ), καὶ πολὺν περὶ πίστεως κατατείνας τὸν λόγον, καὶ τοῦ πατριάρχου Ἀβραάμ μνημονεύσας (καὶ τῆς φύσεως ἀπαγορευούσης τοῦ πατέρα αὐτὸν ἔσσεσθαι, ἥλπισε καὶ προσεδόκησε, καὶ ἐπείσθη ἔσσεσθαι, διὸ καὶ ἐγένετο), ἀκκεῖθεν ἀνάγων εἰς τὸ μὴ δεῖν ποτε εἰς τὴν τῶν λογισμῶν καταπίπτειν ἀσθένειαν, ἀλλὰ τῷ μεγέθει τῆς πίστεως ὀρθοῦσθαι καὶ διανίστασθαι καὶ ὑψηλὰ φρονεῖν· μετὰ ταῦτα λέγει καὶ τῶν ὑπὲρ γέγραμμένων τὸ μέγεθος. Τί δὲ τοῦτο ἐστίν; Ὅτι τὸν Υἱὸν, φησὶ, τὸν μονογενῆ, τὸν γνήσιον, τὸν ἀγαπητὸν, τοῦτον ὁ Θεὸς ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν τῶν ἀγνωμόνων ἔδωκεν οἰκετῶν, καὶ τοὺς μυρίους βεβαρημένους ἁμαρτήμασι, καὶ τοσούτοις φορτίοις πιεζομένους πλημμελημάτων, οὐχὶ τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων ἀπήλλαξε μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ δικαίους εἰργάσατο, οὐδὲν φορτικόν, οὐδὲ ἐπίπονον ἐπιτάξας, οὐδὲ ἐπαχθές, ἀλλὰ πίστιν ζητήσας παρ' ἡμῶν μόνον, καὶ δικαίους ἐποίησε καὶ ἁγίους κατεσκεύασε, καὶ υἱοὺς Θεοῦ ἀπέφηνε, καὶ βασιλείας κληρονόμους ἀπέδειξε, καὶ τοῦ Μονογενοῦς συγκληρονόμους ἀπειργάσατο, καὶ ἀνάστασιν ἐπηγγείλατο, καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν σωμάτων, καὶ λῆξιν μετὰ ἀγγέλων, πάντα λόγον καὶ νοῦν ὑπερβαίνουσιν, καὶ τὴν ἐν οὐρανοῖς διατριβὴν, καὶ τὴν μετ' αὐτοῦ ὁμιλίαν καὶ ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἐντεῦθεν ἤδη χάριν ἐξέχεε, καὶ τῆς τοῦ διαβόλου κατοχῆς ἡμᾶς ἀπήλλαξε, καὶ τῶν δαιμόνων ἡμᾶς ἐρρύσατο, καὶ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν κατέλυσε, καὶ τὴν κατάραν ἠφάνισε, καὶ ἄδου πύλας συνέκλασε, καὶ τὸν παράδεισον ἠνέωξεν, οὐκ ἄγγελον, οὐκ ἀρχάγγελον, ἀλλ' αὐτὸν ἀπέστειλε τὸν Μονογενῆ ὑπὲρ τῆς σωτηρίας τῆς ἡμετέρας, ὥς φησι διὰ τοῦ προφήτου· Οὐ πρέσβυς, οὐδὲ ἄγγελος, ἀλλ' αὐτὸς ὁ Κύριος ἔσωσεν ἡμᾶς. Ταῦτα οὐ μυρίων στεφάνων λαμπρότερα; ὅτι ἡγιασθημεν; ὅτι ἐδικαιώθημεν; ὅτι διὰ πίστεως; ὅτι τοῦ μονογενοῦς Υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐξ οὐρανῶν κατελθόντος

adopted reading προθυμεῖται (which could also be “encourage”; see PGL 2). Mf did not himself acknowledge HS's marginal conjecture to this effect, but PE added that to his note.

51. See the discussion of the *περισσόν* and *ὠφέλεια*, introduced in Rom 3:1, and the argument that follows it throughout that chapter. Chrysostom is here offering his view of the *ἀκολουθία* or rhetorical progression of the argument in Romans that leads up to his focal verse, Rom 5:3. Still, in what follows, John adds steps of the presumed argument Paul is making that are not strictly found between Rom 3 and 4.

52. Especially important for Chrysostom in making this connection with the theme of his homily is Rom 4:18: “Ὁς παρ' ἐλπίδα ἐπ' ἐλπίδι ἐπίστευσεν.

53. John has in mind especially the contrast *μὴ ἀσθενήσας τῇ πίστει ... ἀλλ'*

come in the future but, by appealing to good things in the present, also conditions them for the fight. Thus he first spoke about the good things that have taken place in the world—that is, those that aren’t held in hope and anticipation but are found in present experience and enjoyment, which is also the greatest and clearest proof of the things in the future and things hoped for (cf. Romans 3).⁵¹ And then he developed at length the argument about faith (cf. Rom 4:1–22)⁵² and called to mind the patriarch Abraham, and how when nature forbade him from being a father, Abraham had hope and fervent anticipation and believed that he would become a father; and as a consequence, indeed he was. And from this example, Paul revived their spirits so they wouldn’t ever feel the need to fall into debilitating thoughts, but instead by the magnitude of faith they’d be restored, raised up, and confident (cf. Rom 4:19–24).⁵³ Then after these things, he mentioned the most magnificent of the events that have taken place. What’s that? “That the son,” he says, “the Only-begotten, genuine, beloved one, is the one whom God gave on behalf of us senseless slaves, not only to free us who are burdened with countless sins and pressed down with momentous burdens of error from sins, but also to make us righteous (cf. Rom 4:25; 4:22). Commanding nothing burdensome, arduous, or irksome, but seeking only one thing from us—faith—God even caused us to be righteous, made us saints, declared us sons of God, appointed us inheritors of the kingdom, made us co-heirs with the Only-begotten, and promised resurrection and bodily incorruption, a state of being with the angels that surpasses all understanding and reason, a heavenly abode and ongoing communion with himself. And he’s already poured out from there the grace of the Holy Spirit, and he’s freed us from possession by the devil, rescued us from demons, destroyed sin, obliterated the curse, closed up the gates of Hades, and opened paradise. He did this by sending neither an angel, nor an archangel, but his very Only-begotten on behalf of our salvation, as he says through the prophet, *‘Neither an ambassador nor an angel, but the Lord himself has saved us’* (Isa 63:9).⁵⁴ Are these things not more splendid than crowns: That we were sanctified? That we were justified? That it was through faith? That the Only-begotten son of God came down

ἐνεδυναμώθη τῇ πίστει (Rom 4:19–20) and then Paul’s inference from Abraham’s example to believers who have faith: Οὐκ ἐγράφη δὲ δι’ αὐτὸν μόνον ... ἀλλὰ καὶ δι’ ἡμᾶς οἷς μέλλει λογίζεσθαι, τοῖς πιστεύουσιν (4:23–24).

54. Plus ὁ before κύριος; John has substituted ἡμᾶς for αὐτούς to incorporate the verse into his argument.

ὕπερ ἡμῶν; ὅτι τοῦ Πατρὸς τὸν ἀγαπητὸν αὐτοῦ δεδωκότος δι' ἡμᾶς; ὅτι Πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐδεξάμεθα; ὅτι μετ' εὐκολίας ἀπάσης; ὅτι χάριτος ἀφάτου καὶ δωρεᾶς ἀπελαύσαμεν; Ταῦτα τοίνυν εἰπὼν, καὶ διὰ μικρῶν [161] ῥημάτων ἅπαντα δηλώσας, πάλιν εἰς τὴν ἐλπίδα τὸν λόγον κατέλυσεν. Εἰπὼν γάρ, Δικαιωθέντες οὖν ἐκ πίστεως, εἰρήνην ἔχομεν πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν διὰ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι' οὗ καὶ τὴν προσαγωγὴν ἐσχήκαμεν τῇ πίστει εἰς τὴν χάριν ταύτην, ἐν ᾗ ἐστήκαμεν, ἐπήγαγε. Καὶ καυχώμεθα ἐπὶ τῇ ἐλπίδι τῆς δόξης τοῦ Θεοῦ. Ἐπεὶ οὖν εἶπε τὰ μὲν γεγενημένα, τὰ δὲ μέλλοντα· τὸ μὲν γὰρ δικαιοῦσθαι, καὶ τὸ τὸν Υἱὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν σφαγῆναι, καὶ τὸ δι' αὐτοῦ τῷ Πατρὶ προσαχθῆναι, καὶ τὸ χάριτος ἀπολαῦσαι, καὶ δωρεᾶς, καὶ τὸ ἀμαρτημάτων ἀπαλλαγῆναι, καὶ τὸ εἰρήνην ἔχειν πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, καὶ τὸ ἀγίου Πνεύματος μετασχεῖν, ταῦτα γεγενημένων ἐστί· τὰ δὲ μέλλοντα ἦν, ἡ δόξα ἐκείνη ἢ ἀπόρρητος· ὃ καὶ αὐτὸ ἐπήγαγε, λέγων· Ἐν ᾗ ἐστήκαμεν, καὶ καυχώμεθα ἐπὶ ἐλπίδι τῆς δόξης τοῦ Θεοῦ· ἡ δὲ ἐλπίς, ὥσπερ ἔφθην εἰπὼν, οὐ σφόδρα ἱκανὴ τὸν μικρόψυχον ὀρθῶσαι καὶ ἀναστῆσαι ἀκροατὴν· ὅρα τί ποιεῖ πάλιν, καὶ θέασαι τὴν εὐτονίαν Παύλου, καὶ τὴν φιλόσοφον γνώμην. Ἀπὸ γὰρ αὐτῶν τῶν δοκούντων λυπεῖν καὶ θορυβεῖν καὶ ταραττεῖν τὸν ἀκροατὴν, ἀπ' αὐτῶν τούτων ἀναπλέκει τῆς παρακλήσεως καὶ τοῦ καυχήματος τοὺς στεφάνους. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ταῦτα πάντα κατέλεξε, λοιπὸν ἐπάγει λέγων· Οὐ μόνον ταῦτα λέγω, ἅπερ εἶπον, φησὶν, οἷον τὸ, ὅτι ἡγιασθημεν, ὅτι ἐδικαιώθημεν, ὅτι διὰ τοῦ Μονογενοῦς, ὅτι χάριτος ἀπηλαύσαμεν, ὅτι εἰρήνης, ὅτι δωρεᾶς, ὅτι ἀμαρτημάτων ἀφέσεως, ὅτι Πνεύματος ἀγίου κοινωνίας, ὅτι μετ' εὐκολίας ἀπάσης, ὅτι καὶ χωρὶς μόθων, καὶ χωρὶς ἰδρώτων, ὅτι πίστει μόνῃ, ὅτι τὸν Υἱὸν ἔπεμψε τὸν μονογενῆ, ὅτι τὸ μὲν ἔδωκε, τὸ δὲ ἐπηγγείλατο, δόξαν ἄρρητον, ἀφθαρσίαν, σωμάτων ἀνάστασιν, λῆξιν ἀγγελικὴν, τὴν μετὰ Χριστοῦ διαγωγὴν, τὴν ἐν οὐρανοῖς διατριβήν· ταῦτα γὰρ ἅπαντα παρέστησεν ἐν τῷ εἰπεῖν, Καὶ καυχώμεθα ἐπ' ἐλπίδι τῆς δόξης τοῦ Θεοῦ.

Οὐ τοίνυν ταῦτα λέγει μόνον τὰ γενόμενα καὶ τὰ ἐσόμενα, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὰ τὰ δοκούντα εἶναι ἐν ἀνθρώποις λυπηρὰ, τὰ δικαστήρια λέγω, τὰς

55. διὰ μικρῶν ῥημάτων. In the previously marked, long quotation, by personification John has expanded on Paul's brachylogia ("rhetorical shorthand"). On the phenomenon in Pauline writings and their interpretation, see Margaret M. Mitchell, *Paul and the Emergence of Christian Textuality: Early Christian Literary Culture in Context*, WUNT 393 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017), 111–32.

56. Plus τῇ before ἐλπίδι.

57. See above, §3 (PG 51:160).

58. John has replicated part of 1 Cor 6:11 in these two verbs.

59. I.e., for the future.

from heaven on our behalf? That the Father has given his beloved son for our sakes? That we received the Holy Spirit? That it all came about with such ease? That we've enjoyed an indescribable grace and gift?" Now Paul, having made all this clear in a few words,⁵⁵ [161] completed his argument by returning again to hope. First, he said, "*So then, having been justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom we also have attained access through faith to this grace in which we stand*" (Rom 5:1–2a). Then he went on to say, "*And we boast in the hope of the glory of God*" (Rom 5:2b).⁵⁶ Hence he spoke about things past, then about those in the future. For all these things took place in the past: our being justified, the Son being slain on our behalf, our having access to the Father through him, our enjoying the grace and gift, being freed from sins, having peace with God, sharing in the Holy Spirit. But there were still future events—namely, that glory that defies description. This is the exact thing he goes on to speak of next, when he says, "*in which we stand, and we boast in the hope of the glory of God*" (Rom 5:2). But, as I said before,⁵⁷ hope wasn't fully sufficient to provide a remedy for the fainthearted or to rouse the hearer. Look at what he does again; behold Paul's perseverance and wise intention. For from the very things that are considered to cause grief, tumult, and upset for the hearer, he weaves together crowns of consolation and boasting. Because, when he had listed all these things, he goes on finally to make the point: "Not only am I mentioning the things that I spoke of before," Paul says, "such as that we were sanctified, that we were justified,⁵⁸ that it came about through the Only-begotten, that we have enjoyed grace, peace, a free gift, forgiveness of sins and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit, that it all came about with such ease and without labors, without strenuous exertion, but that it came about by faith alone, and that God sent his Only-begotten son. God has already given all these things. But there are also other things he has promised⁵⁹—indescribable glory, incorruption, bodily resurrection, an angelic state, a life with Christ, an abode in heaven."⁶⁰ All these things are what Paul was referring to when he said, "*And we boast in the hope of the glory of God*" (Rom 5:2).

So then, not only does he speak of things in the past and those in the future, but it's even the very things people consider to be grievous—I

60. John is again exegeting by periphrastic paraphrase, i.e., putting longer words in Paul's mouth for what he meant by the terse phrasing he used in Rom 5:2. John argues that ἐπ' ἐλπίδι τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ is a shorthand that refers to all the eschatological rewards he catalogues here.

ἀπαγωγὰς, τοὺς θανάτους, τὰς ἀπειλὰς, τοὺς λιμούς, τὰς βασάνους, τὰ τήγανα, τὰς καμίνους, τὴν λεηλασίαν, τοὺς πολέμους, τὰς πολιορκίας. τὰς μάχας, τὰς στάσεις, τὰς φιλονεικίας, καὶ ταῦτα τίθησιν ἐν τάξει δωρεᾶς καὶ κατορθωμάτων. Οὐ γὰρ ἐπ' ἐκείνοις μόνοις τοῖς εἰρημένοις χαίρειν δεῖ καὶ γεγηθέναι, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τούτοις καυχᾶσθαι χρή, ὥς ὅταν λέγῃ· Νῦν χαίρω ἐν τοῖς παθήμασί μου ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, καὶ ἀνταναπληρῶ τὰ ὑστερήματα τῶν θλίψεων τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου. Εἶδες ψυχὴν εὐτονον, καὶ γνώμην ὑψηλὴν, καὶ φρόνημα ἀπερίτρεπτον, οὐκ ἐπὶ τοῖς στεφάνοις καλλωπιζόμενον μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀγωνίσμασιν ἐνηδυνόμενον; οὐκ ἐπὶ ταῖς ἀμοιβαῖς χαίροντα, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς παλαίσμασιν ἐναβρυνόμενον; οὐκ ἐπὶ ταῖς ἀντιδόσεσιν εὐφραινόμενον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ παγκρατίῳ καυχώμενον; Μὴ γάρ μοι λέγε τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν, μηδὲ τοὺς στεφάνους ἐκείνους τοὺς ἀκηράτους, μηδὲ τὰ βραβεῖα, ἀλλ' αὐτὰ τὰ παρόντα, τὰ θλίψιν ἔχοντα καὶ μόχθον καὶ τλαιπωρίαν πολλήν· ταῦτα εἰς μέσον ἄγε, καὶ δυνήσομαι δεῖξαι, ὅτι ἐπὶ τούτοις καυχᾶσθαι δεῖ μᾶλλον μειζρόνως. Ἐπὶ μὲν γὰρ τῶν ἔξωθεν ἀγώνων τὰ μὲν πα-[162]λαίσματα τὸν πόνον ἔχει, ὁ δὲ στέφανος τὴν ἡδονήν· ἐνταῦθα δὲ οὐχ οὕτως, ἀλλὰ καὶ πρὸ τῶν στεφάνων αὐτὰ τὰ παλαίσματα πολὺ φέρει τὸ καύχημα. Καὶ ἵνα μάθητε ὅτι ταῦτα τοῦτον ἔχει τὸν τρόπον, ἀναλογίσασθε ἕκαστον τῶν ἀγίων τῶν ἐφ' ἐκάστης γενεᾶς, ὡς φησιν· Ὑπόδειγμα λάβετε, ἀδελφοί, τῆς κακοπαθείας καὶ τῆς ὑπομονῆς, τοὺς προφήτας, οἱ ἐλάλησαν τὸν λόγον ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου. Ἀλλὰ γὰρ καὶ οὗτος ὁ νῦν ἡμῖν τὸν ἀγῶνα τοῦτον προτείνει· καὶ τὸ παρὸν πνευματικὸν θέατρον συγκροτήσας, Παῦλον λέγω, μετὰ τὸ τὰς μυρίας αὐτὸν ἐκείνας ἐκάστου τῶν ἀγίων καταλέξει τλαιπωρίας, ἃς μηδὲ ῥάδιον νῦν κατὰ λόγον διεξιέναι, ἐπάγει λέγων· Περιήλθον ἐν μηλωταῖς, ἐν αἰγείοις δέρμασιν, ὑστερούμενοι, θλιβόμενοι, κακουχούμενοι, ὧν οὐκ ἦν ἄξιος ὁ κόσμος, καὶ ἐπὶ τούτοις

61. Plus μου after παθήμασι.

62. These three rhetorical questions all employ allusions to sporting contests (ἀγῶνες): running (with 1 Cor 9:26), wrestling (παλαίσματα, “wrestling bouts”), and now παγκράτιον, the competition for an “all-powerful” champion in a fight involving wrestling, boxing, and few rules (cf. 1 Cor 9:27).

63. In quotation marks, as a resumption of John's earlier προσωποποιία of Paul (now as an exegesis of Col 1:24). Yet it is often difficult to know when John is speaking for himself or for Paul. In oral performance, there would have been further clues to this (voice tone, gestures) that are not available to us on the basis solely of the written text of the homily.

64. ἔξωθεν, “outside,” part of the lexicon for trying to differentiate the Christian teachings, practices, etc. (as ἔσωθεν or ἡμέτερα) from pagan ones (PGL B.2., “profane, pagan”). More neutrally we would say traditional forms of athletic competition, in which Christians also were engaged (despite John's evident disapproval).

mean trials, being led away for sentencing, various forms of death, threats, famine, torture, roasting racks, furnaces, plundering, wars, sieges, battles, divisions, rivalries—that Paul places in the category of gifts and successes. For one shouldn’t only rejoice and delight in such things, but should even make them an object of boasting, as when Paul says, “*Now I rejoice in my sufferings on your behalf, and I fill up what is lacking in the afflictions of Christ in my flesh*” (Col 1:24).⁶¹ Have you seen that vigorous soul, lofty purpose, and immovable spirit that doesn’t only flaunt the crowns of victory but even finds pleasure in the contest? A man who doesn’t rejoice in the rewards but even takes pride in the bouts? One who doesn’t delight in the recompense but even boasts in the very competition to be the “fighting champ”?⁶² “Don’t mention to me the kingdom of heaven, nor those undefiled crowns, nor the prizes, but instead the very things of the present that entail affliction, labor, and great misery. Bring those things forward, and I’ll be able to show that it’s necessary to boast in them all the more!”⁶³ After all, in the pagan⁶⁴ athletic contests, [162] the bouts on the mat entail hard work, but the crown of victory pleasure. However, with us it’s not like that, but even before the crowns, the bouts themselves are an occasion for much boasting. To learn that this is the way with our contests, consider each of the saints in each generation, as he⁶⁵ says, “*Receive as an example of suffering and endurance, my brothers and sisters, the prophets who spoke the word in the name of the Lord*” (Jas 5:10).⁶⁶ But indeed, this man, who has now put this contest before us and has applauded⁶⁷ the present public spectacle⁶⁸ of spiritual warfare—I mean Paul—after he had listed the countless miseries of each of the saints (which it would be too hard for me to go through word for word right now), goes on to say, “*they went about in sheepskin, in goat skin, deprived, afflicted, maltreated, those of whom the world was not worthy*” (Heb 11:37–38),⁶⁹ even rejoicing in all

65. I.e., James, the author of the epistle, or, possibly, “it,” of “Scripture.”

66. Minus μου after ἀδελφοί; with ὑπομονῆς for μακροθυμίας (but not in Paris. gr. 660); plus τὸν λόγον before ἐν ὀνόματι κυρίου; minus τῷ before ὀνόματι.

67. συγκροτεῖν translated with PGL 1.b (“striking” the hands together); metaphorically from this sense the verb can also mean “approve, support the cause of.”

68. Cf. 1 Cor 4:9.

69. Mf notes that Paris. gr. 660 rewords the passage, including rearranged parts of Heb 11:37 and 38, as follows: δέρμασιν ἐν ἐρημίαις πλανώμενοι, καὶ ὄρεσι, καὶ σπηλαίοις, καὶ ταῖς ὁπαῖς τῆς γῆς, διωκόμενοι, ὑστερούμενοι ὧν οὐκ ἔν.

παῖσιν ἀγαλλόμενοι. Τοῦτο δὲ αὐτὸ ἴδοι τις ἂν, ὅτε μετὰ τὴν φυλακὴν καὶ τὰς λοιδορίας μαστιχθέντες ἀπηλαύνοντο, τί φησιν; Οἱ μὲν οὖν ἐπορεύοντο χαίροντες ἀπὸ προσώπου τοῦ συνεδρίου, ὅτι κατηξιώθησαν ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἀτιμασθῆναι.

δ'. Ἀλλὰ γὰρ καὶ ἐπὶ ἡμῶν ταῦτα γέγονε· καὶ εἰ βούλοίτο τις, ἐνθυμηθῆτω ὁ λέγων, ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τῶν διωγμῶν οἷα συνέβαινεν. Εἰσῆει παρθένος ἀπαλὴ καὶ ἀπειρόγαμος, κηροῦ μαλακώτερον ἔχουσα σῶμα· εἴτα τῷ ξύλῳ προσηλωθεῖσα πάντοθεν, διωρύττετο τὰς πλευρὰς καταξεομένη, καὶ κατερρεῖτο τῷ αἵματι, καὶ καθάπερ νυμφευομένη μᾶλλον καὶ ἐν παστάδι καθημένη, οὕτω μετ' εὐνοίας ἔφερε τὰ γινόμενα διὰ τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν, ἐν αὐτοῖς τοῖς ἀγῶσι στεφανουμένη. Ἐννόησον ἡλίκον ἦν ἰδεῖν τύραννον μετὰ στρατοπέδων καὶ ξιφῶν ἡκονημένων καὶ ὅπλων τοσούτων ἀπὸ μιᾶς κόρης νικώμενον. Ὁρᾷς ὅτι καὶ αὕτῃ ἡ θλίψις καύχησιν ἔχει μεγίστην; Καὶ μαρτυρεῖτε τοῖς λεγομένοις ὑμεῖς. Οὐπὼ γὰρ τῶν μαρτύρων ἀπολαβόντων τὰς ἀμοιβὰς, οὐδὲ τὰ βραβεῖα καὶ τοὺς στεφάνους, ἀλλ' εἰς κόνιν διαλυθέντων καὶ τέφραν, μετὰ πάσης προθυμίας συντρέχοντες εἰς τὰς ἐκείνων τιμὰς, καὶ θέατρον συγκροτοῦμεν πνευματικὸν, καὶ ἀνακηρύττομεν τούτους, καὶ στεφανοῦμεν αὐτοὺς διὰ τε τὰ τραύματα καὶ τὸ αἷμα, διὰ τὰς βασάνους καὶ τὰς πληγὰς, διὰ τὰς θλίψεις ἐκείνας καὶ τὰς στενοχωρίας· οὕτω καὶ αὐταὶ αἱ θλίψεις καύχημα ἔχουσι καὶ πρὸ τῆς ἀμοιβῆς. Ἐννόησον ἡλίκος ἦν ὁ Παῦλος τότε

70. With transposition of ὑπὲρ clause and κατηξιώθησαν; τοῦ Χριστοῦ for τοῦ Ἰησοῦ after ὀνόματος. Chrysostom's reading, with 1505, should be added to NA²⁸. He cites the text in this form in at least another nine instances; in four others, he has αὐτοῦ (with 945. 1175, which RP *app. crit.* cites as an alternate Byz reading).

71. Chrysostom makes a transition from the problem faced by Paul in Romans to his own context (broadly speaking).

72. This appeal to a virgin martyr is very similar to that in John's late work, *Ant. exsil.*: Εἰσῆλθε πολλάκις κόρη ἀπαλὴ ἀπειρόγαμος· κηροῦ ἦν ἀπαλωτέρα, καὶ πέτρας ἐγένετο στερεωτέρα. Τὰς πλευρὰς αὐτῆς ἔξεες, καὶ τὴν πίστιν αὐτῆς οὐκ ἔλαβες (§2 [PG 52:429]) ("Often a tender young woman with no experience of marriage entered. She was softer than wax, and yet she was harder than a rock. You carved out her sides, but you did not take away her faith"). In that instance, the "tyrant" who is defeated by her (and is addressed here by Chrysostom) is the devil.

73. Reading εὐκολίας with Mf's two manuscripts (as twice above, §3 [PG 51:160–61]), against εὐνοίας ("with goodwill"), the reading of all the editions (HS ME Mf PE PG).

74. καύχησιν ἔχει μεγίστην. In English we don't say one "holds" or "has" a boast, but the sense in the Greek is of possession; hence I use the English idiom "be entitled to" (as in, "hold the title to"). John is here restating the Pauline statement of Rom 5:3.

75. μαρτυρεῖτε could be either indicative or imperative. John is enlisting his

those things. One can observe this very thing when, after imprisonment and reproaches, after being scourged and driven out, what does Scripture say? *“Then they went out from the presence of the Sanhedrin, rejoicing because they had been found worthy of being dishonored on behalf of the name of Christ”* (Acts 5:41).⁷⁰

4. But in fact, this is the case in our time, as well.⁷¹ And if any wish, let them take to heart what I say about the things that have occurred at the very moment of persecution. A tender virgin with no experience of marriage, having a body softer than wax, entered, and then she was nailed to the wood hand and foot, her sides were torn into and carved out, and she streamed with blood.⁷² For the sake of the kingdom of heaven, she bore these events with such great ease,⁷³ as if she were on her wedding day and sitting in her bridal chamber, crowned in the very midst of her contests. Consider what a tremendous thing it is to see a tyrant with his armies, sharpened swords, and heaps of armaments defeated by a single young woman! Do you see that it’s the affliction itself that’s entitled to⁷⁴ the greatest boast? You, too, bear witness⁷⁵ to what I am saying. For although the martyrs haven’t yet received their rewards, nor their prizes and crowns,⁷⁶ but have been dissolved into dust and ashes, still we eagerly rush to honor them, and we applaud the public spectacle of spiritual warfare, and we acclaim these martyrs and crown them because of their wounds and blood, because of the tortures and the blows, because of those afflictions and adversities. Thus, the afflictions themselves are entitled to a boast

auditors (now all of them in the plural, in contrast to the singular in the previous sentence) on behalf of his proof.

76. Elsewhere Chrysostom depicts martyrs as having received crowns and rewards immediately upon death, as, e.g., in *Ign.* §5 (PG 50:594): ἐπειδὴ τοίνυν κατέλυσεν ἐκεῖ τὴν ζωὴν, μᾶλλον δὲ ἐπειδὴ πρὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνέβη, ἐπανήει στεφανίτης λοιπόν (“So when he lost his life here, or, rather, when he ascended to heaven, he rose up at last, wearing a crown”); and *Mart.* §2 (PG 50:710): μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἐντεῦθεν ἀπαλλαγὴν εἰς οὐρανὸς ἀναβαίνουσιν, ἀγγέλων αὐτοῖς προηγουμένων, καὶ ἀρχαγγέλων δορυφορούντων (“for after their departure from here they ascend up into heaven, with angels preceding them and archangels as their escorts”). In the present homily, in line with his particular exhortatory intentions, he emphasizes the eschatological time gap between the martyrs’ dusty relics on earth and the final resurrection to come. The unresolved tensions and logical contradictions in ancient Christian eschatology (found already in the Pauline letters, where the future of the eschaton is stressed, e.g., in 1 Thess 4:13–5:11 and 1 Cor 15, while elsewhere, as in Phil 1:21–23, the immediacy of “being with Christ” right after death is emphasized) are used to respond strategically to different kinds of theological and pastoral issues.

τὰ δεσμωτήρια οἰκῶν, καὶ εἰς δικαστήρια ἐπαγόμενος, πῶς περίβλεπτος, πῶς λαμπρὸς, καὶ περιφανὴς παρὰ πᾶσιν ἐφαίνετο, μάλιστα δὲ παρ' ὧν ἐπολεμεῖτο, καὶ ἐπεβουλεύετο. Καὶ τί λέγω, ἀνθρώποις περίβλεπτος, ὅπου γε καὶ τοῖς δαίμοσι τότε μᾶλλον ἦν φοβερός, ὅτε ἐμαστίζετο; "Ὅτε δὲ ἐδεσμεῖτο, ὅτε ἐναυάγει, τότε τὰ μέγιστα εἰργάζετο σημεῖα, τότε μειζόνως περιεγένετο τῶν ἀντικειμένων δυνάμεων. Εἰδὼς οὖν καλῶς τὸ ἀπὸ τῶν θλίψεων τούτων προσγινόμενον τῇ ψυχῇ κέρδος, ἔλεγεν· "Ὅταν ἀσθενῶ, τότε δυνατὸς εἰμὶ· εἴτα ἐπάγει· Διὸ εὐδοκῶ ἐν ἀσθενείαις, ἐν ὕβρεσιν, ἐν ἀνάγκαις, ἐν διωγμοῖς, [163] ἐν παθήμασιν, ἵνα ἐπισκηνώσῃ ἐπ' ἐμέ ἡ δύναμις τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ πρὸς τινὰς ἐν Κορίνθῳ διατρίβοντας, καὶ πρὸς τούτους ἀποτεινόμενος μεγαλοφρονοῦντας ἐφ' ἑαυτοῖς, τῶν δὲ λοιπῶν καταψηφιζομένους, τὸν χαρακτῆρα τῆς Ἐπιστολῆς ἀπογράφων, ἀνάγκην ἔσχεν ἐντεῦθεν τῶν καθ' ἑαυτὸν κατορθωμάτων συνθεῖναι ἡμῖν τὴν εἰκόνα, καὶ τοῦτο οὐκ ἀπὸ τῶν σημείων, οὐκ ἀπὸ τῶν θαυμάτων, οὐκ ἀπὸ τῆς τιμῆς, οὐκ ἀπὸ τῆς ἀνέσεως, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τῶν δεσμωτηρίων, καὶ τῶν δικαστηρίων, καὶ τοῦ λιμοῦ, καὶ τοῦ ψύχους, καὶ τῶν πολέμων, καὶ τῶν ἐπιβουλῶν, οὕτω λέγων αὐτοῖς· Διάκονοι Χριστοῦ εἰσὶ· παραφρονῶν λαλῶ, ὑπὲρ ἐγώ· καὶ δεικνὺς τὸ, Ὑπὲρ, καὶ τὴν ὑπεροχὴν, φησὶν· Ἐν κόποις περισσοτέρως, ἐν πληγαῖς ὑπερβαλλόντως, ἐν φυλακαῖς περισσοτέρως, ἐν θανάτοις πολλάκις, καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς· Εἰ καυχᾶσθαι δεῖ, τὰ τῆς ἀσθενείας μου καυχῆσθαι.

Ὅρᾷς αὐτὸν ἐν τούτοις μᾶλλον μειζόνως καυχώμενον, ἢ ἐπὶ λαμπροῖς στεφάνοις ἐγκαλλωπιζόμενον, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο λέγοντα· Οὐ μόνον δὲ, ἀλλὰ καὶ καυχώμεθα ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσι; Τί δέ ἐστι τὸ, Οὐ μόνον; Οὐ μόνον, φησὶν, οὐκ

77. Literally to "trials"; seeking to capture the wordplay between δεσμωτήρια and δικαστήρια.

78. Cf. Acts 19:11–12, as often mentioned by Chrysostom (for references, see *HT* 531).

79. Despite drawing attention to the temporal succession in Paul's statements (sc. ἐπάγει), Chrysostom has in fact disordered and recombined 2 Cor 12:9–10 (10b, 10a, 9b). On textual readings, verse 12:10b: minus γάρ before ἀσθενῶ; verse 12:10a: ἐν παθήμασιν (cf. 2 Cor 1:5) for καὶ στενοχωρίαις.

80. This is one way that John excuses Paul's "boasting" in 2 Cor 10–13, i.e., that he was "compelled" to engage in self-praise (cf. 2 Cor 12:11: ὑμεῖς με ἠναγκάσατε), an argument developed at length in *Laud. Paul.* 5 below in this volume (discussion in Mitchell, "A Patristic Perspective on Pauline περιαιτολογία").

81. Reading τὸν χαρακτῆρα τῆς ἐπιστολῆς ἀπογράφων with the manuscripts, rather than Mf's suspected reading, ἀποστολῆς (made not in the text itself, but in the *Praefatio* at 3:x: "ibi ego pro ἐπιστολῆς legendum omnino suspicor ἀποστολῆς, apostolatūs").

even before the reward. Consider how great Paul was back when he was living in jails and being dragged before judges,⁷⁷ how admired, how splendid, how illustrious he appeared to all, and especially to those by whom he was attacked and plotted against. And why do I say admired among *people*, when back then he was feared especially by the demons when he was being scourged?⁷⁸ And the times when he was bound or shipwrecked were when he used to perform the greatest signs, when he prevailed over opposing powers all the more. Thus, because he knew well the gain the soul receives from these afflictions, he said, “*When I am weak, then I am strong*,” and then adds, “*Therefore I take delight in weakness, in abuse, in constraint, in persecutions, [163] in sufferings, so that the power of Christ might take up residence with me*” (2 Cor 12:9–10).⁷⁹ For this reason, alluding both to people who lived in Corinth and to those who boast in themselves, and issuing a condemnation of others, he was compelled⁸⁰ to compose a portrait of his own accomplishments for us, committing it to writing in the form of a letter.⁸¹ And he composed that portrait not from signs or marvels, nor from honor or leisure, but from jail and judges, famine and cold, and attacks and plots,⁸² speaking to them in this way: “*Are they envoys of Christ? Speaking like a madman, all the more am I!*” (2 Cor 11:23a). And to show the “*all the more*” and his superiority he says, “*In labors exceedingly, in blows abundantly, in imprisonments exceedingly, at death’s door often*, etc. (2 Cor 11:23). *If it is necessary to boast, I shall boast in things pertaining to my weakness*” (2 Cor 11:30).

You see him boasting all the more in these things rather than priding himself on splendid crowns. It’s for that reason he says, “*And not only that, but we even boast in afflictions*” (Rom 5:3).⁸³ But what does “*not only*” mean? “Not only do we not grow tired of being afflicted⁸⁴ and thrown into

For Chrysostom’s sense of the letters as inscribing a portrait of Paul’s soul, see, e.g., *Hom. 2 Cor. 11:1* §2 (PG 51:303): “Ἐχομεν μετὰ τῶν κατορθωμάτων τούτων καὶ τὰς ἐπιστολάς ἐκείνου τὰς ἀγίας, αἱ τὸν χαρακτῆρα τῆς μακαρίας ἐκείνης ψυχῆς ἀκριβῶς ἡμῖν ὑπογράφουσιν (“we have, along with these good deeds, also Paul’s holy epistles, which sketch the image of that blessed soul accurately for us”). See also further discussion and references in HT 43–64.

82. John is identifying the “*peristasis catalogue*” of 2 Cor 11:23–33, On the form and its significance, see John T. Fitzgerald, *Cracks in an Earthen Vessel: An Examination of the Catalogues of Hardships in the Corinthian Correspondence*, SBLDS 99 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988).

83. John returns to the focal text of his homily.

84. Cf. Eph 3:13.

ἐκκακοῦμεν θλιβόμενοι καὶ ταλαιπωροῦντες, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐπὶ μείζονι προκόπτοντες τιμῇ καὶ δόξῃ, καυχώμεθα μᾶλλον ἐπὶ τοῖς συμβαίνουσι θλιβεροῖς. Εἴτα, ἐπειδὴ δόξαν ἔφησεν εἶναι μεγίστην καὶ καύχημα ἀπὸ τῶν θλίψεων καὶ καλλωπισμόν· ἡ δὲ δόξα εὐδηλον ὅτι καὶ ἡδονὴν ἔχει· ὅπου γὰρ ἡδονή, πάντως ὅτι καὶ δόξα, ὅπου δὲ δόξα τοιαύτη, πάντως καὶ ἡδονή· ἐπειδὴ τοίνυν ἔδειξε λαμπρὸν καὶ περιφανὲς τὸ θλίβεσθαι καὶ ποιοῦν καλλωπίζεσθαι, λέγει ἕτερον αὐτοῦ κατόρθωμα μέγιστον, καὶ καρπὸν μέγιστόν τινα καὶ παράδοξον. Τίς δὲ οὗτος ἐστίν, ἰδωμεν. Εἰδότες οὖν, φησὶν, ὅτι ἡ θλίψις ὑπομονὴν κατεργάζεται, ἡ δὲ ὑπομονὴ δοκιμὴν, ἡ δὲ δοκιμὴ ἐλπίδα, ἡ δὲ ἐλπίς οὐ καταισχύνει. Τί ἐστίν· Εἰδότες ὅτι ἡ θλίψις ὑπομονὴν κατεργάζεται; Τοῦτο μέγιστον ἔχει τὸν καρπὸν, ἰσχυρότερον ποιεῖ τὸν θλιβόμενον τοῦτο. Καθάπερ γὰρ τῶν δένδρων τὰ μὲν σκιατροφούμενα καὶ ἐν ἀπηνέμοις ἐστηκότα χωρίοις, εὐθαλοῦντα τῇ ιδέᾳ, μαλακώτερα γίνεται καὶ χαῦνα, πάσῃ ἀνέμων προσβολῇ ταχέως βλαπτόμενα· τὰ δὲ ἐν κορυφαῖς ὀρέων ὑψηλοτέροις ἐστώτα, καὶ πολλοῖς καὶ μεγάλοις ῥιπιζόμενα τοῖς ἀνέμοις, καὶ ἀνωμαλίαν ἀέρων συνεχῇ φέροντα, καὶ χαλεπωτάτῃ ζάλῃ κλονούμενα, καὶ χιόνι πολλῇ βαλλόμενα, σιδήρου παντὸς ἰσχυρότερα μᾶλλον καθέστηκε· καὶ σώματα δὲ ὁμοίως τὰ πολλαῖς καὶ ποικίλαις ἡδοναῖς συστρεφόμενα, καὶ μαλακοῖς ἱματίοις κοσμούμενα, καὶ συνεχέσι λουτροῖς καὶ μύροις κεκρημένα, καὶ πολυειδέσι τροφαῖς ὑπὲρ [164] τὴν χρεῖαν τρυφῶντα, παντάπασιν ἄχρηστα πρὸς τοὺς ὑπὲρ τῆς εὐσεβείας ἰδρώτας καὶ πόνους καθίστανται, κολάσεως ὄντα μεγίστης ὑπεύθυνα· οὕτω δὴ καὶ ψυχαί, αἱ μὲν τὸν ἀταλαιπωρον βίον μετιοῦσαι, καὶ ἀνέσεως γέμουσαι, καὶ τὸ ἡδέως διακεῖσθαι πρὸς τὰ παρόντα, καὶ τὸν ἀνάληγον τοῦ διὰ τὴν βασιλείαν θλίβεσθαι κατὰ τοὺς ἀγίους ἅπαντας προτιμῶσαι βίον, κηροῦ παντὸς μαλακώτεροι μᾶλλον καὶ ἀσθενέστεροι καθιστάμεναι, αἰωνίου πυρὸς κατὰβρωμα πρόκεινται· αἱ δὲ κινδύνους καὶ πόνους καὶ ταλαιπωρίαις τῆς διὰ τὸν Θεὸν θλίψεως ἐπιδεδομένοι, καὶ ἐν αὐταῖς συστρεφόμεναι, αὐτοῦ τοῦ σιδήρου ἢ τοῦ ἀδάμαντος στερρότεροι καὶ γενναιότεροι μᾶλλον εἰσιν ἐκ τοῦ συνεχῶς πάσχειν κακῶς, τοῖς ἐπιούσιν ἀχείρωτοι καθιστάμεναι, καὶ ἔξιν τινα προσλαβοῦσαι ὑπομονῆς καὶ ἀνδρείας ἀκαταμάχητον.

Καὶ καθάπερ οἱ μὲν πρῶτον νηὸς ἐπιβάντες ναυτιῶσί τε καὶ ἱλιγγιῶσι, ταραττόμενοι καὶ θορυβοῦμενοι ἀηδία καὶ σκοτοδινία κατεχόμενοι· οἱ δὲ

85. John frequently employs the pun on τροφή and τρυφή (τρυφᾶν): nourishment versus luxury. In general, on Chrysostom's view of wealth, see Mitchell, "Silver Chamber Pots and Other Goods Which Are Not Good."

86. Literally κατὰβρωμα, "food," which plays on their own gluttony, as described above (a kind of *contrapasso*).

87. John returns to one of his opening examples, of sea voyagers (§1 [PG 51:155]), to conclude this homily.

misery,” he says, “but we boast all the more in the afflictions that occur, since by them we’re advancing in honor and glory.” Furthermore, because he said that boasting and priding oneself in afflictions is the greatest glory, it’s clear that this glory also has its pleasure. For where there’s pleasure, surely there’s also glory, and where there’s such glory, surely there’s also pleasure. Then, since he’d shown what a splendid and notable act it is to be afflicted and to pride oneself in doing it, he mentions another of its greatest accomplishments, even its greatest and most extraordinary fruit. Let’s look at what this is. “*Because we know*” he then says, “*that affliction brings about endurance, and endurance a test of character, and a test of character hope, and hope is not put to shame*” (Rom 5:3b–5a). What does “*Because we know that affliction brings about endurance*” mean? This result is the greatest fruit, because it makes one who’s afflicted all the stronger. As we know, trees that are grown in the shade and have their habitat in windless areas, though they appear to be thriving, actually are weaker and less solid, quickly harmed by any onslaught of winds. But the trees that stand on the highest mountain summits and are blown about repeatedly by strong winds and continually endure vagaries in the weather, buffeted by the harshest rain storms and pelted by thick snow, instead become stronger than iron. It’s the same with bodies. The ones that are nurtured with all kinds of abundant pleasures, adorned with soft clothing, having many frequent baths, and living in luxury on a diet of diverse foods⁸⁵ well in excess [164] of what they need, become completely useless in the face of the strenuous exertions and labors that piety requires, and are subject to the worst punishment. And it’s the same with souls. The ones that pursue the lazy life, filled with leisure, pleasantly situated in the present and preferring a pain-free life to being afflicted on behalf of the kingdom as all the saints were, become softer and weaker than any kind of wax and are set to be fuel⁸⁶ for the eternal fire. But souls that devote themselves to the dangers, labors, and miseries that come with affliction on behalf of God and are hardened by them, are instead stronger than iron itself, or steel, and more noble as a result of their continual terrible suffering. They are impervious to what may come, since they’ve attained both a state of endurance and incontestable bravery.

Those who go on board a ship⁸⁷ at first get seasick and dizzy, upset and troubled by nausea and overcome by vertigo. But⁸⁸ after they’ve crossed the

88. The μέν ... δέ contrast here must be temporal, in reference to the same people, before and after.

πολλὰ καὶ μακρὰ διαβάντες πελάγη, καὶ μυρίων κυμάτων κατατολμήσαντες, καὶ ναυαγίων συνεχῶν ἀνασχομένοι, μετὰ τοῦ θαρρεῖν ἄπτονται τῆς τοιαύτης ἀποδημίας· οὕτω δὴ καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ πολλοὺς ὑπομείνασα πειρασμοὺς, καὶ μεγάλας θλίψεις ἀνασχομένη, ἐν μελέτῃ λοιπὸν πόνων καὶ ἔξει καρτερίας καθίσταται, οὐχ ὑπάρχουσα ψοφοδεής, οὐδὲ εὐπτότητος, οὐδὲ ταραττομένη τοῖς προσπίπτουσι λυπηροῖς, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τῆς συνεχοῦς γυμνασίας τῶν συμβαινόντων, καὶ τῆς πυκνῆς μελέτης τῶν γινομένων, μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς εὐκολίας ἅπαντα φέρουσα τὰ ἐπιόντα δεινά. Τοῦτο τοίνυν ὁ σοφὸς ἀρχιτέκτων τῆς οὐρανίου πολιτείας δηλῶν, ἔλεγεν· Οὐ μόνον δέ, ἀλλὰ καὶ καυχώμεθα ἐν ταῖς θλίψεσιν· ὅτι πρὸ τῆς βασιλείας καὶ τῶν οὐρανίων στεφάνων μέγιστον ἐντεῦθεν καρπούμεθα τὸν μισθόν, ἀπὸ τοῦ συνεχῶς θλίβεσθαι καρτερικωτέρας τῆς ψυχῆς ἡμῶν γινομένης, καὶ τῶν λογισμῶν ἰσχυροτέρων κατασκευαζομένων. Ταῦτ' οὖν ἅπαντα εἰδότες, ἀγαπητοί, φέρωμεν γενναίως τὰ προσπίπτοντα λυπηρὰ, διὰ τε τὸ τῷ Θεῷ δοκοῦν, καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ ἡμετέρῳ συμφέροντι, καὶ μὴ ἀλύωμεν, μήτε ἀναπίπτωμεν τῇ τῶν πειρασμῶν ἐπαγωγῇ, ἀλλὰ καὶ μετὰ ἀνδρείας ἀπάσης ἰστάμενοι, εὐχαριστῶμεν τῷ Θεῷ διηνεκῶς ὑπὲρ πασῶν τῶν εἰς ἡμᾶς τελουμένων εὐεργεσιῶν, ἵνα καὶ τῶν παρόντων ἀπολαύσωμεν ἀγαθῶν, καὶ τῶν μελλουσῶν ἐπιτύχωμεν δωρεῶν, χάριτι καὶ οἰκτιρμοῖς καὶ φιλανθρωπία τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, μεθ' οὗ τῷ Πατρὶ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος, ἅμα τῷ ἁγίῳ καὶ ζωοποιῷ Πνεύματι, νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ, καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Ἀμήν.

89. John has transformed Paul's image of an expert builder of the edifice of the church into the very architect of the heavenly lifestyle, by which he means both the eschatological destiny of the Christian and its prefigurement in a virtuous and abstemious life on earth.

expanse of many seas and braved thousands of waves and endured their ship being frequently scuttled, they undertake this kind of journey away from port with confidence. It's the same with the soul. After it has borne many trials and endured great afflictions, it finally becomes well practiced in these labors and exists in a state of perseverance, not being timid or easily frightened, nor rattled by the grievous things that befall it, but as a result of the ongoing training these occurrences provide and the continual practice these events afford, it bears all the terrible things that may come with terrific ease. So then, when the "*wise master builder*" (1 Cor 3:10)⁸⁹ of the heavenly life said, "*And not only that, but we even boast in afflictions,*" he was clearly indicating that in advance of the kingdom and the crowns of heaven we reap the greatest reward for ourselves from continually suffering affliction, because our souls become more steadfast, and our powers of reasoning are made all the stronger. So, beloved, knowing all these things, let's bear nobly the grievous things that befall us, both because it's right in God's eyes and it's for our own advantage. And let's not be distraught or lose heart by the onslaught of trials, but, standing firm with consummate bravery, let's give thanks to God continually for all the benefactions⁹⁰ performed for our benefit, so that we might both enjoy the present goods and attain the future gifts, by the grace, mercy, and loving-kindness of our Lord Jesus Christ, with whom be glory and power to the Father, together with the holy and life-giving Spirit, now and always, forever and ever. Amen.

90. John is saying ironically that the persecutions, because of his logic of inversion inspired by Paul's statement in Rom 5:3, are actually benefactions (εὐεργεταί).

Εἰς τὴν ἀποστολικὴν ῥῆσιν τὴν λέγουσαν, «Οἶδαμεν ὅτι τοῖς ἀγαπῶσι τὸν Θεὸν πάντα συνεργεῖ εἰς ἀγαθόν,» καὶ περὶ ὑπομονῆς, καὶ ὅσον τῶν θλίψεων τὸ κέρδος.

α'. [165] Ὡς διὰ μακροῦ τοῦ χρόνου πρὸς ὑμᾶς παραγενόμενος, οὕτω διάκειμαι σήμερον. Εἰ γὰρ καὶ οἴκοι καθειργμένος ἐτύγχανον διὰ τὴν τοῦ σώματος ἀρρωστίαν, ἀλλ' ὡς μακράν που ἀπωκισμένος τῆς ὑμετέρας ἀγάπης, οὕτω διεκείμην. Ὁ γὰρ φιλεῖν εἰδὼς ἀκριβῶς, ὅταν μὴ ἐξῇ τῷ φιλουμένῳ συγγίνεσθαι, καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν πόλιν οἰκῇ, τῶν ἐν ἀλλοτρίᾳ διατριβόντων οὐδὲν ἔλαττον διακείσεται. Καὶ τοῦτο ἴσασιν ὅσοι φιλεῖν ἴσασι. Σύγγνωτε τοίνυν ἡμῖν, παρακαλῶ· οὐ γὰρ ἀπὸ ῥαθυμίας ἡμῖν ὁ χωρισμὸς οὗτος γέγονεν, ἀλλ' ἀσθενείας σώματος ἦν ἡ σιγή. Καὶ οἶδα μὲν ὅτι χαίρετε νῦν πάντες ὑμεῖς ὅτι ἀπεθέμεθα τὴν ἀρρωστίαν· ἐγὼ δὲ χαίρω, οὐχ ὅτι τὴν ἀρρωστίαν μόνον ἀπεθέμην, ἀλλ' ὅτι καὶ τὰ ποθούμενα ὑμῶν πρόσωπα πάλιν ὄραν δύναμαι, καὶ ἐντρυφᾶν ὑμῶν τῇ κατὰ Θεὸν ἀγάπῃ. Καὶ καθάπερ οἱ πολλοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, μετὰ τὴν ἀπαλλαγὴν τῆς ἀρρωστίας, φιάλας καὶ ποτήρια καὶ ψυχρὰνάματα ἐπιζητοῦσιν· οὕτως ἐμοὶ πάσης εὐφροσύνης ἡδυτέρα καθέστηκεν ἡ συνουσία ἢ ὑμετέρα, καὶ τοῦτό μοι καὶ ὑγιείας ὑπόθεσις, καὶ εὐφροσύνης ἀφορμή.

Φέρε οὖν, ἐπειδὴ διὰ τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ χάριν ἀλλήλους ἀπελάβομεν, ἀποδοῶμεν ὑμῖν τὸ χρέος τῆς ἀγάπης, εἴ γε ἔστιν ἀποδοθῆναι τοῦτό ποτε.

1. Provenance: Mayer, *Provenance*, 85, does not consider this homily among those whose date can be ascertained with any certainty, a judgment held also by Mf. In particular, Mf disputes whether one can argue that a similar opening in *Hom. Matt. 18:23*, which he puts in Antioch (ca. 387), indicates this homily must be from Constantinople (on the grounds that John wouldn't have recycled the opening to the same audience). This is not convincing, since John suffered continual illness and referred to it not infrequently and to the same audience (Mf 3:149). HS thought this homily came from John's period in Constantinople, because of the repeated reference to a *δεσμοφύλαξ* (8:730), but this is in John's intertext from Acts 16:19–23 and hence not very probative for the dating. We concur that there is no sure index of provenance or date for this homily.

Hom. Rom. 8:28
(In illud: diligentibus deum)
CPG 4374 (PG 51:165–72)¹

On the passage of the apostle that says “*We know that all things work together for good for those for who love God*” (Rom 8:28), and on endurance and how great the gain is from afflictions.

1. [165] I feel today as though it's been a long time since I've been with you. For while bodily illness kept me confined at home, I felt as if I were somewhere far away from your loving presence.² Indeed, when those who know how to love with all their heart aren't able to be with their beloved, even if they live in the same city, they feel no better than if they were residing in a foreign one. Those who know how to love appreciate this. So please pardon us, I beg you. For this separation of ours hasn't been from dereliction, but our silence was born of bodily illness. And I know that you're all rejoicing now because we've cast off our illness, even as I rejoice, not only because I've cast off the illness but also because I'm able once again to see those faces of yours that I so long for and to luxuriate in your godly love. Many people when they're freed from illness seek out cups and glasses and cold springs; in the same way, your company gives me an even more pleasurable dose of gladness. And this is both the cause of my restored health and an occasion for gladness.

Come on, then, now that by God's grace we've been restored to one another, let's repay to you the obligation of love,³ that is, if it's ever possible

Text: Mf PE (1837) as reprinted by JPM in PG (1862), which contains also Mf's original text-critical notes (1721) on the ME, including readings of Regius 1974 (= Paris. gr. 764 [X]) that are recorded in the notes but not adopted in the text. The PE added no new notes. Pinakes lists only one other manuscript that contains this homily (besides Monac. gr. 352, which was the basis for HS), Mon. Leimonos 42 (Lesbos).

2. τῆς ὑμετέρας ἀγάπης: literally, “your love” (on this use as an address, see PGL G).

3. With the phrase τὸ χρέος τῆς ἀγάπης, “the obligation [or debt] of love,” John is pointing ahead to Rom 13:8, as cited later in this paragraph. The entire homily is suffused with economic language of debt and repayment.

Τοῦτο γὰρ μόνον τὸ ὄφλημα τέλος οὐκ ἐπίσταται· ἀλλ' ὅσω ἀποδίδεται, τοσούτῳ τὸ ὄφλημα ἐπιτείνεται· καὶ καθάπερ ἐπὶ τῶν χρημάτων τοὺς μηδὲν ὀφείλοντας ἐπαινοῦμεν, οὕτως ἐνταῦθα τοὺς πολλὰ ὀφείλοντας μακαρίζομεν. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ὁ τῆς οἰκουμένης διδάσκαλος Παῦλος γράφων ἔλεγε· *Μηδενὶ μηδὲν ὀφείλετε, ἀλλ' ἢ τὸ ἀγαπᾶν ἀλλήλους*, βουλόμενος ἡμᾶς τοῦτο τὸ χρέος καὶ αἰεὶ ἀποδιδόναι, καὶ αἰεὶ ὀφείλειν, καὶ μηδέποτε τὴν ὀφειλὴν ταύτην καταλύειν, μέχρις ἂν τὴν παροῦσαν ζωὴν καταλύσωμεν. Ὡς περ οὖν τὰ χρήματα ὀφείλειν, βαρὺ καὶ ἐπαχθές, οὕτω τὸ τὴν ὀφειλὴν ταύτην μὴ αἰεὶ ὀφείλειν, κατηγορίας ἄξιον. Καὶ ἵνα μάθῃς ὅτι τοῦτο οὕτως ἔχει, ἄκουε τῆς σοφίας τοῦ θαυμαστοῦ τούτου διδασκάλου, ὅπως τὴν παραίνεσιν εἰσήγαγε. Πρότερον γὰρ εἰπὼν· *Μηδενὶ μηδὲν ὀφείλετε*· τότε ἐπήγαγεν· *Εἰ μὴ τὸ ἀγαπᾶν ἀλλήλους*· βουλόμενος πᾶσαν ἡμῶν τὴν ὀφειλὴν ἐνταῦθα κενοῦσθαι, καὶ τοῦτο τὸ χρέος θέλων ἀδιάλυτον μένειν διηνεκῶς. Τοῦτο γὰρ ἐστὶ μάλιστα [166] τὸ συγκροτοῦν καὶ συσφίγγον τὴν ζωὴν τὴν ἡμετέραν. Ἐπεὶ οὖν ἔγνωμεν ὅσον τῆς ὀφειλῆς ταύτης τὸ κέρδος, καὶ ὅτι ἐν τῷ ἀποδίδοσθαι μᾶλλον αὖξεται, φέρε, καὶ ἡμεῖς τὴν ὀφειλὴν, ἣν ὀφείλομεν ὑμῖν, οὐκ ἀπὸ ῥαθυμίας οὐδὲ ἀπὸ ἀγνωμοσύνης τινός, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τῆς συμβάσεως ἀρρωστίας, σήμερον, καθ' ὅσον οἶόν τε, ἐκτίσαι σπουδάζωμεν, μικρά τινα διαλεχθέντες πρὸς τὴν ὑμετέραν ἀγάπην, ὑπόθεσιν τῆς διαλέξεως ποιησάμενοι αὐτὸν τοῦτον τὸν θαυμαστὸν τῆς οἰκουμένης διδάσκαλον· καὶ ἅπερ σήμερον γράφων Ῥωμαίοις διελέγετο, ταῦτα εἰς μέσον ἀγαγόντες ἀναπολήσωμεν, καὶ διὰ μακροῦ τοῦ χρόνου τὴν ἐστίασιν τὴν πνευματικὴν παραθῶμεν ὑμῶν τῇ ἀγάπῃ. Τίνα δὲ ἐστὶ τὰ ἀναγνωσθέντα, ἀναγκαῖον εἰπεῖν, ἵν' ὑπομνησθέντες τῶν εἰρημένων, μετὰ πλείονος τῆς εὐκολίας δέξησθε τὰ παρ' ἡμῶν λεγόμενα. Οἶδαμεν, φησὶν, ὅτι τοῖς ἀγαπῶσι τὸν Θεὸν πάντα συνεργεῖ εἰς ἀγαθόν. Τί βούλεται αὐτὸ τοῦτο τὸ προοίμιον; Οὐδὲν γὰρ ἀπλῶς, οὐδὲ εἰκῇ φθέγγεται ἡ μακαρία αὕτη ψυχὴ, ἀλλὰ κατάλληλα αἰεὶ τοῖς ὑποκειμένοις πάθεσι προσάγει τὰ φάρμακα τὰ πνευματικά.

Τί οὖν ἐστὶν ὃ φησιν; Ἐπειδὴ πολλοὶ πανταχόθεν οἱ πειρασμοὶ περιεστοιχίζοντο τοὺς τότε τῇ πίστει προσιόντας, καὶ ἐπάλληλα ἦν τὰ παρὰ

4. With ἀλλ' ἢ for εἰ μὴ (the latter reading will follow later in this paragraph).

5. John is playing on the different senses of καταλύειν here ("resolve" or "settle" a debt; "dissolve" or "dismiss").

6. I.e., in the present life.

7. I.e., "the obligation of love."

8. Indeed, as Chrysostom's homilies go, this is a short one, so he lives up to this promise.

9. That is, when just read aloud in the *synaxis*. This is Chrysostom's "contemporizing hermeneutic," such that Paul is present and writing or speaking "today" the words

for it to be repaid. For this is the only debt that doesn't have an end, but the more it's repaid, the more the debt is extended. And just as in the case of money we praise those who owe nothing, thus here we consider those who owe a lot to be the most blessed. That's why also Paul, the teacher of the world, wrote and said, "*Owe no one anything but to love one another*" (Rom 13:8),⁴ because he wished us always to repay this debt and always to owe it and never to resolve this debt until we come to the dissolution⁵ of the present life. Just as it's onerous and burdensome to owe money, so also in the case of this debt of love what's blameworthy is not perpetually owing this obligation. To learn that this is so, listen to this marvelous teacher of wisdom and how he introduced this advice. For first he said, "*Owe no one anything*," and then he added, "*except to love one another*," because he wished for all our debt to be expended here⁶ and wanted this obligation⁷ to remain forever unresolved. This is what especially [166] welds and knits our life together. So then, in recognition of the fact that tremendous gain comes from this debt, and that when repaid it grows all the more, come on and, insofar as we're able, today let's eagerly pay off the debt we owe you—not due to dereliction or neglect but from the illness that came on. We shall do so by saying a few words to you,⁸ beloved, making this very man who is the marvelous teacher of the world the basis for our homily. Let's once again bring forward for attention what Paul said today⁹ when writing to the Romans, and let's serve this spiritual feast to you, beloved, after such a long hiatus. "What are the things that were read?" It's necessary to say them to you, so that after remembering what Paul said you might more easily receive the words that will come from us. "*We know that all things work together for good for those for who love God*" (Rom 8:28),¹⁰ he says. What does this introduction mean? After all, this blessed soul uttered nothing in a simple or random way,¹¹ but he always brings forward spiritual remedies that match the pains that beset us.¹²

So, what does Paul say? Many temptations from all directions encircled those who had come to the faith back then, and the schemes of the enemy

he wrote in the past to the Romans. For discussion of the temporal fluidity in John's interpretation of Paul, see *HT* 391–94.

10. Minus δέ after οἶδαμεν.

11. In this homily, as often in his oeuvre, John contrasts things said ἀπλῶς and εἰκῇ with those said ἀκριβῶς or μετ' ἀκριβείας (with careful attention to precise and meaningful detail).

12. This medical metaphor scripts Paul as a diagnostician of the spiritual problems (πάθη) and prescriber of the appropriate solutions (φάρμακα) for them.

τοῦ ἐχθροῦ μηχανήματα, καὶ συνεχεῖς αἱ ἐπιβουλαί, καὶ οὐκ ἡρέμουν οἱ τῷ κηρύγματι πολεμοῦντες, τοὺς μὲν εἰς δεσμωτήρια ἐμβάλλοντες, τοὺς δὲ εἰς ἀπαγωγὰς, τοὺς δὲ εἰς μυρία ἕτερα βάραθρα καθέλκοντες· διὰ τοῦτο καθάπερ στρατηγὸς ἄριστος, ὁρῶν μετὰ πολλοῦ θυμοῦ πνέοντα τὸν ἀντίπαλον, περιιών τοὺς οἰκείους πανταχόθεν διεγείρει, νευροῖ, ἀλείφει, θαρσαλεωτέρους καθίστησι, προθυμοτέρους ποιεῖ πρὸς τὸ τὰς χεῖρας ἀντᾶραι κατὰ τοῦ πολέμου, καὶ μὴ δεδοικέναι τὰς ἐκείνου καταδρομὰς, ἀλλὰ στερρῶ τῷ φρονήματι ἐξ ἐναντίας ἵσταμένους καὶ αὐτὴν αὐτοῦ συγκόπτειν, εἰ οἶόν τε, τὴν ὄψιν, καὶ μὴ καταπλήττεσθαι τὴν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀντίστασιν τὸν αὐτὸν δὲ τρόπον καὶ ὁ μακάριος οὗτος, ἡ οὐρανομήκης ψυχὴ, διεγείρει βουλόμενος τῶν πιστῶν τὰ φρονήματα, καὶ κάτω κείμενον, ὡς εἰπεῖν, αὐτῶν τὸν λογισμὸν ἀνορθῶσαι ἐπειγόμενος, οὕτως ἤρξατο λέγων· Οἶδαμεν [167] δὲ ὅτι τοῖς ἀγαπῶσι τὸν Θεὸν πάντα συνεργεῖ εἰς ἀγαθόν. Ὅρᾳς τὴν σύνεσιν τὴν ἀποστολικήν; Οὐκ εἶπεν, Οἶδα, ἀλλ', Οἶδαμεν, καὶ αὐτοὺς εἰς συγκατάθεσιν ἐφελκόμενος τῶν λεγομένων, ὅτι τοῖς ἀγαπῶσι τὸν Θεὸν πάντα συνεργεῖ εἰς ἀγαθόν. Σκόπει ἀκριβείαν ῥημάτων ἀποστολικῶν. Οὐκ εἶπεν, Οἱ ἀγαπῶντες τὸν Θεὸν διαφεύγουσι τὰ δεινὰ, ἐλευθεροῦνται τῶν πειρασμῶν· ἀλλ', Οἶδαμεν, φησί, τουτέστι, πεπεισμεθα, πεπληροφορήμεθα, δι' αὐτῆς τῶν πραγμάτων τῆς πείρας τὰς ἀποδείξεις εἰλήφαμεν· Οἶδαμεν ὅτι τοῖς ἀγαπῶσι τὸν Θεὸν πάντα συνεργεῖ εἰς ἀγαθόν.

β'. Πόσῃν οἴεσθε δύναμιν ἔχειν τὴν βραχεῖαν ταύτην λέξιν; Πάντα, φησί, συνεργεῖ εἰς ἀγαθόν· μὴ γάρ μοι τὰ χρηστὰ ἐνταῦθα εἴπης, μηδὲ τὴν ἄνεσιν καὶ τὴν ἄδειαν μόνον λογίσῃ, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ ἐναντία, τὰ δεσμωτήρια, τὰς θλίψεις, τὰς ἐπιβουλάς, τὰς καθημερινὰς ἐφόδους, καὶ τότε ὅψι μετὰ ἀκριβείας τοῦ ῥήματος τὴν δύναμιν. Καὶ ἵνα μὴ μακράν που ἀγάγω τὴν ὑμετέραν ἀγάπην, εἰ βούλεσθε, μικρά τινα τῶν τῷ μακαρίῳ τούτῳ συμβάντων εἰς μέσον ἀγάγωμεν, καὶ ὅψεσθε τοῦ ῥήματος τὴν ἰσχύν. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ περιιών πανταχοῦ, σπεύρων τὸν τῆς εὐσεβείας λόγον, τὰς ἀκάνθας ἀνασπῶν, καὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐν τῇ ἐκάστου ψυχῇ καταφυτεύειν ἐπειγόμενος, γενόμενος κατὰ τινα πόλιν τῆς Μακεδονίας, καθὼς ὁ μακάριος Λουκᾶς, ὁ τὸ τῶν Πράξεων

13. Translating ἀπαγωγή with PGL 2. It is also possible to take it as referring to an extrajudicial procedure of citizens' arrest (see LSJ III.1).

14. As with the previous homily, this one is not focused so much on what Chrysostom identifies as a textual ζήτημα that others are pressing as much as it is on making the text a showcase for how the apostle confronted a theological and pastoral problem in the first Christian generation at Rome, of despondency in the face of persecution. But via the intertext of Acts 16:16–34, Chrysostom in turn seeks to address the theological problem of theodicy also for his own generation, to prove that the assurance of Rom 8:28 is not misplaced.

came one after the other. The plots were continual, and those who were battling against the gospel proclamation never took a rest. Some believers they threw into prison, some they dragged off to execution,¹³ some to many other forms of perdition. Now in such circumstances a noble general, seeing the adversary seething with fury, goes around to his own men everywhere and raises their spirits, calms their nerves, encourages them, makes them more confident; he renders them more eager to raise their hands against the foe and not be afraid of his attacks, but on the contrary to stand with firm resolve before him, and even to strike him right in the face if possible and not be panic-stricken about taking the foe on. In the very same way, this blessed man, Paul, the soul that soars up to heaven—when he wished to raise the spirits of the faithful and hastened to restore their mental resolve that was, one might say, laid low—began in this way by saying, “*And we know [167] that all things work together for good for those who love God*” (Rom 8:28).¹⁴ Do you see the apostle’s intelligence? He didn’t say, “I know,” but “*we know*,” thereby drawing them into agreement with what he said: “*that all things work together for good for those who love God*.” Note carefully the precision of the apostle’s words. He didn’t say, “those who love God escape terrible things, they are freed from trials,” but, he says, “*we know*,” that is, “we’ve been persuaded, we’ve been convinced, we’ve received sure proof¹⁵ from the very experience of these things. “*We know that all things work together for good for those who love God*.”

2. How much power do you suppose is contained in this brief passage? “*Everything works together for good*,” he says. Don’t tell me about good things here, nor think only of rest and cessation of fear, but think of the very opposite—imprisonments, afflictions, plots, daily attacks—and then you’ll accurately see the power of this statement. Lest I lead you a bit far afield, beloved, if you want, let’s bring forward into view a few of the things that happened to this blessed man, and you’ll see the potency of this statement. For when he was going around everywhere sowing the word of piety, pulling up thorns and hastening to implant the truth in every soul, he arrived in a certain city of Macedonia.¹⁶ And as the blessed Luke who composed the book of Acts has recounted it for us (Acts 16:16–18), when a slave girl who had an evil spirit and couldn’t endure keeping silent but was

15. Per Mf, Paris. gr. 764 reads *πολλάκις* before *τὰς ἀποδείξεις* (“we have often received sure proof from the very experience of these things”).

16. Philippi (Acts 16:12).

βιβλίον συνθείς, ἡμῖν διηγῆσατο, παιδίσκην τινὰ πνεῦμα πονηρὸν ἔχουσαν, καὶ σιγᾶν οὐκ ἀνεχομένην, ἀλλὰ περιοῦσαν καὶ πανταχοῦ καταδήλους αὐτοὺς διὰ τοῦ δαίμονος ποιεῖν βουλομένην, μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς ἐξουσίας, λόγῳ καὶ ἐπιτάγματι, καθάπερ τινὰ μαστιγίαν ἀπελάσας, ἡλευθέρωσεν ἐκείνην τοῦ πονηροῦ δαίμονος· δέον τοὺς τὴν πόλιν ἐκείνην οἰκοῦντας, ὡς εὐεργέτας λοιπὸν καὶ σωτῆρας βλέπειν τοὺς ἀποστόλους, καὶ παντὶ θεραπείας τρόπῳ περὶ αὐτοὺς χρησαμένους ἀμείψασθαι τῆς τοσαύτης εὐεργεσίας, οἱ δὲ τοῖς ἐναντίοις ἀμείβονται. Καὶ ἄκουε τίσιν αὐτοῖς ἀμείβονται. Ἰδόντες, φησὶν, οἱ κύριοι αὐτῆς, ὅτι ἐξῆλθεν ἡ ἐλπίς τῆς ἐργασίας αὐτῶν, ἐπιλαβόμενοι τὸν Παῦλον καὶ τὸν Σίλαν, εἴλκυσαν εἰς τὴν ἀγορὰν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄρχοντας, καὶ προσήγαγον αὐτοὺς τοῖς στρατηγοῖς, καὶ πολλὰς ἐπιθέντες ἐκείνοις πληγὰς, ἔβαλον εἰς φυλακὴν, παραγγείλαντες τῷ δεσμοφύλακι ἀσφαλῶς τηρεῖν αὐτούς.

Εἶδετε πονηρίας ὑπερβολὴν τῶν τὴν πόλιν ἐκείνην οἰκούντων; εἶδετε τῶν ἀποστόλων ὑπομονὴν καὶ καρτερίαν; Μικρὸν ἀναμείνατε, καὶ ὄψεσθε καὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ τὴν φιланθρωπίαν. Σοφὸς γὰρ ὢν καὶ εὐμήχανος, οὐκ ἐν ἀρχῇ καὶ ἐν προοιμίῳ λύει τὰ δεινὰ, ἀλλ' ὅταν αὐξηθῇ πάντα τὰ παρὰ τῶν ἐναντίων, καὶ δειχθῇ διὰ τῶν πραγμάτων τῶν αὐτοῦ ἀθλητῶν ἡ ὑπομονή, τότε καὶ τὴν οἰκείαν ῥοπὴν ἐπιδείκνυται· ἵνα μηδεὶς ἔχῃ λέγειν, ὅτι διὰ τοῦτο ἐπιπηδῶσι τοῖς κινδύνοις, διὰ τὸ θαρρεῖν ὅτι οὐδὲν ἀηδὲς πείσονται. Διὰ τοι τοῦτό τινας μὲν καὶ ἐναφήσι τοῖς δεινοῖς, ἀπορρήτῳ τινὶ σοφίᾳ χρώμενος, τινὰς δὲ καὶ ἐξαρπάξει, ἵνα διὰ πάντων μάθῃς αὐτοῦ τὴν ὑπερβάλλουσαν φιλανθρωπίαν, καὶ ὅτι μείζους αὐτοῖς τὰς ἀμοιβὰς ταμιευόμενος, συγχωρεῖ πολλάκις ἐπιτείνεσθαι τὰ δεινὰ. Οὕτως οὖν καὶ ἐνταῦθα ποιεῖ. Μετὰ γὰρ τὴν τοσαύτην θαυματουργίαν καὶ τὴν εὐεργεσίαν, [168] ἦν ἐπεδείξαντο ἀπελάσαντες τὸν ἀναίσχυντον ἐκεῖνον δαίμονα, συνεχώρησε καὶ μαστιχθῆναι καὶ εἰς δεσμωτήριον ἐμβληθῆναι. Ἐντεῦθεν γὰρ μάλιστα διεδείκνυτο καὶ ἡ τοῦ Θεοῦ δύναμις. Διὸ καὶ ὁ μακάριος οὗτος ἔλεγεν· "Ἦδιστα οὖν καυχῆσομαι ἐν ταῖς ἀσθενείαις μου, ἵνα ἐπισκηνώσῃ ἐπ' ἐμοὶ ἡ δύναμις τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Καὶ πάλιν· "Ὅταν ἀσθενῶ, τότε δυνατός εἰμι, ἀσθένειαν τοὺς πειρασμοὺς λέγων τοὺς ἐπαλλήλους. Ἀλλ' ἴσως ἂν τις διαπορήσειεν ἐνταῦθα, τίνας ἔνεκεν ἀπήλασαν τὸν

17. Paul and Silas (Acts 16:19).

18. Minus δὲ before ἰδόντες; with προσήγαγον for προσαγαγόντες; καὶ πολλὰς for πολλὰς τε (but Chrysostom has the reading πολλὰς τε in *Hom. Act.* 35.1 [PG 60:254]); ἐκείνοις for αὐτοῖς.

19. I.e., his athletes, such as Paul and Silas, mentioned above.

20. Minus μᾶλλον before καυχῆσομαι; with ἐμοὶ for ἐμέ (the latter reading is found in the other five times John cites the verse: *Hom. 2 Cor.* 26.3; 29.2 [PG 61:579, 598]; *Hom. Heb.* 28.3 [PG 63:195]; *Hom. Rom.* 5:3 §4 [PG 51:163]; *Stat.* 16.4 [PG 49:167]).

traveling around and by the power of the demon had the intent to make them¹⁷ known everywhere, Paul freed her from the wicked demon by the tremendous authority he exercised in his speech and in his command, as though driving out some scourge (Acts 16:16–18). The inhabitants of that city should already have seen the apostles as benefactors and saviors and taken every sort of care to repay them for so great a benefaction, but in fact, they repaid them with the opposite. Hear how they repaid them: “*Her masters,*” he says, “*seeing that the hope of their income had run out, seizing Paul and Silas, dragged them into the marketplace before the rulers and led them to the magistrates ... and landing many punches on them, they threw those men into prison, commanding the jailer to guard them securely*” (Acts 16:19–20a, 23).¹⁸

Did you see the extreme wickedness of the inhabitants of that city? Did you see the endurance and perseverance of the apostles? Wait a bit and you’ll also see God’s merciful love. For because he was wise and strategic, God didn’t put a stop to the terrible things at the outset and very beginning, but it was when all the onslaughts from the opponents were multiplied, and the endurance of his athletes was shown through their deeds, that God also displayed his own power. This was so no one could say that they plunged into dangers because they had confidence that they would suffer nothing disagreeable. In his ineffable wisdom, God allowed some to fall into terrible straits, and others he snatched out of them, just so through all these things you might learn about the abundance of his love for us and learn that he often permits them¹⁹ to suffer intensely terrible things because he’s treasuring up greater rewards for them. And this was precisely the case here, too. For after he displayed such a wondrous act and benefaction [168] by driving out that shameless demon, he permitted them both to be scourged and to be thrown into prison. And it is in these trials especially that God’s power was shown. That’s why this blessed man said: “*Therefore I shall boast all the more gladly in my weaknesses, so that the power of Christ might dwell upon me*” (2 Cor 12:9).²⁰ And again, “*When I am weak, then I am strong*” (2 Cor 12:10),²¹ calling his repeated trials “*weakness*” (2 Cor 11:30; 12:5–10). Now if someone should be perplexed²² about why Paul drove out a demon that had said nothing in opposition to them, but instead

21. Minus γάρ before ἀσθενῶ.

22. Within his overarching argument about God’s beneficences even in the midst of hardship, Chrysostom addresses a minor, but not insignificant, “perplexing question” (διαπορεῖν) about the logic of the narrative in Acts 16.

δαίμονα οὐδὲν ἐναντίον αὐτοῖς λέγοντα, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον καὶ καταδήλους αὐτοὺς ποιοῦντα· ἐπὶ πολλὰς γὰρ ἡμέρας ἐβόα λέγων, ὅτι Οὗτοι οἱ ἄνθρωποι δοῦλοι τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου εἰσὶν, οἵτινες καταγγέλλουσιν ἡμῖν ὁδὸν σωτηρίας. Μὴ ξενισθῆς, ἀγαπητέ· καὶ τοῦτο γὰρ τῆς συνέσεως ἦν τῆς ἀποστολικῆς καὶ τῆς τοῦ Πνεύματος χάριτος. Εἰ γὰρ καὶ μηδὲν αὐτοῖς ἐναντίον ἔλεγεν, ἀλλ' ἵνα μὴ ἐντεῦθεν ἀξιόπιστος γενόμενος ὁ δαίμων, καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοις ὑποσύρειν δύνηται τοὺς ἀφελεστέρους, διὰ τοῦτο ἐπιστομίσας αὐτὸν ἀπήλασεν, οὐ συγχωρήσας αὐτῷ τὰ ὑπὲρ τὴν ἀξίαν φθέγγεσθαι. Τοῦτο δὲ ἐποίει, ἀκολουθῶν τῷ οἰκείῳ Δεσπότη· ἐπεὶ καὶ ἐκεῖνι προσιόντες ἔλεγον, Οἶδαμέν σε τίς εἶ, ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ Θεοῦ· καὶ ὅμως ταῦτα λέγοντας αὐτοὺς ἀπήλυνεν. Ἐγένετο δὲ τοῦτο εἰς κατηγορίαν τῶν ἀναισχύντων Ἰουδαίων, ὅτι ἐκεῖνοι μὲν καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν θαύματα ὁρῶντες καὶ μυρία παράδοξα γινόμενα, ἠπίσταντο, οἱ δὲ δαίμονες ἐπεγίνωσκον, καὶ Ἰὶδον αὐτὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ ὡμολόγουν.

γ'. Ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὴν ἀκολουθίαν ἐπανέλθωμεν τοῦ λόγου. Ἵνα τοίνυν μάθητε ὅπως τοῖς ἀγαπῶσι τὸν Θεὸν πάντα συνεργεῖ εἰς ἀγαθὸν, ἀναγκαῖον πᾶσαν ὑμῖν ἀναγνῶναι ταύτην τὴν ἱστορίαν, ἵνα καὶ ἐντεῦθεν γνῶτε, ὅπως μετὰ τὰς πληγὰς, μετὰ τὸ δεσμωτήριον, εἰς ἀγαθὸν ἅπαντα αὐτοῖς μετέβαλεν ἡ τοῦ Θεοῦ χάρις. Ἀλλ' ἰδῶμεν πῶς τοῦτο δείκνυσιν ὁ μακάριος Λουκᾶς λέγων· Παραγγελίαν δὲ τοιαύτην εἰληφώς ὁ δεσμοφύλαξ ἔβαλεν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν ἐσωτέραν φυλακὴν, καὶ τοὺς πόδας αὐτῶν ἡσφαλίσατο εἰς τὸ ξύλον. Σκόπει πῶς ἐπιτείνεται τὰ δεινὰ, ἵνα καὶ ἡ ὑπομονὴ τῶν ἀποστόλων λαμπροτέρα γένηται, καὶ ἡ ἄφατος τοῦ Θεοῦ δύναμις κατάδηλος ἅπασι καταστῇ. Ἄκουε δὲ καὶ τὸ ἐξῆς. Ἐπάγει γὰρ, Κατὰ δὲ τὸ μεσονύκτιον Παῦλος καὶ Σίλας προσευχόμενοι ὕμνουν τὸν Θεόν. Ὅρα ψυχὴν ἐπτερωμένην, ὅρα διάνοιαν νήφουσαν· μὴ ἀπλῶς παραδράμωμεν, ἀγαπητοί, τὸ εἰρημένον. Οὐ γὰρ εἰκὴ καὶ τὸν καιρὸν ἡμῖν ἐπεσημήνατο, εἰπὼν, Κατὰ δὲ τὸ μεσονύκτιον, ἀλλὰ βουλόμενος δεῖξαι, ὅτι, ὅτε τοῖς ἄλλοις ἅπασιν ἡδὺς ὁ ὕπνος ἐφίσταται καὶ κοιμίζει τὰ βλέφαρα, μάλιστα δὲ τοὺς ἐν ὁδύναις πολλαῖς καθεστῶτας εἰκὸς κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν ἐκεῖνον τοῦ ὕπνου καθελκεσθαι, τότε τοίνυν, φησὶν, ὅτε πάντοθεν περιεγένετο ἡ τοῦ ὕπνου τυραννίς, τότε ἐκεῖνοι Προσευχόμενοι ὕμνουν τὸν Θεόν, τῆς περὶ αὐτὸν ἀγάπης μέγιστον δεῖγμα τοῦτο ποιοῦμενοι.

23. The reading ἡμῖν (with \mathfrak{M} , as expected) is also found in *Hom. Tit.* 3.2 (PG 62:678); *Hom. Act.* 35.1 bis; 35.2 (PG 60:253, 255); *Virginit.* 1.8.2 (SC 125:116); the reading ὑμῖν is found once in John's extant writings, in *Hom. Eph.* 10.1 (PG 62:76).

24. With οἶδαμεν for οἶδα.

25. Cf. John 12:37–41, a passage favored by Chrysostom.

26. Cf. Mark 1:34; 3:11; 5:7 and parr.

27. Plus δὲ before τοιαύτην; plus ὁ δεσμοφύλαξ (added by John to contextualize).

28. Per Mf, Paris. gr. 764 reads ἐφίπταται ("when sweet sleep flutters upon the

even made manifest who they were (for it cried out “*for many days*,” saying, “*These men are servants of the highest God, who are proclaiming to us the way of salvation*” [Acts 16:17]),²³ don’t let that surprise you, my beloved. For this, too, was due to the apostle’s intelligence and the Spirit’s grace. For although the demon had said nothing against them, Paul muzzled it and drove it out, not permitting it to utter things of which it is unworthy, lest the demon might seem credible in this case and thus be able to seduce people who are more credulous in other instances. In doing this Paul was following in the footsteps of his own Lord, since when they approached Christ and said, “*We know who you are, the holy one of God!*” (Mark 1:24),²⁴ nevertheless he drove out the demons that were saying these things. This took place to bring an accusation against the shameless Jews, because despite seeing marvels and innumerable miracles taking place every single day, they didn’t believe,²⁵ while it was the demons who recognized and confessed him as the son of God (cf. Mark 1:24).²⁶

3. But let’s pick up the thread of our homily. Now, so that you might learn how “*all things work together for good for those who love God*,” it’s necessary for you to read the entire story so you might also learn from it how, after the beatings and the imprisonment, the grace of God transformed all those things “*for good*” for them. But let’s see how the blessed Luke shows this when he says, “*After receiving this order, the jailer threw them into the inner prison and secured their feet in the stocks*” (Acts 16:24).²⁷ Note carefully how the terrible things are extended so the endurance of the apostles might be all the more splendid and the indescribable power of God might be made clear to all. Listen also to what follows, for he adds, “*In the middle of the night Paul and Silas were praying and addressing hymns to God*” (Acts 16:25). Look at that soul soaring in flight, look at that mind roused to wakefulness! For in saying “*in the middle of the night*,” Luke wasn’t indicating the time of day to us without any purpose. He wanted to show that when sweet sleep had come upon²⁸ all the others and shut their eyelids in slumber, when those beset by many pains would be especially likely to be weighed down by sleep, just when the tyranny of sleep encompassed them from every direction, was the precise moment that, Luke says, “*they were praying and addressing hymns to God*,” thereby giving the greatest proof of their love for him.

others”) for ἐφίσταται. While there is an abundance of metaphors of flight in this section of the homily, its usage here is awkward.

Καθάπερ γὰρ ἡμεῖς ὑπὸ ἀληγμάτων σωματικῶν ἐνοχλούμενοι, τὴν τῶν γνησίῳ συνουσίᾳ ἐπιζητοῦμεν, ἵνα ἐκ τῆς πρὸς ἐκείνους διαλέξεως τὴν ἐπίτασιν τῆς ὁδύνης παραμυθησώμεθα· οὕτω καὶ οἱ ἅγιοι οὗτοι τῷ πόθῳ τῷ περὶ τὸν Δεσπότην πυρούμενοι, καὶ τοὺς ἱεροὺς ὕμνους ἀναφέροντες, οὐδὲ αἴσθησιν ἐλάμβανον τῶν ὁδυνῶν [169] ἐκείνων, ἀλλ' ὅλοι τῆς ἰκετηρίας ἐγίνοντο, καὶ τὴν θαυμαστὴν ἐκείνην ὕμνωδιαν ἀνέφερον, καὶ λοιπὸν ἐκκλησία ἐγένετο τὸ δεσμωτήριον, καὶ ὁ τόπος ἅπας ἠγιάζετο διὰ τῆς ὕμνωδίας τῶν ἁγίων ἐκείνων. Καὶ ἥν ἰδεῖν θαυμαστὰ καὶ παράδοξα πράγματα, ἀνθρώπους τῷ ξύλῳ προσδεδεμένους, καὶ οὐδὲν ἐμποδιζομένους πρὸς τὴν ὕμνωδιαν. Τὸν γὰρ νήφοντα, καὶ ἐργηγορότα, καὶ ζέοντα πόθον ἔχοντα περὶ τὸν Θεόν, οὐδὲν κωλύσαι δυνήσεται ποτε τῆς πρὸς τὸν Δεσπότην συνουσίας· Θεὸς γὰρ, φησὶν, ἐγγίζων ἐγὼ εἰμι, καὶ οὐ Θεὸς πόρρωθεν· καὶ πάλιν ἀλλαχοῦ, "Ἐτι λαλοῦντός σου ἐρῶ· Ἰδοὺ πάρεμι. "Ενθα γὰρ ἂν ἡ διάνοια νήφουσα, πτεροῦται ὁ λογισμὸς καὶ ἀπαλλάττεται, ὡς εἰπεῖν, τοῦ συνδέσμου τοῦ σώματος, καὶ πρὸς τὸν ποθοῦμενον ἀνίπταται, καὶ τῆς γῆς ὑπερορᾷ. καὶ τῶν ὁρωμένων ἀνωτέρω γενόμενος, πρὸς ἐκεῖνον ἐπείγεται· ὃ δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἁγίων τούτων γεγένηται. "Ορα γὰρ τὴν παραχρῆμα τῶν ὕμνων ἐνέργειαν, καὶ ὅπως καὶ ἐν δεσμωτηρίῳ γενόμενοι καὶ τῷ ξύλῳ προσδεδεμένοι, καὶ μετὰ γοήτων καὶ δεσμίῳ συναναμιγνέτες, οὐ μόνον οὐδὲν παρεβλάβησαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ταύτη μᾶλλον ἐξέλαμψαν, καὶ τῷ φωτὶ τῆς οἰκείας ἀρετῆς κατηύγασαν ἅπαντας τοὺς τὸ δεσμωτήριον οἰκοῦντας. Ἡ γὰρ φωνὴ τῶν ἱερῶν ὕμνων ἐκείνων εἰς τὴν ἐκάστου τῶν δεσμωτῶν εἰσιούσα ψυχὴν, μετέπλαττεν αὐτήν, ὡς εἰπεῖν, καὶ μετερρύθμιζεν. Ἄφνω γὰρ, φησί, σεισμὸς ἐγένετο μέγας, ὥστε σαλευθῆναι τὰ θεμέλια τοῦ δεσμωτηρίου, ἀνεώχθησάν τε παραχρῆμα αἱ θύραι ἅπασαι, καὶ πάντων τὰ δεσμὰ ἀνέθη. Εἶδες τῶν ὕμνων τῶν εἰς τὸν Θεὸν τὴν δύναμιν; Οὐ μόνον αὐτοὶ παρακλήσεως ἀπέλαυσαν οἱ τοὺς ὕμνους ἀναφέροντες, ἀλλὰ καὶ πάντων τὰ δεσμὰ λυθῆναι παρεσκεύασαν· ἵνα δειχθῇ διὰ τῶν πραγμάτων αὐτῶν, ὅπως Τοῖς ἀγαπῶσι τὸν Θεὸν πάντα συνεργεῖ εἰς ἀγαθόν. Ἰδοὺ γὰρ καὶ πληγαί, καὶ δεσμωτήριον, καὶ ξύλον, καὶ μετὰ τῶν δημίῳ διαγωγῇ, καὶ ὅμως ταῦτα ἀγαθῶν ὑπόθεσις γεγένηται καὶ εὐδοκίμησεως ἀφορμῇ, οὐκ

29. With οὐ for οὐχί; minus λέγει κύριος after ἐγὼ εἰμι.

30. With ἐρῶ for ἐρεῖ.

31. λογισμός, as both the thought and the process that generates it (so I have rendered it plural in the translation).

32. One can see the influence of popular Platonism in Chrysostom's view of the soul's desire to leave the body and rise to the level of the divine realities (one that is hardly his own innovation). Despite his powerful rhetoric of difference, Chrysostom regards this as fully compatible and indeed a part of his Christian theological commitments rather than a foreign influence.

When we're troubled by bodily pains we seek to be in the company of our true friends, so that through conversation with them we might gain comfort from the intensity of our pain. In the same way also, those saints, as they burned with ardent desire for the Lord and offered sacred songs of praise, didn't even perceive those pains. [169] Instead, they were entirely devoted to supplication and were offering up that marvelous chorus of praise; in the end, the prison became a church, and the entire place was sanctified by the chorus of praise from those saints. Indeed, it was a marvelous and astounding thing to see men bound in stocks and not in the least hindered from singing hymns of praise! For nothing will ever be able to stop someone who is awake, vigilant, and fervent with devotion for God from holding conversation with the Lord. For, he says, "*I am a God who is near, and not a God who is far away*" (Jer 23:23),²⁹ and again elsewhere, "*While you are speaking I will say, 'Look, I am present'*" (Isa 58:9).³⁰ For when a mind is wakeful and its thoughts³¹ are soaring upward and, as we might put it, set free from the bondage of the body and flying up toward the beloved, it looks down on earthly reality and, transcending what is visible, hastens toward him.³² This is precisely what happened with those saints. Look at the immediate effect of their songs of praise and how even when they were in prison and bound in the stocks, mixed in with charlatans and prisoners,³³ not only were they not harmed in the least, but they even shone forth in greater splendor by virtue of this,³⁴ and by the light of their own virtue they enlightened all those dwelling in the prison. For the sound of those sacred songs of praise entered into the soul of each of the prisoners and transformed and, one might say, reformed it. For, Luke says, "*All of a sudden there was a huge earthquake, such that the foundations of the prison were shaken, and immediately all the doors were opened and the bonds of all were loosened*" (Acts 16:26).³⁵ Have you seen the power of songs of praise to God? Not only did those offering the hymns enjoy consolation, but they even brought it about that the bonds of all of them were unfastened. In this way, how "*all things work together for good for those who love God*" was demonstrated by their actions. For look, there were beatings, imprisonment, stocks, and time spent with public executioners, and nevertheless these experiences became the cause of good effects and the occasion for

33. Per Mf, Paris. gr. 764 reads δημίων ("public executioners") for δεσμίων, as we find again in several places below (PG 51:69, 37; 51:170, 10).

34. Sc. ἡ τῶν ὕμνων ἐνέργεια, "the effect of their songs of praise."

35. Minus δέ before σεισμός; with ἀπασαι for πᾶσαι.

αὐτοῖς μόνον, οὐδὲ τοῖς οἰκοῦσι τὸ δεσμωτήριον δεσμίους, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτῷ τῷ δεσμοφύλακι. Ἐξυπνος γὰρ, φησί, γενόμενος ὁ δεσμοφύλαξ, καὶ ἰδὼν τὰς θύρας ἀνεωγμένους τῆς φυλακῆς, σπασάμενος μάχαιραν, ἔμελλεν ἑαυτὸν ἀναιρεῖν, νομίσας ἐκπεφευγῆναι τοὺς δεσμίους. Ὅρα μοι ἐνταῦθα τοῦ Θεοῦ τὴν φιλανθρωπίαν πάντα λόγον ὑπερβαίνουσιν.

Τίνος γὰρ ἔνεκεν κατὰ τὸ μεσονύκτιον ἅπαντα ταῦτα γίνεται; Οὐδενὸς ἐτέρου χάριν, ἀλλ' ἵνα ἀθόρυβον καὶ ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ τὸ πρᾶγμα οἰκονομηθῇ, καὶ τὴν σωτηρίαν πραγματεύσωνται τοῦ δεσμοφύλακος. Τοῦ γὰρ σεισμοῦ γενομένου καὶ τῶν θυρῶν ἀνοιχθεισῶν, τὰ δεσμὰ ἀνέθη πάντων τῶν αὐτόθι, καὶ οὐδεὶς αὐτῶν ἐκπηδῆσαι συνεχωρήθη. Σκόπει μοι καὶ ἄλλην ἐνταῦθα Θεοῦ σοφίαν. Τὰ μὲν γὰρ ἄλλα πάντα γέγονεν, ὁ σεισμός, λέγω, καὶ ἡ τῶν θυρῶν ἀνοιξις, ἵνα μάθωσι διὰ τῶν ἔργων ἅπαντες, τίνες ἦσαν οἱ τότε τὸ δεσμωτήριον οἰκοῦντες, καὶ ὅτι οὐχ οἱ τυχόντες εἰσὶν ἄνθρωποι· οὐδενὶ δὲ ἐξελθεῖν ἐγένετο, ἵνα μὴ κινδύνων ἀφορμὴ γένηται τοῦτο τῷ δεσμοφύλακι. Καὶ ὅτι τοῦτο ἐστὶν ἀληθές, ἄκουσον πῶς, ὅτε μόνον ὑπόπτεισε τοῦτο γεγενῆσθαι ὁ δεσμοφύλαξ, καὶ ἐνόμισέ τινας ἐκπεφευγῆναι, καὶ τῆς [170] ζωῆς αὐτῆς κατεφρόνησε. Σπασάμενος γὰρ, φησί, μάχαιραν, ἔμελλεν ἑαυτὸν ἀναιρεῖν. Ἀλλ' ὁ πανταχοῦ νήφων καὶ ἐργηγορῶν, ὁ μακάριος Παῦλος, τῇ οἰκείᾳ φωνῇ ἐξήρπασε τῆς φάρυγγος τοῦ θηρίου τὸ ἄρνιον. Ἐφώνησε γὰρ φωνῇ μεγάλῃ, λέγων, Μηδὲν πράξης σεαυτῷ κακόν· ἅπαντες γὰρ ἐσμεν ἐνθάδε. Ὡς ταπεινοφροσύνης ὑπερβολή! οὐκ ἐφρόνησε μέγα ἐπὶ τοῖς γεγενημένοις, οὐ κατεξανέστη τοῦ δεσμοφύλακος. οὐδὲν ὑπέρογκον φθέγγασθαι κατεδέξατο· ἀλλὰ μετὰ τῶν δεσμωτῶν, μετὰ τῶν δημίων, μετὰ τῶν κακούργων ἑαυτὸν κατηρίθμησε, λέγων· Ἀπαντές ἐσμεν ἐνθάδε. Εἶδες αὐτὸν πολλῇ τῇ ταπεινοφροσύνῃ χρώμενον, καὶ οὐδὲν πλέον ἑαυτῷ νέμοντα τῶν αὐτόθι κακούργων; Ὅρα καὶ τὸν δεσμοφύλακα λοιπὸν, οὐχ ὥς ἐνὶ τῶν ἄλλων προσιόντα. Θαρρήσας γὰρ καὶ αἰτήσας φῶτα, εἰσεπήδησε, καὶ ἔντρομος ὑπάρχων, προσέειπε τῷ Παύλῳ καὶ τῷ Σίλα, καὶ προαγαγὼν αὐτοὺς ἔξω, ἔφη· Κύριοι, τί με δεῖ ποιεῖν, ἵνα σωθῶ; Εἶδετε πῶς τοῖς ἀγαπῶσι τὸν Θεὸν πάντα συνεργεῖ εἰς

36. Minus δὲ before γενόμενος; transposition of ἀνεωγμένους and τὰς θύρας before τῆς φυλακῆς; with νομίσας for νομίζων.

37. Resonances with, but not a quotation of, Eph 3:19: ἡ ὑπερβάλλουσα τῆς γνώσεως ἀγάπη τοῦ Χριστοῦ ("the love of Christ that surpasses understanding"); cf. also Phil 4:7.

38. With σωτηρία John is replicating the wordplay in Acts 16:23–34, esp. 16:27–31, on being "safe" from punishment (from others or self-inflicted) or "finding salvation" in a religious sense.

39. With γάρ for δέ; minus ὁ Παῦλος before λέγων.

40. Cf. 2 Pet 2:18: ὑπέρογκα ... ματαιότητος φβεγγόμενοι ("speaking bombastic foolishness").

improved standing, not only for the prisoners dwelling in the prison but even for the prison guard himself. For, he says, “*The jailer, after awakening and seeing that the doors of the holding-cell were opened, drew a sword and was going to kill himself, since he presumed that the prisoners had fled*” (Acts 16:27).³⁶ See right here God’s love for us that surpasses all reason!³⁷

And why did all these things happen in the middle of the night? For no other reason than that the event might providentially unfold without an uproar and in silence, and they might bring about the prison guard’s salvation.³⁸ For after the earthquake occurred and the doors had been opened, the bonds of all those inside were immediately unfastened, and not one of them was permitted to escape. Observe yet another aspect of God’s wisdom here. For all these things happened—I mean the earthquake and the opening of the doors—so everyone might learn through these deeds who these men then dwelling in the prison were and that they weren’t just ordinary people. What ensued was that none of the prisoners went out, lest that be a cause of danger for the jailer. As proof of the truth of this, hear how, when he only suspected that this had taken place and presumed some had escaped, [170] the jailer despaired of life itself. For, Luke says, “*he drew a sword and was going to kill himself*” (Acts 16:27). But the blessed Paul, ever awake and vigilant, snatched the lamb out of the throat of the beast by means of his own voice, for “*he called out in a loud voice saying, ‘Don’t do yourself any harm! For all of us are here’*” (Acts 16:28).³⁹ Oh, the height of humility! He didn’t boast about what happened, nor did he rise up against the prison guard. He didn’t allow himself to speak haughtily.⁴⁰ Instead, he counted himself among the prisoners, the executioners, and the criminals when he said, “*All of us are here*” (Acts 16:28). Did you see⁴¹ him acting with such humility that he apportioned to himself no greater station than that of the criminals inside there? And then look now at the jailer, as well, and how he doesn’t approach any of the others. For after rousing his courage and “*asking for a torch, he hurried in, and in fear he fell down before Paul and Silas. And after leading them outside, he said, ‘Sirs, what must I do to be saved?’*” (Acts 16:29–30).⁴² Have you seen how “*all things work*

41. As often in his homilies, by his use of the form of ἐκφρασις, “vivid description,” John seeks to make the biblical text come to life before the eyes of his audiences (see HT 101–4). This rhetorical refrain accents the experience he wishes the congregation to take away from his vibrant retelling and its significance, as Chrysostom has depicted it and drawn it into the present argument about divine providence even in affliction.

42. Minus δὲ after αἰτήσας; ὑπάρχων for γενόμενος.

ἀγαθόν; εἶδετε τοῦ διαβόλου τὴν μηχανήν, ὅπως διελύθη; ὅπως ἄκυρα αὐτοῦ γέγονε τὰ μηχανήματα; Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἀπήλασαν τὸν δαίμονα, παρεσκεύασεν εἰς τὸ δεσμωτήριον αὐτοὺς ἐμβληθῆναι, νομίζων ἐμποδίζειν τὸν δρόμον τοῦ κηρύγματος διὰ τούτου. Ἀλλ' ἰδοὺ καὶ τὸ δεσμωτήριον ἐμπορίας αὐτοῖς ὑπόθεσις γεγένηται πνευματικῆς.

δ'. Ἄρα καὶ ἡμεῖς, ἂν νήφωμεν, οὐ μόνον ἐν ἀνέσει ὄντες, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν θλίψεσι, κερδαίνειν δυνάμεθα, καὶ τότε μᾶλλον, ἢ ἐν ἀνέσει. Ἡ γὰρ ἄνεσις, ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πλεῖστον, ῥαθυμοτέρους ἐργάζεται· ἡ δὲ θλίψις νήφειν παρασκευάζουσα, ἀξιοῦσθαι ποιεῖ καὶ τῆς ἄνωθεν ῥοπῆς, καὶ μάλιστα, ὅταν διὰ τὴν εἰς τὸν Θεὸν ἐλπίδα τὴν ὑπομονὴν ἐπιδεικνύμεθα καὶ τὴν καρτερίαν ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐπαγομέναις θλίψεσι. Μὴ τοίνυν ἀλγῶμεν, ἐπειδὴν θλιβώμεθα, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον χαίρωμεν· τοῦτο γὰρ ἡμῶν ἢ τῆς εὐδοκίμησης ὑπόθεσις. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ Παῦλος ἔλεγεν, Οἶδαμεν δὲ ὅτι τοῖς ἀγαπῶσι τὸν Θεὸν πάντα συνεργεῖ εἰς ἀγαθόν. Ἀλλ' ἴδωμεν τὴν ζέουσαν ψυχὴν τῶν ἁγίων τούτων. Ἐπεὶ οὖν ἤκουσαν τοῦ δεσμοφύλακος λέγοντος, Τί με δεῖ ποιεῖν, ἵνα σωθῶ; ἄρα ὑπερέθεντο; ἄρα ἀνεβάλοντο; ἄρα ἡμέλησαν πρὸς τὴν κατήχησιν; Οὐδαμῶς· ἀλλὰ τί πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐκείνοι; Πίστευσον ἐπὶ τὸν Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, καὶ σωθήσῃ σὺ, καὶ πᾶς ὁ οἶκός σου.

Ὅρα κηδεμονίαν ἀποστολικήν. Οὐκ ἀρκοῦνται τῇ αὐτοῦ σωτηρίᾳ, ἀλλὰ δι' ἐκείνου βούλονται καὶ τοὺς προσήκοντας αὐτῷ πάντας σαγηνεῦσαι εἰς τὸν τῆς εὐσεβείας λόγον, καιρίαν διδόντες τῷ διαβόλῳ τὴν πληγὴν. Καὶ ἐβαπτίσθη αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ αὐτοῦ πάντες παραχρῆμα, καὶ ἡγαλλιάσατο πανοικί πεπιστευκῶς τῷ Θεῷ. Ἐντεῦθεν παιδευόμεθα μηδέποτε ἐν τοῖς πνευματικοῖς μηδὲ τὸ τυχόν ἀναβάλλεσθαι, ἀλλὰ πάντοτε καιρὸν ἐπιτήδειον ἡγεῖσθαι τὸν παραπίπτοντα. Εἰ γὰρ νυκτὸς οὔσης οἱ ἅγιοι οὗτοι ὑπερθέσθαι οὐκ ἠνέσχοντο, ποίαν ἔξομεν ἀπολογίαν ἡμεῖς, ἐν ἐτέρῳ καιρῷ παρατρέχοντες πνευματικὸν κέρδος; Εἶδες ἐκκλησίαν τὸ δεσμωτήριον γινόμενον; εἶδες τὸ καταγώγιον

43. Alternatively, one might translate ἐμπορία with PGL 3 and render the sentence, “even the prison became the occasion for spiritual profit.” I choose to render the business metaphor more explicitly, due to the continual language of commerce in this homily (see also the use of ἐμπορία again below, in §4 [PG 51:171]).

44. Cf. 2 Cor 8:13; 2 Thess 1:6–7 for the antithesis of ἀνεσις and θλίψις (in the singular).

45. Sc. undergoing θλίψις.

46. Plus πᾶς before ὁ οἶκος.

47. John invokes traditional missionary language of the gospel (as λόγος) and missionaries as fishermen catching converts in their nets, σαγηνεῦσαι (cf. Mark 1:16–20 parr., etc.; cf. also Matt 13:47–50, where the dragnet image is applied to eschatological judgment).

together for good for those who love God”? Have you seen how the devil’s scheme was demolished? How his scheming plans were neutralized? For when Paul and Silas had driven out the demon, the devil arranged for them to be thrown into prison, supposing by this means to stop the course of the gospel proclamation. But lo and behold, even the prison became the base for their spiritual business.⁴³

4. So then, if we stay awake, not only in periods of ease but also of affliction,⁴⁴ we, too, shall be able to gain profit in afflictions even more than at a period of ease. After all, ease for the most part makes us lazier, whereas affliction, by rendering us alert, makes us worthy of assistance from on high—especially when on account of our hope in God we show endurance and steadfastness in all the afflictions that are brought upon us. So let’s not grieve when we are afflicted, but instead let’s rejoice! For this⁴⁵ is the basis of our good standing. That’s why Paul said, “*We know that all things work together for good for those who love God.*” Yet let’s look further at the fervent souls of these saints. After they heard the jailer say, “*What must I do to be saved?*” (Acts 16:30), did they delay? Did they put it off? Did they neglect an opportunity for catechesis? No way! But what did they reply to him? “*Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ and you and all your household will be saved*” (Acts 16:31).⁴⁶

Look at the care the apostles exhibit! They don’t rest content with just his salvation, but they wish through him for all his relatives to be “caught” for the pious gospel message,⁴⁷ thus striking the devil with an opportune blow.⁴⁸ “*And he and all his household were immediately baptized ... and he rejoiced with his whole household that he had come to believe in God*” (Acts 16:33–34).⁴⁹ From this story we’re instructed never to delay in spiritual matters, nor in regard to anything else, but always to consider any moment that arises an opportunity. For if these saints didn’t allow themselves to delay when it was nighttime, then what kind of excuse will we have if we neglect⁵⁰ spiritual gain at other times? Have you seen the prison become a church? Have you seen the public executioners’ quarters suddenly shown

48. *καιρίαν πληγὴν διδόναι* is an idiom meaning “to strike a deadly blow,” but I translate *καιρία* here as “opportune,” since John will play on that sense in what follows. In the full sentence, John may be emphasizing the about-face Paul and Silas effected, “ensnaring” the jailer and family in the face of the devil’s intent to “ensnare” (i.e., place in a *παγίς*) the unsuspecting (1 Tim 3:7 and 2 Tim 2:26).

49. With *ἡγαλλιάσατο* for *ἡγαλλιάτο*; ellipsis as marked.

50. *παρατρέχοντες*, literally, “to run right past” (a favored term of Chrysostom’s for dereliction, in life and in exegesis).

τῶν δημίων, εὐκτήριον οἶκον ἐξαίφνης ἀποδειχθέντα, καὶ τὴν μυσταγωγίαν ἐκεῖ τελουμένην; [171] Τοσοῦτόν ἐστι τὸ νήφειν, καὶ μηδέποτε παρατρέχειν τὰ πνευματικά κέρδη, ἀλλὰ πάντα καιρὸν ἐπιτήδειον ποιεῖσθαι πρὸς τὴν τοιαύτην ἐμπορίαν. Καλῶς ἄρα ἔλεγεν ὁ μακάριος οὗτος γράφων, Ὅτι τοῖς ἀγαπῶσι τὸν Θεὸν πάντα συνεργεῖ εἰς ἀγαθόν.

Ταύτην τὴν ῥῆσιν, παρακαλῶ, καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐγκεκολαμμένην ἔχοντες τῇ διανοίᾳ τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ, μηδέποτε ἀσχάλλωμεν, ἐπειδὴν λυπηροῖς τισι κατὰ τὸν βίον τοῦτον περιπέσωμεν, ἢ περιστάσειςιν, ἢ ἀρρωστίαις σωματικαῖς, ἢ ἐτέροις τισὶ λυπηροῖς πράγμασιν· ἀλλὰ πολλῇ κεχρημένοι τῇ φιλοσοφίᾳ, ἀντέχωμεν πρὸς πάντα πειρασμόν, εἰδότες ὅτι, ἂν νήφωμεν, πανταχόθεν κερδαίνειν δυνάμεθα, καὶ μᾶλλον ἀπὸ τῶν πειρασμῶν ἢ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνέσεων· καὶ μηδέποτε ἀλύωμεν, ἐννοοῦντες ὅσον τῆς ὑπομονῆς τὸ κέρδος, ἀλλὰ μηδὲ ἀπεχθῶς ἔχωμεν πρὸς τοὺς ἐπάγοντας ἡμῖν τοὺς πειρασμούς. Εἰ γὰρ κάκεῖνοι τὸν οἰκεῖον σκοπὸν πληροῦντες τοῦτο ποιοῦσιν, ἀλλ' ὁ κοινὸς Δεσπότης συγχωρεῖ, βουλόμενος ἡμᾶς καὶ διὰ τούτων ἐμπορεύσασθαι τὴν πνευματικὴν ἐμπορίαν, καὶ τῆς ὑπομονῆς λαβεῖν τὸν μισθόν. Ἐὰν οὖν δυνηθῶμεν εὐχα- [172]ρίστως ἐνεγκεῖν τὰ ἐπαγόμενα, οὐ μικρὸν μέρος τῶν πεπλημμελημένων ἡμῖν διαλύσομεν. Εἰ γὰρ τὸν θησαυρὸν τοῦτον καὶ τῆς οἰκουμένης διδάσκαλον, καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν κινδύνους περιπίπτοντα ὁρῶν ὁ Δεσπότης ἠνείχετο, οὐ περιορῶν τὸν οἰκεῖον ἀθλητὴν, ἀλλὰ τὰ σκάμματα αὐτῷ μακρότερα κατασκευάζων, ἵνα τοὺς στεφάνους αὐτῷ λαμπροτέρους ἀπεργάσῃται, τί ἂν εἴποιμεν ἡμεῖς, οἱ μυρίων γέμοντες ἁμαρτημάτων, καὶ διὰ ταῦτα πολλάκις τοῖς πειρασμοῖς περιπίπτοντες, ἵνα τὴν ὑπὲρ τούτων δίκην ἐνταῦθα δόντες, μικρᾶς γοῦν φιланθρωπίας ἀξιωθῶμεν, ἐπὶ τῆς φοβερᾶς ἐκείνης ἡμέρας τῶν ἀπορρήτων ἐκείνων ἀγαθῶν ἀπολαύσαντες; Τοῦτο δὲ λογιζόμενοι παρ' ἑαυτοῖς, πρὸς ἅπαντα γενναίως ἀντέχωμεν, ἵνα καὶ τῆς ὑπομονῆς τὸν μισθὸν δεξώμεθα ἀπὸ τοῦ φιλανθρώπου Δεσπότου, καὶ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν ἡμῖν ἁμαρτημένων ὑποτεμέσθαι δυνηθῶμεν, καὶ τῶν αἰωνίων ἀγαθῶν ἐπιτυχεῖν, χάριτι καὶ φιλανθρωπίᾳ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, μεθ' οὗ τῷ Πατρὶ, ἅμα τῷ ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι δόξα, κράτος, τιμὴ, νῦν καὶ αἰεὶ, καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Ἀμήν.

51. μυσταγωγία τελουμένη: the technical language for the movement of catechumens through initiation (including and surrounding baptism).

52. I.e., ἐμπορία πνευματικῇ, as above (§3 [PG 51:170]), in reference to evangelization.

to be a house of prayer? Have you seen the rites of sacred instruction carried out there?⁵¹ [171] This is what it means to stay awake and never neglect spiritual gains, but to make every moment an opportunity for this kind of business.⁵² How rightly then did this blessed man say in his letter “*that all things work together for good for those who love God*.”

I beg you, let us, too, have this statement carved into our minds⁵³ and never be distressed whenever in the course of this life we encounter pains or hardships or bodily illnesses or other painful things. But let’s withstand every trial by maintaining a philosophical disposition, because we know that if we stay awake we’re able to gain profit from everything—and even more from the hardships than from the periods of ease. And let’s never grieve, as we consider how great the gain of endurance is, nor have enmity toward those who bring the trials against us. For although they do this in order to fulfill their own purpose, the Lord of all permits it because he wishes us to conduct spiritual business even through these hardships, and to receive the wages of endurance. Hence, if we are able [172] to endure what comes in a spirit of gratitude, we shall undo no small portion of the wrongs that are done to us. Indeed, the Lord put up with seeing this treasure and teacher of the world falling into dangers every single day (cf. 2 Cor 11:26). He wasn’t disregarding his own athlete (cf. 1 Cor 9:24–27), but he was making the long-jump pits even lengthier for him so that in turn he might make his crowns of victory all the more splendid. If that’s the case with Paul, then what could we possibly say? After all, we’re filled with countless sins, and it’s because of them that we often fall into trials. Hence, by making amends for our sins in this way, perhaps we might be found worthy of at least a small measure of divine love, and on that fearful day⁵⁴ enjoy those indescribable goods. Keeping this in our minds, let’s hold out nobly before all that comes, so we might receive also the reward for endurance from our loving Lord and be able to guard against the bulk of our sins and attain the eternal goods, by the grace and loving-kindness of our Lord Jesus Christ, with whom be glory, power, and honor to the Father, together with the Holy Spirit, now and always, forever and ever. Amen.

53. ἐγκολάπτεισθαι, one of many metaphors Chrysostom uses for internalizing the scriptural text, which is for him the definitive solution to the problem of despondency.

54. I.e., the day of eschatological judgment, on which note John often ends his homilies.

ΠΡΟΣ ΤΟΥΣ Μὴ ἀπαντήσαντας εἰς τὴν σύναξιν, καὶ εἰς τὴν ἀποστολικὴν ῥῆσιν τὴν λέγουσαν, «Ἐὰν πεινᾷ ὁ ἐχθρὸς σου ψώμιζε αὐτόν,» καὶ περὶ τοῦ μνησικακεῖν.

α'. [171] Οὐδὲν, ὡς ἔοικεν, ὠφελήσαμεν, μακρὸν λόγον πρώην πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἀποτείναντες ὑπὲρ τῆς περὶ τὰς συνάξεις σπουδῆς· πάλιν γὰρ ἡμῖν ἔρημος ἡ ἐκκλησία τῶν τέκνων. Διὸ καὶ πάλιν ἀναγκάζομαι ἐπαχθῆς φανῆναι καὶ βαρὺς, ἐπιτιμῶν τοῖς παροῦσιν, ἐγκαλῶν τοῖς ἀπολειφθεῖσιν· ἐκείνοις μὲν, ὅτι τὴν ῥαθυμίαν οὐκ ἀπέθεντο, ὑμῖν δὲ, ὅτι τῆς τῶν ἀδελφῶν οὐκ ἀντελάβεσθε

1. Provenance: the dating of this homily had earlier rested on the assessment of the significance of the references to the imperial court and attendants in §4 (PG 51:177–78), with Mf, for instance, regarding these as indices of Constantinopolitan provenance (3:156). His view was confidently followed by Stephens in his translation in *NPNF1* 9:306 n. 740: “the allusions which it contains to the Imperial palace and guard, and some other points of internal evidence prove that it was delivered at Constantinople.” However, Mayer, *Provenance*, 370–74, rightly disputes whether one can draw inferences about the context of any homily from John’s use of such conventional rhetorical exempla. In 1956 Wenger argued that this homily must have immediately followed *Hom. Act. 9:1*, hom. 4 (which it succeeds in Athos, Stavronikita 6), based upon “la correspondance parfaite” between the description of the previous homily in §5 of this one with the former at 4.2 (PG 51:147), both of which he placed at Antioch. See Antoine Wenger, “La tradition des oeuvres de Saint Jean Chrysostome,” *Revue des études byzantines* 14 (1956): 5–47, esp. 45. See n. 54 below for the text and translation. While accepting Wenger’s argument that *Hom. Rom. 12:20* must have immediately succeeded *Hom. Act. 9:1*, hom. 4, as Wenger’s manuscript had ordered them (to which I would add that according to Pinakes the same sequence is found in Genova, Biblioteca Franzoniana Urbani 13, and Moscow, Sinod. Gr. 128), Mayer has shown that, because the assumption that *Hom. Act. 9:1*, hom. 1–4 constituted a series delivered at Antioch is not tenable, no argument for certain provenance can thereby be established. See *Provenance*, 249–50, 264, 511, and her extensive treatment of this line of argument in “The Sequence and Provenance of John Chrysostom’s Homilies *In illud: Si esurierit*

Hom. Rom. 12:20
(*In illud: si esurierit inimicus tuus*)
CPG 4375 (PG 51:171–86)¹

Against those who've not come to the liturgical assembly, and on the passage of the apostle that says, "*If your enemy is hungry, feed them*" (Rom 12:20),² and on holding grudges.

1. [171] It seems we didn't benefit you at all the last time by giving you a very long homily about eagerness to come to the liturgical assemblies! For once again our worship assembly is bereft of children.³ And yet again I'm compelled to appear offensive and onerous⁴ as I rebuke those who are present and heap accusations on those who've failed to show up—they

inimicus (CPG 4375), *De mutatione nominum* (CPG 4372) and *In principium Actorum* (CPG 4371)," *Aug* 46 (2006): 169–86. If certainty about the venue or year of this homily eludes us, as it seems to, one thing is sure: the homily is set sometime in the late spring or summer (see the complaints about the heat in §2 [PG 51:174–76]).

Text: Mf PE (1837) as reprinted by JPM in PG (1862), including only one conjectural textual note originally from Mf (1721) and three added in the PE, none of which was based on new manuscript evidence. JPM adopts one of the three PE conjectures at §6 (PG 51:184). All are included in our notes below. Pinakes to date lists just four manuscripts that contain this homily (Athens [XIII, missing §1, with incipit at PG 51:174.12], Genova [XI] and Moscow [X], in addition to Oxon. Coll. Nov. 80, the source for HS); adding Athos, Stavronikita 6, there are five known manuscripts that contain this homily.

2. Minus οὖν before πεινᾷ.

3. This could refer to all believers as children (with the church as their mother, as in §4, below), or (by extension) to them as John's children. It is also possible that he may have in mind those literally of a younger age. In the argument that follows, John chides his hearers for not bringing people in general, including their sons (§3 [PG 51:176]; there is no specific reference to daughters), but he does not restrict his censure to the absence of youths. The evidence for regular attendance of children at the *synaxis* at this time is uncertain (see Mayer-Allen, *John Chrysostom*, 35, citing this homily).

4. Perhaps a play on John having to inhabit the role of stern father in regard to those missing children.

σωτηρίας. Ἀναγκάζομαι βαρὺς φανῆναι καὶ ἐπαχθής, οὐχ ὑπὲρ ἑμαυτοῦ καὶ τῶν ἐμῶν κτημάτων, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν καὶ τῆς ὑμετέρας σωτηρίας, ἧς οὐδὲν ἐμοὶ προτιμότερον. Ὁ βουλούμενος βαρυνέσθω, καὶ φορτικὸν καὶ ἀναισχυτον καλεῖτω· ἐγὼ δὲ οὐ παύσομαι συνεχῶς ὑπὲρ τῶν αὐτῶν ἐνοχλῶν· τῆς γὰρ ἀναισχυντίας ταύτης οὐδὲν ἄμεινον [172] ἐμοί. Ἴσως γὰρ, ἴσως, εἰ καὶ μηδὲν ἕτερον, τοῦτο γοῦν ἐρυθρίασαντες, τὸ μὴ συνεχῶς ὀχλεῖσθαι περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν, ἀντιλήψεσθέ ποτε τῆς κηδεμονίας τῶν ἀδελφῶν τῶν ὑμετέρων. Τί γάρ μοι τῶν ἐπαίνων ὄφελος, ὅταν ὑμᾶς μὴ θεάσωμαι προκόπτοντας κατ' ἀρετήν; τί δέ μοι βλάβος ἐκ τῆς σιγῆς τῶν ἀκουόντων, ὅταν αὐξομένην ὑμῶν ἴδω τὴν εὐλάβειαν; Ἐπαινος γὰρ τοῦ λέγοντος οὐχ ὁ κρότος, ἀλλ' ὁ περὶ τὴν εὐσέβειαν ζῆλος τῶν ἀκουόντων· οὐχ ὁ θόρυβος κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τῆς ἀκροάσεως, ἀλλ' ἡ σπουδὴ ἢ διαπαντὸς τοῦ χρόνου. Ὁ κρότος ἐξῆλθεν ὁμοῦ τε τοῦ στόματος, καὶ εἰς ἄερα διαχυθεὶς ἀπώλετο· τὸ δὲ βελτίονας γενέσθαι τοὺς ἀκούοντας, ἀγῆρω καὶ ἀθάνατον φέρει τὸν μισθὸν καὶ τῷ λέγοντι καὶ τοῖς πειθο-[173] μένοις. Ὁ τῆς βοῆς ὑμῶν ἔπαινος ἐνταῦθα τὸν λέγοντα ποιεῖ λαμπρὸν, ἢ δὲ τῆς ψυχῆς ὑμῶν εὐλάβεια πολλὴν ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ δίδωσι παρρησίαν τῷ διδάξαντι. Ὡστε, εἴ τις τῶν λεγόντων ἐρά, μὴ τῶν κρότων, ἀλλὰ τῆς ὠφελείας τῶν ἀκουόντων ἐράτω.

Οὐκ ἔστι τὸ τυχὸν κακὸν ἀδελφῶν ἀμελεῖν, ἀλλ' ἐσχάτη κόλασις, καὶ ἀπαραίτητος τιμωρία· καὶ τοῦτο ὁ τὸ τάλαντον καταχῶσας ἐδήλωσεν. Οὐδὲν γοῦν ὑπὲρ τῆς οἰκειᾶς ἐνεκαλεῖτο ζωῆς· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐγένετο κακὸς περὶ τὴν καταθήκην· ὁλόκληρον γὰρ αὐτὴν ἀπέδωκεν· ἀλλ' ὅμως ἐγένετο κακὸς καὶ περὶ τὴν ἐργασίαν τῆς παρακαταθήκης. Οὐ γὰρ ἐδιπλασίασε τὸ πιστευθέν· διὸ καὶ ἐκολάζετο. Ὅθεν δῆλον, ὅτι καὶ ἡμεῖς σπουδαῖοι ὦμεν καὶ συγκεκροτημένοι, καὶ πολλὴν ἐπιθυμίαν ἔχωμεν περὶ τὴν ἀκρόασιν τῶν θείων Γραφῶν, οὐκ ἀρκεῖ πρὸς σωτηρίαν ἡμῶν. Διπλασιάσαι γὰρ χρὴ τὴν παρακαταθήκην, διπλῇ δὲ γίνεται, ὅταν μετὰ τῆς ἑαυτῶν σωτηρίας, καὶ τῆς ἐτέρων ἀντιλαμβανώμεθα προνοίας. Ἐπεὶ ἀκακείνος εἶπεν, Ἴδε ἔχεις τὸ σὸν σῶον· ἀλλ' οὐκ ἤρκεσεν αὐτῷ τοῦτο πρὸς ἀπολογία. Ἔδει γὰρ, φησὶ, καταβαλεῖν ἐπὶ τοὺς τραπεζίτας

5. ῥαθυμία for John implies not just indolence but also a kind of moral torpor or indifference (see also later in his homily at nn. 17 and 96).

6. Taking the aorists here as gnomic.

7. συγκεροτεῖσθαι can also mean “be applauded” and hence plays also on κρότος earlier.

because they didn't overcome their laziness,⁵ and you because you've not assisted in the salvation of your brothers and sisters. I'm compelled to appear onerous and offensive, not for the sake of myself and my own interests, but on behalf of you and your salvation, which is more precious to me than anything else. Be offended by this if you want, and call it onerous and shameful. But I'll not stop troubling you again and again about the same concerns, because in my eyes there's nothing better than this sort of shamelessness. [172] For perhaps, just perhaps, even if for no other reason, at least out of embarrassment for not being continually concerned about the same things, you'll assist at some point in the care of your brothers and sisters. After all, what benefit do I get from praise, when I don't see you advancing in virtue? Or what harm do I get from your silence while you listen, when I see your piety increasing? For the praise that accrues to the speaker isn't the applause, but the eagerness of the listeners for piety; not the cheering at the moment of hearing, but the zeal that remains for a long time. Acclaim comes out⁶ of the mouth and immediately disperses into the air and is gone; but when listeners become better people, it confers a reward that's ageless and immortal, both for the one who speaks and for those [173] who obey. Your cry of acclamation makes the speaker famous here and now, but the piety in your soul gives your teacher great confidence at "*the judgment seat of Christ*" (2 Cor 5:10). Therefore, if a speaker desires anything, let it not be applause, but a desire for the benefit of the listeners.

Now, neglecting one's brothers and sisters is no trifling misdeed. No, it is a cause for the worst chastisement and unrelenting punishment. The man who buried the talent shows this clearly (cf. Matt 25:14–30). He wasn't blamed in the least for the way he lived, nor did he do something wicked with the deposit, for he repaid it in full. But nevertheless, when it came to the investment income from the deposit placed in his care, he was wicked, for he didn't double the amount entrusted to him; so, consequently, he was punished. From this it is clear that even if we are studious and disciplined,⁷ and even if we have a great desire for listening to the divine Scriptures, it's not sufficient for our salvation. We must double the deposit in our care. And it's doubled when, along with our own salvation, we provide assistance for the care of others. The slave said, "*Look, you have what is yours in full*" (Matt 25:25),⁸ but that didn't provide him with a satisfactory self-

8. Plus *σῶον* ("safe and sound, whole") after τὸν *σόν*, which John has added here to accent the point of full recompense. Elsewhere he cites the verse simply as *ἔχεις τὸ σόν* (Hom. Matt. 78.2 [PG 58:714]; Hom. Gen. 41.2 [PG 53:376]).

τὸ καταβληθέν. Καί μοι σκόπει, πῶς κοῦφα τοῦ Δεσπότου τὰ ἐπιτάγματα. Ἄνθρωποι μὲν γὰρ τοὺς δανείζοντας χρήματα δεσποτικά καὶ τῆς ἀπαιτήσεως ὑπευθύνους ποιοῦσι. Σὺ κατέβαλες, σὺ, φησὶν, ἀπαίτησον· ἐμοὶ λόγος οὐδεὶς πρὸς τὸν δεξάμενον. Ὁ δὲ Θεὸς οὐχ οὕτως, ἀλλὰ καταβαλεῖν κελεύει μόνον, οὐκέτι δὲ καὶ τῆς ἀπαιτήσεως ἡμᾶς ὑπευθύνους ποιεῖ. Τοῦ συμβουλευσai γὰρ, οὐ τοῦ πείσαι κύριος ὁ λέγων ἐστί. Διὸ τῆς καταβολῆς ὑπεύθυνόν σε ποιῶ μόνον, φησὶ, τῆς δὲ ἀπαιτήσεως οὐκέτι. Τί τούτου κουφότερον; Ἀλλ' ὅμως σκληρὸν ἐκάλει τὸν οὕτως ἡμερον καὶ φιλάνθρωπον δεσπότην ὁ δοῦλος. Τοιαῦται γὰρ τῶν ἀγνωμόνων καὶ ῥαθύμων οἰκετῶν αἱ συνήθειαι· τῶν οἰκείων ἀμαρτημάτων εἰς τοὺς δεσπότας αἰεὶ μετατιθέασι τὰς αἰτίας. Διὰ τοῦτο στρεβλούμενος καὶ δεσμούμενος ἐκεῖνος εἰς τὸ σκότος ἐξήγετο τὸ ἐξώτερον.

Ὅπερ ἵνα μὴ ἡμεῖς πάθωμεν, καταβάλλωμεν τὴν διδασκαλίαν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀδελφούς, καὶ πείθωνται, καὶ μὴ πείθωνται. Πειθόμενοι μὲν γὰρ, καὶ ἑαυτοὺς καὶ ἡμᾶς ὠφελήσουσι· μὴ πειθόμενοι δὲ, αὐτοῖς μὲν ἀπαραίτητον ἐπισπῶνται κόλασιν, ἡμᾶς δὲ οὐδὲ τὸ τυχὸν παραβλάψαι δύναιντ' ἄν. Τὸ γὰρ ἡμέτερον ἐποιήσαμεν, συμβουλευσάντες· εἰ δὲ μὴ πειθοῖντο, οὐδὲν ἡμῖν ἐκ τούτου γένοιτ' ἄν βλάβος. Ἐγκλημα γὰρ, οὐ τὸ μὴ πείσαι, ἀλλὰ τὸ μὴ συμβουλευσai· μετὰ δὲ τὴν παραινέσιν καὶ τὴν συμβουλήν, τὴν διηνεκὴ καὶ τὴν συνεχῇ, οὐκέτι πρὸς ἡμᾶς, ἀλλὰ πρὸς ἐκείνους ἔσται ὁ λόγος τῷ Θεῷ. Ἐβουλόμην γοῦν εἰδέναι σαφῶς, ὅτι παραινούντες αὐτοὺς διατελεῖτε, καὶ εἰ διαπαντὸς μένουσιν ἐπὶ τῆς ῥαθυμίας ἐκεῖνοι, καὶ οὐκ ἂν ὑμῖν οὐδέποτε ἡνόχλησα· νῦν δέδοικα, μὴ ποτε ἐκ τῆς ὑμετέρας ὑπεροψίας καὶ ἀμελείας μένωσιν ἀδιόρθωτοι. Καὶ γὰρ ἀμήχανον ἄνθρωπον συνεχῶς ἀπολαύοντα παραινέσεως καὶ διδασκαλίας, μὴ γενέσθαι βελτίω καὶ σπουδαιότερον. Καὶ δημῶδης μὲν ἐστὶν ἡ παροιμία, ἢ ἐρεῖν μέλλω· πλην ἄλλ' αὐτὸ τοῦτο συνίστησι. Πέτρων γὰρ κοιλαί-[174]νει, φησὶ, ῥανὶς ὑδάτων ἐνδελεχοῦσα.

9. The subject of φησί could be Jesus, the speaker of the parable, or the master of the household, who addresses this line to the slave who hid the talent.

10. A paraphrastic citation: minus οὖν σε after ἔδει; with καταβαλεῖν for βαλεῖν; ἐπὶ τοὺς τραπεζίτας for τοῖς τραπεζίταις; τὸ καταβληθέν for τὸ ἀργύριόν μου; transposition of [τὸ ἀργύριόν μου] and ἐπὶ τοὺς τραπεζίτας.

11. On Chrysostom's depictions of slaves, including such caricatures and stereotypes, see Chris L. de Wet, *Preaching Bondage: John Chrysostom and the Discourse of Slavery in Early Christianity* (Oakland, CA: University of California Press, 2015).

12. ἐξήγετο for Matthew's imperative ἐκβάλετε.

13. Cf. Matt 22:13 for the binding (δήσαντες; cf. δεσμούμενος), which is not present in Matt 25:30. Among the parables in Matthew that end with the casting into outer darkness and the wailing and gnashing of teeth, none refer specially to torture (στρεβλούμενος), but perhaps John has in mind Matt 24:51 (διχοτομήσει).

defense. For, he says,⁹ “*it was necessary to place the investment with the bankers*” (Matt 25:27).¹⁰ Observe how easy the commands of the Lord are. For human beings hold those who lend out their master’s money liable for its return on demand as well. “You’ve made the deposit,” a master says. “Demand its return. I have no reckoning with the one who received it.” But it’s not like that with God; he just commands us to make the deposit, and then he no longer holds us liable for its return. For the Lord is the kind of speaker who seeks to advise, not to persuade. Hence, “I hold you liable only for the deposit,” he says, “and not for its return.” What could be easier than this? Nevertheless, the slave calls the master who is so gentle and loving “harsh” (cf. Matt 25:24), because this is the way it customarily is with senseless and lazy household slaves.¹¹ They always shift the blame for their own sins onto their master. That’s why he tortured and bound him and led him out¹² “*to the outer darkness*” (Matt 25:30).¹³

So we don’t suffer this fate, let’s deposit¹⁴ the teaching with our brothers and sisters, whether they heed it¹⁵ or not. For if they do heed it, then they’ll benefit both themselves and us; but if they don’t heed it, they bring an unrelenting punishment on themselves, but they can’t harm us in the least. For we did our part in giving the advice, but if they don’t heed it, then no harm can come to us from it. What’s blameworthy isn’t failing to persuade, but not giving the advice.¹⁶ After the advice and the counsel, if they’ve been ceaseless and continuous, the accounting to be made to God lies no longer with us but with them. I would at least wish to know unambiguously that you’re continuing to offer them advice, even if they continually remain indolent;¹⁷ then I wouldn’t trouble you anymore. But as it is, I’m afraid they might remain without correction because of your disregard and neglect. For it’s impossible for a person who continually has the benefit of advice and teaching not to become better and more virtuous. Although the proverb I’m going to tell is a popular one, nonetheless I recommend it to your attention: [174] “*A continuous drop of water hollows out a rock,*”¹⁸

14. John is including his addressees in the task of spreading the news of the gospel and the Christian life to others as they go forth from the *synaxis*.

15. *πείθεσθαι*: also “be persuaded by it.”

16. Note that the same contrast between verbs of speaking (*συμβουλεύειν*, *πείθειν*) had been predicated of divine speech above.

17. *ῥαθυμία*, also “laziness” or “moral lassitude” (see LSJ II.2; PGL 2), a key theme of this homily.

18. The proverb, well attested by Galen in *De temperamentis*, *De locis affectis*, and others, is attributed to a *Χοιρίλος* by Simplicius. See Georg Helmreich, ed., *Galen De*

Καίτοι τί μαλακώτερον ὕδατος; τί δὲ πέτρας σκληρότερον; Ἄλλ' ὅμως ἡ ἐνδελέχεια τὴν φύσιν ἐνίκησεν. Εἰ δὲ φύσιν ἐνδελέχεια νικᾷ, πολλῶ μᾶλλον προαιρέσεως δύναται ἂν περιγενέσθαι. Οὐκ ἔστι παίγνια ὁ Χριστιανισμός, ἀγαπητοί, οὐδὲ πρᾶγμα πάρεργον. Συνεχῶς ταῦτα λέγομεν, καὶ οὐδὲν πλέον ποιοῦμεν.

β'. Πῶς οἴεσθέ με ὀδυνᾶσθαι, ἀναμιμνησκόμενον ὅτι ἐν μὲν ταῖς πανηγύρεσι πελάγη θαλάττης μακρὰ μιμεῖται τῶν συνάξεων τὰ πλήθη, νῦν δὲ οὐδὲ τὸ πολλοστὸν τοῦ πλήθους ἐκείνου μέρος ἐνταῦθα συλλέγεται; Ποῦ νῦν εἰσιν οἱ διανοχλοῦντες ἡμᾶς ἐν ταῖς ἐορταῖς; Ἐκείνους ἐπιζητῶ, καὶ δι' ἐκείνους ὀδύρομαι, ἐννοῶν ὅσον πλήθος ἀπόλλυται τῶν σωζομένων, ὅσην ἀδελφῶν ὑπομένω ζημίαν, πῶς εἰς ὀλίγους τὰ τῆς σωτηρίας περιίσταται, καὶ τὸ πλέον τοῦ σώματος τῆς Ἐκκλησίας μέρος νεκρῶ καὶ ἀκινήτῳ προσέοικε σώματι. Καὶ τί πρὸς ἡμᾶς, φησί; Πρὸς ὑμᾶς μὲν οὖν μάλιστα τοὺς μὴ θεραπεύοντας, τοὺς μὴ παραινοῦντας καὶ συμβουλευόντας, πρὸς ὑμᾶς οὐκ ἐπιτιθέντας ἀνάγκην, καὶ μετὰ βίας ἔλκοντας, καὶ τῆς πολλῆς ἀπάγοντας ῥαθυμίας. Ὅτι γὰρ οὐχ ἑαυτῶ χρήσιμον εἶναι χρὴ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ πολλοῖς, ἐδήλωσεν ὁ Χριστὸς, ἅλας ἡμᾶς καὶ ζύμην καλέσας καὶ φῶς· ταῦτα δὲ ἐτέροις ἐστὶ χρήσιμα καὶ λυσιτελῆ. Καὶ γὰρ ὁ λύχνος οὐχ ἑαυτῷ φαίνει, ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἐν σκότῳ καθημένοις· καὶ σὺ λύχνος εἶ, οὐχ ἵνα τοῦ φωτὸς ἀπολαύσης μόνος, ἀλλ' ἵνα ἐκεῖνον τὸν πεπλανημένον ἐπαναγάγῃς. Τί γὰρ ὄφελος λύχνου, ὅταν μὴ φαίνῃ τῷ ἐν τῷ σκότει καθημένῳ; τί δὲ ὄφελος Χριστιανοῦ, ὅταν μηδὲνα κερδάνῃ μηδὲ πρὸς ἀρετὴν ἐπαναγάγῃ; Πάλιν τὸ ἅλας οὐχ ἑαυτὸ ἐπισφίγγει

temperamentis libri iii (Leipzig: Teubner, 1904), 676; Carl Gottlob Kühn, ed., *Claudii Galeni opera omnia*, 22 vols (Leipzig: Knobloch, 1821–1833), 8:27; Hermann Diels, ed., *Simplicii in Aristotelis Physicorum libros quattuor posteriores commentaria*, vol. 10 of *Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca* (Berlin: Reimer, 1895), 1196–97. It is included as fragment 330, line 1 (1.152), in *Supplementum Hellenisticum* among the *fragmenta dubia* that could belong either to the epic poet Choerilus of Samos (fifth c. BCE) or perhaps another poet of that name from Iasos from the fourth c. BCE. See Hugh Lloyd-Jones and Peter Parsons, eds. *Supplementum Hellenisticum*, 2 vols, TK 11 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1983). Their text cites the proverb as follows: πέτρην κοιλαίνει ῥάνις ὕδατος ἐνδελεχείη. Chrysostom's version reads πέτρα for πέτρην; ὑδάτων for ὕδατος; and ἐνδελεχοῦσα for ἐνδελεχείη. (The participle is found in renditions of the saying in other late antique and Byzantine authors such as Didymus the Blind, Isidore of Pelusium, John of Damascus, and Photius.) There are also multiple versions on the same theme in Latin literature, as in Lucretius, *Rer. nat.* 1.313 (*stilicidi casus lapidem cavat*), with further references in William Augustus Merrill, ed., *Lucretius, "De rerum natura" libri sex* (New York: American Book Company, 1907), 322.

19. *προαίρεσις* is a key term and concept for Chrysostom, meaning "ethical volition," "the capacity to choose freely what is right," and the exercise of that faculty (see

it says. Yet what is softer than water? What harder than rock? But nonetheless persistence wins out over nature. And if persistence wins out over nature, how much more might it prevail over each person's will to do what is right?¹⁹ Christianity's not child's play, beloved, nor is it a trifling thing. We say these things continually, and we have no success.²⁰

2. How grieved do you suppose I am when I remember that at the festivals the crowds in the liturgical assemblies were like the huge expanse of the open sea, but now not even a tiny fraction of that crowd is gathered here? Where are they now, those who gave us such annoyance at the feasts? I search for them and I mourn for them when I consider what a large crowd of the saved are now gone, what a loss of brothers and sisters I endure, how few have encountered the teachings of salvation, with the greater part of the body of the church²¹ like a dead and inert corpse. "What does that have to do with us?" someone says. Well, it has to do with you especially, because you don't offer assistance, you don't give advice and counsel, you don't put yourselves under an obligation and drag them forcefully and lead them away from their laziness. When Christ called us "*salt*" and "*leaven*" and "*light*" (Matt 5:13–14),²² he made it clear that we must be of use not only for ourselves individually but also for many others. All three of these things are useful and advantageous to others. The lamp doesn't shine for itself but for those who are sitting in darkness (cf. Luke 1:79; Ps 106:10); you're not a lamp so that you alone might enjoy the light but so you might bring back another who's wandered away. What's the benefit of a lamp if it doesn't shine on one sitting in darkness?²³ What's the benefit of a Christian when they profit no one (cf. 1 Cor 9:19–22)²⁴ and bring no one back to virtue? Again, salt doesn't bind tightly only to itself, but it draws in the rot-

LSJ A.1–2; PGL I.A, B, D; II.B). On the philosophical roots of the term and concept in Aristotle and the Stoics, see p. 789 n. 16 below on *Laud. Paul.* hom. 6.

20. Translating πλέον ποιεῖν with LSJ II.1 s.v. πλείων, as suited to the context of John's lament. The phrase could also mean here "I do nothing more" (as in "nothing else or nothing beyond this"). Perhaps the ambiguity (about whether John's plaint is successful) is intentionally ironic.

21. τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἐκκλησίας; John assumes here the Pauline σῶμα Χριστοῦ ("body of Christ") image for the church (Rom 12:3–8; 1 Cor 12:12–31).

22. Neither in Matt 5:13–14 nor in any other verse in the gospels does Christ call his followers "*leaven*." See n. 27 below for further discussion.

23. Cf. Matt 5:14–16, with 4:16 (quoting Isa 9:1).

24. In Paul's usage, this is missionary language ("gaining" people for Christ). John appears to have in mind here those who are already "*sisters and brothers*" who need

μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ σεσηπότα τῶν σωμάτων συστέλλει, καὶ οὐκ ἀφίησι διαρρυνέντα ἀπολέσθαι. Οὕτω δὴ καὶ σὺ, ἐπειδὴ ἄλλας σε κατεσκεύασεν ὁ Θεὸς πνευματικόν, τὰ σεσηπότα μέλη, τουτέστι, τοὺς ῥαθυμούς ἀδελφῶν καὶ βαναύσους ἐπίσφιγξον καὶ σύστειλον, καὶ τῆς ῥαθυμίας, ὥσπερ τινὸς σηπεδόνος, ἀπαλλάξας, ἔνωσον τῷ λοιπῷ σώματι τῆς Ἐκκλησίας. Διὰ τοῦτό σε καὶ ζύμην ἐκάλεσε· καὶ γὰρ καὶ ἡ ζύμη οὐχ ἑαυτὴν ζυμοῖ, ἀλλὰ τὸ λοιπὸν φύραμα τὸ πολὺ καὶ ἄφατον ἢ μικρὰ καὶ βραχεῖα. Οὕτω δὴ καὶ ὑμεῖς· εἰ καὶ ὀλίγοι ἐστὲ κατὰ τὸν ἀριθμὸν, ἀλλὰ πολλοὶ καὶ δυνατοὶ τῇ πίστει καὶ τῇ κατὰ Θεὸν γίνεσθε σπουδῇ. Ὡςπερ οὖν ἡ ζύμη οὐκ ἀσθενεῖ διὰ τὴν βραχύτητα, ἀλλὰ περιγίνεται διὰ τὴν ἐγκειμένην αὐτῇ θερμότητα καὶ τὴν τῆς ποιότητος δύναμιν· οὕτω δὴ καὶ ὑμεῖς δυνήσεσθε πολλῷ πλείους πρὸς τὴν αὐτὴν ὑμῖν ἐπαναγαγεῖν σπουδῇ, ἢν θέλητε.

Εἰ δὲ τὸ θέρος προβάλλοιντο· καὶ γὰρ καὶ ταῦτα ἀκούω λεγόντων, ὅτι Σφοδρὸν τὸ πνῖγος νῦν, τὸ καῦμα ἀφόρη-[175]τον, οὐκ ἰσχύομεν στενοχωρεῖσθαι καὶ θλίβεσθαι ἐν τῷ πλήθει, ἰδρῶτι πάντοθεν περιρρέομενοι καὶ ἀχθόμενοι τῇ θερμῇ καὶ τῇ στενοχωρίᾳ· αἰσχύνομαι μὲν ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν, πιστεύσατε· γυναικῶδες γὰρ αἱ σκήψεις, μᾶλλον δὲ οὐδὲ ἐκείναις πρὸς συγγνώμην ἀρκοῦσαι αἱ προφάσεις, αἷς μαλακώτερα τὰ σώματα, καὶ ἀσθενεστέρα ἡ φύσις. Πλὴν εἰ καὶ αἰσχρὸν τὸ ἀποκρίνασθαι πρὸς τὴν τοιαύτην ἀπολογία, ἀλλ' ἀναγκαῖον ὁμῶς. Εἰ γὰρ ἐκεῖνοι τοιαῦτα προφασίζονται, καὶ οὐκ ἐρυθριῶσι, πολλῷ μᾶλλον ἡμᾶς οὐκ αἰσχύνεσθαι χρή πρὸς ταῦτα ἀντιλέγοντας.

Τί οὖν εἰποῖμι τοῖς ταῦτα προβαλλομένοις; Τῶν τριῶν παιδῶν ἀναμνησai αὐτοὺς βούλομαι τῶν ἐν τῇ καμίνῳ καὶ ἐν τῇ φλογί, οἱ πανταχόθεν αὐτοῖς περιτρέχον τὸ πῦρ ὁρῶντες, καὶ τῷ στόματι καὶ τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς, καὶ αὐτῇ περιεχυμένον τῇ ἀναπνοῇ, οὐκ ἐπαύσαντο τὸν ἱερὸν καὶ μυστικὸν ἐκεῖνον ὕμνον ἄδοντες τῷ Θεῷ μετὰ τῆς κτίσεως, ἀλλὰ τῶν ἐν λειμῶνι διατριβόντων,

help in strengthening their commitment to liturgical attendance and advancement in virtue. But, at least rhetorically, he is putting this in strong terms, since he earlier referred to believers who were now “gone” or “lost” because they do not attend the *synaxis* (ἀπόλλυσθαι, ζημία).

25. The reference seems to be to salt used to bind and heal open wounds and keep them from contracting gangrene.

26. John is, of course, influenced by Rom 12:4–5 and 1 Cor 12:12–31 in this imagery of the body of Christ as the church, in aggregate and in parts.

27. As pointed out on p. 139 n. 22 above, unlike with light and salt, there is no biblical text where Jesus calls the disciples leaven. John appears to be thinking of 1 Cor 5:6 and Gal 5:9: μικρὰ ζύμη ὅλον τὸ φύραμα ζυμοῖ. There may also be a suggestion of the parable of the woman with the leaven (Matt 13:33–34 // Luke 13:20–21), which is preceded by the parable of the miraculous growth of the tiny mustard seed (Matt 13:31–32 // Luke 13:18–19).

ting parts of bodies and doesn't allow them to waste away and be lost.²⁵ It's the same with you. Since God has made you spiritual "salt," bind together and draw in the rotting members, that is, the lazy and the slackers among the brothers and sisters, and, by freeing them of their laziness as though of rot, unify them with the rest of the body of the church.²⁶ That's why he also called you "leaven."²⁷ It is indeed the case that leaven doesn't leaven itself, but this little tiny thing leavens the rest of the lump, as incredibly large as it is. It's the same with you too. Even if you're small in number, nonetheless be numerous and powerful in faith and zeal for God. It isn't weakened by its tiny size, but because of the heat contained in it, leaven prevails even over what's characteristically strong. In the same way, if you wish, you'll be all the more able to guide many to the same zeal you have.

But what if they use the summer weather as a pretext?²⁸ This is precisely what I hear them saying: "It's stifling hot now, the heat is [175] unbearable, we're not strong enough to be in cramped quarters and crushed by the crowd, we're drenched in sweat all over and oppressed by the heat and the close quarters."²⁹ Believe me, I'm ashamed of them! These are womanish excuses; or, rather, these pretexts wouldn't even sufficiently exonerate women, whose bodies are softer and nature is weaker.³⁰ Although it's shameful even to respond to such a line of self-defense, it's necessary nonetheless. For if men allege such things by way of excuse and aren't ashamed of it, then how much more should we be unashamed when we speak out against it?

So then, what should I say to those who use these things as pretexts? I'd like to remind them of the three youths who were in the furnace and in the flame (cf. Dan 3), who, seeing the fire surrounding them from every direction and pouring right into their mouths and eyes and lungs, didn't stop singing that sacred and mystical hymn of praise to God and creation. Instead, they stood in the midst of the pyre at that moment as though they

28. As noted above, this points to a date in summer for this homily, after the spring feasts of Easter and Pentecost.

29. A mocking prosopopoeia by John of what those who haven't come to the *synaxis* say. One can readily imagine the vocal intonations and body language that accompanied this in the delivery of the homily.

30. As often, John uses the gendered accusation that men are acting like women, or even less "manly" than women, in order to shame them (see de Wet, "Virtue and the (Un)Making of Men in the Thought of John Chrysostom," as cited above, p. 91 n. 15).

ἐν μέσῃ τότε ἐστῶτες τῇ πυρᾷ, προθυμότερον τὴν εὐφημίαν τῷ κοινῷ τῶν ὅλων ἀνέπεμπον Δεσπότη· καὶ μετὰ τῶν τριῶν παίδων τούτων, τῶν λεόντων αὐτοῖς τῶν ἐν Βαβυλῶνι, καὶ τοῦ Δανιὴλ καὶ τοῦ λάκκου· οὐχὶ δὲ τούτου μόνου, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐτέρου λάκκου καὶ προφήτου, καὶ βορβόρου μέχρι τραχήλου τὸν Ἱερεμίαν ἀποπνίγοντος ἀναμνησθῆναι πάλιν αὐτοὺς ἀξιῶ. Καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν λάκκων ἀναβάς, εἰσαγαγεῖν εἰς τὸ δεσμωτήριον βούλομαι τούτους τοὺς τὸ καῦμα προβαλλομένους, καὶ δεῖξαι τὸν Παῦλον ἐκεῖ καὶ τὸν Σίλαν τῷ ξύλῳ προσδεδεμένους, μωλώπων γέμοντας καὶ τραυμάτων, τῷ πλήθει τῶν πληγῶν ἅπαν καταξανθέντας τὸ σῶμα, ἐν μέσῃ τῇ νυκτὶ τὸν Θεὸν ὕμνουντας, καὶ τὴν ἱερὰν ἐκείνην παννυχίδα ἐπιτελοῦντας. Πῶς γὰρ οὐκ ἄτοπον τοὺς μὲν ἀγίους ἐκείνους, ἐν καμίνῳ, καὶ πυρὶ, καὶ λάκκῳ, καὶ θηρίοις, καὶ βορβόρῳ, καὶ δεσμωτηρίῳ, καὶ ξύλῳ, καὶ πληγαῖς, καὶ φυλακαῖς, καὶ τοῖς ἀφορήτοις ὄντας δεινοῖς, μηδὲν τούτων αἰτιᾶσθαι πώποτε, ἀλλὰ μετὰ πολλοῦ τοῦ τόνου καὶ προθυμίας ζεοῦση εὐχαῖς καὶ ὕμνοις ἱεροῖς ἐνδιατρίβειν διηνεκῶς, ἡμᾶς δὲ οὐ μικρὸν, οὐ μέγα τῶν ἀπηριθμημένων ὑπομείναντας παθῶν, διὰ καῦμα, καὶ θερμὴν βραχεῖαν καὶ ἰδρῶτα, τῆς οἰκείας αὐτῶν ἀμελεῖν σωτηρίας, καὶ τὰς συνάξεις ἀφέντας ἔξω πλανᾶσθαι, συλλόγοις προσφθειρομένους οὐδὲν ἔχουσιν ὑγιές;

Τοσαύτη δρόσος τῶν θείων λογίων, καὶ καῦμα προβάλλῃ; Τὸ ὕδωρ, ὃ ἐγὼ δῶσω αὐτῷ, φησὶν ὁ Χριστὸς, γενήσεται ἐν αὐτῷ πηγὴ ὕδατος ἁλλομένου εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον· καὶ πάλιν, Ὁ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ, καθὼς εἶπεν ἡ Γραφή, ποταμοὶ ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας αὐτοῦ ρέουσιν ὕδατος ζωῆς. Πηγὰς ἔχων, εἰπέ μοι, καὶ ποταμοὺς πνευματικούς, καῦμα δέδοικας αἰσθητόν; ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς ἀγορᾶς, εἰπέ μοι, ἔνθα τοσοῦτος θόρυβος καὶ στενοχωρία καὶ πολλὸς ὁ καύσων, πῶς οὐ προβάλλῃ πνίγος καὶ θερμὴν; Οὐ γὰρ δὴ τοῦτο ἔχεις ἂν εἰπεῖν, ὅτι ἐκεῖ μὲν ψυχροτέρας τῆς τοῦ ἀέρος φύσεως ἔστιν ἀπολαύειν, ἐνταῦθα δὲ ἅπαν ἡμῖν συνήχεται τὸ πνίγος, ἀλλὰ πᾶν τούναντίον, ἐνταῦθα μὲν καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς ὑποκειμένης πλακὸς, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς ἄλλης τοῦ οἴκου κατασκευῆς (καὶ γὰρ

31. 6:14–24 (Θ); 6:16–24 (Θ').

32. John contrasts the συνάξεις (Christian liturgical assemblies) with σύλλογοι ("secular" assemblies or meetings of any kind); below he will mention the law courts, the legislature, and the imperial palace as examples. This is a good example of the rhetorics of contested spaces, as analyzed by Shepardson, *Controlling Contested Places*, where even the style the orator uses in his descriptions of the two sets of spaces is intended to make only one of them desirable.

33. δρόσος ("dew," "cooling moisture," used metaphorically "of comfort and refreshment"; see PGL 2a, b), as found also in the Daniel text to which John has just referred at 3:50 (both Θ and Θ'): ἐποίησε τὸ μέσον τῆς καμίνου ὥσει πνεῦμα δρόσου διασυρίζον ("and he made the midst of the furnace as though a refreshing breeze were whistling through it").

were passing time in a meadow and sent up prayerful praise even more eagerly to the one Lord of all creation. And along with the three youths, I think it's right to remind them of the lions that beset them in Babylon and of Daniel and the pit (cf. Dan 6).³¹ And not only this, but remind them of yet another pit and prophet, and the mire up to the neck that strangled Jeremiah (cf. Jer 45:6). Then, coming up from the pits, I'd like to bring those who use the heat as a pretext into the prison and show them Paul and Silas there, bound in the stocks, full of lacerations and wounds, with their bodies completely torn to shreds by the proliferation of beatings, singing praises to God in the middle of the night, performing that sacred vigil (cf. Acts 16:22–25). Indeed, those saints—who were in the furnace, the fire, the pit, the beasts, the mire, the prison, the stocks, the beatings, the confinements, and the unbearable torments—never begged off of a single one of them, but with great intensity and ardent eagerness spent their time in perpetual prayers and sacred hymns. How is it not absurd then that we—who've endured neither the lesser nor the greater types of suffering I've listed—neglect our very own salvation just because of the heat and a little warmth and sweat, and forsake our liturgical assemblies to wander off into the outside world and attend malevolent meetings that have no salutary benefit?³²

The cool draft³³ that comes from the divine words is so great, and you use the heat as a pretext? Christ says, *"the water that I shall give to a person will become in them a fountain of water springing up to eternal life"* (John 4:14), and again, *"As for the one who believes in me, as Scripture has said, rivers of living water will flow from their belly"* (John 7:38). Tell me, despite having spiritual fountains and rivers, are you afraid of physical heat? Tell me, what about the marketplace, where there's a huge crowd, cramped quarters and tremendous heat? How come you don't use the stifling heat and warmth as a pretext there? Surely you couldn't say that in the marketplace one can enjoy air that's naturally cooler, but here the stifling heat bears down on us. Because it's just the opposite. Here the air is lighter and cooler because of the marble floor below and the rest of the construction of our church-building (for it rises up immensely high!).³⁴ But there the

34. Now the ecclesial space itself becomes a dramatic character in the σύγκρισις the orator is setting up. For what we can know of the Great Church and the Old Church in Antioch, and the Great Church and Church of the Apostles in Constantinople, see briefly, Mayer-Allen, *John Chrysostom*, 17–25, and, on the former, Wendy Mayer and Pauline Allen, *The Churches of Syrian Antioch (300–638 CE)*, *Late Antique History and Religion* 5 (Leuven: Peeters, 2012), 68–79, 100–102. Mayer (*Churches of Syrian Antioch*, 68–71) resists identifying this passage with the "Great Church" at Antioch,

εἰς ὕψος ἀνέστηκεν ἄφατον) κουφότερος καὶ ψυχρότερος ὁ ἀήρ· ἐκεῖ δὲ πολὺς μὲν ἥλιος πανταχοῦ, πολλή δὲ ἡ στενοχωρία καὶ καπνὸς καὶ κόνις, καὶ ἕτερα πολλῶ πλείονα τούτων ἐπιτείνοντα τὴν ἀηδίαν. "Οθεν δῆλον, ὅτι ῥαθυ-[176]μίας καὶ ψυχῆς ἀναπεπτωκυίας καὶ τῆς τοῦ Πνεύματος φλογὸς ἀπεστερημένης αὐταὶ αἱ προφάσεις αἱ ἄλογοι.

γ'. Ταῦτα οὐχὶ πρὸς ἐκείνους τοσοῦτον ἀποτεινόμενος λέγω νῦν, ὅσον πρὸς ὑμᾶς τοὺς οὐκ ἐπισπωμένους, τοὺς οὐκ ἀνιστῶντας αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς ῥαθυμίας, καὶ πρὸς τὴν σωτηρίαν ταύτην ἔλκοντας τράπεζαν. Καὶ οἰκέται μὲν κοινὴν μέλλοντες ἐκπληροῦν διακονίαν, τοὺς αὐτῶν συνδούλους καλοῦσιν· ὑμεῖς δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν πνευματικὴν ταύτην μέλλοντες ἀπαντᾶν ὑπηρεσίαν, περιοράτε τοὺς ὁμοδούλους τοῦ κέρδους ἀποστερουμένους. Τί οὖν, εἰ μὴ βούλοιντο, φησί; Ποίησον αὐτοὺς βουληθῆναι τῇ συνεχεῖ προσεδρεῖα· ἂν γὰρ ἴδωσιν ἐπικειμένους ἡμᾶς, πάντως βουλήσονται. Ἀλλὰ γὰρ σκῆψις ταῦτα καὶ πρόφασις. Πόσοι γοῦν ἐνταῦθα πατέρες εἰσὶ καὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς οὐκ ἔχουσι μεθ' ἑαυτῶν ἐστῶτας; μὴ καὶ τῶν τέκνων ἐπισπάσασθαι σοὶ δύσκολον ἦν; "Οθεν δῆλον ὅτι καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ οὐ παρὰ τὴν οἰκείαν ῥαθυμίαν μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ παρὰ τὴν ὑμετέραν ὑπεροψίαν ἔξω μένουσιν. Ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ μὴ πρότερον, νῦν γοῦν διανόστητε, καὶ μετὰ τοῦ μέλους ἕκαστος εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν εἰσιέτω, καὶ πατὴρ υἱόν, καὶ υἱὸς τὸν γεγεννηκότα, καὶ γυναῖκας ἄνδρες, καὶ ἄνδρας γυναῖκες, καὶ δεσπότης δοῦλον, καὶ ἀδελφὸς ἀδελφόν, καὶ φίλος φίλον διεγειρόντων καὶ παρορμώντων πρὸς τὴν ἐνταῦθα σύνοδον· μᾶλλον δὲ μὴ τοὺς φίλους μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς ἐχθροὺς καλωῶμεν ἐπὶ τὸν κοινὸν τοῦτον τῶν ἀγαθῶν θησαυρόν. Ἄν ἴδῃ σου τὴν πρόνοιαν ὁ ἐχθρὸς, καταλύσει τὴν ἀπέχθειαν πάντως.

Εἰπὲ πρὸς αὐτόν· Οὐκ αἰσχύνῃ Ἰουδαίους, οὐδὲ ἐρυθριᾷς, οἱ μετὰ τοσαύτης ἀκριβείας τὸ σάββατον φυλάττουσι, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς ἐσπέρας αὐτῆς πάσης ἐργασίας ἀφίστανται; Κἂν ἴδωσι τὸν ἥλιον πρὸς δυσμὰς ἐπειγόμενον ἐν τῇ τῆς παρασκευῆς ἡμέρᾳ, καὶ συμβόλαια διακόπτουσι, καὶ πράξεις διατέμνουσι· κἂν πριάμενός τις παρ' αὐτῶν πρὸ τῆς ἐσπέρας, ἐν ἐσπέρᾳ τὴν τιμὴν ἔλθῃ κομίζων, οὐκ ἀνέχονται λαβεῖν, οὐδὲ ὑποδέξασθαι τὸ ἀργύριον. Καὶ τί λέγω τιμὴν ὠνίων καὶ συμβόλαια; κἂν θησαυρόν ἐξῇ λαβεῖν, ἔλονται'

which Eusebius had extolled for its high ceiling, though it is tempting to do so. See *Laud. Const.* 9.15 (Heikel, GCS 7:221); *Vit. Const.* 3.50 (Winkelmann, GCS 57:205).

35. μέλος: John is playing on the use of the term for family members and church members (as already by Paul in Rom 12:5; 1 Cor 6:15; 12:12–27).

36. σύνοδος: a third term for a meeting more generally or, with PGL B.3, as equivalent to the ἐκκλησία, either as the “company” present or the building.

37. The first instance of the theme of this homily, concern for enemies, toward

full force of the sun is everywhere, the crowding is tremendous, along with smoke, dust, and other factors that heighten the discomfort even more than these do. All this makes it clear that [176] these unreasonable excuses come from laziness and from a soul that's languishing and bereft of the flame of the Spirit.

3. In drawing out my remarks on this right now, I'm not addressing those people as much as I am you who are not bringing them in, not rousing them from their laziness and dragging them to this saving table. Even household slaves, when they're going to celebrate a common meal, invite their fellow slaves; but you, when you're going to come to this spiritual service, overlook the fact that your fellow slaves are deprived of the gain. "What if they don't want to come?" someone says. Well, by your steady perseverance make them want to. For if they see us continually pressing the case, then surely they'll want to. After all, their claims are an excuse and a pretext. How many fathers are here and don't have their own sons with them? Was it so difficult for you to bring your own children here? This makes it clear that the rest also stay away not solely because of their own laziness but also because of your disregard. So, even if you didn't do this before, at least now rouse yourselves and each of you get yourself to church with another member!³⁵ Let a father wake up and urge his son toward the assembly³⁶ here, let a son do the same for the one who begot him, and husbands their wives, wives their husbands, a master a slave, a sibling a sibling, and a friend a friend. Or rather, not only friends, but let's invite even our enemies to this shared treasury of good things. If your enemy sees your thoughtfulness, surely they'll put an end to their enmity.³⁷

Say to them, "Aren't you ashamed or embarrassed before Jews, who so scrupulously keep the Sabbath and desist from all work from the moment of nightfall? If on the day of Sabbath preparation they even see the sun close to setting, they interrupt their business transactions and cut short their sales. And if anyone who'd bought something from them before evening falls comes around in the evening bringing the payment, they don't permit themselves to take it, nor to receive the money." And why am I speaking about the price of goods and business transactions? If it were possible to procure a treasure, they would choose to lose the profit rather than to trespass against the law.³⁸ In keeping the law—though beyond its

which Chrysostom will eventually make his way, in §5, to arrive at the lemma, Rom 12:20.

38. *καταπατεῖν*: "tread on"; figuratively, "treat with disdain."

ἂν ἀπολέσαι τὸ κέρδος, ἢ καταπατῆσαι τὸν νόμον. Εἴτα Ἰουδαῖοι μὲν, καὶ ταῦτα ἀκαίρως τηροῦντες τὸν νόμον οὕτως εἰσὶν ἀκριβεῖς, καὶ φυλακῆς ἀντέχονται οὐδὲν αὐτοὺς ὠφελούσης, ἀλλὰ καὶ καταβλαπτούσης· σὺ δὲ, ὁ τῆς σκιᾶς ἀνώτερος, ὁ τὸν ἥλιον τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἰδεῖν καταξιώθεις, ὁ πρὸς τὴν τῶν οὐρανῶν πολιτείαν τελῶν, οὐδὲ τὴν αὐτὴν ἐκείνοις ἐπιδείκνυσαι σπουδὴν τοῖς τῇ κακίᾳ προσεδρεύουσιν ἀκαίρως, ὁ τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐγχειρισθείς, ἀλλὰ μικρὸν μέρος ἡμέρας ἐνταῦθα καλούμενος, οὐδὲ τοῦτο ὑπομένεις ἀναλῶσαι πρὸς τὴν τῶν θείων ἀκρόασιν λογίων; καὶ ποίας ἂν τύχοις συγγνώμης, εἰπέ μοι; τίνα δὲ ἔξεις ἀπολογίαν εἰπεῖν εὐλογον καὶ δικαίαν; Οὐκ ἔστιν, οὐκ ἔστι τὸν οὕτως ἀμελεῖ καὶ ῥάθυμον συγγνώμης τυχεῖν ποτε, κὰν μυριάκις ἀνάγκας προβάλληται πραγμάτων βιωτικῶν.

Οὐκ οἶδας, ὅτι ἐὰν ἐλθὼν προσκυνήσης τὸν Θεὸν, καὶ μετὰσχης τῆς ἐνταῦθα διατριβῆς, μᾶλλον σοι τὰ ἐν χερσὶν εὐμαρίζεται πράγματα; Βιωτικὰς ἔχεις φροντίδας; Διὰ ταύτας μὲν οὖν ἐνταῦθα ἀπάντησον, ἵνα τὴν εὐνοίαν [177] ἐπισπασάμενος τοῦ Θεοῦ διὰ τῆς ἐνταῦθα διατριβῆς, οὕτω μετ' ἀσφαλείας ἐξέλθῃς· ἵνα ἔχῃς αὐτὸν σύμμαχον, ἵνα ἀκαταγώνιστος γένῃ τοῖς δαίμοσιν ὑπὸ τῆς ἄνωθεν βοηθούμενος χειρός. Ἄν ἀπολαύσῃς εὐχῶν πατρικῶν, ἂν μετὰσχης κοινῆς εὐχῆς, ἂν ἀκούσῃς θείων λογίων, ἂν ἐπισπάσῃ τοῦ Θεοῦ τὴν βοήθειαν, ἂν τούτοις τοῖς ὅπλοις φραζάμενος οὕτως ἐξέλθῃς, οὐδὲ αὐτὸς ὁ διάβολος ἀντιβλέπει δυνήσεται σοι λοιπὸν, μήτι γε ἄνθρωποι πονηροὶ, σπουδάζοντες ἐπηρεάζειν καὶ συκοφαντεῖν. Ἄν δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς οἰκίας ἐπὶ τὴν ἀγορὰν ἔλθῃς, γυμνὸς τῶν ὅπλων τούτων εὐρεθείς, εὐχείρωτος ἔσῃ τοῖς ἐπηρεάζουσιν ἅπασι. Διὰ τοῦτο πολλὰ καὶ ἐν τοῖς κοινοῖς καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἰδίῳις πράγμασι παρὰ γνώμην ἡμῖν ἀπαντᾷ, ὅτι οὐ περὶ τὰ πνευματικὰ πρῶτον ἐσπουδάκαμεν, καὶ τότε περὶ τὰ βιωτικὰ, ἀλλ' ἀντεστρέψαμεν τὴν τάξιν. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἡ τῶν πραγμάτων

39. Chrysostom assumes throughout his works that the time for observance of the law (i.e., the commandments of the Torah) has passed with the coming of Christ (cf. a certain reading of τέλος νόμου in Rom 10:4, and other NT passages). So even in the midst of expressing admiration for his contemporary Jews' exacting observance of the law, he inserts a reference to its obsolescence. As the progression of the argument demonstrates, Chrysostom intends this as an *a minore ad maius* ("from the lesser to the greater") rhetorical comparison, and hence, ultimately not entirely complimentary to contemporary Jews. The logic is thus: if even Jews do this, how much more so should you? On Chrysostom's vituperative rhetoric about Jews, see Robert L. Wilken, *John Chrysostom and the Jews: Rhetoric and Reality in the Late 4th Century*, The Transformation of the Classical Heritage 4 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983); and, more recently, Christine Shepardson, "Between Polemic and Propaganda: Evoking the Jews of Fourth-Century Antioch," *JMJS* 2 (2015): 147–82, with further literature. Despite John's framing and ultimately demeaning intent, the admiring reference

proper time, to be sure³⁹—Jews are scrupulous in this way, and cling to guarding it, even if it brings them no benefit, but even harm. But you, in contrast, who are beyond the shadow (cf. Heb 10:1),⁴⁰ who've been found worthy of seeing the sun of righteousness (cf. Mal 3:20), who are under the jurisdiction of the citizenship in heaven (cf. Phil 3:20), don't even show the same zeal as those who are persevering in evil beyond its proper time? Can you who've been entrusted with the truth, summoned here for a small portion of the day, not endure spending that much time listening to the divine utterances?⁴¹ What sort of pardon will you have, tell me! What sort of reasonable or just self-defense will you be able to give? It's impossible—impossible—for someone who's so neglectful and lazy ever to gain pardon, even if one might offer any number of constraints in one's daily affairs as a pretext.

Don't you know that if you come and worship God and share in the time spent here,⁴² the work of your hands will be easier? Do you have concerns in your daily lives? Then come here for the sake of those concerns, so that [177] by drawing God's goodwill to yourself through the time you spend here, you might go forth with security, that you might have God as your ally, that, helped by the heavenly hand,⁴³ you might be invincible in the face of demons. If you enjoy the prayers of your spiritual fathers,⁴⁴ if you share in the common prayer, if you hear the divine utterances, if you draw God's help to yourself, if you go forth in this way fortified with these weapons, not even the devil himself will be able to oppose you, much less wicked men who are eager to abuse and entrap you. But if you go from your house to the marketplace and are found stripped of these weapons, you'll be easy prey for all those who bring harm. Many unintended things happen to us in both our public and our private affairs because we don't give our serious attention to spiritual matters first and then to those of everyday

to Jews' fidelity to Torah observance in this homily is striking, and seems to reflect a social reality he expects his listeners to recognize.

40. I.e., the law as providing a shadow (*σκιά*) of the future good things, but no more (for Chrysostom) operative for Christians.

41. As applied to the Scriptures, *λόγια* means oracles, stories, eloquent words (LSJ A.1–2; PGL 3.b–h).

42. *διατριβή* here can mean “the time spent” or “the discourse” (i.e., John's homily).

43. Literally, “the hand from above” (*ἡ ἄνωθεν χεῖρ*).

44. With PGL A.3, taking *εὐχαὶ πατρικαί* to refer to the prayers said by the clergy, as mildly contrasted with what comes next, the general prayers said by the entire congregation.

ἀκολουθία καὶ εὐθύτης ἀντέστραπται, καὶ πολλῆς ἡμῖν ἅπαντα γέμει παραχῆς. Πῶς οἴεσθέ με ὁδυνᾶσθαι καὶ ἀλγεῖν, ὅταν ἐννοήσω, ὅτι πανηγύρεως μὲν καὶ ἐορτῆς ἐπιστάσης, καὶ μηδεὶς ὁ καλῶν ἤ, πᾶσα ἡ πόλις συντρέχει· πανηγύρεως δὲ καὶ ἐορτῆς ἀπελθούσης, καὶ ἅπασαν τὴν ἡμέραν διατελέσωμεν διαρρηγνύντες ἑαυτοὺς καὶ καλοῦντες ὑμᾶς, οὐδεὶς ὁ προσέχων ἐστί; Ταῦτα γὰρ πολλάκις ἐν διανοίᾳ στρέφων, χαλεπῶς ἀνεστέναξα, καὶ πρὸς ἑμαυτὸν εἶπον· τί δεῖ παραινέσεως, ἢ συμβουλῆς, συνηθείᾳ ἀπλῶς ἅπαντα ποιοῦντων ὑμῶν, καὶ οὐδὲν ἀπὸ τῆς διδασκαλίας προθυμοτέρων γινομένων τῆς ἡμετέρας; Ὅταν γὰρ ἐν ἐορταῖς μὲν μηδὲν δεήσητε τῆς παρ' ἡμῶν παραινέσεως, ἀπελθουσῶν δὲ ἐκείνων μηδὲν ὠφελῆσθε παρὰ τῆς ἡμετέρας διδασκαλίας, οὐχὶ περιττὸν ἡμῶν ἀποφαίνετε τὸν λόγον, τό γε εἰς ὑμᾶς ἔκον;

δ'. Τάχα ἀλγοῦσι πολλοὶ τῶν ταῦτα ἀκουόντων. Ἄλλ' οὐχ οὕτως οἱ ῥαθυμοῦντες ἴσασιν· εἰ γὰρ, ἂν ἀπέθεντο τὴν ὀλιγωρίαν, ὡς ἡμεῖς οἱ καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν τὰ ὑμέτερα μεριμνῶντες. τί τοσοῦτον κερδαίνεις ἐκ τῶν ἔξωθεν πραγμάτων, ὅσον ζημιοῖς ἑαυτόν; Οὐκ ἔστιν ἐξ ἐτέρας συνάξεως ἢ συνόδου τοσοῦτον κέρδος λαβόντας ἀπελθεῖν, ὅσον ἀπὸ τῆς ἐνταῦθα διατριβῆς· καὶ δικαστήριον λέγῃς, καὶ βουλευτήριον, καὶ αὐτὰ τὰ βασιλεία. Οὐ γὰρ οἰκονομίαν τῶν ἐθνῶν καὶ πόλεων, οὐδὲ στρατοπέδων ἐπιστάσιαν τοῖς ἐνταῦθα εἰσιούσιν ἐγχειρίζομεν, ἀλλ' ἐτέραν ἀρχὴν καὶ αὐτῆς τῆς βασιλείας σεμνοτέραν· μᾶλλον δὲ οὐχ ἡμεῖς ἐγχειρίζομεν, ἀλλ' ἡ τοῦ Πνεύματος χάρις.

Τίς οὖν ἐστὶν ἡ ἀρχὴ ἡ τῆς βασιλείας σεμνοτέρα, ἣν οἱ ἐνταῦθα εἰσιόντες λαμβάνουσι; Παιδεύονται τῶν ἀτόπων κρατεῖν, βασιλεύειν ἐπιθυμίας πονηρᾶς, ἄρχειν ὀργῆς ἀποτάσσειν φθόνον, δουλοῦσθαι κενοδοξίαν. Οὐκ ἔστιν οὕτω βασιλεὺς σεμνός, ὁ ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου καθήμενος τοῦ βασιλικοῦ, καὶ διάδημα περικείμενος, ὡς ἄνθρωπος τὸν ὀρθὸν ἐν ἑαυτῷ λογισμὸν ἐπὶ τὸν θρόνον τῆς ἀρχῆς τῶν δουλοπρεπῶν παθῶν [178] ἀναβιβάσας, καὶ τῇ κατ' ἐκείνων

45. Perhaps deliberately ambiguous, referring to paying attention to what is said in the homily and to answering the invitation to come to the *synaxis*.

46. In a rare acknowledgement of the PE, JPM notes (PG 51:177^a) that they had offered a possible emendation here (*"Fort. leg."*), of ἣ γὰρ εἰ, placing the entire phrase, ἣ γὰρ ἂν ἀπέθεντο τὴν ὀλιγορίαν, in parenthesis ("for surely that would have been the case if they would have cast off their neglect"). We retain the text of PG and understand the clause beginning ὡς ἡμεῖς as the apodosis of the conditional (with verbal ellipsis from prior clause).

47. An allusion to the Pauline model in 2 Cor 11:28.

48. Cf. Luke 9:25 // Matt 16:26 // Mark 8:36.

49. βασιλεία, meaning "kingdom," "empire," and "kingly or sovereign rule." John is playing on all these senses.

50. An extended metaphorical development of the Stoic concept of τὸ ἡγεμονικόν, or the "governing faculty" of the soul or mind (John will next refer to its presiding

life, but we've reversed the order. That's why the succession and direction of our affairs have been reversed, and everything is full of turmoil. How grieved and pained do you suppose I am when I consider that when the festival and feast are upon us, even if no one summons them, the whole city comes running at once? But once the festivities and the feast have passed, even if we continue all day long tearing our hearts out and summoning you, no one attends.⁴⁵ Turning these things over in my mind repeatedly, I groaned bitterly and said to myself, "What's the need for advice or counsel if you just do everything as you're used to and you're made no more fervent by our teaching? For when at feast times you don't need any advice from us, and when they've passed and you've received no benefit from our teaching, then aren't you rendering our speech to you irrelevant?"

4. Many of you who hear these things are pained, perhaps? But those who are lazy have no such knowledge. For if they did, they'd have cast off their careless attitude,⁴⁶ just as we who care for your interests every single day⁴⁷ have done. Why is it that as much as you gain in your outside affairs you lose in regard to your own self?⁴⁸ It's impossible to go forth with as much gain from any other assembly or meeting—whether you might mention the law court, the legislature, or the imperial palace itself—as you do after time spent here. For to those who enter in here we entrust not the administration of nations and cities, or of armies, but another sort of governance, one that's due more respect than ruling over the empire.⁴⁹ Yet it's not we who do this act of entrusting, but it's the grace of the Spirit.

So, what's the governance that those who enter in here receive, which is more respected than ruling over the empire? They gain instruction in how to conquer improper impulses, gain sovereignty over their wicked desires, rule over anger, renounce jealousy, subdue their vainglory. No emperor sitting upon his imperial throne crowned with a diadem is as respected as the person who has enthroned within themselves the power of right reason⁵⁰ to rule over their slavish passions, [178] crowning their head with

over both ἡ ψυχὴ and ὁ νοῦς), deemed by him also to be aligned with reason (ὁ ὁρθὸς λογισμὸς). This ruling faculty allows for control over τὰ πάθη, which, in this Christianized version, means more the "passions" than the "emotions," as for early and later Stoics (though there is overlap in the typical lists, such as anger). Chrysostom is arguing that the liturgical assemblies (and his homilies within them) offer training in this moral development (hence, a kind of philosophical "school" for the whole family and whole *polis*, in his aspiration). On the role of the passions in Chrysostom's preaching see now Blake Leyerle, *The Narrative Shape of Emotion in the Preaching of John Chrysostom*, Christianity in Late Antiquity (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2020).

δεσποτεία, καθάπερ τινὶ διαδήματι λαμπρῷ, τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀναδήσας. Τί γὰρ ὄφελος ἀλουργίδος, εἰπέ μοι, καὶ χρυσῶν ἱματίων καὶ διαλίθου στεφάνου, ὅταν ἡ ψυχὴ τῶν παθῶν αἰχμάλωτος ᾖ; τί κέρδος ἐκ τῆς ἑξωθεν ἐλευθερίας, ὅταν κυριώτερον ἐν ἡμῖν δουλαγωγῇται αἰσχυρῶς καὶ ἐλεεινῶς; "Ὡςπερ γὰρ πυρετοῦ πρὸς τὸ βάθος καταδυομένου, καὶ τὰ ἔνδον ἅπαντα καταφλέγοντος, οὐδὲν ὄφελος ἐκ τῆς ἄνωθεν ἐπιφανείας τοῦ σώματος, ἂν μηδὲν πάσχη τοιοῦτον· οὕτως, τῆς ψυχῆς ἡμῖν ὑπὸ τῶν ἔνδον παθῶν παρασυρομένης, οὐδὲ ὄφελος τῆς ἑξωθεν ἀρχῆς, οὐδὲ τῆς καθέδρας τῆς βασιλικῆς, ὅταν ὁ νοῦς μετὰ πολλῆς τυραννίδος ἀπὸ τοῦ θρόνου τῆς βασιλείας ὑπὸ τῶν παθῶν καταστρέφεται, καὶ ὑποκύπτῃ καὶ τρέμῃ τὰς ἐπαναστάσεις αὐτῶν." Ὅπερ ἵνα μὴ γένηται, προφῆται καὶ ἀπόστολοι πάντοθεν συντρέχουσι, καταστέλλοντες ἡμῶν τὰ πάθη, καὶ τῆς ἐν ἡμῖν ἀλογίας τὴν θηριωδίαν πᾶσαν ἐκβάλλοντες, καὶ τὴν πολλῷ τῆς βασιλείας σεμνοτέραν ἀρχὴν ἡμῖν ἐγχειρίζοντες. Διὰ τοῦτο ἔλεγον, ὅτι οἱ ταύτης ἑαυτοὺς ἀποστεροῦντες τῆς ἐπιμελείας περὶ τὰ καίρια λαμβάνουσι τὴν πληγὴν, ζημίαν ὑπομένοντες, ὅσῃ οὐδαμῶθεν ἄλλοθεν· ἐπειδὴ καὶ κέρδη κερδαίνουσιν ἐνταῦθα ἐρχόμενοι, ὅσα οὐδαμῶθεν ἐτέρωθεν κερδᾶναι δύναιντ' ἄν· ὥςπερ οὖν καὶ ὁ λόγος ἀπέδειξεν. Οὐκ ὀφθῆσθαι ἐνώπιον Κυρίου κενός, ὁ νόμος ἔλεγε· τουτέστι, χωρὶς θυσιῶν μὴ εἰσέλθῃς. Εἰ δὲ χωρὶς θυσιῶν οὐ δεῖ εἰσεῖναι εἰς οἶκον Θεοῦ, πολλῷ μᾶλλον εἰς συνάξεις μετὰ ἀδελφῶν χρή· βελτίων γὰρ ἐκείνης αὕτη ἡ θυσία καὶ ἡ προσφορὰ, ὅταν ψυχὴν μετὰ σαυτοῦ λαβὼν εἰσέλθῃς, Οὐχ ὁρᾶτε τὰς περιστεράς τὰς μεμελετηκυίας, πῶς ἐξιῶσαι θηρεύουσιν ἐτέρας; Τοῦτο καὶ ἡμεῖς ποιῶμεν. Ποία γὰρ ἔσται σκῆψις, ὅταν τῶν ἀλόγων τὸ ὁμόφυλον ζῶον δυναμένων θηρεύειν, ἡμεῖς οἱ λόγῳ τιμηθέντες καὶ σοφία τοσαύτη, τῆς τοιαύτης ἄγρας ὑπερορῶμεν; Παρήνεσα τῇ προτέρᾳ διαλέξει λέγων· "Ἐκαστος ὑμῶν εἰς τὰς οἰκίας ἀπαντήσατε τῶν πλησίον, ἀναμείνατε ἐξελθόντας, κατὰσχετε, καὶ

51. Minus τοῦ θεοῦ σου after κυρίου. Cf. Exod 23:15, etc.

52. I.e., the Christian *synaxis* exceeds the cult carried out in the temple in Jerusalem (an *a minore ad maius* argument upon which John often relies). There is likely more than a hint here of a distinction between material and spiritual offerings, a *topos* of Christian anti-Judaistic reasoning by John's time that he also assumes.

53. The word *περιστερά* referred to both pigeons and doves (LSJ: *columba livia domestica*). Given the legendary association, for Greek and Romans and, later, Christians (see Christian Hünemörder, "Dove/Pigeon," *BNP*, <https://tinyurl.com/SBLPress1654e>), of doves with peacefulness and even gullibility (cf. Matt 10:16), this might seem to be a curious reference. But the analogy of hunting—but not killing!—prey is probably intentional. Likely because of the attribute *μεμελετηκυία* that John applies, carrier or homing pigeons are in view, though there are no references to them hunting out other pigeons specifically with their tracking powers in *BNP* or in

absolute control over those vices as though it were a shining diadem. Tell me, what's the benefit of the purple robe and the gilded garments and the bejeweled crown when the soul is held captive to the passions? What gain comes from freedom on the outside when the dominant part within us is shamefully and piteously enslaved? When a fever penetrates deep within and enflames all the inner parts there's no benefit to the body even if the outer skin on top of it isn't suffering visibly from the outside. In the same way, when our soul is dragged about by our inner passions there's no benefit from external governance, not even the imperial seat, when the mind is toppled from its imperial throne with tyrannical force by the passions and it bows and trembles before their onslaughts. To prevent this from happening, prophets and apostles are in universal agreement; they restrain our passions, cast out completely the beastly unreason that's within us, and entrust us with a governance that's more respected than that of the rulership that presides over the empire. That's why I was saying those who deprive themselves of this providential care for their present circumstances suffer a blow, enduring a loss greater than can come from any other source. This is because by coming here they achieve profits they couldn't gain from any other source, just as also this statement indicated: "*You shall not appear before the Lord empty-handed*" (Deut 16:16),⁵¹ the Law says. What this means is, "Don't come in without sacrifices." If one shouldn't enter into the house of God without sacrifices, how much more is it necessary to enter into worship assemblies with one's brothers and sisters. And this sacrifice and offering are greater than the former,⁵² when you enter bringing another soul with you. Don't you see how trained pigeons⁵³ venture out to hunt down others? Let's do this ourselves as well. What sort of excuse will there be when creatures without the power of reason are able to hunt down those of their own species while we who've been honored with reason and great wisdom overlook this type of hunting? In my advice to you in the previous homily I said, "Let each of you arrive at the houses near you, wait until they come out, grab them,⁵⁴ and lead them to their

D'Arcy Wentworth Thompson, *A Glossary of Greek Birds* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1895), 139–46. Also, the association of pigeons may have arisen here for John because of the quotation of the call not to appear before the Lord empty-handed; according to Lev 1:14 etc., even a poor person should appear with an offering ἀπὸ τῶν τρυγόνων ἢ ἀπὸ τῶν περιστερῶν, "from the turtle doves or from the pigeons" (cf. Luke 2:24). John's homilies not infrequently exhibit a jump in topics via association, such as this.

54. This is a self-quotation by John, from *Hom. Act. 9:1*, hom. 4. (as noted by Antoine Wenger, "La tradition des oeuvres de Saint Jean Chrysostome," 45; see p. 132

ἐπαναγάγετε πρὸς τὴν κοινὴν μητέρα· καὶ τοὺς θεατρομανοῦντας μιμήσασθε, οἱ μετὰ πάσης σπουδῆς ἀλλήλοις συνταξάμενοι, οὕτως ὑπὸ τὴν ἔω πρὸς τὴν παράνομον ἀναμένουσι θεάν ἐκείνην. Ἄλλ' οὐδὲν πλέον ἡμῖν γέγονεν ἀπὸ τῆς παραινέσεως ἐκείνης. Διὰ τοῦτο πάλιν λέγω, καὶ λέγων οὐ παύσομαι, ἕως ἂν πείσω. Οὐδὲν ὠφελεῖ ἀκρόασις, ἐὰν μὴ πρᾶξις αὐτῇ παρῇ. Βαρυτέραν οὖν ἡμῖν ποιεῖ τὴν τιμωρίαν, ὅταν συνεχῶς τῶν αὐτῶν ἀκούοντες. μὴδὲν τῶν λεγομένων ποιῶμεν. Καὶ ὅτι βαρυτέρα ἢ κόλασίς ἐστιν, ἄκουσον τοῦ Χριστοῦ λέγοντος· Εἰ μὴ ἤλθον, καὶ ἐλάλησα αὐτοῖς, ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ εἶχον· νῦν δὲ πρόφασιν οὐκ ἔχουσι περὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας· καὶ ὁ Ἀπόστολος δέ, Οὐ γὰρ οἱ ἀκροαταὶ τοῦ νόμου δικαιωθήσονται. Καὶ πρὸς τοὺς μὲν ἀκούοντάς φησι ταῦτα· βουλόμενος δὲ καὶ τὸν λέγοντα παιδεῦσαι, ὅτι οὐδὲ ἐκείνῳ κέρδος ἔσται τι πλέον ἀπὸ τῆς διδασκαλίας, ὅταν μὴ πολιτεῖαν ἔχη τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ συνευγεγμένην, καὶ συμβαίνοντα τῷ λόγῳ τὸν βίον, ἄκουσον πῶς καὶ ὁ Ἀπόστολος πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀποτείνεται, καὶ ὁ [179] Προφήτης· Ὁ μὲν γάρ φησι· Τῷ δὲ ἁμαρτωλῷ εἶπεν ὁ Θεός, Ὡς ἐκδιηγῇ τὰ δικαιώματά μου, καὶ ἀναλαμβάνεις τὴν διαθήκην μου διὰ στόματός σου, σὺ δὲ ἐμίσησας παιδεῖαν; Ὁ δὲ Ἀπόστολος πρὸς αὐτοὺς τούτους πάλιν ἀποτεινόμενος, τοὺς ἐπὶ τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ μέγα φρονοῦντας, οὕτω πως φησί· Πέποιθας σεαυτὸν ὁδηγὸν εἶναι τυφλῶν, φῶς τῶν ἐν σκότει, παιδευτὴν ἀφρόνων, διδάσκαλον νηπίων· ὁ οὖν διδάσκων ἕτερον, σεαυτὸν οὐ διδάσκει; Ἐπεὶ οὖν οὔτε ἐμὲ τὸν λέγοντα τὸ λέγειν, οὔτε ὑμᾶς τοὺς ἀκούοντας τὸ ἀκούειν ἄνευ τοῦ πείθεσθαι τοῖς λεγομένοις ὠφελεῖσθαι δύναιτ' ἂν, ἀλλὰ καὶ καταδικάζει πλέον, μὴ μέχρι τῆς ἀκροάσεως τὴν σπουδὴν ἐπιδειξώμεθα, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τῶν ἔργων φυλάττωμεν τὰ λεγόμενα.

Καλὸν μὲν γὰρ τὸ διηνεκῶς ἐνδιατρίβειν θείων ἀκροάσει λογίων· ἀλλὰ τὸ καλὸν τοῦτο ἄχρηστον γίνεται, ὅταν τὴν ἐκ τῆς ὑπακοῆς ὠφέλειαν μὴ ἔχη συνευγεγμένην. Ὡς οὖν μὴ μάτην ἐνταῦθα συλλέγησθε, μετὰ πάσης σπουδῆς, ὁ πολλακίς ὑμῶν ἐδεήθη, καὶ δεόμενος οὐ παύσομαι, τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς

n. 1 above for discussion): Παρακαλῶ οὖν ὑμᾶς, ὅπερ ποιοῦσιν οἱ περὶ τὰ θέατρα μεμνηότες πρὸς τὰς τῶν ἵππων ἀμίλλας, τοῦτο καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιήσατε. Τί δὲ ἐκεῖνοι ποιοῦσιν; Ἀπὸ ἐσπέρας ἀλλήλους συντάσσονται, καὶ εἰς τὰς οἰκίας ἀλλήλων ἀπαντῶσιν ὑπὸ τὴν ἔω, καὶ τόπους ἐτέρους ἑαυτοῖς ἀφορίζουσιν, ἵν' ὁμοῦ συγκροτηθέντες, μετὰ πλείονος ἡδονῆς ἐπὶ τὴν σατανικὴν ἐκείνην ἀνέλθωσι θεάν. Ὡςπερ ἐκεῖνοι κατὰ τῆς ἑαυτῶν σπουδάζουσι ψυχῆς, καὶ ἀλλήλους συγκατασπῶσιν· οὕτως ὑμεῖς προνοήσατε τῆς ἑαυτῶν ψυχῆς, καὶ ἀλλήλους συνδιασώσατε, καὶ συνάξεως μελλούσης γίνεσθαι, ἐπὶ τὴν οἰκίαν ἀπάντησον τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ, καὶ ἀνάμεινον ἔξω τῶν προθύρων, καὶ ἐξελθόντα κατάσχε (4.2 [PG 51:147]). ("I urge you, do what those who are mad for the spectacles of horse racing do. And what's that? On the night before, they organize themselves and meet in each other's houses until dawn. And they demarcate places for themselves so that, welded together as a cohort, they might go up for that satanic spectacle with more abundant pleasure. They

common mother.⁵⁵ Imitate the theater fanatics who are so enthusiastic they make plans with one another so that already at dawn they're awaiting that lawless spectacle." But we've gained nothing more from that advice. That's why I am saying it again—and I won't stop saying it until I persuade you. Hearing confers no benefit at all unless accompanied by practice. Therefore, when we continually hear the same things but don't at all act on what's said, it makes the penalty weightier for us. Hear Christ saying that the punishment is weightier: "*If I had not come and spoken to them, they would not have sin; but now they have no excuse for sin*" (John 15:22);⁵⁶ and also the apostle: "*For the hearers of the law will not be found righteous*" (Rom 2:13).⁵⁷ The apostle directed these words to the hearers. But he wished to instruct also the speakers, that they'll have no further gain from his teaching if they don't yoke his teaching to their manner of life and conform their lifestyle to their speech. Hear how the apostle addresses them, as does the prophet. [179] For the prophet says, "*God said to the sinner, 'Why do you tell of my righteous deeds and take up my covenant with your mouth, but you have hated instruction?'*" (Ps 49:16–17).⁵⁸ And the apostle put it like this when again he addressed those who boast in their teaching: "*You have confidence in yourself that you are a guide to the blind, a light to those in darkness, an instructor of fools, a teacher of the young ... so then, you who teach another, do you not teach yourself?*" (Rom 2:19–20a, 21).⁵⁹ But neither the fact that I the speaker speak nor that you the hearers hear could possibly be beneficial if what's said doesn't lead to persuasion; instead, these actions even lead to more condemnation. Let's not show eagerness only to the point of listening, but let's observe the things that are said in our actions.

It's good to spend our time continually listening to the divine utterances. But this good thing becomes useless when we don't pair it with the benefit that comes from obedience. So you're not gathered here in vain—as I have often begged you and will not stop begging you—with all the effort

pull one another down as though striving against their own souls! In the same way, you, care for your own souls and join together to save one another: when the liturgical assembly is about to take place, arrive at the house of your brother or sister and wait outside the doors, and when they come out, grab them!"

55. Sc. the church (see PGL 2).

56. Minus αὐτῶν after τῆς ἁμαρτίας.

57. Minus δίκαιοι παρὰ τῷ θεῷ, ἀλλ' οἱ ποιηταὶ τοῦ νόμου after τοῦ νόμου and before δικαιωθήσονται (by ellipsis or by parablepsis).

58. With ἐκδιηγῇ (with A), for διηγῇ (Rahlfs).

59. Minus τε after πέποιθας; ellipsis as marked.

ἡμῖν ἐπισπάσασθε, τοὺς πλανωμένους παραινέσατε, συμβουλευσατε μὴ λόγῳ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἔργῳ. Μείζων αὕτη ἢ διδασκαλία ἢ διὰ τῶν τρόπων, ἢ διὰ τῆς πολιτείας. Κἂν μὴδὲν εἶπης, ἐξέλθης δὲ ἀπὸ συνάξεως, διὰ τοῦ σχήματος, καὶ τοῦ βλέμματος, καὶ τῆς φωνῆς, καὶ τῆς βαδίσσεως, καὶ τῆς ἄλλης ἀπάσης καταστολῆς ἐμφαίνων τοῖς ἀπολειφθεῖσιν ἀνθρώποις τὸ κέρδος, ὅπερ ἐντεῦθεν ἐξῆλθες λαβὼν, ἀρκεῖ τοῦτο εἰς παραινέσιν καὶ συμβουλήν. Οὕτω γὰρ ἡμᾶς ἐντεῦθεν ἐξιέναι δεῖ, ὥσπερ ἐξ ἱερῶν ἀδύτων, ὥσπερ ἐξ αὐτῶν καταβάνας τῶν οὐρανῶν, γενομένους κατεσταλμένους, φιλοσοφοῦντας, ῥυθμῷ πάντα καὶ ποιοῦντας καὶ λέγοντας· καὶ γυνὴ τὸν ἄνδρα ὁρῶσα ἀπὸ συνάξεως ἀναχωροῦντα, καὶ τὸν υἱὸν πατὴρ, καὶ τὸν πατέρα ὁ παῖς, καὶ τὸν δεσπότην ἢ δοῦλος, καὶ τὸν φίλον ὁ φίλος, καὶ τὸν ἐχθρὸν ὁ ἐχθρὸς, λαμβανέτωσαν ἅπαντες αἰσθήσιν τῆς ἐνταῦθα γενομένης ἡμῖν ὠφελείας· λήφονται δὲ, ἂν πραοτέρων, ἂν φιλοσοφωτέρων, ἂν εὐλαβεστέρων ὑμῶν γεγεννημένων αἰσθάνωνται. Ἐννόησον οἷας ἀπολαύεις μυσταγωγίας ὁ μεμνημένος σὺ, μετὰ τίνων ἀναπέμπεις τὸ μυστικὸν μέλος ἐκεῖνο, μετὰ τίνων βοᾷς τὸ, Τρισάγιος. Δίδαξον τοὺς ἔξωθεν, ὅτι μετὰ τῶν σεραφίμ ἐχόρευσας, ὅτι εἰς τὸν δῆμον τὸν ἄνω τελεῖς, ὅτι εἰς τὸν χορὸν ἐνεγράφης τὸν τῶν ἀγγέλων, ὅτι τῷ Δεσπότη διελέχθης, ὅτι τῷ Χριστῷ συνεγένου. Ἄν οὕτως ἑαυτοὺς ῥυθμίζωμεν, οὐδὲν ἐξελθόντες δεησόμεθα λόγου πρὸς τοὺς ἀπολειφθέντας· ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμετέρας ὠφελείας, τῆς οἰκείας αἰσθήσονται ζημίας, καὶ δραμοῦνται ταχέως, ὥστε τῶν αὐτῶν ἀπολαῦσαι. Τὸ γὰρ κάλλος ὑμῶν τῆς ψυχῆς διὰ τῶν αἰσθήσεων αὐτῶν ἀπολάμπον ὁρῶντες, κἂν ἀπάντων ὥσι νωθρότεροι, εἰς ἔρωτα τῆς εὐπρεπείας ἐμπεσοῦνται τῆς ὑμετέρας. Εἰ γὰρ σώματος κάλλος ἀναπτεροῖ τοὺς ὁρῶντας, πολλῷ μᾶλλον εὐμορφία ψυχῆς διεγείρει δύναιτ' ἂν τὸν θεατὴν, καὶ πρὸς τὸν ἴσον παρακαλέσαι ζῆλον. Καλλωπίσωμεν τοίνυν ἡμῶν τὸν ἔσω ἄνθρωπον, καὶ τῶν ἐνταῦθα λεγομένων ἔξω μνημονεύωμεν· ἐκεῖ γὰρ αὐτῶν μάλιστα τῆς μνήμης ὁ καιρὸς· καὶ καθάπερ [180] ἀθλητῆς, ἅπερ ἂν ἐπὶ τῆς παλαίστρας μανθάνῃ, ταῦτα ἐπὶ τῶν ἀγώνων ἐπιδείκνυται· οὕτω δὴ καὶ ἡμᾶς, ἅπερ ἂν ἐνταῦθα ἀκούωμεν, ταῦτα ἐπὶ τῶν ἔξωθεν πραγμάτων ἐπιδείκνυσθαι χρή.

60. Cf. Isa 6:3. On the Christian liturgical form of the *τρिसάγιον*, see David G. Martinez, *Baptized for Our Sakes: A Leather Trisagion from Egypt*. P. Mich. 799, Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 120 (Stuttgart: Teubner, 1999).

61. Translation here with PGL 5, but John is also playing on the sense of *τελεῖν* for performing rites in mystery cults, now appropriated for the Christian liturgical acts (PGL 9).

62. ὁ δῆμος ὁ ἄνω, literally, “the people who are above.”

63. On “the inner human being,” see especially 2 Cor 4:16. For philosophical antecedents, see Hans Dieter Betz, “The Concept of the ‘Inner Human Being’ (ὁ ἔσω ἄνθρωπος) in the Anthropology of Paul,” in *Paulinische Theologie und Religions-*

you can muster bring your sisters and brothers to us, advise those who've wandered away, give them counsel not only in word but also in action. The greater teaching is the one that comes about through one's morals, one's way of life. Even if you don't say a word, as you go forth from the liturgical assembly, by means of your bearing, your gaze, your voice, your walk, and every other part of your comportment, you put before the eyes of those who've failed to show up the great gain you've taken away from here as you go. This is indeed all the advice and counsel they need! For thus we must exit from here, as though from the Holy of Holies, as though coming down from heaven itself, as people exercised in self-restraint and devoted to the philosophical life, both doing and saying everything in proper proportion. When a woman sees her husband withdrawing from the liturgical assembly, and a father his son, a child his father, a slave her master, a friend a friend, and an enemy an enemy, let them all receive a visible impression of the benefit that has come to us from this assembly. And they shall receive that benefit if they perceive that you've become gentler, more philosophical in bearing, if you've become more pious. You who've been initiated into the mysteries, consider the sort of mystical instruction you enjoy, with whom you send up that mystical melody, with whom you cry out the "Holy, holy, holy."⁶⁰ Teach those on the outside that you've sung in the chorus of the Seraphim, that you're reckoned among⁶¹ the heavenly citizens,⁶² that you've been enrolled in the choir of angels, that you've spoken with the Lord, that you've conversed with Christ. If we train ourselves in this way, then when we go out we'll have no need to use words to address those who failed to show up. Instead, from our benefit they shall perceive their own loss and quickly come running so they might enjoy the same. When with their own senses they see the beauty of your soul shining, even if they're more lethargic than anyone, they'll fall in love with your loveliness. If seeing a beautiful body can send those who see it into a flutter, how much more would an attractive soul be able to rouse the viewer and encourage them to a like zeal? Now, then, let's adorn our inner self,⁶³ and let's remember out there⁶⁴ the things said in here. Because the proper time for remembrance of these things is especially when we're out there. Just as [180] an athlete shows in competitions the things he learned in the gym,⁶⁵ so also should we show in our actions outside the things we hear in here.

geschichte: Gesammelte Aufsätze V (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 23–52, with further literature and history of research.

64. I.e., out in the world.

65. *παλαίστρα*: literally, the training school for wrestling.

ε'. Μνημόνευσον τοίνυν τῶν ἐνταῦθα λεγομένων, ἵν', ὅτε ἐξέλθῃς, καὶ ἐπιλάβηταί σου ὁ διάβολος, ἢ δι' ὀργῆς, ἢ διὰ κενοδοξίας, ἢ δι' ἄλλου τινὸς πάθους, ἀναμνησθεὶς τῆς ἐνταῦθα διδασκαλίας, δυνηθῇς ῥαδίως ἀποδύσασθαι τὰ ἄμματα τοῦ πονηροῦ. Οὐχ ὁρᾶτε ἐν τοῖς σκάμμασι τοὺς παιδοτρίβας, οἱ μετὰ μυρίους ἄθλους ἀτέλειαν λοιπὸν τῶν παλαισμάτων ἀπὸ τῆς ἡλικίας λαβόντες, ἔξω τῶν скаμμάτων καθήμενοι παρὰ τὴν κόνιν αὐτὴν, τοῖς ἔνδον οὔσι καὶ παλαίουσιν ὑποφωνοῦσιν, ὥστε χεῖρα κατασχεῖν, ὥστε σκέλος ἐλκύσαι, ὥστε λαβεῖν μετὰ τὰ νῶτα, καὶ ἕτερα πολλὰ τοιαῦτα λέγοντες, ὅτι ἂν τὸ καὶ τὸ ποιήσης, ἐκτενεῖς ῥαδίως τὸν ἀνταγωνιστὴν, τὰ μέγιστα συντελοῦσι τοῖς μαθηταῖς; Καὶ σὺ τὸν παιδοτρίβην τὸν σὸν ὄρα, τὸν μακάριον Παῦλον, ὃς μετὰ μυρίους στεφάνους ἔξω τοῦ σκάμματος καθήμενος νῦν, τῆς παρούσης λέγω ζωῆς, τοῖς παλαίουσιν ἡμῖν ὑποφωνεῖ, καὶ βοᾷ διὰ τῶν Ἐπιστολῶν, ὅταν ἴδῃ κατασχεθέντας ὑπὸ ὀργῆς καὶ ὑπὸ μνησικαχίας, καὶ ἀποπνιγομένους ὑπὸ τοῦ πάθους, Ἐὰν πεινᾷ ὁ ἐχθρὸς σου, ψώμιζε αὐτόν. Καὶ καθάπερ ὁ παιδοτρίβης λέγει, ὅτι ἂν τὸ καὶ τὸ ποιήσης, περιέσῃ τοῦ ἀνταγωνιστοῦ, οὕτω καὶ οὗτος προστίθῃσι. Τοῦτο γὰρ ποιῶν, ἀνθρακας πυρὸς σαρεύσεις ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ.

Ἀλλὰ γὰρ μεταξὺ τούτου τοῦ ἀναγινώσκειν με τὸν νόμον, ἐπῆλθε τὸ δοκοῦν φύεσθαι ζήτημα ἐξ αὐτοῦ, καὶ πολλοῖς παρέχειν κατὰ τοῦ Παύλου

66. The imperative is singular, focusing attention on each person in the congregation individually.

67. ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι (with LSJ III.1, “lay hold of,” and III.2, “attack”), of a wrestling grip in particular; cf. the cognate λαβή below (p. 230 n. 89). On John’s view of the Christian life as “mud-wrestling with the devil,” see HT 308, with further references.

68. Continuing the athletic metaphor, ἄμμα in the plural refers to “clinches in wrestling” (LSJ 5).

69. Literally, alongside the dust (κόνις), i.e., just outside the κόνιστρα, the area prepared in a wrestling school to be a soft surface for the matches.

70. Translation of ἐκτείνειν as in line with PGL II, “stretch along the ground, hence prostrate.”

71. Cf. 2 Tim 4:8.

72. Note that John has split the lemma into two parts; this will be important for the argument that follows.

73. The adversative marks the introduction of the “problem.”

74. John refers to Paul’s statement as a νόμος and, below, to Paul as a νομοθέτης, thereby forfeiting one possible solution to the problem: that this was just loose or general advice and not an ethical prescription or legal requirement. Note the same strategy in *Hom. 1 Cor. 7:2–4* below, to emphasize that Paul was issuing laws about marriage.

75. As so often, the ζήτημα on its introduction is granted but qualified by δοκοῦν. Shortly, John will place the responsibility for the “apparent problem” on those who “don’t wish to investigate everything carefully.”

5. So then, remember⁶⁶ the things said in here so when you go out there and the devil lays a hold on you⁶⁷—by means of wrath, vainglory, or any other passion—if you call to mind the teaching given in here, you’ll easily be able to slip out of the clinches⁶⁸ of the evil one. Don’t you see the trainers at the wrestling mats who, after countless matches, are at last exempted from further bouts due to their age? Sitting outside the mats alongside the wrestling ring,⁶⁹ they call out to those wrestling inside it to grip the opponent’s hand, pull their leg, grab them from behind, and many other such things, saying, “if you do such and such, you’ll easily flatten⁷⁰ your opponent.” By doing this they give their pupils the very best assistance possible. Now you, look at your trainer, the blessed Paul! After manifold crowns of victory,⁷¹ he now sits outside the wrestling arena—by which I mean the present life—calling out to us wrestlers. And when he sees us possessed by wrath and grudges and locked in a choke hold by passion, he cries out in his letters: “*If your enemy is hungry, feed them*” (Rom 12:20).⁷² And just like the trainer says, “if you do such and such, you’ll prevail over your opponent,” Paul in turn adds the following: “*For by doing this, you will heap burning coals upon their head*” (Rom 12:20).

However,⁷³ right in the midst of my reading of the law here,⁷⁴ a problem—one that appears to be⁷⁵ generated by this text and to provide for many⁷⁶

76. πολλοῖς remains quite general, and John’s reference to the personified voice of the one articulating the “apparent problem” or “perplexity” does not narrow it down. It seems to refer to Christians (i.e., insiders) but may also refer to external critics who seek a “wrestling hold” against the apostle. Yet there is no example of such in the collection of sources in, e.g., John Granger Cook, *The Interpretation of the New Testament in Greco-Roman Paganism*, Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 3 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000). But the text of Rom 12:20 was clearly viewed as a problem. Already John’s teacher, Diodore, felt the need to deny outright that Paul was recommending vengeance here: οὐ γὰρ ὡς διδάσκαλος κακῶν ταῦτα εἰσηγείται—μὴ γένοιτο—ἀλλὰ τέχνη καὶ σοφία καταστέλλει καὶ ἐξημεροῖ τοῦ θυμουμένου τὴν σφοδρότητα (“Paul was not proposing these things as one instructing them to do what is evil—heaven forbid!—but by craft and wisdom he averts and mollifies the violence of the person who is filled with wrath”). See Diodore, *Fragmenta in epistulam ad Romanos* (in *catenis*), Rom 12:20–21 in Karl Staab, ed., *Pauluskommentare aus der griechischen Kirche: Aus Katenenhandschriften gesammelt und herausgegeben* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1933), 106. Augustine, similarly to Chrysostom, says that it might appear to “many people” (*multis*) that Paul contradicts the words of Christ in the Sermon on the Mount or even his own—right here in Rom 12:14 and 17. But he denies the contradiction by taking the “burning coals” as an incitement to repentance; see *Expositio quarundam propositionum ex epistula apostoli ad Romanos* §63 (CSEL 84:43, ed. Divjak).

λαβὴν, ὅπερ προθεῖναι τήμερον εἰς μέσον ὑμῖν. Τί ποτ' οὖν ἐστὶ τὸ ὑφορμοῦν ταῖς διανοαῖς τῶν μὴ μετὰ ἀκριβείας ἅπαντα ἐξετάζειν βουλομένων; Ἀπάγων ὀργῆς ὁ Παῦλος, φησὶ, καὶ πείθων ἐπεικεῖς εἶναι καὶ μετρίους τοῖς πέλας, μᾶλλον αὐτοὺς ἐξεθηρίωσε, καὶ πρὸς θυμὸν ἐπῆρε. Τὸ μὲν γὰρ εἰπεῖν, Ἐὰν πεινᾷ ὁ ἐχθρὸς σου, ψάμιζε αὐτόν, ἐὰν διψᾷ, πότιζε αὐτόν, καλὸν ἐπίταγμα καὶ φιλοσοφίας γέμον, καὶ τῷ ποιοῦντι καὶ τῷ πάσχοντι χρήσιμον· τὸ δὲ ἐντεῦθεν λοιπὸν πολλὴν ἔχει τὴν ἀπορίαν, καὶ δοκεῖ μὴ συμβαίνειν τῇ γνώμῃ τοῦ τὰ πρότερα εἰρηκότος. Ποῖον δὲ τοῦτο; Τὸ λέγειν, ὅτι Ποιῶν τοῦτο, ἄνθρακας πυρὸς σωρεύσεις ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ. Διὰ γὰρ τούτων τῶν ῥημάτων καὶ τὸν ποιοῦντα καὶ τὸν πάσχοντα ἡδίκησε· τοῦ μὲν τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀνάψας, καὶ πυρὸς ἄνθρακας ἐπιθείς. Τί γὰρ τοσοῦτον ἀπὸ τοῦ ψαμίζεσθαι καὶ ποτίζεσθαι γένοιτ' ἂν ἀγαθὸν, ὅσον κακὸν ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν ἀνθράκων σωρείας; Τὸν μὲν οὖν εὖ πάσχοντα, φησὶν, οὕτως ἡδίκησεν, εἰς μείζονα ἐμβαλὼν τιμωρίαν, τὸν δὲ εὖ ποιοῦντα πάλιν ἐτέρως κατέβλαψε. Τί γὰρ καὶ οὗτος τῆς ἀπὸ τῶν ἐχθρῶν εὐεργεσίας κερδᾶναι δύναται, ὅταν ἐλπίδι τῆς τιμωρίας αὐτὸ ποιῇ; Ὁ γὰρ διὰ

77. See p. 160 n. 94, on this other wrestling idiom, λαβή.

78. ἐπέρχομαι, with perhaps a nuance from both LSJ I.c, “come forward to speak,” and b, “go or come against, attack.”

79. Mf proposed a conjectural emendation of βούλομαι προθεῖναι, “I wish to set before you.” This is possible, but the subject of this infinitive could be assumed to be *με*, as found in the first clause of the sentence (though one expects a finite verb in a relative clause). In any case, John has finally arrived at the scriptural passage for his homily!

80. τὸ ὑφορμοῦν, the “problem, difficulty arising” (PGL), another term in the vocabulary of problems and solutions.

81. It is not exactly clear where the personified speech of the interlocutor ends and where Chrysostom’s exegesis of his point begins. He repeats the φησὶ some lines later (PG 51:181, 50), which shows either that there has been some break in the hypothetical interlocutor’s speech or that John wishes to reemphasize that these are not his own concerns, as stated (and hence the entire long speech is the personified objector). The text as punctuated is one possibility. This is, of course, part of the rhetoric of *ζητήματα καὶ λύσεις*, that is, both to take seriously the problem and yet also to pave the way for the solution. As noted in the introduction, John often uses the rhetorical technique of *αὔξησις*, “amplification,” to make the problem worse before solving it and thus (in his view) putting a decisive end to the objection, turning defense into offense.

82. Countering ὀργή; cf. Eph 4:31; Col 3:8; 1 Tim 2:8.

83. Urging people to be ἐπεικεῖς; cf. Phil 4:5; Titus 3:2.

84. Nowhere in the Pauline letters does one find the term μέτριος, but see σώφρων and cognates (as in Rom 12:3 and often in the Pastoral Epistles: 1 Tim 3:2; Titus 2:2; 2:12; etc.) and ταπεινός and cognates (e.g., Phil 2:3; 2 Cor 10:1; 11:7) along with other verbal paraphrases about putting others before oneself (i.e., modesty) as in Rom 12:16: *μὴ τὰ ὑψηλὰ φρονοῦντες ἀλλὰ τοῖς ταπεινοῖς συναπαγόμενοι*. Crucial to the identification

a wrestling hold⁷⁷ against Paul—comes forward.⁷⁸ This is the problem I'm setting before you today for consideration.⁷⁹ What then is the difficulty that's arising⁸⁰ in the minds of those who don't wish to investigate everything carefully? Someone says,⁸¹ "Although Paul leads people away from wrath⁸² and persuades them to have clemency⁸³ and be measured in their behavior⁸⁴ with their neighbors, here he's instead encouraged beastly behavior and roused them to anger. To say, '*If your enemy is hungry, feed them; if they are thirsty, give them to drink*' (Rom 12:20a)⁸⁵ is a command that's good and full of philosophical virtue, of benefit both for the one who performs the kindness and the one who experiences⁸⁶ it. But the rest of the verse from there on is very perplexing⁸⁷ and seems not to agree with the intent of the man who had said the former things."⁸⁸ What statement is that? To say, "*by doing this, you will heap burning coals upon their head*." After all,⁸⁹ with these words, Paul has done harm⁹⁰ both to the one who does the act and the one who suffers it. He harms the latter by lighting their head on fire and imposing the burning coals. Indeed, what amount of good can come from receiving food and drink that can match the evil that comes from the heaping on of coals? The objector says, "So then, Paul harmed the one who was treated kindly in this way—by hurling them into a worse punishment. But Paul brought harm on the one who did the good deed in another way. For what can the latter gain from their benefaction at

and intensity of the ζήτημα, as John well knows, is that all three of these virtues are advised by Paul immediately before the problem verse, in Rom 12:3–19.

85. This entire section from "However" to "*give him to drink*" is missing from the *NPNFI* translation by W. R. W. Stephens (probably just a parablepsis on the part of the modern translator, due to the repeated quotation of the lemma), and with it much of the punch of the wrestling metaphor and the ζητήματα και λύσεις approach John takes to this passage.

86. πάσχειν means both "experience" and "suffer"; John will play on both senses in his parallelism here about the two parties.

87. ἀπορία, part of the language of problems (or perplexities) and solutions.

88. τὰ πρότερα refers not just to the first half of the verse but also to Paul's instructions against retaliation earlier in this chapter, in Rom 12:14 and 17.

89. One might add here, "it appears" or even "it is alleged that" since John is introducing the problem. See below where he adds φησί to make this explicit. John introduces an expected μέν ... δέ here with τοῦ μέν but loses sight of it in what follows (there is no expected δέ but instead a second μέν ... δέ).

90. John phrases the ἀπορία (via personification) as an accusation against Paul for causing harm: ἡδίκησε (as repeated below).

τοῦτο τρέφων καὶ ποτίζων τὸν ἐχθρὸν, ἵνα ἄνθρακας σωρεύση πυρὸς ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ, οὐχὶ φιλόανθρωπος καὶ χρηστὸς, ἀλλ' ὥμὸς καὶ ἀπηνὴς γένοιτ' ἂν, διὰ μικρᾶς εὐεργεσίας ἄφατον ἐμβαλὼν κόλασιν. Τί γὰρ ἂν γένοιτο χαλεπώτερον τοῦ διὰ τοῦτο τρέφοντος, ἵνα σωρεύση πυρὸς ἄνθρακας ἐπὶ τὴν τοῦ [181] τρεφομένου κεφαλὴν; Ἡ μὲν οὖν ἀντίθεσις αὕτη· δεῖ δὲ λοιπὸν τὴν λύσιν ἐπαγαγεῖν, ἵνα δι' αὐτῶν τούτων τῶν δοκούντων ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι τῶν τοῦ νόμου γραμμάτων ἴδῃς ἀκριβῶς τοῦ νομοθέτου τὴν σοφίαν ἅπασαν. Τίς οὖν ἐστὶν ἡ λύσις;

Συνεῖδε τοῦτο καλῶς ὁ μέγας καὶ γενναῖος ἀνὴρ ἐκεῖνος, ὅτι βαρὺ καὶ χαλεπὸν πρᾶγμα, ἐχθρῷ καταλλαγῆναι ταχέως· βαρὺ δὲ καὶ χαλεπὸν, οὐ παρὰ τὴν οἰκείαν φύσιν, ἀλλὰ παρὰ τὴν ῥαθυμίαν τὴν ἡμετέραν. Αὐτὸς δὲ οὐχὶ καταλλαγῆναι μόνον ἐκέλευσεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ θρέψαι, ὃ πολὺ τοῦ προτέρου βαρύτερον ἦν. Εἰ γὰρ βλέποντες μόνον τοὺς λελυπηκότας τινὲς ἐκθηριοῦνται, πῶς ἂν εἴλοντο θρέψαι πεινῶντας; Καὶ τί λέγω, βλέποντες; Ἄν μνησθῇ τις αὐτῶν, καὶ τὴν προσηγορίαν εἰς μέσον ἐνέγκῃ μόνον, ἀνανεοῖ τὴν πληγὴν τῆς διανοίας ἡμῶν, καὶ μεῖζω ποιεῖ τὴν φλεγμονήν. Ταῦτ' οὖν ἅπαντα συνιδὼν ὁ Παῦλος, καὶ βουλόμενος τὸ δυσκατόρθωτον τοῦτο καὶ χαλεπὸν εὐκόλον ποιῆσαι καὶ ῥάδιον, καὶ πείσαι τὸν μηδὲ ἰδεῖν ἀνεχόμενον τὸν ἐχθρὸν εἰς εὐεργεσίαν τὴν ἐκείνου γενέσθαι, τοὺς ἄνθρακας ἔθηκε τοῦ πυρὸς, ἵν' ἐλπίδι τῆς τιμωρίας προτραπείς, ἐπιδράμῃ τῇ τοῦ λελυπηκότος εὐεργεσίᾳ.

91. Translating the present word order. But perhaps in the manuscripts there has been a transposition of ἀπό and τῆς, with the more expected sense of “what may the latter gain from the benefaction for his enemies.”

92. Or “this is the opposing argument” (with PGL 2). The term ἀντίθεσις can mean both, and John’s referent (αὕτη) could be to Paul’s (for John only “apparent”) self-contradiction or to the interpretation of the interlocutor as just quoted (φησί). But in Chrysostom’s argument, the two things merge anyway, as he takes up the problem in order to solve it.

93. λύσις, the appropriate term for the form of προβλήματα καὶ λύσεις, as expected.

94. This repeats the wrestling metaphor from above (see n. 67 above). The translation takes Paul as the presumed object of the infinitive ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι (sc. αὐτοῦ) as is the sense of the parallel statement above (ἐπῆλθε τὸ δοκοῦν φύεσθαι ζήτημα ἐξ αὐτοῦ, καὶ πολλοῖς παρέχειν κατὰ τοῦ Παύλου λαβήν). Or one could take the syntax differently, splitting the genitives such that τῶν τοῦ νόμου γραμμάτων is the object of the infinitive ἐπιλαμβάνεσθαι, translating “so that by means of these very things that appear to provide a clinch-hold on the wording of the law”). But given the rest of the sentence, it seems that *Paul* is the one in a clinch-hold because of these words, and John is promising via these same words to free his hero from that attack.

95. John’s favored term, ἀκριβῶς, here is an adverb of manner modifying the verb.

the hand of enemies⁹¹ when they do it in the hope of an impending punishment? Because the person who gives food and drink to an enemy for the purpose of heaping burning coals on their head wouldn't be magnanimous and kind, but vicious and cruel, since by means of a small benefaction, they impose an indescribable punishment. What could be more savage than someone who gives food just so they might heap burning coals on the [181] head of the one they feed?" This is the problematic contradiction.⁹² Now, at last, we must bring forward the solution,⁹³ so that by means of the very words of this law that appear to provide a clinch-hold on him⁹⁴ you might with careful attention⁹⁵ see the lawgiver's consummate wisdom. So then, what is the solution?

That great and noble man, Paul, was rightly conscious of the fact that it's an onerous and difficult thing to become quickly reconciled with an enemy. It's onerous and difficult, not because of our nature, but because of our moral sluggishness.⁹⁶ So he in turn commanded us not only to become reconciled⁹⁷ but even to feed the enemy, the latter act being even more onerous than the former. For if some people become enraged just on seeing those who've aggrieved them, how would they choose to feed them when they're hungry? And why do I say "seeing"? If someone even mentions our enemies and invokes their names publicly, it reopens the wound in our mind and causes it to be all the more inflamed. Paul was conscious of all this,⁹⁸ and he wished to render the difficult task of making amends easy and effortless, and to convince someone who couldn't even bear seeing their enemy to be moved to do them a benefaction.⁹⁹ Hence he set down in writing¹⁰⁰ the "burning coals" so that, having been persuaded by the hope of their coming punishment, they might hasten to do good for the person who had aggrieved them.

96. *ῥαθυμία* once more; note that this is the same vice John excoriated earlier in the homily as the reason people are not appearing at the *synaxis*.

97. Perhaps in the context John is referring to Rom 12:16, τὸ αὐτὸ εἰς ἀλλήλους φρονοῦντες, or Rom 12:18, μετὰ πάντων ἀνθρώπων εἰρηνεύοντες.

98. In John's rendering, Paul was an astute moral psychologist and behavioralist.

99. The phrase γίνεσθαι εἰς might reasonably be taken this way, but it is not a set idiom; HS offered a conjecture (mentioned in a note by the PE) that *πρόθυμον* should be added after *γενέσθαι*—hence, "be eager to do the benefaction."

100. In this section John plays on different senses of *τίθημι*, both to set down or give a law (LSJ V) and to set up prizes in games or contests (LSJ III). It also can mean "set down in writing" (LSJ II.9, as here), which from John's point of view both Christ and Paul have done in the canonical New Testament.

Καὶ καθάπερ ὁ ἄλιεὺς πάντοθεν τὸ ἄγκιστρον περιστέλλων τῷ δελέατι, προστίθῃσι τοῖς ἰχθύσιν, ἵνα προσδραμῶν τῇ συνήθει τροφῇ, δι' ἐκείνης ἀλῶ καὶ κατασχεθῇ ῥαδίως· οὕτω δὴ καὶ ὁ Παῦλος, βουλόμενος εἰς τὴν εὐεργεσίαν ἐμβιβᾶσαι τοῦ ἡδίκηκός τοις ἡδίκημένον, οὐ γυνὸν προστίθῃσι τὸ τῆς φιλοσοφίας ἄγκιστρον, ἀλλ' ὥσπερ τινὶ δελέατι, τοῖς ἀνθραξὶ τοῦ πυρὸς περιστείλας, καλεῖ μὲν τὸν ἐπηρεασθέντα τῇ τῆς κολάσεως ἐλπίδι πρὸς τὴν εὐεργεσίαν τοῦ λελυπηκότος· ἐλθόντα δὲ αὐτὸν κατέχει λοιπὸν καὶ οὐκ ἀφήσιν ἀποπηδῆσαι, αὐτῆς τοῦ πράγματος τῆς φύσεως προσηλούσης αὐτὸν τῷ ἐχθρῷ· καὶ μονονουχὶ λέγει πρὸς αὐτόν· Οὐ βούλει δι' εὐλάβειαν τρέφειν τὸν ἡδίκηκόντα; διὰ γοῦν τὴν ἐλπίδα τῆς κολάσεως θρέψον. Οἶδε γάρ, ὅτι ἐὰν ἄψῃται τῆς εἰς αὐτὸν εὐεργεσίας, ἀρχὴ λοιπὸν αὐτῷ καὶ ὁδὸς γίνεται τῆς καταλλαγῆς. Οὐδεὶς γάρ, οὐδεὶς τὸν ψωμιζόμενον ὑπ' αὐτοῦ καὶ ποτιζόμενον διηνεκῶς ἀνάσχοιτο ἔχειν ἐχθρόν, εἰ καὶ παρὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐλπίδι τιμωρίας τοῦτο ποιεῖ. Ὁ γὰρ χρόνος προῖων χαλᾷ καὶ τῆς ὀργῆς τὸν τόνον. Ὡς περ οὖν ὁ ἄλιεὺς, εἰ γυνὸν τὸ θήρατρον προσέθηκεν, οὐκ ἂν ἐπεσπάσατο τὸν ἰχθύν, νυνὶ δὲ περιστείλας αὐτὸ, λανθανόντως ἐνίησι τῷ στόματι τοῦ προσιόντος ζώου τὸ ἄγκιστρον· οὕτω καὶ ὁ Παῦλος, εἰ μὴ προέτεινε τὴν προσδοκίαν τῆς κολάσεως, οὐκ ἂν ἔπεισε τοὺς ἡδίκημένους ἄψασθαι τῆς τῶν λελυπηκότων εὐεργεσίας. Βουλόμενος οὖν ἀποπηδῶντας αὐτοὺς, καὶ δυσχεραίνοντας, καὶ ναρκῶντας καὶ πρὸς αὐτὴν τὴν τῶν ἐχθρῶν ὄψιν, πείσαι τὰ μέγιστα αὐτοὺς εὐεργετεῖν, τοὺς ἀνθρακας ἔθηκε τοῦ πυρὸς, οὐχ ἵνα ἐκείνους ἐμβάλλῃ εἰς ἀπαραίτητον κόλασιν, ἀλλ' ἵνα τοὺς ἡδίκημένους πείσας ἐν τῇ προσδοκίᾳ τῆς κολάσεως εὐεργετεῖν τοὺς ἐχθροὺς, τῷ χρόνῳ λοιπὸν πείσῃ καὶ πᾶσαν αὐτοῖς ἀφεῖναι τὴν ὀργήν.

ς'. Καὶ τὸν μὲν ἡδίκημένον οὕτω παρεμυθίσατο· ὅρα δὲ καὶ τὸν ἡδίκηκόντα πῶς συνάπτει τῷ παρωργι-[182]σμένῳ πάλιν. Πρῶτον μὲν τῷ

101. Although Chrysostom does not say so directly, he is possibly led in this direction by the lexical possibilities of Paul's term for feeding, *ψωμίζειν*, which, in the sense of "giving food by hand," can also mean to "bait" a hook (LSJ II.2). It is also very important to realize that three of the same four words for being hungry and thirsty and for giving food and drink that Paul uses in Rom 12:20 (*πεινᾶν*, *διψᾶν*, *ποτίζειν*) are found in the "great parable" of Matt 25:35, which is at the heart of John's view of Christian ethics. See the classic study by Rudolf Brändle, *Matthäus 25:31–46 im Werk des Johannes Chrysostomus: Ein Beitrag zur Auslegungsgeschichte und zur Erforschung der Ethik der griechischen Kirche um die Wende vom 4. zum 5. Jahrhundert*, BGBe 22 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1979).

102. In casting Paul as a fisherman, John likely has in mind the designation of disciples or apostles as *ἄλιεῖς ἀνθρώπων*, "fishers of people" (Matt 4:19 // Mark 1:17).

103. *προσηλοῦν*, i.e., "nails him fast," "rivets." The connection with the cross of Christ would be strong for John (Col 2:14; cf. 1 Cor 8:11 on the definition of the brother as the one δι' ὃν Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν).

A fisherman wraps his hook in bait¹⁰¹ all around and puts it out in front of the fish so when one dashes forward for its usual food, it's easily caught by it and captured. In the same way also Paul,¹⁰² when wishing to lead one who has been harmed to perform a good deed for the person who caused the harm, doesn't put forward philosophical virtue as an empty hook, but, wrapping it in "the burning coals" like a kind of bait, he calls the injured party to do a good deed for the one who had aggrieved them, out of hope for the latter's punishment. But after that person approaches, Paul in the end holds them fast and doesn't allow them to get away, because the very nature of the act nails¹⁰³ that person to their enemy. It's almost as if Paul says to them: "You don't want to feed the one who wronged you for the sake of piety? Well, then, feed them out of hope for their punishment!" This was because Paul knows that if one embarks on a benefaction for the enemy, it will ultimately be for them¹⁰⁴ the beginning and path toward reconciliation. For no one—no one—could endure continually holding in enmity a person they were giving food and drink to, even if at the start they did this out of the hope for the other's punishment. For as time advances it loosens the intensity even of anger. Indeed, if the fisherman were to cast out his hook¹⁰⁵ without the bait, he wouldn't attract the fish; but when he's wrapped it in bait, he secretly lands the hook in the mouth of the approaching creature. In the very same way, if Paul likewise hadn't extended the expectation of punishment, he wouldn't have persuaded those who've been harmed to embark on a benefaction for the people who had aggrieved them. So, wishing to persuade people who even at the very sight of their enemies turned away from them disgusted and stony-faced instead to do them the most important benefactions, he set down the "burning coals" in writing. He did this not to hurl them into an unrelenting punishment but so that, once he'd persuaded those who'd been wronged to do a good deed for their enemies out of the expectation of punishment, over time he might ultimately persuade them also to let go of all their anger against them.

6. So, in this way, Paul gave consolation to the one who'd initially been harmed.¹⁰⁶ Look also at the means by which once more he unites the one

104. I.e., the benefactor.

105. Chrysostom has used a different term here for the hook, *θήρατρον*, which properly means a "snare."

106. Chrysostom in this argument presumes that the person who is angry had indeed been aggrieved by the other party (the "enemy"). Note that he seeks to overturn both parts of the double charge of the objector: that Paul did harm to each of the two parties by what he advised.

τῆς εὐεργεσίας τρῶπῳ· οὐδεὶς γάρ ἐστιν οὕτως ἄθλιος καὶ ἀναίσθητος, ὃς ποτιζόμενος, καὶ ψωμιζόμενος, μὴ γενέσθαι βούλοιτο δοῦλος καὶ φίλος τῷ ταῦτα αὐτῷ ἐργαζομένῳ· δεύτερον δὲ τῷ φόβῳ τῆς τιμωρίας. Δοκεῖ μὲν γὰρ πρὸς τὸν ψωμιζόντα ἀποτείνεσθαι, λέγων· Τοῦτο γὰρ ποιῶν, ἄνθρακας πυρὸς σωρεύεις ἐπὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ· μάλιστα δὲ τοῦ λελυπηκότος καθάπτεται, ἵνα τῷ φόβῳ τῆς κολάσεως ταύτης μὴ μένη διαπαντὸς ἐχθρὸς ὢν, ἀλλ' εἰδῶς, ὅτι τὰ μέγιστα αὐτὸν καταβλάψαι δύναιτ' ἂν τὸ ψωμίζεσθαι καὶ ποτίζεσθαι, εἰ μένοι διηνεκῶς ἐπὶ τῆς ἀπεχθείας, καταλύσῃ τὴν ὀργήν. Οὕτω γὰρ τοὺς ἄνθρακας τοῦ πυρὸς σβέσαι δυνήσεται. "Ὡστε καὶ ἡ κόλασις καὶ ἡ τιμωρία κειμένη τὸν τε ἡδικομένον ἐπισπᾶται εἰς εὐεργεσίαν τοῦ λελυπηκότος, τὸν τε παροξύναντα φοβεῖ καὶ διανίστησι, καὶ πρὸς καταλλαγὴν ὥθει τοῦ τρέφοντος καὶ ποτίζοντος.

Διπλῶ τοίνυν ἀμφοτέρους συνέδησε δεσμῷ πρὸς ἀλλήλους, καὶ τῷ τῆς εὐεργεσίας, καὶ τῷ τῆς τιμωρίας. Τὸ γὰρ δυσχερὲς, ἄρχειν καὶ εἴσοδον εὑρεῖν τῇ καταλλαγῇ· ταύτης δὲ ἀνοιγείσης οἰωδήποτε τρῶπῳ, τὰ μετὰ ταῦτα πάντα ῥάδια ἔσται καὶ εὐκολα. Κἂν γὰρ παρὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐλπίδι κολάσεως τρέφῃ τὸν ἐχθρὸν ὁ λελυπημένος, ἀλλ' αὐτῷ τῷ τρέφειν γινόμενος φίλος, ἐκβαλεῖν τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν δυνήσεται τῆς τιμωρίας. Φίλος γὰρ γενόμενος, οὐκέτι ἂν τοιαύτη θρέψει προσδοκία τὸν καταλλαγέντα αὐτῷ. Πάλιν ὁ παροξύνας, ἰδὼν τὸν ἡδικομένον τρέφειν αὐτὸν καὶ ποτίζειν προαιρούμενον, διὰ γε τοῦτο αὐτὸ, καὶ τὸν φόβον τῆς ἀποκειμένης αὐτῷ κολάσεως, πᾶσαν ἐκβάλλει τὴν ἀπέχθειαν, κἂν μυριάκις σιδηροῦς ἤ, καὶ ἀπηνῆς, καὶ ἀδάμας, τὴν τε φιλοφροσύνην τοῦ τρέφοντος δυσωπούμενος, καὶ τὴν ἀποκειμένην αὐτῷ κόλασιν δεδοικώς, εἰ μένοι μετὰ τὴν τροφὴν ἐχθρὸς ὢν.

Διὰ τοι τοῦτο οὐδὲ ἐνταῦθα ἔστη τῆς παραινέσεως, ἀλλ' ὅτε ἐκένωσεν ἑκατέρου τὴν ὀργήν, τότε καὶ τὴν γνώμην αὐτῶν διορθοῦται λέγων, *Μὴ νικῶ*

107. *καθάπτεσθαι* with the genitive could mean "appeal to" (LSJ II.4) or, more strongly "upbraid" (LSJ II.2).

108. Presumably, the anger of the aggrieved party, by appealing for reconciliation. Or, possibly John assumes the original offense that led to the estrangement of the two parties was due to the anger of the one who did the initial wrong.

109. John may be turning to a more metaphorical sense of the expression (in terms of the "hot-headedness" of the aggrieved party rather than literal burning coals), but he does not develop that here, unlike many other early Christian interpreters, such as Origen, Pelagius, Ambrosiaster and Augustine. See Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Romans*, AB 33 (New York: Doubleday, 1993), 658.

who did the harm with the one who was provoked to anger by them. [182] First, he does this by the type of benefaction. For no one is so wretched and unfeeling as the person who, when given drink and food, wouldn't wish to become a servant and a friend to the one doing these things for them. Second, he does this by referring to the fear of punishment. For it seems as though when he says, "*For by doing this you will heap burning coals upon his head*," Paul is reaching out to the one who fed the other, but actually he's appealing¹⁰⁷ especially to the person who'd aggrieved the other. Paul's purpose was so that by means of the fear of this punishment the one who'd done the original injury might not remain an enemy forever, but, once they knew that receiving drink and food could bring them the greatest harm if they remain continually at enmity, they might put an end to the anger.¹⁰⁸ In this way they'll be able to extinguish the burning coals.¹⁰⁹ Therefore, both the punishment and the penalty laid down induce the one who'd been harmed to an act of benefaction for the one who'd aggrieved them, and in turn they engender fear and alarm in the one who'd committed the initial provocation and push that person to reconcile with the one who gave them food and drink.

So then, Paul bound the two parties in a double bond with one another—the bond of benefaction and the bond of punishment. After all, what's truly difficult is making a start and finding a path toward reconciliation. But after that pathway has been opened up by any possible means, all that comes after will be easy and effortless. This is because if the one who was grieved feeds their enemy at first out of the hope of punishment, but in the very act of feeding becomes their friend, then they'll be able to cast out the desire for punishment. Indeed, once they've become a friend, they could no longer feed the one who'd been reconciled to them out of such an expectation. And in turn, the one who'd caused the initial provocation,¹¹⁰ once they'd seen the very person they'd wronged voluntarily giving them food and drink, for this exact same reason, along with the fear of the punishment in store for themselves, casts out all enmity. Even if they repeatedly showed themselves to have a demeanor of iron, stone, or steel, they'd be put to shame by the kindness of the one feeding them and be full of fear at the punishment in store for themselves if, once they'd been fed, they'd remained an enemy.

That's why Paul didn't end his advice here, but, after he'd nullified the anger of each of them, he also corrects their mindset, saying, "*Don't be*

110. I.e., inciting anger in the other.

ὑπὸ τοῦ κακοῦ. Ἄν γὰρ μένης, φησὶ, μνησικακῶν καὶ ἀμυνόμενος, δοκεῖς μὲν τὸν ἐχθρὸν νικᾶν, νικᾶσαι δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ κακοῦ, τουτέστιν, ὑπὸ τῆς ὀργῆς· ὥστε, εἰ βούλει νικῆσαι, καταλλάγηθι, καὶ μὴ ἐπεξέλθῃς. Αὕτη γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ λαμπρὰ νίκη, ὅταν ἐν τῷ ἀγαθῷ, τουτέστι, τῇ ἀνεξικακίᾳ νικήσῃς τὸ κακὸν, τὴν ὀργὴν καὶ τὴν μνησικακίαν ἐκβαλὼν. Ἀλλὰ τούτων ἐξ ἀρχῆς οὐκ ἂν ἠνέσχετο τῶν ῥημάτων ὁ ἡδικοκλήμενος καὶ φλεγμαίνων. Διὰ τοῦτο, ὅτε αὐτοῦ τὸν θυμὸν ἐκόρεσε, τότε καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν ἀρίστην αὐτὸν ἤγαγε τῆς καταλλαγῆς αἰτίαν, καὶ οὐκ ἀφῆκεν ἐναπομεῖναι τῇ πονηρᾷ τῆς τιμωρίας ἐλπίδι. Εἶδες νομοθέτου σοφίαν; Καὶ ἵνα μάθῃς ὅτι διὰ τὴν ἀσθένειαν τῶν οὐκ ἀνεχομένων ἄλλως ἑαυτοῖς συνάπτεσθαι, τοῦτον εἰσήγαγε τὸν νόμον, ἀκουσον πῶς ὁ Χριστὸς τὸ αὐτὸ τοῦτο νομοθετῶν, οὐ τὸ αὐτὸ τέθεικεν ἔπαθλον· ἀλλ' εἰπὼν, ὅτι Ἀγαπᾶτε τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ὑμῶν, καλῶς ποιεῖτε τοῖς μισοῦσιν ὑμᾶς, ὅπερ ἐστὶ τρέφειν καὶ ποτίζειν, οὐκ ἐπήγαγεν, ὅτι Τοῦτο γὰρ ποιοῦντες ἄνθρακας πυρὸς σωρεύσετε ἐπὶ τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτῶν, ἀλλὰ τί; Ὅπως γένησθε ὅμοιοι τοῦ Πατρὸς ὑμῶν τοῦ [183] ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς. Εἰκότως· Πέτρῳ γὰρ, Ἰακώβῳ καὶ Ἰωάννῃ διελέγετο, καὶ τῷ λοιπῷ τῶν ἀποστόλων χορῷ· διὰ τοῦτο αὐτὸ τέθεικεν ἔπαθλον.

Εἰ δὲ λέγεις, ὅτι καὶ οὕτω φορτικὸν τὸ ἐπίταγμα, μειζόνως μὲν ὑπὲρ Παύλου πάλιν ἡμῖν ἀπολογῇ, σαυτὸν δὲ πάσης συγγνώμης ἀποστερεῖς. Τί δήποτε; Ὅτι τοῦτο τὸ δοκοῦν εἶναι φορτικόν, ἐν τῇ Παλαιᾷ σοὶ δείκνυμι κατορθούμενον, ὅτε οὕτω τοσαύτης φιλοσοφίας ἐπίδειξις ἦν. Διὰ γὰρ τοῦτο καὶ ὁ Παῦλος οὐχὶ οἰκείους ῥήμασι τὸν νόμον εἰσήγαγεν, ἀλλ' αὐταῖς χρησάμενος ταῖς ῥήσεσιν, αἷς ὁ παρὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν αὐτὸν εἰσαγαγὼν ἔθηκεν, ἵνα μηδεμίαν συγγνώμην καταλείπῃ τοῖς μὴ τηροῦσιν αὐτόν. Τὸ γὰρ, Ἐὰν πεινᾷ ὁ ἐχθρὸς σου, ψάμιζε αὐτόν, ἐὰν διψᾷ, πότιζε αὐτόν, οὐχὶ Παύλου ἐστὶ

111. To follow John's logic and its expression, it is important to know that the words for "holding grudges" and "forbearance" (μνησικακία, "remembering wrong," ἀνεξικακία, "enduring wrong") are cognate with those for evil or wrong (κακός, κακία).

112. φλεγμαίνειν, "to be heated, inflamed" (LSJ II), used metaphorically for smoldering anger, and hence a play on the burning coals.

113. I.e., as Paul did in naming the hope for the future punishment that the enemy may experience fiery coals heaped on their head.

114. John has pluralized three items (ποιῶν, σωρεύσεις, and αὐτοῦ) in his quotation of the verse (otherwise exact) to fit it into this hypothetical address by Christ.

115. Throughout his oeuvre, with one exception (*Delic.* §4 [PG 51:351]), when John cites Matt 5:45 (at least ten times) he has the reading ὅμοιοι for υἱοί (e.g., *Hom. Matt.* 18.3 [PG 57:268–69]; *Hom. 2 Cor.* 4:13 A §7 [PG 51:277]; *Hom. Gen.* 27.8 [PG 53:250]), against M and all other witnesses. Perhaps there is an influence of 1 John 3:2 in this?

116. Another problem introduced by a hypothetical protagonist.

117. I.e., solving the ζητήματα by apologetics on behalf of the apostle.

118. Note here again the language of an "apparent" problem (δοκοῦν). John moves

conquered by evil" (Rom 12:21). For "if you continually hold grudges and are vengeful," he says, "you think you're conquering your enemy, but you're actually being conquered by evil—that is, by wrath. Therefore, if you want to conquer, be reconciled and don't go out after revenge. For what constitutes an illustrious conquest is this: when you conquer evil by good—that is, by forbearance—casting out your wrath and grudges."¹¹¹ Yet the one who was wronged and was seething¹¹² wouldn't have put up with these words at the start. That's why, once Paul had satisfied the anger of the wronged party, then he also led them to the noblest motivation for reconciliation and didn't allow them to remain in the wicked hope for the other's future punishment. Have you seen the lawgiver's wisdom? Now, so you might learn that Paul introduced this law due to the weakness of people who otherwise wouldn't endure being brought back together with one another, hear how Christ, when legislating this very same thing, didn't lay down this same reward.¹¹³ After he said, "*Love your enemies; do good for those who hate you*" (Luke 6:27)—that is, give them food and give them drink—Christ didn't add, "By doing this you will heap burning coals on their heads" (Rom 12:20).¹¹⁴ What did he add instead? "*So that you might be in the likeness of your father who is [183] in heaven* (Matt 5:45).¹¹⁵ And rightly so, for he was speaking to Peter, James, and John and the rest of the band of the apostles. That's why Christ set this up as a reward.

But if you¹¹⁶ say, "the command is so onerous," then you're all the more joining us in defending Paul¹¹⁷ and depriving yourself of any excuse! Why's that? Because I shall show you that this command that appears¹¹⁸ to be onerous was already carried out successfully¹¹⁹ in the Old Testament, when the greater philosophy¹²⁰ had not yet been shown forth. This is the reason Paul didn't even introduce this law in his own words, but used the very wording that the one who introduced it at the beginning used, in order to leave no excuse for those who do not observe it. Because the statement, "*If your enemy is hungry, feed them; if they are thirsty, give them to drink,*"

now to the final problem that he attributes directly to his own audience: the view that the "law" Paul has laid down is so difficult that it is impossible to fulfill.

119. The term *κατορθοῦσθαι* (and noun *κατόρθωμα*) mean both something carried out successfully and an act of virtue or good deed, as the translation seeks to show. At first instance here, John is emphasizing that the deed *is* attainable – his solution to the supposed problem that the command cannot be fulfilled.

120. John means what is for him the superior ethical teaching and lifestyle of the New Testament.

πρώτον ῥῆμα, ἀλλὰ τοῦ Σολομώντος. Διὰ τοῦτο τὰ ῥήματα τέθεικεν, ἵνα πείσῃ τὸν ἀκροατὴν, ὅτι τῶν αἰσχίστων ἐστὶ, παλαιὸν νόμον, καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν ἀρχαίων κατορθωθέντα πολλάκις, νῦν εἰς τοσαύτην ἐπιδοθέντα φιλοσοφίαν φορτικὸν εἶναι νομίζειν καὶ ἐπαχθῆ.

Καὶ τίς αὐτὸν τῶν ἀρχαίων κατώρθωσε, φησί; Πολλοὶ μὲν καὶ ἄλλοι, μάλιστα δὲ ὁ Δαυῖδ μετὰ πλείονος τῆς περιουσίας. Οὐ μὲν ἐψώμισε τὸν ἐχθρὸν, οὐδὲ ἐπότισε μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ κινδυνεύοντα πολλάκις ἐξήρπασε τοῦ θανάτου, καὶ γενόμενος κύριος αὐτοῦ τῆς σφαγῆς, ἐφείσατο καὶ ἄπαξ, καὶ δις, καὶ πολλάκις. Καὶ ὁ μὲν Σαοὺλ οὕτως αὐτὸν ἐμίσει καὶ ἀπεστρέφετο μετὰ τὰς μυριάς εὐεργεσίας, μετὰ τὰ λαμπρὰ τρόπαια, καὶ τὴν ἐπὶ τοῦ Γολιάθ σωτηρίαν, ὥς μηδὲ τῆς προσηγορίας ἀνασχέσθαι τῆς ἐκείνου μνησθῆναι, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτὸν καλεῖν. Ἑορτῆς γάρ ποτε ἐπιστάσης, ἐπειδὴ δόλον αὐτῷ πλέξας τινὰ, καὶ χαλεπὴν ἐπιβουλὴν ῥάψας, οὐκ εἶδε παραγινόμενον. Ποῦ ἐστι, φησὶν, ὁ υἱὸς Ἰεσσαί; Ἐκάλει μὲν αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ πατρὸς, ὁμοῦ μὲν διὰ τὴν ἐχθραν οὐχ ὑπομένων ἀναμνησθῆναι τῆς προσηγορίας, ὁμοῦ δὲ νομίζων ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ πατρὸς δυσγενείας τῇ τοῦ δικαίου λυμαινέσθαι περιφανείᾳ, ἀθλίως καὶ ταλαιπώρως νομίζων. μάλιστα μὲν γὰρ, εἰ καὶ κατηγορεῖν εἶχε τοῦ πατρὸς, οὐδὲν τοῦτο κατέβλαπτε τὸν Δαυῖδ. Τῶν γὰρ αὐτῷ πεπραγμένων ὑπεύθυνός ἐστιν ἕκαστος, καὶ ἀπὸ τούτων ἐπαινέσθαι καὶ κατηγορεῖσθαι δύναται. Νυνὶ δὲ πονηρίαν οὐδεμίαν ἔχων εἰπεῖν, τὴν τοῦ γένους δυσγένειαν εἰς μέσον ἔφερε, αὐτῇ προσδοκῶν ἐπισκοτίζειν αὐτοῦ τὴν λαμπρότητα, ὅπερ καὶ αὐτὸ ἐσχάτης ἀνοίας ἦν. Ποῖον γὰρ ἔγκλημα

121. With ψώμιζε for LXX's τρέφε (with the exception of B, which reads the former, apparently harmonizing with Rom 12:20; so Rahlfs *app. crit.*). Chrysostom waited long into the sermon to acknowledge that Paul was quoting his Scripture, in Prov 25:21, seeking first in his argument for the statement of Rom 12:20 to be defined as a *Pauline* law (νόμος). Now the homily turns to new problems and solutions (and challenges and opportunities) caused by the belatedly acknowledged intertextual relationship.

122. This echoes the language Chrysostom had used in the opening of this homily to refer to himself in his role of scolding his congregations for not bringing others with them to the *synaxis* (see §1 [PG 51:171]).

123. Cf. earlier in the homily, at §3 (PG 51:176; see n. 39), where Chrysostom contrasted the “superior philosophy” of the Christians with that of his contemporary Jews. The Israelites of the Bible are here shown to have been able to keep this—first Solomonic, now, Pauline—“law” that John’s congregants may complain about. This is another then-and-now and a *minore ad maius* contrast.

124. 1 Kgdms 24:1–22; 26:1–26, in reference to Saul.

125. Although John often uses μυριάς to refer to “countless” numbers of things, in this case, he may be referring to the tag quoted in 1 Kgdms 18:7 and 21:12 that so

isn't initially Paul's but Solomon's (Prov 25:21).¹²¹ The reason Paul set down these words was to persuade the hearer that only the most shameless people would consider burdensome and irksome¹²² an old law that was often virtuously carried out by the ancients and had now been added to the most excellent philosophy.¹²³

"Who among the ancients practiced this law," one might ask? Many and diverse people, but David did so exorbitantly. He not only fed his enemy and gave him to drink, but he even repeatedly snatched him away from death when he was in danger. And when he had the power to slay him, he spared him, once, twice,¹²⁴ and often. And yet Saul, after countless benefactions,¹²⁵ after the illustrious victories, including saving him that time with Goliath,¹²⁶ hated David so much and spurned him so much that he couldn't endure even to mention his proper name,¹²⁷ but he called him by reference to his father. For once when there was a feast, when Saul had devised a cunning plot against him and contrived an awful scheme, he didn't see David present. "Where is *'the son of Jesse?'*" he said.¹²⁸ Saul customarily called him by reference to his father,¹²⁹ both because, out of enmity, he couldn't endure mentioning David's proper name and because he thought he'd tarnish the fame of that righteous man by his father's humble pedigree. Saul was wretched and miserable in thinking this. Quite the contrary, even if he could heap blame on his father, that wouldn't harm David in the least. After all, every person is held accountable for the things they've done and can be praised or blamed for them. In this case, since Saul had no evil deeds of David's to speak of, he made a public reference to David's humble family pedigree, expecting by this to throw shade on his fame. This was the height of madness. For what kind of accusation is it to

enraged Saul: Ἐπάταξεν Σαουλ ἐν χιλιάσιν αὐτοῦ, καὶ Δαυιδ ἐν μυριάσιν αὐτοῦ ("Saul killed his thousands, and David his ten thousands").

126. 1 Kgdms 17:41–51.

127. John deliberately refers to his depiction of the psychology of anger given above (§5 [PG 51:181]) as not even bearing to hear the name of the person with whom one is at enmity.

128. A paraphrase of the content of 1 Kgdms 20:27—Τί ὅτι οὐ παραγέγονεν ὁ υἱὸς Ιεσσαὶ καὶ ἐχθὲς καὶ σήμερον ἐπὶ τὴν τράπεζαν; ("Why has the son of Jesse not appeared at the feast both yesterday and today?")—but the title "Son of Jesse" is italicized above since it is a direct quotation.

129. This is true, for instance, in 1 Kgdms 20:30, 31; 22:7, 8, 13, but Saul does in fact refer to David as "David" at places in the narrative, as in, e.g., 1 Kgdms 18:8, 25; 19:22, which John overlooks.

τὸ ἐξ εὐτελῶν εἶναι καὶ ταπεινῶν; Ἄλλ' οὐκ ἤδει ταῦτα ἐκεῖνος φιλοσοφεῖν. Ὁ μὲν οὖν Σαοὺλ υἱὸν Ἰεσσαὶ ἐκάλει· ὁ δὲ Δαυῖδ εὐρῶν αὐτὸν ἔνδον ἐν τῷ σπηλαίῳ καθεύδοντα, οὐκ ἐκάλεσεν αὐτὸν υἱὸν Κεῖς, ἀλλὰ τῷ τῆς τιμῆς ὀνόματι. Οὐ γὰρ μὴ ἐπαγάγω τὴν χεῖρά μου, φησὶν, ἐπὶ χριστὸν Κυρίου. Οὕτω καθαρὸς ἦν ὀργῆς καὶ μνησικακίας ἀπάσης· χριστὸν Κυρίου καλεῖ τὸν τοσαῦτα ἡδικηκότα, τὸν τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ διψῶντα, τὸν μετὰ μυρίας εὐεργεσίας πολλάκις αὐτὸν ἐπιχειρήσαντα ἀνελεῖν. Οὐ γὰρ ἐσκόπει τί παθεῖν ἐκεῖνος ἄξιός ἦν, ἀλλ' ἐσκόπει τί καὶ ποιῆσαι καὶ εἰπεῖν αὐτῷ πρέπον ἦν, ὅπερ μέγιστος ὅρος φιλοσοφίας ἐστί. Τί τοῦτο; ὥσπερ ἐν δεσμωτηρίῳ λαβὼν τὸν ἐχθρὸν, διπλῶ κατεχόμενον δεσμῷ, μᾶλλον δὲ τριπλῶ, καὶ τῇ τοῦ τόπου στενοχωρία, καὶ τῇ τῶν [184] βοηθησάντων ἐρημία, καὶ τῇ τοῦ ὕπνου ἀνάγκῃ, οὐκ ἀπαιτεῖς δίκην οὐδὲ τιμωρίαν αὐτόν; Οὐχί, φησὶν· οὐ γὰρ τί παθεῖν δίκαιος οὗτός ἐστιν, ὁρῶ νῦν, ἀλλὰ τί ποιῆσαι ἐμοὶ προσῆκεν. Οὐκ εἶδε πρὸς τὴν εὐκολίαν τῆς σφαγῆς, ἀλλ' εἶδε πρὸς τὴν ἀκρίβειαν τῆς αὐτῷ πρεπούσης φιλοσοφίας. Καίτοι τί τῶν τότε οὐκ ἦν ἱκανὸν διαναστῆσαι αὐτὸν πρὸς τὴν σφαγὴν; Τὸ δεδεμένον αὐτῷ παραδοθῆναι τὸν ἐχθρὸν; Ἴστε γὰρ δήπου τοῦτο, ὡς μειζρόνως ἐπιτρέχουμεν τοῖς εὐκολίας γέμουσι πράγμασι, καὶ ἡ τοῦ κατορθῶσαι ἐλπίς μειζρόνα τῆς πράξεως ἡμῖν ἐπιθυμίαν ἐντίθησιν, ὥσπερ καὶ ἐπ' ἐκείνου τότε ἦν.

Ἄλλ' ὁ στρατηγὸς τότε συμβουλευόμενος καὶ διεγείρων; ἀλλ' ἡ μνήμη τῶν παρελθόντων; Ἄλλ' οὐδὲν αὐτὸν ἐκίνησε πρὸς τὸν φόνον· αὐτὸ μὲν οὖν αὐτὸν

130. The “nature/nurture” debate was built into the form of the ancient encomium, often played out in the interplay between the rhetorical headings (*κεφάλαια*) of γένος (birth, ancestry) and πράξεις (deeds). See, e.g., Aristotle, *Rhet.* 1.9.32–33, 1367^b; Menander Rhetor, *Epid.* 2.370 (ed. Russell and Wilson); fuller discussion and references in *HT* 200–206.

131. A close and condensing paraphrase of the LXX text’s oath formula: *Μηδὰ μῶς μοι παρὰ κυρίου ἐπενέγκαι χεῖρά μου ἐπ’ αὐτόν*, ὅτι χριστὸς κυρίου ἐστὶν οὗτος (cf. the very close wording also in 24:7). In the argument that follows, John seems to be conflating the two narratives.

132. Translating ὅρος here with LSJ III; also possible are “goal,” “measure,” “rule,” “canon” (also LSJ III), or “definition” (LSJ IV.b, with *PGL* 3).

133. Of the three “bonds,” only the last one, sleep, clearly distinguishes the referent as 1 Kgdms 26 (Saul in the camp) from 1 Kgdms 24 (Saul in the cave). The first one (“tightness of the space,” ἡ τοῦ τόπου στενοχωρία) seems better to fit the earlier narrative of the cave incident in chapter 24. But in LXX, the Hebrew term *לַמְּגִן* is translated *λαμπήνη*, “covered chariot” (LSJ), as though equivalent to *לַמְּגִן*, rather than “entrenchment” (rendered as “encampment” in NRSV); so John could conceivably have taken the chariot to be a tight space. And yet in terms of the second “bond,” in 1 Kgdms 24 Saul is alone relieving himself in the cramped space of the cave (*σπήλαιον*), which does

have sprung from plain and humble ancestors?¹³⁰ Yet Saul didn't know how to think in a properly philosophical way about these things. But whereas Saul used to call him "*the son of Jesse*," David, when he found Saul sleeping in the cave, didn't call him "son of Kish" but by a name of honor: "I shall in no way lay my hand upon '*the Lord's anointed*,'" he says (1 Kgdms 26:11).¹³¹ In this way David was innocent of all wrath and grudges. He calls "*the Lord's anointed*" a man who had done him such harm, who had been thirsty for his blood, who after countless benefactions tried repeatedly to kill him. This is because David set his sights not on what sufferings that man deserved, but rather on what was the proper thing that he himself should do or say, which is the very highest standard¹³² of philosophy. What do I mean by this? "When you had seized your enemy as though in a prison, held fast by a double bond, or even more a triple bond—by the tightness of the space, by the [184] the absence of his aides, and by need for sleep¹³³—you don't demand vengeance or punishment of him?"¹³⁴ "No," David says. "Because what I'm focusing on right now isn't what this man justly should suffer, but what's the right thing for me to do." He didn't set his gaze on the ease of the killing but instead on scrupulous adherence to the philosophical life to which he was suited. After all, were any of the things that had happened in those times not sufficient to rouse David to kill him? To have his enemy bound and handed over to him? Surely you know that we're all the more eager for acts that are completely easy, and the hope of succeeding instills in us a greater desire for an action. This was also the case back then with David.

What about his general¹³⁵ then counseling and inciting him? Or the memory of the past events? Yet nothing moved David to commit the

seem to fit more closely his being bereft of men who could help him than when Saul was asleep in the midst of his troops in 1 Kgdms 26 (και Αβεννηρ και ὁ λαὸς αὐτοῦ ἐκάθευθεν κύκλῳ αὐτοῦ; 1 Kgdms 26:7). In his retelling, John seems to be conjoining, if not conflating, the two narratives, with their similar oath by David to respect Saul as God's anointed one (see n. 131 above). This will be all the more apparent below, in §7 (PG 51:185), where John refers to the cutting of the hem of Saul's garment (cf. 1 Kgdms 24:6) alongside the taking of the jar of water and the cry out to protect the king (1 Kgdms 26:12, 15–16). In any case, whether John has in mind one incident or two, they form for him a consistent portrait of David's clemency, fairness, and philosophical virtue.

134. Chrysostom opens up a dialogue with David.

135. Abishai (Αβεσσα) in 1 Kgdms 26:8, who counseled David to kill Saul with a single blow of his own spear. He is not explicitly called a στρατηγός in this scene in

τὸ τῆς σφαγῆς εὐκόλον ἀπέστρεψεν· ἐνενόησε γάρ, ὅτι διὰ τοῦτο παρέδωκεν αὐτὸν ὁ Θεός, ἵνα αὐτῷ πλείονα φιλοσοφίας ὑπόθεσιν παράσχη καὶ ἀφορμὴν. Ὑμεῖς μὲν οὖν αὐτὸν ἴσως θαυμάζετε, ὅτι οὐδενὸς ἐμνήσθη τῶν παρελθόντων κακῶν· ἐγὼ δὲ δι' ἕτερον πολλῶ μείζον αὐτὸν ἐκπλήττομαι. Ποῖον δὲ τοῦτο; "Ὅτι οὐδὲ ὁ φόβος αὐτὸν τῶν μελλόντων ὥθησε πρὸς τὸ διαχειρίσασθαι τὸν ἐχθρόν." Ἥιδει γὰρ σαφῶς, ὅτι διαφυγὼν αὐτοῦ τὰς χεῖρας, πάλιν κατ' αὐτοῦ στήσεται· ἀλλ' εἴλετο μᾶλλον αὐτὸς κινδυνεύειν ἀπολύσας τὸν ἡδίκηκότα, ἢ τῆς καθ' ἑαυτὸν ἀσφαλείας προνοῶν διαχειρίσασθαι τὸν πολέμιον.

Τί γένοιτ' ἂν οὖν ἴσον τῆς μεγάλης καὶ γενναίας ἐκείνης ψυχῆς, ὅς, τοῦ νόμου κελεύοντος ἐξορύττειν ὀφθαλμὸν ἀντὶ ὀφθαλμοῦ, καὶ ὀδόντα ἀντὶ ὀδόντος, καὶ τοῖς ἴσοις ἀμύνεσθαι, οὐ μόνον τοῦτο οὐκ εἰργάσατο, ἀλλὰ καὶ πολλῶ πλείονα φιλοσοφίαν ἐπεδείξατο; Καίτοι γε εἰ ἀνῆρήκει τότε τὸν Σαοῦλ, καὶ οὕτως αὐτῷ φιλοσοφίας ἐγκώμιον ἀκέραιον ἔμενεν ἂν, οὐ μόνον ὅτι ἡμύνατο, οὐκ αὐτὸς ἄρχων χειρῶν ἀδίκων, ἀλλ' ὅτι καὶ, Ὁφθαλμὸν ἀντὶ ὀφθαλμοῦ, μετὰ πολλῆς ἐνίκᾳ τῆς ἐπιεικείας. Οὐ γὰρ ἀντὶ μιᾶς σφαγῆς μίαν ἐπῆρεν, ἀλλ' ἀντὶ πολλῶν θανάτων, ὧν ἐκεῖνος ἐπήγαγεν, οὐχ ἅπαξ, οὐ δις, ἀλλὰ πολλάκις αὐτὸν ἐπιχειρήσας ἀνελεῖν, ἕνα ἔμελλεν ἐπαγαγεῖν θάνατον· μᾶλλον δὲ οὐ ταῦτα μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ δεδοικότα τὸ μέλλον οὕτως ἐπὶ τὴν ἄμυναν ἔρχεσθαι, καὶ τοῦτο μετὰ τῶν εἰρημένων ὁλόκληρον αὐτῷ τὸν τῆς ἀνεξικακίας διεγείρει στέφανον. Ὁ μὲν γὰρ ὑπὲρ τῶν γεγενημένων εἰς αὐτὸν ὀργιζόμενος καὶ τιμωρίαν ἀπαιτῶν, οὐκ ἂν δύναίτο τῶν τῆς ἀνεξικακίας ἐπιτυχεῖν ἐγκωμίων· τὸν δὲ τὰ μὲν παρελθόντα πάντα πολλὰ ὄντα καὶ χαλεπὰ ἀφέντα, ὑπὲρ δὲ τοῦ μέλλοντος δεδοικότα καὶ προκατασκευάζοντα ἀσφάλειαν ἑαυτῷ, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἀναγκαζόμενον ἐπὶ τὴν ἄμυναν ἀνέρχεσθαι, οὐδεὶς ἂν τῶν τῆς ἐπιεικείας ἀποστερήσειε στεφάνων.

1 Kgdms 26 (where he first appears in the narrative), but as the David cycle continues Abishai is given various commands (e.g., 2 Kgdms 18:2, directly by David) and is depicted as an ἄρχων ἐν τοῖς τρισίν ("a leader among the three"), so John's characterization of him as a στρατηγός fits the overall narrative portrayal.

136. διαχειρίζεσθαι, also meaning to "slay."

137. Verbatim in all three cases, but John has added καί between the two clauses.

138. The verb ἀμύνεσθαι and noun ἄμυνα refer both to requital (or even vengeance) and to self-defense (LSJ B; A.I–II, respectively). This is important for the following argument John will make as David's putative defense attorney (reasoning about his innocence even if he had in fact killed Saul).

139. The PG text of JPM adopts two conjectural emendations that were in the notes of PE, which in turn they had rightly credited to HS: plus ἂν after ἔμενεν (as expected for the unreal conditional); ἀντὶ πολλῶν θανάτων for ὅτι πολλῶν θανάτων in the following sentence, as indicated in JPM's own footnote ("EDIT").

140. For the idiom ἀδίκων χειρῶν ἄρχειν, "give the first blow," see LSJ s.v. χεῖρ IV.

murder. It was actually the very ease of the murder that turned him away from it, because he considered that the reason God had handed Saul over to him was for the deliberate purpose of providing him with a greater opportunity and occasion for exercising his philosophical virtue. Now, you perhaps admire David because he remembered none of the past wrongs. But I marvel at him for a much greater reason. What's that? That not even the fear of future events propelled him to lay his hands on¹³⁶ his enemy. For David knew clearly that if Saul escaped his hands he'd rise against him again, but he chose instead to place his own self in danger by releasing the man who had harmed him rather than to lay hands on his adversary out of a concern for his own security.

What could be the equal of that great and noble soul who—despite the fact that the Law commanded one to pluck out “*an eye for an eye*” and “*a tooth for a tooth*” (Exod 21:24; Lev 24:30; Deut 19:21)¹³⁷ and to requite¹³⁸ oneself with like for like—not only didn't do this, but displayed an even greater philosophical bearing? Indeed, even if he'd slain Saul at that moment, there would¹³⁹ still have been unmitigated praise for his philosophical demeanor. For not only would he have been acting in self-defense—given that it wasn't he who struck the first blow¹⁴⁰—but also it would've been entirely fair for him to have taken¹⁴¹ “*an eye for an eye*.” This is because he wouldn't have carried out one killing for one killing. No, in return for the many deaths that Saul had brought on by attempting to do away with him not once, or twice, but repeatedly, David would have brought about a single death. And indeed, not only for these reasons, but also the consideration that David came to the point of self-defense because he was afraid for his future, and after all, the fact that the act was fully consistent with the *lex talionis* just mentioned, rightly hoist the crown of victory for forbearance onto his head!¹⁴² Certainly a person who becomes enraged and demands retribution for the things that had happened to him couldn't attain praises for forbearance. But no one would refuse to award the crown of victory for fairness to someone who—although he'd forgiven all the past events, as many and horrible as they were—out of fear for the future and the need to gain security for himself, was compelled to come to his own defense.

141. Translating *ὡς ὡς* with LSJ II.b (and I.5).

142. Note the deliberate connection with the “crown” of control over one's passions to which Chrysostom had made reference above, §4.

ζ'. Ἀλλ' ὅμως ὁ Δαυῖδ οὐδὲ τοῦτο ἐποίησεν, ἀλλὰ καινόν τινα καὶ παράδοξον εὔρε φιλοσοφίας τρόπον· καὶ οὔτε ἡ μνήμη τῶν παρελθόντων, οὐχ ὁ φόβος τῶν μελλόντων, οὐχ ἡ προτροπὴ τοῦ στρατηγοῦ, οὐχ ἡ ἐρημία τοῦ τόπου, οὐ τὸ τῆς σφαγῆς εὐκόλον, οὐκ ἄλλο οὐδὲν διήγειρεν αὐτὸν πρὸς τὸν φόνον· ἀλλ' ὥσπερ εὐεργέτου τινὸς, καὶ μεγάλα αὐτὸν πεπονηκότος ἀγαθὰ, [185] οὕτω τοῦ ἐχθροῦ καὶ λελυπηκότος ἐφείσατο. Ποίαν οὖν ἔχομεν ἡμεῖς συγγνώμην, ἀμαρτημάτων παρελθόντων μνημονεύοντες, καὶ τοὺς λελυπηκότας ἀμυνόμενοι, ὅταν ὁ ἀναίτιος ἐκεῖνος, τοσαῦτα μὲν πεπονθώς, πλείονα δὲ καὶ χαλεπώτερα προσδοκῶν αὐτῷ συμβῆσθαι κακὰ ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ ἐχθροῦ σωτηρίας, φαίνεται φειδόμενος οὕτως, ὥς ἐλέσθαι κινδυνεῦσαι μᾶλλον αὐτὸς, καὶ μετὰ φόβου καὶ τρόμου ζῆν, ἢ τὸν μέλλοντα μυρία πράγματα αὐτῷ παρέχειν ἀποσφάζαι δικαίως;

Τὴν μὲν οὖν φιλοσοφίαν ἐκ τούτων ἔστιν ἰδεῖν, ὅτι οὐ μόνον οὐκ ἔσφαξε, τοσαύτης οὔσης ἀνάγκης, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ῥῆμα βλάσφημον εἰς αὐτὸν ἐξήνεγκε, καὶ ταῦτα μὴ μέλλοντος αὐτοῦ ἀκούσασθαι τοῦ ὑβριζομένου. Καίτοι γε ἡμεῖς καὶ φίλους λέγομεν πολλάκις κακῶς ἀπόντας, ἐκεῖνος δὲ οὐδὲ τὸν ἐχθρὸν καὶ τοσαῦτα ἡδικοχότα. Τὴν μὲν οὖν φιλοσοφίαν ἐκ τούτων ἔστιν ἰδεῖν· τὴν δὲ φιλανθρωπίαν, καὶ τὴν ἄλλην κηδεμονίαν, ἐξ ὧν μετὰ ταῦτα ἐποίησε. Τὸ γὰρ κράσπεδον κόψας τοῦ ἱματίου, καὶ τὸν φακὸν τοῦ ὕδατος ὑφελόμενος, ἀπελθὼν πόρρωθεν, καὶ στὰς ἐβόησε, καὶ τῷ διασωθέντι ταῦτα ὑπέδειξεν, οὐχὶ πρὸς ἐπίδειξιν καὶ φιλοτιμίαν τοῦτο ποιῶν, ἀλλὰ διὰ τῶν ἔργων αὐτὸν πείσαι βουλόμενος, ὅτι εἰκὴ καὶ μάτην αὐτὸν ὑπώπτευσεν ὡς ἐχθρὸν, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο αὐτὸν πρὸς φιλίαν ἐπιστάσασθαι σπεύδων. Ἀλλ' ὅμως οὐδὲ οὕτως αὐτὸν πείσας, καὶ δυνάμενος διαχειρίσασθαι, πάλιν εἴλετο μᾶλλον ἐκπεσεῖν τῆς πατρίδος καὶ ἐν ἄλλοτρίᾳ διατρίβειν, καὶ καθ' ἐκάστην ταλαιπωρούμενος ἡμέραν, τὴν ἀναγκαίαν αὐτῷ πορίζειν τροφήν, ἢ μένων οἴκοι λυπεῖν τὸν ἐπίβουλον. Τί γένοιτ' ἂν ἡμερώτερον τῆς ἐκεῖνου ψυχῆς; Ὅντως δικαίως ἔλεγε, Μνήσθητι, Κύριε, τοῦ Δαυῖδ, καὶ πάσης τῆς πραότητος αὐτοῦ.

143. One of many instances of αὐξήσις, “rhetorical amplification,” throughout this argument.

144. μετὰ φόβου καὶ τρόμου: 2 Cor 7:15; Phil 2:12; Eph 6:5. The noun pair is frequent in the LXX, as in Gen 9:2; Exod 15:16; Isa 19:16; cf. Ps 2:11.

145. John has substituted the language used of the miracle-working hem of Jesus's garment in the Gospels, τὸ κράσπεδον τοῦ ἱματίου (Matt 9:20 // Luke 8:44; Mark 6:56 // Matt 14:36), for the wording in the LXX, τὸ περύγιον τῆς διπλοῖδος.

146. Cf. 1 Kgdm 25:2–35.

147. With spelling πραότητος for πραῦτητος. There is no explicit subject for the

7. Yet despite all this, David did no such thing, but he discovered a new and extraordinary way to live the philosophical life. Neither the remembrance of past events nor the fear of future ones, nor the persuasive arguments of his general, nor the isolation of the place, nor the ease of the killing, nor anything else roused him to the murder.¹⁴³ As though Saul were his benefactor and a person who had done fabulous good things for him, [185] David in this way spared the man who was his enemy and had caused him such grief. So then, what sort of excuse will we have? We remember past offenses and seek vengeance against those who've aggrieved us. But that innocent man, who had suffered such terrible things and could only expect more and worse evils to happen to him if the life of his enemy were saved, appears to have spared his enemy in such a way as to choose to be in danger himself and live with fear and trembling¹⁴⁴ rather than justifiably to slay the man who was going to give him endless further troubles.

One can see David's philosophical bearing from the fact that he not only didn't kill Saul even when there was such a pressing need, but he didn't even deliver a slanderous word against him, despite the fact that Saul wouldn't even listen to him, the injured party. Although we often speak badly of our friends when they're absent, David didn't even call a man who had done him such grave harm an "enemy." One can see his philosophical bearing from this. And David's love and care for others can be seen from what he did afterward. For after cutting off the hem of Saul's garment (cf. 1 Kgdms 24:6)¹⁴⁵ and absconding with his water jar (1 Kgdms 26:11–12), he went off a distance, and standing there, he called out and exhibited these items to the man he had saved (1 Kgdms 26:13–20). In doing this, David wasn't showing off or being ostentatious, but instead he wished to persuade Saul by these actions that his suspicion of him as an enemy had no ground or purpose, and he was eager by these means to induce Saul to friendship. Nevertheless, not even by these means was he able to persuade him. Despite having the ability to slay him, once again David chose instead to leave his homeland and live in a strange land, every single day struggling to find the bare necessities of food for himself¹⁴⁶ rather than staying in his homeland and causing grief to a man who plotted against him. What could be gentler than this man's soul? Quite rightly Scripture said, "*Remember, O Lord, David and all his meekness*" (Ps 131:1).¹⁴⁷

verb of speaking, but, given that David is spoken of in third person within it, John likely takes this as Scripture's voice.

Τοῦτον καὶ ἡμεῖς μιμησώμεθα, καὶ μήτε λέγωμεν, μήτε ποιῶμεν κακῶς τοὺς ἐχθροὺς, ἀλλὰ καὶ εὐεργετῶμεν κατὰ δύναμιν· ἡμεῖς γὰρ ἑαυτοὺς εὖ ποιήσομεν μᾶλλον, ἢ ἐκείνους. Ἄν γὰρ ἀφήτε, φησί, τοῖς ἐχθροῖς ὑμῶν, ἀφεθήσεται ὑμῖν. Ἄφες δουρικὰ ἁμαρτήματα, ἵνα λάβῃς συγχώρησιν δεσποτικὴν ἁμαρτημάτων· εἰ δὲ μεγάλα ἡδίκησεν, ὅσῳπερ ἂν μείζονα ἀφῇς, τοσούτῳ μείζονα λήψῃ τὴν συγχώρησιν. Διὰ γὰρ τοῦτο ἐδιδάχθημεν λέγειν, Ἄφες ἡμῖν, καθὼς ἀφίεμεν, ἵνα μάθωμεν, ὅτι τὸ μέτρον τῆς ἀφέσεως παρ' ἡμῶν πρῶτον λαμβάνει τὴν ἀρχήν. Ὡστε, ὅσῳπερ ἂν χαλεπώτερα ὁ ἐχθρὸς ἐργάσῃται κακὰ, τοσούτῳ μείζονως εὐεργετεῖ. Σπεύδωμεν τοίνυν καὶ ἐπειγώμεθα καταλλάττεσθαι πρὸς τοὺς λελυπηκότας, ἂν τε δικαίως, ἂν τε ἀδίκως ὀργίζωνται. Ἄν μὲν γὰρ ἐνταῦθα καταλλαγῆς, ἀπηλλάγῃς τῆς ἐκεῖ κρίσεως· ἐὰν δὲ, μετὰ μενούσης τῆς ἔχθρας, θάνατος ἐπιστὰς ἀπαγάγῃ τὴν ἀπέχθειαν μεσολαβήσας, ἐκεῖ λοιπὸν εἰσαχθῇ τὴν δίκην ἀνάγκη. Καθάπερ οὖν πολλοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἀμφισβητοῦντες, [186] ἂν μὲν ἔξω φιλικώτερον διαλύσωνται πρὸς ἀλλήλους, καὶ ζημίας καὶ φόβου καὶ κινδύνων πολλῶν ἑαυτοὺς ἀπαλλάττουσι, κατὰ γνώμην ἑκατέρους τοῦ τέλους τῆς δίκης ἐκβαίνοντος· ἂν δὲ τῷ δικαστῇ καθ' ἑαυτοὺς ἐπιτρέψωσι, καὶ χρημάτων ζημία καὶ τιμωρία πολλάκις, καὶ τὸ τὴν ἔχθραν μένειν ἀκίνητον αὐτοῖς περιέσται· οὕτω δὴ καὶ ἐνταῦθα, ἂν μὲν κατὰ τὴν παροῦσαν ζωὴν διαλυσώμεθα, πάσης ἑαυτοὺς κολάσεως ἀπαλλάξομεν· ἂν δὲ ἐχθροὶ μένοντες εἰς τὸ δικαστήριον ἀπέλθωμεν ἐκεῖνο τὸ φοβερόν, τὴν ἐσχάτην δώσομεν δίκην ἐπὶ τῇ ψήφῳ τοῦ δικαστοῦ πάντως ἐκείνου, καὶ ἀμφοτέροι τιμωρίαν ὑποστησώμεθα ἀπαραίτητον, ὁ μὲν ἀδίκως ὀργιζόμενος, διὰ τοῦτο ὅτι ἀδίκως, ὁ δὲ δικαίως, διὰ τοῦτο ὅτι δικαίως ἐμνησικάκησε. Κἂν γὰρ ἀδίκως ὤμέν τι πεπονθότες κακῶς, συγχώρησιν δεῖ προσνέμειν τοῖς ἡδικοῦσι. Καὶ σκόπει πῶς τοὺς ἀδίκως λυπήσαντας ὡθεῖ καὶ κατεπείγει πρὸς τὴν καταλλαγὴν τῶν ἡδικημένων. Ἐὰν προσφέρῃς τὸ δῶρόν σου, φησὶν, ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου, ἀκαεῖ μνησθῆς ὅτι ὁ ἀδελφός σου ἔχει τι κατὰ σοῦ, ὕπαγε, πρῶτον διαλλαγῇ τῷ ἀδελφῷ

148. Adapted via paraphrase for this context, substituting τοῖς ἐχθροῖς for τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, with the active voice of Matt 6:14, ἀφήσει καὶ ὑμῖν ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ὁ οὐράνιος, made passive, ἀφήθήσεται ὑμῖν (also ἂν for ἐάν at the start).

149. With καθὼς for ὡς (the reading of \mathfrak{M} and all other witnesses).

150. This harkens back to John's earlier argument that Paul knew that the hardest part about the process of reconciliation was getting it started, i.e., finding an ἀρχή (§5 [PG 51:181]).

151. John is making a wordplay on the cognates καταλλάττειν and ἀπαλλάττειν. The latter, meaning, "be set free from," "depart from," also points to the afterlife, as an idiom for leaving this life (see LSJ B.I and II).

And let us in turn imitate him, and neither say nor do evil to our enemies, but instead, as far as it's in our power, be their benefactors. In this way we shall benefit ourselves more than them. "*If you forgive your enemies*," he says, "*it will be forgiven to you*" (Matt 6:14).¹⁴⁸ Forgive the sins of slaves so you might receive the pardon of the Master for your sins. If someone has done you great harm, inasmuch as you forgive a great deal, you will receive all the more pardon for yourself. The reason we were taught to say "*forgive us ... just as we forgive*" (Matt 6:12)¹⁴⁹ is so we might learn that a measure of forgiveness on our part first constitutes the initial step forward.¹⁵⁰ Therefore, to the degree that your enemy does terrible, wicked things, you should all the more extend benefactions. Hence, let's be eager and hasten to become reconciled with those who've aggrieved us, whether their anger might be justified or not. For if you become reconciled here, you've been rescued¹⁵¹ from judgment there.¹⁵² But if, while your enmity remains in place, death, cutting short your enmity, comes and leads you away, in the end the penalty must be paid there. Many people when they have a legal dispute with one another, [186] if they become reconciled with one another amicably out of court, free themselves from loss, fear, and many dangers when by agreement the lawsuit comes to an end for both of them. But if they turn their affairs over to the judge, then often the net result for them will be loss of property and penalties, and their enmity will continue unchanged. In the same way also in the present life, if we resolve the problem ourselves, we shall free ourselves from all punishment. But if we go off to that terrifying court¹⁵³ remaining enemies, we'll pay the worst penalty of all in the verdict of the one who is truly judge. And both of us shall be subject to a penalty that's inescapable: the one who's moved to anger unjustifiably, a penalty for acting unjustly; and the one who's moved to anger justifiably, a penalty for holding a grudge, even if they had a just reason for it. Indeed, even if we've suffered something bad for unjust reasons, we should dole out pardon to those who've harmed us. Observe closely how the Lord pushes and prods those who've unjustifiably caused grief to be reconciled with those whom they've harmed: "*If you bring your gift before the altar*," he says, "*and there you remember that your brother or sister has something against you ... go and first become reconciled with your brother or sister*"

152. ἐνταῦθα ("here") and ἐκεῖ ("there"), as so often in Chrysostom's homilies, mean "earthly life" and "the life to come."

153. I.e., in the eschatological judgment.

σου. Οὐκ εἶπε, Συνάγαγε, προσένεγκε τὴν θυσίαν, ἀλλὰ, Διαλλάγηθι, καὶ τότε προσένεγκε. Ἄφες αὐτὴν κεῖσθαι, φησὶν, ἵνα ἡ ἀνάγκη τῆς προσφορᾶς καὶ ἄκοντα καταναγκάσῃ πρὸς τὴν καταλλαγὴν ἔλθεῖν τὸν δικαίως ὀργιζόμενον. "Ορα πῶς προτρέπει πάλιν πρὸς τὸν παροξύναντα ἔλθεῖν, εἰπὼν, Ἄφετε τοῖς ὀφειλέταις ὑμῶν, ὅπως καὶ ὁ Πατὴρ ὑμῶν ἀφήσῃ ὑμῶν τὰ παραπτώματα. Οὐ γὰρ μικρὸν τέθεικε μισθόν, ἀλλὰ καὶ σφόδρα ὑπερβαίνοντα τὸ τοῦ κατορθώματος μέγεθος.

Ταῦτ' οὖν ἅπαντα ἐννοοῦντες, καὶ τὴν ἀμοιβὴν τὴν ἐπὶ τούτῳ γινομένην λογιζόμενοι, καὶ ὥς οὐ πολλοῦ καμάτου καὶ σπουδῆς ἐστὶν ἁμαρτήματα ἀπαλεῖψαι, συγχωρῶμεν τοῖς ἡμᾶς ἡδικηκόσιν. Ὁ γὰρ διὰ νηστείας, καὶ ὀδυρμῶν, καὶ εὐχῶν, καὶ σάκκου, καὶ σποδοῦ, καὶ μυρίας ἐξομολογήσεως μόλις ἕτεροι κατορθοῦσι, τὸ τὰ ἁμαρτήματα ἐξαλείφειν λέγω τὰ ἑαυτῶν, τοῦτο ἔξεστιν ἡμῖν ῥαδίως ποιεῖν χωρὶς σάκκου καὶ σποδοῦ καὶ νηστείας, ἂν μόνον ἀπὸ τῆς διανοίας ἐξαλείψωμεν τὴν ὀργὴν, καὶ μετὰ εἰλικρινείας ἀφῶμεν τοῖς ἡδικηκόσιν ἡμᾶς. Ὁ δὲ τῆς εἰρήνης καὶ ἀγάπης Θεὸς πάντα θυμὸν καὶ πικρίαν καὶ ὀργὴν τῆς ψυχῆς ἐξορίσας τῆς ἡμετέρας, καταξιώσαι κατὰ τὴν τῶν μελῶν ἀκολουθίαν μετὰ ἀκριβείας συνδεδεμένους ἀλλήλοις, ὁμοθυμαδόν, ἐν ἐνὶ στόματι καὶ μιᾷ ψυχῇ, διηνεκῶς ἀναπέμπειν τοὺς ὀφειλομένους εὐχαριστηρίους ὕμνους αὐτῷ, ὅτι αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Ἀμήν.

154. Minus οὖν before προσφέρεις, with ἐπὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου for ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον and κάκει for καὶ ἐκεῖ; ellipsis as marked.

155. συνάγειν here seems to mean "gather for worship," but John also may be playing on its transitive sense of "unite" or "reconcile" (see PGL A.2.a, 5).

156. Not a quotation, but an exegetical paraphrase by Chrysostom personifying Christ.

157. The first half of the sentence is not strictly a quotation, even if introduced by John as such, but an apparent paraphrase or conflation of Mark 11:25b and Matt

(Matt 5:23–24).¹⁵⁴ He didn't say, "Come together,¹⁵⁵ offer the sacrifice," but "*become reconciled*," and then offer it. "Leave it lying there," he says, "so the necessity of the offering might force even the person who's been justifiably moved to anger, unwilling as they are, to come to reconciliation."¹⁵⁶ Look at how he persuades the aggrieved party once again to come toward the one who provoked them, when he said, "Forgive your debtors so that *also your Father might forgive your transgressions*" (Mark 11:25).¹⁵⁷ He set up no small reward but one that greatly transcends the magnitude of the good deed.

So now, having in mind all these things and considering the recompense that attends to this and how wiping away sins takes no great toil or trouble, let's pardon those who've harmed us. Precisely what's hardly possible for others to accomplish via fasting, lamentation, prayers, sackcloth, ashes, and continual confession—I mean, wiping away one's own sins—we can easily do without sackcloth, ashes, and fasting if we wipe the anger from our minds and sincerely forgive those who've harmed us. May the God of peace¹⁵⁸ and love, by banishing all anger, bitterness, and wrath from our souls, find us worthy to be bound closely together with one another in the good order of members,¹⁵⁹ "*concordantly, in one voice*" (Rom 15:6) and in one soul¹⁶⁰ to send up to him continually the hymns of thanksgiving and praise that he is due, because to him belong the glory and the power, forever and ever. Amen.

6:12, 14–15 // Luke 11:4. The second half is closer to a quotation from Mark 11:25c, yet hardly exact: minus *ὁ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς* after *ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν*; with *ἀφήση* for *ἀφῆ*; *ὑμῶν* for *ὑμῖν* before *τὰ παραπτώματα*.

158. Cf. 2 Cor 14:33 and, in similar blessing formulae, Rom 15:33; 1 Thess 5:23.

159. Sc. of the body of Christ (cf. 1 Cor 12:12–27; Rom 12:4–5); the church as "body" had been invoked earlier in his homily, at §2 (PG 51:173).

160. *μὴ ψυχή*; cf. Acts 4:32. (*ὁμοθυμαδόν*, as in Rom 15:6, is also a favored term in Acts for the unity of the primitive church, as in Acts 1:14; 2:46; 4:24, etc.)

ΕΙΣ ΤΟ «Ἀσπάσασθε Πρίσκιλλαν καὶ Ἀκύλαν,» καὶ τὰ ἐξῆς,
λόγος α'.

α'. [187] Πολλοὺς ὑμῶν οἶμαι θαυμάζειν ἐπὶ τὴν περικοπὴν τῆς ἀποστολικῆς ἀναγνώσεως ταύτης, μᾶλλον δὲ πάρεργον ἡγεῖσθαι καὶ περιττὸν τοῦτο τῆς ἐπιστολῆς τὸ μέρος, διὰ τὸ προσήσεις ἔχειν μόνον συνεχεῖς καὶ ἐπαλλήλους. Διὸ δὴ καὶ αὐτὸς ἐτέρωσε τήμερον ὠρμημένος, ἀποστὰς ἐκείνης τῆς ὑποθέσεως, εἰς ταύτην καθεῖναι παρασκευάζομαι, ἵνα μάθητε, ὅτι τῶν θείων Γραφῶν οὐδὲν περιττὸν, οὐδὲν πάρεργόν ἐστι, κἂν ἰῶτα ἓν, κἂν μία κεραία ᾗ, ἀλλὰ καὶ ψιλὴ πρόσρησις πολὺ πέλαιος ἡμῖν ἀνοίγει νοημάτων.

1. Provenance: Mf (3:171) locates these two homilies on Rom 16:3 particularly by the reference to *κοινοὶ πατέρες* in *Hom. Rom. 16:3 B §5* (PG 51:203) who are the object of blasphemous and reviling speech, as most likely in Antioch, before John was a bishop. Mayer, *Provenance*, 349–51, disputes whether one can discern from this either the precise referent of the phrase (i.e., whether presbyters or bishops, in residence or visiting) or John's status relative to them, as presbyter or bishop. She concludes “without clear internal evidence, context or independent data there is no immediate means of resolving an issue of this kind” (*Provenance*, 351). In her cumulative table (*Provenance*, 470), Mayer lists the homily as undecided but does not shade the line (which would call for a reassessment). Mf (3:172) also observes a thematic similarity to two other Antiochene homily sets, *Hom. princ. Ac.* and *Hom. Act. 9:1*, in regard to the insistence upon the importance of every word, every letter, in Scripture; but this seems to me to be a constant appeal in Chrysostom's oeuvre across his career and hence a weak criterion for dating. In any case, it is clear that both homilies were delivered in the same place, and sequentially, because the second gives a summation of the chief argumentative headings of the first at the outset of §1 (PG 51:195–96). For an analysis of this homily, see Mitchell, “The Continuing Problem of Particularity and Universality within the *corpus Paulinum*: Chrysostom on Romans 16:3.”

Text: Mf PE (1837) as reprinted by JPM (PG, 1862). Neither Mf (1721) nor PE (1837) included any text-critical notes on this homily (unlike the following one).

Hom. Rom. 16:3 A
(*In illud: salutate Priscillam et Aquilam, et quae sequuntur, sermo 1*)
CPG 4376 (PG 51:187–96)¹

On the statement, “*Greet Priscilla² and Aquila, etc.,*” homily 1.

1. [187] I suppose many of you are astonished at this passage from the apostle that was read today, and even more that you consider this part of the letter to be trifling and superfluous³ because it just contains a continuous list of greetings by name⁴ one after the other. That’s why I’m taking a different approach today, rejecting that supposition, and am preparing to take this very passage as my focus, so you might learn that nothing in the divine Scriptures is superfluous, nothing trifling, even if it is “*one iota*” or “*one stroke of a letter*” (Matt 5:18).⁵ But on the contrary, even a simple named greeting opens up for us a great sea of meanings.⁶

Pinakes lists fifteen manuscripts containing this homily (one of which is HS’s source, Monac. gr. 6, and another may be the Venice manuscript that was his second source).

2. Throughout his oeuvre, Chrysostom cites her name as Πρίσκιλλα (with Acts 18:2 and 26 unambiguously, and with Μ and many witnesses at 1 Cor 16:19) and never Πρίσκα (as is read by Μ at Rom 16:3; but Πρίσκιλλα is found in 81. 365. 614. 629. 630. 945. 1505. 1881^c and versions at Rom 16:3, where it is cited as an alternate Byz reading by RP).

3. This supposition, named at the very outset of the homily as a view possibly held by his hearers, is the problem Chrysostom will seek to address head on.

4. πρόσρησις means both “naming” or “form of address” and “epistolary greeting” (see PGL); John will play off both senses in his interpretation of Rom 16.

5. In English, traditionally (from KJV) “one jot or tittle.” This is John’s counter-proposition or solution to the apparent problem of Scripture containing things that seem to be trivial. In his response he flips the problem on itself and seeks to argue the extreme opposite.

6. νοήματα: also “thoughts” and “understandings” (see PGL 1, 6, 7). What lies in the balance is the essential hermeneutical question: where does meaning reside—in the text, in the reader, in the author? The term is tensively ambiguous in allowing for all three possibilities.

Καὶ τί λέγω, ψιλὴ πρόσρησις; Πολλάκις καὶ ἐνὸς στοιχείου προσθήκη ὁλόκληρον νοημάτων εἰσήγαγε δύναμιν. Καὶ τοῦτο ἐπὶ τῆς τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ προσηγορίας ἔστιν ἰδεῖν. Πῶς γὰρ οὐκ ἄτοπον παρὰ φίλου μὲν ἐπιστολὴν δεχόμενον, μὴ τὸ σῶμα τῆς ἐπιστολῆς ἀναγινώσκειν μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν κάτω κειμένην πρόσρησιν, κάκειθεν μάλιστα στοχάζεσθαι τὴν τοῦ γεγραφένου διάθεσιν, Παύλου δὲ γράφοντος, μᾶλλον δὲ οὐ τοῦ Παύλου, ἀλλὰ τῆς τοῦ Πνεύματος χάριτος τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ὑπαγορευούσης ὁλοκλήρῳ πόλει καὶ δήμῳ τοσοῦτῳ, καὶ δι' ἐκείνων τῇ οἰκουμένη πάσῃ, νομίζειν περιττόν τι εἶναι τῶν ἐγκειμένων, καὶ παρατρέχειν ἀπλῶς, καὶ μὴ ἐννοεῖν, ὅτι ταῦτα πάντα τὰ ἄνω κάτω πεποίηκε; Τοῦτο γάρ ἐστι, τοῦτο, ὃ πολλῆς ῥαθυμίας ἡμᾶς ἐνέπλησε, τὸ μὴ πάσας ἐπιέναι τὰς Γραφάς, ἀλλ' ἃ νομίζομεν εἶναι σαφέστερα, ταῦτα ἐκλεγομένους, τῶν ἄλλων μηδένα ποιεῖσθαι λόγον. Τοῦτο καὶ τὰς αἰρέσεις εἰσήγαγε, τὸ μὴ βούλεσθαι ἅπαν ἐπιέναι τὸ σῶμα, τὸ νομίζειν εἶναί τι περιττόν καὶ πάρεργον. Διὰ τοῦτο τὰ μὲν ἄλλα ἅπαντα ἡμῖν διεσπούδασται, οὐχὶ τὰ περιττὰ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ ἀνόνητα καὶ βλαβερά· τῶν Γραφῶν δὲ ἡ ἐμπειρία ἡμέληται καὶ παρῶπται.

καὶ οἱ μὲν πρὸς τὴν θεω-[188]ρίαν τῆς τῶν ἵππων ἀμίλλης ἐπτοημένοι, καὶ ὀνόματα, καὶ ἀγέλην, καὶ γένος, καὶ πατρίδα, καὶ ἀνατροφὴν τῶν ἵππων ἔχουσιν εἰπεῖν μετὰ ἀκριβείας ἀπάσης, καὶ ἔτη ζωῆς, καὶ ἐνεργείας δρόμων,

7. Taking the aorist εἰσήγαγε as gnomic.

8. Καὶ οὐ κληθήσεται ἔτι τὸ ὄνομά σου Αβραμ, ἀλλ' ἔσται τὸ ὄνομά σου Αβρααμ (Gen 17:5).

9. Or, “how the writer is doing” (i.e., their condition, διάθεσις).

10. The verb ὑπαγορεύειν (PGL 1: “dictate; of oral tradition ... compose, compile”) is meant to emphasize the high stature of the scriptural writing, but it doesn't in itself explain precisely what the role of the Spirit in the act of composition entailed. See also n. 12 below.

11. Chrysostom often refers to the opposite of a careful, close reading (characterized as ἀκριβεία) with παρατρέχειν, “running right by” (see Astruc-Morize-Le Boul-luec, “Le sens caché des Écritures,” 6).

12. Given the statement of dual authorship above, it is ambiguous whether the subject of the verb πεποίηκε is Paul or the Holy Spirit. Although Chrysostom attributes the letter to the “dictation” of the Holy Spirit, in the homily that follows he will credit Paul's virtue, wisdom, and intelligence for the phrasing and intent. He does not again in the present homily credit the Holy Spirit with the senses, but he does refer to the meanings as ὁ πνευματικὸς πλοῦτος, “spiritual wealth” (§1 [PG 51:189]). It is common for John to see the two things as fully compatible and also to alter the divine inspiration image, via 2 Cor 13:3, to Christ being the one speaking in Paul (see HT 76–77 for references). But this emphasis on the inspiration of the Spirit does not for Chrysostom's work of interpretation mean denying Paul's own agency or responsibility for the writing.

Why do I say, “a simple name”? Oftentimes the addition of even a single letter introduces⁷ a whole host of meanings. One can see this, for instance, in the case of the name “Abraham.”⁸ After all, someone receiving a letter from a friend doesn’t read only the body of the letter but also the greeting that lies below it, and from that especially surmises the writer’s intent.⁹ That being so, how is it not absurd when the letter writer is Paul—or, rather, not Paul, but the grace of the Spirit that dictates¹⁰ the letter to a whole city and a great people, and through them to the whole world—to consider anything in it to be superfluous, or simply to run past¹¹ it and not pay attention to the fact that he¹² has fashioned all these words from beginning to end?¹³ For it is this very thing—not going through all the Scriptures, but singling out the portions that we¹⁴ consider to be clearer and taking no account of the others—that has filled us with great indolence. This is precisely what introduces heresies too—not wishing to traverse the whole body¹⁵ and considering anything superfluous and trifling. That is why all the other parts of Scripture have received our¹⁶ most serious attention, not only the “superfluous” parts but even those that are “useless” and “harmful.”¹⁷ But that kind of broad acquaintance with the Scriptures has been slighted and neglected.

Now those [188] who are all aflutter over the spectacle of horse-racing can tell you the names, herd, ancestry, hometown, and upbringing of the horses with complete accuracy and in detail,¹⁸ as well as how old they are,

13. Literally, “top to bottom.” Of course, while a personal letter (like so many preserved on papyri) may allow a glance at the bottom on a single page, one could not do that with the long letter to the Romans.

14. A generic “we,” by which John preliminarily includes himself among those other Christians who are responsible for the problem. But he will differentiate himself in the next sentence.

15. I.e., of Scripture.

16. This is not the generic “we,” but Chrysostom the homilist is separating himself out as not having fallen into this trap that has befallen others (and will not, he promises, do so in the present sermon).

17. John is granting for now not that these passages *are* “useless” or “harmful” but that they are *thought to be* such (sc. νομίζειν in the previous sentences and ἡγεῖσθαι in the opening to the homily); hence I have put the words in quotation marks. This is part of the rhetoric of ζητήματα καὶ λύσεις.

18. The term ἀκριβεία, enormously important for John, is used in this homily (as throughout his oeuvre) with all its senses: “attention,” “detail,” “care,” “accuracy,” and “rigor.” I occasionally double-gloss it so the reader can see the resonances within the argument.

καὶ τίς τίνι συνταττόμενος τὴν νίκην ἀρπάσεται, καὶ ποῖος ἵππος ἐκ ποίας ἀφεθείς βαλβίδος, καὶ τίνα ἔχων ἡνίοχον, περιέσται τοῦ δρόμου, καὶ τὸν ἀντίτεχνον παραδραμεῖται. Καὶ οἱ περὶ τὴν ὀρχήστραν δὲ ἐσχολακότες, οὐκ ἐλάττω τούτων, ἀλλὰ καὶ πλείω μανίαν περὶ τοὺς ἐν τοῖς θεάτροις ἀσχημονοῦντας ἐπιδείκνυνται, μίμους λέγω καὶ ὀρχηστρίας, καὶ γένος αὐτῶν, καὶ πατρίδα, καὶ ἀνατροφὴν, καὶ τὰ ἄλλα πάντα καταλέγοντες· ἡμεῖς δὲ ἐρωτῶμενοι, ὁπόσαι, καὶ τίνες εἰσὶν αἱ Παύλου ἐπιστολαί, οὐδὲ τὸν ἀριθμὸν ἴσμεν εἰπεῖν. Εἰ δέ τινες καὶ εἶεν τὸν ἀριθμὸν ἐπιστάμενοι, ἀλλὰ τὰς πόλεις, αἱ τὰς ἐπιστολάς ἐδέξαντο, ταύτας ἐρωτῶμενοι διαποροῦσι πρὸς τὴν ἐρώτησιν. Καὶ ἄνθρωπος μὲν εὐνοῦχος καὶ βάρβαρος, μυρίαὶ φροντίσιν ὑπὸ μυρίων ἐλκόμενος πραγμάτων, οὕτω προσέκειτο βιβλίοις, ὥς μὴδὲ κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν τῆς ὁδοιπορίας ἡσυχάζειν, ἀλλ' ἐπ' ὀχήματος καθήμενος, ἐγκεῖσθαι μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς ἀκριβείας τῇ τῶν θείων Γραφῶν ἀναγνώσει· ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐδὲ τὸ πολλοστὸν μέρος τῆς ἀσχολίας ἔχοντες τῆς ἐκείνου, καὶ πρὸς τὰ ὀνόματα τῶν ἐπιστολῶν ξενιζόμεθα, καὶ ταῦτα καθ' ἐκάστην κυριακὴν ἐνταῦθα συλλεγόμενοι, καὶ θείας ἀπολαύοντες ἀκροάσεως.

Ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἵνα μὴ μόνον εἰς ἐπιτίμησιν τὸν λόγον ἀναλώσωμεν, φέρε, τὴν πρόσρησιν αὐτὴν τὴν δοκοῦσαν εἶναι περιττὴν καὶ παρενοχλεῖν, εἰς μέσον ἀγάγωμεν. Ἀναπτυσσομένης γὰρ αὐτῆς καὶ δεικνυμένου τοῦ κέρδους ὅσον παρέχει τοῖς προσέχουσιν αὐτῇ μετὰ ἀκριβείας, τότε μείζων ἔσται κατηγορία τοῖς ἀμελοῦσι τοσούτων θη-[189]σαυρῶν, καὶ τὸν πνευματικὸν ἀπὸ τῶν χειρῶν ρίπτουσι πλοῦτον. Τίς οὖν ἐστὶν ἡ πρόσρησις; Ἀσπάξεσθε, φησί, Πρίσκιλλαν καὶ Ἀκύλαν τοὺς συνεργούς μου ἐν Κυρίῳ. Ἄρα οὐ δοκεῖ ψιλή τις εἶναι πρόσρησις, καὶ μὴδὲν μέγα, μὴδὲ γενναῖον ἡμῖν ἐνδείκνυσθαι; Φέρε οὖν, εἰς αὐτὴν μόνην

19. See nn. 33 and 43 below on these encomiastic topoi and their continuing role in the argument of the homily.

20. Once again, the generic “we,” meaning “we Christians.” For the moment, John aligns himself with them for effect in setting up the analogies before later isolating his voice as an exception to this lassitude about the Scriptures.

21. One customary way of introducing a πρόβλημα or ζήτημα is to designate it with forms of δοκεῖν, “what appears to be” or “is supposed to be” a problem (that the orator will solve).

22. ἀναπτύσσεσθαι means literally “unroll” or “open” (as in a scroll; so Luke 4:17) and figuratively to “unfold” or “open” the meaning.

23. κατηγορία: a forensic term, meaning “accusation” or “charge.”

24. With ἐν κυρίῳ for ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ (as also in §3 [PG 51:191]; *Hom. Rom. 16.3 B* §4 [PG 51:201]). However, that John knows the reading ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ is clear, as he cites it that way in *Hom. Rom. 30.3* (PG 60:664); yet even there he is imprecise, reading συλλειτουργοῦς μου rather than συνεργοῦς μου. The explanation for his rendering

their performance on the track, and which horse, matched up in a heat with what other horse, will snatch up the win. And they can tell you what breed of horse, launched from a certain kind of starting gate and with what rider, will prevail in the race and run right past its rival. Likewise, those who devote their time to dance performances don't fall short of the horse-racing enthusiasts, but they display even more madness about those who behave indecorously in the theater—the mimes and the dancing girls, I mean—and can recount in detail their ancestry, hometown, upbringing,¹⁹ and everything else. But when we're asked, "How many and what are the names of the letters of Paul?" we²⁰ can't even tell their number! And even if there might be a few people who know their number, they're still at a loss when asked to provide an answer to the question of what cities received the letters. Yet a man who was a eunuch and a barbarian (cf. Acts 8:26–40), whose mind was pulled in many directions by countless business matters, was so devoted to the sacred books that he didn't even rest on the occasion of a journey but, when sitting in his chariot, was absorbed in the task of reading the divine Scriptures with complete attention. But in our case, although we don't have even a fraction of his occupational burdens, we're like foreigners when it comes to the names of the letters. And that's the case even though we are assembled here every Lord's day and have the benefit of hearing the divine Scripture.

But lest we spend our whole homily solely on rebuke, come, let's turn our attention to the very named greeting that is thought to be superfluous²¹ and annoying. For when it is explicated²² and the great gain that it provides to those who pay it close attention is demonstrated, then all the more egregious will be the indictment²³ against those who ignore such great [189] treasures and throw this spiritual wealth right out of their hands. So then, what's the address? "*Greet*," he says, "*Priscilla and Aquila, my coworkers in the Lord*" (Rom 16:3).²⁴ Doesn't this seem to be a simple named greeting and show us nothing great or noble? Come on, then, let's spend the whole

ἐν κυρίῳ in the present homily seems to be partly by the influence of the repetition of ἐν κυρίῳ in the greetings in Rom 16:8, 11, 12, 13, as well as a harmonization with 1 Cor 16:19 (ἀσπάζεται ὑμᾶς ἐν κυρίῳ πολλὰ Ἀκύλας καὶ Πρίσκιλλα), despite the latter verse containing greetings *from them* rather than to them (a conflation made also in some NT manuscripts at Rom 16:3). John combines the two references to Priscilla and Aquila once again at *Hom. Rom.* 30.3 (PG 60:664): Ἀσπάσασθε Ἀκύλαν καὶ Πρίσκιλλα σὺν τῇ κατ' οἶκον αὐτῶν ἐκκλησίᾳ. It is, of course, ironic that John inaccurately cites two words of his ten-word verse!

ἅπασαν τὴν διάλεξιν ἀναλώσωμεν, μᾶλλον δὲ οὐδὲ ἀρκέσωμεν σήμερον τὰ ἐγκείμενα ἅπαντα τοῖς ὀλίγοις τούτοις ῥήμασιν ἀνιμῆσθαι σπουδάσαντες ὑμῖν νοήματα, ἀλλὰ ἀνάγκη καὶ εἰς ἑτέραν ὑμῖν ἡμέραν ταμειυθῆναι τὴν τῶν θεωρημάτων περιουσίαν, τῶν τικτομένων ἀπὸ τῆς ὀλίγης ταύτης προσρήσεως. Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἅπασαν αὐτὴν ἐπελθεῖν παρασκευάζομαι, ἀλλὰ μέρος αὐτῆς καὶ ἀρχὴν καὶ προοίμιον μόνον· Ἀσπάσασθε Πρίσκιλλαν καὶ Ἀκύλαν.

β'. Πρῶτόν ἐστιν ἐκπλαγῆναι τοῦ Παύλου τὴν ἀρετὴν, ὅτι τὴν οἰκουμένην ἅπασαν ἐγκεχειρισμένος, καὶ γῆν καὶ θάλατταν, καὶ τὰς ὑφ' ἡλίῳ πόλεις ἀπάσας, καὶ βαρβάρους, καὶ Ἑλλήνας, καὶ δήμους τοσοῦτους ἐν ἑαυτῷ περιφέρων, ἐνὸς ἀνδρὸς καὶ μιᾶς γυναικὸς τοσαύτην ἐποιεῖτο φροντίδα· καὶ δεύτερον τοῦτο θαυμάσαι, πῶς ἄγρυπνόν τε καὶ μεμεριμνημένην εἶχε ψυχὴν, οὐχὶ κοινῇ πάντων μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἰδίᾳ μεμνημένος ἐκάστου τῶν δοκίμων καὶ γενναίων. Νῦν μὲν γὰρ οὐδὲν θαυμαστὸν τοὺς τῶν Ἐκκλησιῶν προεστῶτας τοῦτο ποιεῖν, τῷ καὶ τοὺς θορύβους κατεστάλθαι ἐκείνους, καὶ μιᾶς πόλεως ἀναδεδέχθαι πρόνοιαν μόνον· τότε δὲ οὐ τὸ τῶν κινδύνων μέγεθος μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ τῆς ὁδοῦ διάστημα, καὶ τὸ τῶν φροντίδων πλῆθος καὶ τὰ ἐπάλληλα κύματα, καὶ τὸ μὴ συνεχῶς ἅπασιν ἐπιχωριάζειν αἰεὶ, καὶ πολλὰ ἕτερα

25. This statement in the *proimion*, whether planned or added later as a part of the editing of the text of the homilies, points ahead to *Hom. Rom. 16:3 B*.

26. *θεωρήματα*, meaning the higher, mystical sense of Scripture and its specific contents (PGL 3, 4). John may also be making a conscious playful contrast between the *θεωρία* (viewing of the spectacle) of the horse races and the genuine and higher *θεωρία* his homily will disclose (as often; see Leyerle, *Theatrical Shows and Ascetic Lives*). Famously, Chrysostom's teacher, Diodore of Tarsus, in his *Comm. Ps.* Prologue, sought to redefine figurative reading away from the term *ἀλληγορία* ("allegory") to *θεωρία* ("the reading with contemplative insight"). See Jean-Marie Olivier, ed., *Commentarii in psalmos I–L*, vol. 1 of *Diodori Tarsensis commentarii in psalmos*, CCSG 6 (Turnhout: Brepols, 1980), 7–8, lines 123–63. But (as I have argued in *PCBCH* 151–52) this is not a uniform lexical stricture by Diodore or others but a strategic attempt to avoid association with "pagan" Stoic or Platonic allegory. In any case, by the neuter noun *θεωρήματα* here (used in concert with *νοήματα*, above), John means the higher sense of the scriptural text that his homily will excavate and reveal.

27. Mf notes HS's marginal conjecture: *ἀναπτύξασθαι* ("to be unfurled," as earlier in the homily; see n. 22 above) for *ἀνιμῆσθαι*; JPM doesn't include this variant, apparently on the (reasonable) grounds that no conjecture is needed here.

28. With perhaps some irony, John is treating the ten-word passage as a speech unto itself, with a *προοίμιον*, i.e., a rhetorical introduction, in the first four words of the ten. And he invokes that conceit here precisely at the end of his own lengthy and stylized *προοίμιον* to his own homily. For a remarkable modern parallel, Giorgio Agamben's commentary on Romans focuses also on a ten-word verse, the first of the letter

homily solely on this greeting, or, even more, one day won't be enough for us to draw out for you with care and diligence all the deep meanings that reside in these few words. But we shall need yet another day²⁵ for the abundance of spiritual insights²⁶ that are generated by this tiny address to be drawn out²⁷ for you. For today we are preparing to deal not with the whole greeting but just a portion of it—the beginning and *prooimion*:²⁸ “Greet Priscilla and Aquila” (Rom 16:3).

2. First, one should be astounded at the virtue of Paul because, although he was entrusted with care for the entire world—both land and sea, and all the cities under the sun, both barbarian and Greek—and he was carrying about in his consciousness many populous nations, he devoted such thoughtful attention to a single man and a single woman. Second, one should marvel at how he possessed a soul that was vigilant and full of anxious care,²⁹ keeping in mind not only all the people collectively but also everyone who as individuals belonged to the company of the esteemed and noble-minded.³⁰ Nowadays,³¹ it's perhaps not astonishing that those who preside over the churches do this, given that the tumults of those days have been suppressed and these leaders have taken on the oversight of a single city only. But back then, not only the magnitude of the dangers but also the distance of travel, the host of concerns, the buffeting waves, the inability to visit everyone regularly and at any time, and many other things even greater than these were enough to cast even one's most intimate friends

(Rom 1:1), on the recognition of the importance of the epistolary prescript and the supposition that “each word of the incipit contracts within itself the complete text of the Letter, in a vertiginous recapitulation.... Understanding the incipit therefore entails an eventual understanding of the whole” (*The Time That Remains: A Commentary on the Letter to the Romans*, trans. Patricia Dailey [Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2005], 6). Chrysostom, in contrast, takes up an insignificant verse near the very end of the same lengthy letter and tries to find in its ten words not only the full meaning of Romans but also of Paul, of all of Scripture, and the Christian life. And yet there is much in common, as Agamben also takes the first ten words of Romans as a springboard into broader issues of the political order, the philosophy of history, universalism, and Messianism (inter alia).

29. An allusion to 2 Cor 11:28, ἡ μέριμνα πασῶν ἐκκλησιῶν.

30. Tellingly Chrysostom here applies to Paul the same issue of part (τὸ μέρος) and whole (πᾶσαι αἱ γραφαί) that he was engaging in his own *prooimion* in terms of literary study of the Scriptures. Paul, he insists admiringly, did not lose either forest for trees or trees for forest.

31. A then-and-now contrast, meant to amplify the successes of the apostolic age and in turn to chastise ecclesiastical leaders of the present.

πλείονα τούτων, ἱκανὰ τῆς μνήμης ἐκβαλεῖν καὶ τοὺς σφόδρα ἐπιτηδεῖους. Ἄλλ' οὐκ ἐξέβαλε τούτους. Πῶς οὖν οὐκ ἐξεβλήθησαν; Διὰ τὴν τοῦ Παύλου μεγαλοψυχίαν, καὶ τὴν θερμὴν αὐτοῦ καὶ γνησίαν ἀγάπην. Οὕτω γὰρ αὐτοὺς εἶχεν ἐν διανοίᾳ, ὥς καὶ ἐν ἐπιστολαῖς αὐτῶν μεμνήσθαι πολλάκις.

Ἄλλ' ἴδωμεν τίνες καὶ ὅποιοι ἦσαν οὗτοι, οἱ τὸν Παῦλον οὕτω χειρωσάμενοι, καὶ πρὸς τὸν οἰκεῖον ἐπισπασάμενοι πόθον. Ἄρα ὑπατοὶ τινες καὶ στρατηγοὶ ἦσαν, καὶ ὑπαρχοὶ, ἢ ἄλλην τινὰ περιφάνειαν κεκτημένοι, ἢ πλοῦτον πολὺν περιβεβλημένοι, καὶ τῶν τὴν πόλιν ἀγόντων; Οὐδὲν τούτων ἔστιν εἰπεῖν, ἀλλὰ τούναντίον ἅπαν, πτωχοὶ καὶ πένητες, καὶ ἐκ τῆς τῶν χειρῶν ἐργασίας ζῶντες. Ἦσαν γὰρ, φησὶ, σκηνοποιοὶ τῇ τέχνῃ· καὶ οὐκ ἡσχύνετο ὁ Παῦλος, οὐδὲ ὄνειδος εἶναι ἐνόμιζε βασιλικωτάτῃ πόλει καὶ δήμῳ μέγα φρονοῦντι, κελεύων τοὺς χειροτέχνας ἐκείνους ἀσπάξεσθαι, οὐδὲ καθυβρίζειν αὐτοὺς ἡγεῖτο τῇ πρὸς ἐκείνους φιλίᾳ· οὕτως ἦν ἅπαντας πεπαιδευκῶς τότε φιλοσοφεῖν. Καίτοι γε ἡμεῖς πολλάκις συγγενεῖς ἔχοντες πενεστέρους ὀλίγω, τῆς πρὸς αὐτοὺς οἰκειότητος ἄλλοτριούμεθα, καὶ ὄνειδος εἶναι νομίζομεν, εἰ φωραθείημεν ποτε ἐκείνοις προσήκοντες· ὁ δὲ Παῦλος οὐχ οὕτως, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐγκαλλωπίζεται τῷ πράγματι, καὶ οὐ τοῖς τότε μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς μετὰ ταῦτα πᾶσι δῆλον ἐποίησεν, ὅτι εἰς τοὺς πρώτους αὐτῷ τὴν φιλίαν ἐτέλουν [190] ἐκείνοι οἱ σκηνοποιοί.

Καὶ μή μοι λεγέτω τις, Καὶ τί γὰρ μέγα καὶ θαυμαστόν, καὶ αὐτὸν, ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς ὄντα τέχνης, μὴ ἐπαισχύνεσθαι τοῖς ὁμοτέχνους; Τί λέγεις; Τοῦτο γὰρ αὐτὸ μέγιστόν ἐστι καὶ θαυμαστόν. Οὐ γὰρ οὕτως οἱ προγόνων ἔχοντες εἰπεῖν περιφάνειαν ἐπαισχύνονται τοῖς καταδεεστέροις, ὥς οἱ γενόμενοί ποτε ἐπὶ τῆς αὐτῆς εὐτελείας, εἴτα ἀθρόον εἰς λαμπρότητά τινα καὶ περιφάνειαν ἀναβάντες. Ὅτι δὲ Παύλου λαμπρότερον οὐδὲν ἦν, οὐδὲ περιφανέστερον, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτῶν τῶν βασιλέων ἐπισημότερος ἦν, παντὶ που δῆλόν ἐστιν. Ὁ γὰρ δαίμοσιν ἐπιτάττων, καὶ νεκροὺς ἐγείρων, καὶ ἐξ ἐπιτάγματος καὶ πηρῶσαι,

32. In addition to Rom 16:3, see 1 Cor 16:19; 2 Tim 4:19.

33. John delights in inverting the expectations of the ἐγκώμιον (as was a characteristic element of that very genre of rhetoric; see HT 200–206 and, e.g., *Laud. Paul.* 4.10–13 [AP 202–10]). Note that these encomiastic *topoi* about birth, home city, and occupation are the very same ones John had chided his audience for attending too closely to when it comes to the horses on the track or theatrical performers.

34. φιλοσοφεῖν in Chrysostom, as in other early Christian authors, can have a range of meanings, from engaging in philosophical speculation and reasoning to living a chaste and simple life, and often it means both those things together, i.e., an ascetic disposition and set of habits, which Chrysostom regards as especially “Christian virtue,” as here (see the four overlapping categories in PGL A–D).

out of one's memory. But Paul didn't cast these two aside. And why weren't they cast aside? Because of Paul's magnanimity, his warm and genuine love. For he had them so much in his mind that he made mention of them frequently also in his letters.³²

So, let's take a look at what kind of people they were who so captivated Paul and provoked such familial devotion. Were they consuls and generals, governors or people who had gained another kind of distinction, or were they endowed with great wealth or among the leaders of the city? One can't say any of these things but rather the complete opposite: they were poor and penniless and making their livelihood from the work of their hands.³³ For, it says, "*they were tentmakers by trade*" (Acts 18:3). And Paul wasn't ashamed, nor did he consider it a disgrace in the eyes of the lofty imperial city and its proud populace to bid them to greet those manual laborers. Nor did he suppose that the Roman Christians would sneer insolently at his friendship with the pair, since he had instructed all of them back then to have a philosophical bearing.³⁴ And yet in our case, often when we have relatives who are somewhat poorer, we estrange ourselves from familial relations with them and consider it a disgrace if it's ever discovered that we're related to them. But Paul wasn't like that; instead, he even took pride in the fact and made it clear—not only to the people back then but also to all those who come after—that those tentmakers belonged at the top of his list of friends. [190]

Now, don't let anyone say to me, "What's so great and marvelous about him not being ashamed of his fellow craftsmen, when he comes from the same trade as they?"³⁵ What are you saying? In fact, this was the greatest and most marvelous thing! Indeed, those who can claim they have prominent ancestors aren't as ashamed of their lesser ones as are people who were born in the same poverty and then suddenly rose to some fame and prominence. It's doubtless clear to everyone that there was nothing more famous or prominent than Paul, but he was even more dignified than the emperors themselves. After all, it's abundantly clear that a man who commands demons and raises the dead and is able by a mere command both to

35. A reasonable objection, one that is carried forth in NT scholarship that seeks to understand both Paul's labor as a social fact and his attitudes toward it and whether or not they display an aristocratic disdain for labor. For an entrée into the debates, see, e.g., Ronald F. Hock, *The Social Context of Paul's Ministry: Tentmaking and Apostleship* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980); Todd D. Still, "Did Paul Loathe Manual Labor? Revisiting the Work of Ronald F. Hock on the Apostle's Tentmaking and Social Class," *JBL* 125 (2006): 781–95.

καὶ θεραπεῦσαι τοὺς πεπηρωμένους δυνάμενος, οὐ τὰ ἱμάτια καὶ αἱ σκιαὶ ἅπαν νοσημάτων εἶδος ἔλκον, εὐδελον ὅτι οὐδὲ ἄνθρωπος λοιπὸν εἶναι ἐνομίζετο, ἀλλ' ἄγγελός τις ἐξ οὐρανοῦ καταβάς. Ἄλλ' ὅμως τοσαύτης ἀπολαύων δόξης, καὶ πανταχοῦ θαυμαζόμενος, καὶ ὅπουπερ ἂν φανείη πάντας ἐπιστρέφων, οὐκ ἐπσχύνετο τὸν σκηνοποιόν, οὐδὲ ἐλαττοῦσθαι ἐνόμιζε τοὺς ἐν τοσοῦτοις ἀξιώμασιν ὄντας. Καὶ γὰρ εἰκὸς ἐν τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ τῇ Ῥωμαίων πολλοὺς εἶναι περιφανεῖς, οὓς ἡνάγκαζε τοὺς πτωχοὺς ἐκείνους ἀσπασασθαι. Ἦιδει γὰρ, ἦδει σαφῶς, ὅτι εὐγένειαν οὐ πλούτου περιφάνεια, οὐδὲ χρημάτων περιουσία, ἀλλὰ τρόπων ἐπιείκεια ποιεῖν εἴωθεν· ὥς οἱ γε ταύτης μὲν ἀπεστερημένοι, ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς τῶν γεγεννηκότων αὐτοὺς δόξης μεγαλοφρονούντες, ὀνόματι μόνον εὐγενείας ψιλῶ, ἀλλ' οὐχὶ πράγματι καλλωπίζονται· μᾶλλον δὲ αὐτὸ τὸ ὄνομα φωρᾶται πολλάκις, εἰ τις ἐπὶ τοὺς ἀνωτέρω προγόνους τῶν εὐγενῶν ἀναβαίη τούτων. Τὸν γὰρ περιφανῆ καὶ λαμπρόν, καὶ πατέρα ἔχοντα ἐπίσημον εἰπεῖν καὶ πάππον, ἂν μετὰ ἀκριβείας ἐξετάσης, πολλάκις εὐρήσεις ἐπίπαππον εὐτελεῖ τινα καὶ ἀνώνυμον ἐσχηκότα· καθάπερ τῶν εὐτελῶν εἶναι δοκούντων ἂν τὸ γένος ἅπαν ἀναβαίνοντες κατὰ μικρὸν διερευνήσωμεθα, ὑπάρχους καὶ στρατηγούς εὐρήσομεν αὐτῶν πολλάκις τοὺς ἀνωτέρω προγόνους, καὶ εἰς ἵπποφορβούς καὶ συοφορβούς εὖροι τις ἂν γεγεννημένους. Ἄπερ οὖν ἅπαντα Παῦλος εἰδὼς, τούτων μὲν οὐ πολὺν ἐποιεῖτο λόγον, ψυχῆς δὲ εὐγένειαν ἐζήτει, καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ταύτην θαυμάζειν ἐπαίδευσεν. Οὐ μικρὸν οὖν τοῦτο τέως ἐντεῦθεν καρπούμεθα, τὸ μηδενὶ τῶν εὐτελεστέρων ἐπαισχύνεσθαι, τὸ ψυχῆς ἀρετὴν ἐπιζητεῖν, τὸ πάντα τὰ ἔξωθεν ἡμῖν περικείμενα περιττὰ εἶναι νομίζειν καὶ ἀνόνητα.

γ'. "Ἔστι καὶ ἕτερον οὐκ ἔλαττον τούτου καρπώσασθαι κέρδος ἐντεῦθεν, καὶ ὁ μάλιστα συνέχει ἡμῶν τὴν ζωὴν κατορθωθέν. Τί δὲ τοῦτό ἐστι; Τὸ μὴ κατηγορεῖν τοῦ γάμου, μηδὲ νομίζειν ἐμπόδισμα εἶναι καὶ κώλυμα τῆς

36. John draws this portrait of Paul's miracles from Acts: commanding demons (Acts 16:18), raising the dead (Acts 20:10–12), maiming (Acts 13:11), healing the maimed (Acts 14:10), and the power of his garments and shadow (Acts 19:12).

37. On Paul as an angel, see *HT* 80.

38. I.e., Priscilla and Aquila.

39. εὐγένεια: literally "nobility of birth," but also ethical nobility and excellence in general (however attained), a philosophical and moralistic topic that was the locus of ancient debates on nature versus nurture; see, e.g., section 4 of Philo's treatise *Virt.*, entitled *Περὶ εὐγενείας* (§§187–227).

40. ἐπιείκεια combines the senses of forbearance, gentleness, modesty, virtue, equity, and fairness (see *LSJ* and *PGL*). I translate "equitability" here (or, with *τρόπος*, "equitable character") given the context, where John is prizing those who look beyond class distinctions. John also plays on the assonance between ἐπιείκεια and εὐγένεια.

maim and to heal the maimed, one whose garments and shadow got rid of every sort of illness,³⁶ wasn't in the end even considered a mortal but some angel come down from heaven.³⁷ Nevertheless, despite enjoying such an exalted reputation, being universally admired and successfully converting all the people wherever he appeared, he wasn't ashamed of the tentmaker, nor did he consider those in the lower ranks to be any less. For likely in the church of the Romans there were many prominent people, whom he was commanding to greet these poor persons.³⁸ For he knew, he knew clearly, that what's inclined to make nobility of birth³⁹ isn't prominence in wealth or abundance of possessions, but an equitable⁴⁰ character. Those who lack such equitability, while taking pride in the reputation of those who gave birth to them, are boasting in a mere name as a sign of "noble birth," not in its reality. Indeed, often the name itself is traced to see whether someone might go back to ancestors in an earlier time who were among the "nobly born." For if you investigate in detail a man of prominence and renown who can claim to have a distinguished father and grandfather, you'll often find that he had a great-grandfather who was poor and of no reknown.⁴¹ Likewise, if we do a little searching, going back over the whole family tree of those who are thought to be poor, we shall often find governors and generals among their early ancestors, even if one might find that they've become horse trainers and pig breeders. So, because Paul knew all these things,⁴² he didn't take much account of them, but what he sought was nobility of the soul, and he taught others to admire it too. Hence the benefit we reap from this statement from long ago is no tiny matter: not to be ashamed of anyone poorer than we, to seek out virtue of the soul, and to consider all our external circumstances⁴³ to be superfluous and without benefit.⁴⁴

3. There's still another benefit we can reap from this passage that's no less significant than the former and that especially directs our life toward the pursuit of virtue. What's that? Not to have anything against marriage,

41. *ἀνώνυμος*, a "no-name."

42. On how Chrysostom in this homily presents Paul as both deeply knowledgeable of social conventions and in staunch defiance of them, see *HT* 374–77.

43. τὰ ἔξωθεν in rhetorical theory on encomium (*ἐγκώμιον*, *ἑπαινος*) are the same set of topics that John says the racing and theater fans focus on—*γένος*, *ἀνατροφή*, etc. in §1 (PG 51:188). For fuller discussion, see *HT* 200–206 and broader context for references and analysis.

44. John has (once more) turned the tables on what is actually "superfluous" (*περιττά*), from the opening of the homily.

εἰς ἀρετὴν φερούσης ὁδοῦ, τὸ γυναῖκα ἔχειν, καὶ παῖδας τρέφειν, καὶ οἰκίας προΐστασθαι, καὶ τέχνην μεταχειρίζειν. Ἴδου καὶ ἐνταῦθα ἀνὴρ ἦν καὶ γυνή, καὶ ἐργαστηρίων προειστήκεσαν, καὶ τέχνην μετεχειρίζοντο, καὶ τῶν ἐν μοναστηρίοις ζώντων ἀκριβεστέραν ἐπεδείξαντο πολλῶ τὴν φιλοσοφίαν. Πόθεν τοῦτο δῆλον; Ἀφ' ὧν προσεῖπεν αὐτοὺς ὁ Παῦλος, μᾶλλον δὲ οὐκ ἀφ' ὧν προσεῖπεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ [191] ἀφ' ὧν μετὰ ταῦτα ἐμαρτύρησεν. Εἰπὼν γάρ, Ἀσπάσασθε Πρίσκιλλαν καὶ Ἀκύλαν, προσέθηκεν αὐτῶν καὶ τὸ ἀξίωμα. Ποῖον δὴ τοῦτο; Οὐκ εἶπε τοὺς πλουσίους, τοὺς περιφανεῖς, τοὺς εὐπάτριδας· ἀλλὰ τί; Τοὺς συνεργούς μου ἐν Κυρίῳ. Τούτου δὲ οὐδὲν ἴσον εἰς ἀρετῆς γένοιτ' ἂν λόγον· καὶ οὐκ ἐντεῦθεν μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐξ ὧν παρ' αὐτοῖς ἔμεινεν, οὐχὶ ἡμέραν μίαν, δύο καὶ τρεῖς, ἀλλ' ἐνιαυτοὺς ὁλοκλήρους δύο, τὴν αὐτῶν ἔστιν ἀρετὴν ἰδεῖν. Ὡς περ γὰρ οἱ τῶν ἔξωθεν ἄρχοντες οὐκ ἂν ἔλιντο παρ' εὐτελέσι καὶ ταπεινοῖς καταχθῆναι ποτε, ἀλλ' ἐπιζητοῦσι λαμπρὰς οἰκίας ἐπισήμων ἀνδρῶν τινων, ὥστε μὴ τὴν τῶν ὑποδεχομένων αὐτοὺς εὐτέλειαν τῷ μεγέθει τῆς ἀξίας λυμῆνασθαι· οὕτω καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἐποιοῦν· οὐ πρὸς τυχόντας κατήγοντο, ἀλλ' ὥς περ ἐκεῖνοι οἰκίας λαμπρότητα, οὕτω τῆς ψυχῆς ἀρετὴν ἐπεζήτουν οὗτοι, καὶ μετὰ ἀκριβείας διερευνώμενοι τοὺς ἐπιτηδείους αὐτοῖς, πρὸς ἐκείνους κατήγοντο. Καὶ γὰρ καὶ νόμος παρὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦτο κελεύειν ἔκειτο. Εἰς ἣν γὰρ πόλιν, φησὶν, ἢ οἰκίαν εἰσέλθῃτε, ἐρωτήσατε τίς ἐν αὐτῇ ἄξιός ἐστι, κάκει μένατε. Ὡς τε ἄξιοι Παύλου ἦσαν οὗτοι· εἰ δὲ ἄξιοι Παύλου, τῶν ἀγγέλων ἦσαν ἄξιοι. Ἐγὼ τὸ δωματίον ἐκεῖνο, καὶ οὐρανὸν καὶ Ἐκκλησίαν θαρρῶν ἂν προσεῖποιμι. Ὅπου γὰρ Παῦλος ἦν, ἐκεῖ καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ἦν. Εἰ δοκιμὴν ἐπιζητεῖτε, φησὶ, τοῦ ἐν ἐμοὶ λαλοῦντος Χριστοῦ; Ὅπου δὲ Χριστὸς ἦν, ἐκεῖ καὶ ἄγγελοι συνεχῶς ἐφοίτων.

Οἱ δὲ καὶ πρὸ τούτου παρασχόντες ἑαυτοὺς ἀξίους τῆς τοῦ Παύλου θεραπείας, ἐνόησον τίνες ἐγένοντο, ἔτεσι δύο συνοικοῦντες αὐτῷ, καὶ σχῆμα, καὶ βάδισμα, καὶ βλέμμα, καὶ τρόπον στολῆς, καὶ εισόδους καὶ ἐξόδους, καὶ ἄλλα πάντα παρατηροῦντες. Ἐπὶ γὰρ τῶν ἁγίων οὐχὶ τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα

45. The first three of these are reminiscent of the criteria for the ἐπίσκοπος in 1 Tim 3:2–4.

46. ἀξίωμα can mean both “thing of worth” and “rank” (LSJ A.1, 3–4). John is playing on both senses here.

47. John often uses the adverb ἔξωθεν to refer to the world putatively “outside” the church, even as he lives in a Christian imperium and the line between church and “world” is hardly firm, either for him (as an ecclesiastical official or as a participant in the culture of the late antique polis) or for his congregants. We translate his locution this way without thereby accepting the ideological claim this notionally implies.

48. Chrysostom paraphrases here, substituting οἰκία for κώμη and ἐρωτήσατε for ἐξετάσατε in Matt 10:11 (also minus δ' ἂν before πόλιν). The former choice (likely a conflation with Luke 9:4) is essential to his argument about hospitality in this context

nor to consider having a wife, raising children, presiding over a household,⁴⁵ or practicing a trade an impediment or roadblock to the path that leads to virtue. Look at this case: here was a husband and a wife, and they presided over their workshops and practiced a trade, and they displayed a more rigorous philosophical life than those who live in monasteries! How do we know this? From the words Paul used in greeting them, or rather not from the things he said, but also [191] from the testimony he gave after those statements. For after he said, “Greet Priscilla and Aquila,” Paul added also the mark of their worthiness.⁴⁶ What was that? He didn’t call them rich, prominent, or from good families. What instead? “*My coworkers in the Lord.*” Nothing could equal this as a statement of virtue. And it isn’t from this alone that one can see their virtue but also from how long he stayed with them—not one, two, or three days but two whole years! (cf. Acts 18:11). Leaders in the outside world⁴⁷ would never choose to stay at the homes of the poor and lowly, but they seek out the splendid houses of distinguished men, lest the poverty of their hosts diminish the grandeur of their rank. The apostles did something like this, too. They wouldn’t be hosted by just anyone, but in the same way the former would look for a splendid house, the apostles would seek out a virtuous soul and, carefully searching out those who fit their standards, would be hosted by them. And indeed, the very law laid down by Christ commands this, as he says: “*Into whatever city or house you enter, ask who in it is worthy, and stay there*” (Matt 10:11).⁴⁸ Thus, Priscilla and Aquila were worthy of Paul, and, if worthy of Paul, they were worthy of angels! And I would be so bold as to call their domicile both a heaven and a church. For where Paul was, there also was Christ. As he says, “*If you seek a sure test that Christ is speaking in me*” (2 Cor 13:3).⁴⁹ And where Christ was, there also were angels continually attending.

Now consider who these people were who even before this made themselves worthy of Paul’s service, living with him for two years,⁵⁰ watching carefully his bearing, his walk, his gaze, his style of dress, his comings and goings, and everything else. For in the case of saints, it’s not their

(as also in *Hom. 1 Tim.* 5:9 §14 [PG 51:334]; cf. *Laz.* 6.3 [PG 48:1031], twice). That his New Testament text of Matt 10:11 reads *κώμην* and *ἐξετάσατε* (with *℣*) is confirmed at *Hom. Matt.* 32.5 (PG 57:383); cf. *Hom. Col.* 3.4 (PG 62:323); *El. vid.* §7 (PG 51:343).

49. With *εἰ* for *ἐπεὶ* and *ἐπιζητεῖτε* for *ζητεῖτε* (contrast, e.g., *Hom. 2 Cor.* 29.1 [PG 61:597], where Chrysostom cites the lemma with both of the latter readings, with *℣*).

50. Cf. Acts 18:11 (a year and a half).

μόνον, οὐδὲ αἱ διδασκαλῖαι καὶ αἱ παραινέσεις, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡ λοιπὴ τοῦ βίου πᾶσα ἀναστροφή ἄρκοῦσα γένοιτ' ἂν τοῖς προσέχουσι διδασκαλίᾳ φιλοσοφίας. Ἐννόησον ἡλικὸν ἦν ἰδεῖν Παῦλον, καὶ δειπνοποιούμενον, καὶ ἐπιτιμῶντα, καὶ παρακαλοῦντα, καὶ εὐχόμενον, καὶ δακρύνοντα, ἐξιώντα καὶ εἰσιόντα. Εἰ γὰρ δεκατέσσαρας ἐπιστολὰς ἔχοντες μόνον, πανταχοῦ τῆς οἰκουμένης αὐτὰς περιφέρομεν, οἱ τὴν πηγὴν τῶν ἐπιστολῶν ἔχοντες, οἱ τὴν γλῶτταν τῆς οἰκουμένης, οἱ τὸ φῶς τῶν Ἐκκλησιῶν, οἱ τὸν θεμέλιον τῆς πίστεως, οἱ τὸν στῦλον καὶ τὸ ἐδραῖωμα τῆς ἀληθείας, τίνες οὐκ ἂν ἐγένοντο ἀγγέλῳ τοιούτῳ συζῶντες; Εἰ γὰρ τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ δαίμοσιν ἦν φοβερά, καὶ τοσαύτην εἶχον ἰσχὺν, ἡ συνοίκησης αὐτοῦ πόσῃ οὐκ ἂν ἐπεσπάσατο Πνεύματος χάριν; Τὸ γὰρ τὴν κλίνην ὁρᾶν τὴν Παύλου, τὸ γὰρ τὴν στρωμνὴν, τὸ γὰρ τὰ ὑποδήματα, οὐκ ἂν ἤρκεσεν αὐτοῖς εἰς ὑπόθεσιν κατανύξεως διηνεκοῦς; Εἰ γὰρ οἱ δαίμονες ὁρῶντες αὐτοῦ τὰ ἱμάτια ἔφριττον, πολλῶ μᾶλλον οἱ πιστοὶ καὶ συζήσαντες αὐτῷ κατενύσσοντο βλέποντες αὐτά.

Ἄξιον δὲ κακεῖνο ἐξετάσαι, τίνος ἕνεκεν, προσαγορεύων, τὴν Πρίσκιλλαν προτέθεικε τοῦ ἀνδρός. Οὐ γὰρ εἶπεν, Ἀσπάσασθε Ἀκύλαν καὶ Πρίσκιλλαν, ἀλλὰ, Πρίσκιλλαν καὶ Ἀκύλαν. Οὐδὲ γὰρ τοῦτο ἀπλῶς ἐποίησεν, ἀλλ' ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ πλείονα αὐτῇ συνειδέναι τοῦ ἀνδρός εὐλάβειαν. Καὶ ὅτι οὐ στοχασμὸς τὸ εἰρημένον, ἔξεστι καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν [192] Πράξεων τοῦτο μαθεῖν. Τὸν γὰρ

51. Ironically, in *Hom. Rom.* 31.4 (PG 60:665–66), John makes the reverse argument: Δύο ἔτη τὸν Παῦλον ἐξενεδόχῃσαν· ἔτη δὲ δύο τί οὐκ ἂν αὐτῶν εἰργάσατο τὴν ψυχὴν; Τί οὖν ἐγὼ πάθω, φησὶν, ὅτι Παῦλον οὐκ ἔχω; Ἐὰν θέλῃς, ἀκριβέστερον ἔχεις ἢ ἐκεῖνοι· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐκείνους ἡ ὄψις ἢ Παύλου τοιούτους ἐποίησεν, ἀλλὰ τὰ ῥήματα Παύλου.... Λάβε γὰρ τῶν μακαρίων τούτων τὰς βίβλους, καὶ ἐντύγχανε διηνεκῶς ταῖς ἐκείνων γραφαῖς, καὶ δυνήσονται σε ποιῆσαι κατὰ τὴν τοῦ σκηνοποιοῦ γυναῖκα. (“They hosted Paul for two years. What would two years not do to their souls? But ‘what experience can I have,’ someone might say, ‘because I do not have Paul here?’ If you wish, you can possess even more detailed knowledge than they. For it wasn’t Paul’s appearance that made Priscilla and Aquila what they were, but Paul’s words.... Take up the books of these blessed ones [Paul, Peter, John, and the prophets, named in the ellipsis] and read continually in their writings, and they will be able to make you like the tentmaker’s wife.”)

52. Note how John subtly supplies the solution to the problem stated above (§1 [PG 51:188]), that Christians do not even know the number of Paul’s letters.

53. With *στῦλον* for *στῦλος* to fit the syntax of his own sentence. John has applied to Paul the epithet the pseudo-Pauline writer used for the church (*οἶκος θεοῦ* ... *ἥτις ἐστὶν ἐκκλησία θεοῦ ζῶντος, στῦλος καὶ ἐδραῖωμα τῆς ἀληθείας*).

54. *κατάνυξις* is one of the monastic disciplines, “compunction” or “contrition,” i.e., the examination of conscience and repentance of one’s sins. (On how Chrysostom customarily ascribes this discipline to Paul, see *HT* 319–20.) The cognate verb, *κατανύσσω*, used by John in the following sentence, literally means “to sting,” and in the passive, “to be stung” or “moved to repentance” (via guilt pangs). See *PGL* 1.b.

words alone or their instructions and counsel, but indeed the entirety of their mode of living that offers sufficient instruction in the philosophical way of life for those who attend carefully to it. Consider how important it was to see Paul enjoying a meal, administering rebukes, giving encouragement, praying, crying, going and coming.⁵¹ After all, if we, when we have only fourteen letters of his,⁵² carry them all around the world, what about the people who had the very source of the letters, who had the tongue of the world, who had the light of the churches, who had the foundation of faith, who had the “*very pillar and fundament of the truth*” (1 Tim 3:15).⁵³ What kind of people wouldn’t they be, living with such an angel? For if his garments inspired terror in demons (cf. Acts 19:12) and had such tremendous power, how much spiritual grace would sharing an abode not bring them? Indeed, wouldn’t looking at Paul’s bed, his mattress, and his sandals be a sufficient basis for their continual state of contrition?⁵⁴ Because if the demons shivered in fear just looking at his garments (Acts 19:12), how much more would believers who had also lived with him have had their own consciences pricked when looking upon those items?

A further thing worth investigating is why, when addressing them, he put Priscilla before her husband. For he didn’t say, “Greet Aquila and Priscilla” but “*Priscilla and Aquila*.”⁵⁵ Now, he didn’t do this without purpose, but it seems to me this was in recognition of the fact that her piety was superior to her husband’s. And that what I’ve said is no mere conjecture [192] one can learn also from the Acts of the Apostles. For it was she⁵⁶

55. John makes the same argument by appeal to the order of their names, but more tersely, in *Stud. praes.* §4 (PG 63:490), a homily Mayer regards as probably from Constantinople (*Provenance*, 509). That homily bears close resemblance in this and other ways that, with closer investigation, might give evidence that it is an epitome of the present one.

56. The text of Acts actually says that *both* Aquila and Priscilla retrained Apollos (Acts 18:26). While manuscripts vary in the order of their names in 18:26, in \mathfrak{M} (with D L Ψ 323. 614 etc.) the husband comes first, which is how Chrysostom cites Acts 18:26 in *Hom. Act.* 41.1 (PG 60:282). (But Priscilla does come first in the order of names earlier, in Acts 18:18, as is the reading also of \mathfrak{M} , with no dissenting witnesses in NA²⁸.) But for Chrysostom the key to Rom 16:3 is that this is how *Paul* chose to order their names in his command to greet them in his Letter to the Romans. Note that whereas Chrysostom attributes the action of Acts 18:26 to Priscilla here and below in this paragraph as well as in *Hom. Rom.* 30.2 (PG 60:664), in *Hom. Act.* 40.2 (PG 60:284) he singles out Aquila: Ἀκύλας διδάσκει, μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ οὗτος διδάσκεται (“Aquila teaches, but even more he is taught”).

Ἀπολλῶ, ἄνδρα λόγιον ὄντα καὶ δυνατὸν ἐν ταῖς Γραφαῖς, καὶ τὸ βάπτισμα Ἰωάννου μόνον εἰδὸτα, αὕτη λαβοῦσα κατήχησε τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ διδάσκαλον ἀπηρτισμένον ἐποίησεν. Οὐ γὰρ αἱ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων γυναῖκες ταῦτα ἐμερίμνων, ἅπερ αἱ νῦν, ὅπως λαμπρὰ ἱμάτια περιβάλοιντο, καὶ ἐπιτρίμμασι καὶ ὑπογραφαῖς τὴν ὄψιν τὴν ἑαυτῶν καλλωπίσαιεν, καὶ τοὺς ἄνδρας τοὺς ἑαυτῶν ἐνάγχουσαι, τῆς γείτονος καὶ τῆς ὁμοτίμου πολυτελεστέραν ἀναγκάζουσαι πρίασθαι στολὴν, καὶ λευκοὺς ἡμιόνους, καὶ χρυσοπάστους χαλινούς, καὶ θεραπείαν εὐνούχων, καὶ πολὺν θεραπαινίδων ἔσμὸν, καὶ τὴν ἄλλην ἅπασαν τὴν καταγέλαστον φαντασίαν· ἀλλὰ ταῦτα πάντα ἀποσεισάμεναι, καὶ τὸν κοσμικὸν ἀποβαλοῦσαι τύφον, ἐν μόνον ἐξήτουν, ὅπως κοινωνοὶ γένωνται τῶν ἀποστόλων, καὶ τῆς θήρας αὐτῶν μετὰσχοιεν τῆς αὐτῆς. Διὰ τοῦτο οὐκ αὐτὴ μόνη τοιαύτη, ἀλλὰ καὶ αἱ λοιπαὶ πᾶσαι. Καὶ γὰρ περὶ Περσίδος τινὸς φησιν, Ὅτις πολλὰ ἐκοπίασεν εἰς ἡμᾶς, καὶ Μαρίαν καὶ Τρύφαιναν ἀπὸ τούτων θαυμάζει τῶν πόνων, ὅτι ἐκοπίων μετὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων, καὶ πρὸς τοὺς αὐτοὺς ἀγῶνας ἀπεδύσαντο.

Καὶ πῶς Τιμοθέῳ γράφων φησὶ, *Γυναικὶ δὲ διδάσκειν οὐκ ἐπιτρέπω, οὐδὲ αὐθεντεῖν τοῦ ἀνδρός*; Ὅταν καὶ ὁ ἀνὴρ εὐλαβὴς ᾖ, καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν πίστιν κεκτημένος, καὶ τῆς αὐτῆς σοφίας μετέχων· ὅταν δὲ ἄπιστος ᾖ

57. Unmistakably paraphrasing the Acts text, but without direct quotations, as embedded in the syntax of John's own sentence.

58. Another then-and-now contrast, used by Chrysostom both to praise Priscilla and to chastise women and men in the present.

59. John refers to the women of the apostolic age here as *κοινωνοὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων* ("partners of the apostles") but not as themselves holding the role of *ἀπόστολος*. This appears to be in direct contrast to his famous testimony in his serial homilies on Romans to the reading of Ἰουνίαν in Rom 16:7 and its reference to a woman named Junia, who was not only an apostle but also was among the most prominent of them (*οἵτινές εἰσιν ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις*). For full discussion of the text-critical and interpretive issues, see Eldon Jay Epp, *Junia: The First Woman Apostle* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005), and especially 79–81 on Chrysostom's reference in *Hom. Rom.* 31.2 (PG 60:669–70): *πόση τῆς γυναικὸς ταύτης ἡ φιλοσοφία, ὡς καὶ τῆς τῶν ἀποστόλων ἀξιοθῆναι προσηγορίας* ("how great was the philosophical bearing of this woman that she was deemed worthy even of being named among the apostles"). John avoids mention of Junia entirely here in this occasional homily, given his rhetorical and political purpose, to praise Priscilla, while also denying that she is a model or justification for women's taking on in his own day what John regards as presbyteral roles restricted to men. And yet we should note that even in *Hom. Rom.* 31.1–2, we find this same general rhetorical purpose, with Chrysostom giving qualified praises of all the women (Phoebe, Priscilla, Maria), invoking the general statement *λεόντων γὰρ θερμότεραι αἱ τότε γυναῖκες ἦσαν, διανεμόμεναι πρὸς τοὺς ἀποστόλους ὑπὲρ τοῦ κηρύγματος πόνους* ("The women of those days were more fervent than lions, stationed alongside the apostles for the labors of the missionary

who took aside Apollos, “a man of eloquence” and “skilled in the Scriptures” who “knew only the baptism of John” and gave him instruction “in the way of God” (cf. Acts 18:24–26)⁵⁷ and perfected him as a teacher. For the women at the time of the apostles didn’t concern themselves with the things women nowadays do,⁵⁸ like how they might garb themselves with splendid garments or gussy up their faces with makeup and eye shadow or pester their husbands to force them to buy a wardrobe more expensive than that of their neighbors and peers, white steeds, golden bridles, eunuchs in service, a great gaggle of slave girls, and every other ridiculous thing they can conjure up. No. They rejected all this stuff and cast away worldly luxury, seeking one thing only: how they might be partners with the apostles⁵⁹ and share the same manly pursuit⁶⁰ with them. Consequently, Priscilla wasn’t the only woman who was like this, but so were all the rest. In fact, Paul refers to the woman named Persis, “*who labored greatly for us*,”⁶¹ and he marvels at Maria and Tryphaena for these strenuous activities,⁶² because they labored with the apostles and outfitted themselves⁶³ for the same battles.

So how is it that Paul says when writing to Timothy, “*I do not allow a woman to teach or to have authority over a man*” (1 Tim 2:12)?⁶⁴ That’s when the husband is pious and has the same belief and shares the same wisdom.

proclamation”), which subordinates their efforts to those of “the apostles” (similar to what comes next in our homily: ἐκοπίων μετὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων). There are both similarities and differences in the two treatments, but even Paul’s testimony to Junia’s status as an apostle, which John accepts, is not enough to overturn John’s pervasively androcentric perspective (here or there) and his anxiety to avert the “problem” of contemporary women claiming apostolic precedent for their exercise of leadership roles.

60. θήρα: “eager pursuit” (LSJ A.2), and “hunting of wild beasts, the chase” (LSJ A.1.a), a masculine image meant to highlight the contrast (cf. PGL 1, used “metaphorically of Christ’s call of apostles”). One way John handles the famous women of the past is to masculinize them, saying that they surprisingly were not held back by their nature (which he deems inferior to that of men); see further below, §4.

61. John has here conflated the text of the greeting for Maria in Rom 16:6 with that for Persis in 16:12 (ἦτις πολλὰ ἐκοπίασεν εἰς ἡμᾶς for ἐν κυρίῳ in 16:12).

62. A conflation of the greetings of Rom 16:6 (for Maria) and 16:12 (for Tryphaena and Tryphosa), τὰς κοπιώσας ἐν κυρίῳ. Chrysostom then generalizes to these women as all laboring alongside the apostles (including Paul; cf. Rom 16:7).

63. ἀποδύεσθαι, literally, “be stripped for battle,” a perfect contrast to the luxury outfits of “women nowadays,” on John’s telling.

64. With τοῦ before ἀνδρός. Chrysostom’s solution to one problem (why is Priscilla named first?) leads to a new problem—does this lead to a Pauline self-contradiction?

καὶ πεπλανημένος, οὐκ ἀποστερεῖ τὴν αὐθεντίαν τῆς διδασκαλίας αὐτῇ. Κορινθίοις γοῦν ἐπιστέλλων λέγει· Καὶ γυνὴ ἣτις ἔχει ἄνδρα ἄπιστον, μὴ ἀφίετω αὐτόν. Τί γὰρ οἶδας, γύναι, εἰ τὸν ἄνδρα σώσεις; Πῶς δὲ ἂν ἔσωσεν ἡ πιστὴ γυνὴ τὸν ἄνδρα τὸν ἄπιστον; Κατηχοῦσα δηλονότι καὶ διδάσκουσα καὶ ἐνάγουσα πρὸς τὴν πίστιν, ὥσπερ οὖν καὶ αὕτη Ἀπολλῶ ἡ Πρίσκιλλα. Ἄλλως δὲ, ὅταν λέγῃ, *Γυναικὶ διδάσκειν οὐκ ἐπιτρέπω*, περὶ τῆς ἐν τῷ βήματι διδασκαλίας λέγει, περὶ τῆς ἐν κοινῷ διαλέξεως, καὶ τῆς κατὰ τὸν ἱερωσύνης λόγον· ἰδίᾳ δὲ παραινεῖν καὶ συμβουλεύειν οὐκ ἐκώλυσεν. Οὐ γὰρ ἂν, εἰ κεκωλυμένον ἦν, ταύτην ἐπήνεσε τοῦτο ποιοῦσαν.

δ'. Ἀκουέτωσαν ἄνδρες, ἀκουέτωσαν ταῦτα καὶ γυναῖκες· ἐκεῖναι μὲν, ἵνα τὴν ὁμόφυλον καὶ συγγενὴ μιμήσωνται· οὗτοι δὲ, ἵνα μὴ γυναικὸς ἀσθενέστεροι φαίνωνται. Τίνα γὰρ ἔξομεν ἀπολογίαν, τίνα συγγνώμην, ὅταν γυναικῶν τοσαύτην προθυμίαν ἐπιδεικνυμένων καὶ τοσαύτην φιλοσοφίαν, ἡμεῖς τοῖς τοῦ κόσμου πράγμασιν ὤμεν συνδεδεμένοι διηνεκῶς; Ταῦτα καὶ ἄρχοντες μανθανέτωσαν, καὶ ἀρχόμενοι, καὶ ἱερεῖς, καὶ οἱ τῶν λαϊκῶν τὴν τάξιν ἔχοντες, ἵν' ἐκεῖνοι μὲν μὴ τοὺς πλουτοῦντας θαυμάζωσι, μηδὲ τὰς περιφανεῖς διώκωσιν οἰκίας, ἀλλ' ἀρετὴν μετὰ πενίας ζητῶσι, καὶ τοῖς πτωχοτέροις τῶν ἀδελφῶν μὴ ἐπαισχύνωνται, μηδὲ τὸν σκηνοποιὸν, καὶ τὸν βυρσοδέψην, καὶ τὸν πορφυροπώλην, καὶ τὸν χαλκοτύπον παρατρέχοντες, τοὺς ἐν δυναστείαις θεραπεύσωσιν· οἱ δὲ ἀρχόμενοι, ἵνα μὴ νομίζωσιν εἶναι κώλυμα πρὸς τὴν ὑποδοχὴν τῶν ἀγίων, ἀλλ' ἐννοοῦντες [193] τὴν χήραν, ἢ τὸν Ἥλιον ὑπεδέξατο, δράκα ἀλεύρου μόνον ἔχουσα, καὶ τούτους, οἱ τὸν Παῦλον διετίαν ἐξένισαν, τὰς οἰκίας διανοίγωσι τοῖς δεομένοις, καὶ πάντα τοῖς ξένοις ὥσι κοινὰ κεκτημένοι. Μὴ γάρ μοι τοῦτο εἶπης, ὅτι οἰκέτας οὐκ ἔχεις διακονουμένους. Κἂν γὰρ μυρίους ἔχῃς, ὁ Θεὸς σε κελεύει διὰ σαυτοῦ τῆς φιλοξενίας τὸν καρπὸν τρυγᾶν. Διὰ τοῦτο Παῦλος χήρα γυναικὶ διαλεγόμενος, καὶ κελεύων αὐτὴν ξενοδοχεῖν, οὐ δι' ἐτέρων, ἀλλὰ δι' ἑαυτῆς

65. αὐθεντία, also “authority,” but the sense of dominance over the man is clear in Chrysostom’s intertext of 1 Tim 2:12, using the cognate verb: διδάσκειν δὲ γυναικὶ αὐθενεῖν οὐκ ἐπιτρέπω οὐδὲ αὐθεντεῖν ἀνδρός.

66. With ellipsis in 7:13, καὶ οὗτος ... μετ’ αὐτῆς (as marked in the translation).

67. Minus δέ before διδάσκειν.

68. John is quite clear that the speaking role allotted even to the exceptional women of the apostolic age, like Priscilla, does not approach the role that he is occupying as he speaks these words from the βῆμα in the basilica.

69. The “we” here is John and the other men in the congregation. John’s androcentric worldview is well in evidence here, as his praise for Priscilla is used to shame the men in his congregation; the logic of this σύγκρισις, or rhetorical comparison, is that men should not be bested by their inferiors, women.

But when he's unbelieving and has gone astray, Paul doesn't deprive her of the dominant role⁶⁵ of teaching. Indeed, when he's writing to the Corinthians, he says, "*And let a woman who has an unbelieving husband ... not divorce him; for how do you know, woman, if you will save your husband?*" (1 Cor 7:13, 16a).⁶⁶ But how could the believing woman have saved the unbelieving husband? Clearly by instructing and teaching him and leading him to the faith, just as this very woman Priscilla did for Apollos. Otherwise, when he says, "*I do not allow a woman to teach*" (1 Tim 2:12),⁶⁷ he is speaking of teaching in the pulpit, public speaking, and the oratory that is proper to the priesthood.⁶⁸ But Paul didn't forbid them to advise or offer counsel in private, since if this had been forbidden he wouldn't have praised Priscilla for doing it.

4. Let men hear this, let women hear it too! Women, so they might imitate the example of this woman who is their race and kind; men, so they might not appear weaker than a woman. After all, what kind of defense, what excuse will we have if, when women show such great zeal and philosophical bearing, we're perpetually bound up in the affairs of this world?⁶⁹ Let the rulers learn this along with those who stand under their rule, priests and laity alike, so that the former might not admire the rich or people in pursuit of fame for their households, but instead seek virtue via poverty. And let them not be ashamed of poorer brothers and sisters or run past the tentmaker, the tanner, the purple-seller, and the coppersmith⁷⁰ to pay court to those in power. And let those under the authority of a ruler learn this, so that they not consider it to be an impediment to welcoming the saints, but instead reflect on [193] the widow who welcomed Elijah (3 Kgdms 17) even though she had only a single measure of flour, and on these two who extended hospitality to Paul for two years and opened their homes to those in need, holding all their possessions in common⁷¹ with strangers. Now, don't tell me that you don't have household slaves who can provide this service. For even if you had thousands of them, God commands you to harvest the fruit of hospitality by your own hands. That's why Paul, when speaking to a widowed woman and ordering her to provide hospitality, commanded that she do it not through the labor of others but

70. This list of occupations follows Acts 18:3 (Priscilla and Aquila); 10:6 (Simon); 16:14 (Lydia); and 2 Tim 4:14 (Alexander).

71. Cf. the communitarian ideal of the ancient church as described in Acts 4:32: *ἅπαντα κοινά*.

τοῦτο ἐπέταττεν. Εἰπὼν γάρ, Εἰ ἐξενοδόχησεν, ἐπήγαγεν, Εἰ ἀγίων πόδας ἔνιψεν. Οὐκ εἶπεν, εἰ χρήματα ἐδαπάνησεν, οὐδὲ, εἰ τοῖς οἰκέταις ἐκέλευσε τοῦτο ποιῆσαι, ἀλλ', εἰ δι' ἑαυτῆς τοῦτο εἰργάσατο.

Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ὁ Ἀβραάμ τριακοσίους ὀκτὼ καὶ δέκα οἰκογενεῖς ἔχων, αὐτὸς ἐπὶ τὴν ἀγέλην ἔτρεχε, καὶ τὸν μόσχον ἐβάσταζε, καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ἅπαντα διηκόνει, καὶ τὴν γυναῖκα κοινωνὸν ἐποίει τῶν τῆς φιλοξενίας καρπῶν. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ὁ Κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς καὶ ἐν φάτῃ τίκτεται, καὶ ἐν οἰκίᾳ τικτόμενος τρέφεται, καὶ αὐξηθεὶς οὐκ εἶχε ποῦ τὴν κεφαλὴν κλίνει, ἵνα σε παιδεύσῃ διὰ πάντων μὴ πρὸς τὰ λαμπρά τοῦ βίου τούτου κεχηνέναι πράγματα, ἀλλ' εὐτελείας εἶναι ἐραστὴν πανταχοῦ, καὶ πτωχείαν διώκειν, καὶ περιουσίαν φεύγειν, καὶ ἔσωθεν καλλωπίζεσθαι. Πᾶσα γὰρ ἡ δόξα τῆς θυγατρὸς τοῦ βασιλέως, φησὶν, ἔσωθεν. Ἐὰν ἔχῃς προαίρεσιν φιλοξενον, ἅπασαν τῆς φιλοξενίας ἔχεις τὴν θήκην, καὶ ὁβολὸν ἧς κεκτημένος μόνον· ἂν δὲ μισάνθρωπος ᾖ καὶ μισόξενος, καὶ τὰ πάντα ἧς περιβεβλημένος πράγματα, ἐστενοχώρηταί σοι τοῖς ξένοις ἡ οἰκία. Οὐκ εἶχεν αὕτη κλίνας ἀργυρενδέτους, ἀλλ' εἶχε σωφροσύνην πολλήν· οὐκ εἶχε στρωμνὴν, ἀλλὰ προαίρεσιν ἐκέκτητο προσήνῃ καὶ φιλόξενον· οὐκ εἶχε κίονας ἀπαστράπτοντας, ἀλλ' εἶχε ψυχῆς κάλλος ἀπολάμπον· οὐκ εἶχε τοίχους μαρμάρους περιβεβλημένους, οὐδὲ ἔδαφος ψηφίσι διηνησμένον, ἀλλ' ἦν αὕτη ναὸς τοῦ Πνεύματος. Ταῦτα ἐπήνεσεν ὁ Παῦλος, τούτων ἡράσθη· διὰ ταῦτα ἔτη δύο μείνας ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκίας οὐκ ἀπανίστατο· διὰ ταῦτα αὐτῶν μέμνηται διηνεκῶς, καὶ ἐγκώμιον αὐτοῖς συντίθησι μέγα καὶ θαυμαστὸν, οὐχ ἵνα αὐτοὺς λαμπροτέρους ἐργάσθαι, ἀλλ' ἵνα τοὺς λοιποὺς εἰς τὸν αὐτὸν ἀγάγῃ ζῆλον, καὶ πείσῃ μακαρίζειν, οὐχὶ τοὺς πλουτοῦντας, οὐδὲ τοὺς ἐν ἀρχαῖς ὄντας, ἀλλὰ τοὺς φιλοξένους, τοὺς ἐλεήμονας, τοὺς φιλανθρώπους, τοὺς πολλὴν περὶ τοὺς ἀγίους φιλοφροσύνην ἐπιδεικνυμένους.

ε'. Ταῦτα δὴ καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀπὸ τῆς προσήσεως ταύτης μαθόντες, διὰ τῶν ἔργων αὐτῶν ἐπιδειξώμεθα· καὶ μήτε τοὺς πλουτοῦντας ἀπλῶς μακαρίζωμεν, μήτε τοὺς πτωχοὺς ἐξευτελίζωμεν, μηδὲ ἐπαισχυνώμεθα τέχναις, μηδὲ ὄνειδος εἶναι νομίζωμεν ἐργασίαν, ἀλλὰ ἀργίαν, καὶ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν τι ποιεῖν.

72. With εἶχε for ἔχει.

73. With τῆς θυγατρὸς τοῦ βασιλέως (with A, per Rahlfs *app. crit.*) for αὐτῆς θυγατρὸς βασιλέως.

74. See p. 138 n. 19 for the range of meanings of προαίρεσις in Chrysostom.

75. Priscilla or her house (οἰκία); this is likely intentionally ambiguous, as the house that welcomed Paul (as did its host) serves here for John as a metonymy for Priscilla's character, which John praises effusively.

76. A stylized passage marked with anaphora (οὐκ εἶχε) and antithesis (ἀλλά), forming a rhetorical σύγκρισις.

through her own efforts. For after saying, “*If she showed hospitality*,” he added, “*if she washed the feet of the saints*” (1 Tim 5:10). He didn’t say, “if she spent lots of money” or “if she commanded her household slaves to do it,” but if she did the deed herself.

That’s why Abraham, too, although he had three hundred and eighteen domestic slaves (cf. Gen 14:14), himself ran to the flock, carried in the calf and served all the other things, and made his wife his partner in the fruits of hospitality (cf. Gen 18). That’s why our Lord Jesus Christ, too, is born in a manger, and once born is reared in a house (cf. Luke 2:12, 40), and when grown up didn’t have “*anywhere to lay his head*” (Luke 9:58),⁷² so he might instruct you by all these events not to stand in awe of the glittering things of this life, but to be always a lover of frugality, to pursue poverty, to flee abundance, and to adorn yourself in what comes from within. For “*all the glory of the daughter of the king*,” it says, “*comes from within*” (Ps 44:14).⁷³ If you make the choice⁷⁴ to be hospitable, then you hold a safe-deposit box that’s been filled from hospitality, even if you possess only a single coin. But if you hate people and hate strangers, even if you’re endowed with everything, your house is too cramped for strangers. She⁷⁵ didn’t have silver-plated beds, but she had great modesty; she didn’t have furnishings, but she did possess a gentle and hospitable ethical bearing. She didn’t have flashy pillars, but she had a soul possessed of shining beauty. She didn’t have marble walls or a flower-patterned floor mosaic, but she was herself a temple of the Spirit (cf. 1 Cor 3:16).⁷⁶ These are the things Paul praised; these are the people he loved. That’s why he didn’t leave, but he stayed in their house for two years. And the reason Paul made mention of them continually and composed a great and marvelous encomium⁷⁷ to them wasn’t to make them more famous, but to lead the rest to the same zeal and persuade them to consider as blessed not the rich or those in power, but those who’re hospitable, merciful and full of love, who show abundant care for the saints.

5. So then, if we’ve learned these lessons from the greeting (Rom 16:3), then let’s show it in our very deeds. And let’s not simply consider the rich to be blessed or disparage the poor, or be ashamed of trades, or consider that what’s disgraceful is work rather than idleness and having nothing to

77. I.e., the four words of the lemma that is the subject of this homily (Rom 16:3). John now argues that Paul’s encomium to Priscilla and Aquila had the purpose of moral exhortation for others (thus joining Paul’s intent with his own).

Εἰ γὰρ ὄνειδος ἦν τὸ ἐργάζεσθαι, οὐκ ἂν αὐτὸ μετῆλθεν ὁ Παῦλος, οὐκ ἂν ἐπ' αὐτῷ μεῖζον ἐφρόνησεν, οὕτω λέγων· Ἐὰν γὰρ εὐαγγελίζωμαι, οὐκ ἔστι μοι καύχημα. Τίς οὖν μοι ἐστὶν ὁ μισθός; Ἵνα εὐαγγελιζόμενος ἀδάπανον θήσω τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Εἰ δὲ τέχνη ὄνειδος ἦν, οὐκ ἂν τοὺς μὴ ἐργαζομένους ἐκέλευσε μὴδὲ ἐσθίειν. Ἀμαρτία γὰρ μόνον ἐστὶν ὄνειδος· ταύτην δὲ ἀργία τίκτειν εἴωθε, καὶ οὐ μίαν [194] καὶ δύο καὶ τρεῖς μόνον, ἀλλὰ πᾶσαν ὁμοῦ τὴν πονηρίαν. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ τις σοφὸς δεικνύς, ὅτι πᾶσαν τὴν κακίαν ἐδίδαξεν ἡ ἀργία, καὶ περὶ οἰκετῶν διαλεγόμενός φησιν· Ἐμβαλε αὐτὸν εἰς ἔργον, ἵνα μὴ ἀργῇ.

Ὅπερ γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ χαλινὸς τῷ ἵππῳ, τοῦτο τὸ ἔργον τῇ φύσει τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ. Εἰ καλὸν ἦν ἡ ἀργία, πάντα ἂν ἄσπαρτα καὶ ἀνήροτα ἡ γῆ ἀνεβλάστανεν· ἀλλ' οὐδὲν τοιοῦτον ἐργάζεται. Πρώην μὲν οὖν ἐκέλευσεν ἀνήροτα πάντα ἐκβαλεῖν ὁ Θεός· νυνὶ δὲ οὐκ ἐποίησεν οὕτως, ἀλλὰ καὶ ζεῦξαι βόας, καὶ ἄροτρον ἐλκύσαι, καὶ αὐλακα ἀνατεμεῖν, καὶ σπέρματα καταβάλλειν, καὶ ἐτέροις πολλοῖς τρόποις θεραπεῦσαι καὶ ἄμπελον καὶ δένδρα καὶ σπέρματα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις ἐνομοθέτησεν, ἵν' ἡ τῆς ἐργασίας ἀσχολία πάσης ἀπάγῃ πονηρίας τὴν τῶν ἐργαζομένων διάνοιαν. Ἐξ ἀρχῆς μὲν οὖν, ἵνα τὴν δύναμιν ἐπιδείξῃται τὴν ἑαυτοῦ, χωρὶς τῶν πόνων τῶν ἡμετέρων ἅπαντα ἀναδοθῆναι παρεσκεύασε· Βλαστησάτω γὰρ ἡ γῆ βοτάνην χόρτου, φησί· καὶ πάντα ἐκόμα εὐθέως· μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα οὐχ οὕτως· ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ τῶν ἡμετέρων αὐτὰ πόνων ἐκφέρεσθαι ἐκέλευσεν ἐκ τῆς γῆς, ἵνα μάθῃς ὅτι διὰ τὸ χρήσιμον ἡμῖν καὶ λυσιτελεῖς τὸν πόνον εἰσῆγαγε. Καὶ δοκεῖ μὲν εἶναι κόλασις καὶ τιμωρία τὸ ἀκοῦσαι, Ἐν ἰδρώτι τοῦ προσώπου σου φάγῃ τὸν ἄρτον σου· τὸ δὲ ἀληθές, νοθεσία τίς ἐστι καὶ σωφρονισμός, καὶ τῶν τραυμάτων τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀμαρτίας γενομένων φάρμακον. Διὰ ταῦτα καὶ Παῦλος εἰργάζετο διηνεκῶς, οὐκ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ μόνῃ, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ νυκτί· καὶ τοῦτο βοᾷ λέγων· Νυκτὸς γὰρ καὶ ἡμέρας ἐργαζόμενοι, πρὸς τὸ μὴ ἐπιβαρῆσαί τινα ὑμῶν. Καὶ οὐχ ἀπλῶς τέρψεως ἕνεκεν καὶ ψυχαγωγίας τὸ ἔργον μετῇ, καθάπερ πολλοὶ τῶν ἀδελφῶν, ἀλλὰ τοσοῦτον ἐπεδείκνυτο περὶ αὐτὸ πόνον, ὥς καὶ ἐτέροις δυνηθῆναι ἐπικουρῆσαι. Ταῖς γὰρ χρεῖαις μου, φησί, καὶ τοῖς οὖσι μετ' ἐμοῦ ὑπηρέτησαν αἱ χεῖρες αὐταί. Ἄνθρωπος δαίμοσιν ἐπιτάττων, τῆς οἰκουμένης διδάσκαλος ὢν, τοὺς τὴν γῆν οἰκοῦντας ἅπαντας ἐπιτραπεῖς, καὶ τὰς ὑφ' ἡλίῳ κειμένας Ἐκκλησίας ἀπάσας, καὶ δήμους καὶ ἔθνη καὶ πόλεις μετὰ πολλῆς θεραπεύων ἐπιμελείας, νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν εἰργάζετο, καὶ οὐδὲ μικρὸν ἀνέπνει τῶν πόνων ἐκείνων.

78. With ἔργον for ἐργασίαν.

79. καὶ ἐγένετο οὕτως.

80. A reprise of the theme of §2 (PG 51:189).

do. After all, if working were a disgrace, then Paul wouldn't have pursued it, and he wouldn't have boasted all the more in it, as when he said, "*For if I preach the gospel, I do not have a boast. What then is my wage? That in preaching I present the gospel of Christ free of charge*" (1 Cor 9:16, 18). If a trade were a disgrace, then he wouldn't have commanded those who don't work not to eat (2 Thess 3:10). Sin is the only disgrace. Idleness customarily gives birth to sin—and not one [194] or two or three sins only, but every form of wickedness altogether. That's why a certain wise man, in showing that idleness has been the schoolmaster of all evil, said about household slaves, "*Throw him into work, so he might not be idle*" (Sir 33:28).⁷⁸

Work is to our nature what a bridle is to a horse. If idleness were good, then the earth would sprout forth all its produce without seeds or cultivation. But it does no such thing. There was a time way back when God commanded the earth to send forth everything without cultivation (cf. Gen 1). But now he hasn't done this, but he's set down by law that human beings should yoke oxen, pull the plow, cut furrows, put down seed, and by many other means tend the vine, the trees, and the seeds. He did this so that the occupation of work might drive all wickedness out of the minds of those who work. To be sure, at the beginning, to demonstrate his own power, he made provision for everything to be brought forth without our labors, for he says, "*let the earth burst forth with plants of grass*" (Gen 1:11). And everything immediately produced foliage (cf. Gen 1:11).⁷⁹ But subsequently it wasn't like this. Instead, he commanded that these things should be brought forth from the earth through our efforts, so you might learn that he introduced labor for the sake of our benefit and advantage. Now, it seems to be a chastisement and punishment when one hears, "*With sweat on your face you will eat your bread*" (Gen 3:19), but in truth it's a kind of admonition and prudent counsel and a remedy for the wounds that come from sin. This is the reason Paul worked continuously, not only in the day but even at night, as he cries out, saying, "*Night and day working so as not to be a burden to any of you*" (1 Thess 2:9). And it wasn't simply for enjoyment and gratification that he was involved in work, like many of the brothers, but he exhibited so much labor in order to be able to assist others as well. For "*these hands served for my needs and for those with me*" (Acts 20:34), he says. A man who commanded demons, was the teacher of the world, was entrusted with all the inhabitants of the earth and all the churches under the sun, serving peoples, nations, and cities with great care,⁸⁰ he worked night and day and didn't even take a short respite from those labors.

Ἡμεῖς δὲ, οὐδὲ τὸ μυριοστὸν τῆς ἐκείνου φροντίδος μετιόντες, μᾶλλον δὲ οὐδὲ εἰς νοῦν λαβεῖν δυνάμενοι, διατελοῦμεν ἐν ἀργία ζῶντες διηνεκῶς. Καὶ ποίαν ἔξομεν ἀπολογία, ἢ τίνα συγγνώμην, εἰπέ μοι; Ἐντεῦθεν ἅπαντα εἰς τὸν βίον εἰσενήνεκται τὰ κακὰ, ὅτι πολλοὶ μεγίστην ἀξίαν εἶναι νομίζουσι, τὸ μὴ τὰς ἑαυτῶν μεταχειρίζειν τέχνας, καὶ ἐσχάτην κατηγορίαν, τὸ φανῆναί τι τοιοῦτον εἰδότας. Καὶ Παῦλος μὲν οὐκ ἡσχύνετο ὁμοῦ καὶ σμίλην μεταχειρίζων, καὶ δέρματα ῥάπτων, καὶ τοῖς ἐν ἀξιώμασι διαλεγόμενος, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐνεκαλλωπίζετο τῷ πράγματι, μυρίων πρὸς αὐτὸν λαμπρῶν καὶ ἐπισήμων ἀφικνουμένων ἀνθρώπων. Καὶ οὐ μόνον οὐκ ἐπησχύνετο ταῦτα ποιῶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ καθάπερ ἐν στήλῃ χαλκῇ ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς ἐξεπόμευσεν ἑαυτοῦ τὸ ἐπιτήδευμα. Ὅπερ οὖν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἔμαθε, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα αὐτὸ μετεχειρίζε, καὶ τότε μετὰ τὸ εἰς οὐρανὸν ἀρπαγῆναι, μετὰ τὸ εἰς παράδεισον ἀπενεχθῆναι, μετὰ τὸ κοινωνῆσαι ῥημάτων ἀπορ-[195]ρήτων τῷ Θεῷ· ἡμεῖς δὲ, οὐδὲ τῶν ὑποδημάτων ὄντες ἄξιοι τῶν ἐκείνου, αἰσχυρόμεθα τούτοις, ἐφ' οἷς ἐκεῖνος ἐνηβρύνετο· καὶ καθ' ἐκάστην μὲν ἡμέραν πλημμελοῦντες, οὐδὲ ἐπιστρεφόμεθα, οὐδὲ ὄνειδος εἶναι νομίζομεν· τὸ δὲ ἐκ δικαίων πόνων ζῆν, ὡς αἰσχρὸν καὶ καταγέλαστον φεύγομεν. Τίνα οὖν ἔξομεν ἐλπίδα σωτηρίας, εἰπέ μοι; Τὸν γὰρ αἰσχυρόμενον, ἁμαρτίαν αἰσχύνεσθαι δεῖ, καὶ τὸ τῷ Θεῷ προσκροῦσαι, καὶ τὸ ποιῆσαι τι τῶν οὐ δεόντων, ἐπὶ δὲ τέχναις καὶ ἐργασίαις καὶ ἐναβρύνεσθαι. Οὕτω γὰρ καὶ πονηρὰν ἔννοιαν τῇ τῆς ἐργασίας ἀσχολίᾳ τῆς διανοίας ἐκβαλοῦμεν ῥαδίως, καὶ τοῖς δεομένοις ἐπικουρήσομεν, καὶ τὰς ἐτέρων οὐκ ἐνοχλήσομεν θύρας, καὶ τὸν νόμον τοῦ Χριστοῦ πληρώσομεν τὸν εἰπόντα· Μακάριόν ἐστι διδόναι μᾶλλον ἢ λαμβάνειν. Διὰ γὰρ τοῦτο χεῖρας ἔχομεν, ἵνα ἑαυτοῖς βοηθῶμεν, καὶ τοῖς τὰ σώματα πεπηρωμένοις ἐκ τῶν ἡμετέρων εἰσφέρωμεν τὰ κατὰ δύναμιν ἅπαντα· ὡς ἂν τις ἀργῶν διατελῇ, καὶ ὑγιαίνει, τῶν πυρεττόντων ἐστὶν ἀθλιώτερος· οἱ μὲν γὰρ παρὰ τῆς ἀσθενείας ἔχουσι συγγνώμην, καὶ τύχοιεν ἂν ἐλέου· οὗτοι δὲ καταισχύνοντες τὴν τοῦ σώματος εὐεξίαν, εἰκότως ἂν παρὰ πάντων μισοῦνται, ὡς καὶ τοὺς τοῦ Θεοῦ παραβαίνοντες νόμους, καὶ τῇ τραπέζῃ τῶν ἀσθενούντων λυμαινόμενοι, καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν τὴν ἑαυτῶν φαυλοτέραν ποιοῦντες.

81. On this portrait of Paul as a man with a knife in his hands and working with skins, see *Laud. Paul.* 4.10 (AP 202) and discussion and further references in *HT* 246–48.

82. The idea that Paul's letters were in some sense intended to be the public monuments that John regards them as (in this case, as though engraved on a bronze stela or monument, *καθάπερ ἐν στήλῃ χαλκῇ*) is a favored one for Chrysostom. See also in particular *Hom. Gal.* 2:11–14 §3 (PG 51:384), below.

83. I.e., by begging.

But we, who don't share even a fraction of the cares Paul had and, indeed, can't even get our mind around them all, spend our time living continually in idleness. So, tell me, what kind of defense, or what excuse will we have? The source of all the evils that have come into our lives is the fact that many consider it the highest value not to be engaged in their own trade, and consider being denounced for having any knowledge of such things to be the worst accusation. But Paul wasn't ashamed to have a knife in his hands and sew skins⁸¹ at the same time as he spoke to people of high rank, but he even boasted in the matter when many famous and dignified people were there talking to him. And not only was he not ashamed of doing these things, but he even paraded his own work life in his letters (cf. 1 Thess 2:9; 2 Thess 3:8; 1 Cor 4:12) as though on a public inscription made of bronze.⁸² Hence what he'd learned from early in his life he practiced also subsequently—after he was snatched up into the third heaven, after he was taken up into paradise, after he shared ineffable words [195] with God (cf. 2 Cor 12:2–5). But we, who aren't even worthy of his sandals, are ashamed of the very things that Paul took pride in. Although we do wrong every day, we neither repent nor consider it a disgrace, but we flee living from honest labor as though it were something shameful and laughable. So tell me, what hope of salvation will we have? For a person who's ashamed should be ashamed of sin, of quarrelling with God, of doing what isn't right, but they should take pride in their trade and work. Since this is how we shall easily cast wicked thoughts from our minds, by being busy with work, and we shall help those in need and not trouble the doors of others.⁸³ Furthermore, we shall fulfill the law of Christ that said: "*it is more blessed to give than to receive*" (Acts 20:35).⁸⁴ This is why we have hands: so we might help of our own accord and bring all the things we can from our own resources to assist those who are disabled in body. As we know, if people spend their time in idleness, even if they're in good health, they're more miserable than those in the grip of fever. Indeed, while the latter should receive compassion because they have their illness as an excuse, the former, putting to shame their healthy bodily state, would rightly be hated by all given that they transgress the laws of God, vitiate the practice of hospitality⁸⁵ for the weak, and render their own souls all the meaner.

84. With transposition of *μᾶλλον* and *διδόναι*.

85. Translation of *τράπεζα* with PGL C. The theme of hospitality reverberates throughout this homily.

Οὐδὲ γὰρ τοῦτο μόνον ἐστὶ τὸ δεινόν, ὅτι δέον οἴκοθεν καὶ παρ' ἐαυτῶν τρέφεσθαι, τὰς [196] ἐτέρων ἐνοχλοῦσιν οἰκίας, ἀλλ' ὅτι καὶ πάντων αὐτοὶ γίνονται χεῖρους. Οὐ γάρ ἐστιν, οὐκ ἔστι τῶν πάντων οὐδὲν, ὃ μὴ διὰ τῆς ἀργίας ἀπόλλυται. Καὶ γὰρ ὕδωρ, τὸ μὲν ἐστηκὸς σήπεται, τὸ δὲ τρέχον καὶ πανταχοῦ πλανώμενον τὴν ἀρετὴν διασώζει τὴν ἑαυτοῦ· καὶ σίδηρος, ὁ μὲν ἐν ἀργίᾳ κείμενος, ἀπαλώτερός τε καὶ φαυλότερος, ἰσὺ πολλῶν δαπανώμενος, γίνεται· ὁ δὲ ἐν ἐργασίαις ὢν, πολὺ χρησιμώτερος καὶ εὐπρεπέστερος, ἀργύρου παντὸς οὐδὲν ἔλαττον ἀποστίλβων. Καὶ γῆν μὲν τὴν ἀργοῦσαν ἴδοι τις ἂν οὐδὲν ὑγιὲς ἐκφέρουσιν, ἀλλὰ πονηρὰς βοτάνας καὶ ἀκάνθας καὶ τριβόλους καὶ ἄκαρπα δένδρα, τὴν δὲ ἐργασίας ἀπολαύουσιν, καρποῖς ἡμέροις κομῶσιν. Καὶ ἕκαστον δὲ τῶν ὄντων, ὡς εἰπεῖν ἀπλῶς, ὑπὸ μὲν τῆς ἀργίας φθείρεται, ὑπὸ δὲ τῆς οἰκείας ἐργασίας χρησιμώτερον γίνεται. Ταῦτα οὖν εἰδότες ἅπαντα, καὶ πόσον μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀργίας τὸ βλάβος, πόσον δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς ἐργασίας τὸ κέρδος, τὴν μὲν φεύγωμεν, τὴν δὲ διώκωμεν, ἵνα καὶ τὸν παρόντα βίον εὐσχημόνως ζήσωμεν, καὶ δεομένοις ἐκ τῶν ἐνόντων ἐπικουρήσωμεν, καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἀμείνω κατασκευάσαντες τύχωμεν τῶν αἰωνίων ἀγαθῶν· ὧν γένοιτο πάντας ἡμᾶς ἐπιτυχεῖν, χάριτι καὶ φιλανθρωπίᾳ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ᾧ ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος, ἅμα τῷ Πατρὶ καὶ τῷ ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι, νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ, καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Ἀμήν.

The thing that's so terrible about those who burden the households of others isn't just that they should be fed from their own resources and industry, [196] but that they become worse than all other people. For there's nothing, nothing at all, that's not destroyed by idleness. After all, standing water turns putrid; but water that runs and meanders all over preserves its high quality. And iron, if it lies around idle, becomes more pliable and weaker, consumed by rampant rust; but if it is worked on, it becomes much more useful and presentable, shining no less brightly than silver. And land that sits idle brings forth no healthy produce that the eye can see, but instead miserable plants, thorns, burrs, and trees that bear no fruit; but the land that has the benefit of being worked bears the produce of cultivated fruits. Simply put, every single thing that exists is ruined by idleness, but it becomes all the more useful when it puts itself to work. Therefore, knowing all these things—how much harm comes from idleness and how much gain from work—let's flee the former and pursue the latter so we might live the present life in a proper manner and assist those in need from what we can do and by making our own souls better attain the good things that are eternal. May we all attain these, by the grace and loving-kindness of our Lord Jesus Christ, to whom be glory and power, together with the Father and the Holy Spirit, now and always, forever and ever. Amen.

ΕΙΣ ΑΚΥΛΑΝ ΚΑΙ ΠΡΙΣΚΙΛΛΑΝ Καὶ εἰς τὸ μὴ κακῶς λέγειν
τοὺς ἱερεῖς τοῦ Θεοῦ, λόγος β'.

α'. [195] Ἄρα ἐπαιδεύθητε μὴδὲν εἶναι νομίζειν πάρεργον τῶν ἐν τῇ θείᾳ
Γραφῇ κειμένων; ἄρα ἐμάθετε καὶ ἐπιγραφὰς καὶ ὀνόματα καὶ ψιλὰς
περιεργάζεσθαι προσήσεις, τὰς ἐν τοῖς θείοις Λογίοις γεγραμμένας; Ἐγὼ μὲν
γὰρ οὐδένα οἶμαι λοιπὸν τῶν φιλοπόνων τὸν ἀνεξόμενον παραδραμεῖν τι τῶν
ἐν ταῖς Γραφαῖς κειμένων ῥημάτων, κἂν ὀνομάτων ἢ κατάλογος, κἂν χρόνων
ἀριθμὸς, κἂν ψιλὴ πρὸς τινὰς πρόσρησις. Πλὴν ἵνα ἀσφαλεστέρα αὕτη ἢ
διόρθωσις γένηται. φέρε καὶ τήμερον τὰ λειπόμενα τῆς προσηγορίας τῆς πρὸς
Πρίσκιλλαν καὶ Ἀκύλαν ἐπέλθωμεν· καίτοι γε οὐ μικρὰ τὸ προοίμιον αὐτῆς
ἡμᾶς ὠφέλησε. Καὶ γὰρ ἐδίδαξεν ἡμᾶς, πόσον μὲν ἀγαθὸν, ἔργον, πόσον δὲ
κακὸν, ἀργία, καὶ τίς ἢ Παύλου ψυχὴ, πῶς ἄγρυπνος καὶ μεμεριμνημένη,
οὐ κατὰ πόλεις καὶ δήμους καὶ ἔθνη, ἀλλὰ καὶ καθ' ἓνα ἕκαστον τῶν πιστῶν

1. Provenance: see n. 1 on *Hom. Rom.* 16:3 A.

Text: Mf PE (1837) as reprinted by JPM (PG, 1862), including Mf's original textual notes (1721), collating two manuscripts with HS and ME. One was Coislinianus 243, which contains only the second *Hom. Rom.* 16:3, on fols. 245–52^v, and one from the Vatican (no number given by Mf: “*collata cum Vaticano uno*”). As indicated in the introduction (p. 35), a likely candidate is Vat. Ottob. gr. 431 (XI), which also only contains *Hom.* 2, on fols. 53–63^v. Pinakes lists twenty-two manuscripts that contain this homily, seven of which (inclusive of the Vatican codex just cited) do not contain the first *Hom. Rom.* 16:3 but only the second.

2. John is making a wordplay (paronomasia) between good and bad “trifling” (πάρεργον, περιεργάζεσθαι; for the latter, see LSJ 1, “lavish *useless pains* upon,” and LSJ 5, “investigate thoroughly”).

3. ἐπιγραφή, as translated with LSJ 2: “title of a work.”

4. I adopt the reading ἐγγεγραμμένας (with Vat. gr. and Coislin. 243) instead of HS's reading (retained by Mf PE PG) γεγραμμένας. Chrysostom often, as in the prior homily, emphasizes that everything Paul wrote in his letters was “inscribed as on

Hom. Rom. 16:3 B
(*In illud: salutate Priscillam et Aquilam, et quae sequuntur, sermo 2*)
CPG 4376 (PG 51:195–208)¹

On Aquila and Priscilla, and not speaking ill of the priests of God,
homily 2.

1. [195] So then, you were instructed to consider nothing that is in the divine Scriptures to be trifling, right? And you learned that you should properly busy yourself² with even the titles³ and names and simple forms of address that are inscribed⁴ in the divine utterances? For I believe no one who is truly industrious will be content to run past any of the words found in the Scriptures, even if it might be a list of names, a number of years, or a simple greeting⁵ to a few people. Still, so this corrective argument⁶ might be established even more firmly, come on, let's spend today, as well, discussing the remaining parts of this greeting to Priscilla and Aquila. Indeed, the *prooimion*⁷ to it has already provided us with no small benefits. For it taught us⁸ that work is a tremendous⁹ good, but idleness a tremendous evil. It taught what the quality of Paul's soul was, how it stayed awake at night full of concern, thoughtfully caring not only for cities, people, or

a public stela (or monument) of bronze" (§5 [PG 51:194]). Both textual readings are of course fully plausible.

5. For the range of meanings of *πρόσρησις* see p. 181 n. 4 above.

6. By *διόρθωσις* (literally, "correction"), John is referring to the argument of his prior homily, refuting the faulty *ὑπόθεσις*, "assumption," that a passage like Rom 16:3 is "trifling and superfluous" by his own counterproposition that, in fact, it "opens up for us a great sea of meanings" (*Hom. Rom. 16:3 A* §1 [PG 51:187]).

7. See *Hom. Rom. 16:3 A* §1 (PG 51:189), referring to the first four words of the verse, Ἀσπάσασθε Πρίσκιλλαν καὶ Ἀκύλαν.

8. What follows is a list of the *κεφάλαια*, or chief rhetorical headings, of the prior homily, though not exactly in its order, because it starts with the end rather than the beginning, presumably to trigger the hearers' last memory of the prior sermon.

9. One of Mf's two manuscripts reads *ὅπόσον* for *πόσον* in both instances (with the same sense).

πολλήν ποιουμένη τὴν πρόνοιαν. Ἐδειξε πῶς οὐδὲν εἰς φιλοξενίαν ἢ πενία γίνεται κώλυμα, καὶ ὅτι οὐ πλούτου καὶ χρημάτων, ἀλλὰ ἀρετῆς πανταχοῦ χρεία καὶ προαιρέσεως εὐλάβειαν ἐχούσης, καὶ ὅτι πάντων εἰσὶ λαμπρότεροι οἱ τὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ φόβον ἔχοντες, κἂν εἰς πενίαν ἐσχάτην κατενεχθῶσι. Τὴν γοῦν Πρίσκιλλαν καὶ Ἀκύλαν, σκηνοποιούς ὄντας καὶ χειροτέχνας, καὶ ἐν πτωχείᾳ ζῶντας, τῶν βασιλέων πάντων μᾶλλον ἐμακαρίζομεν νῦν· καὶ οἱ μὲν ἐν ἀξιώμασι καὶ δυναστείαις σεσίγηται, ὁ δὲ σκηνοποιὸς μετὰ [196] τῆς γυναικὸς ἄδονται πανταχοῦ τῆς οἰκουμένης. Εἰ δὲ ἐνταῦθα τοσαύτης ἀπολαύουσι δόξης, ἐννόησον ὅσον κατὰ τὴν ἡμέραν ἐκείνην ἀξιωθήσονται τῶν ἀντιδόσεων καὶ τῶν στεφάνων· καὶ πρὸ τῆς ἡμέρας δὲ ἐκείνης, οὐ μικρὰν καὶ ἡδονὴν καὶ ὠφέλειαν καὶ δόξαν ἐκαρπώσαντο νῦν, Παύλῳ τοσοῦτον συζήσαντες χρόνον. Καὶ γὰρ, ὅπερ ἔμπροσθεν ἔλεγον, τοῦτο καὶ νῦν λέγω, καὶ λέγων οὐ παύσομαι, ὅτι οὐχ ἡ διδασκαλία μόνον, οὐδὲ ἡ παραίνεσις καὶ συμβουλή, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὕτη ἡ ὄψις τῶν ἀγίων πολλὴν εἶχεν ἡδονὴν καὶ ὠφέλειαν, καὶ αὐτὸς δὲ τῶν ἱματίων ὁ στολισμὸς, καὶ αὐτὸς τῶν ὑποδημάτων ὁ τρόπος. Καὶ γὰρ ἐντεῦθεν πολλή τις εἰς τὸν ἡμέτερον εἰσενήνκεται βίον ὠφέλεια, τὸ μαθεῖν μέχρι ποῦ τοῖς ἀναγκαίοις ἐχρῶντο. Οὐδὲ γὰρ μόνον τὸ μέτρον οὐχ ὑπερέβαινον τῆς χρείας, ἀλλ' ἔστιν ὅπου οὔτε τῆς χρείας αὐτῆς ἀπέλαυνον ἀπάσης· ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν λιμῷ καὶ δίψει καὶ γυμνότητι διετέλεσαν. Καὶ τοῖς μὲν μαθηταῖς ἐπιτάττων ὁ Παῦλος ἔλεγεν· Ἐχοντες τροφὰς καὶ σκεπάσματα, τούτοις ἀρκεσθῆσόμεθα· περὶ δὲ ἑαυτοῦ φαίνεται λέγων, ὅτι Ἀχρὶ τῆς ἄρτι ὥρας καὶ πεινῶμεν, καὶ διψῶμεν, καὶ γυμνητεύομεν, καὶ κολαφίζόμεθα.

Ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἂ μεταξὺ ἔλεγον, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα εἰσῆλθεν, ἀναγκαῖον εἰς μέσον παραθεῖναι πολλὴν ἔχοντα τὴν ζήτησιν. Τί δὲ τοῦτό ἐστιν; Ἐλεγον, ὅτι καὶ [197] ὁ τῶν ἀποστολικῶν ἱματίων στολισμὸς παρέχει πολλὴν ἡμῖν τὴν ὠφέλειαν· μεταξὺ δέ με ταῦτα λέγοντα εἰσῆλθεν ὁ νόμος τοῦ Χριστοῦ,

10. Per Mf, Vat. gr. reads ἐν πενίᾳ (“in penury”) for ἐν πτωχείᾳ (largely synonymous in meaning).

11. This phrasing (ὁ δὲ σκηνοποιὸς μετὰ τῆς γυναικὸς) foregrounds Aquila, in contrast to John’s interpretation of the order of their names in *Hom. Rom. 16:3 A §3* (PG 51:191–92). Interestingly, in his summation of the prior homily here, Chrysostom has omitted mention of that subargument about the superior piety of Priscilla.

12. Both of Mf’s manuscripts read καρπώσονται, “shall reap for themselves.”

13. Minus δὲ after ἔχοντες; τροφὰς for διατροφὰς—a reading not attested in NA²⁸ but repeated below in §4 (PG 51:201).

14. Reading παραθεῖναι (Mf PE PG); Mf notes that both Vat. gr. and Coislin. 243 read προθεῖναι (“it’s necessary to set forth for attention”).

15. As with others in this volume, this homily is focused on the interplay of ζήτησις (“problem,” “inquiry,” “question,” “quandary,” “point of dispute”) and λύσις (“solution”).

nations in the aggregate but for every single one of the believers individually. It showed us how poverty is no obstacle to hospitality and that what's always needed isn't wealth and possessions but virtue and a pious ethical disposition. It showed that the most illustrious people of all are those who fear God, even if they might be weighed down by extreme poverty. Nowadays we're accustomed to regard Priscilla and Aquila—who were tentmakers and manual laborers and lived in poverty¹⁰—as more blessed than all the emperors. Whereas those in high rank and positions of power meet with silence, the tentmaker, together with his wife,¹¹ [196] receive songs of praise all over the world. And if they enjoy such renown here, consider what great rewards and crowns they will be judged worthy of on that day to come. And even before that day, right now they've already reaped¹² no small pleasure, benefit, and renown, because they lived with Paul for such a long time. Just as I was saying before and am saying now and will not stop saying: it's not only the teaching, advice, and counsel of the saints, but their very appearance, the fashion of their garments, and the particular style of sandals they wore that has conveyed great pleasure and benefit. And learning to what extent they made use of the necessities of life has introduced a great benefit into our life. For they not only didn't exceed the level of their need, but there were times when they didn't even completely satisfy their wants, but lived in famine, in thirst, and in nakedness. Paul commanded this to his disciples when he said, "*If we have food and shelter, we shall be content with that*" (1 Tim 6:8).¹³ And he manifests this behavior when saying about himself, "*Until this very hour we hunger and thirst and are naked and beaten*" (1 Cor 4:11).

However, it's necessary to make a direct comparison¹⁴ of the things I spoke of in my earlier homily and those that have come up since then, because they entail a serious problem that requires investigation.¹⁵ What's that? I was saying that even [197] the particular style of the apostles' sandals provides us with great benefit,¹⁶ and even the fashion of the garments

16. Accepting the reading of Vat. gr. and Coislin. 243, as noted but not adopted by Mf: "*Paulo post iidem και ο των υποδημάτων τρόπος των αποστολικών παρέχει πολλήν ἡμῖν τὴν ὠφέλειαν*" (presumably he means after *Τί δὲ τοῦτό ἐστιν;*). The line appears to have been dropped by parablepsis due to the repeated final five words it shares in common with the next sentence. But the repetition is more likely original, since it follows precisely and in chiasmic order the statement above: *ἀλλὰ και αὕτη ἡ ὄψις των ἁγίων πολλήν εἶχεν ἡδονὴν και ὠφέλειαν, και αὐτὸς δὲ των ἱματίων ὁ στολισμὸς, και αὐτὸς των υποδημάτων ὁ τρόπος.*

ὃν ἔθηκεν αὐτοῖς, οὕτω λέγων· Μὴ κτήσησθε χρυσόν, μηδὲ ἄργυρον, μηδὲ χαλκὸν εἰς τὰς ζώνας ὑμῶν, μηδὲ ὑποδήματα, μηδὲ ῥάβδον εἰς τὴν ὁδόν· φαίνεται δὲ Πέτρος σανδάλια ἔχων. "Ὅτε γοῦν ὁ ἄγγελος καθεύδοντα αὐτὸν ἐξύπνισε, καὶ ἐξήγαγε τοῦ δεσμωτηρίου, φησίν· Ὑποδῆσαι τὰ σανδάλιά σου, καὶ περιβαλοῦ τὸ ἱμάτιόν σου, καὶ ἀκολούθει μοι. Καὶ Παῦλος δὲ Τιμοθέῳ γράφων λέγει· Τὸν φελόνην, ὃν ἀπέλιπον ἐν Τρωάδι παρὰ Κάρπῳ, φέρε ἐρχόμενος, καὶ τὰ βιβλία, μάλιστα τὰς μεμβράνας. Τί λέγεις; ὁ Χριστὸς οὐδὲ ὑποδήματα ἐκέλευσεν ἔχειν, καὶ σὺ φελόνην ἔχεις, καὶ ἕτερος σανδάλια πάλιν; Καὶ εἰ μὲν τῶν εὐτελῶν τινες ἦσαν, καὶ τῶν οὐ πάντοτε τῷ Διδασκάλῳ πειθομένων, οὐκ ἦν ζήτημα τὸ λεγόμενον· ἐπειδὴ δὲ οἱ καὶ τὰς ψυχὰς ἑαυτῶν ἐπιδιδόντες, καὶ κορυφαῖοι καὶ πρῶτοι τῶν μαθητῶν εἰσιν οὗτοι, καὶ πάντα ἐπείθοντο τῷ Χριστῷ, ὁ δὲ Παῦλος οὐ μόνον τὰ ἐπιταττόμενα ἐποίει, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑπὲρ τὰ σκάμματα ἐπεπῆδα, κάκεινου κελεύοντος ἐκ τοῦ Εὐαγγελίου ζῆν, οὗτος ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν αὐτοῦ ἔζη, πλεόν τι τῶν ἐπιτεταγμένων ποιήσας, ἄξιον ὄντως ζητῆσαι, τίνος ἕνεκεν, πάντα αὐτῷ πειθόμενοι, ἐνταῦθα δοκοῦσι παραβαίνειν αὐτοῦ τὸν νόμον. Ἄλλ' οὐ παραβαίνουσιν. Οὐδὲ γὰρ εἰς τοῦτο χρήσιμος ἡμῖν οὗτος ἔσται μόνον ὁ λόγος, εἰς τὴν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀγίων ἐκείνων ζήτησιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰς τὸ τὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἐμφράξαι στόματα. Καὶ γὰρ πολλοὶ χηρῶν οἰκίας ἀνατρέποντες, ὀρφανούς γυμνοῦντες, τὰ πάντων περιβαλλόμενοι, λύκων οὐδὲν ἄμεινον διακείμενοι, ἐκ τῶν ἀλλοτρίων ζῶντες πόνων, ὀρῶντες πολλάκις τινὰς τῶν πιστῶν δι' ἄρρωστίαν σώματος πλείονα περιβεβλημένους ἱμάτια, τὸν νόμον εὐθέως ἡμῖν τοῦ Χριστοῦ προβάλλονται, καὶ ταῦτα λέγουσι τὰ ῥήματα· Οὐκ ἐκέλευσεν ὑμῖν ὁ Χριστὸς μὴ ἔχειν

17. εἰσέρχεσθαι can mean "to enter one's mind" (LSJ VI.2) or, even more agonistically, "as a law-term, of the accuser ... enter the charge" (LSJ III).

18. With an apparent ellipsis (as marked) at the key point for the present context (μὴ πήραν εἰς ὁδόν, μηδὲ δύο χιτῶνας before μηδὲ ὑποδήματα!). But "the pagan" below will cite the text with μὴ δύο χιτῶνας. John has transposed εἰς ὁδόν to after ῥάβδον, reading the singular ῥάβδον for ῥάβδους (as he does also in citing the lemma in *Hom. Matt.* 32.4 [PG 57:382]). Lastly, Mf notes that ME reads αἴρετε after ὁδόν (as does HS), but he omits it because it is lacking in both his manuscripts and "*superflua*."

19. With ellipsis as marked in the text.

20. With transposition of ἐρχόμενος and φέρε.

21. ὑπὲρ τὰ σκάμματα ἐπεπῆδα, literally, "leap farther than the long-jump pits," a favored Chrysostomic metaphor. See PGL A.2; P. R. Colman-Norton, "St. Chrysostom's Use of the Greek Poets," *Classical Philology* 27 (1932): 213–21, 218–19, on this as "a proverbial expression." Mf notes that both of his manuscripts read ἐπεπῆδησε (aorist instead of imperfect).

22. ζητεῖν (cf. ζήτημα, "vexing problem," two sentences earlier).

the apostles wore provides us with great benefit. But as I am right in the middle of saying these things, the law of Christ that he set down for them marched in,¹⁷ saying this: “*Don’t acquire gold, or silver, or copper for your belts ... or sandals, or a staff for the road*” (Matt 10:9–10).¹⁸ And yet Peter clearly owned sandals! Indeed, when the angel woke him when he was asleep and led him out of the prison, he says, “*Put on your sandals ... and put on your coat and follow me*” (Acts 12:8).¹⁹ And in addition, Paul says when writing to Timothy, “*When you come, bring the cloak that I left in Troas with Carpus, and the scrolls, especially the parchments*” (2 Tim 4:13).²⁰ “What are you saying, Paul? Christ commanded you not even to have sandals, and you, Paul, have a cloak, and the other apostle in turn has sandals?” Now, if these were insignificant men, or of the company of those who didn’t always obey the teacher, then this statement wouldn’t be a vexing problem. But in fact, they were men giving up even their own lives, and they were the chiefs and front-runners among the disciples, and they used to obey Christ in everything. Paul, after all, not only was accustomed to doing what was commanded, but he even outjumped the prescribed limits.²¹ While Christ commanded one to live from the gospel, Paul used to live from the work of his hands, doing more than what had been commanded (cf. 1 Cor 9:14–18). Since this is the case, it is truly worth investigating²² why it was that, although these apostles obeyed Christ in everything, they appear²³ to be transgressing his law here. But no.²⁴ They do not transgress. And this homily of ours will be useful not only to address the problem concerning those saints but also to muzzle the mouths of the Greeks.²⁵ Indeed, many of them throw widows out of their houses, strip orphans naked, clothe themselves in everyone else’s garments—being no better than wolves!—and survive on the labors of others. But often, when they happen to see some of the believers wearing more than one garment (due to bodily illness), they immediately cite against us²⁶ the law of Christ and say these words: “Didn’t Christ command you not to have ‘*two garments, or sandals*’ (Matt

23. As noted in the introduction, part of the rhetoric of problems and solutions is to introduce the ζήτημα as only “apparent” (δοκεῖν).

24. Per Mf, both his manuscripts read οὐ γὰρ δὴ for ἀλλ’ οὐ before παραβαίνουσιν.

25. John introduces this part of the problem as coming from outsiders.

26. προβάλλεσθαι means both literally to “throw before” and metaphorically to “bring forward, cite on one’s own part, in defense ... cite as an example” (LSJ III.2.b) and “accuse” (IV). John is playing on these senses here, as the translation tries to capture.

δύο χιτῶνας, μηδὲ ὑποδήματα; πῶς οὖν ὑμεῖς παραβαίνετε τὸν νόμον τὸν περὶ τούτων κείμενον; Εἴτα δαψιλὲς γελάσαντες καὶ ἀνακαγχάσαντες, καὶ καταισχύναντες τὸν ἀδελφὸν, ἀποπηδῶσιν. "Ὅτι οὖν μὴ ταῦτα γένηται, φέρε καὶ τὴν ἐκείνων ἀναισχυντίαν ἐπιστομίσωμεν. Ἐξῆν μὲν οὖν τοῦτο πρὸς αὐτοὺς μόνον εἰπόντας ἀπαλλαγῆναι. Ποῖον δὲ τοῦτο; "Ὅτι εἰ μὲν ἀξιόπιστόν τινα νομίζεις εἶναι τὸν Χριστὸν, εἰκότως ταῦτα προβάλλῃ, καὶ ζητεῖς πρὸς ἡμᾶς· εἰ δὲ ἀπιστεῖς αὐτῷ, τίνος ἕνεκεν προβάλλῃ τὰς νομοθεσίας; Ἄλλ' ὅταν μὲν ἡμῶν κατηγορεῖν ἐθέλῃς, ἀξιόπιστος νομοθέτης ὁ Χριστὸς εἶναι σοι δοκεῖ· ὅταν δὲ αὐτὸν προσκυνεῖν θέῃ καὶ θαυμάζειν, οὐδεὶς οὐκέτι σοι λόγος τοῦ κοινοῦ τῆς οἰκουμένης Δεσπότου.

β'. Πλὴν ἀλλ' ἵνα μὴ δι' ἀπορίαν ἀπολογίας τοῦτο λέγειν ἡμᾶς νομίζωσιν, ἐπ' αὐτὴν ἴωμεν λοιπὸν τῶν ζητουμένων τὴν λύσιν. Τίς οὖν ἡ λύσις ἔσται; Ἐὰν ἴδωμεν, τίσι, καὶ πότε, καὶ διὰ τί ταῦτα ἐπέταττεν ὁ Χριστός. Οὐ γὰρ ἀπλῶς αὐτὰ καθ' ἑαυτὰ τὰ λεγόμενα ἐξετάζειν χρὴ, ἀλλὰ καὶ πρόσωπον, καὶ καιρὸν, καὶ αἰτίαν, καὶ πάντα ταῦτα μετὰ ἀκριβείας δεῖ ἐρευνᾶσθαι. Εὐρήσομεν γὰρ ἀκριβῶς σκοποῦντες, ὅτι οὐ πᾶσι ταῦτα ἐπετέτακτο, ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἀποστόλοις μόνοις, καὶ ἐκεῖνοι δὲ οὐ μέχρι παντός, ἀλλὰ μέχρι τινὸς διωρισμένου καιροῦ. [198] Πόθεν τοῦτο δῆλον; Ἐξ αὐτῶν τῶν εἰρημένων· καλέσας γὰρ τοὺς δώδεκα μαθητάς, εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Εἰς ὁδὸν ἐθνῶν μὴ ἀπέλθῃτε, καὶ εἰς πόλιν Σαμαρειτῶν μὴ εἰσέλθῃτε· πορεύεσθε δὲ μᾶλλον πρὸς τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἀπολωλῶτα οἴκου Ἰσραὴλ· ἀσθενοῦντας θεραπεύετε, λεπροὺς καθαίρετε, δαιμόνια ἐκβάλλετε· δωρεὰν ἐλάβετε· δωρεὰν δότε· μὴ κτήσῃσθε χρυσόν, μηδὲ ἄργυρον, μηδὲ χαλκὸν εἰς τὰς ζῶνας ὑμῶν. "Ὅρα Διδασκάλου σοφίαν, πῶς κοῦφον ἐποίησε τὸ ἐπίταγμα. Πρότερον γὰρ εἰπὼν, Ἀσθενοῦντας θεραπεύετε, λεπροὺς καθαίρετε, δαιμόνια ἐκβάλλετε, καὶ τὴν παρ' αὐτοῦ χάριν δαψιλῇ δοὺς αὐτοῖς, τότε ταῦτα ἐπέταξε, τῇ τῶν σημείων περιουσίᾳ

27. This remarkable piece of "street theatre," even if exaggerated, likely gives us a glimpse of how the Scriptures were or could be a "problem" for Christians even going about their everyday affairs. This adds to the abundant evidence we have of such on the level of elite intellectuals. (Note that Cook, *The Interpretation of the New Testament in Greco-Roman Paganism*, lists no examples like this for Matt 10:10 among anti-Christian writings by philosophers.)

28. Taking this sentence as an interrogative (rhetorical question) like the previous.

29. John promises a λύσις for the ζητήματα (and note the antonym ἀπορία earlier in the sentence, which is also part of the vocabulary of problems and solutions).

30. Who? When? Why? These are three essential questions in investigating τὸ ἱστορικόν in ancient literary criticism to locate and constrict the meaning of a statement by its particular context. Note that, ironically, this is the exact opposite of the

10:10)? How then do you transgress the law that is set down about these things?” Then after erupting in peals of laughter and guffawing and shaming the brother or sister, they speed off.²⁷ To prevent these things from happening, come on, let’s put a muzzle on their impudence as well! Now, it would be possible to dismiss this charge by saying just one thing to them. What’s that? “Well, if you consider Christ to be worthy of respect, then it makes sense that you cite these words and cross-examine us; but if you don’t believe in him, then why are you quoting the laws he laid down? So, when you wish to accuse us, Christ seems to you to be a respectable law-giver, but when it’s necessary to worship and admire him, the Lord of the entire world is no longer of any worth to you?”²⁸

2. However, lest they think we say this because we’re at a loss for how to offer a proper line of defense, let’s proceed at last to the solution²⁹ to these problems. What will the solution be? It depends on looking at to whom, and when, and why³⁰ Christ issued these commands. For one shouldn’t simply³¹ examine the words as they’re stated, but it’s necessary to investigate with careful attention all the following things: the persons involved, the time,³² and the reason. If we make a careful examination, we shall discover that Christ hadn’t issued these commands to everyone, but to the apostles alone, and that even for the apostles they weren’t for all time, but up until a circumscribed moment in time. [198] How is this clear? From the words themselves.³³ For after calling the twelve disciples, he said to them, “*Don’t go off into the way of the gentiles, and don’t enter the city of the Samaritans, but go instead to the lost sheep of the house of Israel.... Heal the sick, cleanse lepers, cast out demons, freely receive, freely give. Don’t acquire gold or silver or copper for your belts*” (Matt 10:6, 8–9).³⁴ Look at the teacher’s wisdom, and how he makes the command easy. Only after he first said, “*Heal the sick, cleanse lepers, cast out demons*” (Matt 10:8) —thereby giving them such a generous dose of his grace—did he then issue these commands

universalizing argument of the previous homily (see Mitchell, “The Continuing Problem of Particularity and Universality within the *corpus Paulinum*”).

31. ἀπλῶς, “simply,” and also, when it comes to texts, “literally” (PGL A and E, respectively, noting that for the term in general, “senses not always clearly distinguishable from one another”).

32. Or “the occasion” or “moment” (καιρός), as in what follows.

33. Note that, having rejected a “literal” meaning (ἀπλῶς), John returns with a call for another kind of reading focused on his own version of “the words themselves.”

34. With καθαίρετε for καθαρίζετε.

ῥαδίαν καὶ κούφην ποιῶν τὴν πενίαν ἐκείνην. Οὐκ ἐντεῦθεν δὲ μόνον δῆλον, ὅτι αὐτοῖς μόνοις ταῦτα ἐπετέτακτο, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐξ ἐτέρων πολλῶν. Καὶ γὰρ τὰς παρθένους ἐκείνας διὰ τοῦτο ἐκόλασεν, ἐπειδὴ ἔλαιον οὐκ εἶχον ἐν ταῖς λαμπάσιν αὐτῶν· καὶ ἐτέροις ἐγκαλεῖ, ὅτι πεινῶντα αὐτὸν εἶδον, καὶ οὐκ ἔθρεψαν, διψῶντα, καὶ οὐκ ἐπότισαν. Τὸν τοίνυν οὐκ ἔχοντα χαλκὸν, οὐδὲ ὑποδήματα, ἀλλ' ἐν ἱμάτιον μόνον, πῶς δυνατόν ἦν ἕτερον διαθρέψαι, πῶς γυμνὸν περιβαλεῖν, πῶς ἄστεγον εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν εἰσαγαγεῖν; Χωρὶς δὲ τούτων, καὶ ἐτέρωθεν αὐτὸ τοῦτο δῆλον ἔσται καὶ καταφανές. Προσελθόντος γάρ τινος καὶ εἰπόντος, Διδάσκαλε, τί ποιήσας ζωὴν αἰώνιον κληρονομήσω; ἐπειδὴ τὰ τοῦ νόμου κατέλεξεν ἅπαντα, ὁ δὲ περιεργαζόμενος, ἔλεγε· Ταῦτα πάντα ἐφυλαξάμην ἐκ νεότητός μου· τί ἔτι μοι ὑστερεῖ; λέγει πρὸς αὐτόν· Εἰ θέλεις τέλειος εἶναι, ὕπαγε, πώλησόν σου τὰ ὑπάρχοντα καὶ δὸς πτωχοῖς, καὶ δεῦρο, ἀκολούθει μοι. Καίτοι εἰ νόμος καὶ πρόσταγμα ἦν, τοῦτο πρῶτον ἐξαρχῆς εἰπεῖν ἔδει, καὶ νομοθετῆσαι, καὶ ἐν προτάγματος τάξει θεῖναι, ἀλλὰ μὴ ἐν συμβουλῇ καὶ παραινέσει αὐτὸ εἰσηγήσασθαι. "Ὅταν μὲν γὰρ λέγῃ, Μὴ κτήσῃσθε χρυσὸν, μηδὲ ἄργυρον, ἐπιτάττων λέγει· ὅταν δὲ λέγῃ, Εἰ ἐθέλεις τέλειος εἶναι, συμβουλεύων καὶ παραινῶν λέγει. Οὐκ ἔστι δὲ ταὐτὸν συμβουλεύειν καὶ νομοθετεῖν. Ὁ μὲν γὰρ νομοθετῶν, ἐκ παντὸς τρόπου βούλεται τὸ ἐπιταττόμενον γίνεσθαι· ὁ δὲ συμβουλεύων καὶ παραινῶν καὶ τῇ γνώμῃ τοῦ ἀκούοντος ἐπιτρέπων τὴν αἵρεσιν τῶν λεγομένων, κύριον ποιεῖ τοῦ δέξασθαι καὶ μὴ τὸν ἀκροατὴν. Διὰ δὲ τοῦτο οὐχ ἀπλῶς εἶπεν, "Ὑπαγε, πώλησόν σου τὰ ὑπάρχοντα, ἵνα μὴ νόμον εἶναι νομίσης τὸ λεγόμενον, ἀλλὰ πῶς; Εἰ ἐθέλεις τέλειος εἶναι, ὕπαγε, πώλησόν σου τὰ ὑπάρχοντα· ἵνα μάθῃς ὅτι ἐν τῇ γνώμῃ τῶν ἀκούοντων τὸ πρᾶγμα κεῖται.

"Ὅτι μὲν οὖν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις ταῦτα ἐπετέτακτο μόνοις, δῆλον ἐντεῦθεν· ἀλλ' οὐδέπω τὴν λύσιν εὐρήκαμεν. Εἰ γὰρ καὶ αὐτοῖς τοῦτο νενομοθέτηται

35. Translating σημεία here with BDAG 2.a., as in John 2:11, etc.

36. Minus ἀγαθέ after διδάσκαλε.

37. The first sentence either follows Luke (with ταῦτα πάντα for πάντα ταῦτα), has the Matthean reading with some manuscripts of Matthew (B D K Γ, etc.), or is a harmonization. In any case, for the second sentence John switches to the Matthean version but reads (or, likely, paraphrases), μοι ὑστερεῖ for ὑστερῶ after τί ἔτι.

38. Ellipsis of καὶ ἔξεις θησαυρὸν ἐν οὐρανοῖς before καὶ δεῦρο, as marked.

39. Mf adopts the reading γίνεσθαι from his two manuscripts, despite preferring the reading of ME, "vero," which is found also in HS, δέχεσθαι (hence, "wishes universal acceptance of what he commands").

40. Or, perhaps, "student."

41. One way that Chrysostom navigates the problems some scriptural passages pose is by appeal to literary genre—law as universalizing a statement, advice as occasional or provisional but not mandatory.

(cf. Matt 10:9). Through the abundance of miracles³⁵ he made the poverty effortless and easy. And it's clear not only from this passage, but also from many others, that he'd issued these commands to the disciples alone. After all, he punished those virgins because they didn't have oil in their lamps (cf. Matt 25:1–12). And he brings a charge against others because they saw him hungry and didn't feed him, thirsty and they didn't give him to drink (Matt 25:42). But how can someone who has no money or sandals but only a single garment clothe another? How can a naked person clothe another? How can a homeless person bring someone into their house? Even apart from these examples, there are other passages that will also make this very point manifestly clear. For when a man approached him and said, "*Teacher, by doing what shall I inherit eternal life?*" (Luke 18:18),³⁶ once Christ had listed all the requirements of the law, the man pressed the inquiry further, saying, "*I have kept all these things from my youth. What more do I lack?*" (Matt 19:20³⁷). Then Christ says to him, "*If you wish to be perfect, go, sell your belongings and give to the poor ... and come, follow me*" (Matt 19:21).³⁸ Now if this were a law and a command, it would've been necessary to state it at the beginning, and to stipulate it as a law and set it down in the form of a command, rather than to introduce it by way of counsel and advice. For when he says, "*Don't acquire gold or silver*" (Matt 10:9), he speaks by way of command; but when he says, "*If you wish to be perfect*" (Matt 19:21), he speaks by way of counsel and advice. Counseling and lawgiving are not the same thing. The one who issues a law wishes what he commands to be done³⁹ in every case; but the one advising and counseling, by leaving the choice about what is said to the judgment of the listener, makes him or her not a mere auditor⁴⁰ but one who has authority about whether or not to accept it.⁴¹ The reason he didn't simply say, "*Go, sell your belongings,*" was so you wouldn't consider the statement a law. But how did he put it? "*If you wish to be perfect,*⁴² *go, sell your belongings*" (Matt 19:21), so that you might learn that the matter remains in the judgment of the hearers.

The fact that Christ had issued these commands⁴³ to the apostles alone is clear from this evidence. But we've not yet discovered the solution.⁴⁴ For even if he's issued this law only to them, why is it that, when they'd been

42. John ignores the Markan and Lukan versions of the pericope, in which this introductory phrase is lacking.

43. In Matt 10:9–10.

44. Or "solved the problem" (i.e., found the λύσις to the ζήτησις).

μόνοις, τίνος ἔνεκεν ἐπιταγέντες μηδὲ ὑποδήματα ἔχειν, μηδὲ διπλοῦν ἱμάτιον, εὐρίσκονται, ὁ μὲν σανδάλια κεκτημένος, ὁ δὲ καὶ φελόνην ἔχων; Τί οὖν ἂν εἵπομεν πρὸς ταῦτα; Ὅτι οὔτε αὐτοὺς μέχρι παντὸς ἀφήκεν ὑπὸ ταύτην εἶναι τῶν νόμων τὴν ἀνάγκην, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὸν σωτήριον ἵεναι μέλλων θάνατον, ἀπέλυσεν αὐτοὺς τῆς νομοθεσίας ταύτης. Πόθεν τοῦτο δῆλον; Ἀπ' αὐτῶν τῶν τοῦ Σωτῆρος ῥημάτων. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἔμελλεν ἐπὶ τὸ πάθος ὁδεύειν, καλέσας αὐτοὺς φησιν· Ὅτε ἀπέστειλα ὑμᾶς ἄτερ βαλαντίου καὶ πήρας, μή τινος ὑστερήσατε; Οἱ δὲ ἀποκριθέντες εἶπον· Οὐδενός. Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Ἀλλὰ νῦν ὁ ἔχων βαλάντιον, ἀράτω, καὶ πή-[199]ραν· καὶ ὁ μὴ ἔχων, πωλησάτω τὸ ἱμάτιον αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀγοράσει μάχαιραν. Ἀλλ' ἴσως εἴποι τις ἂν, ὅτι τοὺς μὲν ἀποστόλους διὰ τῶν εἰρημένων ἀπήλλαξας τῶν ἐγκλημάτων· τὸ δὲ ζητούμενόν ἐστιν εἰπεῖν, τίνος ἔνεκεν ἐναντία ὁ Χριστὸς ἐνομοθέτησε, ποτὲ μὲν λέγων, Μὴ κτήσησθε πήραν, ποτὲ δὲ λέγων, Ὁ ἔχων βαλάντιον, ἀράτω, καὶ πήραν. Τίνος οὖν ἔνεκεν τοῦτο πεποίηκεν; Ἀξίως τῆς αὐτοῦ σοφίας καὶ προνοίας τῆς ὑπὲρ τῶν μαθητῶν. Παρὰ μὲν γὰρ τὴν ἀρχὴν ταῦτα ἐπέταξεν, ἵνα ἔργῳ καὶ πείρᾳ τὴν ἀπόδειξιν τῆς αὐτοῦ δυνάμεως λάβωσι, καὶ λαβόντες θαρρήσωσι λοιπὸν εἰς τὴν οἰκουμένην ἐξελθεῖν ἅπασαν. Ἐπειδὴ δὲ λοιπὸν ἱκανῶς ἔγνωσαν αὐτοῦ τὴν δύναμιν, ἐβούλετο καὶ αὐτοὺς οἰκοθεῖν τὴν αὐτῶν ἀρετὴν ἐπιδείξασθαι, καὶ μὴ μέχρι τέλους αὐτοὺς διαβαστάζεσθαι, ἀλλ' ἐνδιδόναι πολλαχοῦ καὶ συγχωρεῖν, καὶ πειρασμοὺς αὐτοὺς ὑπομένειν, ἵνα μὴ διὰ τέλους ἀργοὶ μένωσι. Καὶ καθάπερ οἱ νήχεσθαι διδάσκοντες, παρὰ μὲν τὰς ἀρχὰς τὰς αὐτῶν ὑποτιθέντες χεῖρας μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς ἀκριβείας τοὺς μαθητὰς τοὺς ἑαυτῶν διαβαστάζουσι, μετὰ δὲ πρῶτην καὶ δευτέραν καὶ τρίτην ἡμέραν πολλαχοῦ τὴν δεξιὰν αὐτῶν ὑποσύραντες ἐκεῖνοις, κελεύουσιν ἑαυτοῖς βοηθεῖν, καὶ πού καὶ μικρὸν βαπτίζεσθαι ἐπιτρέπουσι, καὶ πολλὴν τῷ στόματι δέχεσθαι τὴν ἄλμην· οὕτω δὴ καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ἐποίησεν ἐπὶ τῶν μαθητῶν. Ἐν ἀρχῇ καὶ ἐν προοιμίῳ οὐ μικρὸν, οὐ μέγα αὐτοὺς ἀφήκε παθεῖν, ἀλλὰ πανταχοῦ παρῇν τειχίζων αὐτοὺς, περιφράττων, πάντα μετὰ ἀφθονίας αὐτοῖς

45. The famous *πήρα* carried by Cynic philosophers; one might translate “beggar’s bag” (see BDAG).

46. Minus *καὶ ὑποδημάτων* δὲ before *μή τινος*; plus *ἀποκριθέντες* before *εἶπον*; *οὐδενός* for *οὐθενός*; ὁ δὲ *εἶπεν* (with *Ν** *D* *Θ* etc.) for *εἶπεν οὖν* (*℣* and other witnesses); minus *ὁμοίως* before *καὶ πήραν*; *πωλησάτω* for *πωλήσει* (as is read by *℣*). The translation above replicates the masculine grammar of the Greek because that will be important for John’s argument about the (male) apostles and about Judas in particular.

47. The solution to one problem, as so often, leads to new problems.

48. Minus *ὁμοίως* before *καὶ πήραν*. John has also cut off the opening of the verse, Ἀλλ’ νῦν, from the wording of the objector; these words are crucial to his own argument by appeal to the temporal variance between the statements.

commanded not to have sandals or a second garment, one of them is found owning sandals and the other possessing a cloak? What could we say in the face of these facts? That Christ did not permit them to live under the necessity of these laws for all time, but when he was about to go to his saving death he released them from this legal requirement. How is this clear? From the very words of the Savior. When he was about to set out on the way to his passion, he called them and said, “*‘When I sent you without a purse or a knapsack,⁴⁵ did you lack anything?’ And they answered, ‘Nothing.’ And he said to them, ‘But now he who has a purse, let him carry it, and [199] also a knapsack. And he who doesn’t have a sword, let him sell his garment, and he will buy one’*” (Luke 22:35–36).⁴⁶ But perhaps someone might say, “While you’ve exonerated the apostles of blame by these arguments, we still need to discuss the problem⁴⁷ of why Christ issued contradictory laws, at one time saying, “*Don’t acquire a purse*” (Matt 10:9–10) and at another, “*He who has a purse, let him carry it, and also a knapsack*” (Luke 22:36).⁴⁸ Why has he done this? Because he was acting in a way that worthily reflects his wisdom and forethought for his disciples.⁴⁹ For at the beginning, he gave these commands so they might have a demonstration of his power in the deeds and in their own experiences, and then, once they’d had that, they might finally have the confidence to go out into the whole world. Later, once they’d sufficiently recognized his power, Christ wished for them, too, to show their virtue out of their own resources and not to rely upon support⁵⁰ up until the end. Instead he oftentimes wished to allow and consent for them to endure trials so they might not in the end remain idly passive. This is just like those who teach swimming: at the beginning, they place their hands under their students with tender care and buoy them up, but after the first and second and third day, oftentimes they pull their right hand away from the students and charge them to help themselves. And sometimes they even allow them to be dunked under a bit and take a big gulp of seawater into their mouths. Christ acted in the same way with his disciples. In the beginning and at the start, he didn’t allow them to suffer either great or small trials, but he was continually present as their bulwark

49. John asks the question his protagonist offered, then immediately answers it.

50. διαβαστάζεσθαι, which will be translated below, as contextually appropriate for the two metaphors (swimming and flying), as “be buoyed up” and “be held aloft.” John’s point is that Christ gave them miracles early on to help buoy up the apostles, but later he was able to take away that external support so that they could carry out their mission and virtuous lifestyle on their own.

ἐπιρρεῖν παρασκευάζων· ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἔδει καὶ τὴν ἀνδρείαν αὐτοὺς ἐπιδείξασθαι τὴν αὐτῶν, συνέστειλεν ὀλίγῃ τὴν χάριν, ἐγκελευσάμενος αὐτοῖς πολλὰ καὶ δι' ἑαυτῶν ἀνύειν. Διὰ τοι τοῦτο, ὅτε μὲν οὐκ εἶχον ὑποδήματα, οὐδὲ ζώνην, οὐδὲ ῥάβδον, οὐδὲ χαλκὸν, οὐδενὸς ὑστερήθησαν· Μὴ τινος γάρ, φησὶν, ὑστερήσατε; Οἱ δὲ ἀποκριθέντες εἶπον· Οὐδενός. Ἐπειδὴ δὲ αὐτοὺς ἐκέλευσε καὶ βαλάντιον ἔχειν, καὶ πήραν, καὶ ὑποδήματα, εὐρίσκονται καὶ πεινῶντες καὶ διψῶντες καὶ γυμνητεύοντες. Ὅθεν δῆλον, ὅτι πολλαχοῦ συνεχῶρει καὶ παρακινδυνεύειν αὐτοὺς καὶ στενοχωρεῖσθαι, ἵνα τινὰ μισθὸν ἔχωσιν. Οὕτω που καὶ οἱ ὄρνιθες τοῖς νεοττοῖς ποιοῦσι τοῖς ἑαυτῶν· καὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖνοι, ἕως μὲν τὰ πτερὰ ἀπαλὰ ἔχουσιν, ἐπὶ τῆς καλιᾶς καθήμενοι θάλπουσιν· ἐπειδὰν δὲ ἴδωσι πτεροφυήσαντας, καὶ δυναμένους τὸν ἀέρα τέμνειν, πρῶτον μὲν περὶ αὐτὴν τὴν καλιὰν ἵπτασθαι παρασκευάζουσιν, ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ πορρωτέρω περιάγουσι, παρὰ μὲν τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐπόμεναι καὶ διαβαστάζουσαι, μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα αὐτοὺς ἑαυτοῖς ἀφιεῖσαι βοηθεῖν. Οὕτω καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ἐποίησε, καθάπερ ἐν καλιᾷ, τῇ Παλαιστίνῃ τρέφων τοὺς μαθητάς· ἐπειδὴ δὲ πέτεσθαι ἐδίδαξε παρὼν καὶ διαβαστάζων αὐτοὺς, τέλος ἀφῆκεν εἰς τὴν οἰκουμένην πτῆναι, κελεύσας καὶ ἑαυτοῖς πολλαχοῦ βοηθεῖν. Καὶ ὅτι τοῦτό ἐστιν ἀληθές, καὶ ἵνα τὴν δύναμιν αὐτοῦ μάθωσι, πάντων αὐτοὺς ἐγύμνωσε, καὶ μονοχίτωνας ἀπέστειλε, καὶ χωρὶς ὑποδημάτων ἐκέλευσε βαδίζειν, αὐτῆς οὖν τῆς ῥήσεως ἀκούσαντες σαφῶς εἰσόμεθα. Οὐ γὰρ ἀπλῶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· Ἄρατε βαλάντιον καὶ πήραν, ἀλλ' ἀνέμνησεν αὐτοὺς τῶν προτέρων, οὕτως εἰπών· Ὅτε ἀπέστειλα ὑμᾶς ἄτερ βαλάντιου καὶ πήρας, μὴ τινος ὑστερήσατε; τουτέστιν, Οὐ πάντα μετὰ ἀφθονίας ὑμῖν ἐπέρρει, καὶ πολλῆς ἀπελάυσατε δαψιλείας; ἀλλὰ νῦν βούλομαι ὑμᾶς καὶ δι' ἑαυτῶν ἀγωνίζεσθαι· βούλομαι ὑμᾶς καὶ πενίας πείραν λαβεῖν· διὰ τοῦτο λοιπὸν ἐπὶ τὴν ἀνάγκην οὐκ ἄγω τοῦ προτέρου νόμου, ἀλλ' ἐπιτρέπω καὶ βαλάντιον ἔχειν καὶ πήραν, ἵνα μὴ, καθάπερ δι' [200] ἀψύχων ὀργάνων, ἐνεργεῖν τὰ καθ' ὑμᾶς νομίζωμαι, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑμεῖς τὴν οἰκείαν ἔχητε ἐπιδείκνυσθαι φιλοσοφίαν.

γ'. Καὶ τί, φησὶν, οὐκ ἂν μείζων ἐφάνη ἡ χάρις, εἰ διαπαντὸς οὕτως ἐτέλεσαν ὄντες; Ἀλλ' αὐτοὶ οὐκ ἐγένοντο οὕτω δόκιμοι· εἰ γὰρ μηδεμιᾶς

51. Plus ἀποκριθέντες before εἶπον.

52. Minus καὶ ὑποδημάτων before μὴ τινος.

53. John engages in a prosopopoeia of Christ, explaining his own teaching and the rationale behind it.

54. φιλοσοφία, in all its resonances.

and backstop, providing for everything to come freely their way. But when it was necessary for them to show their own courage, he held back a bit on his supply of grace, commanding them to accomplish many things on their own power. That's why at the time when they didn't have sandals, a belt, a staff, or copper, they didn't lack for anything, as it says, "*Did you lack anything?*" *And they answered, 'Nothing'*" (Luke 22:35).⁵¹ But when he commanded them to have a purse, a knapsack and sandals, they're found hungry, thirsty, and naked. From this it's clear that Christ often allowed for them to be in danger and dire straits so they might receive a gain from it. This is also what birds do with their own young. While the hatchlings' wings are weak, the adults sit on the nest and nurse them. But when they see that their wings have developed and they're ready to cut through the air, they make them fly around the nest, and then they lead them farther off, and after at first following and holding them aloft, later they allow them to be self-supporting. Christ did the same thing, feeding his disciples in Palestine just as in a nest. When he taught them to fly, he was present and holding them aloft; in the end he allowed them to fly into the whole world, after commanding them always to be self-supporting. And because this is truly the case and so they might learn his power, he stripped them of all things and sent them out clothed in a single garment and commanded them to walk without sandals. We shall see this clearly by listening to the passage itself. For he didn't simply say to them, "Carry a purse and a knapsack," but he reminded them of the earlier statements, saying: "*When I sent you without a purse or a knapsack, did you lack anything?*" (Luke 22:35).⁵² This means,⁵³ "Didn't everything come to you generously, and didn't you enjoy great abundance? But now I want you to carry out the struggle on your own. I want you also to have had the experience of poverty. That's why in the end I'm not insisting on the necessity of the earlier law. Instead, I'm allowing you to have a purse and a knapsack, lest [200] I am thought to be the one who is carrying out your actions, as though you were mere lifeless tools. No, I did this so you might be able to exemplify a life of virtue⁵⁴ that is your very own."⁵⁵

3. "But why is it," someone might say, "that grace wouldn't have been manifested all the more if they were able to maintain the former state of

55. Mf notes that his two manuscripts add here *Εἴτα οὐκ ἂν μείζων*, "Then wouldn't that be all the better?" It could be a dittography of the following sentence, *οὐκ ἂν μείζων* (or have been lacking in HS's manuscripts by a parablepsis error).

ἔλαβον θλίψεως πεῖραν, μὴ πενίας, μὴ διωγμοῦ, μὴ στενοχωρίας, ἔμειναν ἂν ἄργοι καὶ νωθεῖς· νῦν δὲ οὐχὶ τὴν χάριν διαλάμψαι μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν τῶν ὑπακουόντων δοκιμὴν ἠθέλησεν ἐπιδειχθῆναι, ἵνα μὴ μετὰ ταῦτα τινες ἔχωσι λέγειν, ὅτι Οὐδὲν παρ' ἐαυτῶν εἰσήνεγκαν ἐκεῖνοι, ἀλλὰ τὸ πᾶν τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ ῥοπῆς ἐγένετο. Ἡδύνατο μὲν γὰρ αὐτοὺς ὁ Θεὸς μέχρι τέλους ἐν ἀφθονίᾳ καταστῆσαι τοσαύτη, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἠθέλησε διὰ πολλὰς καὶ ἀναγκαίας προφάσεις, ἃς πολλάκις πρὸς τὴν ὑμετέραν ἀγάπην εἰρήκαμεν· μίαν μὲν δὴ ταύτην, ἑτέραν δὲ οὐκ ἐλάττονα ταύτης, ἵνα καὶ μετριάξιν εἰδῶσι· τρίτην δὲ, ἵνα μὴ μείζονα ἢ κατὰ ἄνθρωπον λάβωσι δόξαν. Διὰ δὲ ταῦτα, καὶ πολλῶ πλείονα τούτων, ἀφείς αὐτοὺς πολλοῖς τῶν ἀδοκῆτων περιπίπτειν, οὐκ ἠβουλήθη ὑπὸ τὴν ἀκρίβειαν τῆς νομοθεσίας τῆς προτέρας ἀφεῖναι, ἀλλ' ἐχάλασε καὶ ἀνῆκε τῆς φιλοσοφίας τὸν τόνον ἐκείνης, ὥστε μὴ βαρύν τινα καὶ ἀφόρητον αὐτοῖς γενέσθαι τὸν βίον, πολλαχοῦ ἐγκαταλιμπανομένοις, καὶ τὸν ἀκριβῆ νόμον ἐκεῖνον ἀναγκαζομένοις τηρεῖν. Ἐπειδὴ δὲ χρὴ καὶ τὸ προκείμενον ἀσαφές ὄν ποιῆσαι καταφανές, ἀναγκαῖον καὶ τοῦτο εἰπεῖν. Εἰπὼν γὰρ, Ὁ ἔχων βαλάντιον, ἀράτω, καὶ πῆραν, ἐπήγαγε· Καὶ ὁ μὴ ἔχων, πωλήσει τὸ ἱμάτιον αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀγοράσει μάχαιραν.

Τί ποτε τοῦτό ἐστι; καθοπλίζει τοὺς μαθητὰς ὁ λέγων, Ἐάν τις σε ῥάπιση εἰς τὴν δεξιάν σιαγόνα, στρέψον αὐτῷ καὶ τὴν ἄλλην; ὁ κελεύων εὐλογεῖν τοὺς λοιδορουμένους, ἀνέχεσθαι τῶν ἐπηρεαζόντων, εὐχεσθαι ὑπὲρ τῶν διωκόντων, εἴτα καθοπλίζει, καὶ διὰ μαχαίρας μόνης; Καὶ ποῖον ἂν ἔχοι τοῦτο

56. I.e., be sustained by grace when they lived without a knapsack or cloaks or sandals, as during the period when the earlier “law” of Matt 10:9–10 was in effect and before it was rescinded right before the passion (Luke 22:35–38).

57. The hypothetical interlocutor presses the question of divine consistency.

58. I.e., approved by testing (δόκιμος here, and δοκιμή in the next sentence), “found worthy,” as in the Pauline letters (e.g., 1 Cor 9:27; 2 Cor 10:18; 13:3, 5–7).

59. ἐπιδειχθῆναι is lacking in both of Mf’s manuscripts; hence, “God wished not only for his grace to shine but also for the test-worthiness of those who heeded him.”

60. As Mf notes, HS and ME have a plus here, καὶ νῦν δὲ εἴπομεν (“and now again we should say”), after εἰρήκαμεν, which he does not adopt because it is lacking in one of his manuscripts and seems “*superflua*.” The evidence here is mixed, both externally and internally, since John often does move from what he has always said to saying it once again (as in §1 of the present homily [PG 51:196]).

61. Vainglory is a consistent Chrysostomic concern, as fueled, e.g., by 1 Thess 2:4–6; John 12:43 (see his *De inani gloria et de educandis liberis* in SC 188, ed. Malin-gre, but also throughout his oeuvre).

62. Per note above, here φιλοσοφία refers to the “philosophical life” as a life of ascetic renunciation.

63. Minus ὁμοίως before καὶ πῆραν.

things⁵⁶ all the way up to the end?”⁵⁷ But then they wouldn’t have been shown as worthy.⁵⁸ For if they’d had no experience of affliction or poverty or persecution or distress, they would’ve remained lazy and sluggish. But as it is, God wished not only for his grace to shine forth but also for those who obeyed him to be shown to be worthy of the test.⁵⁹ This was so that in later times people might not be able to say, “Those apostles contributed nothing from their own resources, but their entire achievement was due to divine influence.” God was able to outfit them with such generous gifts up until the end; but, for many necessary reasons that we’ve often spoken to you about before,⁶⁰ beloved, he didn’t wish to do so. The first reason is the one just mentioned, and the second no less important than the first: so that they might know how to live in moderation. And the third: so that they might not receive glory that’s beyond what human beings deserve.⁶¹ So, for all these reasons and even more besides, after allowing them to encounter many unexpected things, he didn’t wish to leave them subject to the rigorous requirement of the legislation he’d laid down previously, but he loosened and relaxed the stringency of that lifestyle⁶² so their life might not be burdensome and unbearable, always leaving everything they had behind (cf. Matt 19:27 and parr.) and under compulsion to observe that rigorous law. Since it was necessary to make clear what was about to ensue (which was as yet unclear), he had to say this, also. Thus, after he said, “*He who has a purse, let him carry it, and also a knapsack*” (Luke 22:36),⁶³ he added, “*And he who doesn’t have a sword will sell his garment and he will buy one*” (Luke 22:36).⁶⁴

What kind of a statement is this? Does the one who says, “*if anyone strikes you on the right cheek, turn to him also the left*” (Matt 5:39),⁶⁵ arm his disciples? Does the one who commands them to bless those who offer insult, to endure those who heap abuse, to pray on behalf of those who persecute them (cf. Luke 6:28; Matt 5:44), later arm them? And with a single sword? What possible sense does this make?⁶⁶ After all, if there were a need to take up arms, then one would need to acquire not just a single sword but

64. When John cited the verse earlier (§2 [PG 51:199]), he read *πωλησάτω* for *πωλήσει*, but he now reads both verbs (also *ἀγοράσει*, as earlier) as future indicative with *ἄν* (see RP). This will make possible his interpretation of the statement (especially the second one) as a future prediction, rather than a command, in what follows.

65. *ἐάν τις σε for ἀλλ’ ὅστις σε; εἰς for ἐπὶ before τὴν δεξιὰν σιαγόνα* (against *ἄν*).

66. Alternatively: “what possible reason could he have for this?” John takes on directly the problem of possible inconsistency in the gospel accounts on Jesus’s teachings on weapons and violence.

λόγον; Εἰ γὰρ ὅλως ἔδει καθοπλίσαι, οὐ μαχαίρας ἔδει κτήσασθαι μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀσπίδα καὶ κράνος καὶ κνημίδας. "Ὅλως δὲ, εἴ γε ἀνθρωπίνως τὰ τοιαῦτα ἔμελλεν οἰκονομεῖν, πόσοις οὐκ ἦν τὸ ἐπίταγμα γέλως; Εἰ γὰρ μυρία τοιαῦτα ὅπλα ἐκτήσαντο πρὸς τοσαύτην ἔφοδον καὶ ἐπιβουλὴν δῆμων, τυράννων, πόλεων, ἐθνῶν, τίνες ἔμελλον οἱ ἔνδεκα φανεῖσθαι; Φωνῆς γὰρ ἀκοῦσαι χρεμετίζοντος ἵππου δυνατὸν ἦν αὐτοῖς; πρὸς δὲ τὴν ὄψιν μόνην οὐκ ἂν κατεπλάγησαν τῶν στρατοπέδων, ἐν λίμναις καὶ ποταμοῖς καὶ ἀκατίοις τραφέντες μικροῖς; Τίνος οὖν ἕνεκεν τοῦτο λέγει; Τὴν ἔφοδον τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐνδείξασθαι βουλόμενος, καὶ ὅτι μέλλουσιν αὐτὸν συλλαμβάνειν. Καὶ τοῦτο φανερώς μὲν οὐκ ἠθέλησεν εἰπεῖν, δι' αἰνιγμάτων δὲ, ὥστε μὴ θορυβῆσαι πάλιν αὐτοῦς. "Ὡσπερ οὖν ὅταν ἀκούσης αὐτοῦ λέγοντος, ὅτι "Ὁ ἠκούσατε εἰς τὸ οὖς, κηρύξατε ἐπὶ τῶν δωματίων, καὶ ὁ ἠκούσατε ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ, εἶπατε ἐν τῷ φωτί, οὐ τοῦτο ὑποπτεύεις, ὅτι κελεύει τοὺς στενωποὺς καὶ τὴν ἀγορὰν ἀφέντας ἐπὶ τῶν δωματίων κηρύττειν· οὐδὲ γὰρ φαίνονται τοῦτο ποιήσαντες οἱ μαθηταί· ἀλλὰ τὸ, 'Επὶ τῶν δωματίων, καὶ τὸ, 'Ἐν τῷ φωτί, τὸ μετὰ παρρησίας αἰνίττεται· τὸ δὲ, Εἰς τὸ οὖς, καὶ τὸ, 'Ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ, τοῦτο δηλοῖ, ὅτι "Ὅπερ ἐν μικρῷ μέρει τῆς οἰκουμένης, καὶ ἐν ἐνὶ χωρίῳ τῆς Παλαιστίνης ἠκούσατε, τοῦτο πανταχοῦ τῆς γῆς ἐξ-[201]ηγήσατε. Οὐ γὰρ δὴ ἐν σκοτίᾳ, οὐδὲ εἰς τὸ οὖς διελέγετο αὐτοῖς, ἀλλ' ἐφ' ὑψηλῶν τῶν ὀρέων, καὶ ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς πολλάκις. Οὕτω καὶ ἐνταῦθα ὑποληπτέον. "Ὡσπερ οὖν ἐκεῖ δῶματα ἀκούοντες, ἐτέρως ἐνόησαμεν, οὕτω καὶ ἐνταῦθα μαχαίρας ἀκούοντες, μὴ τοῦτο νομίσωμεν, ὅτι ἐπέταξε μαχαίρας κεκτῆσθαι, ἀλλ' ὅτι διὰ τῶν μαχαिरῶν τὴν ἐνεστώσαν αἰνίττεται ἐπιβουλὴν, καὶ ὅτι μέλλει πάσχειν παρὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ἅπερ ἔπαθε. Καὶ τοῦτο ἐκ τῶν ἐξῆς δῆλον. Εἰπὼν γὰρ, Ἀγοράσει μάχαιραν, ἐπήγαγε· Δεῖ γὰρ τὰ γεγραμμένα περὶ ἐμοῦ τελεσθῆναι, ὅτι ἐν τοῖς ἀνόμοις ἐλογίσθη. Εἰπόντων δὲ ἐκείνων, ὅτι Εἰσὶν ὧδε δύο

67. ἔφοδος, also "approach," as in the second sentence after this one.

68. Chrysostom assumes the cohort that apprehends Jesus in the garden are "the Jews," a harmonizing of John 18:12 with the Synoptics, where those who arrest Jesus are a variable "crowd" or "cohort" sent by the chief priests and scribes or Pharisees (cf. also John 18:3).

69. αἰνιγμα: "hint," "puzzle," "dark saying," "figure," "type," "symbol," part of the vocabulary of nonliteral meanings (notice the contrast here with φανερώς).

70. Chrysostom's partially paraphrased quotation reverses the two halves of the verse and changes both ὁ ἀκούετε and ὁ λέγω ὑμῖν to ὁ ἠκούσατε to render them parallel.

71. John contests that anyone would assume the literal meaning for this passage.

72. Note the interplay between the clear and unclear, the literal and the figurative (what I term "the veil-scale" in *PCBCH* 58–78).

73. ἐτέρως νοεῖν, a phrase synonymous with the etymology of ἀλληγορεῖν: to interpret, or mean, something other than what is stated.

also a shield, a helmet, and leg armor. Actually, if he were going to procure such equipment in a normal human way, how would this command not be laughable in so many respects? If the apostles had acquired thousands of weapons like this, what would they look like in the face of a mighty onslaught⁶⁷ and plot from peoples, tyrants, cities, and nations? Could they even recognize the sound of a horse neighing? Wouldn't they be absolutely terrified at the mere appearance of opposing armies, given that they were brought up amid harbors, rivers, and little boats? So why does Christ say this? He wishes to point to the approach of the Jews⁶⁸ and the fact that they are going to apprehend him. He did not wish to say this openly but figuratively,⁶⁹ so as not to upset them again. Likewise, when you hear him saying, "*What you have heard in the ear, proclaim upon the rooftops, and what you have heard in the dark, say in the light*" (Matt 10:27),⁷⁰ you don't suppose he is commanding them to leave the alleyways and marketplace to proclaim upon on the rooftops.⁷¹ Nor do the disciples appear to have done this. But "*upon the rooftops*" and "*in the light*" are figurative ways of saying "openly."⁷² And "*in the ear*" and "*in the dark*" mean this: "what you have heard in a small part of the world and in the single territory of Palestine, go and shout [201] out throughout the entire world." After all, he didn't speak to them "*in darkness*" or "*in the ear*," but upon high mountains and often in synagogues. We should understand this passage (Luke 22:36b) in the same way. Just as in the latter case when we hear "*rooftops*" we understand something else,⁷³ thus also here when we hear "*sword*," let's not suppose that he commanded them to acquire a sword, but rather that by the reference to "swords," he is figuratively speaking of the plot that is underway and the fact that he is going to suffer the things that he suffered at the hands of the Jews. This is clear from what follows; for after saying, "*he will buy a sword*,"⁷⁴ he added, "*For it is necessary for what was written about me to be brought to completion, 'He was reckoned among the lawless'*" (Luke 22:36–37, quoting Isa 53:12).⁷⁵ And after they said, "*There are two swords*

74. As noted above, John quotes Luke 22:36 with the reading of \mathfrak{M} (i.e., ἀγοράσει for ἀγορασάτω), and he now appears to supply Judas as the intended subject of this prediction by Jesus, as will be fulfilled in the swords carried by those arresting Jesus in Matt 26:47; cf. Luke 22:47–52.

75. Although John introduces this as a quotation, it is more a paraphrase, despite three words in common. Chrysostom: δεῖ γὰρ τὰ γεγραμμένα περὶ ἐμοῦ τελεσθῆναι, ὅτι ἐν τοῖς ἀνόμοις ἐλογίσθη. \mathfrak{M} : ἔτι τοῦτο τὸ γεγραμμένον δεῖ τελεσθῆναι ἐν ἐμοί, τὸ Καὶ μετὰ ἀνόμων ἐλογίσθη.

μάχαιραι, καὶ τὸ λεχθὲν μὴ συνιέντων, φησὶν, Ἰκανόν ἐστι Καίτοι γε οὐκ ἦν ἰκανόν· εἰ μὲν γὰρ ἀνθρωπίνῃ βοηθείᾳ κεχρηῆσθαι αὐτοὺς ἐβούλετο, οὐ μόνον δύο καὶ τρεῖς, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἑκατὸν ἦσαν ἰκαναὶ μάχαιραι· εἰ δὲ οὐκ ἐβούλετο ἀνθρωπίνῃ βοηθείᾳ αὐτοὺς κεχρηῆσθαι, καὶ αἱ δύο περιτταί. Ἄλλ' ὅμως οὐκ ἐξεκάλυψε τὸ αἰνίγμα· καὶ γὰρ πολλαχοῦ φαίνεται τοῦτο ποιῶν· ἐπειδὴ μὴ νοήσωσι τὸ λεχθὲν, παρατρέχει καὶ ἀφήσι, τῇ τῶν πραγμάτων ἐκβάσει τῶν μετὰ ταῦτα τὴν κατανόησιν τῶν εἰρημένων ἐπιτρέπων λοιπόν· ὅπερ οὖν καὶ ἄλλαχοῦ ἐποίησε. Καὶ γὰρ περὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως αὐτοῦ διαλεγόμενος, οὕτω πως ἔλεγε· Λύσατε τὸν ναὸν τοῦτον, καὶ ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις ἐγερῶ αὐτόν. Καὶ ὅμως οὐκ ᾔδεισαν οἱ μαθηταὶ τὸ λεγόμενον· καὶ ὅτι οὐκ ᾔδεισαν, οὐ εὐαγγελιστῆς ἐπεσημήνατο, λέγων· Ὅτε δὲ ἀνέστη ὁ Ἰησοῦς, τότε ἐπίστευσαν τῷ λόγῳ αὐτοῦ, καὶ τῇ Γραφῇ. Καὶ πάλιν ἄλλαχοῦ· Οὐδὲ γὰρ ᾔδεισαν, ὅτι δεῖ αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀναστῆναι.

δ'. Ἀλλὰ τὸ μὲν ζήτημα ἰκανὴν ἔχει τὴν λύσιν· ἡμεῖς δὲ ἐπὶ τὸ λειπόμενον τῆς προσθήσεως μέρος τὸν λόγον ἀγάγωμεν. Τί ποτ' οὖν ἐστὶ τὸ λεγόμενον, καὶ πόθεν εἰς ταῦτα ἐξέβημεν; Ἐμακαρίζομεν τὴν Πρίσκιλλαν καὶ τὸν Ἀκύλαν, ὅτι συνώκουσιν τῷ Παύλῳ, ὅτι καὶ τὸν τρόπον τῆς στολῆς, καὶ τὸν τρόπον τῶν ὑποδημάτων, καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ἅπαντα μετὰ ἀκριβείας αὐτοῦ κατεμάνθανον. Ἐντεῦθεν τὸ ζήτημα ἡμῖν ἐτέχθη τοῦτο. Ἐζητοῦμεν γὰρ, τίνας ἔνεκεν, τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἀπαγορεύοντος μηδὲν ὅλως ἔχειν, εἰ μὴ μόνον ἱμάτιον, ἐφαίνοντο καὶ ὑποδήματα καὶ φελόνην ἔχοντες. Εἶτα ὁ λόγος ἀπέδειξεν, ὅτι οὐ παραβαίνοντες τὸν νόμον, ἀλλὰ καὶ σφόδρα τηροῦντες τούτοις ἐχρῶντο. Ταῦτα δὲ ἐλέγομεν, οὐκ εἰς περισυσίαν χρημάτων ὑμᾶς ἀλείφοντες, οὐδὲ παρακαλοῦντες πλείω τῆς χρείας κεκτῆσθαι, ἀλλ' ἵνα ἔχγητε πρὸς τοὺς ἀπίστους ἀντιλέγειν τοὺς διαχλευάζοντας τὰ ἡμέτερα. Καὶ γὰρ ὁ Χριστὸς

76. With εἰσὶν ὧδε δύο μάχαιραι for ἰδοὺ, μάχαιραι ὧδε δύο.

77. ἐκκαλύπτειν, part of the hermeneutics of the “veil scale.”

78. αἰνίγμα, translated above with forms of “figure” or “figurative,” here clearly contrasted with what is “veiled.”

79. Much paraphrased: with ὅτε δὲ ἀνέστη for ὅτε οὖν ἡγέρθη; plus τότε before ἐπίστευσαν and after ellipsis; τῷ λόγῳ αὐτοῦ, καὶ τῇ γραφῇ for τῇ γραφῇ, καὶ τῷ λόγῳ ᾧ εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς.

80. With οὐδέ for οὐδέπω; minus τὴν γραφὴν after ᾔδεισαν.

81. ζήτημα, referring back to the ζήτησις about Luke 22:36 (which was itself generated by the prior ζήτησις about apostolic possessions, an apparent violation of Matt 10:9–10). John asserts that he has solved this problem by appeal to different historical circumstances and to Christ having used figurative speech that is not to be taken literally.

here" (Luke 22:39),⁷⁶ because they didn't understand his statement, Christ says, "*It is enough*" (Luke 22:38). Yet of course it was not enough. For if he had wished them to have made use of human assistance, not just two or three but even a hundred swords would have been insufficient. But if he didn't wish them to avail themselves of human means of assistance, then even two are excessive. Nonetheless, he did not unveil⁷⁷ the cloaked meaning.⁷⁸ Christ clearly did this often. When they don't comprehend what he has said, he moves on and lets it be, allowing the full apprehension of what he has said to arise from the unfolding of subsequent events. He did this in other places too. For instance, when discussing his resurrection, he spoke as follows: "*Destroy this temple, and I shall raise it in three days*" (John 2:19). But nevertheless the disciples didn't understand what had been said. The evangelist indicated that they didn't understand, saying, "*When Jesus was raised ... then they believed in his statement and in the Scripture*" (John 2:22).⁷⁹ And again, in another place, "*For they did not understand that it was necessary for him to rise from the dead*" (John 20:9).⁸⁰

4. Now the problem⁸¹ has a satisfactory solution. So, let's direct our homily to the remaining portion of this named greeting.⁸² What then is this statement, and where were we when we digressed into these topics? We were pronouncing blessings on Priscilla and Aquila because they used to live with Paul and had accurate and detailed knowledge of the fashion of his garments, the style of his sandals, and all the other things about him. It was at this point that this problem arose for us. For we were inquiring about why, when Christ forbid them from having anything except a single garment, clearly Peter and Paul had both sandals and a cloak. Then our homily demonstrated that in having these things they were not transgressing the law but very much keeping it. We said these things not⁸³ to urge you to an excess of possessions or to encourage you to acquire more than you need, but so you might have means to refute the unbelievers who mock

82. Mf emended the text of HS and ME here, adopting the reading τῆς προσηρσεως (from Coislin. 243) for πρῶην ῥήσεως (misspelled in PE and PG as πρῶην), which he regarded as a faulty reading ("perperam"). But this can be disputed, since the phrase meaning "of the reading from the previous time" works fine as well (both readings appropriately refer back to Hom. Rom. 16:3 A §1 [PG 51:189]).

83. This formulation often indicates that John sees a potential problem that may have arisen in his line of argument in providing the solution; in this case, a defense of certain possessions by the two chiefs of the apostles could possibly be perceived as a counterargument to his general exhortations to ἀκτημοσύνη, "renunciation of possessions."

λύσας τὸν πρότερον νόμον, οὐχὶ οἰκίας, οὐδὲ ἀνδράποδα, οὐδὲ κλίνας, οὐδὲ ἀργυρώματα, οὐδὲ ἄλλο τι τοιοῦτον οὐδὲν ἐκέλευσεν ἔχειν, ἀλλὰ τῆς ἀνάγκης ἀπηλλάχθαι τῶν πρότερον εἰρημένων. Καὶ ὁ Παῦλος δὲ οὕτω παρῆναι λέγων· Ἔχοντες τροφὰς καὶ σκεπάσματα, τούτοις ἀρκεσθισόμεθα. Τὸ γὰρ περιττὸν τῆς χρείας εἰς τοὺς δεομένους ἀναλίσκεσθαι δεῖ.

καθάπερ οὖν καὶ οὗτοι ἐποιοῦν, Πρίσκιλλα καὶ Ἀκύλας. Διόπερ αὐτοὺς ἐπαινεῖ καὶ θαυμάζει, καὶ μέγιστον αὐτῶν συντίθησιν ἐγκώμιον. Εἰπὼν γὰρ, Ἀσπάσασθε Πρίσκιλλαν καὶ Ἀκύλαν τοὺς συνεργούς μου ἐν Κυρίῳ, καὶ τὴν αἰτίαν τίθησι τῆς τοιαύτης ἀγάπης. Ποίαν δὴ ταύτην; Οἵτινες ὑπὲρ τῆς ψυχῆς μου, φησὶ, τὸν ἑαυτῶν τράχηλον ὑπέθηκαν. Οὐκοῦν διὰ τοῦτο αὐτοὺς ἀγαπᾷς καὶ φιλεῖς, ἴσως εἴποι τις; Μάλιστα μὲν οὖν· εἰ καὶ τοῦτο μόνον ἦν, ἀρκοῦν ἐγκώμιον ἦν. Ὁ γὰρ τὸν στρατηγὸν σώσας, τοὺς στρατιώτας διέσωσεν ἄν· ὁ τὸν ἱατρὸν ἀπαλλάξας τῶν κινδύνων, τοὺς κάμνοντας εἰς ὑγίαν ἐπανήγαγεν· ὁ τὸν κυβερνήτην ἐξαρπάσας τοῦ κλύδωνος, τὸ πλοῖον ὅλον [202] τῶν κυμάτων ἀπήλλαξεν· οὕτω καὶ οἱ τὸν διδάσκαλον τῆς οἰκουμένης διασώσαντες, καὶ τὸ αἷμα τὸ ἑαυτῶν ἐκχέαντες ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐκείνου σωτηρίας, κοινοὶ τῆς οἰκουμένης ἦσαν εὐεργέται, ἐν τῇ περὶ τὸν διδάσκαλον προνοίᾳ τοὺς μαθητὰς ἅπαντας διασώσαντες. Ἰνα δὲ μάθῃς, ὅτι οὐ περὶ τὸν διδάσκαλον ἦσαν τοιοῦτοι μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τῶν ἀδελφῶν τὴν αὐτὴν ἐπεδείκνυντο πρόνοιαν, ἄκουσον τῶν ἐξῆς. Εἰπὼν γὰρ, Οἵτινες ὑπὲρ τῆς ψυχῆς μου τὸν ἑαυτῶν τράχηλον ὑπέθηκαν, ἐπήγαγε λέγων· Οἷς οὐκ ἐγὼ μόνος εὐχαριστῶ, ἀλλὰ καὶ πᾶσαι αἱ Ἐκκλησίαι τῶν ἐθνῶν. Τί λέγεις; σκηνοποιῖς, πτωχοῖς χειροτέχναις, οὐδὲν πλεον τῆς ἀναγκαίας ἔχουσι τροφῆς, πᾶσαι αἱ Ἐκκλησίαι τῶν ἐθνῶν εὐχαριστοῦσι; καὶ τί τοσοῦτον οἱ δύο οὗτοι Ἐκκλησίας τοσαύτας ὠφελῆσαι ἴσχυσαν; ποίαν χρημάτων εἶχον περιουσίαν; ποῖον δυναστείας μέγεθος; τίνα παρὰ ἄρχουσι παρρησίαν; Χρημάτων μὲν περιουσίαν καὶ δυναστείαν παρὰ τοῖς κρατοῦσιν οὐκ ἐκέκτηντο· ὁ δὲ τούτων ἀπάντων μεῖζον ἦν, προθυμίαν γενναίαν καὶ ψυχὴν πρὸς κινδύνους παρατεταγμένην μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς περιουσίας εἶχον. Διὰ τοῦτο πολλῶν εὐεργέται ἐγένοντο καὶ σωτῆρες. Οὐ γὰρ οὕτως οἱ πλουτοῦντες καὶ ψοφοδεεῖς ὡς οἱ πενία συζῶντες καὶ μεγαλόψυχοι τὰς Ἐκκλησίας ὠφελεῖν δύναιτ' ἄν. Καὶ μηδεὶς παράδοξον εἶναι νομίζεται

84. As noted above (184 n. 24), John consistently cites the lemma with ἐν κυρίῳ for ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.

85. The PE editors offer in the note a conjectural reading plus ἄν (ἴσως εἴποι τις ἄν), as expected with the optative.

86. Paul was asked and then answered the question. The explanation for it that follows seems to come in the voice of Chrysostom.

our teachings. Furthermore, when Christ dissolved the earlier law (sc. Matt 10:9–10), he did not command them to possess houses or slaves or beds or silver plates or any other such thing, but he freed them from being compelled to obey the former instructions. Paul also advises this same thing when he says, “*If we have food and shelter, we shall be content with that*” (1 Tim 6:8). Anything in excess of what we need should be spent for those in need.

This is exactly what those two, Priscilla and Aquila, used to do. That’s why Paul praises and admires them and composes a great encomium to them. For after stating, “*Greet Priscilla and Aquila my coworkers in the Lord*” (Rom 16:3),⁸⁴ he sets down the reason for such love. And what was that? “*Who put their own necks at risk for my life,*” he says (Rom 16:4a). “Well, was this the reason you love and cherish them, Paul?” someone might say.⁸⁵ “Yes, especially this.”⁸⁶ If it were the sole reason, it would be a sufficient cause for praise. Because the one who has saved the general has saved the soldiers; the one who freed the doctor from danger has led the sick to health; the one who pulled the pilot out of the surf [202] has rescued the whole boat from the waves. In the same way, those who saved the teacher of the world and poured out their blood on behalf of his safety were the common benefactors of the whole world, because they saved all the disciples by their care for their teacher. Listen to what comes after this, so you might learn that they behaved like this not only for their teacher, but they showed the same care for the brothers and sisters, also. After saying, “*Who put their own necks at risk for my life,*” he continues, saying, “*for whom not only I give thanks, but also all the churches of the gentiles*” (Rom 16:4b). “What are you saying, Paul? Do all the churches of the gentiles give thanks for tentmakers, poor manual laborers who have nothing more than the food they need to get by? Why were these two able to benefit so very many churches? What abundance of possessions did they have? What magnitude of power? What boldness in the face of rulers?”⁸⁷ They hadn’t acquired an abundance of possessions and power from those who hold onto such things, but instead something greater than all these: they had a noble will and a soul that stood with abundant resolve in the face of dangers. That’s why they were the benefactors and saviors of all. For those who live in poverty and have a generous spirit may be able to benefit the church in a way that the rich and fearful cannot. Let no one think what I just said is incred-

87. This seems to be the end of Chrysostom’s direct questions to Paul, followed by John’s own answer on Paul’s behalf.

τὸ λεγόμενον· ἀληθές γάρ ἐστι, καὶ ἀπ' αὐτῶν δείκνυται τῶν πραγμάτων. Ὁ μὲν γὰρ πλούσιος πολλὰς ἔχει τοῦ παραβλάπτεσθαι τὰς λαβὰς. Δέδοικεν ὑπὲρ οἰκίας, ὑπὲρ οἰκετῶν, ὑπὲρ ἀγρῶν, ὑπὲρ χρημάτων, μὴ τις αὐτόν τι τούτων ἀφέληται. Καὶ τὸ πολλῶν εἶναι κύριον, πολλῶν εἶναι δοῦλον ποιεῖ. Ὁ μέντοι πένης, εὖζωνός τις ὢν καὶ πάσας ταύτας ἀποθέμενος τὰς λαβὰς, λέων ἐστὶ πῦρ πνέων, καὶ ψυχὴν ἔχει γενναίαν, καὶ πάντων ἐξανιστάμενος ῥαδίως ἅπαντα πράττει τὰ δυνάμενα τὰς Ἐκκλησίας ὠφελεῖν, κἂν ἐλέγξαι δέη, κἂν ἐπιτιμῆσαι, κἂν μυρίας διὰ τὸν Χριστὸν ἀναδέξασθαι ἐπαχθείας· καὶ ἐπειδὴ ἅπαξ τῆς ζωῆς ὑπερεῖδε τῆς παρουσίας, πάντα ῥαδίως καὶ μετὰ πολλῆς ποιεῖ τῆς εὐκολίας. Τί γὰρ καὶ δέδοικεν, εἰπέ μοι; Μὴ τις αὐτοῦ τὰ χρήματα ἀφέληται; Ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔστι τοῦτο εἰπεῖν. Ἀλλὰ μὴ τῆς πατρίδος ἐκπέση; Ἀλλὰ πᾶσα ἡ ὑπ' οὐρανὸν πόλις αὐτῷ ἐστίν. Ἀλλὰ μὴ τῆς τρυφῆς αὐτόν τις περικόψη καὶ τῆς δορυφορίας; Ἀλλὰ καὶ τούτοις ἅπασι χαίρειν εἰπὼν, ἐν οὐρανῷ πολιτεύεται, καὶ πρὸς τὴν μέλλουσαν ἐπέιγεται ζωὴν. Κἂν αὐτὴν ἐπιδοῦναι δέη τὴν ψυχὴν, καὶ τὸ αἷμα εἰσενεγκεῖν, οὐ παραιτήσεται. Ἐντεῦθεν ὁ τοιοῦτος καὶ τυράννων, καὶ βασιλέων, καὶ δέμων, καὶ πάντων ἐστὶ δυνάτωτέρος τε καὶ εὐπορώτερος.

Καὶ ἵνα μάθῃς ὅτι οὐ κολακεία τὸ λεγόμενον, ἀλλ' ἀληθῶς, οἱ μὴδὲν κεκτημένοι, οὗτοι μάλιστα πάντων ἐλευθεροστομεῖν δύναντ' ἂν, πόσοι πλούσιοι κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν ἦσαν Ἡρώδου; πόσοι δυνάσται; τίς παρήλθεν εἰς μέσον; τίς ἐπετίμησε τῷ τυράννῳ; τίς ἤμυνεν ἀδικουμένοις τοῖς τοῦ Θεοῦ νόμοις; Τῶν μὲν εὐπόρων οὐδεὶς· ὁ δὲ πένης καὶ πτωχός, ὁ μὴ κλίνην, μήτε τράπεζαν, μήτε στέγην ἔχων, ὁ τῆς ἐρήμου πολιτῆς Ἰωάννης, οὗτος μόνος καὶ πρῶτος μετὰ παρρησίας ἀπάσης τὸν τύραννον ἤλεγχε, καὶ τοὺς μοιχαλίους ἐξεκάλυπτε γάμους, καὶ παρόντων ἀπάντων καὶ ἀκουόντων, τὴν καταδικάζουσαν αὐτὸν ἐξέφερε ψῆφον. Καὶ πρὸ τούτου δὲ πάλιν ὁ μέγας Ἡλίας, τῆς μηλωτῆς μὴδὲν κεκτημένος πλέον, τὸν ἀσεβῆ καὶ παράνομον [203] Ἀχαάβ ἐκείνον μόνος ἤλεγξε μετὰ πολλῆς ἀνδρείας. Οὐδὲν γὰρ οὕτως ἐλευθεροστομεῖν παρασκευάζει, καὶ θαρρεῖν ἐν ἅπασι πείθει τοῖς δεινοῖς, καὶ ἀναλώτους ἐργάζεται καὶ ἰσχυροὺς, ὡς τὸ μὴδὲν κεκτηῖσθαι, μὴδὲ περιβολὴν τινα πραγμάτων ἔχειν. Ὡστε εἴ τις βούλοιο πολλὴν κεκτηῖσθαι δύναμιν

88. The translation retains the masculine pronouns here, consistent with the imagery of (male) estate ownership and athletic contests.

89. λαβή literally means a wrestling “hold” or “grip” and metaphorically a “handle” or an “opportunity” (LSJ II and III); it is a favored image of John’s. Here it means both the girth by which one can be grabbed and the chance to grab it. In the sentences that follow, John describes the poor person as a lean (“stripped down”) and nimble grappler.

90. PE calls attention to HS’s marginal note here, ἀλλὰ μίαν εἶναι νομίζει τὴν ἄνω

ible, for it is true and it is shown from the facts themselves. For a rich man⁸⁸ has many holdings⁸⁹ by which he can be harmed. He fears for his house, his slaves, his fields, his possessions, worried that someone might deprive him of any of them. Being the owner of many things makes one a slave of many things. But the poor man is stripped down for the contest and deflects all these attempts to lay a hold on him. He is a lion breathing fire, and he possesses a noble soul; being free from all these things, he readily does all he can to benefit the churches, whether there is need to give a reproof, offer a rebuke, or to accept countless burdens for the sake of Christ. And since he has renounced the present life once and for all, he accomplishes all these things readily and easily. Now tell me, what's he afraid of? Could someone deprive him of his possessions? No, one can't say that. Could someone exile him from his homeland? No, all the earth below the heavens is his city.⁹⁰ Could someone cut him off from luxury and from his bodyguards? No, declaring that he even rejoices (cf. Phil 2:17; 3:1; 4:1) in all such experiences, he has his citizenship in heaven (cf. Phil 3:20), and he strives for the future life. Even if he must give up his very life and offer his blood, he will not refuse. Because of this, people like him are more powerful and prosperous than tyrants, emperors, peoples, and all humanity.

So that you might learn that it is not a matter of flattery but the truth to say that those who have no possessions are able to speak out more freely than all, let me ask you: How many rich people were there at the time of Herod? How many who were powerful? Which of them came forward to speak out publicly? Who rebuked the tyrant? Who constantly defended God's laws when they were wronged? None of the prosperous. But the poor and impoverished man, who had neither a bed nor a table nor a roof, John, the citizen of the desert, who alone and first accused the tyrant with utter boldness, disclosed his adulterous marriage and, with all present and listening, broadcast the judgment condemning him (cf. Matt 14:3–12 and parr.). And before John, once again the great Elijah, possessing nothing more than a sheepskin, [203] alone and with tremendous bravery accused the impious and lawless Ahab (3 Kgdms 20:17–29). Nothing prepares people to speak out freely and convinces one to have confidence in all terrible trials and makes them incorruptible and strong as does not having acquired any possessions and not having anything cloaking their affairs. Therefore, if any wish to acquire great power, let them welcome poverty,

("but he considered there to be only one city, the one that is above") for ἀλλὰ πᾶσα ἡ ὑπ' οὐρανὸν πόλις αὐτῷ ἐστίν (as translated above).

ἀσπασάσθω πενίαν, καταφρονείτω τῆς παρούσης ζωῆς, μηδὲν εἶναι νομιζέτω θάνατον. Οὗτος οὐχὶ τῶν εὐπόρων μόνον, οὐδὲ τῶν ἀρχόντων, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτῶν τῶν βασιλευόντων πλείονα τὰς Ἐκκλησίας ὠφελῆσαι δυνήσεται. Οἱ μὲν γὰρ βασιλεύοντες καὶ οἱ εὐποροί, ὅσα ἂν ποιήσωσιν, ἀπὸ χρημάτων ποιοῦσιν· ὁ δὲ τοιοῦτος πολλάκις καὶ ἀπὸ κινδύνων καὶ ἀπὸ θανάτων πολλὰ καὶ μεγάλα συνετέλεσεν. Ὅσω δὲ χρυσίου παντὸς τιμιώτερον αἷμα, τοσούτῳ βελτίων ἐκείνης αὕτη ἢ εἰσφορά.

ε'. Τοιοῦτοί τινες ἦσαν καὶ οὗτοι οἱ Παύλου ξενοδόχοι, ἡ Πρίσκιλλα καὶ ὁ Ἀκύλας, οἱ χρημάτων μὲν περιουσίαν οὐκ εἶχον, πλούτου δὲ παντὸς εὐπορωτέραν ἐκέκτηντο γνώμην, καθ' ἑκάστην ἀποθανεῖσθαι προσδοκῶντες ἡμέραν, καὶ ἐν σφαγαῖς καὶ αἵμασι ζῶντες, καὶ διὰ παντὸς μαρτυροῦντες τοῦ χρόνου. Διὰ τοῦτο ἦνθι τὰ ἡμέτερα κατὰ τοὺς καιροὺς ἐκείνους, ὅτι οὕτω μὲν οἱ μαθηταὶ τοῖς διδασκάλοις, οὕτω δὲ οἱ διδάσκαλοι συνεδέδεντο τοῖς μαθηταῖς. Οὐ γὰρ δὴ περὶ τούτων μόνον φησὶν ὁ Παῦλος, ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ ἐτέρων πολλῶν. Καὶ γὰρ Ἑβραίοις καὶ Θεσσαλονικεῦσι γράφων καὶ Γαλάταις, πολλὴν ἅπασι μαρτυρεῖ πειρασμῶν ἐπαγωγὴν, καὶ δείκνυσιν δι' ὧν ἐπέστελλεν, ὅτι καὶ ἠλαύνοντο καὶ τῆς πατρίδος ἐξέπιπτον, καὶ τὰς οὐσίας ἀπώλλουν, καὶ μέχρις αὐτοῦ τοῦ αἵματος ἐκινδύνευον· καὶ ἅπας ἐναγώνιος αὐτοῖς ὁ βίος ἦν, καὶ αὐτὰ δὲ ἀκρωτηριασθῆναι τὰ μέλη οὐκ ἂν ὑπὲρ τῶν διδασκάλων παρητήσαντο. Τοῖς γοῦν Γαλάταις ἐπιστέλλων ἔλεγε· Μαρτυρῶ γὰρ ὑμῖν, ὅτι, εἰ δυνατόν, τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ὑμῶν ἐξορύξαντες ἂν ἐδώκατέ μοι. Καὶ τὸν Ἐπαφρᾶν δὲ τὸν ἐν Κολοσσαῖς ἐπὶ τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἀποδέχεται πάλιν, εἰπὼν, ὅτι Ἡσθένησε παραπλήσιον θανάτου, καὶ ἠλέησεν αὐτὸν ὁ Θεός, οὐκ αὐτὸν δὲ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐμέ, ἵνα μὴ λύπην ἐπὶ λύπῃ σχῶ. Οὕτω δὲ εἶπε δεικνύς, ὅτι δικαίως ἔμελλεν ἀλγεῖν ἐπὶ τῇ τελευτῇ τοῦ μαθητοῦ. Καὶ τὴν ἀρετὴν δὲ αὐτοῦ πάλιν ἐκκαλύπτει πᾶσιν, οὕτωςί λέγων, ὅτι Ἠγγισε μέχρι θανάτου παραβουλευσάμενος τῇ ψυχῇ, ἵνα ἀναπληρώσῃ τὸ ὑμῶν ὑστέρημα τῆς πρὸς με λειτουργίας.

Τί γένοιτ' ἂν ἐκείνων μακαριώτερον, τί δὲ ἡμῶν ἀθλιώτερον; εἴ γε ἐκεῖνοι μὲν καὶ τὸ αἷμα, καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ὑπὲρ τῶν διδασκάλων προΐεντο, ἡμεῖς δὲ

91. John is probably thinking, e.g., of Heb 11:13–40; 1 Thess 1:6–8; 2:14–16; see below for his explicit citations of Galatians.

92. John identifies the Ἐπαφράς mentioned in Col 1:7; 4:12; Phlm 23 with Ἐπαφρόδιτος, likely a longer form of the same name, in Philippians. (He does so despite the description in Phil 2:25 that the latter clearly represents the Macedonian Philippian church, not that at Colossae.)

93. With καὶ ἠλέησεν αὐτὸν ὁ θεός for ἀλλὰ ὁ θεός αὐτὸν ἠλέησεν; ἐπὶ λύπῃ for ἐπὶ λύπην.

94. With transposition of μέχρι θανάτου and ἤγγισεν.

let them despise the present life, let them consider death to be nothing. The person who is like this will be able to benefit the churches more than anyone can—not only more than the affluent, but even more than the rulers and the emperors. While the emperors and the affluent enact what they do out of their possessions, the poor most often accomplish many great things out of dangers and deadly threats. The contribution of the poor outweighs that of the rich as much as blood is more precious than gold.

5. This is precisely the kind of people that Paul's hosts Priscilla and Aquila were; they didn't have an abundance of things, but they possessed a resoluteness that was a greater source of success than all wealth, expecting every single day to be put to death, in a life filled with wounds and bloodshed, and constantly bearing witness. This is the reason our Christian teaching was flourishing in those days: because the students were bound to their teachers in the same way as teachers were to their students. Paul says this not only about them but also many others. For example, when writing to the Hebrews, the Thessalonians, and the Galatians,⁹¹ he gives testimony to all of them of the great onslaught of trials, and he shows through what he wrote in the letters that they were driven out and exiled from their home country, lost their possessions, and faced dangers even to the point of death. Their entire life was a battle, and they didn't hold back from even cutting off their own body parts for the sake of their teachers. Indeed, when writing to the Galatians, he said, *"For I testify to you that, if possible, you would have dug out your eyes and given them to me"* (Gal 4:15). Once again, when he commends Epaphras who lived in Colossae⁹² for the same things, he says, *"He was sick near to death, and God had mercy on him—not him alone but also on me, so that I might not have grief upon grief"* (Phil 2:27).⁹³ In saying this, Paul was demonstrating that he was rightly going to grieve at the death of the disciple. Paul reveals Epaphras's virtue again to all when he says, *"He drew near to death, risking his life so that he might complete what you could not do in service to me"* (Phil 2:30).⁹⁴

What could be more blessed than they?⁹⁵ What more wretched than we?⁹⁶ After all, they gave up both their blood and their lives on behalf of

95. I.e., for Chrysostom, the saints of the earliest church who were students of the apostles.

96. Mf notes that he adopts the reading of Coislin. 243 here, *τί δὲ ἡμῶν ἀθλιώτερον* (which was also in the Greek manuscript that Gelenius had translated into Latin in the sixteenth century), as translated in the text above, but lacking in ME (and HS).

οὐδὲ ῥῆμα ψιλὸν πολλάκις προέσθαι τολμῶμεν ὑπὲρ τῶν κοινῶν πατέρων, ἀλλὰ ἀκούοντες αὐτοὺς βλασφημουμένους, λοιδορουμένους κακῶς καὶ παρὰ τῶν οἰκείων καὶ παρὰ τῶν ἀλλοτρίων, οὐκ ἐπιστομίζομεν τοὺς λέγοντας, οὐ καλύομεν, οὐκ ἐλέγχομεν. Εἴθε μὲν οὖν μὴ αὐτοὶ τῆς κακηγορίας ἤρχομεν ταύτης. Νυνὶ δὲ οὐ τοσαῦτα παρὰ τῶν ἀπίστων σκώμματα καὶ ὀνειδή, ὅσα παρὰ τῶν δοκούντων εἶναι πιστῶν καὶ μεθ' ἡμῶν τετάχθαι γινόμενα εἰς τοὺς ἄρχοντας ἴδοι τις ἂν. Ἔτι οὖν ζητήσομεν πόθεν ῥαθυμία τοσαύτη καὶ εὐλαβείας ὑπεροψία γέγονεν, ὅταν οὕτως ὤμεν ἀπεχθῶς πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας διακείμενοι τοὺς ἡμετέρους; Οὐ γάρ ἐστιν, οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδὲν, ὃ καταλύσαι καὶ διαφθεῖραι Ἐκκλησίαν δύναται ἂν, μᾶλλον δὲ οὐκ ἔστιν οὕτω γενέσθαι τοῦτο ἀλλαχόθεν ῥαδίως, ἀλλ' ἢ ὅταν οἱ μαθηταὶ τοῖς διδασκάλοις, καὶ τοῖς πατράσιν οἱ παῖδες, καὶ τοῖς ἄρχουσιν οἱ ἀρχόμενοι μὴ μετὰ πολλῆς ὥσι συνδεδεμένοι τῆς ἀκριβείας. Εἴτα ἂν μὲν τὸν ἀδελφόν τις [204] εἶπη κακῶς, καὶ τῆς ἀναγνώσεως τῶν θείων ἀπείργεται Γραφῶν. Ἵνα τί γὰρ ἀναλαμβάνεις τὴν διαθήκην μου διὰ στόματός σου; φησὶν ὁ Θεός· εἴτα τὴν αἰτίαν τιθεις, ἐπήγαγε· Καθήμενος κατὰ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου κατελάλεις. Τὸν πνευματικὸν δὲ πατέρα κατηγορῶν, ἄξιον εἶναι νομίζεις σαυτὸν ἐπιβῆναι τῶν ἱερῶν προθύρων; Καὶ πῶς ἂν ἔχοι λόγον; Εἰ γὰρ οἱ κακολογοῦντες πατέρα ἢ μητέρα θανάτῳ τελευτῶσι, ποίας ἄξιος ἔσται δίκης ὁ τὸν πολλῶ τῶν γονέων ἐκείνων ἀναγκαιότερον ὄντα καὶ βελτίῳ τολμῶν λέγειν κακῶς; Καὶ οὐ δέδοικε, μήποτε διαστᾶσα ἡ γῆ παντελῶς αὐτὸν ἀφανίσῃ, ἢ σκηπτὸς ἄνωθεν κατενεχθεὶς καταφλέξῃ τὴν κατήγορον γλῶτταν; Οὐκ ἤκουσας τί πέπονθεν ἡ Μωϋσέως ἀδελφὴ κατειποῦσα τοῦ ἄρχοντος; πῶς ἀκάθαρτος γέγονε, καὶ εἰς λέπραν ἐνέπεσε, καὶ τὴν ἐσχάτην ὑπέμεινε ἀτιμίαν, καὶ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ παρακαλοῦντος καὶ τῷ Θεῷ προσπίπτοντος, οὐδεμιᾶς ἔτυχε συγγνώμης, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐκθεμένη τὸν ἅγιον ἐκείνον, καὶ πρὸς τὴν ἀνατροφὴν αὐτοῦ συντελέεσασα,

97. These κοινὸι πατέρες are bishops and priests (PGL A.1–2), whom John expects the congregation to defend from anticlerical calumny, just as Priscilla and Aquila (who now disappear from the homily) exhibited such loyalty to their teacher, Paul. Although we cannot be sure of the provenance (see p. 180 n. 1 above), one can imagine Chrysostom delivering this homily when a young priest, perhaps even in the presence of his bishop Flavian, as is argued by Kelly, *Golden Mouth*, 55–82, and in particular 100–103, who regards John's "progressive sharpening of his attacks on critics of the church's rulers (*archontes*) within his exegetical homilies ... as evidence of his increasingly confident identification with the leadership" (101). We can see throughout the argument that follows how John strategically presents himself as both an observer and even participant in the problem ("we" are perpetrating) and one who as a priest is targeted by it.

98. This could reflect the conflict of the Antiochene schism, involving rival bishops to Chrysostom's patron Flavian—Paulinus (362–388 CE) and (after 388–392

their teachers, while we often don't dare to offer a simple word on behalf of our common fathers.⁹⁷ Instead, when we hear them being slandered, wickedly reviled by both our own people and outsiders, we don't muzzle the speakers, we don't prevent them, we don't refute them. Would that we ourselves were not the first to engage in such maligning! But as it is, one can see that the jibes and rebukes unbelievers direct against our leaders aren't as terrible as those coming from people who are supposed to be believers and stand within our own ranks.⁹⁸ Will we need to look any further to find where such heedlessness and disdain for our reverence⁹⁹ comes from, when we show such hostility for our fathers? For there is nothing, nothing, that is able to destroy and ruin the church. Or, rather, from no other source can it happen more easily than when students and teachers, children and fathers, and the ruled and the rulers are not bound to one another with a very secure bond of unity. And yet those who malign a brother or a sister [204] have separated themselves from the reading of the divine Scriptures. For God says, "*For why ... do you take up my covenant with your mouth?*" (Ps 49:16),¹⁰⁰ and then he includes the reason for this, adding, "*You sit saying terrible things, attacking your brother*" (Ps 49:20). If you bring accusations against your spiritual father, do you consider yourself worthy to approach the holy gates? How would that make sense? After all, if those who malign father or mother are indeed put to death (cf. Exod 21:16),¹⁰¹ what sort of penalty will the person deserve who dares to malign someone so much more important and better than their parents? Should they not fear that the earth might rise up and completely obliterate them (cf. Num 16:32) or that a thunderbolt might come down from above and incinerate their accusing tongues (cf. Num 16:35)? Haven't you heard what happened to Moses's sister when she maligned the leader (cf. Num 12:1–15)? How she became unclean and contracted leprosy and endured the worst sort of dishonor, and how even though her brother begged and prostrated himself before God, she received no leniency? Instead, despite her having exposed the

CE) Evagrius. For historical overviews, see Shepardson, *Controlling Contested Places*, 15–19; Kelly, *Golden Mouth*, 100–103.

99. With *εὐλάβεια* here John is making a neat play between its meanings as "reverence" for bishops and even a title for the bishop ("your reverence"), as well as a general term for the Christian "religion" and its practices ("piety"). Full discussion in *PGL*, with references.

100. With ellipsis as marked.

101. Not an exact quotation, because John has made the subject plural to generalize the rule.

καὶ ὅπως ἡ μήτηρ γένοιτο τροφὸς, καὶ μὴ ἐν βαρβαρικῇ χειρὶ τραφῇ τὸ παιδίον ἐξαρχῆς συμπράξασα, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα στρατηγήσασα τοῦ γυναικείου γένους, καθάπερ Μωϋσῆς τοῦ τῶν ἀνδρῶν, καὶ πάντα συνδιενεγκοῦσα τὰ δεινὰ, καὶ ἀδελφῇ Μωϋσέως οὖσα, οὐδὲν ὅμως ἀπὸ τούτων ἀπάντων ἐκέρδανεν εἰς τὸ διαφυγεῖν τὴν ὀργὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐπὶ τῇ κακῇ κατηγόρᾳ; ἀλλ' ὁ Μωϋσῆς, ὁ τοσοῦτον λαὸν ἐξαιτησάμενος μετὰ τὴν ἄφατον ἀσέβειαν ἐκείνην, οὗτος ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀδελφῆς προσπίπτων καὶ συγγνώμην αἰτῶν, οὐκ ἴσχυσεν ἴλεω ποιῆσαι τὸν Θεόν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπετιμᾶτο σφοδρῶς· ἵνα μάθωμεν ἡμεῖς ὅσον κακὸν ἐστὶ, τὸ τοὺς ἄρχοντας λέγειν κακῶς, καὶ τοὺς ἐτέρων κρίνειν βίους.

Καὶ γὰρ ἐπὶ τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης, οὐκ ἀφ' ὧν ἀμαρτάνομεν μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀφ' ὧν ἐτέροις ἐψηφισάμεθα, κρινεῖ πάντως ἡμῖν ὁ Θεός· καὶ πολλάκις ὁ τῇ φύσει κοῦφόν ἐστιν ἀμάρτημα, τοῦτο χαλεπὸν καὶ ἀσύγγνωστον γίνεταί τῇ τοῦ ἀμαρτάνοντος περὶ ἐτέρου κρίσει. Τάχα ἀσαφές τὸ εἰρημένον· οὐκοῦν αὐτὸ σαφές ποιῆσαι πειράσομαι. Ἡμαρτέ τις· ἕτερον ἀμαρτάνοντα τὴν αὐτὴν ἀμαρτίαν κατεδίκασε σφοδρῶς. Ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ οὐ τοσαύτην ἐπισπᾶται κόλασιν, ὅσην ἡ φύσις τῆς ἀμαρτίας ἀπαιτεῖ, ἀλλὰ καὶ διπλασίονα πολλῶ καὶ τριπλασίονα· οὐ γὰρ ἀφ' ὧν αὐτὸς ἡμαρτεν, ἀλλ' ἀφ' ὧν ἕτερον ἀμαρτάνοντα τὰ αὐτὰ χαλεπῶς ἐκόλασε, ψηφιεῖται αὐτῷ τὴν τιμωρίαν ὁ Θεός. Καὶ ὅτι τοῦτο ἐστὶν ἀληθές, ἀπὸ τῶν γεγενημένων καὶ ἐκβάντων, μειζόνως, ὅπερ ὑπεσχόμεν ὑμῖν, αὐτὸ ποιήσω καταφανές.

Ὁ Φαρισαῖος, καίτοι γε αὐτὸς οὐδὲν ἀμαρτῶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ ζήσας, καὶ πολλὰ ἔχων κατορθώματα εἰπεῖν, ἐπειδὴ τὸν τελώνην, τὸν ἄρπαγα καὶ πλεονέκτην καὶ παρανομώτατον κατεδίκασε, τοσαύτην ἔδωκε δίκην, ὡς ἐκείνου μείζονι τηρεῖσθαι κολάσει. Εἰ δὲ ὁ μηδὲν μὲν ἀμαρτῶν αὐτὸς, ἀμαρτάνοντα δὲ ἕτερον καὶ περιφανῇ πᾶσιν ἐπὶ παρανομίαις ὄντα, ῥήματι ψιλῶ καταδικάσας τοσαύτην ἐπεσπάσατο κόλασιν, οἱ πολλὰ μὲν καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν ἀμαρτάνοντες, ἐτέρων δὲ βίους καταδικάζοντες, οὐδὲ ἐμφανεῖς ὄντας

102. Exod 15:21. John interprets ἐξῆρχεν δὲ αὐτῶν as “rule over” rather than “begin” (with participle λέγουσα).

103. Presumably John is referring to God's declaration in response to Moses that Miriam had to stay outside the camp for seven days (Num 12:14–15).

104. Literally, “that day,” the language of apocalyptic for the last or judgment day, as found in the prophets and in NT texts (references in BDAG, “ἡμέρα,” 3.b.β).

105. The parable itself does not specify the punishment, but says the tax collector returned home more justified than the Pharisee (δεδικαιωμένος ... παρ' ἐκεῖνον). John

saintly Moses as a child and contributed to his upbringing by ensuring that his mother would be his nurse and the child might not from an early age be nursed by a barbarian hand (cf. Exod 2:4–10), and later having served as general of the troop of women¹⁰² just as Moses was of the men, and having endured such terrible dangers along with him—and being Moses's sister!—nonetheless, she gained nothing from all these things to help her flee the wrath God has for verbal abuse. But Moses, who saved the people from punishment after that unspeakable act of impiety (cf. Exod 32:11–14), the man who prostrated himself on behalf of his sister and asked for leniency (cf. Num 12:13), was not able to make God show mercy, but instead he made the rebuke even more harsh.¹⁰³ This was so we might learn what a tremendous evil it is to malign our leaders and to judge the lives of others.

On that day to come,¹⁰⁴ God will judge us comprehensively, not only for the sins we committed but also for the judgments we leveled against others. And oftentimes the sin that's less serious by nature becomes grave and unpardonable because of the judgment the sinner exercised against someone else. Perhaps what I just said is unclear? All right, then, I shall try to make it clear. Someone has sinned; they harshly condemn another who commits the same sin. On the coming judgment day, they won't gain for themselves the measure of punishment that the nature of their sin requires, but so much more—two or three times as much. For God will not condemn them to the punishment that is the consequence of the sins they themselves committed, but instead to the punishment for the same infractions they so severely chastised another for committing. I shall make the fact that this is true all the more perfectly clear, as I promised you, by reference to things and events that have taken place.

Although he himself had committed no sin but, indeed, lived righteously and could boast of many virtuous deeds, the Pharisee received as great a punishment as would normally be reserved for the chastisement of the man he condemned as a tax collector, thief, miser, and heinous transgressor (cf. Luke 18:9–14).¹⁰⁵ So, a man who hadn't sinned at all himself, but condemned with a single utterance another who had sinned and who was manifest to all for his transgressions, gained for himself such an extreme punishment. If that was so, what about us? We commit many sins every day and condemn the lives of others—lives that are neither manifest nor visible to anyone. Consider how great a punishment we will face and

is extrapolating on the eschatological implications of the attached gnomic saying, *πᾶς ὁ ὑψῶν ἑαυτὸν ταπεινωθήσεται, ὁ δὲ ταπεινῶν ἑαυτὸν ὑψωθήσεται*.

τινί, οὐδὲ δῆλους, ἐννόησον ὅσῃν ὑποστησόμεθα κόλασιν, πῶς ἐκπεσούμεθα πάσης συγγνώμης. Ἐν ᾧ γὰρ κρίματι, φησί, κρίνετε, καὶ ὑμεῖς κριθήσεσθε.

ς'. Διὰ δὴ ταῦτα ἀντιβολῶ, καὶ παραινῶ, καὶ δέομαι, ταύτης ἀποστῆναι τῆς πονηρᾶς συνηθείας. Τοὺς μὲν γὰρ ἱερέας κακῶς ἀκούοντας οὐδὲν παραβλάψομεν, [205] οὐ μόνον ἂν ψευδῇ τὰ λεγόμενα ἦ, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀληθῇ· ἐπεὶ καὶ ὁ Φαρισαῖος τὸν τελώνην οὐδὲν κατέβλαψεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὠφέλησε, καίτοι γε ἀληθῇ περὶ αὐτοῦ λέγων· ἡμεῖς δὲ ἑαυτοὺς τοῖς ἐσχάτοις περιβαλοῦμεν κακοῖς· ἐπεὶ καὶ ὁ Φαρισαῖος καθ' ἑαυτοῦ τὸ ξίφος ὥθησε, καὶ καιρίαν πληγὴν λαβὼν ἀπῆλθεν. Ἵνα οὖν μὴ καὶ ἡμεῖς τὰ αὐτὰ πάθωμεν, κρατῶμεν ἀκολάστου γλώττης. Εἰ γὰρ τὸν τελώνην εἰπὼν κακῶς, οὐ διέφυγεν ἐκεῖνος, οἱ τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν κακῶς λέγοντες, ποῖαν ἔχομεν ἀπολογίαν; εἰ τὸν ἀδελφὸν βλασφημήσασα Μαρία ἄπαξ, τοσαύτην ἔδωκε δίκην, ποῖας σωτηρίας ἡμῖν ἐλπίς, ὅταν μυρίαις καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν τοὺς ἄρχοντας πλύνωμεν λοιδορίαις; Μὴ γάρ μοι τοῦτο λεγέτω τις, ὅτι ἐκεῖνος Μωϋσῆς ἦν· δυνήσομαι γὰρ εἰπεῖν καὶ ἐγώ, ὅτι ἀκακίην Μαρία ἦν. Ἄλλως δὲ, ἵνα καὶ τοῦτο αὐτὸ μάθῃς σαφῶς, ὅτι εἰ καὶ ἐγκλημάτων ὑπεύθυνοι ὦσιν οἱ ἱερεῖς, οὐδὲ οὕτω σοι θέμις τὸν ἐκείνων βίον κρίνειν, ἄκουσον τί φησι περὶ τῶν ἀρχόντων τῶν Ἰουδαϊκῶν ὁ Χριστός· Ἐπὶ τῆς Μωϋσέως καθέδρας ἐκάθισαν οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι· πάντα οὖν, ὅσα ἂν λέγωσιν ὑμῖν ποιεῖν, ποιεῖτε· κατὰ δὲ τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν μὴ ποιεῖτε. Καὶ τί γένοιτ' ἂν χειρόν ἐκείνων, ὧν ὁ ζῆλος ἔφθειρε τοὺς μαθητευομένους; Ἀλλ' ὅμως οὐδὲ οὕτω κατεβίβασεν αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς ἀξίας, οὐδὲ εὐκαταφρονήτους ἐποίησεν εἶναι τοῖς ἀρχομένοις· καὶ μάλα εἰκότως. Εἰ γὰρ ταύτης ἐπιλάβοιντο τῆς ἐξουσίας οἱ ἀρχόμενοι, ὀφθήσονται πάντας ἀποχειροτονοῦντες, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ βήματος καταβιβάζοντες. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ Παῦλος τὸν ἀρχιερέα τῶν Ἰουδαίων ὑβρίσας, καὶ εἰπὼν, Τύπτειν σε μέλλει ὁ Θεός, τοῖχε κεκονιαμένε· καὶ σὺ κάθη κρίνων

106. Plus ὑμεῖς before κριθήσεσθε.

107. Chrysostom defends the hierarchy at all costs, even to the point of granting the problem of clergy misconduct, at least implicitly, and claiming that verbal correction by the laity is a worse sin than any true faults of the clergy. This line of argument will cause its own problems below.

108. Μαρία for Μαριαμ (LXX). She was introduced above as ἡ Μωϋσέως ἀδελφή (§5 [PG 51:204]).

109. With ὅσα ἂν λέγωσιν for ὅσα ἐὰν εἴπωσιν; ποιεῖν, ποιεῖτε for τηρεῖν, τηρεῖτε καὶ ποιεῖτε. This final reading (ποιεῖν, ποιεῖτε) is found over thirteen times in Chrysostom's oeuvre, including the homily on this passage in *Hom. Matt.* 72.1 (PG 58:667, twice); *Laud. Paul.* 6.11 (SC 300:282), below in this volume. Interestingly, John's citation here accords with the reading of Γ (036) with ποιεῖν ποιεῖτε (the first word with 700, the latter marked as a singular reading in NA²⁸).

how we shall be deprived of any leniency. “*For by the judgment you level against others, you also will be judged*” (Matt 7:2),¹⁰⁶ he says.

6. So then, for these reasons I entreat, I advise, and I beg you to stay away from this evil habit. We shall not inflict any harm at all on the priests if they are spoken ill of—[205] not only if the things said are false but even if they are true.¹⁰⁷ After all, the Pharisee did no harm to the tax collector (cf. Luke 18:9–14), but in fact he benefitted him, despite saying things that were true about him. But we shall inflict the worst casualties on ourselves. And indeed, the Pharisee plunged his sword into himself and went away having suffered a mortal wound. Therefore, let’s hold on to an unbridled tongue, lest we, too, suffer the same things. If, after speaking ill of the tax collector, that man did not escape, what kind of self-defense will we who speak ill of our fathers have? If Miriam¹⁰⁸ suffered such a terrible punishment after slandering her brother just once, what hope of salvation will we have when we dress down our leaders every single day with countless insults? Now, don’t let anyone say to me, “He was Moses,” because I in turn shall be able to say, “And she was Miriam!” And you can clearly understand this same point—that even if the priests are answerable to the accusations, it is not lawful for you to judge their lives—from another source. Listen to what Christ says about the Jewish leaders: “*The scribes and the Pharisees have sat on the seat of Moses; do everything that they tell you to do, but do not act according to their deeds*” (Matt 23:2–3).¹⁰⁹ And what could be worse than those Pharisees,¹¹⁰ whose zeal used to destroy the disciples?¹¹¹ But nevertheless, Christ didn’t tear down their reputation or make them an object of contempt in the eyes of those they ruled. And with good reason. For if the people who live under their authority should get their hands on the rulers’ power, they’ll be seen deposing them all and pulling them down from their judgment seat. For this reason Paul, too, after he was insolent to the high priest of the Jews and said, “*God is going to smite you, you white-washed wall! And yet you sit in judgment on me?*” (Acts 23:3), once he had

110. Mf adopts this reading, Καὶ τί γένοιτ’ ἂν χεῖρον ἐκείνων, from Coislin. 243 for that of HS ME, τί δὲ γένοιτ’ ἂν τοῦ βίου χεῖρον ἐκείνων (“what could be worse than the life of those”).

111. John is likely influenced here by the self-portraits of Paul the Pharisee that accent the ζῆλος activating his persecuting of the churches (Phil 3:6, κατὰ ζῆλος διώκων τὴν ἐκκλησίαν; Gal 1:13–14; Acts 22:3–4; cf. Acts 17:5–6).

με; ἐπειδὴ τινων ἤκουσεν ἐπιστομιζόντων αὐτὸν, καὶ λεγόντων, Τὸν ἀρχιερέα τοῦ Θεοῦ λοιδορεῖς; δεῖξαι βουλόμενος, ὅσῃ ἀπονέμειν δεῖ τοῖς ἄρχουσι τὴν αἰδῶ καὶ τὴν τιμὴν, τί φησιν; Οὐκ ἤδειν ὅτι ἀρχιερεὺς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἦν. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ Δαυῖδ παρανομοῦντα λαβὼν τὸν Σαοῦλ, καὶ φόνου πνέοντα, καὶ μυρίας ὄντα κολάσεως ἄξιον, οὐ μόνον αὐτοῦ τῆς ζωῆς ἐφείσατο, ἀλλ' οὔτε ῥῆμα φορτικὸν εἰς αὐτὸν ἐκβαλεῖν ὑπέμεινε· καὶ τὴν αἰτίαν τίθησι λέγων, ὅτι Χριστὸς Κυρίου ἐστίν.

Οὐκ ἐντεῦθεν δὲ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐτέρωθεν ἐκ πολλῆς τῆς περιουσίας ἔστιν ἰδεῖν, πῶς πόρρω που τὰ τῶν ἱερέων διορθοῦν τὸν ἀρχόμενον ἐσθηκέναι χρή. Τῆς γὰρ κιβωτοῦ ποτε ἀναγομένης, ἐπειδὴ τινες τῶν ἀρχομένων περιτρεπομένην καὶ καταπίπτειν μέλλουσιν ἰδόντες ἀνῶρθωσαν, ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ χωρίῳ δίκην ἔδοσαν, ὑπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου πληγέντες καὶ νεκροὶ μέιναντες. Καίτοι γε οὐδὲν ἄτοπον ἐποίουν· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀνέτρεπον τὴν κιβωτὸν, ἀλλ' ἀνατρέπεσθαι μέλλουσιν καὶ καταπίπτειν ἀνῶρθουν. Ἄλλ' ἵνα ἐκ πολλῆς περιουσίας μάθῃς τῶν ἱερέων τὸ ἀξίωμα, καὶ πῶς οὐ θέμις τὸν ὑποτεταγμένον καὶ ἐν τάξει λαϊκῶν ὄντα τοιαῦτα ἐπανορθοῦν, ἀπέκτεινεν αὐτοὺς ἐν μέσῳ τῷ πλήθει, τοὺς ἄλλους πάντας ἐκ πολλῆς φοβῶν τῆς ὑπερβολῆς, καὶ πείθων μηδέποτε τοῖς τῆς ἱερωσύνης προσιέναι ἀδύτοις. Εἰ γὰρ δὴ μέλλοιεν ἕκαστοι ἐπὶ προφάσει τοῦ τὰ κακῶς γινόμενα διορθοῦν εἰς τὸ τῆς ἱερωσύνης εἰσάγειν ἑαυτοὺς ἀξίωμα, οὔτε πρόφασις ἐπιλείψει διορθώσεώς ποτε, οὔτε ἄρχοντα, οὔτε ἀρχόμενον διαγνωσόμεθα, ἀναμειγμένων πάντων ἀλλήλοις. Καὶ μὴ μέ τις νομίση τῶν ἱερέων κατεγνωκότα ταῦτα λέγειν (διὰ γὰρ τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ χάριν, πολλήν, ὡς καὶ ὑμεῖς ἴστε, τὴν ἐπιείκειαν ἐν ἅπασιν ἐπιδείκνυνται, καὶ [206] οὐδεμίαν οὐδενὶ ποτε παρεσχήκασιν λαβὴν), ἀλλ' ἵνα ὑμεῖς μάθητε, ὅτι εἰ καὶ

112. With ἀρχιερεὺς τοῦ θεοῦ ἦν for ἐστὶν ἀρχιερεὺς.

113. 1 Kgdms 19–29, cast in language reminiscent of Acts 9:1.

114. A categorical defense of the hierarchy of the clergy in the church and their insulation from critique by the laity. One wonders if such would be as easily accepted as stated, especially given that the reason for this discussion is the apparently well-known occurrence of such critique.

115. In both versions, it is the singular man Οὔζα (Uzzah), who is struck down, not multiple persons, as John depicts it.

116. I.e., “keep it straight upright.” John is here playing on the literal and metaphorical senses of words with the ὀρθ- stem (διορθοῦν, ἀνορθοῦν, ἐπανορθοῦν, διόρθωσις, “make straight,” “correct”), a term that is not found in the LXX passages he cites.

117. In context this is unmistakably ὁ θεός (as explicitly stated in 2 Kgdms 6:7, and slightly moderated in the retelling in 1 Par 13:10).

heard some men shushing him and saying, “*You’re insulting the high priest of God?*” (Acts 23:4), wanted to show the degree of respect and honor that should be rendered to the high priests. What did he say? “*I didn’t know that he was God’s high priest*” (Acts 23:5).¹¹² For the same reason, when David caught Saul breaking the law and breathing threats of murder¹¹³ and worthy of boundless punishment, not only did he spare his life, but he didn’t dare to make a single harsh statement against him. David sets forth the reason when he says, “he is *the Lord’s anointed*” (1 Kgdms 26:9, 11).

Not only from this prior instance, but also from another case one can see in an extreme way how far those who stand under the authority of the priests should stay away from correcting their actions.¹¹⁴ For one time, when the ark of the covenant was being lifted up and some of those under the authority of the priests saw that it was being twisted around and about to fall, they moved to correct its course and paid the punishment right there on the spot, standing still, struck dead by the Lord (cf. 2 Kgdms 6:6–7; 1 Par 13:9–10).¹¹⁵ But what they were trying to do wasn’t out of line. For they weren’t trying to overturn the ark but to correct its alignment¹¹⁶ when it was going to be overturned and fall. But, so you might learn from this extreme example the worthy rank that belongs to the priests and how it is unlawful for one who is a subordinate and stands in the position of the laity to deliver correction in such matters, he¹¹⁷ killed these men in the midst of the crowd, inspiring tremendous fear in all the others and convincing them never to approach the hidden precincts that belong to the priesthood.¹¹⁸ After all, if each person were to intrude themselves into the ranks of the priesthood on the pretext of correcting wrongs that were done, neither would there be any end to the pretext of correction, nor would we be able to distinguish the one in authority from those under authority, as they’ve all been mixed up with one another. Now don’t let anyone think that in saying this I am condemning the priests¹¹⁹—for by God’s abundant grace, as you yourselves well know, they display equity in all things and [206] never provide anyone a handle¹²⁰ for accusation!¹²¹ No, I’m saying this so

118. An unveiled appeal to the threat of divine punishment for speaking out against the priests.

119. John seeks to deflect the problem his line of defense opens up, i.e., that he seems to be allowing that there *is* clergy misconduct.

120. See n. 89 above.

121. This asseveration by John of the innocence of bishops and priests of the charges being brought against them is much too important within his argument to be relegated to a parenthesis (as has been done since HS).

μοχθηρούς εἶχετε πατέρας καὶ φορτικούς διδασκάλους, οὐδὲ οὕτως ἀκίνδυνον ὑμῖν ἦν, οὐδὲ ἀσφαλὲς βλασφημεῖν αὐτοὺς καὶ λοιδορεῖσθαι. Εἰ γὰρ ἐπὶ τῶν σωματικῶν γονέων σοφός τις φησι, *Κὰν ἀπολίπη σύνεσιν, συγγνώμην ἔχε· τί γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἀποδώσεις, καθὼς αὐτοί σοι;* πολλῶ μᾶλλον ἐπὶ τῶν πνευματικῶν τοῦτον φυλάττεσθαι χρὴ τὸν νόμον, καὶ τὸν ἐκάστου βίον ἑαυτὸν ἕκαστον περιεργάζεσθαι καὶ πολυπραγμονεῖν, ἵνα μὴ ἀκούσωμεν κατ' ἐκείνην τὴν ἡμέραν, *Ὑποκριτὰ, τί βλέπεις τὸ κάρφος τὸ ἐν τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου, τὴν δὲ ἐν τῷ σῷ ὀφθαλμῷ οὐ κατανοεῖς δοκόν;* Καὶ γὰρ ὑποκριτῶν ἔργον, τὸ δημοσίᾳ μὲν καὶ πάντων ὁρώντων τὰς χεῖρας φιλεῖν τῶν ἱερέων, καὶ γονάτων ἄπτεσθαι, καὶ παρακαλεῖν ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν εὐχεσθαι, καὶ δεομένους βαπτίσματος ἐπὶ τὰς ἐκείνων τρέχειν θύρας, οἵκοι δὲ καὶ ἐν ἀγοραῖς τοὺς τοσοῦτων ἀγαθῶν αἰτίους ἡμῖν καὶ διακόνους μυρίοις πλύνειν ὀνειδέσιν, ἢ ἐτέρων ὀνειδιζόντων ἀνέχεσθαι. Εἰ μὲν γὰρ ἀληθῶς κακὸς ὁ πατήρ, πῶς αὐτὸν ἀξιόπιστον εἶναι νομίζεις διάκονον τῆς τῶν φρικτῶν ἐκείνων μυσταγωγίας; Εἰ δὲ ἀξιόπιστος ἐκείνων εἶναι σοι δοκεῖ διάκονος, τίνος ἔνεκεν ἀνέχη κακῶς ἐτέρων λεγόντων αὐτὸν, καὶ οὐκ ἐπιστομίζεις, οὐδὲ ἀγανακτεῖς, οὐδὲ δυσχεραίνεις, ἵνα παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ πολὺν τὸν μισθὸν ἀπολάβῃς, καὶ παρ' αὐτῶν ἐκείνων τῶν κατηγορούντων τὸν ἔπαινον; *Κὰν γὰρ μυριάκις ὥσιν ὑβρισταί, πάντως ἐπαινέσονται σε καὶ ἀποδέξονται τῆς περὶ τοὺς πατέρας κηδεμονίας· ὥσπερ, ἂν μὴ τοῦτο ποιῶμεν, ἅπαντες ἡμῶν καταγνώσκονται, καὶ αὐτοὶ οἱ κακῶς λέγοντες.* Καὶ οὐ τοῦτο μόνον ἐστὶ τὸ δεινόν, ἀλλ' ὅτι καὶ ἐκεῖ τὴν ἐσχάτην δώσομεν δίκην. Οὐδὲν γὰρ οὕτω τὰς Ἐκκλησίας λυμαινεται, ὥς τοῦτο τὸ νόσημα· καὶ καθάπερ σῶμα μὴ μετὰ ἀκριβείας συνδεδεμένον τῇ τῶν νευρῶν περιβολῇ, πολλὰς τίκτει τὰς ἀρρωστίας, καὶ ἀβίωτον ποιεῖ τὸν βίον· οὕτω καὶ Ἐκκλησία, μὴ σφοδρᾶ καὶ ἀρραγεῖ τῇ τῆς ἀγάπης ἀλύσει περιβεβλημένη, μυρίου τίκτει πολέμους, καὶ τὴν ὀργὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ αὖξει, καὶ πολλῶν πειρασμῶν γίνεται ὑπόθεσις. Ὅτι οὖν μὴ ταῦτα συμβαίνει, μηδὲ τὸν Θεὸν παροξύνωμεν, καὶ τὰ ἡμέτερα ἐπαυξήσωμεν κακὰ, καὶ τὴν κόλασιν ἀπαραίτητον παρασκευάζωμεν, καὶ πολλῆς ἀηδίας πληρῶμεν τὴν ζωὴν τὴν ἡμετέραν, πρὸς εὐφημίαν τὴν γλῶτταν μεταθέντες, τὸν ἑαυτῶν καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν περιεργαζόμεθα βίον, καὶ τὴν ἐτέρων ζωὴν τῷ τὰ ἀπόρρητα μετὰ ἀκριβείας εἰδότηι κρίνειν ἐπιτρέψαντες,

122. One expects an unreal concession or conditional here, either with καὶ εἰ in the protasis or ἂν in the apodosis (especially after John's vehement denial earlier in the sentence).

123. In context: "your father."

124. With ἀπολίπη for ἀπολείπη.

125. Plus ὑποκριτὰ (cf. Matt 7:5) before τί βλέπεις; transposition of δοκόν and οὐ κατανοεῖς.

126. The illness of speaking badly of one another, especially the priests.

you yourselves might learn that, if you were to have unscrupulous fathers and irksome teachers, it wouldn't be¹²² risk-free or safe for you to slander and revile them. Because when it comes to physical parents, a certain wise man said, "*Even if he*¹²³ *loses his mind, have forbearance*" (Sir 3:13).¹²⁴ If that's the case, then why will you repay them in kind for what they did to you? So then how much more in the case of spiritual parents is it necessary to keep this law and for each to busy oneself and pay scrupulous attention to one's own life, lest on that day to come we might hear, "*You hypocrite! Why do you see the speck in your brother's eye but do not perceive the plank in your own?*" (Matt 7:3).¹²⁵ For this is what hypocrites do: in public, while everyone is looking, they kiss the hands of the priests, touch their knees, beg them to pray on their behalf, and run up to their doors to beg for baptism. But at home and in the marketplace they themselves castigate with countless calumnies the very ministers who are the sources of such benefactions, or alternatively they put up with other people who engage in the calumny. Now, if the father is truly evil, then how do you suppose that he is a worthy minister of initiation into those awesome mysteries? And if he does seem to you to be a worthy minister of those rites, then why do you put up with it when others speak ill of him? You don't shush them up, nor are you irritated or disgusted. If so, you might receive an enormous reward from God and even praise from the very people making these accusations. For even if they're insolent most of the time, perhaps they'll praise you and welcome your solicitation for the fathers. Likewise, if we don't do this, then all will have contempt for us, even those who are doing the maligning. And this is not only terrible in itself, but on account of it we shall suffer the most extreme punishment, because nothing ruins the churches as much as this illness.¹²⁶ Just as a body, if it isn't bound securely together by the tight wrapping of sinews, bears many illnesses and makes living unsustainable, in the same way the church, if it isn't clothed in a bond of love that is fervent and unbreakable, gives birth to countless battles, and it will increase God's wrath and be the cause of many trials. So then, lest these things happen, let's not provoke God to anger and cause our calamities to increase greatly and secure for ourselves an inescapable chastisement and fill our life with tremendous misery.¹²⁷ Instead, switching our tongues to

127. Mf adopts the reading *καὶ πολλῆς ἀηδίας πληρώμεν τὴν ζωὴν τὴν ἡμετέραν*, from Coislin. 243, noting that it was lacking in ME (but he does not note that HS had had the longer reading, too).

αὐτοὶ τὰ ἑαυτῶν ἁμαρτήματα κρίνωμεν. Οὕτω γὰρ καὶ τὸ τῆς γεέννης δυνησόμεθα διαφυγεῖν πῦρ. Ὡσπερ γὰρ οἱ τὰ ἀλλότρια πολυπραγμονοῦντες κακὰ, τῶν οἰκείων οὐδένα ποιοῦνται λόγον· οὕτως οἱ δεδοικότες εἰς τὸν ἐτέρων παρακύψαι βίον, πολλὴν ἑαυτοῖς τῶν πεπλημμελημένων ποιήσονται τὴν φροντίδα· οἱ δὲ τὰ ἑαυτῶν ἀναλογιζόμενοι κακὰ, καὶ ταῦτα καθ' ἐκάστην κρίνοντες τὴν ἡμέραν, καὶ δίκας ἑαυτοὺς ἀπαιτοῦντες, ἡμερον ἔξουσι τότε τὸν δικαστὴν. Καὶ τοῦτο ὁ Παῦλος δηλῶν ἔλεγεν· Εἰ γὰρ ἑαυτοὺς ἐκρίνομεν, οὐκ ἂν ἐκρινόμεθα ὑπὸ Κυρίου, ἵν' οὖν διαφύγωμεν τὴν ψῆφον ἐκείνην, πάντα τὰ ἄλλα ἀφέντες, περιεργαζόμεθα τὴν ἑαυτῶν ζωὴν, καὶ κολάζωμεν τὸν λογισμὸν τὸν ἁμαρτάνειν ἀναπείθοντα, καὶ κατανύττωμεν τὸ συνειδὸς, καὶ λόγον ἑαυτοὺς ἀπαιτῶμεν τῶν πεπραγμένων ἡμῖν. Οὕτω γὰρ δυνησόμεθα κοῦφον τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων ποιήσαντες τὸ φορτίον, συγγνώμης ἀπολαῦσαι πολλῆς, καὶ τὸν παρόντα βίον μεθ' ἡδονῆς διάγειν, καὶ τῶν μελ-[207]λόντων ἐπιτυχεῖν ἀγαθῶν, χάριτι καὶ φιλανθρωπίᾳ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι' οὗ καὶ μεθ' οὗ [208] τῷ Πατρὶ δόξα, ἅμα τῷ ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Ἀμήν.

positive speech, let's busy ourselves every day with our own lives, and let's judge our own sins, leaving the judgment of others' lives to the one who has detailed knowledge of things that are secret (cf. Matt 6:4). This is how we shall be able to flee the fire of Gehenna. Those who meddle in the misdeeds of others take no account of their own; in the same way, in turn, those who are afraid to snoop into the lives of others put their close attention on their own transgressions. People who take careful account of their own misdeeds and judge them every single day and demand that they be punished will have a gentle judge on that future day. Paul spoke of this clearly when he said, "*If we would judge ourselves, then we would not be judged by the Lord*" (1 Cor 11:31–32).¹²⁸ Therefore, in order that we might flee that verdict, let's leave off all the other things and busy ourselves¹²⁹ with our own lives, let's chasten the mental impulse that moves us to sin, let's feel guilt pangs in our conscience, and let's demand of ourselves an accounting for the things we have done. In this way, by lightening the weight of our sins, we shall be able to enjoy great leniency and live the present life with delight [207] and attain the future good things by the grace and loving-kindness of our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom and with whom [208] be glory to the Father, together with the Holy Spirit, forever and ever. Amen.

128. With ἐκρίνομεν for διεκρίνομεν; minus κρινόμενοι δέ before ὑπὸ κυρίου.

129. I.e., the proper focus of περιεργάζεσθαι, a theme that unites both homilies.

ΕΙΣ ΤΟ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΙΚΟΝ ΠΗΤΟΝ «Διὰ δὲ τὰς πορνείας ἕκαστος
τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα ἔχέτω.»

α'. [207] Πρὸς τὰς τοῦ μέλιτος πηγὰς καὶ τήμερον ὑμᾶς χειραγωγῆσαι βούλομαι, μέλιτος οὐδέποτε κόρον ἔχοντος. Τοιαύτη γὰρ τῶν Παύλου ῥημάτων ἡ φύσις, καὶ πάντες δὲ, ὅσοι πληροῦσι τὰς ἑαυτῶν καρδίας ἐκ τῶν πηγῶν τούτων, διὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου φθέγγονται· μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ μέλιτος ἀρετὴν ἀποκρύπτει πᾶσαν ἢ τῶν θείων ἡδονῇ λογίων. Καὶ τοῦτο

1. Provenance: HS (8:730) thought the subject matter of *Hom. 1 Cor. 7:2–4* and *Hom. 1 Cor. 7:39–40* on marriage was so general that it was impossible to locate either of these. Mf (3:192) placed this homily—along with two others on marriage thought to have been preached as a series *Περὶ γάμου* (*Hom. 1 Cor. 7:39–40* and *Laud. Max.*)—in Constantinople, due to a reference to a Maximus (of Seleucia?) who had preached earlier (see treatments in Mayer, *Provenance*, 65, 67, 71, 86, who demonstrates that Tillemont was actually the first to reach this position). Mayer herself dates only the third, *Laud. Max.*, with certainty to Constantinople (*Provenance*, 470). Mazzoni Dami, *Giovanni Crisostomo, Prima omelia sul matrimonio*, 16–18, confirms Mf's dating and adds as a further consideration the judgment that this homily (along with the other two) shows a maturation in John's thinking and argumentation about marriage (with Grillet in SC 125:23, n. 3, on Chrysostom's *De virginitate*). Confirmation of this surmise awaits further analysis.

Text: Mf PE (1837) as reprinted by JPM (PG, 1862), together with Mf's original text-critical notes (1721) on ME, based on his collation of *Colbertinus* 970 (= Paris. gr. 748 [XI]) and *Colbertinus* 1030 (= Paris. gr. 768 [XIII]). The ME, in line with its precursor, HS, was based upon Monac. gr. 352 (XI). In 1998 a critical edition was made of this homily by Mazzoni Dami, *Giovanni Crisostomo, Prima omelia sul matrimonio* (abbreviated hereafter as DMD). Through a collation of eighteen medieval manuscripts (and four XVI–XVII copies), DMD showed that Monac. gr. 352 contains a large number of singular readings—some with the goal of “amplificare retoricamente il testo” (DMD 79; cf. 124, 129)—and that HS's transcription and edition of it also introduced some errors into the textual history that have been carried down into the PE and PG editions (DMD 79–80). DMD identified a *stemma codicum* of the manuscripts, reconstructing

Hom. 1 Cor. 7:2–4
(*In illud: propter fornicationes ... uxorem, etc.*)
CPG 4377 (PG 51:207–18)¹

On the passage of the apostle: “*But on account of sexual misconduct, let each man have his own wife* (1 Cor 7:2).²

1. [207] Again today I wish to lead you to fountains of honey, a honey of which one can never get enough.³ For such is the nature of Paul’s words, and all those who fill their hearts from these fountains speak forth in the Holy Spirit. And, indeed, the pleasure of the divine utterances makes one lose sight of even the good taste⁴ of honey. The prophet shows this when he says: “*How sweet in my throat are your utterances, more than honey and*

the archetype ω and subarchetypes α (from which stem all three of the witnesses included in Mf PE PG) and δ . The translation here has at various points adopted DMD’s readings, as indicated in my footnotes; where these readings were already given in footnotes by Mf (but not adopted in his text) from his two Paris codices, that is also indicated. Perhaps the most important new reading is an extended passage attested in subarchetype δ but not in α (and hence included for the first time in DMD) in §3 (PG 51:213). (Some typos in DMD, mostly of accents, are silently corrected here.)

2. The notes to the translation will seek to bring out some of the technical magic terms and thematics at work in this homily, but for a fuller treatment see Mitchell, “John Chrysostom and Christian Love Magic: A Spellbinding Moment in the History of Interpretation of 1 Cor 7.2–4,” *NTS* 68 (2022): 119–43.

3. Cf. Pindar, *Nem.* 7.52–53: $\kappa\acute{o}\rho\omicron\nu\delta' \epsilon\chi\epsilon\iota \kappa\alpha\iota \mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\iota \kappa\alpha\iota \tau\acute{\alpha} \tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\pi\upsilon\nu' \acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\epsilon' \text{ Ἀφροδίσια}$ (ed. Maehler), for the contrary statement using the same idiom ($\kappa\acute{o}\rho\omicron\nu\delta' \epsilon\chi\epsilon\iota\nu$): “one can get enough even of honey and the pleasant blossoms of Aphrodite” (my translation). This was a well-known tag—see, e.g., Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Pomp.* 3.12 (ed. Radermacher and Usener)—and such an allusion ties in well with the broader theme of this homily, on proper marital love. John calls Paul’s words fountains of honey also in *Proph. Obscurit.* 2.1 (PG 56:176).

4. MF noted that one of his two manuscripts reads $\eta\delta\omicron\nu\eta\nu$ (“pleasure”) for $\acute{\alpha}\rho\epsilon\tau\eta\nu$ (“excellence,” “goodness”). DMD 77 has confirmed that this reading in Paris. gr. 768 (XIII) was copied from a manuscript not known to Mf, Paris. gr. 754 (XI). She reasonably infers that this was a scribal error in the latter manuscript, due to $\eta\delta\omicron\nu\eta$ in the following sentence.

δηλῶν ὁ Προφήτης ἔλεγεν, Ὡς γλυκέα τῷ λάρυγγί μου τὰ λόγια σου, ὑπὲρ μέλι τῷ στόματί μου. Οὐ μέλιτος δέ ἐστιν ἡδίων μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ χρυσοῦ καὶ λίθου παντὸς τιμιωτέρα καὶ ἀργυρίου παντὸς καθαρωτέρα ἢ ἡδονὴ τῶν θείων λογίων. Τὰ λόγια γὰρ Κυρίου, φησὶ, λόγια ἀγνὰ, ἀργύριον πεπυρωμένον, δοκίμιον τῇ γῇ, κεκαθαρισμένον ἐπταπλασίως. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ τις σοφὸς ἔλεγεν· Ἐσθίειν μέλι πολὺ [208] οὐ καλόν, τιμᾶν δὲ χρὴ λόγους ἐνδόξους. Ἐξ ἐκείνου μὲν γὰρ καὶ νόσος οὐκ οὔσα τίκεται πολλάκις, ἀπὸ δὲ τούτων καὶ τὴν οὔσαν ἀρρωστίαν ἀποθέσθαι δυνάμεθα· καὶ τὸ μὲν μέλι κατὰ πέψιν διαφθείρεται, τὰ δὲ λόγια τὰ θεῖα, ὅταν πεφθῇ, τότε καὶ ἡδὶω γίνεται καὶ χρησιμώτερα, αὐτοῖς τε τοῖς ἔχουσι, καὶ ἑτέροις πολλοῖς. Καὶ τραπέζης μὲν τις αἰσθητῆς μετὰ δαψιλείας ἀπολαύων, εἴτα ἐκεῖθεν ἐρευγόμενος, ἀηδὴς τῷ κοινωνοῦντι γίνεται· ἀπὸ διδασκαλίας δὲ τις ἐρευξάμενος πνευματικῆς, πολλῆς τῆς εὐωδίας μεταδίδωσι τῷ πλησίον. Ὁ γοῦν Δαυὶδ τοιαύτης συνεχῶς ἀπολαύων ἐστιάσεως ἔλεγεν, Ἐξηρεύξατο ἡ καρδία μου λόγον ἀγαθόν.

Ἔστι γὰρ καὶ πονηρὸν λόγον ἐρεύξασθαι. Καὶ καθάπερ ἐπὶ τῆς αἰσθητῆς τραπέζης κατὰ τὴν φύσιν τῶν ἐδεσμάτων καὶ ἡ τῆς ἐρυγῆς ποιότης ἐκδίδεται· οὕτω δὴ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς τῶν ῥημάτων δυνάμεως, οἵαπερ ἂν σιτῶνται, τοιαῦτα [209] καὶ ἐρεύγονται πολλοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων. Οἷον ἂν εἰς θέατρον ἀναβῆς καὶ πορνικῶν ἁσμάτων ἀκούσης, τοιαῦτα καὶ ἐρεύξῃ πάντως εἰς τὸν πλησίον ῥήματα· ἂν δὲ εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἔλθῶν, μετάσχῃς ἀκουσμάτων πνευματικῶν, τοιαύτας ἔξεις καὶ τὰς ἐρυγὰς. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ὁ Προφήτης ἔλεγεν, Ἐξηρεύξατο ἡ καρδία μου λόγον ἀγαθόν, τῆς τραπέζης, ἧς αἰεὶ μετεῖχε, τὴν βρῶσιν ἡμῖν ἐνδεικνύμενος. Τούτῳ καὶ ὁ Παῦλος πειθόμενος, παρῆναι λέγων· Πᾶς λόγος σαπρὸς ἐκ τοῦ στόματος ὑμῶν μὴ ἐκπορευέσθω, ἀλλ' εἴ τις ἀγαθός. Καὶ τίς

5. With DMD reading καὶ κηρίον (with Mf's note referring to Paris. gr. 748) after ὑπὲρ μέλι. Chrysostom reads the plus when he cites the verse in *Hom. Jo.* 1.3 (PG 59:27) and *Hom. Heb.* 8.4 (PG 63:74). Note that codex A (LXX) has the minus (cf. Ps 18:11, per Rahlfs *app. crit.*)

6. With DMD reading *παραινῶν* for *σοφός*, but (with Paris. gr. 748 and 768) retaining *τις* before *παραινῶν* (inexplicably dropped by DMD, but accurately represented in Mf's 1721 note).

7. Statements in the book of Proverbs on honey and on “whores” frame this homily; see §5 (PG 51:216–17) below.

8. John is playing on the literal and metaphorical senses of *ἐρεύγεσθαι* as “vomit forth, belch forth” and “utter” (PGL). The LXX of Ps 44:2, which he is about to cite, affords this play, as it is more graphic here than MT, Ps 45:1: *שׁפּר*: “my heart is astir” (BDB).

9. Reading the aorist participle, *ἀπολαύσας* (with DMD), instead of *ἀπολαύων*.

10. With DMD omitting καὶ after διὰ τοῦτο. In terms of content, for John and

honeycomb in my mouth” (Ps 118:103).⁵ The pleasure of the divine utterances is not only sweeter than honey but also more precious than gold or any gemstone and purer than any silver. For “*the utterances of the Lord*,” he says, “*are pure utterances, silver refined by fire, a tested substance on the earth, purified sevenfold*” (Ps 11:7). For this reason, someone offered this by way of advice:⁶ “*it’s not good [208] to eat a lot of honey, but it’s necessary to honor reputable words*” (Prov 25:27).⁷ After all, from the former often an illness not present is produced, but from the latter we’re able to get rid of even the illness that presently exists. For indeed, honey is destroyed in the digestive process, but the divine utterances when digested become both sweeter and more useful, both to those who possess them and to many others. Now someone who has plentiful enjoyment from a physical meal and then belches from it is most unpleasant to their companion. But one who has belched forth⁸ utterances from the spiritual teaching shares the rich fragrance with their neighbor. Indeed, David, when he had continually enjoyed⁹ this kind of feasting, said, “*My heart belched out a good word*” (Ps 44:2).

Yet it’s possible to belch forth a wicked word too. In the case of a physical meal, the quality of the belching corresponds to the nature of the foods eaten. The same is true also with the power of words: many people belch forth [209] things akin to what they eat. For example, if you go up to the theater and you listen to whorish hymns, then those are the kinds of things you’ll surely belch forth in the presence of your neighbor. But if by coming to church you share in the hearing of spiritual things, then those are the kind of belches you’ll have as well. That’s why the prophet¹⁰ said, “*My heart belched out a good word*” (Ps 44:2), showing us the nature¹¹ of the meal¹² he shared. And, persuaded by him,¹³ Paul gave this advice, saying, “*Let no rotten word come out from your mouth, but only if it is something good*”

other patristic authors, of course, David is a prophet (as already in the NT, in, e.g., Matt 22:43 and parr.; Luke 24:44; Acts 2:25–31).

11. With DMD reading φύσιν (the reading of Paris. gr. 748 and 768 noted by Mf) for βρωσιν. The latter, as printed in PG, is a conjectural reading that goes back to HS (see DMD 124), who found the reading of MS B, φράσιν, unintelligible. φύσιν is clearly to be preferred, by both attestation and sense.

12. τράπεζα can be the meal or the table on which it is served. While in the previous instances the emphasis was more on the food, here John seems to switch to the table, with perhaps an allusion to 1 Cor 10:21: οὐ δύνασθε τραπέζης κυρίου μετέχειν καὶ τραπέζης δαιμονίων.

13. With DMD reading Ὁ δὲ Παῦλος αὐτῷ for Τούτῳ καὶ ὁ Παῦλος.

ἐστιν ὁ σαπρὸς, φησίν; Ἐὰν μάθῃς τὸν ἀγαθόν, τότε εἴσῃ καὶ τὸν σαπρόν· πρὸς γὰρ τὴν ἀντιδιαστολὴν ἐκείνου τοῦτον τέθεικε. Τίς οὖν ἐστιν ὁ ἀγαθός, οὐδὲν δεήσει παρ' ἐμοῦ μαθεῖν· αὐτὸς γὰρ ἡμῖν αὐτοῦ τὴν φύσιν ἡρμήνευσε. Εἰπὼν γάρ, *Εἴ τις ἀγαθός, ἐπήγαγε, Πρὸς οἰκοδομὴν τῆς Ἐκκλησίας*, δεικνύς ὅτι οὗτός ἐστιν ἀγαθός ὁ τὸν πλησίον οἰκοδομῶν. “Ὡσπερ οὖν ὁ οἰκοδομῶν, ἀγαθός, οὕτως ὁ καθαιρῶν, σαπρὸς καὶ φαῦλος.

Καὶ σὺ τοίνυν, ἀγαπητέ, εἰ μὲν ἔχεις τι τοιοῦτον εἰπεῖν, ὃ δύναται βελτίω ποιῆσαι τὸν ἀκούοντα, μὴ κωλύσης λόγον ἐν καιρῷ σωτηρίας· εἰ δὲ μηδὲν τοιοῦτον ἔχεις, ἀλλὰ πονηρὰ καὶ διεφθαρμένα ῥήματα, σίγησον, μὴ κατηγορήσης τοῦ πλησίον. Οὗτος γὰρ ὁ λόγος σαπρὸς ἐστιν, οὐκ οἰκοδομῶν τὸν ἀκούοντα, ἀλλὰ καὶ καταστρέφων. Ἄν τε γὰρ ἀρετῆς ἐπιμελῆται, πρὸς ἀπόνοιαν αἴρεται πολλάκις· ἂν τε ἡμελημένος ᾖ, ῥαθυμότερος γίνεται. Ἄν αἰσχροὺς μέλλῃς φθέγγεσθαι ῥῆμα καὶ γέλωτος γέμον, σίγησον. Καὶ γὰρ καὶ οὗτος ὁ λόγος σαπρὸς ἐστί, τὸν τε λέγοντα τὸν τε ἀκούοντα ἀσελγεστέρους ποιῶν, καὶ τὰς ἐν ἐκάστῳ πονηρὰς ἐπιθυμίας ἀνάπτων. “Ὡσπερ οὖν τῷ πυρὶ τὰ ξύλα τροφή γίνεται καὶ ὕλη, οὕτω τοῖς πονηροῖς βουλευμάσι τὰ ῥήματα. Διὰ τοῦτο οὐ χρὴ πάντα, ἅπερ ἂν ἔχωμεν ἐν διανοίᾳ, φθέγγεσθαι πάντως· ἀλλὰ σπουδάζειν μὲν καὶ τῆς διανοίας αὐτῆς ἐξορίζειν τὰς πονηρὰς ἐπιθυμίας καὶ πᾶσαν αἰσχροὺς ἔννοιαν. Εἰ δὲ ποτε λαθόντες παραδεξόμεθα ῥυπαροὺς λογισμοὺς, μηδέποτε διὰ τῆς γλώττης αὐτοὺς ἐκφέρωμεν, ἀλλ' ἀποπνίγωμεν αὐτοὺς διὰ τῆς σιγῆς. Καὶ γὰρ καὶ θηρία καὶ ἑρπετὰ εἰς λάκκον ἐμπίπτοντα, ἂν μὲν εὖρη τινὰ διέξοδον ἄνωθεν, ἀναβάντα ἀγριώτερα γίνεται· ἂν δὲ μένη κάτω διηνεκῶς συγκεκλεισμένα, πάντοθεν ἀπόλλυται ῥαδίως καὶ ἀφανίζεται· οὕτω δὲ καὶ τὰ πονηρὰ ἐνθυμήματα, ἂν μὲν εὖρη τινὰ διὰ τοῦ στόματος ἡμῶν καὶ τῶν ῥημάτων ἐξοδόν, ἀνάπτει τὴν ἔνδον φλόγα· ἂν δὲ ἀποκλείσῃς αὐτὰ διὰ τῆς σιγῆς, ἀσθενέστερα γίνεται, καὶ καθάπερ λιμῷ τηκόμενα τῇ σιωπῇ, ταχέως ἐναποθνήσκει τῇ διανοίᾳ. “Ὡστε καὶ ἐπιθυμίας τινὰ αἰσχροὺς ἐπιθυμίαν, μὴ φθέγγῃ δὲ ῥῆμα αἰσχροὺς, κατέσβεσας καὶ τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν.

14. With DMD reading *σαπρὸς* for *σαπρὸς, φησίν*. The interlocutor poses a query about the Pauline utterance that (in John's telling) Paul will go on to solve. And yet lying behind this is the fact that the subject of the lection is what might be characterized as a “rotten word”: *πορνεία*. John is already working toward the main theme of the homily.

15. With DMD reading *χρείας* rather than *ἐκκλησίας*. The latter is in one sense the more difficult reading (given that it would involve a misquotation of Ephesians), but John (as well as scribes) is fully capable of conflating Pauline verses (here 1 Cor 14:12 with Eph 4:29). But elsewhere in his oeuvre, John cites the verse from Eph 4:29 (as he is clearly seeking to do here) with *χρείας* at *Hom. Eph.* 14.2 (PG 62:103) and *Hom. Gen.* 15.5 (PG 53:125).

(Eph 4:29). Someone asks, “And what is the ‘rotten word’?”¹⁴ If you learn the good word, then you’ll know the rotten one too, for Paul has placed the latter in opposition to the former. Then you won’t need to learn from me what the good word is, since Paul himself has interpreted the nature of it to us. For after saying, “*only if it is something good*,” he added, “*for the upbuilding of what is needed*” (Eph 4:29),¹⁵ showing that the good person is the one who builds up their neighbor. Consequently, just as the one who builds up is good, so also the one who tears down¹⁶ is rotten and mean.

Now beloved, if you have something to say that is of such a quality that it can make the hearer better, don’t hold back your word when the time is right for their salvation.¹⁷ But if you don’t have anything like that to say, but only wicked and corrupt words, then be silent and don’t speak against your neighbor. This word is “rotten” because it doesn’t build up the hearer, but even brings ruin on them. For if they practice virtue, it often leads them to despair; if they couldn’t care less for virtue, it makes them all the more indolent. If you’re about to utter a word that’s shameful and filled with derision, be silent. For this word is indeed rotten, because it makes both the one who speaks it and the one who hears it more debauched and ignites the wicked desires in each of them. Indeed, words ignite wicked designs the same way logs feed and fuel a fire. That’s why we don’t always have to utter absolutely everything that we have in our minds, but instead we should think seriously and banish wicked desires and every shameful idea from our very minds.¹⁸ But if at times we unwittingly entertain filthy thoughts, let’s not ever make them public with our tongues, but let’s strangle them with our silence. As we know, when animals and reptiles fall into a pit, if they find an exit route up and out, they become all the more vicious after they escape; but if they remain continually shut up below, they’re readily destroyed and obliterated from all sides. It’s the same with wicked thoughts. If they find an exit route through our mouth and our words, they ignite the inner flame; but if you lock them away in silence, they become weaker, and, wasting away from silence as though starved of food, they quickly die in the mind. Therefore, if you have a shameful desire but you don’t utter a

16. The contrast between *οικοδομή* and *καθαίρεσις* is grounded in 2 Cor 10:8; 13:10, where Paul is in turn echoing Jer 1:10; 24:6.

17. With the phrase *ἐν καιρῷ σωτηρίας*, John may be invoking 2 Cor 6:2, where Paul is quoting Isa 49:8.

18. Throughout this argument, although John makes no direct allusion, one imagines he may have Matt 15:16–20 in view.

Οὐκ ἔχεις διάνοιαν καθάραν; Κἂν στόμα ἔχε καθαρὸν, καὶ μὴ κενώσης ἔξω τὸν βόρβορον, ἵνα μὴ καὶ ἕτερον καὶ σαυτὸν καταβλάβῃς. Οὐ γὰρ τοῖς λέγουσι μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς ἀκούουσιν αἰσχροῖς φθεγγομένων ἐτέρων πολλή προσγίνεται κηλὶς. Διὰ τοῦτο παραινῶ καὶ [210] συμβουλεύω, μὴ μόνον τοῦ λέγειν τὰ τοιαῦτα, ἀλλὰ καὶ λεγόντων ἐτέρων τοῦ ἀκούειν ἀπέχεσθαι, καὶ τῷ θεῷ προσηλωθῆαι νόμῳ διηνεκῶς. Τὸν γὰρ τοιοῦτον καὶ ὁ Προφήτης μακαρίζει, λέγων· Μακάριος ἀνὴρ, ὃς οὐκ ἐπορεύθη ἐν βουλῇ ἀσεβῶν, καὶ ἐν ὁδῷ ἁμαρτωλῶν οὐκ ἔστη, καὶ ἐπὶ καθέδραν λοιμῶν οὐκ ἐκάθισεν· ἀλλ' ἦ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ Κυρίου τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ αὐτοῦ μελετήσῃ ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτός.

β'. Ἐν μὲν οὖν τοῖς ἔξωθεν συλλόγοις, εἰ καὶ τι λεχθεῖν ποτὲ χρηστὸν, ἀλλ' ἐν πολλοῖς τοῖς φαύλοις μόλις ἐν ὑγιῆς οἱ πολλοὶ φθέγγονται· ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν θείων Γραφῶν τούναντίον ἅπαν· πονηρὸν μὲν οὐδένα οὐδέποτε ἀκούσῃ λόγον, πάντας δὲ σωτηρίας καὶ πολλῆς γέμοντας φιλοσοφίας· οἷα δὴ καὶ τὰ σήμερον ἡμῖν ἀναγνωσθέντα. Τίνα δὲ ταῦτά ἐστι; Περὶ δὲ ὧν ἐγράψατέ μοι, φησί, καλὸν ἀνθρώπῳ γυναικὸς μὴ ἄπτεσθαι· διὰ δὲ τὰς πορνείας ἕκαστος τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα ἐχέτω, καὶ ἐκάστω τὸν ἴδιον ἄνδρα. Περὶ γάμων ὁ Παῦλος νομοθετεῖ, καὶ οὐκ αἰσχύνεται, οὐδὲ ἐρυθριᾷ· καὶ μάλα εἰκότως. Εἰ γὰρ ὁ Δεσπότης αὐτοῦ γάμον ἐτίμησε, καὶ οὐκ ἐπησχύνθη, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῇ παρουσίᾳ καὶ τῷ δώρῳ τὸ πρᾶγμα ἐκόσμησε (καὶ γὰρ καὶ δῶρα τῷ γάμῳ μείζονα ἀπάντων εἰσῆνεγκε, τὴν τοῦ ὕδατος φύσιν εἰς οἶνον μεταβαλὼν), πῶς ὁ δοῦλος ἡρυθρίασεν ἂν περὶ γάμου νομοθετῶν;

19. ἔξωθεν refers both to the space outside the ἐκκλησία (hence, competing spaces and moments of assembly within the πόλις) and to non-Christians (“pagans”).

20. I.e., “healthy.” The language of *ὑγίεια* as applied to words (λόγοι) or teaching (διδασκαλία), found also among philosophers (see BDAG, “*ὑγιής*,” 2), is especially characteristic of the Pastoral Epistles within the NT (e.g., *λόγος ὑγιής*, Titus 2:8; and often with the participle of *ὑγιαίνειν*, as in 1 Tim 1:10; 2 Tim 1:13; 4:3; Titus 1:9).

21. As noted above, the problem John must address is that the reading for the day is about the unsavory issue of *πορνεία* (see below, p. 254 n. 27, for its range of meanings, all negative), which seems incongruous with this stated requirement about uniformly salutary readings.

22. With DMD reading *ἄνδρα ἐχέτω* instead of *ἄνδρα*.

23. Note that John has introduced Paul’s words in 1 Cor 7:2–4 as being about *marriage* (a philosophical topic more fit for public oratory) rather than about sexual misconduct (*πορνεία*). On Chrysostom’s development of a pastoral theology of marriage that incorporates a kind of lay monastic sensibility, see Michel Foucault, *Les aveux de la chair*, vol. 4 of *Histoire de la sexualité*, ed. Frédéric Gros (Paris: Éditions Gallimard,

shameful word, you’ve extinguished the desire too. You have a pure mind, don’t you? Have also a pure mouth, and don’t empty your filthy garbage outside, lest you harm both yourself and another. For a gigantic stain is affixed not only to those who speak but also to those who hear others uttering shameful things. For this reason, I advise and [210] counsel you not only to avoid saying such things but also to avoid listening to others who say them, and instead to rivet yourselves continually to the divine law. For the prophet also blesses such a person, saying, “*Blessed is the man who has not walked in the counsel of the impious, or stood in the path of sinners, or sat on the chair of the pestilent, but instead his pleasure is in the law of the Lord, and he will studiously attend to his law day and night*” (Ps 1:1–2).

2. In assemblies out there in the world,¹⁹ even if occasionally something useful might be said, on many sordid occasions the majority of people hardly utter a single thing that’s salutary.²⁰ But in the case of the divine Scriptures, it’s the exact opposite. You’ll never hear a single wicked word in them, but all the words are full of salvation and profound philosophy.²¹ Such indeed are the things that were read to us today. And what are these? “*Now concerning the things about which you wrote to me,*” he says, “*it is good for a man not to touch a woman. But on account of sexual misconduct, let each man have his own wife and let each woman have her own husband*” (1 Cor 7:1–2).²² Paul lays down laws about marriage,²³ and he’s not ashamed, nor does he blush. And rightly so! For his Lord esteemed marriage and wasn’t ashamed of it but even honored the practice²⁴ with both his presence and a gift—for indeed, he brought the greatest gifts of all to the wedding by changing the very nature of water into wine (cf. John 2:1–12). If that’s so, then rightly his servant²⁵ doesn’t blush when laying down laws about these things.²⁶

2018), chap. III, 2 “Le devoir des époux” (which includes reference to this homily for that theme, of the “debt” spouses owe to one another).

24. To follow John’s argument, it is important to know that γάμος means both “marriage” and (especially in the plural, as here) “wedding celebrations.”

25. On Paul as a δοῦλος Χριστοῦ, see Rom 1:1; Phil 1:1; Gal 1:10; Titus 1:1.

26. With DMD reading εἰκότως οὐδὲ ὁ δοῦλος ἐρυθρίᾳ περὶ τούτων (the reading of Paris. gr. 748 and 768, noted by Mf) for πῶς ὁ δοῦλος ἡρυθρίασεν περὶ γάμου (“how his slave blushed concerning marriage”). John tries to turn the embarrassment of the topic of the reading into an advantage; Paul was speaking with commendable παρρησία (as, presumably, is his preacher) despite the shameful topic.

Οὐ γὰρ πονηρὸν ὁ γάμος πρᾶγμα, ἀλλὰ πονηρὸν ἡ μοιχεία, πονηρὸν ἢ πορνεία· γάμος δὲ πορνείας ἀναιρετικὸν φάρμακον. Μὴ τοίνυν αὐτὸν ἀτιμάζωμεν ταῖς διαβολικαῖς πομπαῖς· ἀλλ', ὅπερ ἐποίησαν οἱ ἐν Κανᾷ τῆς Γαλιλαίας, καὶ οἱ νῦν γυναῖκας λαμβάνοντες ποιεῖτωσαν, τὸν Χριστὸν ἐχέτωσαν μέσον. Καὶ πῶς δυνατόν τοῦτο γενέσθαι, φησί; Δι' αὐτῶν τῶν ἱερέων· Ὁ δεχόμενος γὰρ, φησὶν, ὑμᾶς, ἐμὲ δέχεται. Ἄν τοίνυν τὸν διάβολον ἀπελάσῃς, ἂν τὰ πορνικὰ ἄσματα, καὶ τὰ κεκλασμένα μέλη, καὶ τὰς ἀτάκτους χορείας, καὶ τὰ αἰσχρὰ ῥήματα, καὶ τὴν διαβολικὴν πομπήν, καὶ τὸν θόρυβον, καὶ τὸν κεχυμένον γέλωτα καὶ τὴν λοιπὴν ἐξελάσῃς ἀσχημοσύνην, εἰσαγάγῃς δὲ τοὺς ἁγίους Χριστοῦ δούλους, καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς δι' αὐτῶν παρέσται πάντως μετὰ τῆς μητρὸς καὶ τῶν ἀδελφῶν· Ὅς γὰρ ἂν ποιήσῃ, φησὶ, τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Πατρὸς μου, οὗτός μου ἀδελφὸς καὶ ἀδελφὴ καὶ μήτηρ ἐστί. Καὶ οἶδα ὅτι βαρὺς τισιν εἶναι δοκῶ καὶ φορτικὸς, ταῦτα παραινῶν καὶ παλαιὸν ἔθος ἐκκόπτων. Πλὴν ἄλλ' οὐδέν μοι τούτου μέλει· οὐ γὰρ τῆς χάριτος τῆς παρ' ὑμῶν, ἀλλὰ τῆς ὠφελείας δέομαι τῆς ὑμετέρας· οὐ τῶν κρότων καὶ τῶν ἐπαίνων, ἀλλὰ τοῦ κέρδους καὶ τῆς φιλοσοφίας. Μὴ μοι λεγέτω τις, ὅτι ἔθος

27. πορνεία can be a generic term for sexual misconduct, for both Paul (1 Cor 5:1; 1 Cor 7:2, etc.) and for John, but it can also in particular mean “sex with a prostitute” (πόρνη). Because for Chrysostom this is a derisive term of abuse, I choose the corresponding ugly English term, “whore,” which can mean both “a person who engages in sexual intercourse for pay: prostitute”; or “a promiscuous or immoral woman” (Merriam-Webster), which is what πόρνη seems to mean for Chrysostom (so also Chris L. de Wet, “John Chrysostom on Homoeroticism,” *Neot* 48 [2014]: 187–218, esp. 188). In Chrysostom’s ideology of gender and sexual relations, the term means a woman who trades sex for payment and in turn any woman engaging in sexual activity he regards as unlawful and dangerous. However, in §5 (PG 51:216) Chrysostom does point to “loss of money” (ἡ τῶν χρημάτων ζημία) as one of the calamitous results of consorting with πόρνοι.

28. ἀναιρετικὸν φάρμακον. The term φάρμακον can mean “drug, remedy, medicine, enchanted potion, philter, charm, or spell” (LSJ). For the senses of the term and the negotiation and play on this ambiguity, see Christopher A. Faraone, *Ancient Greek Love Magic* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999), 7–8, 110–19. Because this is the first of a range of magical terms that will constitute a central and recurrent theme of the homily, I emphasize here the potential sense of a magical spell or remedy. According to LSJ A, the term ἀναιρετικόν means “destructive” and, as applied to plants, can mean “poisonous.”

29. The conventional hymn to the god of marriage, Hymen, was sung as the bride was brought to the groom’s house including, clearly, by Christians. Here (as Chrysostom sees it) he has a cultural and religious “problem” on his hands.

30. DMD adopts the reading γαμοῦντες (δ) for γυναῖκας λαμβάνοντες (α) (see her discussion on DMD 132–33). Both readings are possible, but on internal grounds I

For marriage isn't a wicked practice, but what's wicked is adultery, what's wicked is sexual misconduct.²⁷ And marriage is a potion²⁸ that destroys sexual misconduct. So then, let's not dishonor it with satanic processions,²⁹ but let those taking wives³⁰ now do just as the people in Cana of Galilee did; let them have Christ in their midst. "And how is this possible," someone asks? Through the presence of the priests themselves, for "*the one who receives you,*" he says, "*receives me*" (Matt 10:40). So if you would drive away Satan, if you would drive out the whorish hymns,³¹ the effeminate songs, the disorderly choruses, the shameful words, the satanic procession, the commotion, the pealing laughter, and the rest of the unseemly behavior, and you would bring in the holy servants of Christ, then Christ, too, will be fully present in them, along with his³² mother and his brothers; for, he says, "*Whoever does the will of my father is the person who is my brother and sister and mother*" (Matt 12:50).³³ Now I know that I seem to some to be heavy-handed and irksome when I advise these things and buck an ancient custom.³⁴ But that doesn't bother me at all. For I don't want your gratitude, but your betterment; not your applause and praise, but your gain and philosophical life. Don't let anyone say to me, "It's a custom."³⁵ For where sin is brazenly enacted, don't you mention custom.

retain the PG reading because the homily is directed at an audience constructed rhetorically as male and with marriage seen as their proprietary role.

31. John refers to events in a wedding ceremony, including the *ἐπιθαλάμιος λόγος* ("wedding speech") and *κατευναστικός λόγος* ("bedchamber speech"), as described by Menander Rhetor, *Epid.* (2.399–412 [ed. Russell and Wilson]). These are all performative speech acts meant to secure good fortune from the gods for the couple.

32. The Greek says just "with the mother and the brothers," but the reference to Matt 12:46 becomes clear from the quotation from Matt 12:50 that follows. It is possible that John wants his audience at first to think that Christ will be there with "the mother and brothers" of the married couple, but he quickly challenges that impression and includes the mother and brothers of the Lord among οἱ ἄγιοι τοῦ Χριστοῦ δοῦλοι mentioned previously.

33. With ὅς for ὅστις; minus τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς after πατρός μου; with οὗτος for αὐτός.

34. I.e., traditional wedding celebrations (a pet peeve of John's).

35. One can only imagine that this is an actual response. Given how ingrained these marital practices were in ancient Mediterranean culture, and how thoroughly drenched in allusions to classical myths and deities, John had a very steep climb to try to eradicate, change, or replace them. In general on this topic, see Alain Natali, "Mariages chrétiens à Antioche au IV^e siècle," in *Sociabilité, pouvoirs et société; Actes du colloque de Rouen 24/26 Novembre 1983*, ed. Françoise Thelamon (Rouen: Publications de l'université de Rouen, 1987), 111–16. See also Maxwell, *Christianization and Communication*, 157–59, on Chrysostom's attempts to change habits and customs around

ἐστίν· ὅπου ἀμαρτία τολμᾶται, ἔθους μὴ μνησθῆς· ἀλλ', εἰ μὲν πονηρὰ τὰ γινόμενα, καὶ παλαιὸν ἔθος ἦ, κατάλυσον· ἂν δὲ μὴ πονηρὰ, καὶ συνήθεια μὴ ἦ, εἰσάγαγε καὶ καταφύτευσον.

“Ὅτι δὲ οὐ παλαιὸν ἔθος ἦν τὸ τοιαῦτα ἀσχημονεῖν, ἀλλὰ καινοτομία τις ἐστὶ τὰ γινόμενα, ἀναμνήσθητι πῶς ἔγνημεν ὁ Ἰσαὰκ τὴν Ῥεβέκκαν, πῶς ὁ Ἰακώβ τὴν Ῥαχήλ. Καὶ γὰρ τῶν γάμων αὐτῶν μέμνηται ἡ Γραφή, καὶ πῶς εἰς τὰς οἰκίας τῶν νυμφίων ἤχθησαν αὗται αἱ νύμφαι λέγει, καὶ οὐδενὸς τοιοῦτου μέμνηται· ἀλλὰ συμπόσιον μὲν καὶ δεῖπνον ἐποίησαντο τοῦ συνήθους φαιδρότερον, καὶ τοὺς προσήκοντας ἐκάλεσαν [211] εἰς τοὺς γάμους· αὐλοὶ δὲ, σύριγγες, καὶ κύμβαλα, καὶ τὰ οἰνώδη σκιρτήματα, καὶ ἡ λοιπὴ ἡ νῦν ἀσχημοσύνη πᾶσα ἐκποδῶν ἦν. Οἱ δὲ ἐφ’ ἡμῶν καὶ ὕμνους εἰς τὴν Ἀφροδίτην ᾄδουσι χορεύοντες, καὶ μοιχείας πολλὰς, καὶ γάμων διαφθοράς, καὶ ἔρωτας παρανόμους, καὶ μίξεις ἀθέσμους, καὶ πολλὰ ἕτερα ἀσεβείας καὶ αἰσχύνης γέμοντα ἄσματα κατ’ ἐκείνην ᾄδουσι τὴν ἡμέραν, καὶ μετὰ μέθην καὶ τοσαύτην ἀσχημοσύνην δι’ αἰσχρῶν ῥημάτων δημοσίᾳ τὴν νύμφην πομπεύουσι. Πῶς οὖν αὐτὴν ἀπαιτεῖς σωφροσύνην, εἰπέ μοι, εἰς τοσαύτην ἀναίδειαν ἐκ πρώτης αὐτὴν παιδοτριβῶν τῆς ἡμέρας, καὶ παρασκευάζων ἐπ’ ὅψειν αὐτῆς καὶ γίνεσθαι καὶ λέγεσθαι ταῦτα, ἃ μὴδὲ σπουδαίοις ἀνδραπόδοις ἀκοῦσαι θέμις; Τοσοῦτον χρόνον ἐπόνεσεν ὁ πατὴρ μετὰ τῆς μητρὸς φυλάττων τὴν παρθένον, ὥστε μήτε εἰπεῖν, μήτε ἐτέρου ἀκοῦσαι λέγοντός τι τῶν τοιούτων ῥημάτων, καὶ θαλάμους, καὶ γυναικωνίτιδας, καὶ φύλακας, καὶ θύρας, καὶ μοχλοὺς,

marriage (referring to the brief notice in *Hom. 1 Cor. 12.5–6* [PG 61:103–4] but not the more extensive treatment in this homily).

36. The contrast between *καταλύνειν* and *καταφύτευειν* (“eradicate” and “cultivate,” to capture the paronomasia in the Greek) is reminiscent of Jer 1:10; 24:6.

37. John is on thin ice here. Actually, only in the latter case is a meal mentioned (called *γάμος*), and, of course, he is overlooking the complication that at the end of the night, Laban introduced Leah rather than Rachel into the marriage bed with Jacob! Perhaps this “problem” is why he moves so quickly off this example.

38. In Gen 29:22: *συνήγαγεν δὲ Λαβαν πάντας τοὺς ἄνδρας τοῦ τόπου καὶ ἐποίησεν γάμον*.

39. DMD has confirmed that *ὀνώδη*, “ass-like” (as found in HS), is the reading “presente in tutta la tradizione manoscritta” (DMD 125). The conjecture by FD ME of *οἰνώδη* (“wine-filled”), adopted also by JPM in PG, is unnecessary. As the editors of PE (not the hand of JPM, as DMD 127 assumes) noted, Mf’s conjecture of the nonexistent word *οἰμώδη* is “vitiose” (“in error”), and HS’s reading, confirmed also by Paris. gr. 748, is to be preferred. See discussion in DMD 125–27 and *app. crit.* on 149.

40. Reading *καὶ μίξεις ἀθέσμους* before *καὶ πολλὰ ἕτερα ἀσεβείας*, as found in PG; this was the only place Mf (1721) had emended the text of HS ME (that lacked the phrase), on the basis of the plus reading in Paris. gr. 748 and 768.

If the practices are wicked, even if the custom is an ancient one, eradicate them! But if the practices aren't wicked, bring them in and cultivate³⁶ them, even if they're not customary.

Now, to show you that performing such unseemly acts wasn't an ancient custom but that these goings-on are a recent invention, call to mind how Isaac married Rebecca, how Jacob married Rachel. For indeed, Scripture makes mention of their weddings (cf. Gen 24:67; 29:21–30), and it tells how these brides were led into the houses of the bridegrooms,³⁷ and it doesn't mention any custom like this. Instead, they made a feast and a banquet more joyous than is now the custom, and they invited suitable guests³⁸ [211] to the wedding celebration, while flutes, Pan-pipes, cymbals, and leaping about like asses,³⁹ and all the rest of the present unseemly behavior was nowhere in sight. But the choral singers in our day sing hymns to Aphrodite, and on that very day, they sing about serial adultery, defilement of marriages, unlawful lovers, illicit couplings,⁴⁰ and many other songs filled with impiety and shame. And after a drunken bout and so much unseemly behavior, they parade the bride around publicly with shameful words. So, tell me, how do you demand her to be chaste⁴¹ when you train her in such shamelessness from the first day and have things said and done before her eyes that aren't right even for dutiful slaves to hear? The father together with the mother has for so long taken great pains to guard their virgin daughter so she might not say or hear anyone speaking any words like these, busily devising private bedchambers, living quarters for women, guards, doors, bolts, and nighttime sorties,⁴² letting her be seen by no one,

41. σωφροσύνη is the classic virtue of moderation, in things sexual and otherwise. In the NT it is especially demanded of women in the Pastoral Epistles (e.g., 1 Tim 2:9; Titus 2:4–6), as also in other philosophical moralizing texts, such as the Neo-Pythagorean pseudepigraphical letters. See Annette Bourland Huizenga, *Moral Education for Women in the Pastoral and Pythagorean Letters: Philosophers of the Household*, NovTSup 147 (Leiden: Brill, 2013). The Pastorals (and the history of their influence to his time) are a clear influence on John's domestic sexual ethic, one that does not demand complete abstinence from sexual activity but insists on decorum, modesty, and moderation, and maintains a special focus on women's behavior as an index of the propriety of the church. See Margaret Y. MacDonald, *Early Christian Women and Pagan Opinion: The Power of the Hysterical Woman* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), for the early period, and Kate Cooper, *The Virgin and the Bride: Idealized Womanhood in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1996), and much further literature.

42. Understanding πρόδος here with LSJ II.1, it refers to young girls going outside of the home in the evening but not during the day, before the eyes of the public.

καὶ τὰς ἐν ἐσπέρᾳ προόδους, καὶ τὸ μηδενὶ φαίνεσθαι μηδὲ τῶν ἐπιτηδείων, καὶ πολλὰ ἕτερα πλείονα τούτων πραγματευόμενος, καὶ σὺ πάντα ἐκεῖνα ἐν μιᾷ ἐλθὼν ἐξέχεας ἡμέρᾳ, ἀναίσχυντον αὐτὴν παρασκευάζων γενέσθαι διὰ τῆς ἀτίμου πομπῆς ἐκείνης, καὶ διεφθαρμένα ῥήματα εἰς τὴν ψυχὴν εἰσάγων τῆς νύμφης; Οὐκ ἐντεῦθεν τὰ μετὰ ταῦτα κακά; οὐκ ἐντεῦθεν μοιχεῖται καὶ ζηλοτυπία; οὐκ ἐντεῦθεν ἀπαιδία καὶ χηρεῖται καὶ ὀρφανία ἄωροι; Ὅταν γὰρ τοὺς δαίμονας καλῆς διὰ τῶν ἀσμάτων, ὅταν τὴν ἐκείνων ἐπιθυμίαν πληροῖς διὰ τῶν αἰσχυρῶν ῥημάτων, ὅταν μίμους καὶ μαλακοὺς εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν εἰσάγῃς καὶ τὸ θέατρον ἅπαν, ὅταν πορνῶν ἐμπλήσῃς τὴν οἰκίαν, καὶ τῶν δαιμόνων ὀλόκληρον παρασκευάσῃς ἐκεῖ κωμᾶσαι τὸν χορὸν, τί προσδοκᾷς λοιπὸν ὑγιές, εἰπέ μοι; Τίνος δὲ ἕνεκεν καὶ ἱερέας εἰσάγεις, μέλλων τῇ ὑστεραίᾳ τοιαῦτα τελεῖν;

Βούλει φιλοτιμίαν ἐπιδείξασθαι κέρδος ἔχουσιν; Κάλεσον χοροὺς πενήτων. Ἄλλ' αἰσχύνῃ πάντως, καὶ ἐρυθριᾷς; Καὶ τί ταύτης τῆς ἀλογίας χεῖρον, ὅταν τὸν μὲν διάβολον ἔλκων εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν, μηδὲν νομίζῃς αἰσχυρὸν ποιεῖν, τὸν δὲ Χριστὸν μέλλων εἰσάγειν, ἐρυθριᾷς; Ὡσπερ γὰρ πενήτων εἰσιόντων ὁ Χριστὸς παραγίνεται, οὕτω μαλακῶν καὶ μίμων ἐκεῖ χορευόντων

43. E.g., the κατευναστικὸς λόγος, which Menander Rhetor euphoniously calls a προτροπή πρὸς τὴν συμπλοκήν ("an exhortation to copulation" [ed. Russell and Wilson, my translation]). Menander insists that this is not the place to praise the bride's σωφροσύνη and φρόνησις ("chasteness" and "wisdom"), but instead her ὥρα and κάλλος ("youth" and "beauty") See *Epid.* 2.405.

44. Chrysostom presumes that calling upon Aphrodite, Hymen, and other traditional gods is "summoning demons." The phrasing τοὺς δαίμονας καλεῖν is another instance of his play on the language of magical incantations.

45. μῖμοι: "mimes," "mimics," "impersonators." See Ruth Webb, *Demons and Dancers: Performance in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2009), on these ubiquitous performances and their considerable social power and influence. Often mimes gave satirical performances of play-bits, such as on adultery (likely a presumption behind Chrysostom's argument here).

46. As in Paul's 1 Cor 6:9, μαλακός means a man who is a "softie," "effeminate," and is intended to be an insult, so I choose an English word, "pansy," that is "disparaging and offensive: a weak or effeminate man or boy; a male homosexual" (Merriam-Webster). Compare de Wet, "John Chrysostom on Homoeroticism," 188, with n. 4, who for the same reasons opts for the translation "fag." Chrysostom assumes actors are especially prone to this stereotype—see Leyerle, *Theatrical Shows and Ascetic Lives*, 100–42 (Chapter 5, "Ridiculous Men").

47. John likely has in mind ἐταῖραι, or courtesans, at the wedding receptions. In any case, he assumes actors and mimes who perform at the wedding reception are

not even your close friends, and many more practices besides these. And now in a single day, you’ve gone and squandered all those efforts by rendering her shameless by that dishonorable procession and by introducing corrupt words into the bride’s soul?⁴³ Doesn’t this result in the bad things that follow? Doesn’t it result in acts of adultery and jealous rivalries? Doesn’t it result in childlessness, widowhood, and children being left orphans before their time? For when you summon demons⁴⁴ with these songs, when you satisfy their lust with these shameful words, when you bring mimes⁴⁵ and pansies⁴⁶ and the entire theater into your home, when you fill the house with whores⁴⁷ and you have the whole chorus of demons revel there,⁴⁸ tell me, what healthy outcome do you expect later? And why is it that you even bring priests in when you’re going to carry out these sorts of rites on the next day?

Do you want to show that there’s profit in ostentatious display?⁴⁹ Then invite choruses of poor people.⁵⁰ Ah, but no doubt you’re ashamed and embarrassed at that? What could be worse than this craziness—that when you drag Satan into your house, you don’t think you’re doing anything shameful, but at the prospect of bringing Christ in,⁵¹ you blush with shame? For just as Christ is present when the poor enter in, so in turn Satan revels

sexually promiscuous. As noted above (n. 27), the term πόρνη is a completely a negative one for John, as it was for Paul (e.g., 1 Cor 6:15, translated as “whore” in Wycliffe or “harlot” in KJV, though modern English translations, such as RSV, NRSV, NIV, conventionally render it “prostitute”). John inherits and promulgates, both from Paul and broader cultural convention, a misogynist stereotype of the malicious, plotting πόρνη. See Dayna S. Kalleres, “Drunken Hags with Amulets and Prostitutes with Erotic Spells: The Re-Feminization of Magic in Late Antique Christian Homilies,” in *Daughters of Hecate: Women and Magic in the Ancient World*, ed. Kimberly B. Stratton and Dayna S. Kalleres (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014), 219–51, esp. 238–44.

48. Menander Rhetor counsels the speaker making the bedchamber speech (κατευναστικός λόγος) to say to the assembled company there: “while they are completing the rites of marriage and being completely initiated [ἔως αὐτοὶ τελοῦσι τὰ ὄργια τοῦ γάμου καὶ τελοῦνται], let’s put on garlands of roses and violets, light our lamps, cavort around the bridal chamber, begin to dance and cry out the ‘hymenal hymn’ [τὸν ὑμέναιον ἐπιβώμεθα], stomping the ground with our feet, clapping our hands, the whole group of us dressed in garlands” (*Epid.* 2.409 [ed. Russell and Wilson, my translation]).

49. φιλοτιμία; also (suitable here, as well) “social ambition” (LSJ I.1 and 3).

50. With Luke 14:16–24 // Matt 22:1–14; cf. Luke 14:12–14.

51. John has Matt 25:31–46 in mind, as so often (see Brändle, *Matthäus 25:31–46 im Werk des Johannes Chrysostomus*).

ὁ διάβολος ἐν τῷ μέσῳ κωμάζει. Καὶ ἀπὸ μὲν τῆς δαπάνης ἐκείνης κέρδος οὐδέν, ἀλλὰ καὶ πολλὴ γένοιτ' ἂν ἡ βλάβη· ἀπὸ δὲ τούτων τῶν ἀναλωμάτων πολὺν τινα λήψῃ τὸν μισθὸν ταχέως. Ἀλλὰ οὐδεὶς ἐπὶ τῆς πόλεως τοῦτο εἰργάσατο; Ἀλλὰ σὺ κατάρξαι σπούδασον καὶ ἀρχηγὸς γενέσθαι τῆς καλῆς ταύτης συνηθείας, ἵνα καὶ οἱ μετὰ ταῦτα εἰς σὲ ἀναφέρωσι. Κἂν ζηλώσῃ τις, κἂν μιμῆσται τοῦτο τὸ ἔθος, πρὸς τοὺς ἐξετάζοντας ἔξουσι λέγειν οἱ ἔγγονοι καὶ οἱ ἐξ ἐγγόνων, ὅτι Ὁ δεῖνα τὸν καλὸν τοῦτον νόμον πρῶτος εἰσήγαγεν. Εἰ γὰρ ἐπὶ τῶν ἔξωθεν ἀγώνων, ἐν τοῖς συμποσίοις, οἱ πρὸς τὸ φιλοτιμότερον τὰς ἀνοήτους ταύτας λειτουργίας ἐξάγοντες, παρὰ πολλῶν ἄδονται· πολλῶ μᾶλλον ἐπὶ τῆς λειτουργίας τῆς πνευματικῆς ἅπαντες ἐπαινέσονται, καὶ χάριν ὁμολογήσουσι τῷ πρῶτῳ τὴν θαυμαστὴν ταύτην ἀρχὴν εἰσαγαγόντι, καὶ ἔσται τὸ αὐτὸ καὶ φιλοτιμία καὶ κέρδος. Καὶ γὰρ ὅφ' ἐτέρων τοῦτο κατορθούμενον, σοί, τῷ πρῶτῳ φυτευσμένῳ, τῶν καρπῶν ἐκείνων οἴσει τὴν ἀμοιβήν· τοῦτό σε καὶ πατέρα ποιήσει ταχέως, τοῦτο καὶ τῶν τικτομένων προστήσεται, καὶ τὸν νυμφίον τῇ νύμφῃ [212] συγκαταγηράσαι παρασκευάσει. "Ὡσπερ γὰρ τοῖς ἁμαρτάνουσιν ἀπειλεῖ συνεχῶς ὁ Θεὸς, λέγων, ὅτι "Ἔσονται οἱ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν ὀρφανοί, καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες ὑμῶν χῆραι· οὕτω καὶ τοῖς ἐν ἅπασιν αὐτῷ πειθομένοις καὶ γῆρας λιπαρὸν καὶ πάντα μετὰ τούτων δώσειν ὑπισχνεῖται τὰ ἀγαθά.

γ'. Καὶ Παύλου δὲ ἔστιν ἀκοῦσαι τοῦτο λέγοντος, ὅτι θανάτους ἁώρους πολλάκις ἁμαρτημάτων ἐποίησε πλῆθος. Διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ, φησὶν, ἐν ὑμῖν πολλοὶ ἀσθενεῖς καὶ ἄρρωστοι, καὶ κοιμῶνται ἱκανοί. "Ὅτι δὲ πένητες τρεφόμενοι οὐδὲν τοιοῦτον ἀφίᾳσι συμπεσεῖν, ἀλλὰ, κἂν γένηται τι τῶν ἀδοκῆτων, ταχίστην ἐπάγουσιν αὐτοῦ τὴν διόρθωσιν, ἀπὸ τῆς κόρης μάθανε τῆς ἐν Ἰόππῃ. Καὶ γὰρ ταύτην ποτὲ νεκρὰν κειμένην περιστάντες οἱ τρεφόμενοι πένητες καὶ δακρύσαντες ἀνέστησαν, καὶ πρὸς ζωὴν ἐπανήγαγον. Τοσοῦτον εὐχὴ χρηρῶν

52. I.e., invite the poor to a wedding banquet (cf. Luke 14:16–24 // Matt 22:1–14).

53. John is playing on the senses of *λειτουργία* as "public service" or benefaction (LSJ I.A., II.1–2; PGL A) and as (Christian) "service and worship" of human beings and God, respectively (PGL B, C).

54. Or, as above, "social ambition."

55. I.e., those who follow the new "custom" of inviting the poor to the wedding reception.

56. John has transposed the two clauses and reads οἱ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν for τὰ παιδιά ὑμῶν.

57. γῆρας λιπαρόν: Homer, *Od.* 11.136; 19.368 (ed. von der Mühll); Pindar, *Nem.* 7.99 (ed. Maehler), and so on. This may or may not be a classical allusion here, since by John's time the phrase has long been a commonplace—e.g., Josephus, *A.J.* 8.2 (ed. Niese); Plutarch, *Exil.* 603b (ed. Sieveking); Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 6.11.1 (SC 41:100, ed. Bardy); etc. This phrase, used frequently by John (see, e.g., *Laz.* 5.3 [PG 48:1030];

in their midst when pansies and mimes set up a chorus there. From the latter expenditure comes no profit, but indeed the potential for great harm, whereas from the former expenses, you'll quickly receive a huge reward. But no one in our city has done this before?⁵² Well then, make it your task to start it, and become the inaugurator of this virtuous custom so even those who come afterward will trace it back to you. If someone admires and imitates this custom, then his grandchildren and great-grandchildren will be able to tell those who inquire that it was so-and-so who was the first to introduce this good custom. In the case of competitions held during banquets in the outside world, those who produce these useless public services⁵³ to make the more ostentatious display⁵⁴ have their praises sung by many. That being so, how much more in the case of this spiritual service will all utter praises and confess their gratitude to the person who was the first to introduce this marvelous custom? Hence the ostentatious display and the gain will be one and the same! Indeed, this good deed carried out by others⁵⁵ will bring the recompense of those fruits to you who first planted it. This will also make you a father quickly; it will set you in authority over the children born to you, and it will make the groom [212] live to a ripe old age with his bride. For just as God continually threatens those who sin, saying, "*your sons will be orphans, and your wives widows*" (Exod 22:23),⁵⁶ so also he promises to give those who trust in him in all these matters a sleek old age⁵⁷ and all the good things that accompany it.

3. Paul, too, can be heard saying that an abundance of sins often makes for untimely deaths. For, he says, "*this is why many among you are weak and sick, and a good number have gone to sleep*" (1 Cor 11:30). Learn from the girl at Joppa⁵⁸ that when poor people are fed, they allow no such thing to happen; but even if something quite unexpected should occur, they bring about a very swift correction of it. Indeed, it was the case that the poor who were being fed,⁵⁹ by standing around this girl who was lying there dead at that moment and by shedding their tears, raised her and

Hom. 2 Cor. 4:13 Γ §8 [PG 51:297]), is also employed by his contemporary late fourth-century educated Christian writers such as Gregory of Nyssa, *Vita sanctae Macrinae* §13 (SC 178:184, ed. Maraval) and Gregory of Nazianzus, *Or. Caesar*. §4 (SC 405:188, ed. Calvet-Sébasti).

58. A reference to Tabitha (Dorcas) in Acts 9:36–43, who was raised up from the dead by Peter.

59. The Acts narrative does not specify either that they were poor or that they were fed. But John associates these characteristics with *πᾶσαι αἱ χήραι*, "all the widows," whom he is naming as the heroines of the story. John connects them with poverty both

καὶ πενήτων γέλωτος παντὸς καὶ χορείας ἐστὶ χρησιμώτερα. Ἐνταῦθα πρὸς μίαν ἡμέραν ἢ τέρψις, ἐκεῖ διηνεκὲς τὸ κέρδος. Ἐννόησον ἡλίκον ἐστὶ τοσαύτας ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς εὐλογίας λαβοῦσαν τὴν νύμφην, εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν εἰσέναι τοῦ νυμφίου. Πόσων στεφάνων ταῦτα σεμνότερα; πόσου χρησιμώτερα πλούτου; ὡς τὰ γε νῦν γινόμενα ἐσχάτης παραπληξίας καὶ παραφροσύνης ἐστίν. Εἰ γὰρ μηδὲ κόλασις, μηδὲ τιμωρία τις ἔκειτο τοῖς τὰ τοιαῦτα ἀσχημονοῦσιν, ἐννόησον ὅσης ἐστὶ τιμωρίας, ἀνέχεσθαι τοσαύταις πλυνομένους λοιδορίαις, δημοσίᾳ, πάντων ἀκούοντων, ὑπὸ ἀνθρώπων μεθυόντων καὶ διεφθαρμένων τὸν νοῦν. Οἱ μὲν γὰρ πένητες λαμβάνοντες εὐλογοῦσι, μυρία συνεύχονται τὰ ἀγαθὰ. ἐκεῖνοι δὲ μετὰ τὴν μέθην, μετὰ τὴν ἀδηφαγίαν, πάντα βόρβορον σκωμμάτων κατὰ τῆς τῶν γαμούντων καταχέουσι κεφαλῆς, ἄμιλλάν τινα διαβολικὴν πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἔχοντες· καὶ καθάπερ ἐχθρῶν ὄντων τῶν συνιόντων, οὕτως οἱ προσήκοντες αὐτοῖς φιλοτιμοῦνται πρὸς ἀλλήλους, ἐν τῷ ῥήτῳ καὶ ἄρρητῳ λέγειν ὀνειδῆ περὶ τῶν γημάντων, μιμῆσαι τοὺς ἀντιτεταγμένους· καὶ ἡ πρὸς ἀλλήλους τούτων φιλονεικία μεθ' ὑπερβολῆς ἀπάσης τὸν νυμφίον μετὰ τῆς νύμφης καταισχύνεσθαι παρασκευάζει.

Ἄρ' οὖν ἐτέραν ζητήσομεν ἀπόδειξιν, εἰπέ μοι, τῶν δαιμόνων κινούντων τὰς ἐκείνων ψυχὰς ταῦτα καὶ γίνεσθαι καὶ λέγεσθαι παρ' αὐτῶν; Τίς οὖν ἀμφισβητήσει λοιπὸν, ὅτι δαιμόνων κινούντων τὰς ἐκείνων ψυχὰς καὶ λέγεται ταῦτα πάντα καὶ γίνεται παρ' ἐκείνων; Οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδεὶς· καὶ γὰρ τοιαῦται τοῦ διαβόλου αἱ ἀντιδόσεις, λοιδορίαι, καὶ μέθαι, καὶ παραφροσύνη ψυχῆς. Εἰ δέ τις οἰωνίζοιτο τὸ πένητας ἀντὶ τούτων εἰσάγεσθαι, καὶ συμφορᾶς λέγοι εἶναι σύμβολα ταῦτα, μαθέτω καὶ τοῦτο, ὅτι οὐ τὸ πένητας τρέφεσθαι καὶ χήρας, ἀλλὰ τὸ μαλακοὺς καὶ πόρνας, τοῦτο ἀπάσης ἀηδίας καὶ μυρίων ἐστὶ σύμβολον κακῶν. Πολλάκις γὰρ ἀπ' αὐτῆς τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκ τῶν φίλων τὸν νυμφίον αἰχμάλωτον λαβοῦσα ἀπῆλθεν ἢ πόρνη, καὶ τὸν ἔρωτα τὸν πρὸς τὴν νύμφην ἔσβεσε, καὶ τὴν εὐνοίαν ὑπέσυρε, καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην, πρὶν ἐξαφθῆναι, κατέλυσε, καὶ μοιχείας ἐγκατέβαλε σπέρματα. Ταῦτα δεδοικέναι τοὺς πατέρας ἐχρῆν, εἰ καὶ μηδὲν ἕτερον, καὶ κωλύειν τῶν μίμων καὶ τῶν ὀρχουμένων τὰς εἰς τοὺς

because they are widows and because Tabitha had made clothes for them, going so far as to attribute a key agential role to the widows in this miracle (presumably because they brought their benefactress to the attention of the apostle Peter) that is lacking in the Acts narrative.

60. The crowning or garlanding of the bride for the procession to the groom's house was likely a part of the festivities (Natali, "Mariages chrétiens à Antioche," 112).

61. I.e., the bride and groom at the reception and accompanying events.

62. Minus ἀνθρώπων before τὸν νοῦν.

63. The most famous of these were the *Fescennini versus*, "improvised songs, sung

brought her back to life. The prayer of widows and poor people is more advantageous than any burlesque or choral dance; from the latter comes delight for a single day, but from the former ongoing gain. Consider how magnificent it is for the bride to enter into the house of the groom after receiving such great blessings on her head. What crowns⁶⁰ are more noble than this? What amount of wealth more advantageous? And yet the practices that now take place are the height of delirium and derangement. For even if no punishment or chastisement were lying in store for those who perform such unseemly acts, consider how great the chastisement is that is endured by those who are dressed down⁶¹ by people who are drunk and “*mentally defiled*” (1 Tim 6:5)⁶² with such insults offered in public with everyone listening. When the poor receive gifts, they offer a blessing, and they join in prayer for countless good things. But in contrast, those revilers, after they overimbibe and overeat, pour all kinds of filthy jokes⁶³ down on the heads of those who are marrying, as though they had a kind of satanic rivalry with one another. And like enemies locked in battle, so do their relatives engage in competition with one another in pronouncing speakable and unspeakable reproaches about the married couple in imitation of their opponents. And their contest with one another causes the groom, along with the bride, to be ashamed to the highest degree.

So then, tell me, shall we seek another proof of the fact that it’s because demons are moving their souls that these things are done and are said by them? Who in the end will dispute the fact that all these things are both said and done by them because demons are moving their souls? No one. For these sorts of things—retaliations, insults, drunken bouts, psychic derangement—come from the devil. Now if some might regard it as an ill-omen for the poor to be invited in instead of the usual retinue, and say it’s a portent of misfortune ahead, let them learn this as well: what’s a portent of utter unpleasantness and countless calamities isn’t the poor and widows being fed but the pansies and the whores. For often the whore, having from that day forward taken the groom captive from his friends, has gone off and extinguished the loving passion he had for his bride, dragged away his goodwill, destroyed his love before it’s been inflamed, and sown in him the seeds of adultery. Fathers should be afraid of these things, and, even if for no other reason, they should prevent mimes and dancers from coming

at weddings, which fall into the category of quite commonly found apotropaic obscenity. The custom even continued in Christian times” (Edward Courtney, “Fescennini versus,” *BNP*, http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1574-9347_bnp_e410960).

γάμους παρουσίας. Γάμος γάρ, οὐχ ἵνα ἀσελγῶ-[213]μεν εἰσενήνεκται, οὐδ' ἵνα πορνεύωμεν, ἀλλ' ἵνα σωφρονῶμεν. Ἀκουσον γοῦν τοῦ Παύλου λέγοντος· Διὰ δὲ τὰς πορνείας ἕκαστος τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα ἐχέτω, καὶ ἐκάστη τὸν ἴδιον ἀνδρα ἐχέτω.

Δύο γὰρ ταῦτά ἐστι, δι' ἅπερ εἰσενήνεκται γάμος, ἵνα τε σωφρονῶμεν, καὶ ἵνα πατέρες γινώμεθα· τῶν δὲ δύο τούτων προηγουμένη ἡ τῆς σωφροσύνης ἐστὶ πρόφασις. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ εἰσῆλθεν ἐπιθυμία, εἰσῆλθε καὶ γάμος τὴν ἀμετρίαν ἐκκόπτων, καὶ πείθων μιᾷ χρῆσθαι γυναικί. Τὰς γὰρ παιδοποιίας οὐχ ὁ γάμος ποιεῖ πάντως, ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνο τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸ λέγον, Αὐξάνεσθε, καὶ πληθύνεσθε, καὶ πληρώσατε τὴν γῆν· καὶ μαρτυροῦσιν ὅσοι γάμῳ μὲν ἐχρήσαντο, πατέρες δὲ οὐκ ἐγένοντο. Ὡστε προηγουμένη αὕτη ἡ αἰτία, ἡ τῆς σωφροσύνης, καὶ μάλιστα νῦν, ὅτε ἡ οἰκουμένη πᾶσα τοῦ γένους ἡμῶν ἐμπέπλησται. Παρὰ μὲν γὰρ τὴν ἀρχὴν ποθεινὸν τὸ τῶν παίδων ᾗν, διὰ τὸ

64. John's cultural history of marriage as having been introduced by God is a deliberate counternarrative to the etiologies of marriage that assign responsibility to the Greek gods, which are constitutive of the oratory at weddings. See Menander Rhetor, *Epid.* 2.411 (ed. Russell and Wilson).

65. See p. 257 n. 41 above on this key term, *σωφρονεῖν*. In English, one should think of the first gloss in Merriam-Webster here: "innocent of unlawful sexual intercourse," with also a sense of having proper control over one's sexual appetites (see the association with the antonym, *ἀμετρία*, in the next sentence).

66. John insists that 1 Cor 7:2 should serve as a kind of talismanic incantation against sexual immorality. Here one is to ἐγγράφειν ("inscribe") it on the mind as a kind of a mental amulet and ἐγκολάπτειν ("carve") it on objects in the home, with focal attention on the bedroom, so those objects will serve as house phylacteries. He literally "circumscribes" the home with these verses, closing in from the outer walls to the inner bedroom (θάλαμος) to the bed itself. John will return to this theme in §3 (PG 51:213) and in the conclusion to the homily in §5 (PG 51:218).

67. Cf. Deut 6:6, of the Shema: καὶ ἔσται τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα, ὅσα ἐγὼ ἐντέλλομαι σοι σήμερον, ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου καὶ ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ σου. Additionally, Chrysostom's focus on *διάνοια* probably reflects the influence of the Shema as recast in Matt 22:37 (which has also influenced LXX manuscripts of Deut 6:5), as well, of course, of Jer 38:34 LXX of texts located in the mind and heart. In the present homily Chrysostom is proposing that 1 Cor 7:2–4 serve as a "Shema of sex."

68. As throughout this homily, Chrysostom adopts a thoroughly androcentric

to wedding celebrations. For marriage [213] has been introduced⁶⁴ not so that we might engage in debauchery or sexual misconduct but so we might be chaste.⁶⁵ Indeed, listen to Paul saying, “*But on account of sexual misconduct, let each man have his own wife, and let each woman have her own husband*” (1 Cor 7:2). I would wish each man to inscribe⁶⁶ this passage on his mind⁶⁷ and to usher his own bride⁶⁸ into the house of the bridegroom using these words, and to have this very statement carved on the walls of the house,⁶⁹ on the bridal chamber, and on the marital bed itself: “*But on account of sexual misconduct, let each man have his own wife, and let each woman have her own husband*” (1 Cor 7:2).⁷⁰

There are two reasons why marriage has been introduced: both so we might be chaste and so that we might become fathers. But of these two reasons, the motivation of chasteness has preeminence. For when desire⁷¹ entered, marriage also entered,⁷² thus cutting off immoderation and urging one to have sexual intercourse with just one woman. For marriage certainly doesn’t create childbearing, but what does is that divine statement that says, “*Increase and multiply and fill the earth*” (Gen 1:28). The many who, though they engaged in the practice of marriage, didn’t become fathers provide testimony of this fact. Therefore, this reason—that of chasteness—has preeminence, and especially so now, when the whole world is filled with our human race. For at the beginning there was

perspective on marriage and addresses himself to the men in his audience, while also prescribing behavior for women, who are discussed among the men but (with a few exceptions) not directly addressed.

69. Cf. Deut 6:9: καὶ γράψετε αὐτὰ ἐπὶ τὰς φλιάς τῶν οἰκῶν ὑμῶν καὶ τῶν πυλῶν ὑμῶν.

70. With DMD reading plus Ταύτην τὴν ῥῆσιν ἐβουλόμην ἕκαστον εἰς τὴν διάνοιαν ἐγγράψαι, τὴν ἑαυτοῦ μετὰ τούτων τῶν ῥημάτων τὴν νύμφην εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν ἄγεσθαι τοῦ νυμφίου, καὶ εἰς τοὺς τοίχους τῆς οἰκίας καὶ εἰς τὸν θάλαμον καὶ εἰς αὐτὴν τὴν εὐνὴν ἐγκεκοῶσθαι τοῦτο τὸ ῥῆμα· Διὰ δὲ τὰς πορνείας ἕκαστος τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα ἐχέτω καὶ ἑκάστη τὸν ἴδιον ἄνδρα ἐχέτω after τὸν ἴδιον ἄνδρα ἐχέτω (PG 51:213, 4). This passage is missing from subarchetype α, which includes all three manuscripts represented in the text of PG and his precursors, HS ME Mf PE (see n. 1 above); it is included in subarchetype δ. One may understand its loss as due to homoioteleuton, with text dropped between the two quotations of 1 Cor 7:2, ending in τὸν ἴδιον ἄνδρα ἐχέτω (so DMD 81).

71. Or “lust” (ἐπιθυμία).

72. One detects a resonance with Rom 5:12 here in εἰσῆλθεν used to refer to a key moment in the history of human civilization and culture when sin (or, in this case, desire or lust) came into the world. Yet John does not spell out fully an appeal to “the fall” here.

μνημόσυνον καὶ λείψανα καταλιμπάνειν ἕκαστον τῆς ἑαυτοῦ ζωῆς. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἀναστάσεως οὐδέπω ἦσαν ἐλπίδες, ἀλλ' ὁ θάνατος ἐκράτει, καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἐντεῦθεν ζωὴν ἀπόλλυσθαι ἐνόμιζον οἱ τελευτῶντες, ἔδωκεν ὁ Θεὸς τὴν ἐκ τῶν παίδων παραμυθίαν, ὥστε τῶν ἀπελθόντων εἰκόνας ἐμφύχους μένειν, καὶ τὸ γένος ἡμῶν διατηρεῖσθαι, καὶ τοῖς μέλλουσι τελευτᾶν, καὶ τοῖς ἐπιτηδεύουσιν τοῖς ἐκείνων μεγίστην εἶναι παράκλησιν τὰ ἐκείνων ἔκγονα. Καὶ ἵνα μάθῃς ὅτι διὰ τοῦτο μάλιστα ποθεῖνὰ τὰ τέκνα ἦν, ἄκουσον τί πρὸς τὸν Ἰωβ ἀποδύρεται μετὰ τὰς πολλὰς πληγὰς ἢ γυνή. Ἴδου, φησὶν, ἀπώλετο τὸ μνημόσυνόν σου ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς, οἱ υἱοὶ σου καὶ αἱ θυγατέρες σου. Καὶ πάλιν ὁ Σαοὺλ πρὸς τὸν Δαυΐδ· Ὁμοσόν μοι, ἵνα μὴ ἀφανίσῃς τὸ σπέρμα μου, καὶ τὸ ὄνομά μου μετ' ἐμέ. Ἐπειδὴ δὲ λοιπὸν ἡ ἀνάστασις ἐπὶ θύραις, καὶ θανάτου λόγος οὐδεὶς, ἀλλὰ πρὸς ἑτέραν ζωὴν ὁδεύομεν βελτίω τῆς οὔσης, περιττὴ ἢ περὶ ταῦτα σπουδὴ. Εἰ γὰρ παίδων ἐπιθυμεῖς, πολλῶ βελτίους καὶ χρησιμωτέρους δυνήσῃ κτήσασθαι νῦν, ὅτε πνευματικαὶ τινες ὠδῖνες εἰσῆχθησαν, καὶ βελτίων τόκος, καὶ γηροκόμοι χρησιμώτεροι. Ὡστε μία τίς ἐστὶ γάμου πρόφασις, τὸ μὴ πορνεύειν, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τὸ φάρμακον εἰσηνήκεται τοῦτο. Εἰ δὲ μέλλοις καὶ μετὰ γάμον κεχρηῆσθαι πορνείαις, περιττῶς ἥλθες ἐπὶ τὸν γάμον, καὶ εἰκὴ καὶ μάτην· μᾶλλον δὲ οὐκ εἰκὴ καὶ μάτην μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπὶ βλάβῃ. Οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν ἴσον οὐκ ἔχοντα γυναῖκα πορνεύειν, καὶ μετὰ γάμον πάλιν τὸ αὐτὸ τοῦτο ποιεῖν. Οὐδὲ γὰρ πορνεία τὸ τοιοῦτο λοιπὸν ἐστίν, ἀλλὰ μοιχεία. Εἰ γὰρ καὶ παράδοξόν ἐστι τὸ εἰρημένον, ἀλλ' ἀληθές.

73. The Greek reads ἕκαστον ... ἐκάστου (masculine), consistent with the purpose “so that ‘we’ might become fathers” and the patriarchal assumption that the male is responsible for the “generation” of children.

74. Cf. Rom 5:14: ἐβασίλευσεν ὁ θάνατος.

75. With DMD reading τὰς πολλὰς καὶ ἀφάτους πληγὰς (with Paris. gr. 748 and 768, as noted by Mf) for τὰς πολλὰς πληγὰς.

76. A quotation, with paraphrase: with ἀπώλετο for ἡφάνισται; transposition of σου after τὸ μνημόσυνον (but note that subarchetypes α and δ are split here; the adopted reading matches LXX codex A); οἱ υἱοὶ σου for υἱοί (A reads υἱοὶ σου); αἱ θυγατέρες for θυγατέρες. This quotation had been identified as Job 18:17 by all editors from HS to Mf to DMD. However, though reminiscent of John's words (τὸ μνημόσυνον αὐτοῦ ἀπόλοιτο), Job 18:17 is not as close verbally as is Job 2:9b, and, more importantly, 18:17 cannot be correct, since it is spoken by Bildad and not by Job's wife, as John properly indicates for this quotation of 2:9b.

77. Not an exact quotation, as John has coalesced two verbal clauses into one: ἵνα μὴ ἀφανίσῃς for ὅτι οὐκ ἐξολεθρεύσεις but then minus οὐκ ἀφανιεῖς before τὸ ὄνομά μου; μετ' ἐμέ for ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ πατρὸς μου (also minus ἐν κυρίῳ in the oath formula).

a desire for children, in order that each man⁷³ could leave behind a memorial or remnant of his own life. This is because there weren't yet any hopes for resurrection, but death held sway,⁷⁴ and those who were dying thought they'd perish after the present life. This is why God gave them the consolation of children: so that living images of those who had departed might survive, our human race be preserved, and their descendants serve as the greatest comfort for those who are about to die and for their friends. For you to learn that it was especially for this reason children were desired, listen to what Job's wife lamented to him after the many indescribable blows⁷⁵ he received: "*Look,*" she said, "*your memorial, your sons and your daughters, has perished from the earth*" (Job 2:9b).⁷⁶ And again Saul said to David, "*Swear to me that you will not cause my seed, and my name after me, to disappear*" (1 Kgdms 24:22).⁷⁷ But at the end,⁷⁸ when the resurrection is at hand and death is of no account, and we travel to another life that's better than the present, concern for these things⁷⁹ is unnecessary. For if it is children you desire, you're able to acquire greatly superior and more useful children now, when birth pangs of a spiritual nature, a better type of childbearing, and better caregivers for our old age have been introduced.⁸⁰ Therefore, there's only one motivation for marriage—so as not to commit acts of sexual misconduct—and that's why this potion⁸¹ has been introduced. But if even after marriage you wish to engage in sexual misconduct, you've entered into marriage to no purpose, both uselessly and in vain—or, rather, not only uselessly and in vain, but even to your harm. For it's not the same thing for a man without a wife to engage in sexual misconduct⁸² as it is for him to do the very same thing yet again after marriage, because this act is not sexual misconduct but adultery. Even if what I say is surprising, nonetheless it's true.

78. Ἐπειδὴ δὲ λοιπὸν answers Παρὰ μὲν γὰρ τὴν ἀρχὴν several lines previous.

79. I.e., leaving descendants as a permanent memorial after one's death.

80. This is apparently a reference to the advent of the church and its rites marking a new, metaphorical life span of "spiritual birth pangs" and "new births" as administered by priests, as in *Sac.* 3.6: Οὗτοι γὰρ εἰσιν, οὗτοι οἱ τὰς πνευματικὰς πιστευθέντες ὡδῖνας καὶ τὸν διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος ἐπιτραπέντες τόκον (SC 272, ed. Malingrey). The βελτίων τόκος that John describes in *Hom. Act.* 21.5 (PG 60:168) is the new birth of resurrection (interestingly, there in relation to Acts 9:36–43, a text referred to above in §3).

81. Cf. ἀναιρετικὸν φάρμακον earlier (§2 [PG 51:210; DMD 148]).

82. As noted with its cognates above (nn. 27 and 47) πορνεύειν can refer to generalized sexual misconduct, or sex with "prostitutes" or "whores" in particular.

δ'. Οὐκ ἀγνοοῦμεν γὰρ ὅτι πολλοὶ μοιχείαν νομίζουσιν, ὅταν τις ὕπανδρον φθείρῃ γυναῖκα μόνον· ἐγὼ δὲ καὶ δημοσίᾳ πόρνη, καὶ θεραπαίνιδι, καὶ ἄλλῃ τινὶ γυναικὶ ἄνδρα οὐκ ἐχούσῃ πρόσχῃ κακῶς καὶ ἀκολάστως, ἔχων γυναῖκα, μοιχείαν τὸ τοιοῦτον εἶναί φημι. Οὐ γὰρ δὴ μόνον ἀπὸ τῶν ὑβριζομένων, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ὑβριζόντων τὸ τῆς μοιχείας συνίσταται ἐγκλημα. Μὴ γάρ μοι τοὺς ἔξωθεν νόμους εἴπῃς νῦν, οἱ τὰς μὲν γυναῖκας μοιχευομένας εἰς δικαστήριον ἔλκουσι [214] καὶ εὐθύνας ἀπαιτοῦσιν, ἄνδρας καὶ γυναῖκας ἔχοντας καὶ θεραπαίνισι προφθειρομένους οὐκ ἀπαιτοῦσιν εὐθύνας· ἀλλ' ἐγὼ σοι τὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ νόμον ἀναγνώσμαι, ὁμοίως καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γυναικὸς καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἀγανακτοῦντα, καὶ μοιχείαν εἶναι τὸ πρᾶγμα λέγοντα. Εἰπὼν γὰρ, Καὶ ἐκάστῃ τὸν ἴδιον ἄνδρα ἐχέτω, ἐπήγαγε· Τῇ γυναικὶ ὁ ἀνὴρ τὴν ὀφειλομένην εὐνοίαν ἀποδιδότω. Τί ποτε δηλοῦν βουλόμενος τοῦτο εἶπεν; ἄρα ἵνα τὰς προσόδους αὐτῇ τῶν χρημάτων διατηρήσῃ; ἵνα τὴν προῖκα σώαν; ἵνα ἱμάτια παράσχῃ πολυτελεῖ; ἵνα τράπεζαν δαψιλεστέραν, ἵνα ἐξόδους λαμπράς; ἵνα οἰκετῶν θεραπείαν πολλήν; Τί λέγεις; ποῖον εὐνοίας εἶδος ζητεῖς; καὶ γὰρ ταῦτα πάντα

83. ὕπανδρος γυνή: a woman under a man's authority, i.e., married to him.

84. δημοσίᾳ πόρνη, literally a "public prostitute," engaging in sexual acts for money. Many of these women were also slaves. See Kyle Harper, "Marriage and Family," in *The Oxford Handbook of Late Antiquity*, ed. Scott Fitzgerald Johnson (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 667–714, esp. 681. John refers to prostitutes in the public sphere and then next with the term θεραπανίδες to slaves in one's own household, who were generally assumed to be sexual property of their masters (but that doesn't keep him from blaming them also for πορνεία for their involvement in such acts). On the need for a wife to accept her husband's having sex with ἐταῖραι or θεραπανίδες, see the famous passage in Plutarch, *Conj. praec.* §16 (*Mor.* 140B).

85. Mathew Kuefler, *The Manly Eunuch: Masculinity, Gender Ambiguity, and Christian Ideology in Late Antiquity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001), 76–86, while documenting increasing legal and social limitations on men in the fourth century, cites as an example the Constantinian law of 331 (Cod. Theod. 3.16.1) that women can be legally prosecuted for divorcing a husband for being a *muliercularius*, which he argues means a man who frequents prostitutes (others think it is a synonym for *moechus*, the Greek loan word for adulterer). Further on how the prescriptions Chrysostom is offering here do not conform with Roman family law (citing also this text), see Harper, "Marriage and Family," 681–83. As Harper notes, the rhetoric of persuasion such as John exercises has a limited ability to effect wide-scale social change in this area.

86. Translation of συνίσταται with PGL II.3.

87. εὐθυναὶ means both these things (see PGL), and John seems to have both the judicial procedure and outcome in mind.

88. The preponderance of manuscript evidence reads προσφθειρομένους, not

4. We aren't unaware that many people suppose "adultery" is only when a man defiles another man's wife.⁸³ But I say if a man who has a wife carries on in a wicked and lascivious manner with a whore who works the streets,⁸⁴ a household slave, or some other woman who doesn't have a husband, such an act is adultery.⁸⁵ Indeed, the accusation of adultery is confirmed⁸⁶ not only by those who've been abused but even by the abusers themselves. So don't tell me now about the laws of the outside world that drag women who engage in adultery into court [214] and require a public examination and punishment,⁸⁷ but don't require a public examination and punishment for married men who defile themselves⁸⁸ with their female slaves. Instead, I shall read to you the law of God⁸⁹ that censures both the woman and the man alike and says this act is adultery. For after saying, "*and let each woman have her own husband*," Paul added: "*Let the husband give the goodwill*⁹⁰ *that is owed to his wife*" (1 Cor 7:3).⁹¹ Then what does "goodwill" mean?⁹² That he should keep a close eye on the proceeds from her investments?⁹³ Surely not. Or keep her dowry safe? That he should provide expensive clothes? Or a splendid table? Or lavish excursions? Or a ready supply of help from household slaves? "What are you saying, Paul, tell me!"⁹⁴ What type of 'goodwill' do you seek? Surely all the things just mentioned belong to the category of 'goodwill.'" "I mean noth-

προφθειρομένους, which is a typo in PG for the correct reading in his source text, Mf PE (so DMD 127). The presence or absence of a sigma involves a significant difference in the characterization of the men's behavior: "are seduced by their female slaves" (so JPM PG) or "defile themselves with their female slaves" (with DMD).

89. John regards this utterance of Paul's letter to be a divine law.

90. εὐνοια: "goodwill, favor, love, acts of kindness" (so LSJ I; PGL: "affection, love," but no references from Chrysostom). John will seek to define the term in what follows. See the following note on the text-critical issue.

91. Chrysostom's text, as expected, has the reading τὴν ὀφειλομένην εὐνοίαν with M (also K L 104. 365. 1241. 1505 sy) instead of τὴν ὀφειλὴν, with P^{11.46} & A B C D etc., and CI Or, as adopted by NA²⁸.

92. With DMD reading Τί ποτ' οὖν ἐστὶν εὐνοια for Τί ποτε δηλοῦν βουλόμενος τοῦτο εἶπεν ("what does he wish to signal in saying this?"). Note that here (by whichever wording) John is shown to have identified an exegetical problem, of the proper referent of the term εὐνοια.

93. John may be making a double entendre with πρόσδοι, which can mean "investment income" but also, as found in medical writers, "sexual intercourse" (LSJ II and I.5).

94. With DMD reading εἰπέ μοι after λέγεις.

εὐνοίας ἐστίν. Οὐδέν τι τοιοῦτο λέγω, φησίν, ἀλλὰ τὴν σωφροσύνην καὶ τὴν σεμνότητα. Τὸ σῶμα τοῦ ἀνδρὸς οὐκέτι τοῦ ἀνδρὸς, ἀλλὰ τῆς γυναικὸς. Τηρείτω τοίνυν αὐτῇ τὸ κτῆμα σῶον, καὶ μὴ μειούτω, μηδὲ παραφθειρέτω· καὶ γὰρ τῶν οἰκετῶν ἐκεῖνος εὐνους λέγεται, ὃς ἂν τὰ δεσποτικά δεξάμενος χρήματα, μηδὲν ἐξ αὐτῶν διαφθείρῃ. Ἐπειδὴ τοίνυν τῆς γυναικὸς ἐστὶ κτῆμα τὸ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς σῶμα, εὐνους ἔστω περὶ τὴν παρακαταθήκην ὁ ἀνὴρ. Ὅτι γὰρ τοῦτό φησιν, εἰπὼν, Τὴν εὐνοίαν ἀποδιδότω, ἐπήγαγεν· Ἡ γυνὴ τοῦ ἰδίου σώματος οὐκ ἐξουσιάζει, ἀλλ' ὁ ἀνὴρ· ὁμοίως καὶ ὁ ἀνὴρ τοῦ ἰδίου σώματος οὐκ ἐξουσιάζει, ἀλλ' ἡ γυνή. Ὅταν τοίνυν ἴδῃς πόρνην δελεάζουσαν, ἐπιβουλεύουσαν, ἐρῶσαν τοῦ σώματος, εἰπὲ πρὸς αὐτήν· Οὐκ ἔστιν ἐμὸν τὸ σῶμα, τῆς γυναικὸς ἐστὶ τῆς ἐμῆς· οὐ τολμῶ καταχρησασθαι, οὔτε ἐτέρα τοῦτο ἐνδοῦναι γυναικί. Τοῦτο καὶ γυνὴ ποιεῖτω. Πολλὴ γὰρ ἐνταῦθα ἡ ἰστοιμία· καίτοι γε ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοις πολλὴν δίδωσιν ὑπεροχὴν ὁ Παῦλος, οὕτω λέγων· Πλὴν καὶ ὑμεῖς οἱ καθ' ἓνα, ἵνα ἕκαστος τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα οὕτως ἀγαπᾷ ὥς ἑαυτόν· ἡ δὲ γυνή, ἵνα φοβῆται τὸν ἄνδρα· καὶ, Κεφαλὴ γυναικὸς ὁ ἀνὴρ, καὶ, Ὁφείλει ἡ γυνὴ ὑποτάσσεσθαι τῷ ἀνδρί. Καὶ πάλιν ἐν τῇ Παλαιᾷ, Πρὸς τὸν ἄνδρα σου ἡ ἀποστροφή σου, καὶ αὐτός σου κυριεύσει. Πῶς οὖν ἐνταῦθα ἴσῃν ἀντίδοσιν δουλείας καὶ δεσποτείας εἰσήγαγε; Τὸ γὰρ εἰπεῖν, Ἡ γυνὴ τοῦ ἰδίου σώματος οὐκ ἐξουσιάζει, ἀλλ' ὁ ἀνὴρ· ὁμοίως καὶ ὁ ἀνὴρ τοῦ ἰδίου σώματος οὐκ ἐξουσιάζει, ἀλλ' ἡ γυνή, ἰσότητά τινα πολλὴν ἐστὶν εἰσάγοντος. Καὶ καθάπερ ἐκεῖνος δεσπότης ἐστὶ τοῦ σώματος αὐτῆς, οὕτω καὶ αὕτη δέσποινα τοῦ ἐκείνου σώματος. Τίνος οὖν ἔνεκεν τοσαύτην ἰστοιμίαν εἰσήγαγεν; Ὅτι

95. As often in his homilies, John addresses his author, Paul. The line between the personified speech of Paul and that of his expositor is not always clear from the written text, but would have been more so in voice and gesture in the oral delivery. What follows may still belong to Paul's self-interpretation (via *προσωποποιία*) and hence it is retained within the quotation.

96. With DMD reading οὐκ ἐστὶ for οὐκέτι.

97. John is paraphrasing 1 Cor 7:4.

98. Retaining the reading of PG, σῶον (α); DMD reads ἀκέραιον (with δ; ἀκαίρειον in MSS FMDT), "Let him keep her possession inviolate" (or "untouched" or "undefiled").

99. This is not a precise reference to any single parable (such as Matt 25:14–30), but to conventional wisdom, such as John makes elsewhere (e.g., *Hom. Act.* 24.4 [PG 60:190]: Ἐν οἰκίᾳ δεσποτικῇ τούτους εὐνουστέρους τῶν δούλων κρίνομεν, ὅσοι περ ἂν μηδὲν παρορῶσιν ἀτάκτως κείμενον σκεῦος ["We judge those slaves in a master's house to be the most 'good-willed' who don't look past anything they see that's out of place"]).

100. With ὀφειλομένην omitted.

101. Minus δὲ after ὁμοίως (here and when quoted again later in this section).

102. With DMD reading ἐμὸν τὸ σῶμα τὸ ἐμὸν (with δ) for ἐμὸν τὸ σῶμα (with α).

ing like this,” he says, “but chasteness and dignified behavior.”⁹⁵ The body of the husband doesn’t belong⁹⁶ to the husband, but to the wife.⁹⁷ So then, let him keep her possession safe,⁹⁸ and let him neither degrade nor defile it. For that household slave is said to be “good-willed”⁹⁹ who, after taking custody of his master’s goods, doesn’t lose a single one of them. So, since the husband’s body is the woman’s possession, let the husband be “good-willed” when it comes to what’s been deposited in his care. Paul put it this way when after he said, “*Let him return the goodwill*” (1 Cor 7:3),¹⁰⁰ he then added, “*The wife does not have authority over her own body, but the husband does; likewise also the husband does not have authority over his own body, but the wife does*” (1 Cor 7:4).¹⁰¹ Hence, when you see a whore luring you in, setting a trap, lusting after your body, say to her, “My body¹⁰² is not mine, but it belongs to my wife. I don’t dare to abuse it or give it into the hands of another woman.” Let a wife do this, too. For in this passage there’s great equality of privilege, although in other places Paul grants the husband much superiority, saying as follows: “*except so that you, too, each one of you, might love his own wife as himself; but as for the wife, that she might fear her husband*” (Eph 5:33),¹⁰³ and “*the husband is the head of his wife*” (1 Cor 11:3),¹⁰⁴ and “*the woman should be subordinated to her husband*” (cf. Eph 5:22).¹⁰⁵ And again, it says in the Old Testament: “*your inclination*¹⁰⁶ *will be toward your husband, and he will lord it over you*” (Gen 3:16). So how is it that in our passage he introduced an equal interchange of servitude and mastery?¹⁰⁷ For one who says, “*The wife does not have authority over her own body, but the husband does; likewise also the husband does not have authority over his own body, but the wife does*” (1 Cor 7:4), is introducing a tremendous measure of equality. Just as the husband is the master of her body, so also is she the master of his body. Why then did Paul introduce such great equality of privilege here? Because in the

103. Chrysostom has replaced the first imperative with a *ἵνα* clause (*ἵνα ἀγαπᾷ*) to balance with the second (*ἵνα φοβῆται*).

104. The quotation has the exact wording of 1 Cor 11:3, but John apparently has in mind here the similar statement in Eph 5:23.

105. This is a paraphrase of Eph 5:22, not a direct quotation, as introduced. John’s text would have read αἱ γυναῖκες τοῖς ἰδίοις ἀνδράσιν ὑποτάσσεσθαι (with *ἡ*), which he has reworded with *ὀφείλει* (cf. Eph 5:28; 1 Cor 11:10).

106. LXX has ἀποστροφή (LSJ: “refuge”; “turning toward”; NETS: “recourse”) for the rare (and much debated) noun in the MT, רְשׁוּקָה, usually translated “desire.”

107. Via this question John is introducing a problem of “apparent” inconsistency in Pauline and other scriptural statements on gender roles (equality versus hierarchy).

ἐνταῦθα ἀναγκαία ἡ ὑπεροχή· ἔνθα δὲ σωφροσύνης καιρὸς καὶ σεμνότητος, οὐδὲν ἔχει πλέον τῆς γυναικὸς ὁ ἀνὴρ, ἀλλ' ὁμοίως ἐκείνη κολάζεται, τοὺς τοῦ γάμου παραφθείρας νόμους· καὶ μάλα εἰκότως. Οὐ γὰρ διὰ τοῦτο ἦλθεν ἡ γυνὴ πρὸς σέ, καὶ πατέρα καὶ μητέρα ἐγκατέλιπε καὶ τὸν οἶκον ἅπαντα, ἵνα καθυβρίζηται, ἵνα θεραπευνίδιον εὐτελὲς ἐπεισάγῃς αὐτῇ, ἵνα μυρίου ποιῆς πολέμους, συνέμπορον ἔλαβες, καὶ κοινωνὸν τοῦ βίου, καὶ ἐλευθέραν, καὶ ὁμότιμον. Πῶς γὰρ οὐκ ἄτοπον τὴν προῖκα αὐτῆς ὑποδεχόμενον, πᾶσαν ἐπιδείκνυσθαι εὖνοιαν, καὶ μηδὲν αὐτῆς ἐλαττοῦν· ὁ δὲ τῆς προικὸς ἐστὶν ἀπάσης τιμιώτερον, τὴν σωφροσύνην καὶ τὴν σεμνότητα [215] καὶ τὸ σῶμα τὸ ἑαυτοῦ, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἐκείνης κτῆμα, διαφθείρειν τε καὶ μαιίνειν; Ἄν τὴν προῖκα μειώσῃς, τῷ κηδεστῇ δίδως λόγον· ἂν τὴν σωφροσύνην μειώσῃς, τῷ Θεῷ τὰς εὐθύνas ὑφέξεις, τῷ τὸν γάμον εἰσαγαγόντι, καὶ τὴν γυναῖκα ἐγχειρίσαντι. Καὶ ὅτι τοῦτο ἐστὶν ἀληθές, ἀκουσον τί φησιν ὁ Παῦλος περὶ τῶν μοιχευόντων· Ὁ γὰρ ἀθετῶν, οὐκ ἄνθρωπον ἀθετεῖ, ἀλλὰ τὸν Θεὸν τὸν δόντα τὸ Πνεῦμα αὐτοῦ τὸ ἅγιον εἰς ὑμᾶς.

Ὅρᾳς δι' ὅσων ὁ λόγος ἀπέδειξεν ὅτι μοιχεία ἐστὶν, οὐ μόνον τὸ ὑπανδρὸν γυναῖκα διαφθείρειν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ ἡντιναοῦν πόρνην, ἔχοντα γυναῖκα; Ὡς περ γὰρ μοιχεύεσθαι γυναῖκα λέγομεν, καὶ εἰς οἰκέτην, καὶ εἰς ὄντιναοῦν ἀμάρτη, ἄνδρα ἔχουσιν· οὕτω καὶ ἄνδρα μοιχεύειν ἂν εἴποιμεν, καὶ εἰς θεραπευνίδα, καὶ εἰς ἡντιναοῦν δημῶδη γυναῖκα ἀσελγαίνῃ, γυναῖκα ἔχων αὐτός. Μὴ τοίνυν ἀμελῶμεν τῆς ἑαυτῶν σωτηρίας, μηδὲ τῷ διαβόλῳ προτείνωμεν ἡμῶν τὴν ψυχὴν διὰ τῆς ἀμαρτίας ταύτης. Καὶ γὰρ ἐντεῦθεν αἱ μυρίαί τῶν οἰκῶν ἀνατροπαί, οἱ μυριοί πόλεμοι· ἐντεῦθεν τὰ τῆς ἀγάπης ὑπορρεῖ, καὶ τὰ τῆς εὐνοίας ὑποσύρεται. Ὡς περ γὰρ ἀμήχανον σώφρονα ἄνθρωπον ὑπεριδεῖν γυναικὸς καὶ καταφρονῆσαι ποτε· οὕτως ἀμήχανον ἄνθρωπον ἀσελγῇ καὶ ἀκόλαστον φιλεῖν τὴν γυναῖκα τὴν ἑαυτοῦ, καὶ ἀπάντων εὐμορφότερα ἤ. Ἀπὸ

108. Translation of καιρός here with LSJ IV.

109. John has applied a complementary gender hermeneutic of his own here by extending Gen 2:24 (which refers explicitly to the man) to the wife: καταλείπει ἄνθρωπος τὸν πατέρα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ.

110. Translation of λαμβάνειν with LSJ II.c.

111. Throughout this homily the phrase γάμος εἰσενεγκάται (cf. in the active voice here: τὸν γάμον εἰσαγαγών) refers to God instigating and legislating the practice of marriage.

112. With ὁ γὰρ ἀθετῶν for τοιγαροῦν ὁ ἀθετῶν; τὸν δόντα for τὸν καὶ δόντα after τὸν θεόν. John quotes 1 Thess 4:8, well aware of its context, which is apposite for his argument: Τοῦτο γάρ ἐστιν θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ, ὁ ἁγιασμός ὑμῶν, ἀπέχεσθαι ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ τῆς πορνείας (1 Thess 4:3).

other cases there was a need for superiority, but here, when it concerns the profit¹⁰⁸ that comes from chasteness and dignity, the husband has no advantage over the woman, but he is punished in the same way as she is if he has defiled the laws of marriage. And rightly so. For the woman didn't come to you in marriage and "leave father and mother" (cf. Gen 2:24; Matt 19:5)¹⁰⁹ and her whole household so that she might be wantonly insulted, so that you might bring in alongside her a lowly house-servant, so that you might incite endless battles. You've received in marriage¹¹⁰ a traveling companion, a life partner, one who is both free and equal to you in honor. When you receive her dowry, you demonstrate complete goodwill and don't depreciate it in any way. So how is it not absurd that you defile and pollute something more precious than any dowry—that is, chasteness and dignity [215] and your very own body, which is her possession? If you diminish a dowry, you owe your father-in-law an accounting; but if you diminish chasteness, you'll provide a public examination to God, who introduced marriage¹¹¹ and placed this woman into your hands. For proof that this is true, listen to what Paul says about those who commit adultery: "*For the one who rejects this isn't rejecting a human being, but God, who gave his Holy Spirit to you*" (1 Thess 4:8).¹¹²

So, do you see how many proofs our homily has given that adultery takes place not only when a married man defiles another married woman, but also any sort of woman who will engage in sexual misconduct? For just as we say that a married woman commits adultery if she sins with a household slave or any sort of person, thus also we've said that a married man commits adultery if he carries on licentiously with a woman, whether she's a household slave or some common whore. So then, let's not neglect our own salvation, nor offer our soul to the devil by engaging in this sin. Indeed, from this sin has come the destruction of countless houses and countless wars. From it the habits of love fall into ruin,¹¹³ and those of goodwill are undermined. For just as it's impossible for a chaste man ever to disdain or despise his wife, so also it's impossible for a licentious and promiscuous man to love¹¹⁴ his own wife, even if she's more beautiful than

113. With DMD reading *καταρρεῖ* for *ὑπορρεῖ*.

114. *φιλεῖν* here, with *ἀγάπη* to follow. It is often hard to see a distinction between the terms (as also in the NT in, e.g., John 21:15–17, though there is a longstanding debate on the point; see p. 471 n. 3), but perhaps the translation "cherish" for *φιλεῖν* here may mark a slight difference. However, John does seem consistently to use *ἔρω* in regard to (unlawful) "lust" or, between marital partners, perhaps "passion" (as in §3 [PG 51:212]).

γὰρ σωφροσύνης ἀγάπη τίκτεται, ἀπὸ δὲ ἀγάπης τὰ μυρία ἀγαθὰ. Λιθίνας τοίνυν νόμιζε τὰς λοιπὰς γυναῖκας, εἰδὼς ὅτι μετὰ γάμον, κἂν ἀκολάστοις ἴδῃς ὀφθαλμοῖς ἑτέραν γυναῖκα, κἂν δημοσίαν, κἂν ὑπανδρον, τοῖς τῶν μοιχῶν ἐγκλήμασιν ὑπεύθυνος γέγονας. Ταῦτα σεαυτῷ καθ' ἐκάστην ἔπαδε τὰ ῥήματα· κἂν ἴδῃς ἐπιθυμίαν ἄλλης γυναικὸς ἐγειρομένην ἐν σοὶ, εἴτα ἐκ τούτου σοι τὴν γυναῖκα ἀηδῇ φαινομένην, εἴσελθε εἰς τὸν θάλαμον, καὶ τὸ βιβλίον ἀναπτύξας τοῦτο, καὶ λαβὼν Παῦλον μεσίτην, καὶ συνεχῶς ἐπάδων ταῦτα τὰ ῥήματα, κατὰσβεσον τὴν φλόγα. Καὶ οὕτω καὶ ἡ γυνὴ πάλιν ἔσται σοι ποθεινότερα, οὐδεμιᾶς ἐπιθυμίας τὴν πρὸς αὐτὴν εὖνοιαν ὑποσυρούσης· οὐχ ἡ γυνὴ δὲ ἔσται ποθεινότερα μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ σὺ σεμνότερος πολλῷ καὶ ἐλευθεριώτερος δόξεις εἶναι. Οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν, οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδὲν αἰσχροτέρον ἀνθρώπου μετὰ γάμον πορνεύοντος. Οὐ γὰρ δὴ μόνον τὸν κηδεμόνα καὶ τοὺς φίλους καὶ τοὺς ἀπαντῶντας, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτοὺς ἐρυθριᾷ τοὺς οἰκέτας. Καὶ οὐ τοῦτο μόνον ἐστὶ τὸ δεινόν, ἀλλ' ὅτι καὶ τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτὴν δεσποτηρίου παντὸς ἀηδεστέραν ὄψεται, πρὸς τὴν ἐρωμένην βλέπων, καὶ τὴν πόρνην διηνεκῶς φανταζόμενος.

ε'. Βούλει μαθεῖν ἀκριβῶς ὅσον ἐστὶ τὸ δεινόν; Ἐννόησον οἶον οἱ τὰς γυναῖκας ἑαυτῶν ὑποπτεύοντες ζῶσι βίον, πῶς ἀηδῇ τὰ σιτία, ἀηδῇ ποτά. Δηλητηρίων ἢ τράπεζα δοκεῖ γέμειν φαρμάκων· καὶ ὥσπερ ὄλεθρον, μυρίων

115. While ἐπάδειν can mean to recite or sing more generally, it is more specifically the language of magical charms or incantation (see LSJ 2 and PGL 3). This positive, prophylactic version of a “Pauline incantation” is meant to avert the ἔρως magic John envisions the “whore” as wielding (as he will develop the point in the next section). John will conclude the homily by returning to and reenacting this performative ritual (see §5 [PG 51:218]).

116. With DMD reading καθ' ἐκάστην ἔπαδε σεαυτῷ τὴν ἡμέραν τὰ ῥήματα for ταῦτα σεαυτῷ καθ' ἐκάστην ἔπαδε τὰ ῥήματα (PG).

117. With the verb ἀναπτύσσω John may be invoking the biblical language of scrolls or books, as found in Luke 4:17. And yet if a book is envisioned, it is unclear whether he has in mind just the document of 1 Corinthians or a larger biblical corpus. On the importance of the “book” (notional and material) for Christian gospel-amulets, see Robert Matthew Calhoun, “The Gospel(-Amulet) as God’s Power for Salvation,” *Early Christianity* 10 (2019): 21–55.

118. This use of μεσίτης, “intermediary,” one “in the middle” (literally, “taking Paul as an intermediary”), raises the question of who is the other person (besides the husband) involved in this act of “mediation.” If the other party is the “whore,” then Paul is ironically an intermediary who does not facilitate contact but blocks it in the physical form of the book (hence one might translate: “positioning Paul between her and you”). But that is not how the term μεσίτης is usually used (see, e.g., Pseudo-Lucian, *Amatores* §47, where Eros is the μεσίτης bringing the loving couple together). If that is the case here, John is saying that Paul, right there in the bedroom via text (in codex

all other women. For love is born from chasteness, and from love come countless good things. Consequently, regard the rest of women as though they were objects of stone, knowing that after marriage if you even look with eyes full of promiscuous intent at another woman, whether a common whore or a married woman, you've become liable to accusations of adultery (cf. Matt 5:27–28). Sing these words as an incantation¹¹⁵ to yourself every day.¹¹⁶ And if you perceive that lust for another woman is being aroused in you, and concomitantly your own wife seems repugnant to you, go into your bedroom, unroll this book,¹¹⁷ and, making Paul your go-between,¹¹⁸ continually sing these words as an incantation and thereby extinguish the flame! And in this way, also, your wife will again be more desirable to you,¹¹⁹ since no lust¹²⁰ is dragging away the goodwill you have for her. And not only will your wife be more desirable, but you in turn will seem more dignified and less servile.¹²¹ For there's nothing—nothing—more shameful than a man who has sex with a whore after he gets married, because it isn't only his patron, his friends, and all¹²² those he runs into that he causes to blush, but even his own household slaves. And this isn't the only terrible result, but he'll see his own house as more repugnant than any prison, since he casts his eye on his beloved while constantly fantasizing about the whore.

5. Do you want to learn in detail just how terrible this is? Consider what sort of life men who are suspicious of their wives lead: how nausea-inducing the food, how nausea-inducing the beverages.¹²³ The dining room table seems likely to be full of poisonous potions.¹²⁴ And so they

and inscriptions, via §3 above), mediates the proper love between the husband and wife in their bedroom. A third option would be that Paul is the *μεσίτης*, “intermediary,” between the husband and God, to whom he prays in his private room (with an echo of Matt 6:6; cf. 1 Tim 2:5 on Christ as mediator between God and humanity).

119. *ποθεινοτέρα*. The secondary effect of the prophylactic Pauline “spell” against the prostitute who threatens the marriage is a positive love charm toward the wife (hence, Paul as the *μεσίτης* of their love). Chrysostom assumes here that the married couple should have proper sexual attraction for one another.

120. *ἐπιθυμία* here of illicit and uncontrolled desire.

121. Literally, “more free” (*ἐλευθεριώτερος*).

122. With DMD reading *ἅπαντας* after *ἀπαντῶντας*.

123. With DMD (and Mf's note) reading *τά* before *πότα*.

124. *δελητήρια φάρμακα*: also “deadly incantations,” in the first instance coming from the wife and next from the “whore.” In the case of the wife, it is perhaps not clear whether this might be *philia*-magic to keep his affections (using the typology of Farone, *Ancient Greek Love Magic*, 29 *et passim*) or poison to kill him so she can move on with her lover (so the suspicious husband's fear).

γέμουσαν κακῶν, οὕτω φεύγουσι τὴν οἰκίαν. Οὐχ ὕπνος αὐτοῖς ἐστίν, οὐ νύξ προσηγής, οὐ συνουσία φίλων, οὐκ αὐταὶ αἱ τοῦ ἡλίου ἀκτῖνες· ἀλλὰ καὶ παρ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ φωτὸς ἐνοχλεῖσθαι νομίζουσιν, οὐχ ὅταν ἴδωσι μοιχευομένην τὴν γυναῖκα μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀπλῶς ὑποπτεύωσι. Ταῦτα νόμιζε καὶ τὴν γυναῖκα πάσχειν, ὅταν ἀκούσῃ παρ' ὅτουοῦν, ἢ καὶ [216] ὑποπτεύσῃ, ὅτι πόρνη γυναικὶ σαυτὸν ἐξέδωκας. Ταῦτα λογιζόμενος, μὴ τὰς μοιχείας φεύγε μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς ὑποψίας· καὶ ἀδίκως ὑποπτεύσῃ, θεράπευσον καὶ πείσον. Οὐ γὰρ ἐξ ἔχθρας ἢ ἀπονοίας, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ κηδεμονίας τοῦτο ποιεῖ, καὶ τοῦ σφόδρα δεδοικέναι περὶ τοῦ κτήματος τοῦ ἰδίου. Κτῆμα γὰρ αὐτῆς ἐστίν, ὥσπερ ἔφθην εἰπὼν, τὸ σῶμα τὸ σὸν, καὶ κτῆμα τῶν ὄντων ἀπάντων τιμιώτερον. Μὴ τοίνυν αὐτὴν περὶ τὰ μέγιστα ἀδικήσῃς, μηδὲ καιρίαν δῶς τὴν πληγὴν. Εἰ γὰρ ἐκείνης καταφρονήσεις, ἀλλὰ τὸν Θεὸν φοβήθητι, τὸν ἐκδικὸν τῶν τοιούτων, τὸν ἀφορήτους κολάσεις τοῖς τοιούτοις ἀπειλήσαντα ἀμαρτήμασι. Τῶν γὰρ τοιαῦτα τολμώντων, φησὶν, Ὁ σκώληξ οὐ τελευτήσει, καὶ τὸ πῦρ οὐ σβεσθήσεται.

Εἰ δὲ οὐ σφόδρα σε δάκνει τὰ μέλλοντα, τὰ γοῦν παρόντα σε φοβεῖται. Πολλοὶ γοῦν τῶν πόρναις προσεχόντων καὶ ἐνταῦθα κακοὶ κακῶς ἀπάλλοντο, περιεργίας ὑπομείναντες ὑπὸ τῶν πορνευομένων γυναικῶν. Φιλονεικοῦσαι γὰρ ἐκεῖναι τῆς μὲν συνοικούσης αὐτῶ καὶ κατεγγυηθείσης ἀποστῆσαι γυναικὸς, τῶ δὲ αὐτῶν ἔρωτι προσδῆσαι τέλεον, μαγανείας ἐκίνησαν, καὶ φίλτρα κατεσκευάσαν, καὶ πολλὰς γοητείας ἔρραψαν· εἶτα οὕτως εἰς ἄρρωστίαν αὐτὸν ἐμβαλοῦσαι χαλεπήν, καὶ φθορὰ παραδοῦσαι, καὶ τηκεδόνι μακρᾶ, καὶ μυρίοις περιβαλοῦσαι κακοῖς, ἀπήνεγκαν τῆς παρουσίας ζωῆς. Εἰ μὴ φοβῇ τὴν γέενναν, ἄνθρωπε, τὰς γοητείας αὐτῶν φοβήθητι. Ὅταν γὰρ σαυτὸν διὰ τῆς ἀσελγείας ταύτης ἔρημον ποιήσῃς τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ συμμαχίας, καὶ γυμνώσῃς σαυτὸν τῆς ἄνωθεν βοηθείας, λαβοῦσά σε μετὰ ἀδείας ἢ πόρνης, καὶ τοὺς αὐτῆς καλέσασα δαίμονας, καὶ τὰ πέταλα ράψασα, καὶ τὰς ἐπιβουλάς

125. This is likely an ironic play on one of the common meanings of ἐκδιδόναι, to “give in marriage” (LSJ A.2.a).

126. Minus αὐτῶν after both nouns (σκώληξ and πῦρ). All editors from HS to DMD identify the quotation as Mark 9:48 (which cites Isa 66:24). But John’s wording is clearly the Isaianic version of the saying, with the future-tense verbs.

127. περιεργία; cf. Acts 19:19.

128. ἔρω; also “love.”

129. This passage is replete with the technical language of the magical arts for binding spells and love/eros magic (προσδεῖν, μαγανεία, φίλτρα, γοητεία), along with the physical ailments they are said to effect on command, as well as the traditional association of prostitutes and courtesans with forms of love magic (on which see Kalleres, “Drunken Hags with Amulets and Prostitutes with Erotic Spells”).

flee the house as though from a plague, since it is filled with innumerable malignities. They have no sleep, no gentle nights, no fellowship with their friends, nor even the rays of the sun! Instead they believe the light itself is what gives them trouble—not only when they spy their wives in the act of adultery, but even if they just harbor suspicions. Consider that these are the things your wife suffers, too, when she hears from somebody else or even [216] harbors the suspicion that you’ve given yourself¹²⁵ to a woman who is a whore. When you think over these things, don’t just flee from acts of adultery, but even from the suspicion of it. And if she suspects you unjustly, pay attention to her and dissuade her, for she doesn’t do this from enmity or madness, but from great care and out of tremendous fear for her own possession. For, as I’ve just said, your body is her possession—and it’s the most precious possession of all. So don’t defraud her of the greatest thing she has, nor give her a blow that’s fatal. For if you’ll treat her with contempt, then be afraid of God, the avenger of women like her, who has threatened unbearable punishments for sins like these. For he says that for those who dare to do such things: “*The worm will not die, and the fire will not be extinguished*” (Isa 66:24).¹²⁶

But if the future doesn’t sharply sting you, then let the present strike fear into you. For many of the bad men who have consorted with whores have come to bad ends because of it, once they’ve submitted to the manipulative craft¹²⁷ of these women who make whores of themselves. Out of their ambition to separate him from the wife who shares his home and has received his pledge of fidelity, and to bind him completely by lust¹²⁸ for them, those women have set in motion forms of magical trickery, concocted love charms, and devised many acts of sorcery.¹²⁹ Then, after throwing him into such painful sickness and handing him over to rot and waste away, and lassoing him with countless ills, they’ve carried him away from the present life. So, man, if you don’t fear hell, fear their magical spells!¹³⁰ For by this debauchery you cause yourself to lose God as an ally, and you strip yourself of assistance from on high.¹³¹ At that very moment, the whore—having taken you captive by licentiousness, summoned her demons, stitched her magical spells,¹³² and set in motion her schemes—so

130. A bit of a wordplay, Γέεννα ... γοητεία.

131. John claims that this sin leaves the Christian man bereft of the talismanic powers afforded by his faith and its operative rituals.

132. πέταλα (“leaves”) of thin metal or foil on which magic charms or spells were written. Which kinds of spells does John have in mind here? He might be referring to

ἐργασαμένη, μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς εὐκολίας περιγίνεται σου τῆς σωτηρίας, ὄνειδός σε καὶ γέλωτα τῶν τὴν πόλιν οἰκούντων ἀπάντων καταστήσασα, ὥστε μηδὲ ἐλεῖσθαι κακῶν πάσχοντα. Τίς γὰρ ἐλεήσει, φησὶν, ἐπαοιδὸν ὀφίοδηκτον, καὶ πάντας τοὺς προσάγοντας θηρίοις; Παρίημι τὴν τῶν χρημάτων ζημίαν, τὰς καθημερινὰς ὑποψίας, τὸν τυφόν, τὴν ἀπόνοιαν, τὴν ὕβριν τὴν παρὰ τῶν πορνῶν γινομένην εἰς τοὺς ἀνοήτους, ἃ θανάτων μυρίων ἐστὶ πικρότερα. Καὶ τὴν μὲν γυναῖκα πολλάκις οὐδὲ βαρὺ ῥῆμα εἰποῦσαν οὐκ ἤνεγκας, τὴν δὲ πόρνην καὶ ραπίζουσαν προσκυνεῖς. Καὶ οὐκ αἰσχύνῃ, οὐδὲ ἐρυθριᾷς, οὐδὲ εὐχῇ διαστῆναί σοι τὴν γῆν; Πῶς δυνήσῃ εἰς ἐκκλησίαν εἰσελθεῖν, καὶ τὰς χεῖρας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνατεῖναι; ποίῳ στόματι καλέσαι τὸν Θεόν, ὃ τὴν πόρνην ἐφίλησας; Καὶ οὐ δέδοικας, οὐδὲ φρίττεις, εἰπέ μοι, μή ποτε σκηπτὸς ἄνωθεν ἐνεχθεὶς καταφλέξῃ τὴν ἀναίσχυντόν σου κεφαλὴν; Κἂν γὰρ τὴν γυναῖκα λάθῃς τὴν ἡδίκημένην, ἀλλὰ τὸν ἀκοίμητον ὀφθαλμὸν οὐ λήσῃ ποτέ· ἐπεὶ καὶ τῷ μοιχῷ ἐκείνῳ τῷ λέγοντι, Σκότος κύκλω μου καὶ τοῖχοι, τί εὐλαβοῦμαι; ἀντεφθέγξατο ὁ σοφὸς ἐκεῖνος, οὕτω λέγων· "Οτι ὀφθαλμοὶ Κυρίου μυριοπλάσις ἡλίου φωτεινότεροι, βλέποντες εἰς τὰ ἔργα τῶν ἀνθρώπων. Διὰ τοῦτο δὴ πάντα ὁ Παῦλος ἔλεγεν· "Ἐκαστος τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα ἐχέτω, καὶ ἐκάστη τὸν ἴδιον ἄνδρα ἐχέτω· τῇ γυναικὶ ὁ ἄνθρωπος τὴν ὀφειλομένην εὐνοίαν ἀποδιδότω, ὁμοίως καὶ ἡ γυνὴ τῷ ἀνδρὶ. Μὲλι ἀποστάζει ἀπὸ χειλέων γυναικὸς πόρνης, ἢ πρὸς καιρὸν λιπαίνει σὸν φάρυγγα, ὕστερον μέντοι πικρότερον χολῆς εὐρήσεις, [217] καὶ ἡκονημένον μᾶλλον μαχαίρας διστόμου. Ἴδὼν ἔχει τῆς πόρνης τὸ φίλημα, ἰδὼν λανθάνοντα

curse tablets or *defixiones*, linking with τῷ δὲ αὐτῶν ἔρωτι προσδῆσαι τέλεον above, in line with Faraone's insistence that *eros*-magic is related to magical curses, inasmuch as love is a disease one hopes to cause the target to experience (*Ancient Greek Love Magic*, 43–55). Alternatively, he envisions these as love charms the prostitute has stitched into her own clothing to draw the husband to her (further discussion and literature in Mitchell, "John Chrysostom on Christian Love Magic").

133. σωτηρία, also "health" (per his illnesses described above).

134. DMD notes that the manuscripts are split between two synonyms, the reading ὀφίοδηκτον (δ) and ἐχιόδηκτον (α). DMD adopts the latter (probably because it is more difficult, since the OG of Sirach reads the former).

135. The rhetorical figure *παράλειψις*, "pretended omission," that actually discloses the information allegedly left out.

136. One can perhaps imagine the tension in the *synaxis* at this direct accusation and harangue against the men present.

137. ἀκοίμητος ὀφθαλμός, a commonplace attribute of the divine—see, e.g., Philo, *Mut.* §40; *Historia Alexandri Magni* 60.7 (recension E, Cod. Eton Coll.; text Anastasios Lolos and Vasilis L. Konstantinopoulos, vol. 2).

easily stands victorious over your salvation.¹³³ And because she's rendered you a reproach and a laughingstock to the entire population of the city, you won't even be pitied when you suffer so badly. For, it says, "*Who will pity the snake charmer who gets bitten by his snake, or all who provoke wild animals?*" (Sir 12:13).¹³⁴ I'm passing over¹³⁵ the loss of money, the daily suspicions, the delusion, the madness, the abuse these fools receive at the hands of whores—things more bitter than a thousand deaths. When it comes to your wife, you often don't even put up with it when she says a harsh word; but with the whore, you worship her even when she slaps you! And you're not ashamed or embarrassed, nor do you pray for the earth to open wide for you? How will you be able to enter into the church and extend your hands to heaven?¹³⁶ Tell me, how will you be able to invoke God with the same mouth with which you kissed the whore? Aren't you afraid, don't you shiver with fright lest at some point a thunderbolt born from above might set your shameless head on fire? For even if you're out of the sight of your wife who's been done such an injustice, you'll never escape the notice of "the eye that never sleeps."¹³⁷ Since to that adulterer who says, "*Darkness and walls encircle me.... Why am I being discreet?*" (Sir 23:18),¹³⁸ that wise man responded thus: "*Because the eyes of the Lord are ten thousand times brighter than the sun, as they look at the deeds of human beings*" (Sir 23:19).¹³⁹ Indeed, that's why Paul said all this: "*let each man have his own wife, and let each woman have her own husband. Let the husband give the goodwill that is owed to his wife, and likewise the wife to her husband*" (1 Cor 7:2–3). "*Honey*¹⁴⁰ *drips from the lips of the woman who is a whore ... but later you will find it more bitter than bile [217] and sharper than a two-edged sword*" (Prov 5:3–4).¹⁴¹ The whore's kiss contains poison, an unseen

138. The ellipsis (as marked) is key to John's citation: οἱ τοῖχοί με καλύπτουσιν, καὶ οὐθεὶς με ὁρᾷ ("The walls cover me, and no one sees me"). Verses 17–18 provide the relevant context for what is quoted: ἄνθρωπος πόρνος ... λέγων ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ αὐτοῦ· Τίς με ὁρᾷ; ("A man who engages in sexual misconduct ... says in his soul, 'Who sees me?'").

139. With some paraphrase: βλέποντες εἰς τὰ ἔργα τῶν ἀνθρώπων for ἐπιβλέποντες πάσας ὁδοὺς ἀνθρώπων.

140. Chrysostom returns to the opening image of the homily, with a stark contrast between good and bad honey.

141. I adopt the reading of DMD, minus ἥ πρὸς καιρὸν λιπαίνει σὸν φάρυγγα. DMD shows that some manuscripts within both subarchetypes [i.e., BCLMTZ] include the phrase. The minus (marked with ellipsis above for clarity) means "who temporarily soothes your throat" or "who for a period pleases your palate" (so Johann Cook, NETS). Also minus γάρ before ἀποστάζει.

καὶ ἐγκεκρυμμένον. Τί τοίνυν διώκεις ἡδονὴν κατάγνωσιν ἔχουσαν, ὀλεθρον τίκτουςαν, πληγὴν ἐπάγουσαν ἀνίατον, ἐξὸν εὐφραίνεσθαι καὶ μηδὲν πάσχειν δεινόν; Ἐπὶ γὰρ τῆς ἐλευθέρας γυναικὸς ὁμοῦ καὶ ἡδονὴ καὶ ἀσφάλεια καὶ ἄνεσις καὶ τιμὴ καὶ κόσμος καὶ συνειδὸς ἀγαθόν· ἐκεῖ δὲ πολλὴ μὲν ἡ πικρία, πολλὴ δὲ ἡ βλάβη, διηνεκὴς δὲ ἡ κατηγορία. Κἂν γὰρ μηδεὶς ἀνθρώπων ἴδῃ, τὸ συνειδὸς οὐδέποτε παύσεται σου κατηγοροῦν· ἀλλ' ὅπουπερ ἂν ἀπέλθῃς, ἔψεται κατηγορῶν καὶ μεγάλα καταβοῶν, ὁ κατήγορος οὗτος. Ὡστε εἴ τις ἡδονὴν διώκει, οὗτος μάλιστα φευγέτω τὴν πρὸς τὰς πόρνas ὁμιλίαν. Οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐκείνης τῆς συνηθείας πικρότερον, οὐδὲν τῆς συνουσίας ἀηδέστερον, οὐδὲν τῶν τρόπων μιαιώτερον.

Ἐλαφος φιλίας, καὶ πῶλος σῶν χαρίτων ὁμιλείτω σοι· ἡ πηγὴ τοῦ ὕδατος σου σοὶ ἔστω πηγὴ. Πηγὴν ὕδατος ἔχων καθαρὰν, τί τρέχεις ἐπὶ λάκκον βορβόρου γέμοντα, γεέννης ὄζοντα, καὶ κολάσεως ἀφάτου; ποίαν ἔξεις ἀπολογίαν; τίνα συγγνώμην; Εἰ γὰρ οἱ πρὸ τοῦ γάμου πορνεία προσέχοντες κολάζονται καὶ δίκην διδῶσι, καθάπερ ἐκεῖνος ὁ τὰ ῥυπαρὰ ἐνδεδυμένος ἱμάτια, πολλῷ μᾶλλον οἱ μετὰ τὸν γάμον. Διπλοῦν [218] γὰρ ἐνταῦθα καὶ

142. Translation of τῆς ἐλευθέρας γυναικὸς with LSJ s.v. ἐλεύθερος A.1.b.

143. I.e., the conscience. On the forensic roles of conscience, including as accuser (as well as witness, advocate, and judge), see Hans-Josef Klauck, “Accuser, Judge and Paraclete—On Conscience in Philo of Alexandria,” *SK* 20 (1999): 107–18. In Paul, see Rom 2:15; 1 Cor 4:3–5.

144. Cf. 1 Cor 6:18: φεύγετε τὴν πορνείαν.

145. ὁμιλία, both sexual and social (LSJ I and II, as with the verb, ὁμιλεῖν, in what follows).

146. As with wedding ceremonies discussed above, John acknowledges that he is trying to change long-standing cultural custom (συνήθεια).

147. συνουσία, both sexual and social (LSJ and PGL).

148. πῶλος is also used poetically of a young woman (LSJ I.3).

149. This LXX text offers various resonances for John’s argument: τῶν χαρίτων may refer to “(sexual) favors granted” (LSJ III.2) as well as “love charms” (LSJ II.4). For John these animal epithets refer to the wife as the husband’s proper (and even alluring) sexual partner.

150. Proverbs 5, from which John quoted vv. 3 and 4 above, is focused on counsel to a young man not to engage in infidelity against his wife with a “bad” or “cheap” woman (φαύλη γυνή; Prov 5:3). The water metaphor for sexual congress within marriage, which begins πῖνε ὕδατα ἀπὸ σῶν ἀγγείων καὶ ἀπὸ σῶν φρεάτων πηγῆς (“drink water from your own buckets and from the cisterns of your own fountain”), spans Prov 5:15–18. John has reworded Prov 5:18 here, by transposing σου and τοῦ ὕδατος, ἔστω and σοι, and substituting πηγὴ for ἰδία, which has the effect of summarizing the sense of the full argument in vv. 15–18 (i.e., “drink only from your own well”). John assumes (with Sirach) that the wife is a possession of the husband’s estate.

and hidden poison. Why then do you pursue a pleasure that contains condemnation, gives birth to destruction, and brings on a wound that will not heal, when you can be in a happy state and suffer nothing horrible? For with the married woman,¹⁴² one finds all together pleasure, security, leisure, honor, order, and a good conscience. But with the other woman, there's great bitterness, abundant harm, and perpetual accusation. For even if no human being sees you, your conscience will never stop accusing you, but wherever you go, this accuser¹⁴³ will follow you, hurling accusations and shouting out loudly. Therefore, if anyone pursues pleasure, let him especially flee¹⁴⁴ from consorting¹⁴⁵ with whores. For nothing is more bitter than that custom,¹⁴⁶ nothing more repugnant than such intercourse,¹⁴⁷ nothing fouler than those habits.

“Let an affectionate doe and a filly¹⁴⁸ of your fancies¹⁴⁹ consort with you. Let the well your water comes from be a well that is your own” (Prov 5:19, 18).¹⁵⁰ When you have a pure well of water, why do you run to a lake full of filth, smelling of death,¹⁵¹ reeking of hell and unspeakable punishment? What sort of defense will you have, what sort of excuse? For if men who engage in sex with whores before marriage are punished and pay a penalty just like that¹⁵² man who was dressed in filthy garments (cf. Matt 22:11–13),¹⁵³ how much more will men who do so after marriage? [218] For in

Another reason this full passage likely suggested itself to John is the image of the eyes of God seeing clandestine adulterous behavior, found just a few verses later at Prov 5:21 (ἐνώπιον γάρ εἰσιν τῶν τοῦ θεοῦ ὀφθαλμῶν ὁδοὶ ἀνδρός, “a husband’s modes of behavior stand before the eyes of God”), for which point he had quoted Sir 23:19 earlier.

151. With DMD reading θανάτου πνέοντα after γέμοντα.

152. As DMD notes, εἰκείνος in Migne is a typo for ἐκείνος (correct in HS and Mf PE).

153. The text of Matt 22 says only that the man was without a proper wedding garment (εἶδεν ἐκεῖ ἄνθρωπον οὐκ ἐνδεδυμένον ἔνδυμα γάμου), and not in filthy garments (cf. Jas 2:2). But in several other places where John refers to the passage, he characterizes this guest’s clothing as ῥυπαρά (e.g., *Virginit.* 84.3 [SC 125:392], *Laz.* 4.1 [PG 48:1007]). In *Oppugn.* 3.15 [PG 47:374]) John associates the man’s unsuitable garments with filth again and specifies that this is the filth of πορνεία, sexual misconduct (the same logic he is applying in this homily): Καὶ ὁ τὰ ῥυπαρὰ ἐνδεδυμένος ἱμάτια, καὶ ὁ τὰ δηνάρια τὰ ἑκατὸν ἀπαιτῶν, οὐκ ἐπειδὴ μονάζοντες ἦσαν, ἔπασχον ἅπερ ἔπασχον· ἀλλ’ ὁ μὲν διὰ τὴν πορνείαν, ὁ δὲ διὰ τὴν μνησικακίαν ἀπώλοντο (“And the man dressed in filthy garments and the man who demanded the hundred denarii back [Matt 18:28] didn’t suffer what they did because of solitary living, but the first was destroyed because of sexual misconduct, and the second for bearing grudges”). Note that John had referred to the parable of the wedding feast (Matt 22:1–14) earlier in this homily, in §2.

τριπλοῦν τὸ ἔγκλημα γίνεται, ὅτι τε παραμυθίας ἀπολαύοντες, ἀπεσκήρτησαν εἰς τὴν ἀσέλγειαν ἐκείνην, καὶ ὅτι τὸ πρᾶγμα οὐχὶ πορνεία μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ μοιχεία λογίζεται, ὃ πάσης ἁμαρτίας ἐστὶ χαλεπώτερον. Ταῦτ' οὖν καὶ ἑαυτοῖς καὶ ταῖς γυναῖξιν ἐπάδοντες οὕτω διατελῶμεν· διὸ δὴ καὶ αὐτὸς εἰς ταῦτα καταλύσω τὰ ῥήματα. Διὰ δὲ τὰς πορνείας ἕκαστος τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα ἔχεται, καὶ ἑκάστη τὸν ἴδιον ἄνδρα ἔχεται· τῇ γυναικὶ ὁ ἀνὴρ τὴν ὀφειλομένην εὐνοίαν ἀποδίδωται, ὁμοίως καὶ ἡ γυνὴ τῷ ἀνδρὶ. Ἡ γυνὴ τοῦ ἰδίου σώματος οὐκ ἐξουσιάζει, ἀλλ' ὁ ἀνὴρ· ὁμοίως καὶ ὁ ἀνὴρ τοῦ ἰδίου σώματος οὐκ ἐξουσιάζει, ἀλλ' ἡ γυνή. Μετὰ ἀκριβείας ταῦτα φυλάξαντες τὰ ῥήματα, καὶ ἐν ἀγορᾷ, καὶ ἐν οἰκίᾳ, καὶ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ, καὶ ἐν ἑσπέρᾳ, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς τραπέζης, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς εὐνῆς, καὶ πανταχοῦ καὶ αὐτοὶ μελετῶμεν, καὶ τὰς γυναῖκας παιδεύωμεν, καὶ πρὸς ἡμᾶς λέγειν, καὶ παρ' ἡμῶν ἀκούειν, ἵνα σωφρόνως τὸν παρόντα ζήσαντες βίον, καὶ τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν ἐπιτύχωμεν, χάριτι καὶ φιλανθρωπίᾳ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι' οὗ καὶ μεθ' οὗ τῷ Πατρὶ, ἅμα τῷ ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι, ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Ἀμήν.

154. I.e., of the marriage bed.

155. On the ironies involved in Chrysostom the ascetic pronouncing these words, see Mitchell, "John Chrysostom and Christian Love Magic."

156. Minus δέ after ὁμοίως both times (as earlier in this homily).

the latter case, the charge is doubled or tripled, because such men, although enjoying domestic comforts,¹⁵⁴ have scampered off to that debauchery, and because the act is reckoned not only as sex with whores, but also adultery, which is worse than any sin. Thus, let's continually sing these words as an incantation both to ourselves and our wives. And hence I, too,¹⁵⁵ shall conclude with these words: *"But on account of sexual misconduct, let each man have his own wife, and let each woman have her own husband. Let the husband give the goodwill that is owed to his wife, and likewise the wife to her husband. The wife does not have authority over her own body, but the husband does; likewise also the husband does not have authority over his own body, but the wife does"* (1 Cor 7:2–4).¹⁵⁶ By keeping these words constantly in our minds¹⁵⁷ in the marketplace and at home, day and night, at table and in bed,¹⁵⁸ and everywhere, let's practice them ourselves, and let's instruct our wives both to say them to us and to hear them from us, so that, after living the present life with due chasteness, we might attain the kingdom of heaven, by the grace and loving-kindness of our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom and with whom be glory to the Father, together with the Holy Spirit, forever and ever. Amen.

157. Chrysostom's favored appeal to ἀκρίβεια here combines the customary sense of attention to detail and rigor with alertness.

158. Cf. Deut 6:7: καὶ προβιβάσεις αὐτὰ τοὺς υἱοὺς σου καὶ λαλήσεις ἐν αὐτοῖς καθήμενος ἐν οἴκῳ καὶ πορευόμενος ἐν ὁδῷ καὶ κοιταζόμενος καὶ διανιστάμενος. See n. 67 above on Chrysostom's imitation of the Shema here.

ΕΙΣ ΤΟ «Γυνὴ δέδεταί νόμῳ, ἐφ' ὅσον χρόνον ζῇ ὁ ἀνὴρ αὐτῆς· ἐὰν δὲ κοιμηθῇ, ἐλευθέρα ἐστὶν ᾧ θέλει γαμηθῆναι, μόνον ἐν Κυρίῳ. Μακαριωτέρα δὲ ἐστίν, ἐὰν οὕτω μείνῃ.»

α'. [217] Περὶ γάμου πρώην ἡμῖν ὁ μακάριος Παῦλος ἐνομοθέτει, καὶ τῶν τοῦ γάμου δικαιωμάτων, Κορινθίοις οὕτω γράφων καὶ λέγων· Περὶ δὲ ὧν ἐγράψατέ μοι, καλὸν ἀνθρώπῳ γυναικὸς μὴ ἄπτεσθαι· διὰ δὲ τὰς πορνείας ἕκαστος τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα ἐχέτω, καὶ ἑκάστη τὸν ἴδιον ἄνδρα ἐχέτω. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἡμεῖς τὴν διάλεξιν ἅπασαν εἰς ταῦτα τὰ ῥήματα ἀναλώσαμεν. Οὐκοῦν ἀνάγκη καὶ σήμερον περὶ τῆς αὐτῆς ὑμῖν ὑποθέσεως διαλεχθῆναι πάλιν, ἐπειδὴ καὶ σήμερον περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν ὁ αὐτὸς διαλέγεται Παῦλος. Καὶ γὰρ ἠκούσατε αὐτοῦ βοῶντος καὶ λέγοντος· Γυνὴ δέδεταί νόμῳ, ἐφ' ὅσον χρόνον ζῇ ὁ ἀνὴρ αὐτῆς· ἐὰν δὲ κοιμηθῇ ὁ ἀνὴρ αὐτῆς, ἐλευθέρα ἐστὶν ᾧ θέλει

1. Provenance: see p. 246 n. 1, on previous homily, which this one clearly succeeds, as John indicates in the προοίμιον.

Text: Mf PE (1837) as reprinted by JPM (PG, 1862), with Mf's original text-critical notes (1721) on ME, based on his collation of two manuscripts, *Colbertinus* 970 (= Paris. gr. 748 [XI]) and *Colbertinus* 1030 (= Paris. gr. 768 [XIII]). JPM makes one emendation of the text in §3 (PG 51:222), as indicated below, after consulting (but neither reprinting nor acknowledging) a note from the PE. As with the previous homily, HS's received transcription of Monac. gr. 352 appears to have been errant in places, and he make conjectural emendations that in a couple of cases turn out to be accurate to the reading of that manuscript (see notes). Pinakes lists thirteen manuscripts containing this homily (one of which is HS's source, Monac. gr. 352), but not the two Paris codices, so there are a total of fifteen known manuscripts that contain it.

2. For text-critical issues, see n. 16 below. (This rendering of the lemma is slightly abbreviated from the full quotation by which John introduces the lection within the homily.)

3. The translation adopts the reading of the title as printed in PG (which goes back to HS). There is variation in the manuscripts, however. HS himself chose to adopt the textual reading *κοιμηθῇ*, instead of the reading of Monac. gr. 352 *ἀποθάνῃ* (with NT

Hom. 1 Cor. 7:39–40
(De libello repudii)
CPG 4378 (PG 51:217–26)¹

On the statement, “A wife is bound by the law² for as long as her husband lives. But if he goes to death’s sleep, she is free to get married to whomever she wishes—only, in the Lord. Yet she is more blessed if she remains as she is” (1 Cor 7:39–40).³

1. [217] Last time,⁴ the blessed Paul was laying down laws about marriage and about the ordinances that govern the marital state⁵ when he wrote and told the Corinthians: “Now concerning the things about which you wrote to me, it is good for a man not to touch a woman. But on account of sexual misconduct, let each man have his own wife, and let each woman have her own husband” (1 Cor 7:1–2). That’s why we, too, spent our entire homily on these words. Accordingly, today as well we must devote our homily to this topic, since the very same Paul speaks again today about the same matters.⁶ For you heard him crying out and saying: “A wife is bound by the law for as long as her husband lives. But if he goes to death’s sleep, she is free to get married to whomever she wishes—only, in the Lord. Yet she is more

codex A), but he printed the manuscript reading in the margin. The latter is also the reading of Paris. gr. 768 (but note that within the homily itself Chrysostom quotes the lemma each time with κοιμηθῆ). Paris. gr. 748 has the most expanded title, plus ὁ ἀνὴρ αὐτῆς after κοιμηθῆ; minus μόνον ἐν κυρίῳ after γαμηθῆναι; plus κατὰ τὴν ἐμὴν γνώμην· δοκῶ δὲ καὶ πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἔχειν after μείνῃ.

4. At the previous *synaxis* (πρώην, literally, “the day before yesterday,” “just now”), the homily that was devoted to 1 Cor 7:2–4.

5. The repetition of *περὶ γάμου* and [*περὶ*] *τῶν τοῦ γάμου δικαιωμάτων* may refer to the order of topics in his previous homily, where John treated weddings (marital celebrations) first and then the rules governing the marital state.

6. For Chrysostom, Paul’s voice is both in the past (writing to the Corinthians) and in the present (speaking directly to the congregation when his words are read by the ἀναγνώστης and reanimated by the preacher), what I term his contemporaneity hermeneutic. This opening links the two sermons, their two voices, and the two time zones.

γαμηθῆναι, μόνον ἐν Κυρίῳ. Μακαριωτέρα δέ ἐστιν, ἐὰν οὕτω μείνη κατὰ τὴν ἐμὴν γνώμην· δοκῶ δὲ καὶ γὰρ Πνεῦμα Θεοῦ ἔχειν. Ἐψώμεθα τοίνυν αὐτῷ καὶ σήμερον, καὶ περὶ ταύτης διαλεξώμεθα τῆς ὑποθέσεως· ἀκολουθοῦντες γὰρ Παύλῳ, δι' αὐτοῦ πάντως τῷ Χριστῷ ἐψόμεθα, ἐπειδὴ καὶ οὗτος οὐχ ἑαυτῷ, ἀλλ' ἐκείνῳ ἀκολουθῶν, πάντα ἔγραφε.

Καὶ γὰρ οὐ τὸ τυχὸν πρᾶγμα γάμος εὖ διακείμενος, ὥσπερ οὖν μυρίων συμφορῶν ὑπόθεσις γίνεται τοῖς οὐκ εἰς δέον αὐτῷ χρωμένοις. Ὡςπερ γὰρ βοηθός ἐστιν ἡ γυνή, οὕτω πολλάκις καὶ ἐπίβουλος γίνεται. Ὡςπερ οὖν λιμὴν ἐστιν ὁ γάμος, οὕτω καὶ ναυάγιον, οὐ παρὰ τὴν οἰκίαν φύσιν, ἀλλὰ παρὰ τὴν γνώμην τῶν κακῶς αὐτῷ χρησαμένων. Ὁ μὲν γὰρ κατὰ τοὺς προσήκοντας αὐτὸν ἐπιτελῶν, νόμους, τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγορᾶς καὶ πάντων τῶν πανταχοῦ κακῶν παραμυ-[218]θίαν τινὰ καὶ ἀπαλλαγὴν εὕρισκει τὴν οἰκίαν, καὶ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα· ὁ δὲ ἀπλῶς καὶ ὡς ἔτυχε τὸ πρᾶγμα μεταχειριζόμενος, καὶ πολλῆς ἐπὶ τῆς ἀγορᾶς ἀπολαύσῃ γαλήνης, σκοπέλους καὶ σπιλάδας εἰσελθὼν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν ὀψεται. Ἐπεὶ οὖν οὐ περὶ τῶν τυχόντων ἡμῖν ὁ κίνδυνος, ἀναγκαῖον μετὰ ἀκριβείας τοῖς λεγομένοις προσέχειν, καὶ τὸν μέλλοντα γυναῖκα ἄγεσθαι, μετὰ τῶν τοῦ Παύλου νόμων, μᾶλλον δὲ μετὰ τῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ νόμων τοῦτο ποιεῖν.

Οἶδα μὲν οὖν ὅτι πολλοῖς εἶναι δοκεῖ καινὸν καὶ παράδοξον τὸ λεγόμενον· πλὴν οὐ διὰ τοῦτο σιγήσομαι, ἀλλὰ πρῶτον τὸν νόμον ὑμῖν ἀναγνούς, οὕτω τὴν δοκοῦσαν ἀντινομίαν λύσαι πειράσομαι. Τίς οὖν ἐστιν ὁ νόμος, ὃν ὁ Παῦλος ἡμῖν ἔθηκε; *Γυνή, φησί, δέδεταί νόμῳ*. Οὐκοῦν οὐ δεῖ ἀποσχίζεσθαι ζῶντος τοῦ ἀνδρός, οὐδὲ ἕτερον ἐπεισάγειν νυμφίον, οὐδὲ δευτέρους ὁμιλεῖν γάμοις. Καὶ ὅρα πῶς μετὰ ἀκριβείας καὶ αὐτῇ τῶν λέξεων τῇ φύσει κέχρηται. Οὐ

7. With ἐὰν δέ for ἐὰν δὲ καί; ὁ ἀνὴρ αὐτῆς for ὁ ἀνὴρ after κοιμηθῇ.

8. The translation adopts the reading ἐψώμεθα for PG ἐψώμεθα (*sic*), a reading that goes back to HS, apparently a mistake in the transcription. The actual reading of Monac. gr. 352 is ἐψόμεθα, “we shall follow in the footsteps,” which is also possible.

9. The wordplay in the Greek (in which this double dose of misogyny is phrased) is neatly captured in the Latin translation of Sigismund Gelenius: “*Nam sicut mulier adjutrix est, ita saepe et insidiatrix.*”

10. Per Mf, both his manuscripts read ἐπί (“troubles at the marketplace”) for ἀπό.

11. τοῖς λεγομένοις, “the things said,” here encompasses both the words of the lectionary reading from Paul and John’s homily.

12. A key text for Chrysostom in identifying Paul’s words with Christ is 2 Cor 13:3: τοῦ ἐν ἐμοὶ λαλοῦντος Χριστοῦ. Nonetheless, a constant source of “problems” is how to reconcile the words of Christ in the gospels with the words of Paul in the letters.

13. An “apparent” (δοκεῖν) problem, that Paul’s teaching seems to defy custom or logical expectation. Παράδοξον can mean “strange,” “incredible,” “contrary to expectation,” and “beyond reason” (LSJ; PGL).

blessed if she remains as she is, in my judgment. And I suppose that I, too, have the spirit of God” (1 Cor 7:39–40).⁷ So now, let’s walk in the footsteps of Paul today,⁸ too, and let’s devote our homily to this topic; for when we follow him, through him we shall follow Christ completely, since indeed in everything he wrote Paul wasn’t following himself, but Christ (cf. 1 Cor 11:1).

Now marriage, if it’s conducted well, is no trifling matter, and that’s why it’s the cause of countless misfortunes for those who don’t use it properly. Even as a wife is an “*auxiliary*” (Gen 2:18), so is she often also an adversary.⁹ Even as marriage is a harbor, so is it also a shipwreck—not by its own nature, but by the intent of those who use the institution badly. For the man who discharges his marriage according to the laws proper to it finds that his house and his own wife provide consolation [218] and deliverance from all the troubles that arise from¹⁰ the marketplace and everywhere else. But the man who undertakes the act of marriage carelessly, as though it were a trifling matter, even if he might enjoy great calm out in the marketplace, will see rocks and reefs when he enters his house. Consequently, since the danger we face is from things that aren’t trifling, it’s necessary to attend carefully to the things said,¹¹ and for the man who’s going to marry a woman to do it according to the laws of Paul—or, rather, the laws of Christ.¹²

Now I know that this statement (1 Cor 7:39–40) seems to many people to be new and strange.¹³ But I’ll not be silent just because of that. Instead, after first reading the law¹⁴ to you, I shall try to resolve the apparent legal contradiction.¹⁵ So then, what’s the law Paul has set down for us? “*A wife is bound by the law*,” he says (1 Cor 7:39).¹⁶ Consequently, she should not become separated while her husband is alive, nor bring in alongside him another bridegroom, nor consummate a second marriage. Look at how

14. Identifying the genre of this text as “law” (νόμος) means that certain kinds of solutions (such as an appeal to the historical contingency of advice, for instance) are not available to John. Conversely, regarding this as a legal text endows the passage with the weight and authority Chrysostom wishes to wield.

15. λύσαι: “(re)solve” a problem, in this case, of laws that appear to conflict with one another (ἡ δοκοῦσα ἀντινομία) about whether remarriage is or is not permissible (as 1 Cor 7:39 seems to indicate). For the larger set of issues for patristic interpreters see Clark, *Reading Renunciation*, 233–55 (ch. 9, “The Exegesis of Divorce”).

16. Crucial to Chrysostom’s interpretation of the passage is the reading plus νόμῳ after δέδεται with Ὡ (and other witnesses, ⲛ² D¹ F G L P ψ etc.); NA²⁸ regards this reading as a harmonization with Rom 7:2.

γὰρ εἶπε, Συνοικεῖτω τῷ ἀνδρὶ, ἐφ' ὅσον χρόνον ζῇ· ἀλλὰ τί; Γυνὴ δέδεται νόμῳ, ἐφ' ὅσον χρόνον ζῇ ὁ ἀνὴρ αὐτῆς· ὥστε καὶ βιβλίον ἀποστασίου δῶ, καὶ τὴν οἰκίαν ἀφῇ, καὶ πρὸς ἄλλον ἀπέλθῃ, τῷ νόμῳ δέδεται, καὶ μοιχαλὶς ἐστὶν ἡ τοιαύτη.

Ἐὰν τοίνυν ὁ ἀνὴρ ἐκβαλεῖν βούληται τὴν γυναῖκα, ἢ ἡ γυνὴ τὸν ἄνδρα ἀφεῖναι, ταύτης ἀναμνησκέσθω τῆς ῥήσεως, καὶ τὸν Παῦλον νομιζέτω παρεῖναι καὶ καταδιώκειν αὐτὴν βοῶντα καὶ λέγοντα, Γυνὴ δέδεται νόμῳ. Καθάπερ γὰρ οἱ δραπετεύοντες οἰκέται, καὶ τὴν οἰκίαν ἀφῶσι τὴν δεσποτικὴν, τὴν ἄλλους ἔχουσιν ἐπισυρομένην· οὕτω καὶ γυναῖκες, καὶ τοὺς ἄνδρας ἀφῶσι, τὸν νόμον ἔχουσι καταδικάζοντα ἀντὶ [219] ἀλύσεως, κατηγοροῦντα μοιχείαν, κατηγοροῦντα τῶν λαμβανόντων, καὶ λέγοντα· Περίεστιν ὁ ἀνὴρ ἔτι, καὶ μοιχεία τὸ γινόμενόν ἐστι. Γυνὴ γὰρ δέδεται νόμῳ, ἐφ' ὅσον χρόνον ζῇ ὁ ἀνὴρ αὐτῆς. Καὶ πᾶς ὁ ἀπολελυμένην γαμῶν μοιχᾶται. Καὶ πότε, φησὶν, ἐξέσται αὐτῇ δευτέροις ὁμιλῆσαι γάμοις; Πότε; Ὅταν τῆς ἀλύσεως ἀπαλλαγῇ, ὅταν ὁ ἀνὴρ τελευτήσῃ. Τοῦτο γοῦν δηλῶν, οὐ προσέθηκεν, ὅτι Ἐὰν τελευτήσῃ ὁ ἀνὴρ αὐτῆς, ἐλευθέρα ἐστὶν ὃ θέλει γαμηθῆναι, ἀλλ', Ἐὰν κοιμηθῇ, μονονουχὶ παραμυθούμενος τὴν ἐν χρείᾳ, καὶ πείθων μένειν ἐπὶ τῷ προτέρῳ, καὶ μὴ δεύτερον εἰσαγαγεῖν νυμφίον. Οὐκ ἐτελεύτησέ σου ὁ ἀνὴρ, ἀλλὰ καθεύδει. Τίς καθεύδοντα οὐκ ἀναμένει; Διὰ τοῦτο φησὶν Ἐὰν δὲ κοιμηθῇ, ἐλευθέρα ἐστὶν ὃ θέλει γαμηθῆναι· οὐκ εἶπε, Γαμείσθω, ἵνα μὴ δόξῃ βιάζεσθαι καὶ ἀναγκάζειν· οὔτε ἐκώλυσε βουλομένην ὁμιλεῖν δευτέρῳ γάμῳ, οὔτε μὴ θέλουσαν προετρέψατο, ἀλλὰ τὸν νόμον ἀνέγνω εἰπὼν, Ἐλευθέρα ἐστὶν ὃ θέλει γαμηθῆναι. Ἐλευθέραν δὲ αὐτὴν μετὰ τὴν τοῦ ἀνδρὸς τελευτὴν γεγενῆσθαι λέγων, ἔδειξεν ὅτι πρὸ τούτου δούλη ἦν, ζῶντος ἐκείνου· δούλη δὲ οὕσα καὶ ὑποκειμένη τῷ νόμῳ, καὶ μυριάκις βιβλίον ἀποστασίου λάβῃ, τῷ τῆς μοιχείας ἀλίσκεται νόμῳ. Οἰκέταις μὲν γὰρ ἔξεστι δεσπότης ἀμείβειν

17. A memorable, even comic image for Chrysostom's contemporaneity herme-neutic for the "real encounter" with Paul through his letters (fuller treatment in *HT* 34–68, 428–39).

18. With minus (or ellipsis) of ἀπὸ ἀνδρός after ἀπολελυμένην.

19. One can imagine that this practical matter is hardly a hypothetical question among Chrysostom's congregants.

20. μένειν can also mean "to be satisfied with" (LSJ I.5).

21. John is putting into Paul's mouth, as the intended meaning of 1 Cor 7:39 addressed to widows, the words of the Synoptic Jesus to the crowd about the young girl whom he raises from the dead (Mark 5:39 // Matt 9:24 // Luke 8:52). John prefers Paul's euphemistic term for death, κοιμᾶσθαι (1 Cor 7:39; 1 Thess 4:13), to ἀποθνήσκειν, because it makes all the more clear the connection between sleeping/awakening and dying/rising.

Paul has used a form of expression that's very precise. For he didn't say, "Let her live with her husband as long as he lives," but what? "*A wife is bound by the law for as long as her husband lives.*" Therefore, even if he gives her a writ of divorce and she leaves the house, and if she goes off to another man, she's been bound by the law; hence a woman such as this is an adulteress.

So, if a man wishes to throw his wife out of the house, or a wife wishes to leave her husband, let them remember this statement and consider that Paul is present and chasing after her, crying out and saying,¹⁷ "*A wife is bound by the law!*" Slaves who run away, even if they leave their master's house, have their chain trailing after them. In just the same way, wives, if they leave their husbands, in place of a chain have the law openly declaring the judgment [219], accusing her of adultery, accusing any men who take her in marriage, saying, "Her husband's still alive and what's taking place here is adultery!" For "*A wife is bound by the law for as long as her husband lives*" (1 Cor 7:39); "*and every man who marries a divorced woman commits adultery*" (Luke 16:18).¹⁸ "Then when will it be lawful for her to consummate a second marriage?" someone¹⁹ asks. When? When she's been released from the chain, that is, when her husband dies. To indicate this clearly, Paul didn't put it, "If her husband dies, *she is free to get married to whomever she wishes*," but "*if he goes to death's sleep*" (1 Cor 7:39), almost as if he were consoling the woman in the widowed state and persuading her to remain with²⁰ her first husband and not bring in a second bridegroom. "Your husband hasn't died, '*but he's asleep!*'"²¹ What woman won't wait for a man who's asleep? That's why Paul said, "*But if he goes to death's sleep, she is free to get married to whomever she wishes*" (1 Cor 7:39).²² He didn't say, "Let her get married," so as not to appear to be forcing and compelling her. He neither prevents the woman who wishes to consummate a second marriage, nor does he urge on the woman who doesn't want to, but he recited²³ the law, saying, "*She is free to get married to whomever she wishes*" (1 Cor 7:39). In saying that she has become "free" after the death of her husband, he indicated that previously, while her husband was living, she was a slave.²⁴ Now because she was a slave and subject to the law, even if she might

22. With ἐὰν δέ for ἐὰν δὲ καί; minus ὁ ἀνὴρ after κοιμηθῇ.

23. Translating ἀναγιγνώσκειν with PGL C.

24. John effortlessly inscribes the ideology of marriage as slave ownership of the woman. Lurking in the background here are also Pauline statements about the law and slavery (e.g., Gal 4:1–11; 4:21–5:3).

ζῶντας· γυναικί δὲ οὐκ ἔξεστιν ἄνδρας ἀμείβειν, ζῶντος τοῦ ἀνδρός· ἐπεὶ τὸ πρᾶγμα μοιχεία ἐστί. Μὴ γάρ μοι τοὺς παρὰ τοῖς ἔξωθεν κειμένους νόμους ἀναγνῶς, τοὺς κελεύοντας διδόναι βιβλίον ἀποστασίου, καὶ ἀφίστασθαι. Οὐ γὰρ δὴ κατὰ τούτους σοι μέλλει κρίνειν τοὺς νόμους ὁ Θεὸς ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ, ἀλλὰ καθ' οὓς αὐτὸς ἔθηκε. Καὶ οἱ τῶν ἔξωθεν δὲ νόμοι οὐχ ἀπλῶς, οὐδὲ προηγουμένως τοῦτο τεθείκασιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτοὶ κολάζουσι τὸ πρᾶγμα· ὥστε καὶ αὐτόθεν δέκνυνται, ὅτι ἀηδῶς πρὸς ταύτην ἔχουσι τὴν ἁμαρτίαν. Τὴν γοῦν αἰτίαν τοῦ ἀποστασίου γινομένην γυμνὴν καὶ ἔρημον χρημάτων ἐκβάλλουσι, καὶ ὅθεν ἂν γένηται τῆς διαλύσεως ἢ πρόφασις, καὶ τῇ ζημίᾳ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦτον κολάζουσιν· οὐκ ἂν οὖν τοῦτο ποιήσαντες ἐπῆνουν τὸ γινόμενον.

β'. Τί οὖν καὶ Μωϋσῆς; Τοῦτο ἔπραττε κάκεῖνος διὰ τὴν αὐτὴν αἰτίαν. Σὺ δὲ ἄκουε τοῦ Χριστοῦ λέγοντος, ὅτι 'Εὰν μὴ περισσέυῃς ἡ δικαιοσύνη ὑμῶν πλέον τῶν γραμματέων καὶ Φαρισαίων, οὐ μὴ εἰσέλθῃτε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν.' Ἀκουε αὐτοῦ πάλιν λέγοντος, 'Ὁ ἀπολύων τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας, ποιεῖ αὐτὴν μοιχευθῆναι, καὶ ὁ ἀπολελυμένην γαμῶν μοιχᾶται. Διὰ τοῦτο ἦλθεν ὁ μονογενὴς Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, διὰ τοῦτο δούλου μορφὴν ἔλαβε, διὰ τοῦτο τὸ αἷμα ἐξέχεε τὸ τίμιον, τὸν θάνατον κατέλυσε, τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ἔσβεσε, δαψιλεστέραν τὴν τοῦ Πνεύματος ἔδωκε χάριν, ἵνα πρὸς μείζονά σε ἀγάγῃ φιλοσοφίαν.' Ἄλλως δὲ, οὐδὲ ὁ Μωϋσῆς προηγουμένως τοῦτο ἐνομοθέτησεν, ἀλλ' ἀναγκαζόμενος συγκαταβῆναι τῇ τῶν νομοθετουμένων ἀσθενείᾳ. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ πρὸς φόνους ἦσαν ἔτοιμοι, καὶ

25. The syntax and parallelism with the previous clause seem to require γυναιξί for γυναικί.

26. I.e., non-Christians, pagans. Or perhaps one might translate, "in the world out there" (i.e., outside of the church). Chrysostom uses this rhetoric despite the fact that John and his congregants live under a Christian imperium; hence the civil laws in force are not, in fact, a completely "external" force as he presents them.

27. Note that John uses almost the exact phrase as Matt 19:7 (διδόναι βιβλίον ἀποστασίου) to refer to the law of these "outsiders" as contrasted with the law of God.

28. I.e., legal divorce.

29. I.e., adultery, as above, punishable as a criminal offense. On the complexities of marriage and divorce laws (as preserved in the Codex Theodosianus), and the extent of changes under Christian emperors from Constantine forward, see Mathew Kuefler, "The Marriage Revolution in Late Antiquity: The Theodosian Code and Later Roman Marriage Law," *Journal of Family History* 32 (2007): 343–70, esp. 357, which cites Cod. Theod. 9.7.7, from 392 CE, on the criminal offense of adultery, with reference to the considerable scholarship on the topic (and see also p. 268 n. 85 above).

30. I.e., contracting a second marriage while the first spouse is still living.

receive a writ of divorce a thousand times over, she stands convicted by the law of adultery, because it's lawful for household slaves to change masters while they're living, but it's not lawful for wives²⁵ to change husbands if their husband is alive, since that act constitutes adultery. Now don't recite to me the laws that are in place among the outsiders²⁶ that command one to give a writ of divorce²⁷ and be separated. Because surely on that day to come, God is going to judge you not by these laws but by the ones he himself has laid down. While the laws of the outsiders haven't laid down this practice²⁸ either as a general rule or as a preference, nonetheless even they punish the act.²⁹ Hence, of their own accord, those laws are shown to have an unfavorable view of this sin.³⁰ After all, they reject a case for divorce that comes without any sort of cash settlement, and consequently, if there's an occasion for dissolving the marriage, they punish the husband by the loss of his property. Therefore, by doing this, they were hardly praising this act.

2. But what about Moses? He did this, too,³¹ and for the same reason. And yet listen to Christ when he says, "*Unless your righteousness greatly exceeds that of the scribes and Pharisees, in no way will you enter into the kingdom of heaven*" (Matt 5:20). And hear him saying again, "*The man who divorces his wife, except in the case of sexual immorality, causes her to commit adultery, and the one who marries a divorced woman commits adultery*" (Matt 5:32; Luke 16:8).³² The reason the only begotten son of God³³ came, the reason he "took the form of a slave" (cf. Phil 2:7),³⁴ the reason he poured out his precious blood,³⁵ destroyed death, extinguished sin, and gave the magnificent grace of the spirit, was so he might lead you to a higher philosophy.³⁶ But even apart from that, Moses didn't even lay down this law by preference, but he did so when he was forced to accom-

31. For insightful discussion of the exegetical problems of apparent legal contradiction, and the inventive and often tortured solutions ancient Christian intellectuals offered, see Clark, *Reading Renunciation*, 233–40 (who also refers to this passage).

32. John has harmonized the two versions (taking the form of the subjects more closely from Luke and the verbs from the Matthean version), but the tell-tale Matthean exception clause, *παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας* ("apart from the reason of sexual misconduct"), is in place. John reads *μοιχευθῆναι* for *μοιχᾶσθαι* against \mathfrak{M} (but with NA²⁸, which lists no variants).

33. Cf. 1 John 4:9.

34. Not an exact quotation (*δούλου μορφὴν ἔλαβε* for *μορφὴν δούλου λαβών*) but an unmistakable allusion.

35. Cf. Mark 14:24 // Matt 26:28 // Luke 22:20.

36. By *μείζων φιλοσοφία* John means "Christianity" as opposed to "Judaism," and the law of Christ over the law of Moses (the logic of supersessionism).

συγγενικῶν αἱμάτων τὰς οἰκίας ἐπλήρουν, καὶ οὔτε τῶν οἰκείων, οὔτε τῶν ἄλλοτρίων ἐφείδοντο· ἵνα μὴ κατασφάττωσι τὰς γυναῖκας ἔνδον, ὥς ἂν ἀηδῶς ἔχωσιν, ἐκέλευσεν ἐκβαλεῖν, μείζον ἀναιρῶν κακὸν τὴν περὶ τὰς σφαγὰς εὐκολίαν. “Ὅτι γὰρ μαιφόνοι τινὲς ἦσαν, ἄκουε αὐτῶν τῶν προφητῶν λεγόντων· Οἰκοδομοῦντες Σιών ἐν αἵματι, καὶ Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἐν ἀδικίαις· καὶ πάλιν, Αἵματα ἐφ’ αἵμασι μίσγουσι· [220] καὶ πάλιν, Αἱ χεῖρες ὑμῶν αἵματος πλήρεις. “Ὅτι δὲ οὐ κατὰ τῶν ἄλλοτρίων μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ κατὰ τῶν οἰκείων ἐμαίνοντο, καὶ τοῦτο δηλῶν ὁ Προφήτης ἔλεγε· Καὶ ἔθυσαν τοὺς υἱοὺς αὐτῶν καὶ τὰς θυγατέρας αὐτῶν τοῖς δαιμονίοις. Οἱ δὲ παῖδων αὐτῶν μὴ φεισάμενοι, οὐκ ἂν ἐφείσαντο γυναικῶν. “Ἰν’ οὖν μὴ τοῦτο γένηται, τοῦτο ἐπέτρεψε. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ἐρωτᾷσι καὶ λέγουσι, Πῶς Μωϋσῆς ἐπέτρεψε δοῦναι βιβλίον ἀποστασίου; δεικνὺς ὅτι οὐκ ἀντινομοθετῶν αὐτῷ ταῦτα ἔγραφε, οὕτω πῶς φησι· Μωϋσῆς πρὸς τὴν σκληροκαρδίαν ὑμῶν εἶπεν, ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς δὲ οὐ γέγονεν οὕτως· ἀλλ’ ὁ ποιήσας ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἄρρεν καὶ θῆλυ ἐποίησεν αὐτούς. Εἰ καλὸν τοῦτο ἦν, φησὶν, οὐκ ἂν ἓνα ἄνδρα ἐποίησε καὶ μίαν γυναῖκα, ἀλλὰ ἓνα ποιήσας τὸν Ἀδὰμ, δύο ἂν ἐποίησε τὰς γυναῖκας, εἴ

37. συγκαταβαίνειν, “accommodation,” a recurrent theological claim by Chrysostom that stands already in a long tradition by his time. See Mitchell, “Pauline Accommodation and ‘Condescension’ (συγκατάβασις): 1 Cor 9:19–23 and the History of Influence,” in *Paul Beyond the Judaism-Hellenism Divide*, ed. Troels Engberg-Pedersen (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001), 197–214.

38. Chrysostom fashions a brutal anti-Judaistic portrait of Moses’s generation as engaging in or always on the verge of murder. As often in ancient Christian anti-Judaistic rhetoric, Chrysostom adduces the prophets of Israel as testimony against their own people, in this case with the contrived invective’s intent being to show that “some of” the “Jews” were especially prone to domestic violence, and hence Moses had to accede to divorce to preempt the worse crime of murder. Wendy Mayer has recently forcefully insisted that such statements, as found in the series of homilies *adversus Judaeos*, cannot be dismissed as “mere rhetoric” without reckoning with their serious cognitive, emotional, social and practical impact upon the audiences (“Preaching Hatred? John Chrysostom, Neuroscience, and the Jews,” in *Revisioning John Chrysostom*, 58–136). A key vehicle of the power of this discourse for Mayer is its “repeated activation of the same circuits in the brain through repetition of the same metaphorical concepts and language” (“Preaching Hatred?” 78). Further research should be done on more incidental references such as this (and others marked in notes within this volume), where the anti-Jewish invective is, strictly speaking, rather incidental to Chrysostom’s main theme, and yet the drumbeat of Jews as killers is pounded (on which see “Preaching Hatred?” 104–6, 118). How do such notes within Chrysostom’s homilies on the one hand evidence the techniques of social conditioning of his audiences and, on the other, the degree to which the preacher assumes these attitudes have been normalized and will be received without demur?

moderate the weakness³⁷ of those for whom he was legislating. For they were prepared to commit acts of murder and were filling their houses with the blood of their own relatives, sparing neither the members of their own household nor strangers.³⁸ He commanded them to throw their wives out of the house so they might not murder at home the wives who displeased them. In this way he eliminated the greater evil, that is, the readiness to kill. For proof that some of them were bloodthirsty murderers, listen to their prophets when they say, “*Building up Zion with blood, and Jerusalem with acts of wickedness*” (Mic 3:10),³⁹ and again, “*They mix blood upon blood*” (Hos 4:2), [220] and yet again, “*Your hands are full of blood*” (Isa 1:15).⁴⁰ The prophet shows also that they were madly raging not only against strangers but even against the members of their own household when he says, “*They sacrificed their sons and their daughters to the demons*” (Ps 105:37).⁴¹ Men who didn’t spare their children wouldn’t have spared their wives. Lest this happen, Moses “*allowed*” (Matt 19:8) the practice of divorce. That’s why Christ also, when the Jews asked him and said, “*How did Moses allow one to give a writ of divorce?*” (Matt 19:7),⁴² showed that in writing these things Moses wasn’t fashioning a legal contradiction. Christ put it this way, “*Moses said with a view to your hardness of heart, ‘it was not like this from the beginning’*” (Matt 19:8)⁴³ “*but the one who made them from the beginning made them male and female*” (Matt 19:4; cf. Gen 1:27).⁴⁴ “If this practice were good,” Christ says,⁴⁵ “God would not have made one man and one woman. Instead, after making one man, Adam, God would

39. With αἵματι for αἵμασιν.

40. Minus γάρ before χεῖρες.

41. This passage fits John’s argument in particular because of the following verse: καὶ ἐξέχεαν αἷμα ἀθῶον, αἷμα υἱῶν αὐτῶν καὶ θυγατέρων (“and they poured out innocent blood, the blood of their sons and daughters”).

42. With πῶς for τί οὖν; Μωϋσῆς for Μωσῆς; ἐπέτρεψε (from Matt 19:8) for ἐνετείλατο. The latter rendering by John retrojects Jesus’s answer (and John’s own) that Moses merely “allowed” divorce into the question from the Pharisees (not “the Jews” as Chrysostom presents it) about what Moses had *commanded*.

43. With εἶπεν for ἐπέτρεπεν ὑμῖν ἀπολῦσαι τὰς γυναῖκας ὑμῶν (or by ellipsis). John’s syntax places the following two quotations from that same Matthean passage into direct discourse.

44. With ἐξ ἀρχῆς for ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς.

45. John is here giving an extended προσωποποιία of Christ’s argument to the Pharisees in Matt 19:3–9 as well as the reasoning behind it.

γε ἐβούλετο τὴν μὲν ἐκβαλεῖν, τὴν δὲ εἰσαγαγεῖν· νῦν δὲ διὰ τοῦ τρόπου τῆς δημιουργίας τὸν νόμον εἰσήγαγεν, ὃν ἐγὼ γράφω νῦν. Ποῖον δὲ τοῦτον; Τὸ τὴν κληρωθεῖσαν ἐξ ἀρχῆς γυναῖκα, ταύτην ἔχειν διαπαντός· οὗτος ἐκείνου παλαιότερος ὁ νόμος, καὶ τοσοῦτον, ὅσον ὁ Ἀδὰμ τοῦ Μωϋσέως. "Ὡστε οὐ καινοτομῶ νῦν ἐγώ, οὐδὲ ξένα ἐπισφένω δόγματα, ἀλλὰ τοῦ Μωϋσέως πρεσβύτερα καὶ ἀρχαιότερα.

Ἄξιον δὲ καὶ αὐτὸν τὸν νόμον ἀκοῦσαι Μωϋσέως, ὃν περὶ τούτου ἔθηκεν. Ἐάν τις γυναῖκα λάβῃ, φησί, καὶ συνοικήσῃ αὐτῇ, καὶ ἔσται, ἐὰν μὴ εὖρῃ χάριν ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ, ὅτι εὕρεν ἐν αὐτῇ ἀσχημοσύνης πρᾶγμα, γράψει αὐτῇ βιβλίον ἀποστασίου, καὶ δώσει αὐτῇ εἰς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῆς. "Ὁρα· οὐκ εἶπε, Γραψάτω, καὶ δότω· ἀλλὰ τί; Γράψει αὐτῇ βιβλίον ἀποστασίου, καὶ δώσει αὐτῇ εἰς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῆς. Πολὺ δὲ τούτου κάκεινου τὸ μέσον· τὸ μὲν γὰρ εἰπεῖν, Γραψάτω, καὶ δότω, κελεύοντος καὶ ἐπιτάττοντος· τὸ δὲ εἰπεῖν, Γράψει βιβλίον ἀποστασίου, καὶ δώσει εἰς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῆς, τὸ γεγεννημένον ἀπαγγέλλοντος, οὐκ οἴκοθεν τὸν νόμον εἰσάγοντος. Ἐὰν οὖν τις, φησὶν, ἐκβάλῃ τὴν γυναῖκα, καὶ ἀποστείλῃ αὐτὴν ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀπελθοῦσα γένηται ἀνδρὶ ἐτέρῳ, καὶ μισήσῃ αὐτὴν καὶ ὁ ἀνὴρ ὁ ἔσχατος, καὶ γράψῃ αὐτῇ βιβλίον ἀποστασίου, καὶ δώσῃ εἰς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῆς, καὶ ἐξαποστείλῃ αὐτὴν ἐκ τῆς οἰκίας αὐτοῦ, ἢ ἀποθάνῃ ὁ ἀνὴρ αὐτῆς, ὃς ἔλαβεν αὐτὴν ἑαυτῷ γυναῖκα, οὐ δυνήσεται ὁ ἀνὴρ ὁ πρότερον ἐξαποστείλας αὐτὴν ἐπαναστρέψαι καὶ λαβεῖν αὐτὴν ἑαυτῷ γυναῖκα. Εἴτα ἐνδεικνύμενος, ὅτι οὐκ ἐπαινεῖ τὸ γεγεννημένον, οὐδὲ γάμον εἶναι νομίζει, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὴν ἀσθένειαν αὐτῶν συγκαταβαίνει, εἰπὼν, Οὐ δυνήσεται ὁ ἀνὴρ ὁ πρότερος λαβεῖν αὐτὴν ἑαυτῷ γυναῖκα, ἐπήγαγε, Μετὰ τὸ μιανθῆναι αὐτὴν, ἐμφαίνων διὰ τοῦ τρόπου τῆς λέξεως, ὅτι ὁ δεύτερος γάμος, ζῶντος τοῦ προτέρου ἀνδρὸς γενόμενος, μiasma μᾶλλον ἐστίν, ἢ γάμος. Διὰ τοῦτο οὐκ εἶπε, Μετὰ τὸ γαμηθῆναι αὐτὴν. Ὅρᾳς ὅτι συνωδὰ τῷ Χριστῷ φθέγγεται; Εἴτα καὶ τὴν αἰτίαν προσέθηκεν, "Ὅτι

46. Gen 2 is considered the primary "law" about the permanence of marriage, not superseded by Deut 24 (which Chrysostom will treat next).

47. Christ offers John the solution to the problem of what appear to be contradictory, new or strange laws. Note that this is the original objection to the Pauline lemma in §1 (PG 51:218), to which John will eventually return.

48. Although not explicitly marked as such, from what follows it appears that the προσωποποιία of Christ ends here and next John speaks in his own voice addressing his congregation.

49. Minus δέ before τις; with transposition of λάβῃ and γυναῖκα; ἀσχημοσύνης πρᾶγμα for ἄσχημον πρᾶγμα; minus καὶ before γράψει; plus αὐτῇ before εἰς.

50. Minus αὐτῇ before βιβλίον.

51. Introduced as a quotation, but much paraphrased: plus οὖν before τις; plus

have made two women if he had wished Adam to throw one out and bring the other one in. But as it is, in the very manner of creation God introduced the law that I am inscribing now. What law is this? To have for all time this one woman who was allotted from the beginning. Now this law is older than the one mentioned earlier,⁴⁶ inasmuch as Adam is older than Moses. Consequently, I am not innovating now or introducing strange teachings⁴⁷ but ones that are older and more ancient than Moses.”⁴⁸

It's fitting also to listen to the very law Moses set forth about this: “*If a man takes a woman,*” he says, “*and lives with her, and it shall be that if she doesn't find favor with him because he has found some shameful thing in her, he will write her a writ of divorce and will put it into her hands*” (Deut 24:1).⁴⁹ Notice that he didn't say, “let him write and let him give,” but what? “*He will write her a writ of divorce and will put it into her hands.*” Now, there is a great difference between these two things. Saying “let him write and let him give” is the act of one who is commanding and giving orders, whereas saying “*he will write a writ of divorce and will put it into her hands*” (Deut 24:1)⁵⁰ is the expression of one who is announcing something that happens, not one who's introducing this law on his own authority. “Therefore,” he says, “*if someone throws his wife out and sends her from his house, and after she leaves she becomes another man's wife, and the later husband hates her, too, and writes her a writ of divorce and puts it into her hands, and sends her out of his house, or her husband who took her as his wife dies, the former husband will not be able, after he sent her out, to turn back and take her for his own wife*” (Deut 24:1–4).⁵¹ So then, he's not praising this occurrence, nor does he even consider it to be a marriage, but he's accommodating their weakness. Moses shows this when after saying, “*The former husband will not be able ... to take her for his own wife*” (Deut 24:4),⁵² he added, “*after she has become defiled*” (Deut 24:4). He makes it absolutely clear through this choice of words that the second marriage, since it took place while the first husband was alive, is more a defilement than a marriage. That's why he didn't say, “after she was married.” Do you see that Moses speaks in complete accord with Christ?⁵³ Then he added

ἐκβάλῃ τὴν γυναῖκα (paraphrase of the earlier part of Deut 24:1); three verbs (γράφῃ, δώσῃ, ἐξαποστείλῃ) in subjunctive instead of future to fit ἐάν, αὐτῆς for ὁ ἔσχατος after ἀποθάνῃ ὁ ἀνὴρ; πρότερον for πρότερος (but the former is read in the following citation); ἐπαναστρέψαι for ἐπαναστρέψας.

52. Ellipsis as marked.

53. John pronounces the problem of ἀντινομία solved.

βδέλυγμά ἐστιν ἐναντίον τοῦ Θεοῦ. Καὶ Μωϋσῆς μὲν οὕτως· ὁ δὲ προφήτης Μαλαχίας σαφέστερον πολλῶ τοῦ Μωϋσέως αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἐνδείκνυται, μᾶλλον δὲ οὐ Μαλαχίας, ἀλλ' ὁ Θεὸς διὰ τοῦ Μαλαχίου, λέγων οὕτως· Εἰ ἄξιον ἐπιβλέψαι εἰς θυσίαν ὑμῶν; ἢ λαβεῖν δεκτὸν ἐκ τῶν χειρῶν ὑμῶν; εἴτα εἰπόντος, Τίνος ἔνεκεν, φησὶ, γυναῖκα ἐκ [221] νεότητός σου ἐγκατέλιπες; καὶ δεικνὺς ἡλίκον ἐστὶ κακὸν, καὶ ἀποστερῶν πάσης συγγνώμης τὸν τοῦτο ποιήσαντα, διὰ τῶν ἐξῆς τὴν κατηγορίαν αὖξει, ἐπάγων οὕτω καὶ λέγων· Καὶ αὕτη κοινωνός σου, καὶ γυνὴ διαθήκης σου, καὶ ἐγκατάλειμμα πνεύματός σου, καὶ οὐκ ἄλλος ἐποίησεν. "Ορα πόσα τίθῃσι δικαιώματα· πρῶτον τὸ τῆς ἡλικίας, Γυνὴ νεότητός σου· εἴτα τὸ ἀναγκαῖον, Καὶ αὕτη κοινωνός σου· εἴτα τὸν τῆς δημιουργίας τρόπον, Ἐγκατάλειμμα πνεύματός σου.

γ'. Πρὸς τούτοις ἅπασιν, ὁ πάντων τούτων μεῖζον ἦν, τὸ τοῦ ποιήσαντος ἀξίωμα. Τοῦτο γάρ ἐστι τὸ, Οὐκ ἄλλος ἐποίησεν. Οὐκ ἔχεις, φησὶν, εἰπεῖν, ὅτι σὲ μὲν ὁ Θεὸς ἐποίησεν, ἐκείνην δὲ οὐχ ὁ Θεός, ἀλλ' ἄλλος τις ἐκείνου καταδεέστερος· ἀλλ' εἴς καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς ἀμφοτέρους εἰς τὸ εἶναι παραγαγών· ὥστε εἰ καὶ μηδὲν ἕτερον, τοῦτο γοῦν αἰδεσθῆις, φύλαττε τὴν πρὸς αὐτὴν ἀγάπην. Εἰ γὰρ δούλοις πολλάκις τοῖς πρὸς ἀλλήλους στασιάζουσιν ὑπόθεσις τοῦτο γεγένηται, τὸ δεῖν λέγω τοὺς ἀμφοτέρους ἐνὶ καὶ τῷ αὐτῷ δουλεῦσαι δεσπότη, πολλῶ μᾶλλον ἐφ' ἡμῶν τοῦτο γίνεσθαι χρῆ, ὅταν καὶ δημιουργὸν καὶ δεσπότην τὸν αὐτὸν ἔχωμεν οἱ ἀμφότεροι. Εἶδες πῶς καὶ ἐν τῇ Παλαιᾷ

54. With ἐναντίον τοῦ θεοῦ for ἐναντίον κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ σου.

55. With εἰ ἄξιον for ἄξιον; plus ὑμῶν after θυσίαν.

56. With transposition of ἔνεκεν and τίνος.

57. The reading of the PG text (which goes back to HS), ἐγκατέλιπες, is corrupt, and Mf's note is also not fully accurate. (He omits the key word μή.) The translation adopts the actual reading of HS's source text, Monac. gr. 352, μὴ ἐγκαταλίπης, as is read also by Paris. gr. 748 (and cf. Paris. gr. 768, μὴ καταλίπης) (HS 5:339 had in fact included a conjectural reading of μὴ ἐγκαταλίπης in the margin, but it has gone unnoticed). In addition to this being the reading of the manuscripts, the point is clarified when one realizes Chrysostom has here in his recounting of the dialogue found within the prophetic text skipped down to Mal 2:15 (not 2:14, ἀνα μέσον γυναικὸς νεότητός σου, ἣν ἐγκατέλιπες, as all editors since HS have misidentified the quote).

58. Reading εἴτα δεικνὺς, with Paris. gr. 748 and 768 (as correctly noted by Mf), for καὶ δεικνὺς (HS and all editions to PG), which is read by none of the three witnesses. Monac. gr. 352 has the shorter reading, δεικνὺς.

59. With ἐγκατάλειμμα for ὑπόλειμμα; σου for αὐτοῦ (sc. θεοῦ), though below it will be clear that John still thinks the spirit in question is God's; with transposition of καὶ οὐκ ἄλλος ἐποίησεν to the end of verse from the beginning.

60. Mf noted that the Greek manuscript used by Gelenius in his Latin translation included a whole sentence here that is missing from HS ME and from his own two

also the reason: “*because it is an abomination before God*” (Deut 24:4).⁵⁴ Now that is what Moses said. And the prophet Malachi demonstrated this very same thing even more clearly than Moses—or, rather, it wasn’t Malachi but God speaking through Malachi in this way: “*whether it is fitting to look upon your sacrifice, or to receive a tithe from your hands?*” (Mal 2:13).⁵⁵ Then, after someone asked, “*Why is that?*” (Mal 2:14),⁵⁶ he said, “*Don’t forsake⁵⁷ the wife [221] of your youth*” (Mal 2:15). Then, to show⁵⁸ what a great wrong this was and deprive the one who did it of any excuse, in what follows he amplifies the accusation by adding to it in this way and saying: “*And this woman is your partner, and your covenanted wife, and the remnant of your spirit, and no other made her*” (Mal 2:14–15).⁵⁹ Look at how many ordinances he set down here: first that of age (“*the wife of your youth*”), then that of necessity (“*this woman is your partner*”), and then the mode of creation (“*the remnant of your spirit*”).⁶⁰

3. And on top of all these things is the consideration that’s greater than all of them: the dignified status of the one who made her. For this is what “*no other made her*” (Mal 2:15) means. He’s saying, “you cannot say that God made you, but it wasn’t God who made her, but some other, inferior to him. No. One and the same God brought both of you into existence.⁶¹ Therefore, even if for no other reason, guard the love you have for her out of due reverence for that fact.” This claim—that both of them must serve one and the same master, I mean—is often made as a rationale to slaves who are contending⁶² with one another. If that’s so, then how much more should it be the case with us, when we both⁶³ have the same God as our creator and our master? Have you seen how even in the Old Testament

Paris manuscripts: “*Non enim de terra formata est sicut Adam, sed deformati e terra latere, et hoc est quod dicit ἐγκατάλειμμα, Et reliquiae spiritus tui*” (“For she [Eve] was not formed from the earth, as Adam had been, but from the side of the man who had been formed from the earth; and this is what ἐγκατάλειμμα means: ‘and the remnant of your spirit.’”). The corresponding Greek would read along these lines: οὐ γὰρ ἐπλάσθη ἐκ τῆς γῆς καθάπερ Ἀδάμ, ἀλλὰ ἐκ τῆς πλευρᾶς τοῦ ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς πλασθέντος· καὶ τοῦτ’ ἔστιν ὃ λέγεται ἐγκατάλειμμα. καὶ ἐγκατάλειμμα πνεύματός σου.

61. Cf. also Mal 2:10: Οὐχὶ θεὸς εἷς ἔκτισεν ὑμᾶς; (“Did not the one God create you?”).

62. Mf notes that his two manuscripts read δούλους ... στασιάζοντας for δούλοις ... στασιάζουσιν. Taken as an accusative of respect, the sense would be “in the case of slaves who are contending.”

63. I.e., both wife and husband (John is using a generic “we” here for the two partners in the couple).

ἀρχὰς καὶ προοίμια λοιπὸν ἐλάμβανε τῆς καινῆς φιλοσοφίας τὰ προστάγματα; Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ πολὺν ἐνετράφησαν τῷ νόμῳ χρόνον, καὶ πρὸς τὰ τελειότερα παραγγέλματα ὁδεύειν ὤφειλον, καὶ πρὸς τὸ τέλος λοιπὸν ἀπήντα αὐτοῖς τὰ τῆς πολιτείας, μετὰ τοῦ προσήκοντος καιροῦ λοιπὸν ἐπὶ ταύτην ἄγει τὴν φιλοσοφίαν αὐτοὺς ὁ προφήτης. Πειθώμεθα τοίνυν τῷ καλῷ τούτῳ νόμῳ, καὶ πάσης αἰσχύνης ἑαυτοὺς ἀπαλλάξωμεν καὶ μήτε τὰς ἑαυτῶν ἐκβάλωμεν, μήτε τὰς ὑπὸ ἐτέρων ἐκβληθείσας δεχώμεθα. Ποίῳ γὰρ ὄψει προσώπῳ τὸν ἄνδρα τῆς γυναικός; ποίοις ὀφθαλμοῖς τοὺς φίλους τοὺς ἐκείνου, τοὺς οἰκέτας; Εἰ γὰρ τελευτήσαντος τοῦ συνοικοῦντος, τὴν γυναῖκα τις τὴν ἐκείνου λαβὼν, εἶτα τὴν εἰκόνα μόνην ἀνακειμένην ἰδὼν, ἔπαθέ τι καὶ ἐδυσχέρανεν, ὡς ζῶντα τὸν ἄνδρα ὁρῶν τῆς αὐτῷ συνοικουσίας, ποῖον βιώσεται βίον; πῶς οἴκαδε εἰσελεύσεται; μετὰ ποίας γνώμης, μετὰ ποίων ὀφθαλμῶν ὄψεται τὴν ἐκείνου γυναῖκα τὴν αὐτοῦ;

Μᾶλλον δὲ οὐδὲ ἐκείνου, οὔτε αὐτοῦ δικαίως ἂν τις τὴν τοιαύτην προσείποι· ἡ γὰρ μοιχαλὶς οὐδενός ἐστι γυνή. Καὶ γὰρ τὰς πρὸς ἐκεῖνον συνθήκας ἐπάτησε, καὶ πρὸς σὲ μετὰ τῶν προσηκόντων νόμων οὐκ ἤλθε. Πόσης οὐκ ἂν εἴη παρανοίας, πρᾶγμα τοσούτων γέμον κακῶν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν εἰσαγαγεῖν; Μὴ γὰρ σπάνις ἐστὶ γυναικῶν; Τίνος ἕνεκεν, πολλῶν οὐσῶν, ἅς μετὰ τῶν προσηκόντων νόμων καὶ μετὰ καθαροῦ συνειδότος λαμβάνειν ἔξεστιν, ἐπὶ τὰς κεκωλυμένας τρέχομεν, τὰς οἰκίας ἀνατρέποντες, καὶ πολέμους ἐμφυλίου εἰσάγοντες, καὶ πανταχόθεν ἔχθραν ἑαυτοῖς παρασκευάζοντες, μυρίαν κατηγορίαν ἀνοίγοντες στόματα, καὶ τὴν ζωὴν τὴν ἑαυτῶν καταισχύνοντες, καὶ, τὸ πάντων χαλεπώτατον, ἀπαραίτητον ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς κρίσεως συνάγοντες ἑαυτοῖς κόλασιν; Τί γὰρ ἐροῦμεν τότε τῷ μέλλοντι κρίνειν ἡμᾶς, ὅταν τὸν νόμον παρενεγκῶν εἰς μέσον καὶ ἀναγνοὺς εἴποι· Ἐκέλευσα ἀπολελυμένην γυναῖκα μὴ λαμβάνειν, εἰπὼν ὅτι μοιχεῖα τὸ πρᾶγμά ἐστι. Πῶς οὖν ἐτόλμη-[222]σας ἐπὶ κεκωλυμένον γάμον ἐλθεῖν; Τί ἐροῦμεν, καὶ τί ἀποκρινοῦμεθα; Οὐ γὰρ δεῖ τοὺς παρὰ τῶν ἔξωθεν κειμένους νόμους ἐκεῖ προβαλέσθαι, ἀλλ' ἀνάγκη σιγῶντας καὶ δεδεμένους εἰς τὸ τῆς γεέννης ἀπάγεσθαι πῦρ μετὰ τῶν μοιχῶν καὶ τῶν τοὺς ἄλλοτρίους

64. φιλοσοφία, as so often in John, referring both to the teachings and to the life-style of Christianity.

65. In his salvation history of the law, John assumes his auditors know Malachi is the last of the prophets of the Old Testament, pointing toward the perfect law of the New.

66. I.e., the second husband, whose wife's first husband is still alive.

67. One can only imagine whether the celibate preacher's taking on of the role of "we" who do this might have added an element of humor, or of shame, or other heightened sense to the homily during its live delivery.

these precepts of the new philosophy⁶⁴ had their origins and beginnings? When they'd been reared in the law for a long time and were obligated to follow the path toward the more perfect commands, then finally in the end the commands governing a higher lifestyle came forward to meet them, finally at the opportune moment the prophet leads them to this philosophical way of life.⁶⁵ So then, let's obey this good law, and let's rid ourselves of all shame and not throw out our own wives or take as wives those who've been thrown out by others. With what sort of countenance will you look at your wife's husband? With what sort of eyes will you look at his friends or his household slaves? After all, someone who takes the wife of another man in marriage after her life-partner has died is pained and irked by just seeing a picture of him there, as though he were seeing the husband of his own partner alive. That being the case, what sort of life will such a man have?⁶⁶ How will he enter his house? With what frame of mind, with what sort of eyes will he look at that man's wife as his own?

Or, rather, one could go further and say that such a woman is rightly neither that man's wife nor one's own. For the adulteress is no one's wife, because she's trampled on the marital covenant that she had with him, and she didn't come to live with you in accordance with the proper laws. Wouldn't it be the height of madness to introduce into your home a practice filled with so many bad consequences? There's no scarcity of women, is there? There are so many women whom one can take as a wife in accordance with the proper laws and a clean conscience. So why is it that we run to forbidden women,⁶⁷ thereby overturning our houses,⁶⁸ introducing internecine battles, creating enmity for ourselves on all sides, opening the mouths of countless accusers, casting shame on our own lives, and, worst of all, leading ourselves into unremitting punishment on the day of judgment? For what shall we say then to the one who's going to judge us⁶⁹ when, after bringing the law out publicly and reciting it he says, "I commanded you not to take in marriage a woman who has been divorced, saying that this act is adultery. How is it, then, that you dared [222] to enter into a marriage that has been forbidden?" What shall we say, and what answer shall we give? For we cannot bring forward in that context the civil laws set down by the lawgivers in the outside world, but we must be led away, silent

68. John may have Titus 1:11 (οἵτινες ὅλους οἴκους ἀνατρέπουσιν) in mind here; in any case, it is a phrase he uses frequently.

69. I.e., God.

ἀδικησάντων γάμους· ὃ τε γὰρ ἀπολύσας χωρὶς αἰτίας, τῆς ἐπὶ πορνεία, ὃ τε ἐκβεβλημένην γαμῶν, τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ζῶντος, ὁμοίως μετὰ τῆς ἐκβληθείσης κολάζονται. Διὸ παρακαλῶ, καὶ δέομαι καὶ ἀντιβολῶ, μήτε ἀνδρας ἐκβάλλειν γυναῖκας, μήτε γυναῖκας ἀνδρας ἀφιέναι, ἀλλ' ἀκοῦειν τοῦ Παύλου λέγοντος· Γυνὴ δέδεταί νόμῳ, ἐφ' ὅσον χρόνον ζῇ ὁ ἀνὴρ αὐτῆς· ἐὰν δὲ κοιμηθῇ ὁ ἀνὴρ, ἐλευθέρα ἐστὶν ᾧ θέλει γαμηθῆναι, μόνον ἐν Κυρίῳ.

Ποίαν γὰρ ἔχοιεν συγγνώμην οἱ, τοῦ Παύλου καὶ δεύτερον ἐπιτρέποντος γάμον μετὰ τὴν τελευταίαν τοῦ συνοικοῦντος, καὶ τοσαύτην παρέχοντος ἄδειαν, πρὸ τῆς τελευταίας τολμῶντες τοῦτο ποιεῖν; τίνας ἂν τύχοιεν ἀπολογίας, ἢ οὗτοι οἱ ζώντων τῶν ἀνδρῶν τὰς γυναῖκας λαμβάνοντες, ἢ ἐκεῖνοι οἱ πρὸς τὰς πανδήμους ἀπερχόμενοι πόρναις; Καὶ γὰρ καὶ ἐκεῖνο μοιχείας ἕτερον εἶδος, τὸν γυναῖκα ἔχοντα ἔνδον, πόρναις γυναιξὶν ὁμιλεῖν. Ὡς περ γὰρ ἡ τὸν ἀνδρα ἔχουσα γυνή, καὶ οἰκέτῃ καὶ ἐλευθέρῳ τινὶ γυναῖκα μὴ ἔχοντι ἑαυτὴν ἐκδῶ, τοῖς τῆς μοιχείας ἀλίσκεται νόμοις· οὕτω καὶ ὁ ἀνὴρ, καὶ εἰς πάνδημον πόρνην, καὶ εἰς ἑτέραν γυναῖκα ἀνδρα οὐκ ἔχουσαν ἀμάρτοι, γυναῖκα ἔχων, μοιχείας τὸ πρᾶγμα νενόμισται. Φεύγωμεν τοίνυν καὶ τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον τῆς μοιχείας. Τί γὰρ ἔξομεν εἰπεῖν, τί δὲ προβαλέσθαι τοιαῦτα τολμῶντες; ποίαν εὐπρόσωπον παρεξόμεθα πρόφασιν; Τὴν τῆς φύσεως ἐπιθυμίαν; Ἄλλ' ἐφέστηκεν ἡ κληρωθεῖσα γυνή, τῆς ἀπολογίας ἡμᾶς ταύτης ἀποστεροῦσα. Διὰ τοῦτο γάμος εἰσενήνεκται, ἵνα μὴ πορνεύσῃς· μᾶλλον δὲ οὐχ ἡ γυνὴ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἕτεροι πολλοὶ τῆς αὐτῆς ἡμῖν μετασχόντες φύσεως ταύτης ἡμᾶς ἀποστεροῦσι τῆς συγγνώμης. Ὅταν γὰρ ὁ σύνδουλός σου, τὸ αὐτὸ σῶμα ἔχων, τὴν αὐτὴν ἐπιθυμίαν κεκτημένος, ὑπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς ἀνάγκης ὠθοῦμενος, μηδεμίαν ἑτέραν ἰδὴ γυναῖκα, ἀλλὰ μένη τὴν αὐτοῦ στέργων μόνην, ποίαν ἔξεις ἀπολογίαν σὺ τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν προβαλλόμενος; Καὶ τί λέγω τοὺς ἔχοντας γυναῖκας; Ἐννόησόν μοι τοὺς διαπαντὸς ἐν παρθενίᾳ ζώντας, καὶ μὴδ' ὅλως ὁμιλήσαντας γάμῳ, καὶ πολλὴν ἐπιδειξαμένους σωφροσύνην.

70. That is, by the wife.

71. Present tense for future (present of anticipation), with Smyth §1879.

72. With ἐὰν δέ for ἐὰν δὲ καί.

73. See p. 254 n. 27, pp. 258–59 n. 47, and p. 268 n. 84 in the previous homily for these translations.

74. A reprise of the argument of the prior homily, especially §§4–5 (PG 51:213–218).

75. John is echoing Paul here: φεύγετε τὴν πορνείαν (1 Cor 6:18).

76. Cf. 1 Cor 7:2: διὰ δὲ τὰς πορνείας, here for John referring to all sexual conduct, inclusive of sex with prostitutes.

77. σύνδουλοι, used here in a Pauline sense (Col 1:7; 4:7) of a fellow Christian as slave of the same master, Christ (for later usage see PGL).

and bound, into the fire of hell, along with the adulterers and those who've violated other peoples' marriages. For the man who has divorced—apart from the single cause “*of sexual immorality*” (Matt 19:9)⁷⁰—and the man who marries a woman who's been thrown out by a husband who's still alive are both going to be punished⁷¹ the same, along with the woman who was thrown out. Therefore, I urge, I beg, I entreat husbands not to throw out their wives and wives not to leave their husbands, but to heed Paul when he says, “*A wife is bound by the law for as long as her husband lives. But if he goes to death's sleep, she is free to get married to whomever she wishes—only, in the Lord*” (1 Cor 7:39).⁷²

Given that Paul allowed a second marriage after the death of the spouse and provided such immunity for it, what sort of pardon could be had by men who dare to marry before the first husband is dead? What sort of defense could men obtain who take in marriage either the wives of men who are still living or those who go off to common whores?⁷³ This is because when a man who has a wife at home consorts with women who are whores, it is yet another form of adultery.⁷⁴ The woman who has a husband, if she gives herself sexually to either a slave or a free man, stands convicted by the laws of adultery. In the same way, if a man who has a wife sins, either with a common whore or another woman who has no husband, it is considered an act of adultery. So then, let's flee this type of adultery too.⁷⁵ What shall we be able to say or produce in our defense if we've dared to do such acts? What sort of specious excuse shall we offer? The desire of nature? But the wife who's been allotted to us stands right there depriving us of this line of defense. This is why marriage has been introduced: so you might not engage in sexual misconduct.⁷⁶ But indeed, it's not only one's own wife who deprives us of this excuse but also the many others who share the same nature as we. After all, when your fellow slave,⁷⁷ having the same body, possessing the same desire, propelled by the same needs, looks at no other woman but remains steadfastly loving his spouse alone, what sort of defense will you have when you offer “desire” as an excuse? And why am I speaking of married men? Consider the men who live in perpetual virginity⁷⁸ and have never consummated a marriage and have exhibited complete chastity.⁷⁹ So then, when others are chaste

78. John is making an indirect reference to himself as a celibate monk (as well as others).

79. σωφροσύνη, also “self-control.”

“Οταν οὖν ἄλλοι χωρὶς γάμου σωφρονῶσι, ποίας σὺ τεύξῃ συγγνώμης μετὰ γάμον πορνεύων;

Ταῦτα καὶ ἄνδρες καὶ γυναῖκες ἀκούετωσαν, καὶ χῆραι, καὶ γεγαμηκυῖαι· πᾶσι γὰρ ὁ Παῦλος διαλέγεται, καὶ ὁ νόμος οὗτος ὁ λέγων· Γυνὴ δέδεταί νόμῳ, ἐφ’ ὅσον χρόνον ζῇ ὁ ἀνὴρ αὐτῆς· ἐὰν δὲ κοιμηθῇ, ἐλευθέρα ἐστὶν ᾧ θέλει γαμηθῆναι, μόνον ἐν Κυρίῳ. Καὶ ταῖς ἐχούσαις ἄνδρας, καὶ ταῖς οὐκ ἐχούσαις, καὶ ταῖς χηρευούσαις, καὶ ταῖς δεύτερον εἰσαγούσαις νυμφίον, καὶ πάσαις ἀπλῶς ὁ λόγος οὗτος χρήσιμος. Ἡ μὲν γὰρ ἔχουσα ἄνδρα οὐχ αἰρήσεται, ζῶντος ἐκείνου, ἔσεσθαι ἐτέρου, ἀκούσασα ὅτι ζῶντος αὐτοῦ δέδεταί· ἡ δὲ ἀποβαλοῦσα πάλιν, ἂν μὲν βουλευθῇ δευτέροις ὁμιλῆσαι γάμοις. οὐχ ἀπλῶς, οὐδὲ ὡς ἔτυχε, τοῦτο ἐργάζεται, ἀλλὰ μετὰ τῶν κειμένων παρὰ τοῦ Παύλου νόμων, εἰπόντος, Ἐλευθέρα ἐστὶν ᾧ θέλει γαμηθῆναι, μόνον ἐν Κυρίῳ, τουτέστι, μετὰ σωφροσύνης, μετὰ σεμνότητος. Ἄν δ’ ἄρα ἔλθῃ πρὸς τὸν ἀπελθόντα τὰς συνθήκας φυλάξαι, ἀκούσεται τοὺς ἀποκειμένους αὐτῇ στεφάνους, καὶ μείζονα λήψεται προθυμίαν. Μακαριωτέρα γάρ ἐστι, φησὶν, ἐὰν οὕτω μείνῃ.

δ'. [223] Ὅρᾳς πῶς ἅπασιν ὁ λόγος χρήσιμος, τῇ τε ἐκείνων ἀσθενείᾳ συγκαταβαίνων, καὶ ταύτας οὐκ ἀποστερῶν τῶν οἰκείων ἐπαίνων; “Ὅπερ γὰρ ἐπὶ τοῦ γάμου καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς παρθενίας ἐποίησε, τοῦτο καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ προτέρου γάμου καὶ τοῦ δευτέρου. Καθάπερ γὰρ ἐκεῖ οὐκ ἀπέκλεισε τὸν γάμον, ἵνα μὴ βαρῇσιν τοὺς ἀσθενεστερούς, οὔτε ἀνάγκην ἐπέθηκεν, ἵνα μὴ τοὺς βουλομένους παρθενεύειν ἀποστερήσῃ τῶν κειμένων στεφάνων, ἀλλ’ ἔδειξε μὲν ὅτι καλὸς ὁ γάμος, ἐδήλωσε δὲ ὅτι κρείττων ἡ παρθενία· οὕτω δὲ καὶ ἐνταῦθα πάλιν ἡμῖν ἐτέρους τίθησι βαθμούς, δεικνὺς ὅτι μείζον μὲν καὶ ὑψηλότερον τὸ τῆς χηρείας, δεύτερον δὲ καὶ κατώτερον τὸ τῶν δευτέρων

80. Mf’s two manuscripts read γεγαμημέναι, “women who have been married (to another),” for γεγαμηκυῖαι.

81. John directs his address, as he thinks Paul did this part of his letter, to both genders.

82. Minus ὁ ἀνὴρ after κοιμηθῇ—same as in the introduction of the lemma in §1 (PG 51:217).

83. Reading ἔσεσθαι ἐτέρῳ for PG’s ἔσεσθαι ἐτέρου. HS had printed the reading of Monac. gr. 352, ἔσεσθαι ἐτέρῳ, but included a marginal conjectural emendation of ἐτέρου for ἐτέρῳ (HS 5:341). The editors of PE (1837) added a note to this effect—which Mf (1721) had not—and added in their note the reading of Paris. gr. 748, προσθέσθαι ἐτέρῳ (perhaps, “take on another husband for herself”). They do not record the reading of Mf’s second manuscript, Paris. gr. 768, προσγενέσθαι ἐτέρῳ. JPM chose to emend the text but apparently ignored the Paris. gr. 748 evidence entirely and (though not printing that PE note) adopted HS’s conjectural reading ἔσεσθαι ἐτέρου and crafted a note of his own: “Hæc erat Savilii conjectura, quam scripturæ vulgatae ἐτέρῳ prætulimus.

without marriage, what sort of pardon will you obtain when you engage in sexual misconduct after marriage?

Let both men and women listen to these things, both the widows and the married!⁸⁰ For Paul is speaking to all of them,⁸¹ and this law says, “A wife is bound by the law for as long as her husband lives. But if he goes to death’s sleep, she is free to get married to whomever she wishes—only, in the Lord” (1 Cor 7:39⁸²). This law is useful for all women universally—for those who have husbands and those who do not, for those who’ve been widowed and those who’ve brought in a second bridegroom. The woman who has a husband won’t choose to become another’s wife⁸³ while the former is alive, once she has heard that “*she is bound*” to him while he is alive. And again, the woman who’s been bereaved, if she wishes to consummate a second marriage, doesn’t do this casually or as though it were a trifling matter, but in line with the laws laid down by Paul when he said, “*She is free to get married to whomever she wishes—only, in the Lord*,” that is, with chasteness, with dignity. But if instead she chooses to keep her covenant with her dead husband, she will hear of the crowns in store for her,⁸⁴ and she will gain an even greater desire.⁸⁵ “For *she is more blessed*,” Paul says, “*if she remains as she is*” (1 Cor 7:40).⁸⁶

4. [223] Do you see how this statement is useful for everyone, as Paul accommodates the weakness of the former, while not depriving the latter of their own praises? For what he did in the case of marriage (cf. 1 Cor 7:1–24) and in the case of virginity (cf. 1 Cor 7:25–38) is exactly what he did also in the case of first and second marriage (cf. 1 Cor 7:39–40). In the earlier arguments he didn’t exclude marriage, so as not to overburden the weak, nor did he make marriage compulsory, so he wouldn’t deprive those who wish to live as virgins of the crowns in store for them. Instead, he demonstrated that marriage is good, and he showed that virginity is better. In the same way, here once again he sets out different ranks for us, showing that the state of widowhood is better and more exalted, and that of second

EDIT.” (PG 51:222). Consequently, the PG reading corresponds with none of the three manuscript witnesses (none of which reads the genitive *ἐτέρου*), nor has the reader been given the information about the three different infinitives (each of which could take a dative, including *ἔσεσθαι*, as a dative of possession, and hence could be a plausible reading).

84. I.e., her eschatological reward (cf. 1 Cor 9:25; 2 Tim 4:8).

85. John plays here on the competing “desires” (*προθυμίας*) the woman has, for sexual relations, for the husband, and for eschatological reward.

86. With *γάρ* for *δέ* to embed the verse in the argument.

γάμων, τούς τε ισχυροτέρους καὶ μὴ μεταπηδᾶν βουλομένους ἀλείφω, καὶ τοὺς ἀσθενεστεροὺς οὐκ ἀφιεῖς πεσεῖν.

Εἰπὼν γὰρ, *Μακαριωτέρα δέ ἐστιν, ἐὰν οὕτω μείνη, ἵνα μὴ νομίσης ἀνθρώπινον εἶναι τὸν νόμον, ἀκούων, Κατὰ τὴν ἐμὴν γνώμην, ἐπήγαγε· Δοκῶ δὲ κάγω Πνεῦμα Θεοῦ ἔχειν. Οὐκ ἔχεις τοῖνυν εἰπεῖν, ὅτι ἀνθρωπίνη ἐστὶν ἡ γνώμη, ἀλλὰ τῆς τοῦ Πνεύματος χάριτος ἢ ἀπόφασις, καὶ θεὸς ὁ νόμος. Μὴ τοῖνυν Παύλου νομίζωμεν εἶναι ταῦτα λέγοντος, ἀλλὰ τοῦ Παρακλητοῦ ταῦτα νομοθετοῦντος ἡμῖν. Εἰ δὲ λέγει, Δοκῶ, οὐχ ὥς οὐκ ἔχων λέγει, ἀλλὰ μετριάζων καὶ συστέλλων ἑαυτόν. "Ὅτι μὲν οὖν μακαριωτέρα ἐστὶν, εἶπε· πῶς δὲ μακαριωτέρα, οὐκ ἔτι προσέθηκεν, ἀρκοῦσαν ἀπόδειξιν δοὺς τὸ παρὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος κομίζειν τὴν ἀπόφασιν. Εἰ δὲ βούλει καὶ λογισμοῖς ἐξετάσαι, πολλὴν ἀποδείξεω ἐμπορίαν ἐνταῦθα εὐρήσεις· καὶ ὅψει τὴν χήραν μακαριωτέραν οὔσαν, οὐ κατὰ τὸν μέλλοντα αἰῶνα μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ κατὰ τὸν παρόντα βίον. Καὶ τοῦτο αὐτὸ μάλιστα οἶδεν ὁ Παῦλος, ὃ καὶ περὶ τῶν παρθένων ἠνίκατο λέγων. Παραινῶν γὰρ καὶ συμβουλευὼν παρθενίαν αἰρεῖσθαι, οὕτω πως ἔλεγε· Νομίζω ὅτι καλὸν ἀνθρώπῳ τὸ οὕτως εἶναι διὰ τὴν ἐνεστῶσαν ἀνάγκην· καὶ πάλιν, Καὶ ἐὰν γήμη ἢ παρθένος, οὐχ ἡμαρτε· παρθένον ἐνταῦθα λέγων, οὐ τὴν ἀποταξαμένην, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἀπειρόγαμον μόνον, καὶ μὴ γενομένην ὑπεύθυνον τῇ τῆς διηνεκοῦς παρθενίας ὑποσχέσει. Θλίψιν δὲ τῇ σαρκὶ ἔξουσιν οἱ τοιοῦτοι· ἐγὼ δὲ ὑμῶν φείδομαι. Ἐνὶ γὰρ καὶ ψιλῷ ῥήματι τούτῳ κατέλιπε τῷ συνειδότη τῶν ἀκροατῶν ἅπαντα ἀναλέξασθαι, τὰς ὠδῖνας, τὰς παιδοτροφίας, τὴν φροντίδα, τὰς ἀρρωστίας, τοὺς θανάτους τοὺς ἁώρους, τὰς ἀπεχθείας, τὰς φιλονεικίας, τὸ γνῶμαις μυρίαις δουλεύειν, τὸ τῶν ἁλλοτρίων κακῶν ὑπεύθυνον εἶναι, τὸ μυρίας ἀναδέχεσθαι λύπας μίαν ἔχουσαν ψυχὴν. Ἀπάντων δὲ τούτων ἀπαλλάττεται τῶν κακῶν ἢ τὴν ἐγκράτειαν ἐλομένη, καὶ μετὰ τῆς τῶν ἀνιαρῶν ἀπαλλαγῆς κατὰ τὴν μέλλουσαν ζωὴν πολὺν ἔχει κείμενον τὸν μισθόν. Ταῦτ' οὖν ἅπαντα εἰδότες, σπουδάζωμεν τοῖς προτέροις*

87. ἀπόφασις, also "statement" or "opinion" (PGL).

88. Cf. John 14:26, where the παράκλητος is equated with τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον.

89. A new question or problem arises: *Why* is a widow who remains unmarried more blessed?

90. Minus δέ after περὶ.

91. Minus οὖν after νομίζω; minus τοῦτο καλὸν ὑπάρχειν; transposition of διὰ τὴν ἐνεστῶσαν ἀνάγκην and ὅτι καλὸν ἀνθρώπῳ τὸ οὕτως εἶναι.

92. On ἀποτάσσειν as a technical term for monastic renunciation, see PGL II.D.

93. Or "profession" (LSJ III).

94. I.e., those who marry.

marriage is second to it and lesser. In this way he spurs on those who are stronger and don't wish to leap from one husband to another, while not leaving the weaker ones to fail.

And after saying, "*She is more blessed if she remains as she is,*" he added, "*And I suppose that I, too, have the spirit of God*" (1 Cor 7:40), lest when you hear "*in my judgment*" (1 Cor 7:40) you consider this law to be a human one. Indeed, you can't say the judgment is a human one; rather, the decree⁸⁷ comes from the grace of the Spirit, and the law is a divine one. So let's not consider these things as coming from Paul speaking, but rather from the Paraclete⁸⁸ admonishing us. If Paul says, "*I suppose*" (1 Cor 7:40), it's not because he isn't able to declare it, but because he's being modest and humbling himself. For he said that she is more blessed (cf. 1 Cor 7:40), but didn't yet add how she's more blessed, although he gave as sufficient proof of it the fact that he was providing this decree from the Spirit. Now, if you want to investigate the reasons as well,⁸⁹ you'll find a great wealth of proofs here, and you'll see that the widow is more blessed not only when it comes to the age to come, but also in terms of the present life. And Paul especially knew this very thing, which he hinted at when he spoke "*concerning the virgins*" (1 Cor 7:25).⁹⁰ For when advising and counseling them to choose a life of virginity, he spoke in this way: "*For I consider that it is good for a man to be this way ... on account of the present pressing need*" (1 Cor 7:26),⁹¹ and, again, "*And if the virgin marries, she does not sin*" (1 Cor 7:28). In saying "*virgin*" here, he's not referring to the woman who has renounced marriage,⁹² but to the one who is simply unmarried and is not answerable to a promise⁹³ of perpetual virginity. "*For such people*⁹⁴ *will have affliction in the flesh, and I am sparing you*" (1 Cor 7:28). By this one simple word,⁹⁵ he left it to the inner knowledge of his hearers to recount for themselves all these things—birth-pains, childrearing, anxiety, illnesses, untimely deaths, enmities, contentions, being enslaved to innumerable thoughts, being held liable for the wicked deeds of others, being responsible for a single soul that contains countless griefs. The woman who has chosen chastity is freed from all these ills, and along with her being set free from these grievous realities, she has a huge reward in store in the life to come. Therefore, since we know all these things, let's be zealous to remain satisfied with a first

95. Sc. θλίψις, "affliction"; as throughout *Hom. Rom. 5:3* (PG 51:155–64), John argues that Paul is using this term as a shorthand encompassing all kinds of hardships and torments.

ἀρκεῖσθαι γάμοις. Ἄν δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ δευτέρους παρασκευαζώμεθα εἰσέρχεσθαι, μετὰ τοῦ προσήκοντος τρόπου καὶ σχήματος, μετὰ τῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ νόμων. Διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ εἶπεν, Ἐλευθέρα ἐστὶν ᾧ θέλει γαμηθῆναι· καὶ ἐπήγαγε, Μόνον ἐν Κυρίῳ, ὁμοῦ καὶ ἄδειαν διδούς, καὶ τειχίζων τὴν ἄδειαν, καὶ ἐξουσίαν παρέχων, καὶ τῇ ἐξουσίᾳ πάλιν ταύτῃ ὅρους καὶ νόμους τιθεὶς πανταχόθεν· οἷον, ἵνα μὴ μιαροὺς καὶ διεφθαρμένους ἄνδρας εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν εἰσαγάγῃ ἢ γυνή, ἢ τοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς σκηνῆς, ἢ τοὺς πορνείας προσέχοντας· ἀλλὰ μετὰ σεμνότητος, μετὰ σωφροσύνης, μετὰ εὐλαβείας, ἵνα πάντα εἰς δόξαν Θεοῦ γένηται. [224] Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ πολλαὶ πολλάκις γυναῖκες, τῶν πρώτων τελευτησάντων ἀνδρῶν, μοιχευθεῖσαι πρότερον, οὕτω τοὺς ὑστέρους εἰσήγαγον, καὶ τρόπους ἑτέρους μιαροὺς ἐπενόησαν, διὰ τοῦτο ἐπήγαγε, Μόνον ἐν Κυρίῳ· ἵνα μηδὲν τούτων ὁ δεύτερος ἔχῃ γάμοις· οὕτω γὰρ δυνήσεται ἐγκλημάτων ἀπηλλάχθαι. Πάντων μὲν γὰρ βέλτιον ἀναμένειν τὸν τετελευτηκότα, καὶ τὰς πρὸς ἐκεῖνον συνθήκας διατηρεῖν, καὶ ἐγκράτειαν αἰρεῖσθαι, καὶ τοῖς καταλειφθεῖσιν ἐπιμένειν παιδίοις, καὶ παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ πλείονα τὴν εὐνοίαν ἐπισπάσασθαι. Ἄν δ' ἄρα τις βουλευθῇ δεύτερον ἐπεισαγαγεῖν νυμφίον, μετὰ σωφροσύνης, μετὰ σεμνότητος, μετὰ τῶν προσηκόντων νόμων· καὶ γὰρ καὶ τοῦτο ἐφεῖται, πορνεία δὲ κεκάλυται μόνον καὶ μοιχεία.

Ταύτην τοίνυν φεύγωμεν, καὶ οἱ γυναῖκας ἔχοντες, καὶ οἱ μὴ ἔχοντες· καὶ μὴ κατασιχνύωμεν ἡμῶν τὸν βίον, μηδὲ καταγέλαστον ζῶμεν ζῶν, μηδὲ μολύνωμεν τὸ σῶμα, μηδὲ πονηρὸν συνειδὸς εἰς τὴν διάνοιαν εἰσαγάγωμεν. Πῶς γὰρ εἰς ἐκκλησίαν ἔλθειν δυνήσῃ μετὰ τὴν πρὸς τὰς πόρνas ὁμιλίαν; πῶς τὰς χεῖρας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνατεῖναι, αἷς τὴν πόρνην περιελάμβανες; πῶς κινῆσαι γλῶτταν, καὶ τῷ στόματι καλέσαι τούτῳ, ᾧ τὴν πόρνην ἐφίλησας; ποίοις ὀφθαλμοῖς ὄψει τῶν φίλων τοὺς σεμνοτέρους; Καὶ τί λέγω τοὺς φίλους; Κἂν γὰρ μηδεὶς ὁ συνειδὼς ᾗ, σὺ σαυτὸν ἀναγκασθῇ πρὸ πάντων ἐρυθριᾶν καὶ αἰσχύνεσθαι, καὶ πάντων μᾶλλον τὸ ἑαυτοῦ βδελύττεσθαι σῶμα. Εἰ γὰρ μὴ τοῦτο ᾗν, τίνος ἔνεκεν ἐπὶ βαλανεῖον μετὰ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τρέχεις ἐκείνην; οὐκ ἐπειδὴ βορβόρου παντὸς ἀκαθαρτότερον ἑαυτὸν εἶναι νομίζεις; Ποίαν ἑτέραν ζητεῖς μείζονα ἀποδείξιν τῆς τῶν γεγεννημένων ἀκαθαρσίας, ἢ τίνα τὸν

96. Now John joins the widows in speaking as “we.”

97. With ἵνα ... γένηται for ποιεῖτε.

98. One imagines Chrysostom has in mind 1 Tim 5:11–14, though he does not invoke it directly.

99. πορνεία; see p. 254 n. 27. It can mean general sexual misconduct, but here in what follows, as in the prior homily (*Hom. 1 Cor. 7:2–4*), John focuses on sex with “whores,” either prostitutes or promiscuous women (in his moralizing mien and mind-set John assumes the overlap of the two categories).

marriage.⁹⁶ And if we're preparing to enter into a second marriage, let it be done in the proper manner and fashion, that is, in accordance with the laws of God. For this is why he said, "*She is free to get married to whomever she wishes,*" and added, "*only, in the Lord*" (1 Cor 7:39). Paul is simultaneously granting freedom and setting a bulwark around that freedom, providing license and again by this license setting boundaries and laws from every direction, such as to prevent the woman from bringing filthy and corrupt men into her house, or stage-actors, or men who have their minds on sexual immorality. Instead, let it be with dignity, chasteness, and piety, so that "*everything might be for the glory of God*" (1 Cor 10:31).⁹⁷ [224] After all, oftentimes many women, if they've engaged in adultery previously, have brought in those very men as husbands after the death of their first husband, and designed other filthy schemes. This is the reason Paul added "*only, in the Lord*" (1 Cor 7:40), so that the second marriage might involve none of these things. In this way, she'll be free from accusations. On the one hand, the best course of all is to wait for the husband who has died, keep the marital covenant with him, choose chastity, abide by the children who are left to her, and secure a greater measure of goodwill for herself from God. However, if a woman wishes to bring in a second bridegroom, then it should be done with chasteness, dignity, and in accordance with the proper laws.⁹⁸ For this, too, is allowed; but what is prohibited is only sex with whores⁹⁹ and adultery.

So now, both men who have wives and those who don't, let's flee from sex with whores.¹⁰⁰ Let's not be ashamed of the way we live, nor live lives ripe for ridicule, nor defile our bodies, nor infect our minds with a guilty conscience. For how will you be able to enter into church after consorting with whores? How can you extend to heaven the very hands with which you've caressed the whore? How can you move your tongue and offer an invocation with the very mouth with which you kissed the whore? With what sort of eyes will you look at your more dignified friends? And why should I speak of your friends? For even if no one might be conscious of it, you'll force your own self to blush and be ashamed before all people and abhor your own body even more than everyone else does. For if this were not the case, then why do you run to the bath after this sin? Isn't it because you consider yourself to be more unclean than a sewer? What better proof of the impurity of such goings-on do you seek, or what judgment do you

100. John turns back to the men, reprising the theme of the prior homily once more.

Θεὸν προσδοκᾷς ψῆφον οἴσιν, ὅταν ὁ πεπλημμελῆκώς σὺ τοιαύτην περὶ τῶν γεγενημένων γνώμην ἔχῃς;

Ὅτι μὲν οὖν ἀκαθάρτους ἑαυτοὺς εἶναι νομίζουσι, σφόδρα ἐπαινῶ καὶ ἀποδέχομαι· ὅτι δὲ οὐκ ἐπὶ τὸν προσήκοντα τῶν καθαρσίων ἔρχονται τρόπον, ἐγκαλῶ διὰ τοῦτο καὶ μέμφομαι. Εἰ μὲν γὰρ σωματικὸς ὁ ῥύπος ἦν, εἰκότως τοῖς τῶν βαλανείων καθαρμοῖς ἑαυτὸν ἀπέσμηχες· τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν καταρρυπάνας καὶ ποιήσας ἀκάθαρτον, τοιοῦτον ζῆτει καθάρισον, ὃ τὴν ἐκείνης κηλὶδα ἀποσμηῆξαι δυνήσεται. Ποῖον δὲ ἐστὶ τῆς τοιαύτης ἀμαρτίας τὸ βαλανεῖον; Θερμαὶ δακρύων πηγαί, στεναγμοὶ κάτωθεν ἀπὸ καρδίας ἀνιόντες, κατάνυξις διηνεκῆς, εὐχαὶ ἐκτενεῖς, ἐλεημοσύναι, καὶ ἐλεημοσύναι δαφιλεῖς, τὸ καταγνῶναι τῶν γεγενημένων, τὸ μηκέτι τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἐπιχειρῆσαι πράγμασιν· οὕτως ἀμαρτίας ἀποσμήχεται φύσις, οὕτως ἐκκαθαίρεται τῆς ψυχῆς ὁ ῥύπος· ὥστε ἐὰν μὴ τοιαῦτα ποιῶμεν, κἂν ἀπάσας τῶν ποταμῶν διέλθωμεν τὰς πηγὰς, οὐδὲ μικρὸν τῆς ἀμαρτίας ταύτης ὑφελέσθαι δυνησόμεθα μέρος. Τὸ μὲν οὖν ἄμεινον, μηκέτι πείραν λαβεῖν τῆς μυσαρᾶς ταύτης ἀμαρτίας. Εἰ δ' ἄρα τις ὑπεσκελίσθη ποτὲ, ταῦτα ἐπιτιθέτω τὰ φάρμακα, πρότερον ὑποσχόμενος μηκέτι τοῖς αὐτοῖς περιπεσεῖν. Ὡς ἐὰν ἀμαρτάνοντες καταγινώσκωμεν τῶν ἤδη γεγενημένων, πάλιν δὲ τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἐπιχειρῶμεν, οὐδὲν ἡμῖν ὄφελος ἔσται τῶν καθαρσίων. Ὁ γὰρ ἀπολούμενος, καὶ τῷ αὐτῷ πάλιν ἐγκυλινδούμενος βορβόρῳ, καὶ ὁ καθαιρῶν πάλιν ὅπερ ὠκοδόμησε, καὶ οἰκοδομῶν πάλιν, ἵνα καθέλῃ, οὐδὲν κερδαίνει πλέον, ἢ τὸ περιττὰ ποιεῖσθαι καὶ ταλαιπωρεῖν. Καὶ ἡμεῖς τοίνυν, ἵνα μὴ μάτην μηδὲ εἰκῇ τὴν ζωὴν ἀναλώσωμεν, τὰ πρότερα ἀμαρτήματα ἐκκαθαίρωμεν, καὶ τὸν ἐπίλοιπον ἅπαντα βίον ἐν σωφροσύνῃ καὶ κοσμιότητι [225] καὶ τῇ λοιπῇ διαγάγωμεν ἀρετῇ· ἵνα καὶ τὸν Θεὸν ἔχοντες ἴλεω, τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν ἐπιτύχωμεν, χάριτι καὶ φιλανθρωπίᾳ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν [226] Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ᾧ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Ἀμήν.

101. κατάνυξις, one of the monastic practices that John seeks to instill in his congregants.

102. The Greek does not have an expressed subject, but since the topic seems still to be men who have sex with “whores,” I have translated “him.”

103. φάρμακα: “remedies,” “potions” (LSJ A.2, 3), with perhaps a deliberate hearkening back to the abundant use of magical language in the prior homily.

expect God to render when even you, the one who has enacted the sin, have such a judgment about what took place?

Now on the one hand, I warmly praise and welcome the fact that men who do this consider themselves to be unclean; but on the other, I accuse and blame them, because they haven't come to a proper set of habits about cleanliness. Now, if the filth were a bodily matter, then it stands to reason that you were trying to wipe yourself off with the cleansings that the baths provide. But after you've brought filth down onto your soul and rendered it impure, seek the sort of cleansing that'll be able to wipe the stain off of it. And what sort of bath is there for this sort of sin? Warm fountains of tears, groans rising up from the heart deep down inside, constant compunction,¹⁰¹ extended prayers, almsgiving, and the most plentiful form of almsgiving: condemning the things that have taken place and not attempting these same acts again. This is the way nature is wiped off of sin, this is the way filth is cleansed from the soul. Consequently, if we don't do such things as this, then even if we pass through every one of the streams that flow into rivers we won't be able to rid ourselves of a tiny fraction of this sin. Now of course, what's better is no longer to take part in this vile sin. However, if someone might be tripped up at some point, let him¹⁰² apply these remedies,¹⁰³ once he's first made a promise no longer to fall into the same acts. Because if after we've sinned we condemn what happened, but then we attempt the same things again, we'll have no benefit from the cleansings. For the person who has washed himself and then again wallows in the same mire,¹⁰⁴ and the one who tears down again what he built up¹⁰⁵ and builds up again so that he might tear down, gains nothing more than superfluous labors and hardship. Therefore, so that we, too, might not live a life that is vain or empty, let's cleanse ourselves of the former sins, and let's conduct the entire rest of our lives henceforward in chasteness, orderliness, [225] and in the rest of the virtues, so that, having also a merciful God, we might attain to the kingdom of heaven by the grace and loving-kindness of our Lord [226] Jesus Christ, to whom be the glory forever and ever. Amen.

104. A proverbial expression, often applied to pigs, as found in the NT in 2 Pet 2:22 (my translation follows KJV's memorable English rendering).

105. Cf. Gal 2:18; for further references to the contrast between *καθαίρειν* and *οικοδομεῖν* in Paul and, before him, Jeremiah, in p. 251 n. 16.

ΕΙΣ ΤΟ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΙΚΟΝ ΠΗΤΟΝ «Οὐ θέλω ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν,
ἀδελφοί, ὅτι οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν πάντες ὑπὸ τὴν νεφέλῃν ἦσαν, καὶ
πάντες διὰ τῆς θαλάσσης διήλθον.»

α'. [241] Οἱ ναῦται τοῦτο μάλιστα φιλοῦσι τοῦ πελάγους τὸ μέρος, ὅπερ ἂν
λιμέσι πυκνοῖς καὶ νήσοις διειλημμένον ᾗ. Τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἀλίμενον πέλαγος, κἂν
γαλήνην ἔχῃ, πολὺν παρέχει τοῖς πλέουσι τὸν τρόπον. ἔνθα δὲ ἂν ὥσιν ὅρμοι,
καὶ ἀκταί, καὶ αἰγιαλοὶ πανταχόθεν ἐκτεταμένοι, μετὰ πολλῆς πλέουσι τῆς
ἀσφαλείας. Κἂν γὰρ βραχὺ διεγερθεῖσαν τὴν θάλασσαν ἴδωσι, δι' ὀλίγου
τὴν καταφυγὴν ἔχοντες, ταχίστην καὶ εὐκόλον τῶν ἐπικειμένων κακῶν
ἀπαλλαγὴν εὔρασθαι δύναιнт' ἂν. Διὰ δὴ ταῦτα, οὐχ ὅταν πλησίον λιμένος
ἐλαύνωσι μόνον, ἀλλὰ κἂν πόρρωθεν ὦσι, πολλὴν καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς ὀψευς ταύτης

1. Provenance: the evidence very strongly favors an Antiochene setting, because John mentions in §1 (PG 51:242) that the martyr feast in honor of St. Barlaam was held the day before, on which he preached also (*Barl.*, CPG 4361; PG 50:675–82), and there is strong evidence of a cult for this saint at Antioch, localized as the place of his martyrdom and burial, but as of yet no evidence exists for the saint's commemoration at Constantinople (Mayer, *Provenance*, 439–40). It is clear from the rhapsodic opening, linking the refreshment of a cool breeze in summer with the martyr festivals, that this sermon was delivered in the summer. There is some evidence for the date of 14 August for St. Barlaam's feast day (Mayer, *Provenance*, 439), which would place the present homily (*Hom.* 1 Cor. 10:1–11) on 15 August. Joseph-Marie Sauget suggests instead the date of 1 June on the basis of the dating of the later panegyric to Barlaam by Severus of Antioch ("Barlaam," *Encyclopedia of Ancient Christianity* 3:330–31). Mayer concludes that the evidence is "strongly indicative of an Antiochene provenance" for the martyr homily, which is buttressed by the evidence of *Hom.* 1 Cor 10:1–11, which "serves to strengthen this conclusion, as well as suggesting that this second sermon, too, was delivered at Antioch" (*Provenance*, 439). But ultimately, while there is "a high degree of probability" of Antiochene provenance, "unfortunately, without a direct link between the martyr's life or resting place and the city in which John is preaching these considerations cannot be accepted as definitive" (*Provenance*, 440). A second piece of evidence

Hom. 1 Cor. 10:1–11
(In dictum Pauli, nolo vos ignorare, etc.)
CPG 4380 (PG 51:241–52)¹

On the passage of the apostle, “*I do not wish you to be ignorant, sisters and brothers, of the fact that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea*” (1 Cor 10:1).²

1. [241] Sailors especially love the part of the sea that is dotted with harbors and islands. For even when it is calm, the open sea so far from port gives those who sail on it much anxiety; but where there are moorings, cliffs, and beaches arrayed in all directions, they sail with a great sense of security. Even if they see the sea becoming a bit roiled up, they quickly and easily find deliverance from the troubles that are upon them because they have a place of refuge only a short distance away. Hence, for all these reasons, not only when they draw near a harbor, but even when far away,

is John’s reference to prayers τῶν προέδρων πάντων, “of all the leaders,” in the closing of the homily in §6 (PG 51:252). Mayer notes that on the basis of existing scholarship, each usage by John of this phrase seems to come from Antioch (*Provenance*, 342–46), but she determines that “no certain conclusion can be drawn” (*Provenance*, 346). At the very least it can be said that there are no positive arguments for a Constantinopolitan setting, and very strong indications of an Antiochene one.

Text: Mf PE (1837) as reprinted by JPM (PG, 1862), with Mf’s original text-critical notes (1721) on ME, based on his collation of two manuscripts, *Colbertinus* 970 (= Paris. gr. 748 [XI]) and *Colbertinus* 3058 (= Paris. gr. 730 [XI]). In this case, the editors of PE (1837), in addition to adding a few new notes, emended the text of Mf with readings from Paris. gr. 748 that in four places confirmed conjectures by HS (as is indicated in the notes below). JPM rewords their notes in ways that are not always clear and do not show whose judgment is being replicated. (JPM marks these as “EDIT.,” but none is his own independent judgment or argument.) Pinakes lists twenty manuscripts containing this homily, including the two used by HS (Oxon. Coll. Nov. 80 and Monac. gr. 6), to which can be added the two Paris codices used by Mf, for a total of twenty-two known manuscripts that contain the text of this homily.

2. Minus γάρ.

παράκλησιν δέχονται. Οὐ γὰρ ὡς ἔτυχεν αὐτῶν τὰς ψυχὰς ἀνακτᾶσθαι πέφυκε καὶ ὄρους κορυφὴ φαινομένη πόρρωθεν, καὶ καπνὸς ἀναθρώσκων, καὶ προβάτων ποίμνια παρὰ τὴν ὑπώρειαν νεμόμενα. Ἐπειδὴν δὲ καὶ εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦ λιμένος τὸ στόμα ἔλθωσιν, ὁλόκληρον καρποῦνται τὴν εὐφροσύνην. Τότε γὰρ καὶ κώπην ἀποτίθενται, καὶ τὰ σώματα ὑπὸ τῆς ἄλμης τεταριχευμένα ποτίμοις περικλύζουσιν ὕδασι, καὶ εἰς τὸν αἰγιαλὸν ἐξελθόντες, καὶ τῇ γῇ μικρὸν ὁμιλήσαντες γυμνοῖς τοῖς σώμασι, πᾶσαν τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς ναυτιλίας ἀποτίθενται τλαιπωρίαν.

Ὡσπερ οὖν ἐκεῖνοι τοῦτο μάλιστα τῆς θαλάσσης ἀσπάζονται τὸ μέρος διὰ τὰς πυκνὰς ταύτας καὶ συνεχεῖς ἀναπαύσεις· οὕτω δὲ καὶ ἐγὼ ταύτην μάλιστα φιλῶ τὴν ὥραν, οὐκ ἐπειδὴ χειμῶνος ἀπηλλάγμεθα, οὐδὲ ἐπειδὴ θέρους ἀπολαύομεν, ζεφύρου λιγυρὰ πνέοντος, ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ τοὺς πνευματικούς λιμένας ἔχομεν συνεχῶς διαδεχομένους ἡμᾶς, τῶν ἁγίων μαρτύρων λέγω τὰς πανηγύρεις. Οὐ γὰρ οὕτως οἱ λιμένες πλωτῆρας, ὡς αἱ τῶν ἁγίων τούτων ἑορταὶ τοὺς πιστοὺς ἀνακτᾶσθαι πεφύκασιν. Ἐκείνους μὲν γὰρ θαλαττίων κυμάτων ἐμβολῆς καὶ ἐρεσίας μακρὰς ἀπαλλάττουσι λιμένες· τοὺς δ' εἰς πανήγυριν μαρτύρων ἀπαντῶντας πνευμάτων πονηρῶν καὶ [242] ἀκαθάρτων, λογισμῶν ἀτόπων, πολλῆς τῆς ἐν ψυχῇ γινομένης ζάλης, ἢ τῶν ἁγίων μνήμη τούτων ἐξαρπάζειν εἴωθε. Κἂν ἐκ τῶν πολιτικῶν, κἂν ἐκ τῶν οἰκιακῶν πραγμάτων ἀθυμίαν τινὰ ἐπισυρόμενος εἰσέλθῃ, πᾶσαν αὐτὴν ἀποθέμενος, οὕτως ἅπεισι, καὶ ῥᾶων γίνεται καὶ κουφότερος, οὐχὶ κώπην ἀποτιθέμενος, οὐδὲ οἰάκων ἐξανιστάμενος, ἀλλὰ τὸ δυσβάστακτον καὶ ποικίλον τῆς βιωτικῆς λύπης φορτίον διαλύων, καὶ πολλὴν τῇ ψυχῇ δεχόμενος τὴν εὐφροσύνην. Καὶ τούτων ἀπάντων μάρτυρες ὑμεῖς, οἱ τοῖς ἄθλοις τοῦ μακαρίου Βαρλαάμ χθές ἐντρύφήσαντες, καὶ μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς ἀδείας εἰς τὸν ἐκείνου σκιρτήσαντες λιμένα, καὶ τὴν ἄλμην τῶν βιωτικῶν φροντίδων ἀπολουσάμενοι, καὶ κοῦφοι οἶκαδε ἀπὸ τῶν ἐκείνου διηγημάτων ἀναχωρήσαντες. Ἄλλ' ἰδοὺ καὶ ἐτέρων μαρτύρων προσελαύνει ἄλιν πανήγυρις. Ἐως ἂν οὖν εἰς τὸν ἐκείνων λιμένα φθάσωμεν, φέρε δὴ μιμησώμεθα τοὺς πλωτῆρας· καὶ καθάπερ ἐκεῖνοι τὸ πέλαγος πλέοντες ἄδουσι, τῇ ᾧ τὸν πόνον παραμυθούμενοι· οὕτω δὲ καὶ

3. This stylized opening is suited both to the season at which the homily was preached and to the pericope, which is Paul's own refashioning in 1 Cor 10 of the narrative of the Israelites crossing the Red Sea and associated events (Exod 14–15, etc.). The theme of water is also critical for the baptismal typology within that text, which John will adopt and extend in his homily.

4. I.e., to the martyr festival.

5. On this local Antiochene martyr and saint, who died after holding up defiantly against torture that sought to burn his hand with coals so violently as to get him to turn them and thus offer a libation to “pagan” gods, see Chrysostom's panegyric *Barl*.

they receive tremendous comfort from the sight of it. For it's not by chance that the sight of mountaintops from afar, smoke rising, and flocks of sheep grazing on the mountainside revive their souls. And then when they enter the very mouth of the harbor they enjoy a gladness that is complete. They cast off their oars, wash the brine off their salt-encrusted bodies with fresh water, and, going out onto the beach and rolling around a bit on land with unclad bodies, they cast off all the misery of life at sea.³

Sailors welcome this part of the sea in particular on account of its constant and continual restful calm. In the very same way I, too, especially love this time of year—not because we're freed from winter or because we enjoy the heat of summer even as a sweet westerly wind blows, but because we have the continual relief of spiritual harbors—I mean, the festivals of the holy martyrs. Yet harbors don't revive mariners in the same way that the feasts of these saints do the faithful. Harbors free the former from the battering of ocean waves and long days at the oar, but the remembrance of these saints customarily snatches away the faithful who attend the feast of the martyrs from evil and [242] unclean spirits, from inappropriate thoughts, from a downpour in their souls. If someone comes⁴ who's been drawn into a level of despondency because of circumstances in their public or private life, they go away feeling better and less burdened because they've cast off completely their despondency. They don't cast off their oar or give over the rudder, but by getting rid of the intolerable and manifold burdens that bring sadness in everyday life, they enjoy great gladness in their soul. And you are witnesses of all these things, you who just yesterday luxuriated in the contests in which the blessed Barlaam⁵ was engaged, and, after fearlessly leaping into his harbor⁶ and washing the salt of daily cares from yourselves, you retired to your homes less burdened because of the stories about that saint. And the feast day of other martyrs approaches again as

(PG 50:675–82), which is introduced and translated in Wendy Mayer, *St. John Chrysostom: The Cult of the Saints: Select Homilies and Letters* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2006), 177–89. It is tempting to see the preacher here making here a pointed contrast between suffering and leisure, and even fire and water, heat and cool. For further background on Barlaam (who is not to be confused with the same named figure in the medieval legend of Barlaam and Joasaph, which, remarkably, depends upon episodes in the life of the Buddha), see Sauget, “Barlaam,” 330–31, and literature cited there.

6. Mf adopted the reading of his two manuscripts, λιμένα, in place of HS ME, λειμῶνα, “meadow” (noting that this had been a conjecture of HS, and that the former reading seems to be required by the flow of the argument).

ἡμεῖς, ἕως εἰς τὸν ἐκείνων φθάσωμεν λιμένα, λόγους τινὰς πνευματικοὺς πρὸς ἀλλήλους κινήσωμεν, τὸν μακάριον Παῦλον τῆς καλῆς ταύτης ὁμιλίας ἡγεμόνα ποιησάμενοι, καὶ ἥνπερ ἂν αὐτὸς κελεύῃ, ταύτην ἐπόμενοι.

Ποίαν οὖν ἔπεσθαι κελεύει; Τὴν διὰ τῆς ἐρήμου, καὶ τῶν ἐκεῖ συμβάντων θαυμάτων ὁδόν. Καὶ γὰρ ἠκούσατε σήμερον αὐτοῦ βοῶντος, καὶ λέγοντος· Οὐ θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν, ἀδελφοί, ὅτι οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν πάντες ὑπὸ τὴν νεφέλῃν ἦσαν, καὶ πάντες διὰ τῆς θαλάσσης διήλθον, καὶ πάντες εἰς τὸν Μωϋσῆν ἐβαπτίσαντο, καὶ πάντες τὸ αὐτὸ βρῶμα πνευματικὸν ἔφαγον, καὶ πάντες τὸ αὐτὸ πόμα [243] πνευματικὸν ἔπιον. Ἐπίνον γὰρ ἐκ πνευματικῆς ἀκολουθούσης πέτρας, ἥ δὲ πέτρα ἦν ὁ Χριστός. Ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐν τοῖς πλείοσιν αὐτῶν εὐδόκησεν ὁ Θεός· κατεστρώθησαν γὰρ ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ. Ταῦτα δὲ τύποι ἡμῶν ἐγενήθησαν, εἰς τὸ μὴ εἶναι ἡμᾶς ἐπιθυμητὰς κακῶν, καθὼς κακεῖνοι ἐπεθύμησαν· μηδὲ εἰδωλολάτραις γίνεσθαι, καθὼς τινες αὐτῶν, ὥσπερ γέγραπται· Ἐκάθισεν ὁ λαὸς φαγεῖν, καὶ ἀνέστησαν τοῦ παίξιν. Μηδὲ πορνεύωμεν, καθὼς τινες αὐτῶν ἐπόρνευσαν, καὶ ἔπεσον ἐν μιᾷ ἡμέρᾳ, εἰκοσιτρεῖς χιλιάδες. Μηδὲ ἐκπειράζωμεν τὸν Χριστὸν, καθὼς τινες αὐτῶν ἐπείρασαν, καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν ὄψεων ἀπώλοντο. Μηδὲ γογγύζωμεν, καθὼς τινες αὐτῶν ἐγόγγυσαν, καὶ ἀπώλοντο ὑπὸ τοῦ ὀλοθρευτοῦ.

Καὶ δοκεῖ μὲν εἶναι σαφῆ τὰ λεγόμενα, παρέχει δὲ τινα διαπόρησιν οὐ τὴν τυχοῦσαν τοῖς προσέχουσι. Καὶ γὰρ ἄξιον ζητῆσαι πρῶτον, τίνας ἔνεκεν τὰς παλαιὰς αὐτὸς ἐμνημόνευσεν ἱστορίας, ἐκ ποίας ἀκολουθίας περὶ εἰδωλοθύτων

7. Mf notes that his two manuscripts read ἥνπερ ἂν ... ταύτη ἐπόμενοι for ἥνπερ ... ταύτη ἐπόμενοι (the sense is not significantly different).

8. τύπος, literally “impression,” “model,” “copy,” “image,” “type” (BDAG); also “outline,” “sketch” (LSJ VIII, along with the previous glosses). The word, chosen by Paul, would become one of the frequent terms used for figurative interpretation by early Christian interpreters. *Typology* is a modern term, and it encapsulates a long-standing theological debate about whether or how τύπος is related to ἀλληγορία. Both these words that are used for purportedly nonliteral interpretations are themselves employed as rhetorical labels that either valorize or repudiate certain kinds of readings as legitimate or illegitimate. Τύπος itself, thrown into what will become the early Christian literary tradition by Paul in 1 Corinthians (and enhanced by the Letter to the Hebrews’ antithetical term ἀντίτυπος in Heb 9:24), is especially used in contexts of the relationship between the Testaments, as in this, the inaugural Pauline passage (PCBCH 32, 131–32). I shall translate it throughout as “prefiguration,” but all of these senses listed above should be kept in view to follow John’s argument, which is itself making a claim about the independent status and worth of the τύπος in itself, and its subordinate status vis-à-vis its fulfillment in the ἀλήθεια of later events; see especially §4 (PG 51:247–49).

9. With εἰδωλολάτραις (unattested v.l.) for εἰδωλολάτραι before γίνεσθε; minus καὶ πειν after φαγεῖν; plus τοῦ before παίξιν (1 Cor 10:7); καθὼς τινες for καθὼς καὶ τινες

well! And so, until we reach the harbor of those martyrs, come, let's imitate the mariners. Just as they sing as they sail the sea, using their song as a consolation to themselves in their work, let's also relay some spiritual words to one another until we reach the harbor that is theirs. Let's have the blessed Paul take the lead in this communal effort, and let's follow whatever path he commands.⁷

What then is the path Paul commands us to follow? The path that leads through the wilderness, the path where marvelous events took place. Indeed, you heard him calling out today and saying, *"And I do not wish you to be ignorant, sisters and brothers, of the fact that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea, and all were baptized into Moses ... and all ate the same spiritual food, and all drank the same spiritual drink. [243] For they drank from a spiritual rock that was following them; and the rock was Christ. But God was not pleased with the majority of them. For they were strewn in the wilderness. Now these things were prefigurations⁸ of us, in order that we might not be desirous of wicked things just as they desired them, or become idolaters like some of them, as it is written: 'the people sat down to eat and rose up in order to play' (Exod 32:6). Let us not engage in sexual misconduct as some of them engaged in sexual misconduct, and twenty-three thousand fell in a single day (cf. Num 25:1–9; 26:62). Nor let us tempt Christ just as some of them tested him, and they were destroyed by the snakes (Num 21:5–9). Nor let us grumble as some of them grumbled, and were destroyed by the annihilator"* (1 Cor 10:1–10).⁹

These statements seem to be clear, but actually they offer perplexing and nontrivial questions¹⁰ to those who pay careful attention. For it is fitting to search out, first, why it was that he made mention of¹¹ these

before αὐτῶν ἐπείρασαν (1 Cor 10:9); γογγύζωμεν for γογγύζετε; καθὼς τινες for καθὼς καὶ τινες before αὐτῶν ἐγόγγυσαν (1 Cor 10:10). Ellipsis in 1 Cor 10:2 as marked in text; JPM (PG) typo in 1 Cor 10:3, παί for καί before πάντες τὸ αὐτὸ βρώμα (1 Cor 10:3). Note that while the same ellipsis of ἐν τῇ νεφέλῃ καὶ ἐν τῇ θαλάσῃ is found again below in §3 (PG 51:246), John cites the lemma in full in his treatment of the verse in *Hom. 1 Cor. 23.2* (PG 60:190).

10. διαπόρῃσις, cognate to ἀπορία, and part of the language of ζητήματα καὶ λύσεις, as is made clear also by ζητεῖν in the following sentence. In this case the "problem" at first inception is a passage that might "appear" (δοκεῖν) to be clear but actually is not. (On the hermeneutics of clarity and obscurity in ancient, and modern Pauline interpretation, see *PCBCH* 95–115.)

11. Mf notes that his two manuscripts read τῆς παλαιᾶς αὐτοὺς ἀνέμνησεν ("he reminded them of the ancient scriptural history") for τὰς παλαιὰς αὐτὸς ἐμνημόνευσεν ("he made mention of these parts of the ancient scriptural history").

διαλεγόμενος εἰς ταύτην ἐνέπεσε τὴν διήγησιν, τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς ἐρήμου φέρων εἰς μέσον. Οὐ γὰρ ἀπλῶς, οὐδὲ ὡς ἔτυχεν, ὁ μακάριος ἐκεῖνος φθέγγεται, ἀλλὰ μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς ἀκολουθίας καὶ ἀκριβῆ διατηρῶν πανταχοῦ τῶν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ λεγομένων τὴν συμφωνίαν. Τίνος οὖν ἕνεκεν, καὶ πόθεν εἰς ταύτην ἐνέπεσε τὴν ἱστορίαν; Ἐπετίμα τοῖς ἀπλῶς καὶ ἀνεξετάστως εἰς τὰ εἰδῶλα εἰσιούσι, καὶ μιὰς ἀπογενομένοις τραπέζης, καὶ εἰδωλοθύτων ἀπτομένοις· καὶ δείξας, ὅτι διπλὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ πράγματος ὑπομένουσι βλάβην, τοὺς τε ἀσθενεῖς πλήττοντες, καὶ αὐτοὶ κοινωνοὶ δαιμόνων γινόμενοι, καὶ καταστείλας αὐτῶν ἱκανῶς τὰ φρονήματα διὰ τῶν ἔμπροσθεν εἰρημένων, καὶ παιδεύσας, ὅτι δεῖ τὸν πιστὸν μὴ τὸ ἑαυτοῦ βλέπειν μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ τῶν πολλῶν, βουλόμενος αὐτοῖς ἐπιτείνειν τὸν φόβον, παλαιῶν αὐτοὺς ἀναμιμνήσκει διηγημάτων. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἐκεῖνοι μέγα ἐφρόνουν, ὡς πιστοὶ, καὶ πλάνης ἀπαλλαγέντες, καὶ γνώσεως καταξιωθέντες, καὶ τῶν ἀπορρήτων κοινωνήσαντες μυστηρίων, καὶ πρὸς βασιλείαν οὐρανῶν κληθέντες, δεῖξαι θέλων, ὅτι τούτων ὄφελος οὐδὲν, ἂν μὴ πολιτεία προσῇ συμφωνοῦσα τῇ τοσαύτῃ χάριτι, ἐκ παλαιᾶς αὐτοὺς παιδεύει ἱστορίας.

β'. Ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦτο αὐτὸ πάλιν πολλῆς γέμει ζητήσεως. Τίνος ἕνεκεν οὐκ ἀπὸ τῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ ῥημάτων αὐτοῖς διαλέγεται τῶν ἐν Εὐαγγελίῳ κειμένων, οὐδὲ γεέννης αὐτοὺς ἀναμιμνήσκει, καὶ σκότους ἑξωτέρου, καὶ σκώληκος ἰοβόλου, καὶ δεσμῶν ἀθανάτων, καὶ πυρὸς τοῦ ἡτοιμασμένου

12. *ἱστορία* means both “story” and “history” (full discussion of various meanings in *PGL*, including “the literal sense” of a text). For John, the scriptural narrative of Exodus is both story and history, and his discussion about Paul’s term, *τύπος*, that follows in this homily will try to establish the middle ground between the two, at least on hermeneutical and theological grounds.

13. *ἀκολουθία*, the rhetorical progression and logical sequence of an argument or discourse.

14. Cf. 1 Cor 8:1, 4. John is asking the same question about the rhetorical disposition of 1 Cor 8–10 as do modern commentators, where there has been much debate. See John Fotopoulos, *Food Offered to Idols in Roman Corinth: A Social-Rhetorical Reconsideration of 1 Corinthians 8:1–11:1*, WUNT 2/151 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003); Margaret M. Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians*, HUT 28 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1991; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1993), 237–57.

15. As often, John asserts that every statement Paul made was carefully planned and is full of meaning.

16. εἰδῶλα; one expects instead εἰδωλεῖα, sc. “going into idol temples” (cf. 1 Cor 8:10).

17. τράπεζα: a table, or metonymy for the meal placed there and the fellowship around it (cf. 1 Cor 10:21, τράπεζα δαιμονίων).

18. παιδεύειν here and below means both “instruct” and “chastize.”

parts of the ancient scriptural history,¹² and then, what was the logic of his argument¹³ such that he embarked on this narrative and brought the events of the wilderness front and center when he was speaking about meat sacrificed to idols?¹⁴ After all, that blessed man didn't speak randomly or by chance,¹⁵ but with a careful line of thought he always maintains a harmonious arrangement in the things he says. So, why and to what end did he embark on this scriptural history? He was rebuking people who without thought or scrutiny were flocking to idols,¹⁶ tasting that foul meal,¹⁷ and having contact with idol meat. He showed that they were enduring a double harm from the act, both assaulting the weak (cf. 1 Cor 8:7–12) and becoming "partners of demons" (cf. 1 Cor 10:20–21). And once he'd sufficiently put their thinking in order by what he'd said earlier, and instructed¹⁸ them that the faithful shouldn't look only to "*their own individual advantage*" but also to "*that of the many*" (1 Cor 10:24, 33), he reminds them of the ancient stories¹⁹ because he wished to heighten their fear. This is because they were boasting in their status as people of faith, in having been freed from error, found worthy of "*knowledge*" (cf. 1 Cor 8:1–3), sharing in the ineffable "*mysteries*" (cf. 1 Cor 2:1–10), and "*called*" to the kingdom of heaven (cf. 1 Cor 1:2, 24–26). Hence, wishing to show that they would have no benefit from these things if their behavior wasn't in harmony with this enormous gift of grace, Paul instructs them by means of the ancient scriptural history.²⁰

2. But this very fact also contains a significant question requiring investigation:²¹ why is it²² that Paul didn't speak to them from the words of Christ found in the Gospel, or remind them of hell and the outer darkness (cf. Matt 8:12; 22:13; 25:30), the poisonous worm (cf. Mark 9:44, 48; cf. Isa

19. Normally when John uses a string of aorist participles to recount an argument, he is showing its *ἀκολουθία* in its proper order. He has signaled his intent to do that here, but, as the inset citations in the text show, John has incongruously incorporated parts of the argument that follow 1 Cor 10:1–10 rather than precede it.

20. As noted above, the reader should also keep in mind the translation "story" (as in "scriptural narrative") for *ἱστορία*.

21. *ζήτημα*; as so often, the solution (*λύσις*) to one problem leads John to another vexing question. An explanation of Paul's *σκοπός* (rhetorical goal) in his argument in 1 Corinthians leads John to ask if there were not better threats, i.e., those from Christ (in the gospels), that Paul could have invoked to admonish them.

22. The lengthy amplification of the problem of why Paul didn't refer to Christ's words instead of the Old Testament might be placed in quotation marks as the direct speech of a hypothetical interlocutor, but I have not done so since there is no *φησίν*. An alternate persona might have been marked as such by John's change in voice or tone (without *φησίν*).

τῷ διαβόλῳ καὶ τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ, καὶ τοῦ βρυγμοῦ τῶν ὀδόντων, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν ἀπορρήτων κολάσεων; Εἰ γὰρ φοβῆσαι ἐβούλετο, ἀπὸ τῶν μεζόνων τοῦτο ποιῆσαι ἔδει, οὐκ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ. Ἐκεῖνοι μὲν γὰρ, εἰ καὶ ἐκολάσθησαν, ἀλλ' ἡμερώτερον καὶ προσκαίρως, καὶ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ μιᾷ· οὗτοι δὲ ἀθάνατα μέλλουσι τιμωρεῖσθαι καὶ χαλεπώτερα. Τίνος οὖν ἕνεκεν ἐκεῖθεν αὐτοὺς ἐφόβησεν, οὐδὲ ἀνέμνησε τῶν τοῦ Χριστοῦ ῥημάτων; Καὶ γὰρ ἡδύνατο λέγειν πρὸς αὐτούς· Οὐ θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν, ἀδελφοί, οἷους ὁ Χριστὸς ἔθηκε νόμους περὶ τῶν πίστιν μὲν ἐχόντων, βίον δὲ ἄριστον οὐκ ἐπιδεικνυμένων. Καὶ γὰρ θαύματα ποιήσαντας ἀνθρώπους, καὶ προφητεῖαν ἐπιδεικνυμένους ἐξέβαλε τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν, λέγων· Πολλοὶ ἐροῦσί μοι ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ, Κύριε, Κύριε, οὐ τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι δαιμόνια ἐξεβάλομεν, καὶ τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι [244] προεφητεύσαμεν, καὶ δυνάμεις πολλὰς ἐποιήσαμεν; Καὶ τότε ὁμολογήσω αὐτοῖς, Ὑπάγετε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ, οὐκ οἶδα ὑμᾶς, οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι τὴν ἀνομίαν. Καὶ τὰς παρθένους δὲ οὐχ ὑπὲρ πίστεως ἐγκαλῶν καὶ δογμάτων, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ βίου διεφθαρμένους καὶ ἀπανθρωπίας καὶ ὠμότητος, ἀπέκλεισε τοῦ νυμφῶνος· καὶ τὸν τὰ ῥυπαρὰ ἐνδεδυμένον ἱμάτια, διὰ τοῦτο δεδεμένον ἐξέβαλεν, οὐκ ἐπειδὴ δόγματα οὐκ εἶχεν ὀρθὰ, ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ βίον ῥυπαρὸν καὶ ἀκάθαρτον· καὶ οὗς ἐκέλευσεν εἰς τὸ πῦρ ἀπενεχθῆναι τὸ ἡτοιμασμένον τῷ διαβόλῳ καὶ τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ, οὐ διὰ τοῦτο ἔπεμψεν ἐκεῖ, ἐπειδὴ τῆς πίστεως ἦσαν ἐκπεπτωκότες, ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ οὐδέποτε οὐδένα ἠλέησαν. Τούτων πάντων καὶ τῶν τοιούτων αὐτοὺς ἀναμνῆσαι ἡδύνατο, καὶ εἰπεῖν· Οὐ θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν, ἀδελφοί, ὅτι οὗτοι πάντες καὶ βαπτίσματος ἔτυχον, καὶ μυστηρίων ἐκοινώνησαν, καὶ πίστιν πολλὴν ἐπεδείξαντο, καὶ γνώσιν εἶχον ἀπηρτισμένην· ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ βίον οὐ παρέσχον τῇ πίστει συνάδοντα, τῆς βασιλείας ἐξεβλήθησαν, καὶ τῷ πυρὶ παρεδόθησαν.

23. With transposition of *μιᾷ* and *ἡμέρᾳ*. John has singled out the only date marker in the text, and, moreover, he avoids the other punishments that follow in 1 Cor 10:9–10 (on other days than the single occasion).

24. John uses the “rewording topos” to make this point, i.e., if Paul had intended x, he would have said it this way. This rhetorical commonplace (which John will employ again in what follows) was used by Paul himself in the same letter under discussion, in 1 Cor 5:10 (discussion and references in *PCBCH* 18–19, 27–29). Note that, as with Paul, John begins his hypothetical rewording with the first words of the actual lemma before diverting into what (he says) Paul did *not* say.

25. *βίος*: “way of life”; here similar in meaning to *πολιτεία* at the end of §1 (PG 51:243).

26. With transposition of *δαιμόνια ἐξεβάλομεν* and *ἐπροφητεύσαμεν*; minus *τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι* before *δυνάμεις*; Ὑπάγετε ... ὑμᾶς is a paraphrase of οὐδέποτε ἔγνω ὑμᾶς· ἀποχωρεῖτε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ (Matt 7:23).

66:24), eternal bonds (cf. Matt 22:13), the fire prepared for the devil and his angels (cf. Matt 25:41), the gnashing of teeth (cf. Matt 8:12; 22:13; 25:30), and the rest of the indescribable punishments? After all, if he wanted to frighten them, he should've done it from these more terrible things rather than from the events in the desert. For although those people were punished, it was less harsh and short-lived, taking place "*in a single day*" (1 Cor 10:8),²³ whereas the people Christ mentioned are going to be punished for eternity and with greater severity. So why did Paul frighten them with these stories rather than remind them of the words of Christ? He could've said to them, "I do not wish you to be ignorant, sisters and brothers,²⁴ of the laws Christ laid down about those who have faith but do not display exemplary conduct."²⁵ After all, Christ even threw people who'd done marvelous deeds and shown the gift of prophecy out of the kingdom of heaven, saying, "*Many will say to me on that day, 'Lord, Lord, did we not in your name throw out demons and in your name [244] prophesy and do many miracles?' And then I shall confess to them, 'Go away from me; I don't know you, you workers of lawlessness'*" (Matt 7:22–23).²⁶ And he also shut the virgins out of the wedding feast, not due to accusations about faith or proper teachings, but because of their corrupted way of life, their hatefulness and cruelty (cf. Matt 25:1–13).²⁷ And he bound and threw out the man dressed in filthy garments, not because the man didn't have the right teachings but because of his filthy and unclean conduct (cf. Matt 22:11–13).²⁸ And as for the ones he commanded to be led away to "*the fire prepared for the devil and his angels*" (Matt 25:41),²⁹ he didn't send them there because they'd fallen away from the faith, but because they'd never shown anyone mercy (cf. Matt 25:42–43). Paul could've reminded them of all these and similar examples and said, "I do not wish you to be ignorant, sisters and brothers, of the fact that all these people had received baptism and shared in the mysteries³⁰ and showed great faith and had complete knowledge, but because they didn't display a way of life that accords with their faith, they were thrown out of the kingdom and handed over to the fire."

27. Chrysostom is embellishing here; there is nothing in the parable about these moral charges against the "foolish virgins" who did not bring oil for their lamps. See the similar argument in *Hom. 1 Tim. 5:9–10* §6 (PG 51:326).

28. On John's interpretation of the man's filthy garments as symbolizing the sin of *πορνεία*, see p. 281 n. 153 above.

29. Minus τὸ αἰώνιον after πῦρ.

30. Not coincidentally, John is using the language of the initiation of catechumens here.

Τίνος οὖν ἕνεκεν οὐ ταῦτα εἶπεν, ἀλλὰ ταῦτα πάντα ἀφείς, οὕτω πάς φησιν. Οὐ θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν, ἀδελφοί, ὅτι οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν πάντες ὑπὸ τὴν νεφέλην ἦσαν, καὶ τῶν Μωϋσέως αὐτοὺς ἀναμιμνήσκων, τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς χάριτος τέως σιγήσας; Οὐχ ἀπλῶς, οὐδὲ ἄνευ λόγου τινὸς τοῦτο ποιεῖ. πολλῆς γὰρ σοφίας ἦν πεπληρωμένος. Ἀλλὰ τί δήποτε, καὶ διὰ τί; Δυστοῖν ἕνεκα τούτων· ὁμοῦ τε αὐτῶν βουλόμενος καθάψασθαι μᾶλλον, καὶ δεῖξαι τῆς Παλαιᾶς Διαθήκης πρὸς τὴν Καινὴν πολλὴν οὕσαν τὴν συγγένειαν. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ πολλοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, οἱ μὲν τῇ γεέννῃ διαπιστοῦσι, καὶ οὐδὲ εἶναι κόλασιν νομίζουσιν, ἀλλὰ τὸν Θεὸν ἀπλῶς ἕνεκεν φόβου καὶ σωφρονισμοῦ ταῦτ' ἠπειληκέναι, σκώληκα τὸν ἀτελεύτητον, τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἄσβεστον, τὸ σκότος τὸ ἐξώτερον, τοῖς δὲ παρελθοῦσιν οὐκ ἔχουσιν ἀπιστῆσαι. Τὰ γὰρ γεγενημένα πῶς ἂν τις δύναιτο λέγειν μὴ γενέσθαι; Τοῖς μὲν γὰρ οὐδέπω φανείσιν, οὐδὲ εἰς ἔργον ἐξελθοῦσιν εἰσι πολλοὶ οἱ διαπιστοῦντες, τοῖς δὲ γεγενημένοις καὶ τέλος εἰληφόσι, καὶ μυριάκις τις ἀνεύθυνος ἢ καὶ ἀγνώμων, οὔτε, εἰ βουληθείη, δυνήσεται ποτε ἀπιστεῖν. Ἀπὸ τῶν σφόδρα ὡμολογημένων, καὶ τέλος ἐχόντων, καὶ ὧν πολλὰ μένει τὰ λείψανα, βούλεται αὐτοὺς πιστώσασθαι περὶ τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ δικαιοκρισίας, μονονουχὶ λέγων. Εἰ μὴ νομίζεις εἶναι γέενναν, μὴδὲ τιμωρίαν καὶ κόλασιν, ἀλλ' ἀπλῶς τὸν Θεὸν ἠπειληκέναι, τὰ παρελθόντα ἀναλογισάμενος, καὶ τοῖς μέλλουσι πιστεῦε. Εἰ γὰρ ὁ αὐτός ἐστι Θεός, ὁ καὶ τὰ πρότερα καὶ τὰ νῦν οἰκονομῶν, καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς Παλαιᾶς, καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τῆς χάριτος, ὥσπερ οὖν καὶ ἔστιν ὁ αὐτός, ποῖον ἂν ἔχοι λόγον,

31. Now the problem is phrased as a direct question. John likely has John 1:17 in view in drawing this contrast between the time of Moses and the time of χάρις.

32. As always, this is the presupposition behind John's interpretation of Paul's words.

33. See the same appeal and argument in *Hom. 2 Cor. 4:13 B*, §2 (PG 51:282–83).

34. A pastoral problem, from Chrysostom's point of view.

35. The idea that religion itself was created in order to get human beings to act rightly due to fear, is very old. See, e.g., the famous Critias frag., 25 (*apud* Sextus Empiricus, *Math.* 9.54; ed. Diels and Kranz, 2:319–21).

36. On this account the “problem” Paul faced (as did his preacher) was dubiety about eschatological threats, to which he responded with what John alleges is the incontrovertible evidence of biblical “events.” This kind of incredulity about Christian truth claims concerning the afterlife, whether on the grounds of popular skepticism or philosophical reasoning such as Epicureanism, among Christians as well as outsiders, is a constant from the time of Paul through that of Chrysostom, and hardly came to an end with the Constantinian or Theodosian reigns, as this text (and much other evidence) clearly shows.

37. This is of course not entirely true, especially if what one has is in fact not events but a written account of purported events, which itself needs to be tested for

So why didn't Paul say these things, but instead, leaving all these things aside, said this: "And *I do not wish you to be ignorant, sisters and brothers, of the fact that all our fathers were under the cloud*" (1 Cor 10:1), thus reminding them of the events that happened with Moses, but remaining silent about those in the time of grace?³¹ He does this neither randomly nor without reason;³² for he was filled with much wisdom. But why, then, and for what purpose? There were two reasons: he wished at one and the same time to upbraid them further and to demonstrate the kinship the Old Testament has with the New.³³ This is because, while it is the case that there are many people who don't believe in hell and don't think that there's a punishment,³⁴ but that God has simply issued these threats—the undying worm, the unquenchable fire, the outer darkness—to occasion fear and to rein in peoples' behavior,³⁵ they can't disbelieve the events that have already taken place.³⁶ After all, how could someone say events that have happened didn't happen? There are many people who disbelieve things that have never been seen or come to actuality. But even someone hugely irresponsible or ignorant can't refuse to believe events that have taken place and have been brought to completion.³⁷ So Paul wishes them to come to belief about God's just judgment by appealing to events that are fully agreed upon and have been brought to conclusion and of which many remnants still remain. It's as if he said, "If you don't think hell or chastisement or punishment exist, but that God has simply laid down threats, then by considering the events that have happened, believe in the ones that will take place. For if it is the same God who was in charge of both the former and present events, that is, those of the Old Testament and those under the dispensation of grace—and indeed it is the same God!—then what sense would it make

plausibility, possibility and probability. The unhistorical character of much of biblical narrative was in fact a "problem" for ancient interpreters. These distinctions (τὸ πιθανόν, τὸ δυνατόν, τὸ εἰκός) were taught in ancient education and literary criticism, such as are found, e.g., in the *progymnasmata* for ἀνασκευή or κατασκευή of a διήγημα versus a μῦθος—e.g., Aphthonius, *Prog.* 5–6 (ed. Rabe, 14–16). What John sidesteps—for now—is that Paul's exempla from the past (per Exodus and Numbers) include events that might be deemed rather implausible, such as the killer snakes of Num 21:6 or the manna of Exod 16 and Num 11. He will return to the category of φύσις, or what is "natural," below in §4 (PG 51:249). For the use of similar language, and yet in a more philosophically direct argument about types of believability and unbelievability in the ἱστορία of Scripture, see Origen, *Princ.* 4.2.9 (SC 268:334–40, ed. Crouzel and Simonetti). For now, John is greatly simplifying in order to justify Paul's choice of this biblical ἱστορία to dissuade the Corinthians from bad behavior.

ἐκείνους μὲν ἀμαρτάνοντας κολάσαι καὶ τιμωρήσασθαι, ἡμᾶς δὲ ταῦτα, καὶ πολλῶ χαλεπώτερα ἐκείνων παίοντας ἀτιμωρήτους ἀφεῖναι; Ἐρωτῶ τοίνυν· ἐπόρνευσαν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, καὶ ἐκολάσθησαν; ἐγόγγυσαν, καὶ ἐτιμωρήθησαν; Ἀνάγκη πᾶσα ὁμολογήσαι. Πῶς οὖν ὁ τιμωρησάμενος ἐκείνους, σὲ τὰ αὐτὰ τολμῶντα παρόψεται; Οὐκ ἂν ἔχοι λόγον. Ἄλλ' οὐκ ἔδωκας δίκην ἐνταῦθα; Διὰ τοῦτο μάλιστα πίστευε γέενναν εἶναι καὶ κόλασιν, ἐπειδὴ δίκην ἐνταῦθα οὐκ ἔδωκας. Εἰ γὰρ μὴ ἔμελλέ τις ἀποκεῖσθαι μετὰ ταῦτα τιμωρία, οὐκ ἂν τὰ αὐτὰ [245] τοῖς προτέροις τολμήσας, ἀτιμώρητος ἔμεινας. Καὶ σὺ τοίνυν ὅταν λάβῃς τινὰ χαῦνον, καὶ διαλελυμένον, καὶ πολλὴν ἀσέλγειαν ἐπιδεικνύμενον, καὶ λέγῃ πρὸς σέ, ὅτι μῦθος ταῦτά ἐστιν, οὐκ ἔστι κόλασις, οὔτε γέεννα, ἀλλ' ἀπλῶς ὁ Θεὸς ἠπέλιψε φοβῆσαι βουλόμενος, λέγε πρὸς αὐτόν· Ἄνθρωπε, τοῖς μέλλουσιν ἀπιστεῖς, ἐπειδὴ μὴ φαίνεται, μηδὲ εἰς μέσον ἦλθε, μηδὲ ὑπὸ τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς κεῖται τοῖς ἡμετέροις· μὴ ἐπὶ τοῖς γεγεννημένοις καὶ τέλος εἰληφόσι δυνατὸν ἀπιστῆσαί τινα; Ἐννόησόν μοι τὰ Σόδομα καὶ τὰ Γόμορρα. Ἐκείνῃ δὲ χώρα δι' οὐδεμίαν ἐτέραν ἀμαρτίαν τοσαύτην ἔδωκε δίκην, ἢ ὅτι παρανόμους εἰσήγαγον μίξεις οἱ τὰς πόλεις οἰκήσαντες ἐκείνας, καὶ ἀθέσμους ἔρωτας, καὶ τοὺς τῆς φύσεως νόμους ἐκ βάθρων ἀνέτρεψαν. Πῶς οὖν ἂν ἔχοι λόγον, τὸν Θεὸν, τὸν αὐτὸν ὄντα καὶ τότε καὶ νῦν, ἐκείνους μὲν ἀμαρτάνοντας κολάσαι χωρὶς συγγνώμης ἀπάσης, σὲ δὲ τὸν μετ' ἐκείνους ἀμαρτόντα, τὸν πολλῶ μείζονος ὄντα τιμωρίας ἄξιον καὶ κολάσεως, ὅσω καὶ χάριτος ἀπῆλυσας, καὶ οὐδὲ ταῖς ἐκείνων ἐσωφρονίσθης τιμωρίαις, ἀτιμώρητον ἀφεῖναι;

38. John retrojects his negative caricature of “Jews” onto the Israelite wilderness generation.

39. As PE notes, HS added in the margin the plus reading: ἐκείνους μὲν ἀμαρτάνοντας κολάσαι, ἡμᾶς δὲ ταῦτα, καίτοι πολλῶ αἰσχροτέρα ἐργασαμένους οὐ κολάσαι (“to punish them when they sin, but not to punish us for the things we’ve done, even though they are much more shameful?”).

40. This seems to be where John’s personification of the apostle ends and his own inquiry to his audience begins, though it is often hard to tell where their personae part, since John deliberately blends their voices and merges past and present.

41. PE (followed by PG) adopts the reading τὰ αὐτά for τοιαῦτα (“these kinds of things”), with Paris. gr. 748.

42. χαῦνος, translated with an eye on LSJ s.v. χαυνοῦν II.2 (“relax, weaken ... Pass. of character”). The adjective (as also the verb) can equally mean “empty, frivolous” (LSJ II), but the following two descriptive terms (διαλελυμένος, ἀσέλγειαν ἐπιδεικνύμενος) are related to sexual sins. Given that, and the exemplum John will use next about Sodom and Gomorrah, χαῦνος here may be functioning as a synonym of Paul’s (and John’s) disparaging use of μαλακός for men who engage in homoerotic acts (1 Cor 6:9). On the use of the Sodom story in Chrysostom’s antihomoerotic invective see further de Wet, “Chrysostom on Homoeroticism,” 212–14.

for God to punish and chastise those sinners, but leave us, who have made even worse mistakes than they, unpunished? So, let me ask you: did the Jews³⁸ engage in sexual misconduct, and were they punished? Did they grumble, and were they chastised? How then will the one who chastised them overlook you when you dare to do the same things? It would make no sense.”³⁹ But⁴⁰ you haven’t suffered judgment in this life? Believe all the more that hell and punishment exist for that very reason—because you haven’t suffered the punishment in this life. For if some penalty weren’t going to be in store after this, [245] then you wouldn’t remain unpunished now if you dared to do the same things⁴¹ that they had. Moreover, when you catch someone behaving with loose morals,⁴² in dissolution and openly displaying his debauchery, and he says to you, “These things are a myth!⁴³ There’s no punishment or hell, but God simply issues threats because he wants to inspire fear,”⁴⁴ say to him: “Mister, you don’t believe in future things because they haven’t been visible or publicly manifested or taken place under our gaze. But surely it’s not possible to refuse to believe things that have happened and have been brought to their completion, is it? Consider the events at Sodom and Gomorrah (cf. Gen 13:13; 19:1–26). That region suffered such a terrible punishment for no other sin than that the men who inhabited those cities introduced illicit sexual unions and unlawful lovers, and toppled the laws of nature from their very foundations (cf. Rom 1:26–27). How then could it make sense that God, who is the same both then and now,⁴⁵ punished those sinners without any leniency, but he leaves you unpunished—you, who do the same sin as they, who deserve even greater chastisement and punishment given that you have the benefit of grace and haven’t even been chastened⁴⁶ by the punishments those men endured?”⁴⁷

43. On *μῦθος* and incredulity see above, pp. 320–21 n. 37.

44. This *prosopopoeia* is a revealing piece of late ancient debate about the limited power and effectiveness of Christian threats of the afterlife to counter or contain “debauchery.”

45. Cf. Heb 13:8, of Christ as *ἐχθές καὶ σήμερον ὁ αὐτὸς καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας*.

46. PE (followed by PG) adopted the reading *ἐσωφρονίσθης* (with Paris. gr. 748) where HS ME have *σωφρονισθεῖς*.

47. Of course, the person addressed here has a simple retort—these things are also *μῦθοι*! But John does not address this, even though he will problematize the simple historical sense of the biblical *ἱστορία* below in §§3–4 (PG 51:247–49).

γ'. Διὰ δὴ ταῦτα καὶ Παῦλος οὐδὲν περὶ γεέννης τέως εἰπὼν, ἐπειδὴ πολλοῖς τὰ μέλλοντά ἐστιν ἄπιστα, ἀπὸ τῶν ἤδη συμβάντων, καὶ ὧν ἱκανὴν εἶχον πίστιν, αὐτοὺς σωφρονίσαι βούλεται. Εἰ γὰρ καὶ φοβερώτερα τὰ μέλλοντα, ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἀτελεστέροις τῶν ἀνθρώπων τὰ παρελθόντα πιστότερα, καὶ ταῦτα μᾶλλον αὐτοὺς ἐκείνων φοβεῖν εἴωθε. Διὰ ταῦτα ἐντεῦθεν αὐτοῖς διαλέγεται, οἷς οὐδὲ τὸν σφόδρα ἀναισχυνοῦντα ἀπιστῆσαι δυνατὸν ἦν· ὁμοῦ δὲ καὶ Μαρκίῳ καὶ Μάνεντι, καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς τὰ αὐτὰ ἐκείνοις νοσοῦσι καιρίαν δίδωσι τὴν πληγὴν. Εἰ γὰρ μὴ ἐστὶν ὁ αὐτὸς Θεὸς τῆς Παλαιᾶς καὶ τῆς Καινῆς, ὁ καὶ ἐκεῖνα νουθετήσας, καὶ ταῦτα μέλλων διατυποῦν, περιττῶς μοι ταῦτα λέγεις, ὦ Παῦλε, καὶ φόβον οὐδένα τοῖς ἀκροαταῖς ἐντίθης. Δύναται γὰρ ὁ ἀκούων λέγειν, ὅτι εἰ ἕτερος ἐκεῖνός ἐστι Θεός, καὶ ἕτερος οὗτος, οὐ πάντως οὗτος κατὰ τὴν ἐκείνου κρινεῖ γνώμην, οὐδὲ τοῖς αὐτοῖς πείθεται νόμοις. Τί γὰρ, εἰ τῷ τῆς Παλαιᾶς Θεῷ πάντας ἔδοξε κολάσαι καὶ τιμωρῆσασθαι, τί μορμολύττεις καὶ ἐκφοβεῖς; Ἔτερον ἔχω Δεσπότην τὸν μέλλοντά με κρίνειν. Ὡστε εἰ ἕτερος ἦν ὁ τῆς Παλαιᾶς, καὶ ἕτερος ὁ τῆς Καινῆς, τοῦναντίον, ὅπερ ἐβούλετο, ὁ Παῦλος ἐποίησεν· οὐ γὰρ μόνον οὐκ ἐφόβησε τὸν ἀκούοντα, ἀλλὰ καὶ πάσης ἀγωνίας καὶ δέους ἀπήλλαξεν· ὅπερ οὐδὲ τῶν τυχόντων ἀνθρώπων καὶ σφόδρα ἀνοήτων τις ἔπαθεν ἂν, μήτι γε Παῦλος ὁ τοσαύτης γέμων σοφίας. Ὅθεν δῆλον, ὅτι εἷς καὶ ὁ αὐτός ἐστι Θεὸς ὁ καὶ τοὺς Ἰουδαίους ἐπὶ τῆς ἐρήμου καταστρώσας, καὶ ἡμῶν τοὺς ἁμαρτάνοντας κολάζειν μέλλων. Οὐ γὰρ εἰ μὴ εἷς ἦν (πάλιν γὰρ τὸ αὐτὸ ἐρῶ), ἀπὸ τῶν ἤδη γεγενημένων ὑπ' ἐκείνου, καὶ περὶ τῶν μελλόντων ἡμᾶς ἐφόβει· ἐπειδὴ δὲ ὁ αὐτός ἐστιν, ἀναντίρρητον εἰσήγαγεν αὐτοῖς τὴν περὶ τῆς τιμωρίας προσδοκίαν, δεικνὺς

48. οἱ ἀτελέστεροι; John regards 1 Cor 2:6–3:4 as portraying the Corinthians as not yet τέλειοι, but still νήπιοι.

49. Cf. 1 Tim 6:4. John envisions Paul as having given an anticipatory correction of the later heresiological problem of Marcionites and Manichaeans; this is the second reason promised above for why Paul cited the Old Testament and not the words of Christ here; see §2 (PG 51:244).

50. νουθετεῖν, echoing the language of the lemma, ἐγράφη δὲ πρὸς νουθεσίαν (1 Cor 10:11).

51. Chrysostom sprinkles in this side-address to Paul en passant, but the argument in this part of the homily seems to involve John mostly interacting with the voices of Christians (real or hypothetical) who may not find the threat of future punishment enough to change their behavior.

52. Chrysostom is mimicking the actual Marcionite or Manichaean point of view, but likely also has in view members of his congregation whom he wishes to associate with that camp in order to get them to heed the warnings of the Old Testament (such as Paul invokes in 1 Cor 10:1–10).

53. The translation understands ὥστε as the start to Chrysostom's response to this

3. Surely this is the reason Paul said nothing here about hell: since for many people future realities are unbelievable, he wanted to chasten them by appealing to events that had already happened and in which they already sufficiently believed. For even when the future events are more fearful, for people who are less mature,⁴⁸ events that have already taken place are more likely to generate fear than those in the future, because they're more believable. So here Paul talks to them about things that would be impossible for the most shameless person to disbelieve, while at the same time he deals a fatal blow to both Marcion and Mani and all those who suffer the same illness⁴⁹ as they do. If the God of the Old and New Testaments—the one who both was admonishing⁵⁰ the former actions and was prefiguring the ones to come later—isn't the same, then in my view you, Paul,⁵¹ are mentioning these things for no benefit, and you're instilling no fear at all in your hearers. For the one who hears these things can say, "If the former is a different God from the latter, then the God of the New Testament in no way will judge according to the verdict of the God of the Old, nor does he follow the same laws. So why are you frightened and afraid if the God of the Old Testament decided to punish and chastise them all? I have a different Lord who is going to judge me."⁵² The consequence of this argument is,⁵³ if the God of the Old Testament is a God different from the God of the New Testament, then Paul would have accomplished the exact opposite of what he wanted to.⁵⁴ For not only did he fail to inspire fear in the hearers, but he even freed them from all anguish and fear. But that's something no ordinary or completely dull-witted person would endure, much less Paul, who was full of such great wisdom. From all this it's clear that the God who scattered the bodies of the Jews in the wilderness and the God who is going to punish those among us who sin is one and the same. For if he weren't a single God (again I am making the same point), then Paul would incongruously have been trying to inspire fear in us⁵⁵ about the future from things that had been done by that other god. But since it's the same God, Paul brought them to the expectation of punishment without any fear of contradiction, showing that they should be frightened and afraid. After

just-articulated, misguided view, first on the grounds of consequence or result, i.e., that Paul would have subverted his own purpose, as such interpreters must imply.

54. As always for John, this would be an intolerable "problem" if true. For further discussion, see Mitchell, "A Variable and Many-Sorted Man."

55. Note how Chrysostom moves back and forth between the historical Corinthians and his hearers in the late fourth-century context.

ὅτι δεδοικέναι χρή καὶ φοβεῖσθαι. Οὐ γὰρ ἂν ὁ τοὺς πατέρας ἡμῶν κολάσας ἀμαρτάνοντας, ἡμῶν φείσεται τὰ αὐτὰ πλημμελούντων.

Ἄξιον δὲ ἐπ' αὐτὴν τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐλθεῖν τοῦ διηγήματος, καὶ ἐκάστην διερευνήσασθαι ῥῆσιν μετ' ἀκριβείας ἀπάσης. Οὐ θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν, ἀδελφοί. Τοὺς μαθητὰς ἀδελφοὺς ἐκάλεσεν, οὐκ ἀπὸ τοῦ τῆς ἀξίας, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τοῦ τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοὺς προσαγορεύων ὀνόματος. Ἦιδει γὰρ, ἥδει σαφῶς, ὅτι ταύτης ἴσον οὐδὲν, καὶ τὸ μέγιστον τῆς ἀξίας εἶδος, τὸ τῆς ἀγάπης εἶδος ἐστὶ. Τοῦτο [246] δὲ πρῶτον καὶ ἡμεῖς ζηλώσωμεν. Κἂν σφόδρα καταδεέστεροί τινες ἡμῶν ὦσι, τοῖς τῆς θεραπείας αὐτοὺς καλῶμεν ὀνόμασι, μὴ μόνον ἐλευθέρους, ἀλλὰ καὶ δούλους, μὴ μόνον πλουσίους, ἀλλὰ καὶ πένητας, ἐπεὶ καὶ Παῦλος οὐχὶ τοὺς πλουσίους τοὺς παρὰ Κορινθίοις, οὐδὲ τοὺς ἐλευθέρους καὶ περιφανεῖς, οὐδὲ τοὺς ἐπισήμους μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἰδιώτας, καὶ οἰκέτας, καὶ πάντας ἀπλῶς ταύτη τετίμηκε τῇ προσηγορίᾳ. Ἐν γὰρ Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ οὐ δοῦλος, οὐκ ἐλεύθερος, οὐ βάρβαρος, οὐ Σκύθης, οὐ σοφὸς, οὐκ ἄσφοπος, ἀλλὰ πᾶσα ἀξία ἀνωμαλία βιωτικῆς ἀνήρηται. Καὶ τί θαυμαστόν, εἰ Παῦλος τοὺς ὁμοδούλους οὕτως ἐκάλεσεν, ὅπου γε καὶ ὁ Δεσπότης αὐτοῦ τὴν ἡμετέραν οὕτω ἐκάλεσε φύσιν, οὕτω λέγων· Ἀπαγγελῶ τὸ ὄνομά σου τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς μου, ἐν μέσῳ Ἐκκλησίας ὑμνήσω σε; Οὐ μόνον δὲ ἐκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς ἀδελφοὺς, ἀλλὰ καὶ γενέσθαι ἀδελφὸς ἡμῶν ἠθέλησε, καὶ ἐγένετο τὴν σάρκα ὑποδὺς τὴν ἡμετέραν, καὶ τῆς φύσεως ἡμῶν κοινωνήσας τῆς αὐτῆς. Ὅπερ οὖν καὶ αὐτὸ θαυμάζων ὁ Παῦλος ἔλεγεν· Οὐ γὰρ ἀγγέλων ἐπιλαμβάνεται ὁ Θεὸς, ἀλλὰ σπέρματος Ἀβραάμ ἐπιλαμβάνεται, ὅθεν ὥφειλε κατὰ πάντα τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ὁμοιωθῆναι. Καὶ πάνιν· Ἐπεὶ οὖν καὶ τὰ παιδία κεκοινωνήκε σαρκὸς καὶ αἵματος, παραπλησίως καὶ αὐτὸς μετέσχε τῶν αὐτῶν.

Πάντα δὲ ταῦτα ἀκούοντες, ἀλαζονείαν, καὶ τῦφον, καὶ ἀπόνοιαν ἄπασαν τῆς ψυχῆς ἐξορίσωμεν τῆς ἡμετέρας, καὶ μετὰ πολλῆς τοῦτο κατορθώσωμεν τῆς σπουδῆς, τὸ θεραπευτικοῖς ὀνόμασι καὶ τιμὴν ἔχουσι τοὺς πλησίον καλεῖν. Εἰ γὰρ καὶ μικρὸν καὶ ψιλὸν εἶναι δοκεῖ τὸ κατορθῶμα, ἀλλ' ὅμως μεγάλων

56. Having addressed the two “problems” of (1) why Paul drew upon Old Testament exempla (rather than eschatological teachings of Christ) to strike fear into the Corinthians and (2) whether the God of the Old and the New are the same, John now turns to a close reading of the text.

57. ἀξία has multiple resonances in this context: “worth,” “value,” “merit,” “reputation,” “dignity” (LSJ).

58. The editors of PE confirmed HS’s marginal conjectural reading of ὥσιν for ὄντες (as was the reading of HS ME) on the basis of Paris. gr. 748, and they adopted that reading in the text (which was taken up by PG).

59. I.e., ἀδελφοί.

60. A paraphrase incorporating Gal 3:28 and Col 3:11.

all, the God who punished our ancestors when they sinned won't spare us when we do the same wrongs.

It will be worthwhile for us to go through the account, starting at the very beginning, and examine each word with detailed attention.⁵⁶ *"I do not wish you to be ignorant, sisters and brothers"* (1 Cor 10:1). He called his disciples "sisters and brothers," bestowing this name on them not based on worth⁵⁷ but based on love. For he knew—he knew clearly—that nothing is equivalent to love and that the greatest form of worthiness is that of love. [246] So let's emulate this ourselves as well, as a matter of first importance. Even if some among us are⁵⁸ of inferior station, let's call them by respectful names, not only the free but also slaves, not only the rich but also the poor. After all, Paul indiscriminately honored with this very form of address⁵⁹ not only the rich among the Corinthians, not only the free and illustrious, nor only the notable, but even the uneducated, the household slaves, everyone. For *"in Christ Jesus"* (Gal 3:26, 28), there is neither slave nor free, neither barbarian or Scythian,⁶⁰ neither wise nor unwise, but every type of worthiness that counts in everyday life has been obliterated. So why is it surprising if Paul names his fellow slaves in this way,⁶¹ when his Lord also named our nature in this way when he said, *"I shall proclaim your name to my sisters and brothers; in the midst of the assembly I shall sing hymns to you"* (Ps 21:23).⁶² Not only did he call us *"sisters and brothers,"* but he wished also to become our brother, and he was born after taking on our flesh (cf. Phil 2:7)⁶³ and sharing in the same nature as we. This is what Paul marveled at when he said, *"For God doesn't help angels, but he helps the seed of Abraham, which is why he was obligated to become like his sisters and brothers in all respects"* (Heb 2:16–17).⁶⁴ And again, *"Then since the children share flesh and blood, he himself likewise shared in the same"* (Heb 2:14).⁶⁵

Hearing all these things, let's banish all boasting, conceit, and madness from our souls, and let's enact with all zeal this virtuous deed of calling our neighbors by names that confer respect and honor. Even if this act of virtue seems small and simple, nonetheless it is the cause of tremendous goods.

61. I.e., ἀδελφοί, all understood as δοῦλοι Χριστοῦ.

62. With ἀπαγγεῶ for διηγῆσομαι.

63. μορφὴν δούλου λαβών.

64. Minus δῆπου after γάρ; plus ὁ θεός before ἀλλά.

65. Plus καί after οὖν; transposition of καὶ αὐτὸς παραπλησίως to παραπλησίως καὶ αὐτός.

ἀγαθῶν ἐστὶν αἴτιον· ὥσπερ οὖν τὸ ἐναντίον πολλὰς πολλάκις ἔχθρας καὶ ἔρεις καὶ φιλονεικίας ἐποίησεν.

Οὐ ταύτην δὲ μόνον τὴν ῥῆσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν ἐξῆς μετὰ πολλῆς ἐξεταστέον τῆς ἀκριβείας· οὐδὲ γὰρ ταύτην ἀπλῶς τέθεικεν. Εἰπὼν γάρ· Οὐ θέλω ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν, ἀδελφοί, ἐπήγαγεν· Ὅτι οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν πάντες· οὐκ εἶπεν, Ὅτι οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, οὐδὲ οἱ ἐξ Αἰγύπτου ἐξελθόντες· ἀλλὰ τί; Οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν πάντες· ὁμοῦ καὶ τὴν ταπεινοφροσύνην ἐπιδεικνύμενος τὴν ἑαυτοῦ, ὅτι οὐκ ἀπηξίωσε τὴν πρὸς ἐκείνους συγγένειαν, τοσοῦτον αὐτοὺς ἀναβεβηκῶς κατὰ τὸν τῆς ἀρετῆς λόγον, καὶ τῶν τὴν Παλαιὰν διαβαλλόντων ἐπιστομίζων τὴν ἀναίσχυντον γλῶτταν. Οὐ γὰρ ἂν, εἰ πρὸς ἐκείνην ἀπεχθῶς διέκειτο, ἀπὸ τῶν εὐφημοτέρων ὀνομάτων ἂν ἐμνήσθη, τῶν τότε γενομένων ἀπάντων διαβολὴν ἐχόντων. Πάντες. Οὐδὲ τοῦτο ἀπλῶς τέθεικε τὸ, Πάντες, οὐδὲ παρέργως, ἀλλὰ μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς σοφίας. Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἅπαξ εἰπὼν ἐσίγησεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ δις καὶ τρίς καὶ πολλάκις, ἵνα μάθῃς, ὅτι οὐ παρέργως αὐτὰ προσέρριπεν. Εἰπὼν γάρ· Ὅτι οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν πάντες ὑπὸ τὴν νεφέλην ἦσαν, ἐπήγαγε· Καὶ πάντες διὰ τῆς θαλάσσης διήλθον, καὶ πάντες εἰς τὸν Μωϋσῆν ἐβαπτίσαντο, καὶ πάντες τὸ αὐτὸ βρῶμα πνευματικὸν ἔφαγον, καὶ πάντες τὸ αὐτὸ πόμα πνευματικὸν ἔπινον. Ἦκουσας πῶς πολλάκις τὸ, Πάντες, τέθεικεν; Οὐκ ἂν δὲ τοῦτο ἐποίησεν, εἰ μὴ μέγα τι καὶ θαυμαστὸν μυστήριον αἰνίξασθαι ἤθελεν. Εἰ γὰρ ἀπλῶς ἐτίθει, ἥρκει ἅπαξ εἰπόντα σιγῆσαι, καὶ εἰπεῖν οὕτως· Ὅτι οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν πάντες ὑπὸ τὴν νεφέλην ἦσαν, καὶ διὰ τῆς θαλάσσης διήλθον, καὶ εἰς τὸν Μωϋσῆν ἐβαπτίσαντο, καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ βρῶμα πνευματικὸν ἔφαγον, καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ πόμα πνευματικὸν ἔπινον. [247] Νῦν δὲ οὐχ οὕτως εἶπεν, ἀλλὰ καθ' ἕκαστον τῶν γενομένων τὸ, Πάντες, τιθεῖς, θύραν ἡμῖν τῆς ἑαυτοῦ γνώμης παρήνοιξεν οὐ μικράν, ὥστε κατιδεῖν αὐτοῦ τὴν σοφίαν. Τίνος οὖν ἕνεκεν συνεχῶς τῆς λέξεως ταύτης μέμνηται; Βούλεται δεῖξαι πολλὴν οὖσαν τῆς Παλαιᾶς πρὸς τὴν Καινὴν τὴν συγγένειαν, καὶ ὅτι ταῦτα τύπος ἐκείνων ἦν, καὶ σκιά τῶν μελλόντων. Καὶ πρῶτον ἀπὸ

66. "Them" is "the Jews" (the Israelites of the wilderness generation), with John emphasizing in a single sentence both Paul's ancestry as a Jew and his superiority to his people. On Chrysostom's ambiguous treatments of Paul's Judaism, see *HT* 228–34; Andrew S. Jacobs, "A Jew's Jew: Paul and the Early Christian Problem of Jewish Origins," *JR* 86 (2006): 258–86; Courtney Wilson VanVeller, "John Chrysostom and the Troubling Jewishness of Paul," in *Revisioning John Chrysostom*, 32–57.

67. I.e., Paul's time in Roman Corinth (ca. 51–54 CE). A casual generalizing reference by John to what he wishes to characterize as widespread "pagan" anti-Judaism.

68. Minus ἐν τῇ νεφέλῃ καὶ ἐν τῇ θαλάσσῃ (or ellipsis) before ἐβαπτίσαντο; ἔπινον for ἔπινον.

69. John is remarking on Paul's use of the rhetorical figure anaphora (with the fourfold repetition of πάντες).

The same is true with the opposite course, which often causes enmity, contention, and strife.

Now it's not only this statement that we must examine with detailed attention, but also what comes next. After saying, "*I do not wish you to be ignorant, sisters and brothers,*" he added, "*that all our fathers.*" He didn't say, "the Jews," or "those who went out from Egypt," but what? "*All our fathers.*" At one and the same time Paul was displaying his own humility, because he didn't deem himself unworthy of kinship with them even though he far outstripped them in virtue,⁶⁶ and he was also silencing the shameless tongues of the people who hold a slanderous view of the Old Testament. After all, if Paul had held a negative view of the Old Testament, he wouldn't have made mention of it in such favorable terms, given that all the people living at that time⁶⁷ held it in contempt. "*All.*" Nor did he say "*all*" casually or incidentally, but with tremendous wisdom. Nor, once he said it, was he silent, but he said it two, three, and many more times, so you might learn that he didn't bring forward these examples incidentally. After saying, "*that all our fathers were under the cloud,*" he added, "*and all passed through the sea, and all were baptized into Moses, and all ate the same spiritual food, and all drank the same spiritual drink*" (1 Cor 10:1–4).⁶⁸ Did you hear how often he included the word "*all*"?⁶⁹ He wouldn't have done this if he didn't wish to hint at a great and marvelous mystery. If he were including it without a specific purpose, then it would've been sufficient for him to say it once and be silent; he would have put it this way: "That our fathers were all under the cloud, and they passed through the sea, and they were baptized into Moses, and they ate the same spiritual food, and they drank the same spiritual drink." [247] Yet that is in fact not the way he said it, but in reference to each of the events, by putting in "*all*," he opened no tiny window⁷⁰ into his own intention, so we might peer into his wisdom. So why did he continually mention this word?⁷¹ He wished to show the close kinship⁷² that the Old Testament has with the New, and that the former things were a "*prefiguration*" (1 Cor 10:6) of the latter and a "*shadow of things to come*"

70. A keen metaphor by which John signals authorial intention as a hermeneutical key.

71. The repetition of πάντες in the text leads to this expressed quandary. Was Paul just repeating himself, or was this on purpose?

72. συγγένεια: as throughout this argument, an "integral" or "congenital" "close relationship," "kinship." See also, e.g., Hom. 2 Cor. 4:13 B §2 (PG 51:282), and throughout that homily, as often in Chrysostom's oeuvre.

τούτου τὴν συμφωνίαν δείκνυσι. Βουλόμενος γὰρ δεῖξαι, ὅτι ὥσπερ ἐν τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ οὐκ ἔστι δούλου καὶ ἐλευθέρου διάκρισις, οὐδὲ ξένου καὶ πολίτου, οὐδὲ γέροντος καὶ νέου, οὐδὲ σοφοῦ καὶ ἀσόφου, οὐδ' ἰδιώτου καὶ ἄρχοντος, οὐδὲ γυναικὸς καὶ ἀνδρὸς, ἀλλὰ πᾶσα ἡλικία, καὶ πᾶσα ἀξία, καὶ ἑκατέρωθεν φύσις ὁμοίως εἰς τὴν κολυμβήθραν ἐκείνην ἐμβαίνουνσι τῶν ὑδάτων, καὶ βασιλεὺς ἢ τις, καὶ πτωχὸς, τῶν αὐτῶν ἀπολαύουσι καθαρσίῳ· καὶ τοῦτό ἐστι μάλιστα τὸ μέγιστον τῆς παρ' ἡμῖν εὐγενείας τεκμήριον, ὅτι ὁμοίως καὶ τὸν προσαίτην, καὶ τὸν τὴν ἀλουργίδα ἔχοντα μυσταγωγούμεν, καὶ οὐδὲν πλεόν οὗτος ἐκείνου κατὰ τὸν τῶν μυστηρίων ἔχει λόγον· οὕτω καὶ ἐν τῇ Παλαιᾷ συνεχῶς τὸ, Πάντες, τέθεικεν. Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἔχεις εἰπεῖν, ὅτι Μωϋσῆς μὲν διὰ ξηραῖς, Ἰουδαῖοι δὲ διὰ τῆς θαλάσσης διήλθον, οὐδ' ὅτι οἱ μὲν εὐποροὶ δι' ἐτέρας ὁδοῦ, οἱ δὲ πενέστεροι δι' ἐτέρας, οὐδὲ ὅτι αἱ γυναῖκες μὲν ὑπὸ τὸν ἄερα, ἄνδρες δὲ ὑπὸ τὴν νεφέλην, ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ τῆς θαλάσσης πάντες, καὶ ὑπὸ τὴν νεφέλην πάντες, καὶ εἰς τὸν Μωϋσῆν πάντες. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἡ διάβασις ἐκείνη τοῦ μέλλοντος βαπτίσματος ἦν τύπος, ἔδει τοῦτο πρῶτον τῶν ὅλων διατυπωθῆναι, τὸ πάντας τῶν αὐτῶν ἀπολαῦσαι, ὥσπερ οὖν καὶ ἐνταῦθα πάντες τῶν αὐτῶν ἐξίστης μετέχουσι. Καὶ πῶς δύναται, φησὶν, ἐκεῖνο τύπος εἶναι τῶν παρόντων; Ἄν μάθης πρότερον, τί μὲν ἔστι τύπος, τί δὲ ἀλήθεια, τότε σοι καὶ τούτου παρέξομαι τὰς εὐθύνas.

δ'. Τί ποτ' οὖν ἔστι σκιά, τί δὲ ἀλήθεια; Φέρε, τὸν λόγον ἐπὶ τὰς εἰκόνας ἀγάγωμεν, ἃς οἱ ζωγράφοι γράφουσι. Εἶδες πολλάκις εἰκόνα βασιλικὴν κυανῶ κατακεχρωσμένην χρώματι, εἶτα τὸν ζωγράφον λευκὰς περιάγοντα γραμμὰς, καὶ ποιοῦντα βασιλέα, καὶ θρόνον βασιλικόν, καὶ ἵππους παρεστῶτας, καὶ δορυφόρους, καὶ πολεμίους δεδεμένους καὶ ὑποκειμένους. Ἄλλ' ὅμως ὁρῶν ταῦτα σκιαγραφούμενα, οὔτε οἶδας τὸ πᾶν, οὔτε ἀγνοεῖς τὸ πᾶν, ἀλλ' ὅτι μὲν ἄνθρωπος γράφεται καὶ ἵππος, ἀμυδρῶς ἐπίστασαι· ποῖος δὲ ἐστὶν ὁ βασιλεὺς, καὶ ποῖος ὁ πολέμιος, οὐ σφόδρα ἀκριβῶς οἶδας, ἕως ἂν ἐλθοῦσα τῶν χρωμάτων ἢ ἀλήθεια τρανώσῃ τὴν ὄψιν καὶ σαφεστέραν ποιήσῃ. Ὡσπερ

73. On Chrysostom's telling, Paul was an anticipatory or proleptic anti-Marcionite, explicitly and intentionally showing that there was *συμφωνία* between the Testaments, not *ἀντιθέσεις*, as both the form and claim of Marcion's theology. See Eric W. Scherbenske, "Marcion's Antitheses and the Isagogic Genre," VC 64 (2010): 255–79.

74. *κολυμβήθραν*, "cistern" (cf. John 5:2), but in patristic sources used as equivalent to *βαπτιστήριον* and *βάπτισμα* (PGL B). Although he doesn't say so explicitly, John likely has in mind *πάντες* in Gal 3:28 and 1 Cor 12:13, combining both the rite of baptism and the negation of the different statuses.

75. *ἐκείνου sic*. (One expects *ἐκείνου*.)

76. I.e., the sacraments and the instruction of catechumens in general.

(Heb 10:1). And from this, he first wanted to show the harmony.⁷³ He wanted to show that just as in the church there's no distinction between slave and free, or stranger and citizen, old and young, wise and unwise, lay and leader, or woman and man, but every age and every rank and each nature all the same go into the font of waters,⁷⁴ whether a king or a pauper, they have the benefit of the same cleansing. This is in fact the greatest proof of our nobility, that we initiate both the beggar and the one who wears the imperial purple, and the latter receives nothing more than the former⁷⁵ when it comes to the mysteries.⁷⁶ Thus in the Old Testament, as well, Paul continually included “*all*.” For you can't say that Moses passed through on dry land and the Jews through the sea, or that the wealthier went on one route and the poor on another, or that the women were under the air and the men were under the cloud, but they “*all*” passed through the sea, they “*all*” were under the cloud, they “*all*” were baptized into Moses.⁷⁷ Since that crossing was a prefiguration of the baptism to come, it was necessary first that the fact that all of them enjoy the same benefits be prefigured of all of them, just as accordingly all also share equally in the same things here and now. “And how can that event be a prefiguration of present realities?” someone says.⁷⁸ If you first learn what a prefiguration is and what truth is, then I shall provide you with a full account of that too.⁷⁹

4. What then is “shadow,” and what is “truth”? Come, and let's focus our discussion on the portraits that artists paint. You've often seen an imperial portrait⁸⁰ cast in bright blue color, and then the artist draws white sketch marks around it and makes the shape of an imperial figure, an imperial throne, horses and bodyguards alongside him, and his enemies bound and placed below him. Nevertheless, although you see these things sketched in,⁸¹ you neither know the whole picture, nor are you entirely ignorant of it. You know vaguely that a man and a horse are sketched there, but until the true colors come in and sharpen the countenance and make it clearer, you

77. John has elided the verbs in all these last clauses. He matches Paul's anaphora with one of his own here.

78. The new ζήτημα.

79. Chrysostom offers the steps toward the answer to the questions as both a multistage argument and a pedagogical process.

80. On εικόνες βασιλικαί, “imperial images (or portraits),” see HT 55–64.

81. σκιαγραφούμενα. The term and concept of σκιά (“shadow”) in Heb 8:5 and 10:1 (σκιάν γὰρ ἔχων ὁ νόμος τῶν μελλόντων ἀγαθῶν, οὐκ αὐτὴν τὴν εἰκόνα τῶν πραγμάτων) constitutes a crucial building block of the artistic metaphor for figurative biblical interpretation as John graphically depicts it here.

οὖν ἐπὶ τῆς εἰκόνης ἐκείνης οὐκ ἀπαιτεῖς τὸ πᾶν πρὸ τῆς τῶν χρωμάτων ἀληθείας, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀμυδρὰν τινὰ λάβης γνῶσιν τῶν γινομένων, ἱκανῶς τὴν σκιαγραφίαν ἀπηρτίσθαι νομίζεις· οὕτω μοι καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς Παλαιᾶς καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς Καινῆς λογίζου, καὶ μὴ με πᾶσαν ἀπαιτήσης τῆς ἀληθείας τὴν ἀκρίβειαν ἐπὶ τοῦ τύπου· καὶ δυνησόμεθά σε διδάξαι, πῶς εἶχε τινὰ συγγένειαν ἡ Παλαιὰ πρὸς τὴν Καινὴν, καὶ ἡ διάβασις ἐκείνη πρὸς τὸ ἡμέτερον βάπτισμα. Κάκεϊ ὕδωρ, κἀνταῦθα ὕδωρ· κολυμβήθρα ἐνταῦθα, καὶ ἐκεῖ πέλαγος· πάντες ἐνταῦθα εἰς τὰ ὕδατα ἐμβαίνουσι, κάκεϊ πάντες· κατὰ τοῦτο ἡ συγγένεια. Λοιπὸν βούλει μαθεῖν τῶν χρωμάτων τὴν ἀλήθειαν; Ἐκεῖ μὲν Αἰγύπτου διὰ τῆς θαλάσσης ἀπηλλάττοντο, ἐνταῦθα [248] δὲ εἰδωλολατρείας· κάκεϊ μὲν ὁ Φαραὼ κατεποντίζετο, ἐνταῦθα δὲ ὁ διάβολος· ἐκεῖ Αἰγύπτιοι ἀπεπνίγοντο, ἐνταῦθα δὲ ὁ παλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων κατορύττεται. Καὶ ἴδε συγγένειαν τύπου πρὸς ἀλήθειαν, καὶ ἀληθείας ὑπεροχὴν πρὸς τύπον. Οὕτε γὰρ ἀπηλλοτριῶσθαι πάντῃ χρὴ τὸν τύπον τῆς ἀληθείας, ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἂν εἴη τύπος· οὕτε πάλιν ἐξισάζειν πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν, ἐπεὶ πάλιν καὶ αὐτὸς ἀλήθεια ἔσται· ἀλλὰ δεῖ μένειν ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκείας συμμετρίας, καὶ μήτε τὸ πᾶν ἔχειν τῆς ἀληθείας, μήτε τοῦ παντὸς ἐκπεπτωκέναι. Ἄν μὲν γὰρ τὸ πᾶν ἔχῃ, ἀλήθεια πάλιν ἐστὶ καὶ αὐτός· ἂν δὲ τοῦ παντὸς ἐκπέσῃ, τύπος εἶναι λοιπὸν οὐ δύναται· ἀλλὰ δεῖ τὸ μὲν ἔχειν, τὸ δὲ τῇ ἀληθείᾳ τηρεῖν. Μὴ τοίνυν τὸ πᾶν με ἀπαιτήσης ἐπὶ τῆς Παλαιᾶς, ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ μικρά τινὰ καὶ ἀμυδρὰ λάβης αἰνίγματα, ἀγαπητὸν εἶναι νόμιζε τοῦτο. Ποῦ οὖν ἐστὶν ἡ συγγένεια τοῦ τύπου πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν; Ὅτι πάντες ἐκεῖ, καὶ ἐνταῦθα πάντες· ὅτι δι' ὕδατος ἐκεῖ, καὶ ἐνταῦθα δι' ὕδατος· ὅτι δουλείας ἀπηλλάγησαν ἐκεῖνοι, καὶ ἡμεῖς δουλείας, ἀλλ' οὐ τῆς αὐτῆς· ἀλλ' οἱ μὲν τῆς Αἰγυπτίων, ἡμεῖς δὲ τῆς τῶν δαιμόνων· ἐκεῖνοι τῆς τῶν βαρβάρων, ἡμεῖς τῆς κατὰ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν. Πρὸς ἐλευθερίαν ἀνήχθησαν ἐκεῖνοι, καὶ ἡμεῖς, ἀλλ' οὐ πρὸς τὴν αὐτὴν, ἀλλὰ πρὸς πολλῷ λαμπροτέραν ἡμεῖς. Εἰ δὲ μείζω τὰ ἡμέτερα καὶ ὑπερέχοντα ἐκείνων, μὴ θορυβοῦ. Τοῦτο γὰρ μάλιστά ἐστιν ἀληθείας, τὸ πολλὴν ἔχειν πρὸς τὸν τύπον τὴν ὑπεροχὴν, οὐκ ἐναντίωσιν, οὐδὲ μάχην.

82. On ὁ παλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος cf. also Col 3:9; Eph 4:22.

83. Stylistically John sets off his governing contrast within this argument via chiasmus.

84. Here the argument turns to a *minore ad maius*, showing not congruity but superiority.

85. Note how this solution to the problem of how a τύπος relates to ἀλήθεια maps directly onto Chrysostom's triangulation of the truth-regimes of his own time, plotting himself deliberately between Jews on the one hand and Marcionites on the other concerning the valuation of the Old Testament.

don't know in much detail which emperor it is or which prisoner. In the case of that portrait, you don't ask for the whole meaning before the true colors are applied, but even if you grasp only a vague sense of what these things are, you consider the sketch sufficiently complete. Consider both the Old and the New Testaments in the very same way. Don't ask me for the truth in all its detail to be found in the prefiguration. We shall be able to teach you now that the Old Testament has a close kinship with the New, even as that Exodus crossing has a kinship with our baptism. Here we find water, and there we find water too; here a font, and there a sea; here all go into the waters, and there all go in too. In this respect there is kinship. Then do you want to learn the full-color truth? There they were rescued from the sea, and here from [248] idolatry; there Pharaoh was drowned, and here the devil; there the Egyptians were asphyxiated, and here the "*old human being*" full of sin is buried (cf. Rom 6:6).⁸² Look at the close kinship the prefiguration has with the truth, as well as the superiority of the truth to the prefiguration.⁸³ One shouldn't entirely divorce the prefiguration from the truth, since then it wouldn't be a prefiguration; but again neither should one equate it with the truth, since then the prefiguration would itself be the truth. Instead, it's necessary for the prefiguration to remain within its own limits, neither having the whole truth nor completely falling short of it. For if it had the whole, then, again, the prefiguration would itself be the truth, even as, if the prefiguration fell completely short of the truth, in the end it couldn't be a prefiguration. Instead, it must contain, but not fully preserve, the truth. So, don't ask me for the whole picture in the Old Testament, but if you grasp a few faint figurative glimpses, consider that to be precious. And where do we find the kinship that the prefiguration has with the truth? There it was "*all*," and here is it "*all*"; there it was through water, and here it is through water; there they were rescued from slavery, and here we are rescued from slavery. Yet it isn't the same slavery. In their case, it was from slavery at the hands of the Egyptians; in ours, slavery at the hands of demons; in theirs, from slavery at the hands of barbarians; in ours, from slavery to the pursuit of sin. They were rescued for freedom, and so are we. Yet it's not the same freedom, but for us it's a much more splendid freedom.⁸⁴ Now don't be disturbed if our circumstances are better and superior to theirs. For what is especially characteristic of the truth is that it has much superiority to the prefiguration, but neither opposition nor conflict.⁸⁵

Τί δέ ἐστι, Πάντες εἰς τὸν Μωϋσῆν ἐβαπτίσαντο; Καὶ τάχα ἀσαφές τὸ λεγόμενον· οὐκοῦν σαφέστερον αὐτὸ ποιῆσαι πειράσομαι. Θάλασσα ἦν πρὸ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν κεχυμένη τῶν ἐκείνων τότε, καὶ ἐκελεύοντο διαβαίνειν ξένην τινὰ καὶ παράδοξον ὁδὸν, ἣν οὐδείς οὐδέποτε ἀνθρώπων διέβη. Ὁκνοῦν καὶ ἀνεδύοντο, καὶ ἐδυσχέαινον. Διέβη πρῶτος Μωϋσῆς, καὶ πᾶσι μετ' εὐκολίας ἔδωκεν ἀκολουθῆσαι λοιπόν. Τοῦτό ἐστιν· Εἰς τὸν Μωϋσῆν ἐβαπτίσαντο· ἐκείνῳ πιστεύσαντες, οὕτως ἐθάρρυσαν ἐπιβῆναι τῶν ὑδάτων, ἡγεμόνα τῆς ὁδοιπορίας λαβόντες. Τοῦτο καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ γέγονεν· ἐξαγαγὼν γὰρ ἡμᾶς τῆς πλάνης, καὶ τῆς εἰδωλολατρείας ἀπαλλάξας, καὶ πρὸς τὴν βασιλείαν χειραγωγῶν, αὐτὸς πρῶτος ταύτης ἡμῖν ἤρξε τῆς ὁδοῦ, πρῶτος εἰς τοὺς οὐρανούς ἀναβάς. Ὡςπερ οὖν ἐκεῖνοι Μωϋσῇ θαρρήσαντες κατετόλμησαν τῆς ὁδοιπορίας, οὕτως ἡμεῖς Χριστῷ θαρρήσαντες κατατολμῶμεν τῆς ἀποδημίας ταύτης. Καὶ ὅτι τοῦτό ἐστι τό· Εἰς Μωϋσῆν ἐβαπτίσαντο, δηλὸν ἐκ τῆς ἱστορίας. Οὐ γὰρ εἰς τὸ ὄνομα Μωϋσέως ἐβαπτίσαντο. Εἰ δὲ ἡμεῖς οὐ μόνον ἀρχηγὸν τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἔχομεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰς τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ βαπτιζόμεθα, ἐκείνων μὴ βαπτισθέντων εἰς τὸ ὄνομα Μωϋσέως, μηδὲ ἐνταῦθα ταράττου· εἶπον γὰρ, ὅτι δεῖ τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἔχειν τινὰ ὑπεροχὴν πολλὴν καὶ ἄφατον.

Εἶδες ἐπὶ τοῦ βαπτίσματος τίς μὲν ὁ τύπος, τίς δὲ ἡ ἀλήθεια; Φέρε, σοὶ δεῖξω καὶ τὴν τράπεζαν καὶ τὴν τῶν μυστηρίων κοινωνίαν ἐκεῖ σκιαγραφουμένην, ἂν μὴ τὸ πᾶν ἀπαιτῇς με πάλιν, ἀλλ' οὕτως ἐξετάσῃς τὰ γενόμενα, ὥς εἰκὸς ἐν σκιαγραφίᾳ καὶ τύποις ἰδεῖν. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ εἶπε περὶ τῆς θαλάσσης καὶ τῆς νεφέλης καὶ τοῦ Μωϋσέως, ἐπήγαγε πάλιν· Καὶ πάντες τὸ αὐτὸ βρῶμα πνευματικὸν ἔφαγον. Ὡςπερ σὺ, φησὶν, ἀπὸ τῆς κολυμβήθρας τῶν ὑδάτων ἀναβαίνων, ἐπὶ τὴν τράπεζαν τρέχεις, οὕτω κακεῖνοι ἀπὸ τῆς θαλάττης ἀναβάντες, ἐπὶ τράπεζαν [249] ἦλθον καινὴν καὶ παράδοξον, τὸ μάννα λέγω. Καὶ πάλιν ὥςπερ σὺ παράδοξον ἔχεις πότον, τὸ αἷμα τὸ σωτήριον, οὕτω κακεῖνοι παράδοξον ἔσχον τοῦ πόματος τὴν φύσιν, οὐ πηγὰς εὐρόντες, οὐδὲ ποταμούς ρέοντας, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ πέτρας σκληρᾶς καὶ ἀνύδρου πολλὴν δεξάμενοι ναμάτων δαψίλειαν.

86. Accepting the reading of PG here, as taken from PE (one of many indications JPM relied on the 1837 and not the 1721 edition of Mf). PE had adopted the reading ἀσαφές instead of σαφές (as read by HS ME Mf) after the editors followed up on a marginal conjecture by HS and found it confirmed in Paris. gr. 748. John introduces this as a “problem”—the text is not clear on first reading (what, after all, does it mean to be “baptized into Moses”?)—that his homily promises to solve by bringing needed clarity.

87. John has switched from the more generic term ὁδοιπορία to ἀποδημία. The latter, with the sense of journeying away from home, is also used euphemistically of death (PGL 2), here in reference both to death in baptism and to the death and resurrection to which it points (cf. Rom 6:3–11; cf. 2 Cor 5:8–9).

88. ἱστορία once more.

What does “*they all were baptized into Moses*” (1 Cor 10:2) mean? Perhaps this statement is unclear?⁸⁶ So then, I shall try to make it clearer. At that time the sea was spread out before their eyes, and they were commanded to cross it on a strange and extraordinary path that no person had ever before crossed. Moses crossed first, and then he allowed all of them to follow with ease. That’s what “*they were baptized into Moses*” means. Because they believed in him they were so confident as to go into the water, taking him as their leader on the journey. This is also what happened in the case of Christ. After leading us away from error, freeing us from idolatry, and conveying us to the kingdom, Christ was himself the first to embark on this path for us, the first to have gone up to heaven (cf. John 3:13; 6:62; 20:17). And just as they dared to undertake the journey because of their confidence in Moses, we, too, dare to undertake this journey of departure⁸⁷ because of our confidence in Christ. The scriptural text⁸⁸ itself makes clear⁸⁹ that this is what “*they were baptized into Moses*” (1 Cor 10:2)⁹⁰ means. For they weren’t baptized into the name of Moses (cf. 1 Cor 1:13–15). Don’t let it trouble you that we not only have Jesus as our leader but are even baptized into his name, while they weren’t baptized into the name of Moses, for I already said that the truth must have a significant and indescribable superiority.

Have you seen what is “prefiguration” and what is “truth” when it comes to baptism? Come then, I shall show you that both the meal⁹¹ and the communion of the sacramental mysteries are sketched out in this passage, too, as long as you don’t ask me again for the whole picture. But you should investigate the past events in such a way that you can gain plausible insight via sketch and prefiguration. After Paul spoke about the sea and the cloud and Moses, he added again, “*And all ate the same spiritual food*” (1 Cor 10:3). “Just as you,” Paul says, “come up from the font of waters and run to the table, so also they, after rising up from the sea, [249] came to a new and marvelous meal—I mean, the manna (cf. Exod 16; Num 11:4–9). And again, just as you have a drink that is marvelous—the blood of the Savior—so also they had a drink that by nature was marvelous. They didn’t find fountains or flowing rivers, but they received cascading streams from

89. Having solved the “problem” of an unclear text, John pronounces it clear in and of itself.

90. Minus τὸν before Μωϋσῆν.

91. τράπεζα refers both to the table and to the meal served upon it (cf. 1 Cor 10:21). John is referring to the eucharistic meal.

Διὰ τοῦτο αὐτὸ καὶ πνευματικὸν ἐκάλεσεν, οὐκ ἐπειδὴ τῇ φύσει τοιοῦτον ἦν, ἀλλὰ ἐπειδὴ τῷ τρόπῳ τῆς χορηγίας τοιοῦτον ἐγένετο. Οὐ γὰρ κατὰ φύσεως ἀκολουθίαν αὐτοῖς ἐδίδото, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τοῦ στρατηγοῦντος αὐτῶν Θεοῦ. "Ὅπερ οὖν καὶ αὐτὸ διορθούμενος ἔλεγεν. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ εἶπε· Καὶ πάντες τὸ αὐτὸ πόμα πνευματικὸν ἔπιον, ὕδωρ δὲ ἦν τὸ πινόμενον, βουλόμενος δεῖξαι, ὅτι διὰ τοῦτο Πνευματικὸν εἶπεν, οὐ διὰ τὴν φύσιν τοῦ ὕδατος, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν τῆς χορηγίας τρόπον, ἐπήγαγεν. Ἐπινον γὰρ ἐκ τῆς πνευματικῆς ἀκολουθούσης πέτρας· ἡ δὲ πέτρα ἦν ὁ Χριστός. Οὐχὶ ἡ φύσις τοῦ λίθου, φησὶν, ἀλλ' ἡ δύναμις τοῦ ἐνεργοῦντος Θεοῦ τὰς πηγὰς ἐκεῖνας ἠφεί.

ε'. Ἐνταῦθα καὶ τὴν Παύλου τοῦ Σαμοσατέως αἵρεσιν ἀνέσπασε πρόρριζον. Εἰ γὰρ ὁ Χριστὸς ἦν ὁ πάντα ἐνεργῶν ἐκεῖνα, πῶς αὐτὸν ἐκ τότε εἶναι λέγουσιν, ἐξ οὗ Μαρία αὐτὸν ἔτεκεν; Ὅταν γὰρ πρὸ μὲν τῆς Μαρίας τὰ κατὰ τὴν ἔρημον φαίνεται συμβάντα, ἐκεῖνα δὲ πάντα ὁ Χριστὸς ἦν πεποικηκώς κατὰ τὴν τοῦ Παύλου φωνήν, ἀνάγκη καὶ πρὸ τοῦ τόκου τούτου, καὶ πρὸ τῶν ὠδίνων αὐτὸν εἶναι τούτων· οὐ γὰρ δήπου ὁ μὴ ὢν ἐνεργεῖν ἔμελλεν οὕτω θαυμαστὰ καὶ παράδοξα πράγματα.

"Ὡσπερ δὲ εἰπὼν, ὅτι πάντες διὰ τῆς θαλάσσης διήλθον, τὴν εὐγένειαν τῆς Ἐκκλησίας ἐδήλωσεν ἄνωθεν προδιατυπουμένην· οὕτως εἰπὼν, Τὸ αὐτὸ βρῶμα πνευματικὸν ἔφαγον, τὸ αὐτὸ τοῦτο πάλιν ἠνίξατο. Καθάπερ γὰρ ἐν τῇ Ἐκκλησίᾳ οὐχ ἑτέρου μὲν σώματος ὁ πλούσιος, ἑτέρου δὲ ὁ πένης, οὐδὲ ἑτέρου μὲν οὗτος αἷματος, ἑτέρου δὲ ἐκεῖνος· οὕτω καὶ τότε, οὐχ ἕτερον μὲν ὁ πλούσιος ἐλάμβανε μάννα, ἕτερον δὲ ὁ πένης· οὐδὲ ἑτέρας μὲν ἐκεῖνος μετέσχε πηγῆς, ἑτέρας δὲ οὗτος καταδεεστέρας· ἀλλὰ ὥσπερ νῦν ἡ αὐτὴ τράπεζα, τὸ αὐτὸ ποτήριον, ἡ αὐτὴ τροφή ἅπασι πρόκειται τοῖς ἐνταῦθα εἰσιούσιν· οὕτω

92. The quotation marks signal Chrysostom's personification of Paul explaining his own meaning of what he wrote to the Corinthians.

93. Here John contests that these were, in fact, normal or "natural" events (with the term φύσις occurring three times in rapid succession). Despite the discussion above about *ἱστορία* and what people will more readily believe, John here wishes to insist on the divine intervention involved in such "unnatural" occurrences.

94. I.e., God specifically commanded Moses about the collection and eating of the manna and about the striking of the rock. The title "commander" also for John refers to God's role throughout the exodus events as leading Israel to safety.

95. Paul is presented as having offered "anticipatory correction" (διορθούμενος), here, against a naturalist or rationalist explanation of the miracles, and, in the following argument, against the Christology of Paul of Samosata, which denied Christ's preexistence. Paul was a figure of importance at Antioch, as bishop ca. 260–268, and then condemned at its synods in 264 and 268 and deposed. (For more on Paul of Samosata, see Patricio de Navascués, "Paul of Samosata," *Encyclopedia of Ancient Christianity* 3:111–12, with further bibliography and history of research.) John has in view here also Paul's followers,

a rock that was hard and dry as dust” (Num 20:7–13).⁹² The reason Paul called it “*spiritual*” wasn’t that it was such by nature, but it became so by the manner of its provision. It wasn’t by a natural process that it was given,⁹³ but by the activity of God, who was their commander.⁹⁴ And Paul put it this way as a corrective.⁹⁵ He said, “*And all drank the same spiritual drink*” (1 Cor 10:4), even as what they drank was water, because he wished to show that the reason he called it “*spiritual*” wasn’t the nature of the water but the manner of its provision. And once he’d said that, he added, “*For they drank from the spiritual rock that was following them; and the rock was Christ*” (1 Cor 10:4).⁹⁶ “It was not the nature of the rock,” Paul says, “but the power of God at work that released those fountains.”

5. Here he also pulls up by the roots the heresy of Paul of Samosata. For if Christ were the one acting in all these events, then how do they say that he came into existence at the time when Mary gave birth to him? When the events in the desert clearly took place before Mary, and Christ was the one who had done them all, according to Paul’s statement, then it must be that Christ existed before that birth and those birth pangs. Someone not alive would hardly be likely to enact such marvelous and extraordinary things!

When he had said that “*all passed through the sea*” (1 Cor 10:1), Paul showed that the true nobility⁹⁷ of the church was prefigured beforehand as in a sketch. After saying, “*They ate the same spiritual food*” (1 Cor 10:3), he again signals this very thing figuratively. In the church now, the rich don’t partake of one body and the poor of another, nor the rich of one blood and the poor of another (cf. 1 Cor 10:16–22; 11:17–34).⁹⁸ In the very same way back then, neither did the rich receive one kind of manna and the poor another (cf. Exod 16; Num 11:4–9), nor the rich share one font of water and the poor another, inferior one (cf. Num 20:7–13). Nowadays the same table, the same drink, the same food are set before all those who come here.

called “Samosatians” or “Paulianists.” It is perhaps a sharp irony that he takes on their views here in this argumentative context, given that the twelfth canon of Nicaea (325 CE) required them to be *rebaptized* to rejoin the “orthodox” church.

96. Plus τῆς before πνευματικῆς, but not found in the citation of the lemma earlier in the homily in §1 (PG 51:243).

97. εὐγένεια; as the argument shows, John has in mind 1 Cor 1:26, οὐ πολλοὶ εὐγενεῖς.

98. Of course, John is reading against the text here, as Paul derides some Corinthians for just this problem of rich versus poor. Furthermore, one can hardly accept John’s harmonious picture of his own context as accurate social description (yet it is an ideal he is expressing in their midst as a public act of its own).

καὶ τότε τὸ αὐτὸ μάννα, ἢ αὐτὴ πηγὴ ἅπασι προὔκειται. Καὶ τὸ δὴ θαυμαστὸν καὶ παράδοξον, ἐπεχείρησάν ποτέ τινες κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν ἐκεῖνον πλεόν συλλέξαι τοῦ δέοντος, καὶ οὐδὲν ἀπώναντο τῆς πλεονεξίας. Ἀλλ' ἕως μὲν τὴν ἰσότητά ἐτίμων, ἔμενε τὸ μάννα μάννα ὄν· ἐπειδὴ δὲ πλεονεκτεῖν ἐπεθύμησαν, ἢ πλεονεξία τὸ μάννα σκώληκα ἐποίησε· καίτοι γε οὐ μετὰ τῆς τῶν ἄλλων ζημίας τοῦτο ἐποιοῦν· οὐ γὰρ δὴ ἐκ τῆς τοῦ πλησίον ἀρπάζοντες τροφῆς, οὕτως αὐτοὶ πλεόν συνέλεγον, ἀλλ' ὅμως ἐπειδὴ τοῦ πλείονος ἐπεθύμησαν, κατεγνώσθησαν. Εἰ γὰρ καὶ μηδὲν τὸν πλησίον ἡδίκουν, ἀλλ' ἑαυτοὺς τὰ μέγιστα κατέβλαπτον, πρὸς πλεονεξίαν τῷ τρόπῳ τῆς συλλογῆς ταύτης συνεπιζόμενοι. Ὡστε ὁμοῦ τὸ αὐτὸ καὶ τροφὴ ἦν καὶ θεογνωσίας διδασκαλία· ὁμοῦ καὶ τὰ σώματα ἔτρεφε, καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ἐπαίδευεν· οὐκ ἔτρεφε δὲ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ πόνων ἀπήλλαττεν. Οὐ γὰρ ἔδει ζεῦξαι βοῦς, οὔτε ἄροτρον ἐλκύσαι, οὐδὲ ἀνατεμεῖν αὐλακας, οὐδὲ ἐνιαυτὸν ἀναμεῖναι, ἀλλ' ἐσχεδιασμένην εἶχον τὴν τράπεζαν, πρόσφατον καὶ νεαρὰν καὶ ἐφήμερον· καὶ τὸ εὐαγγελικὸν ἐκεῖνο παράγγελμα διὰ τῶν ἔργων αὐτοὺς ἐπαίδευε, τὸ μὴ μεριμνᾶν εἰς τὴν αὔριον· οὐδὲ γὰρ ὄφελος ἀπὸ τῆς μερίμνης ταύτης ἐγένετο. Εἰ γάρ τις πλεόν συνέλεξε, διεφθείρετο καὶ ἀπώλλυτο, καὶ πλεονεξίας ἔλεγχος τὸ γινόμενον μόνον ἦν. Εἶτα ἵνα μὴ κατὰ φύσεως ἀκολουθίαν εἶναι νομίζωσιν ἐκεῖνοι τὸν ὄμβρον, ἐν ἡμέρᾳ σαββάτου οὐδὲν τοιοῦτον [250] ἐγίνετο, τοῦ Θεοῦ ταῦτα ἀμφοτέρω αὐτοὺς διδάσκοντος, ὅτι ἐν ταῖς προτέραις ἡμέραις αὐτὸς ἐνήργει τὸν θαυμαστὸν τοῦτον καὶ παράδοξον ὑετὸν, καὶ ὅτι κατὰ τὴν ἡμέραν ἐκεῖνην διὰ τοῦτο ἐπέιχεν, ἵνα καὶ ἄκοντες παιδεύωνται τοῦ σαββάτου τὴν ἡμέραν ἀργεῖν. Οὐκ ἐπὶ τῆς τροφῆς δὲ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἐνδυμάτων, καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ὑποδημάτων, καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀπάντων, δι' αὐτῶν τῶν ἔργων ἦν ἰδεῖν τὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων παραγγέλματα ἐκτελούμενα. Οὐδὲ γὰρ οἰκίαν εἶχον, οὐ τράπεζαν, οὐ κλίνην, οὐχ ἱμάτιον δεύτερον, οὐχ ὑποδήματα, τοῦ Θεοῦ οὕτως οἰκονομήσαντος. Ὅρα πόση τῆς Παλαιᾶς πρὸς τὴν Καινὴν συγγένεια. Ὡσπερ γὰρ τοὺς ἀποστόλους ἐσχημάτιζεν ὁ Χριστὸς ὕστερον τῶν ἀναγκαίων ἔνεκεν,

99. See especially Exod 16:18: οὐκ ἐπλεόνασεν ὁ τὸ πολὺ, καὶ ὁ τὸ ἔλαττον οὐκ ἡλαττόνησεν (quoted also by Paul in 2 Cor 8:15).

100. John presumes the reason for gathering more for the next day is πλεονεξία, greed. In Exod 16 LXX the Israelites are ordered by Moses not to leave any manna until the morning, and when they disobediently do, it turns to worms (Exod 16:20 LXX). But when they are given a double portion the day before the Sabbath, that does not turn to worms when held over (Exod 16:24 LXX); still, some are chided by Moses when they nonetheless go out on the Sabbath to look for manna (Exod 16:27–29 LXX). John's sermons often find their way to excoriations of greed.

101. Cf. *Hom. 1 Tim. 5:9* §13 (PG 51:334).

In the very same way back then, the same manna and the same font were set before all. Further, what is all the more marvelous and extraordinary, at that time, when some attempted to gather more than they should (cf. Exod 16:18–20, 27), they enjoyed no benefit from their greed. As long as they honored equality,⁹⁹ the manna remained the manna that it was. But when they had the desire to become greedy, their greed turned the manna into worms. But their doing this wasn't accompanied by loss for the others. This was because, although they snatched away their neighbor's food, the neighbors were gathering more.¹⁰⁰ But nevertheless, when the greedy desired more they were condemned. Even if they did no harm to their neighbors, they were inflicting the greatest harm on themselves by becoming habitually greedy in their mode of food-gathering. Consequently, the event was at one and the same time both nourishment and instruction in the knowledge of God; at one and the same time, it was nourishing their bodies, and it was teaching their souls. He wasn't only feeding them, but also rescuing them from suffering. It wasn't necessary to yoke oxen or pull the plow, nor to cut furrows or wait a whole year, but they had a meal at their fingertips, fresh, ready to eat, and good for one day.¹⁰¹ Through these actions, God was instructing them of that command of the gospel: "*not to be worried about tomorrow*" (Matt 6:34).¹⁰² For there was no gain to be had from this worry. If someone gathered more, it decomposed and was ruined, and that occurrence alone was a reproof of their greed. Then, lest they suppose the shower of food¹⁰³ was due to the course of nature, no such thing took place on the day of the Sabbath. [250] In this way, God was teaching them both of these things: that on the earlier days of the week, he himself was the one bringing about this marvelous and extraordinary "rain," and that on the seventh day, he held back so they might unwittingly learn to do no work on the day of the Sabbath (cf. Exod 16:25–30). And not only in the case of food, but also that of clothing and sandals and everything else, one can see through these very acts the commands that were given to the apostles being fulfilled (cf. Matt 6:25–34; 10:9–15). For they had no house, no dining table, no bed, no extra tunic, no sandals; and God was ordering things in just this way. Look at the very close kinship the Old Testament has with the New. Just as Christ later would configure his apostles to be concerned only with

102. With *μεριμνᾶν* for *μεριμνήσῃτε* (to render the verse in indirect discourse).

103. *ῥμβρος*, usually of rain, but John is playing on Exod 16:4, where God says to Moses, Ἴδού ἐγὼ ὡς ἄρτους ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. See also the following, where he refers to it as *ὕετός*.

οὕτω πως κακείνοις ὁ τῆς πολιτείας ἐρρυθμίζετο τρόπος, καὶ ἡ κτίσις ἅπασα πρὸς τὴν ὑπηρεσίαν ἐκείνων παρεσκευάζετο. Καὶ τίνος ἕνεκεν ταῦτα ἐγένετο, φησί; Ἐμελλεν αὐτοὺς εἰς ἓνα συγκλείειν τῆς οἰκουμένης τόπον, καὶ κελεύειν ἐκεῖ διηνεκῶς αὐτὸν θεραπεύειν, καὶ μήτε ναὸν, μήτε βωμὸν ἀλλαχοῦ που τῆς οἰκουμένης ἰδρῦσθαι, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀναθήματα καὶ θυσίας ἐκεῖ φέρειν, καὶ ἑορτὰς ἐπιτελεῖν, καὶ τὸν νόμον ἀναγινώσκειν, καὶ πάντα τὰ ἄλλα τὰ τῆς ἀγιαστίας ἐκπληροῦν ἐκείνης. Ἰν' οὖν μὴ τῷ διωρισμένῳ τῆς θεραπείας τρόπῳ καὶ τὴν πρόνοιαν αὐτοῦ συγκεκλείσθαι ἐκεῖ νομίζωσι, καὶ μερικὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι Θεὸν, προλαβὼν τὴν αὐτοῦ δύναμιν ἐπὶ τῆς ἀλλοτρίας ἐπέδειξεν, ἐπὶ τῆς Αἰγύπτου, ἐπὶ τῆς ἐρήμου, ἔνθα οὐδεὶς ἦν ὁ θεραπεύων, ἔνθα οὐδεὶς ἦν ὁ προσκυνῶν· καὶ πρὸς τὰ ἐναντία ἡ κτίσις ὑπηρετεῖτο, δι' ὧν ἐποίει, τὴν ἐξ ἀρχῆς αὐτοῦ δημιουργίαν καὶ τοὺς ἀγνωμονοῦντας αὐτῷ λογίζεσθαι πείθουσα. Καὶ γὰρ ἡ θάλασσα τοὺς μὲν ἀπέπνιγε, τοὺς δὲ διέσωζε· καὶ ὁ ἀὴρ νῦν μὲν κατέφερε χάλαζαν, καὶ τοὺς βαρβάρους ἀπώλλυ, νῦν δὲ κατέφερε μάννα, καὶ τοὺς Ἰουδαίους διέτρεφε. Πάλιν ἡ γῆ νῦν μὲν σκνῖπας ἐπὶ κολάσει τῶν πολεμίων, νῦν δὲ ὀρτυγομήτραν ἐπὶ σωτηρίᾳ τῶν οἰκείων ἐξέφερε. Κακείνοις μὲν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ σκότος, τούτοις δὲ ἐν νυκτὶ φῶς ἐγίνετο. Καὶ Αἰγύπτιοι μὲν τὸν Νεῖλον ἔχοντες παραρρέοντα, δίψει καὶ αὐχμῷ διεφθείροντο· οὗτοι δὲ ἐν ἐρήμῳ ξηρᾷ καὶ αὐχμῷ στρατοπεδεύοντες, πολλῆς ἀπέλαυνον ὑδάτων δαψιλείας· καὶ τοὺς μὲν βάτραχοι κατηγωνίζοντο, τούτους δὲ οὐδὲ οἱ γίγαντες ἐκεῖ χειρῶσασθαι ἴσχυον.

ς'. Ἀλλὰ τίνος ἕνεκεν τούτων ὑμᾶς ἀνέμνησεν ὁ μακάριος Παῦλος; Διὰ τὴν αἰτίαν, ἣν ἐξ ἀρχῆς εἶπον ὑμῖν, ἵνα μάθης ὅτι οὔτε βάπτισμα, οὔτε ἁμαρτημάτων ἄφεσις, οὐ γνώσις, οὐ μυστηρίων κοινωνία, οὐ τράπεζα ἱερὰ, οὐχ ἡ ἀπόλαυσις τοῦ σώματος, οὐχ ἡ κοινωνία τοῦ αἵματος, οὐκ ἄλλο τούτων οὐδὲν ἡμᾶς ὠφελῆσαι δυνήσεται, ἐὰν μὴ βίον ὀρθόν, καὶ θαυμαστὸν, καὶ πάσης ἁμαρτίας ἀπηλλαγμένον ἔχωμεν. Ὅτι γὰρ διὰ τοῦτο τούτων ἀνέμνησε,

104. Sc. the wilderness generation. Mf notes that the manuscripts are split between κακείνοις ... ἐρρυθμίζετο (as is his adopted reading, and was followed by the Latin translation, "*sic et illis vitae modus adaptatus est*") and κακείνους ... ἐρρυθμίζε ("this mode of life was training them, also").

105. John is likely inspired here and further below by Wis 19:6–7, which hymns the role of nature in helping the children of Israel during the exodus: ὅλη γὰρ ἡ κτίσις ἐν ἰδίῳ γένει πάλιν ἄνωθεν διευποῦτο ὑπηρετοῦσα ταῖς σαῖς ἐπιταγαῖς. For him this answers the promise implied in Matt 6:25–34 with the examples of nature's provisions.

106. ἀγνωμονοῦντες, translated with PGL.

107. Mf notes that his two manuscripts read ἀπώλλυν for ἀπώλλυ. (Both forms are found for the imperfect.)

108. The coordination of the gnats and the quail is made in Wis 19:10–11.

the bare necessities, this mode of life was suited to them, also,¹⁰⁴ and all creation was prepared to serve them.¹⁰⁵ “Why did these things happen?” someone says. God was going to enclose them in a single part of the world and command them to worship him there perpetually, and not to erect a temple or altar in any other part of the world, but to bring both offerings and sacrifices there, celebrate feasts, read the law, and complete all the other requirements of that cultic service (cf. Deut 12:1–14, etc.). Hence, lest they think that he had confined his providential care for them for the purpose of establishing a territorially defined form of worship and consider him only a local god, he proactively showed his power in a foreign land, in Egypt, in the wilderness, where there was no one who served him, where there was no one who worshipped him. And creation itself served opposing ends through what it did, as it persuaded the natural world God had fashioned from the beginning to bring a reckoning on the ungrateful.¹⁰⁶ Indeed, the sea swallowed some and saved others (cf. Exod 14:15–31). The air brought down hail at one time and destroyed¹⁰⁷ the barbarians (cf. Exod 9:18–26) and at another time it brought down manna and fed the Jews (cf. Exod 16; Num 11:4–9). Yet again, the earth at one time sent forth gnats for the destruction of the enemies (cf. Exod 10:21–22) and at another time quail for the salvation of her own (cf. Exod 16:13; Num 11:31–35).¹⁰⁸ For the former, there was darkness in the daytime, and for the latter, light at night (cf. Exod 10:21–23; 13:21–22). The Egyptians, despite having the flowing Nile, were destroyed by thirst and drought, while those who encamped in the dry and arid desert enjoyed a great abundance of water. The former did battle with frogs (cf. Exod 8:1–11), and the latter even the giants in the land could not subdue (cf. 1 Kgdms 17).¹⁰⁹

6. But why did the blessed Paul remind you of these things?¹¹⁰ For the reason I mentioned to you at the start: so you might learn that neither baptism nor forgiveness of sins nor knowledge nor sharing in the mysteries nor the holy table nor the enjoyment of the eucharistic body nor “*communion in the blood*” (1 Cor 10:16) nor anything beside these will be able to benefit us in the least unless we have a life that is upright, admirable, and free of all sin. For this reason, by recounting the history, he portrayed in

109. On the land of the conquest as filled with giants, see also, e.g., Num 13:33; Deut 1:28; Josh 12:4; 13:12.

110. Once again, John conflates the two audiences, Paul’s Corinthians and his own Antiochene congregants. His mentor in this contemporizing hermeneutic was of course Paul himself, in this very pericope: ταῦτα δὲ πάντα τύποι συνέβαινον ἐκεῖνοις· ἐγγράφη δὲ πρὸς νοουθεσίαν ἡμῶν (1 Cor 10:11).

καταλέξας τὸν τύπον τοῦ βαπτίσματος, τὸν διὰ τῆς θαλάσσης καὶ τῆς νεφέλης, τὸν τύπον τῶν μυστηρίων, τὸν διὰ τοῦ μάννα καὶ τῆς πέτρας προδιέγραψεν ἐν τῇ Παλαιᾷ, καὶ εἰπὼν, ὅτι Πάντες τὸ αὐτὸ βρῶμα πνευματικὸν ἔφαγον, καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ πόμα πνευματικὸν ἔπιον, ἐπήγαγε λέγων· Ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐν τοῖς πλείοσιν αὐτῶν εὐδόκησεν ὁ Θεός. Μετὰ τοσαῦτα καὶ τηλικοῦτα θαύματα, φησὶν, οὐκ ἠγάπησεν αὐτοὺς ὁ Θεός. Ἀλλὰ τί; Κατεστρώθησαν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ. Τίνος οὖν ἕνεκα ταῦτα λέγεις ἡμῖν, ὦ Παῦλε; Ταῦτα δὲ τύπος ἡμῖν ἐγενήθησαν εἰς τὸ μὴ γενέσθαι ἡμᾶς ἐπιθυμητὰς κακῶν, καθὼς κακεῖνοι ἐπεθύμησαν, μηδὲ εἰδῶ-[251]λολάτρας γίνεσθαι, καθὼς τινες αὐτῶν, ὥσπερ γέγραπται· Ἐκάθισεν ὁ λαὸς φαγεῖν καὶ πιεῖν, καὶ ἀνέστησαν παίζειν. Ὅρα τοῦ Παύλου τὴν σύνεσιν. Εἶπε τὴν ἁμαρτίαν, εἶπε τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς ἁμαρτίας, εἶπε τὴν κόλασιν τὴν ἐπὶ τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, διὰ πάντων ἡμᾶς παιδεύων φεύγειν τὴν ἐκεῖνων μίμησιν. Αἰτία τῆς ἁμαρτίας ἡ ἀδηφαγία· Ἐκάθισε γὰρ ὁ λαὸς φαγεῖν καὶ πιεῖν. Ἡ ἁμαρτία, αὐτὸ τὸ παίζειν. Εἶτα ἡ τιμωρία, ὅτι Κατεστρώθησαν ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ. Πάλιν, Μηδὲ πορνεύωμεν, καθὼς τινες αὐτῶν ἐπόρνευσαν. Ἐνταῦθα τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς πορνείας οὐκ ἔθηκεν, ἀλλὰ τὴν τιμωρίαν. Ποίαν δὲ ταύτην; Ἔπεσον ἐν μιᾷ ἡμέρᾳ εἰκοσιτρεῖς χιλιάδες. Τίνος δὲ ἕνεκα τὴν πρόφασιν οὐκ εἶπεν, ἀφ' ἧς ἡ πορνεία γέγονε; Τοῖς φιλοπόνοις διδοὺς ἐπὶ τὴν ἱστορίαν ἐλθεῖν, καὶ μαθεῖν τοῦ κακοῦ τὴν ρίζαν. Οὗτος γὰρ ἰατρείας τρόπος, τὸ λέγειν ἐξ ὧν τίκεται τὰ νοσήματα, καὶ φάρμακα ἐπιτιθέναι τοῖς τραύμασι. Διὰ τοῦτο φησι· Ταῦτα δὲ πάντα τύποι συνέβαινον ἐκείνοις, ἐγράφη δὲ πρὸς νοουθεσίαν ἡμῶν. Ὡστε ὁ ποιήσας ἐκεῖνα, καὶ κολάσας τοὺς ἀγνωμονήσαντας, οὗτος ἡμᾶς νοουθετεῖ νῦν, οὐ διὰ ῥημάτων μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ δι' αὐτῶν τῶν πραγμάτων, ὅπερ μέγιστός ἐστι νοουθεσίας τρόπος. Εἶδες πῶς τοῖς ἐν τῇ χάριτι τὸν ἐν τῇ Παλαιᾷ ταῦτα ποιήσαντα διδάσκαλον ἐπέστησε, δεικνὺς ὅτι εἰς ἐστι καὶ ὁ αὐτός, ὁ καὶ ἐκεῖνα ποιήσας, καὶ ταῦτα δι' αὐτοῦ φθεγγόμενος; Εἰ γὰρ ἄλλότριος ἦν, οὐκ ἐκεῖνα τούτων τύπους ἐκάλεσεν, οὐκ ἂν εἰς νοουθεσίαν ἡμῶν

111. Ironically, given his emphasis on it in §3 above, John has here dropped πάντες before τὸ αὐτὸ πόμα.

112. Minus γάρ after κατεστρώθησαν (to embed the quotation in this context).

113. With τύπος for τύποι (1 Cor 10:6); ἡμῖν for ἡμῶν (1 Cor 10:6); γενέσθαι for εἶναι after εἰς τὸ μὴ (1 Cor 10:6); γίνεσθαι for γίνεσθε (1 Cor 10:7).

114. Again, John chooses one of his pet sin complaints, gluttony. In the context of the Exodus narrative, of course, the sin was the idolatry with the golden calf.

115. John is not strictly following the order of the text here in going through his topics of sin, cause, and punishment.

116. Minus γάρ after κατεστρώθησαν, again (to embed the quotation in this context).

the Old Testament the advance prefiguration of baptism via the sea and the cloud, and the prefiguration of the sacramental mysteries via the manna and the rock when he said, “*all ate the same spiritual food, and drank the same spiritual drink*” (1 Cor 10:3–4).¹¹¹ And then he added, “*But God was not pleased with the majority of them*” (1 Cor 10:5). “After so many impressive marvels,” Paul says, “God didn’t love them.” But what instead? “*They were strewn in the wilderness*” (1 Cor 10:5).¹¹² “Why are you saying this to us, Paul?” “*Now these things were a prefiguration for us, in order that we might not become desirous of wicked things just as they desired them, nor become [251] idolaters like some of them, as it is written: ‘the people sat down to eat and drink and rose up to play’*” (Exod 32:6; 1 Cor 10:6–7).¹¹³ Look at Paul’s intelligence! He told of the sin, he told of the cause of the sin, he told of the punishment for the sin, throughout instructing us to flee from imitating their example. The cause of the sin was gluttony,¹¹⁴ for “*the people sat down to eat and drink*” (1 Cor 10:7; Exod 32:6). The sin was the very act of “playing.” Then¹¹⁵ the chastisement was: “*they were strewn in the wilderness*” (1 Cor 10:5).¹¹⁶ And again, “*Let us not engage in sexual misconduct as some of them engaged in sexual misconduct*” (1 Cor 10:8). Here he didn’t set out the cause of the sexual misconduct, but the punishment. What was that? “*Twenty-three thousand fell in a single day*” (1 Cor 10:8; cf. Num 25:1–9; 26:62). Why didn’t he describe the occasion from which the sexual misconduct arose? He was allowing those who were more industrious to enter into the story and learn the root of the evil deed.¹¹⁷ For this is a form of healing: to tell where sicknesses are generated from and apply medicines to the wounds. That’s why he says, “*All these things happened to them as prefigurations, but they were written down for our admonition*” (1 Cor 10:11).¹¹⁸ Hence, the one¹¹⁹ who did those things and punished the people who were ungrateful is the very one who now admonishes us—not from words alone but from the very events as well, which is the greatest form of admonition. Have you seen how he introduced the one who did these things in the Old Testament as the teacher for the people formed in grace, thus demonstrating that it is one and the same God who did the former things and who says the latter ones via Paul? For if it were another

117. Where the text is not explicit, Chrysostom argues, it draws the reader in to find deeper answers.

118. Mf obliquely noted that some “other witnesses” read πάντα τύποι συνέβαινον, while still others lack τύποι.

119. I.e., God.

αὐτὰ γεγράφθαι εἶπεν, οὐκ ἂν διδάσκαλον ἡμῖν ἐπέστησεν, ὃν οὐκ ἐνόμιζεν εἶναι Θεόν, οὐκ ἂν ἀπὸ τῶν ὑπ' ἐκείνου γενομένων τότε ἡμᾶς ἐφόβησεν, ὡς εἰς τὰς ἐκείνου πάλιν μέλλοντας ἐμπίπτειν χεῖρας. Νῦν δὲ δεικνύς, ὅτι εἰς τὰς ἐκείνου μέλλομεν ἐμπίπτειν πάλιν χεῖρας, καὶ ἐκάτε-[252]ρος ὁ λαὸς, καὶ ἐκεῖνος καὶ οὗτος, τοῖς ἐκείνου διοικοῦνται νόμοις, ἀνέμνησε πάντων ἐκείνων, καὶ εἶπεν, ὅτι *Πρὸς νουθεσίαν ἡμῶν ἐγράφη*. Ταῦτα οὖν εἰδότες, τοῖς τε παρελθοῦσι, τοῖς τε μέλλουσι πιστεύωμεν. Ἄν δέ τινες ὥσιν οἱ τοῖς μέλλουσιν οὐ πιστεύοντες, ἀπὸ τῶν παρελθόντων αὐτοὺς ἐνάγωμεν εἰς τὴν τῆς ἀρετῆς ἐπιμέλειαν τὰ κατὰ τοὺς Σοδομίτας διηγούμενοι, τὰ κατὰ τὸν κατακλυσμὸν λέγοντες, τὰ κατὰ τὴν Αἴγυπτον ἀναμιμνήσκοντες, ἵνα ταῖς ἐτέρων σωφρονισθέντες κολάσεσι, καὶ βίον ἄριστον ἐπιδειξάμενοι, καὶ τὸν περὶ τῆς γέννησης καὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως δέξωνται λόγον. Ἐπεὶ καὶ νῦν ὅσοι τῇ κρίσει διαπιστοῦσιν, οὐδαμὸθεν ἐτέρωθεν, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ βίου διεφθαρμένου καὶ πονηροῦ συνειδότος τοῦτο πάσχουσιν. Ὡστε ἐὰν ἐκκαθάρωμεν ἑαυτῶν τὰς ἀμαρτίας, καὶ τῷ φόβῳ τῶν παρελθόντων παιδεύσωμεν, καὶ περὶ τῶν μελλόντων πείσομεν δέξασθαι λόγον. Ὡσπερ γὰρ δόγματα πονηρὰ βίον ἀκάθαρτον εἰσάγειν εἶωθεν, οὕτω καὶ διεφθαρμένος βίος πονηρίαν δογμάτων πολλάκις ἔτεκεν. Ὅπερ ἵνα μὴ γένηται, καὶ ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς, καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ταῦτα κατεπάδοντες τὰ ῥήματα, τὴν τε ὀρθὴν πίστιν διαμένωμεν ἔχοντες, καὶ πολιτείαν ἀρίστην ἐπιδειξώμεθα, ἐπειδὴ πανταχόθεν ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος ἀπέδειξεν, ὅτι ταύτης χωρὶς οὐδὲν ὄφελος ἡμῖν ὀρθῶν δογμάτων. Γένοιτο δὲ εὐχαῖς τῶν ἁγίων, καὶ τῶν προέδρων ἀπάντων, τὴν τε ὀρθότητα τῶν δογμάτων, ἣν ἄνωθεν καὶ ἐκ προγόνων παρελάβομεν, ἀκέραιον διατηρῆσαι, καὶ βίον αὐτῇ συμβαίνοντα προσθεῖναι, ἵνα τῶν ἐπηγγελμένων ἀγαθῶν ἐπιτύχωμεν, χάριτι καὶ φιλανθρωπία τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, μεθ' οὗ τῷ Πατρὶ, ἅμα τῷ ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι, δόξα, κράτος, τιμὴ, νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ, καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Ἀμήν.

120. Minus δέ; transposition of *ἐγράφη* and *πρὸς νουθεσίαν ἡμῶν*.

121. A return to the theme introduced early in the homily, in §2 (PG 51:244).

122. Mf notes that some manuscripts read *τῶν κατὰ τὴν Αἴγυπτον* for *τὰ κατὰ τὴν Αἴγυπτον*, rendering the phrase the object of *ἀναμιμνήσκοντες* rather than *διηγούμενοι* (hence, “reminding them of the things that happened in Egypt, so that”).

123. As so common in early Christian heresiology (from Paul forward), false teaching and bad morals are presented as inseparably linked.

God, Paul wouldn't have called the things that happened to them "prefigurations," wouldn't have said they were written down for our admonition, wouldn't have introduced him as a teacher for us, wouldn't have considered him to be God, and wouldn't have instilled fear in us by the things that were done by him then on the grounds that we're going to fall into his hands again. Now, in showing that we're going to fall into his hands again and that each [252] of the two peoples—both the former and the latter—are administered by the laws of that God, Paul made mention of all those events and said, "*They were written down for our admonition*" (1 Cor 10:11).¹²⁰ Therefore, knowing these things, let's believe in both the past events and those to come. And if there are some people who don't believe in the future events,¹²¹ let's induce them to care for virtue by appealing to past events, recounting the story of the men of Sodom, telling the story of the flood, the things that happened in Egypt, issuing those reminders¹²² so that, once they've been chastened by the punishments endured by others and been shown a life of virtue, they might accept the teaching about hell and the resurrection. After all, even now there are people who refuse to believe in the judgment, but they suffer this fate from no other cause than a corrupt life and a wicked conscience. Consequently, if we cleanse ourselves of sin and are chastened by fear of past events, then we shall be persuaded to accept the teaching about what is to come in the future. For just as wicked teachings customarily introduce an impure way of life, so in turn a corrupted way of life often generates wicked teaching.¹²³ To prevent this from happening, continually singing these soothing words to ourselves and to others,¹²⁴ let's remain in the correct faith, and let's display a virtuous manner of life. After all, our homily has shown from every angle that apart from this faith we have no benefit from correct teachings.¹²⁵ And may we by the prayers of the saints and all the leaders keep undefiled the correct teaching that we received from time past and from our ancestors and add to it a life consistent with that teaching, so we might attain the good things that have been promised, by the grace and loving-kindness of our Lord Jesus Christ, with whom be glory, power, and honor to the Father, together with the Holy Spirit, now and always, forever and ever. Amen.

124. The congregation is likely meant to remember here the example invoked at the outset of this homily in §1 (PG 51:242) of sailors singing to lighten their labor: τὸ πέλαγος πλέοντες ἄδουσι, τῇ ᾠδῇ τὸν πόνον παραμυθούμενοι.

125. I.e., the tenets of true Christian doctrine, as Chrysostom teaches it (cf. *PGL* B.5).

ΕΙΣ ΤΟ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΙΚΟΝ ΡΗΤΟΝ Τὸ λέγον· «Δεῖ δὲ καὶ αἰρέσεις
εἶναι ἐν ὑμῖν, ἵνα οἱ δόκιμοι φανεροὶ γένωνται.»

α'. [251] Ἰκανῶς πρῶν ἡμῖν διεθερμάνθη τὸ πνευματικὸν τοῦτο θέατρον, ὅτε τὴν Ἱερουσαλὴμ εἰσήγαγον ὑμῖν τῷ λόγῳ θρηνοῦσαν, καὶ τὰς οἰκείας ἐξαγγέλλουσιν [252] συμφοράς. Καὶ γὰρ εἶδον ὑμῶν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τότε ὠδίνοντας πηγὰς ἀφίεναι δακρύων· εἶδον, ἐξ ὧν ἔπασχον, τὴν ἐκάστου διάνοιαν ὀλοφυρμῶν γέμουσαν καὶ [253] συγκεχυμένην. Διὸ καὶ ταχέως αἰσθόμενος συνέστειλα τὴν τραγωδίαν, ἥρπασα ἐκ τοῦ μέσου τὸν λόγον, ὥστε

1. Provenance: according to Mayer, *Provenance*, 86, only Mf takes up the issue of the date and setting of this homily. He pointed to the opening that suggests the prior homily depicted Jerusalem in lament so fervently that all were weeping, but he concluded that on this basis it is not possible to identify either the date or the city in which this homily was preached. Further work will be needed to engage the closeness of this argument to *Hom. 1 Cor. 27*, and likelihood of historical ordering of the two, as well as discussion on the location of the homilies in that series. Mayer documents that earlier scholars placed the series at Antioch on the basis of references to the homily sets on John and Matthew (*Provenance*, 61, 176, 181–82, 208, 224), but she only includes *Hom. 1 Cor. 21* as of certain provenance at Antioch (*Provenance*, 512).

Text: Mf PE (1837) as reprinted by JPM (PG, 1862). Mf (1721) had no text-critical notes on this homily. PE added one small note about a single word in a biblical quotation, which is reprinted in PG, as indicated below (see n. 19). Pinakes lists eight manuscripts beyond the two that were used by HS, Monac. gr. 6 and Monac. gr. 352 (which were the basis for all subsequent editions). As noted in the introduction, there is a dissertation that has undertaken a critical text of this homily: Bellucci, “Per l’edizione critica dell’omelia *In illud: ‘Oportet et haereses esse’* di S. Giovanni Crisostomo,” but I have not had access to it for the present volume.

2. αἵρεσις for Paul (here and Gal 5:20) meant “faction,” “sect,” or “party.” (For lexical and rhetorical discussion, see Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation*, 153 and literature cited there). By John’s time, the word (at least in part based on this Pauline precedent) had been well established in Christian polemics as a negative term for faithless schismatics, viewed as those who had deviated from the path of “orthodoxy.”

Hom. 1 Cor. 11:19
(In dictum Pauli: oportet et haereses esse)
CPG 4381 (PG 51:251–60)¹

On the passage of the apostle that says, “*But it is necessary for there even to be ‘heresies’² among you, that³ those who meet with approval might be made manifest*” (1 Cor 11:19).⁴

1. [251] Last time, our spiritual theater⁵ was brought to a fever pitch when in my homily I brought before you Jerusalem lamenting and proclaiming her own [252] misfortunes. For at that moment, I saw your anguished eyes releasing fountains of tears. I saw that from their sufferings⁶ your minds⁷ were filled with lamentation [253] and deeply distressed. When I perceived that, I quickly put a stop to the tragedy. I pulled up from my homily right

See Alain Le Boulluec, *La notion d’hérésie dans la littérature grecque, IIe–IIIe siècles* (Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1985). This background is important in understanding why for Chrysostom having the apostle say that these “heresies” were “necessary” is in his time a *ζητούμενον*, “vexing problem requiring investigation.” In places below, when Chrysostom is making a particular definitional argument, the translation puts the word ‘heresy’ in single quotations for emphasis, but the variable resonances of the term should be kept in mind throughout.

3. Note that this is only a provisional translation of the verse; Chrysostom will discuss the possible renderings of the *ἵνα* clause below.

4. With *δέ* for *γάρ*; transposition of *ἐν ὑμῖν* and *εἶναι*.

5. The first of several theatrical references with which the opening to this homily is filled. *θέατρον* here may be appropriating the term to the liturgy, or more specifically be a reference to the audience or spectators (so *PGL B*). In that case, we might translate, “this spiritual crowd.” On Chrysostom’s open contestation—and competition—with the theater, see Leyerle, *Theatrical Lives and Ascetic Shows*.

6. I.e., that experienced by the inhabitants of Jerusalem under the Babylonian destruction depicted in the book of Lamentations, attributed to Jeremiah (as will be mentioned below).

7. Note the tumble of anthropological terms in the opening to this homily (*ὀφθαλμοί, διάνοια, καρδία, ψυχή*) culminating in a play on the Pauline (and Pseudepigraphical Pauline) *σῶμα Χριστοῦ* ecclesiology and its *κεφαλὴ* in Eph 4:1–16.

τὸν θρῆνον ἐκεῖνον τῆς ἐκάστου καρδίας ἐκρήγνυσθαι μέλλοντα προκατασχεῖν. Ψυχὴ γὰρ πένθει κατασχεθεῖσα, οὔτε εἰπεῖν, οὔτε ἀκοῦσαι τι δύναιτ' ἂν ὑγίης. Τίνος οὖν ἔνεκεν ἐκείνων ὑμᾶς ἀνέμνησα νῦν; "Οτι καὶ τὰ σήμερον ῥηθήσεται μέλλοντα συγγενῇ τῶν τότε εἰρημένων ἐστίν. "Ωσπερ γὰρ ἐκεῖνα τὴν ἐν τῷ βίῳ ῥαθυμίαν ἡμῶν ἀνέστελλε, καὶ τὴν ὀλιγωρίαν τὴν περὶ τὰ πρακτέα διώρθου, οὕτω δὴ τὰ ῥηθησόμενα νῦν περὶ τὴν τῶν δογμάτων ἀκριβῆ παρατήρησιν ἀσφαλεστέρους ἡμᾶς ἐργάσασθαι δύναιτ' ἂν· ὥστε ἐξ ἀπάντων ἀπηρτισμένους εἶναι, εἰς ἄνδρα τέλειον, εἰς μέτρον ἡλικίας φθάνοντας κατὰ τὸν θεῖον Ἀπόστολον. Τότε τὸ σῶμα ὑμῖν ἐθεραπεύσαμεν, νῦν τὴν κεφαλὴν ἰατρούμεν· τότε διὰ τῶν Ἱερεμίου λόγων, νῦν διὰ τῶν τοῦ Παύλου ῥημάτων.

Τίνα οὖν ἐστὶ τὰ Παύλου ῥήματα, ἃ σήμερον ἡμῖν ἐξεργάσασθαι πρόκειται; Δεῖ δὲ καὶ αἰρέσεις εἶναι, φησὶν, ἐν ὑμῖν, ἵνα οἱ δόκιμοι φανεροὶ γένωνται ἐν ὑμῖν. Οὐ μικρὸν τὸ ζητούμενον. Εἰ γὰρ συμβουλευὼν τοῦτό φησιν ὁ Παῦλος, καὶ δεῖ αἰρέσεις εἶναι, ἀναίτιοι οἱ τὰς αἰρέσεις εἰσάγοντες. Ἄλλ' οὐκ ἔστι τοῦτο, οὐκ ἔστιν· οὐ γὰρ συμβουλευόντος τὸ ῥῆμά ἐστίν, ἀλλὰ τὸ μέλλον προλέγοντος. "Ωσπερ γὰρ ἱατρὸς, ὁρῶν τὸν κάμνοντα ἀδηφαγία καὶ μέθῃ προσέχοντα καὶ ἐτέροις κεκωλυμένοις, φησὶν ὅτι τὴν ἀταξίαν ταύτην δεῖ πυρετὸν τεκεῖν, οὐχὶ νομοθετῶν, οὐδὲ συμβουλευὼν, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῶν παρόντων

8. An interestingly ambiguous statement as to whose head is in view. On the one hand, we have the body of the church and the head of Christ (Eph 4:15–16, as prepared for by the partial quotation of Eph 4:13). But on the other, the ὑμῖν from the first clause should apply also to the second. Is “your head” that will be healed today the church, or the thinking capacity of each person within it?

9. For John, the author of the book of Lamentations (θρῆνοι).

10. δόκιμος, a favored Pauline term that means to be tested and found worthy (cf. BDAG 1; 2 Cor 10:18; 13:7, and the antonym, ἀδόκιμος in 1 Cor 9:27; 2 Cor 13:5–7). What is ambiguous especially in the lemma of 1 Cor 11:19 is the question of in whose eyes one is deemed to be “approved” (God? other Corinthians?) and when, exactly, is this approval conferred and manifested (in the moment? in eschatological judgment?). The translation tries to keep this as neutral as possible, though John does not focus his attention on this particular point in the present homily—though he does a bit more in *Hom. 1 Cor. 27.2* (PG 61:225–27).

11. With δέ for γάρ; transposition of ἐν ὑμῖν and εἶναι, as above.

12. τὸ ζητούμενον.

13. In this initial argument John will appeal to the genre of statements as a key to their meaning; he insists that 1 Cor 11:19 is not written in the form of advice or counsel (συμβουλευεῖν), but of prophecy (προαναφωνεῖν, προφητεύειν).

14. οἱ τὰς αἰρέσεις εἰσάγοντες. An essential component of heresiological rhetoric is the idea that the heretics “bring in” or “introduce” novelties where orthodoxy was already firmly in place—an ideology reproduced in scholarship until the groundbreaking work

in the middle so as preemptively to contain that lament that was going to break each of your hearts. After all, a soul constrained by grief isn't able to speak or hear anything salutary. So, why have I now reminded you of those events? Because words that are akin to what was said then will be spoken today, as well. The earlier words curtailed the indolence in our everyday lives and corrected the negligence in our deeds. In the same way, then, the words to be spoken now can make us more steadfast in our close observance of the doctrinal teachings, so that by means of them we might become perfect—as the divine apostle puts it, arriving at the state of “*a perfect human being, the measure of maturity*” (Eph 4:13). Then we healed your body, and this time we shall cure your head;⁸ then it was with the words of Jeremiah,⁹ but this time the words of Paul.

So, what are the words of Paul that are set before us today to work through? He says, “*But it is necessary for there even to be ‘heresies’ among you, that those who meet with approval¹⁰ might be made manifest among you*” (1 Cor 11:19).¹¹ The problem this poses¹² is not minor. For if Paul says this by way of giving advice,¹³ and it is necessary for there to be heresies, then those who introduce heresies¹⁴ bear no blame. But that isn't the case—surely it isn't! This statement isn't that of one who's giving advice,¹⁵ but one who's predicting what will happen in the future.¹⁶ When a doctor¹⁷ sees someone who's ill devoting themselves to gluttony, drunkenness, and other things they're told not to, and the doctor says, “It is necessary for this undisciplined behavior to produce a fever,” he isn't legislating or advising,

of Walter Bauer, *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*, ed. Robert A. Kraft and Gerhard Krodel, trans. Philadelphia Seminar on Christian Origins (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971) trans. of *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1934), and much scholarship following. See, more recently, Todd S. Berzon, *Classifying Christians: Ethnography, Heresiology, and the Limits of Knowledge in Late Antiquity* (Oakland: University of California Press, 2016); Matthijs den Dulk, *Between Jews and Heretics: Refiguring Justin Martyr's “Dialogue with Trypho”* (New York: Routledge, 2018), both with references to the abundant current bibliography.

15. John denies Paul is advising that there *must* or *should* be αἵρέσεις.

16. In fact, δεῖ, usually translated “it is necessary,” can, according to LSJ, especially in later Greek, take on some of the meaning proper to χρῆ, of “the sense of moral obligation,” especially in relation to the participle, δεόν, which means “that which is binding, needful, right” (LSJ A). The grammatical ambiguity has fueled John's anxiety.

17. Translating with masculine pronouns since John assumes the doctor, farmer, and ship captain (traditional exempla) are male roles that in turn will fit his comparison to Paul.

τὸ μέλλον μετὰ σκέψεως προλέγων· καὶ γεωργὸς πάλιν, ἡ κυβερνήτης ὁρῶν νεφῶν συνδρομὰς καὶ βροντὰς καταρρηγνυμένας μετὰ ἀστραπῶν, φησὶν ὅτι δεῖ τὰ νέφη ταῦτα τεκεῖν υἱὸν καὶ ὄμβρον σφοδρὸν, οὐδὲ οὗτος παραινῶν, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἐσόμενον προαναφωνῶν· οὕτω καὶ Παῦλος τὸ, Δεῖ, τέθεικε. Πολλάκις γοῦν καὶ ἡμεῖς ὁρῶντες ἀνθρώπους ἀλλήλοις συρρηγνυμένους καὶ χαλεπαῖς ἑαυτοὺς πλύνοντας λοιδορίαις, λέγομεν, Δεῖ συμπληγάδας γενέσθαι τούτους καὶ φυλακίζεσθαι, οὐ συμβουλεύοντες οὐδὲ ἡμεῖς, οὐδὲ παραινούντες ἐκείνοις, (πῶς γάρ;) ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τοῦ παρόντος τὸ μέλλον στοχαζόμενοι. Οὕτω δὴ καὶ ὁ Παῦλος οὐχὶ συμβουλεύων ταῦτά φησιν, ὅτι Δεῖ καὶ αἱρέσεις ἐν ὑμῖν εἶναι, ἀλλὰ προαναφωνῶν καὶ προφητεύων τὸ μέλλον ἔσεσθαι. "Οτι γὰρ οὐ συμβουλεύει αἱρέσεις εἶναι, αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ λέγων, ὅτι Κἂν ἄγγελος ὑμᾶς εὐαγγελίζηται παρ' ὃ παρελάβετε, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω. Αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ τὴν περιτομὴν, ἐπειδὴ παρὰ καιρὸν παρελαμβάνετο, καὶ ἐθόλου τὸ καθαρὸν τοῦ κηρύγματος, ἐκβάλλων καὶ λέγων, Ἐὰν περιτέμνησθε, Χριστὸς ὑμᾶς οὐδὲν ὠφελήσει.

Πῶς οὖν, φησὶ, καὶ αἰτίαν προσέθηκεν εἰπὼν, "Ἵνα οἱ δόκιμοι φανεροὶ γένωνται; Τὸ, "Ἵνα, πολλαχοῦ ἐν ταῖς Γραφαῖς οὐκ ἔστιν αἰτιολογίας, ἀλλὰ τῆς τῶν πραγμάτων ἐκβάσεως. Οἶον, ἦλθεν ὁ Χριστὸς, καὶ τὸν τυφλὸν ἀναβλέψαι ἐποίησε· κάκεῖνος μὲν αὐτὸν προσεκύνησεν· οἱ δὲ Ἰουδαῖοι, τούτου θεραπευθέντος, πάντα ἐποιοῦν, ὥστε συσκιάσαι τὸ θαῦμα, καὶ τὸν Χριστὸν ἡλαυνον. Τότε τοίνυν φησὶν· Εἰς κρίμα ἐγὼ ἦλθον εἰς τὸν κόσμον τοῦτον, ἵνα οἱ μὴ βλέποντες βλέπωσι, καὶ οἱ βλέποντες τυφλοὶ γένωνται. Ἄρα οὖν διὰ τοῦτο ἦλθεν, ἵνα ἐκεῖνοι τυφλοὶ γένωνται; Οὐ διὰ τοῦτο ἦλθε, τοῦτο

18. Minus γάρ before καί.

19. Minus ἡμεῖς ἢ before ἄγγελος; ellipsis or conflation of Gal 1:8 and 1:9 leads to ὑμᾶς εὐαγγελίζηται for either εὐαγγελίζηται ὑμῖν (Gal 1:8, as marked in text) or ὑμᾶς εὐαγγελίζηται (Gal 1:9). The PE added a note with a single correction ("Bibl. ὑμῖν.") on ὑμᾶς and cited the verse as Gal 1:8, apparently without noticing the other variances just listed or the fact that παρ' ὃ παρελάβετε, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω can only be from Gal 1:9.

20. I.e., the reason for saying, "It is necessary for there even to be heresies among you." In what follows, John plays on the terms αἰτία/αἰτιολογία and ἔκβασις to differentiate between purpose (as in "reason for") and result (as in "outcome"), respectively.

21. Among current English translations, RSV translates "in order that," but most others paraphrase, such as NRSV, "for only so will it become clear," or NIV, "to show which of you have God's approval." KJV leaves it most ambiguous, with "that," and so I follow it here and elsewhere in the translation of this homily, except where John appears to be citing the verse as a purpose clause in order to refute that sense.

22. In the NT (along with Koine Greek more generally) ἵνα can introduce a result clause (see BDAG 1 and 3; compare Smyth §2193, BDF §§369, 378, and the examples John cites next from John 9:39 and Rom 5:20). But of course ἵνα also often does

but from the present circumstances foretelling the future on the basis of what he sees. Likewise, when a farmer or a ship captain sees clouds coming together and thunder breaking along with lightning, and he says, “It is necessary for these clouds to produce rain and a severe storm,” he’s not offering advice, but predicting what’s going to happen. In the same way Paul, too, stipulates, “it is necessary.” Indeed, with us, as well, when we see people clashing with one another and dressing each other down with sharp insults, we say, “It is necessary for these people to come to blows and get tossed in jail,” but we aren’t offering advice or giving them instructions (how could that be?). No, instead we’re making a conjecture about what will happen in the future from what’s going on in the present. Surely, it’s in just this manner that Paul also says, “*It is necessary for there even to be heresies among you*” (1 Cor 11:19),¹⁸ not advising, but predicting and prophesying what will happen in the future. After all, the very person who says, “*Even if an angel might proclaim to you a gospel ... besides the one you received, let that person be anathema*” (Gal 1:8–9)¹⁹ doesn’t give advice that it’s necessary for there to be heresies! When circumcision was being accepted beyond its time and the purity of the gospel was being obscured, he’s the man who cast it out and said, “*If you become circumcised, Christ will not benefit you one bit!*” (Gal 5:2).

“Then what does Paul mean,” someone asks, “when he adds the reason²⁰ and says, ‘*that those who meet with approval might be made manifest*’ (1 Cor 11:19)?”²¹ The word *hina* often in Scripture doesn’t mean the purpose, but the result, of events.²² For example, Christ came and he made the blind man see (cf. John 9). He worshipped Christ (cf. John 9:38), but after the man had been healed, “the Jews” were doing everything to hide the miracle and were persecuting Christ. Then Christ said, “*I have come into this world for judgment, that those who do not see might see, and those who see might become blind*” (John 9:39).²³ Was this the purpose for which he came, so that they might become blind?²⁴ No, he didn’t come for this purpose, but

introduce a purpose clause (the interpretation that John is straining vehemently here to deny).

23. With transposition of εἰς τὸν κόσμον τοῦτον and ἄλλθον. Among NT translations NIV, NRSV, NAB, CEB, etc. translate “so that”; RSV, following KJV, has “that.”

24. ἵνα ἐκεῖνοι τυφλοὶ γένωνται, very close to the exact wording of the text, but not introduced as a quotation (and John is denying its meaning!). But one could mark it as such, given the textual correspondence. One should imagine some intonation and gestures in the live delivery that helped to mark different interpretations of the very same words.

δὲ ἐξέβη, καὶ τὴν ἔκβασιν ἐν σχήματι αἰτιολογίας τέθεικε. Πάλιν, νόμος ἐδόθη, ἵνα [254] καλύσῃ τὴν τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων φορὰν, ἵνα ἐπεικεστέρους ποιήσῃ τοὺς δεχομένους. Ἀλλὰ τοῦναντίον ἐξέβη παρὰ τὴν ῥαθυμίαν ἐκείνων· ἠϋξήσαν γὰρ τὰ ἁμαρτήματα· καὶ φησὶν ὁ Παῦλος, Νόμος δὲ παρεισηλθεν, ἵνα πλεονάσῃ τὸ παράπτωμα· καὶ μὴν οὐ διὰ τοῦτο ἐπείσῃλθεν, ἀλλ' ἵνα ἐλαττώσῃ τὸ παράπτωμα. Τοῦτο δὲ ἐξέβη παρὰ τὴν ἀγνωμοσύνην τῶν δεξαμένων αὐτόν.

Οὕτω δὴ καὶ ἐνταῦθα, τὸ, "Ἰνα, οὐχὶ αἰτιολογίας ἐστίν, ἀλλὰ ἐκβάσεως. "Ὅτι γὰρ ἄλλη τίς ἐστὶν αἰτία τῶν αἱρέσεων, καὶ οὐ διὰ τοῦτο ἐγένοντο αἱρέσεις, ἵνα οἱ δόκιμοι φανεροὶ γένωνται, ἀλλ' ἐτέρωθεν ἔλαβον τὰς προφάσεις, ἄκουσον τοῦ Χριστοῦ δῆλον τοῦτο ποιοῦντος ἡμῖν. Ὡμοιώθη, φησὶν, ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν ἀνθρώπῳ σπεύροντι καλὸν σπέρμα ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἐν τῷ καθεύδειν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, ἦλθεν ἐχθρὸς ἄνθρωπος, καὶ ἔσπειρε τὰ ζιζάνια. Ὅρᾳς, ὅτι διὰ τοῦτο αἱρέσεις, ἐπειδὴ ἐκαθεύδῃσαν οἱ ἄνθρωποι, ἐπειδὴ ἐρραθύμῃσαν; ἐπειδὴ οὐ προσέσχον μετὰ ἀκριβείας τοῖς λεγομένοις; "Ἰν' οὖν μὴ λέγῃ τις, Τίνος ἕνεκεν συνεχώρησεν ὁ Χριστός; φησὶν ὁ Παῦλος, ὅτι Οὐδέν σε βλάπτει ἢ συγχώρησις αὕτη· ἐὰν ᾖ δόκιμος, φανερώτερος ἔσῃ μᾶλλον. Οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ἴσον, μηδενὸς ὑποσκελίζοντος, μηδὲ ἀπατῶντος, ἐπὶ τῆς ὀρθῆς στῆναι πίστεως, καὶ μυρίων προσρηγνυμένων κυμάτων, ἄσιστον καὶ ἀπερίτρεπτον μεῖναι. Καθάπερ οὖν τὰ δένδρα αἱ τῶν ἀνέμων προσβολαὶ πάντοθεν ῥιπίζουσαι ἰσχυρότερα ποιοῦσιν, ἢ καλῶς ἐρριζωμένα καὶ μετὰ ἀκριβείας· οὕτω δὴ καὶ τὰς ψυχὰς τὰς πεπηγυίας ἐν τῷ θεμελίῳ τῆς ὀρθῆς πίστεως, ὅσαι ἂν προσβάλωσιν αἱρέσεις, οὐ περιτρέπουσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἰσχυρότερας ποιοῦσι. Τί οὖν πρὸς τοὺς ἀσθενοῦντας, φησὶ, καὶ περιτρεπομένους καὶ ὑποσκελιζομένους ῥαδίως; Οὐδὲ ἐκεῖνοι παρὰ τὴν τῆς αἱρέσεως προσβολήν, ἀλλὰ παρὰ τὴν οἰκείαν ἀσθένειαν τοῦτο πάσχουσιν. Ἀσθένειαν δὲ οὐ φυσικὴν λέγω, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἐκ προαιρέσεως, τὴν καὶ ἐκγλημάτων

25. Cf. Gal 3:21; John 1:17.

26. Among current English translations, only NRSV agrees with Chrysostom in translating ἵνα here, "with the result that." NIV, NAB, CEB, etc. translate "so that"; KJV (again) leaves it ambiguous, with "that" (as translated above).

27. Cf. Rom 10:2–3.

28. Once again, John is quoting the exact words of the lemma while denying one possible sense of it. (PG does not mark this in italics as a quotation.)

29. Plus καί before καθεύδειν; ἐχθρὸς ἄνθρωπος for αὐτοῦ ὁ ἐχθρός; plus τὰ before ζιζάνια.

this was the result; and he indicated the result in the form of a purpose clause. For another example, the law was given²⁵ [254] so that it might prevent the tendency to sin, so that it might make those who receive it more inclined to virtue. But what resulted was the opposite, due to their indolence. Indeed, their sins increased, as Paul says, “*And the law came in that the transgression might abound*” (Rom 5:20).²⁶ Certainly the law didn’t come for this reason, but rather so that it might decrease the transgression. Yet this is what resulted, due to the willful ignorance of those who received the law.²⁷

In just the same way, in this passage (1 Cor 11:19) the word *hina* doesn’t indicate the purpose, but the result. The reason for heresies is something else, and heresies didn’t come about “*so that those who meet with approval might be made manifest*” (1 Cor 11:19),²⁸ but they receive their actual causes from elsewhere. Hear how Christ makes this clear to us. He says, “*The kingdom of heaven is like a man who sows good seed in his field, and, while people are sleeping, a man who is an enemy came and sowed weeds*” (Matt 13:24–25).²⁹ Do you see that heresies came about because the people were asleep, because they were indolent? Because they didn’t receive with careful attention what was said? Then, lest anyone ask, “Why did Christ permit this?” Paul says, “This permission doesn’t harm you a bit; if you’re approved, then you’ll be all the more manifest.” It’s not the same thing to stand in the correct faith³⁰ and remain unshaken and unmoved when there’s no one to trip you up or deceive you as it is to do so when there are countless waves battering you. After all, onslaughts of wind blowing from every direction make trees all the stronger, as long as they’re well rooted and securely grounded. It’s the exact same thing with souls that are fixed onto the foundation of the correct faith: if heresies assail them, they don’t move them, but instead make them even stronger. Then someone says, “What about people who are weak and easily moved and shaken?” It’s not because of the onslaught of heresy that they suffer this, but because of their own weakness! I don’t mean weakness of nature but rather weakness in will,³¹ weakness that’s deserving of condemnation and stands under threat of punishment and chastisement, a weakness that we have mastery

30. ὁρθὴ πίστις, or, with PGL A.6, “the faith that is orthodox” (here, of course, in contrast to αἱρέσεις, “heresies”).

31. προαίρεσις, “ethical volition.” Chrysostom diagnoses the problem of heresies as an individual ethical failing.

ἀξίαν καὶ ὑπὸ κόλασιν καὶ τιμωρίαν κειμένην, ἣν καὶ ἡμεῖς κύριοι διορθῶσαι. Διὸ κατορθοῦντές τε ἐπαινούμεθα, καὶ μὴ κατορθοῦντες κολαζόμεθα.

β'. Καὶ ἵνα μάθῃς, ὅτι τοὺς νήφοντας οὐδὲν δύναται παραβλάψαι, καὶ ἐτέρωθεν τοῦτο ἀποδείξει πειράσομαι. Τί τοῦ διαβόλου γένοιτ' ἂν πονηρότερον, τί δὲ μιαιώτερον; Ἄλλ' ὅμως οὗτος ὁ πονηρὸς καὶ κακοῦργος καὶ πολλὴν ἔχων ἰσχὺν, μετὰ πάντων αὐτοῦ τῶν μηχανημάτων προσβαλὼν τῷ Ἰῶβ, καὶ πᾶσαν αὐτοῦ τὴν βελοθήκην εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν καὶ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ δικαίου κενώσας, οὐ μόνον αὐτὸν οὐ περιέτρεψεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ λαμπρότερον ἐποίησε. Καὶ οὗτος μὲν οὐδὲ παρὰ τοῦ διαβόλου τότε ἐβλάπτετο· ὁ δὲ Ἰούδας, ἐπειδὴ ἡμελημένος καὶ ῥάθυμος ἦν, οὐδὲν παρὰ τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ συνουσίας ἐκέρδανεν, ἀλλ' ἔμεινεν ὡς προδότης μετὰ τὰς πολλὰς παραινέσεις ἐκεῖνας καὶ συμβουλὰς· τὸ δὲ αἴτιον, ὅτι μὴ βουλόμενόν τινα οὐκ ἀναγκάζει, οὐδὲ βιάζεται ὁ Θεός· ὥσπερ οὖν οὐδὲ ἐκείνον. Οὕτως ἐὰν νήφωμεν καὶ ἡμεῖς, οὐδὲ ὁ διάβολος ἡμᾶς βλάψαι δύναται· ἂν δὲ μὴ νήφωμεν, ἀλλὰ ῥαθυμῶμεν, οὐδὲ παρὰ τῶν ὠφελούντων κερδανοῦμεν [255] ποτε, ἀλλὰ καὶ ζημίαν ὑποστησόμεθα τὴν ἐσχάτην. τοσοῦτόν ἐστι ῥαθυμία κακόν. Οἱ γοῦν Ἰουδαῖοι οὐ μόνον οὐκ ὠφελήθησαν, τοῦ Χριστοῦ παραγενομένου, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐβλάβησαν· ἀλλ' οὐ παρὰ τὸν Χριστὸν, ἀλλὰ παρὰ τὴν οἰκείαν αὐτῶν ῥαθυμίαν καὶ ἀγνωμοσύνην. Καὶ τοῦτο ἄκουσον αὐτοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ λέγοντος· Εἰ μὴ ᾗλθον, φησὶ, καὶ ἐλάλησα αὐτοῖς, ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ εἶχον· νῦν δὲ πρόφασιν οὐκ ἔχουσι περὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν. Ὅρᾳς, ὅτι ἡ παρουσία αὐτοῦ καὶ συγγνώμης αὐτοὺς ἀπεστέρησε, καὶ τὴν ἀπολογία αὐτῶν ἐξέκοψε; Τοσοῦτόν ἐστι κακὸν μὴ συγκροτεῖν ἑαυτὸν, μηδὲ τὰ καθ' ἑαυτὸν οἰκονομεῖν ὡς χρή. Τοῦτο καὶ ἐπὶ σωμάτων συμβαῖνον ἴδοι τις ἂν· τὸν μὲν γὰρ νοσοῦντα τὰς ὄψεις καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ ἥλιος σκοτίζειν εἴωθε, τὸν δὲ ὑγιῆ οὐδὲ τὸ σκότος παραβλάψαι δύναται.

Καὶ τοῦτον οὐχ ἀπλῶς μηχανῶν τὸν λόγον· ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ πολλοὶ τὰς ἑαυτῶν ἀφέντες ῥαθυμίας αἰτιάσθαι, καὶ τὴν ἀγνωμοσύνην αὐτῶν καὶ τὴν ἀναισθησίαν διορθοῦν, τοῦτο μὲν οὐ ποιοῦσι, περιέρχονται δὲ ζητοῦντες ἑαυτοῖς ψυχράς ἀπολογίας, καὶ λέγοντες· Εἰ μὴ ὁ διάβολος ἦν, οὐκ ἂν ἀπωλόμεθα· εἰ μὴ νόμος ἦν, οὐκ ἂν ἡμάρτομεν· εἰ μὴ αἱρέσεις ἦσαν, οὐκ ἂν ὑπεσκελίσθημεν. Σκῆψεις ταῦτα καὶ προφάσεις, ἄνθρωπε· τὸν γὰρ νήφοντα οὐδὲν βλάπτει ποτὲ, ὥσπερ οὖν τὸν καθεύδοντα καὶ ῥαθυμοῦντα καὶ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ προδιδόντα σωτηρίαν οὐδὲν ὠφελεῖ. Τοῦτο γοῦν αὐτὸ καὶ ὁ Παῦλος αἰνιττόμενος ἔλεγεν, Ἵνα οἱ δόκιμοι φανεροὶ γένωνται ἐν ὑμῖν· τουτέστι, μὴ θορυβεῖσθε, μηδὲ

32. αἰνίττεσθαι, a key term by which John navigates the “veil-scale” between the surface and deeper meanings of the text.

over ourselves to correct. Accordingly, if we correct that weakness, we're praised; and if we don't correct it, we're punished.

2. In order for you to learn that nothing can harm those who stay vigilant, I'll try to prove it also in a different way. What could be more evil than the devil, what more foul? Nevertheless, this evil, malevolent, and powerful creature, despite attacking Job with all his stratagems and emptying his full quiver of arrows into this just man's house and body, not only didn't move him, but made him all the more splendid. Job wasn't harmed at all by the devil at that time. In contrast, Judas, because he was careless and indolent, received no benefit at all from his association with Christ; but after all the plentiful instructions and advice Judas remained the betrayer that he was. The reason was that God doesn't compel or exert force on a person who isn't willing; and he didn't do so with Job, either. Thus if we, too, stay vigilant, not even the devil is able to harm us. However, if we don't stay vigilant, but instead grow slack, we'll receive no gain whatsoever from those who offer assistance, [255] but we shall incur the most extreme loss as well. Indolence is that great an evil. After all, "the Jews" not only received no benefit from Christ's coming; instead, they were even harmed—not because of Christ, but because of their own indolence and willful ignorance. Hear Christ himself saying this: "*If I had not come,*" he says, "*and spoken to them, they would not have sin. But now they do not have an excuse for their sin*" (John 15:22). Do you see that Christ's coming both deprived them of any pardon and cut off their means of self-defense? Not disciplining oneself or governing one's affairs as one should is such a great evil. One can see this happening with physical bodies as well. For a person with a visual impairment, the sun itself seems to cast darkness, but not even darkness can harm a person who is in good health.

I'm not making this argument at such length without a reason. Since, although many are at leave to assign the blame to their own indolence and to correct their willful ignorance and obtuseness, they don't do this, but instead they go around looking for vain excuses for themselves. They say, "If there wasn't a devil, then we wouldn't be perishing. If there weren't a law, then we wouldn't sin. If there weren't heresies, then we wouldn't be tripped up." These things are excuses and pretexts, mister! For nothing can ever harm someone who is vigilant, in the same way as nothing can benefit someone who's asleep and indolent and betrays their own salvation. It's precisely this point that Paul was making in a veiled fashion³² when he said, "*that those who meet with approval might be made manifest among you*" (1 Cor 11:19). What he means is, "Don't be upset or perplexed. Her-

ἀλύετε· οὐδὲν ὑμᾶς αἰ αἰρέσεις παραβλάψαι δύνανται. “Ὅτι μὲν οὖν, εἰ καὶ περὶ αἱρέσεων ἦν ὁ λόγος, οὐδὲ οὕτως ἔχει ζήτημα τὸ εἰρημένον, ἐκ τούτων δῆλον. Προφητεία γάρ ἐστιν, οὐ συμβουλή· πρόρρησις, οὐ παραίνεσις· καὶ τὸ, “Ἰνα, ἐκβάσεως, οὐκ αἰτιολογίας.

“Ὅτι δὲ οὐδὲ περὶ δογμάτων ἐστὶν ὁ λόγος αὐτῷ νῦν, ἀλλὰ περὶ πενήτων καὶ πλουσίων, περὶ τοῦ φαγεῖν καὶ μὴ φαγεῖν, περὶ τῆς τῶν εὐπόρων ἀσωτίας καὶ λαιμαργίας, περὶ τῆς τῶν πενήτων ἐγκαταλείψεως τῆς παρ’ αὐτῶν γενομένης, ἀνάσχεσθε μικρὸν ἄνωθεν διηγουμένου· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἂν ἄλλως ὑμῖν γένοιτο σαφὲς τὸ λεγόμενον. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἤρξαντο σπεῖρειν τὸν λόγον τῆς εὐσεβείας οἱ ἀπόστολοι, προσῆλθον εὐθέως τρισχίλιοι, καὶ πάλιν πεντακισχίλιοι, καὶ πάντων αὐτῶν ἦν ἡ καρδιά καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ μία. Τὸ δὲ τῆς ὁμονοίας αἴτιον, καὶ συνδῆσαν αὐτῶν τὴν ἀγάπην, καὶ τοσαύτας ψυχὰς εἰς ἓν συναγαγόν, ἡ τῶν χρημάτων ὑπεροψία ἦν. Οὐδεὶς γὰρ τι τῶν ὑπαρχόντων, φησὶν, ἴδιον ἔλεγεν εἶναι, ἀλλ’ ἦν αὐτῶν ἅπαντα κοινά. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἀνηρέθη ἡ ρίζα τῶν κακῶν, τὴν φιλαργυρίαν λέγω, πάντα ἐπεισῆλθε τὰ ἀγαθὰ, καὶ λοιπὸν συνεσφίγγοντο πρὸς ἀλλήλους, οὐδενὸς ὄντος τοῦ διαιροῦντος αὐτούς. Τὸ γὰρ ἐμὸν, καὶ τὸ σὸν, τοῦτο τὸ ψυχρὸν ῥῆμα καὶ μυρίους πολέμους εἰς τὴν οἰκουμένην εἰσαγαγόν, ἐκ τῆς ἀγίας ἐκείνης Ἐκκλησίας ἐξώριστο, καὶ τὴν γῆν ὥκουν, καθάπερ οἱ ἄγγελοι τὸν οὐρανὸν, καὶ οὔτε ἐφθόουν οἱ πένητες τοῖς πλουτοῦσιν· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἦσαν πλούσιοι· οὔτε ὑπερεώρων οἱ πλούσιοι τῶν πενήτων· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἦσαν πένητες· ἀλλὰ πάντα ἦν κοινά. Καὶ οὐδὲ εἷς τι τῶν ὑπαρχόντων ἴδιον ἔλεγεν εἶναι· οὐ γὰρ, καθάπερ νῦν γίνεται, οὕτω καὶ τότε συνέβαινε. Νῦν μὲν γὰρ ἔχοντες τὰ ἑαυτῶν, διδῶσι τοῖς δεομένοις· τότε δὲ

33. John pronounces the ζήτημα solved.

34. To capture the paronomasia: πρόρρησις/παραίνεσις.

35. This ὅτι δέ answers ὅτι μὲν above. John has maintained that *even if* Paul’s statement *were* about heresies, it would not actually raise problems, but now he turns to argue that it actually is not about “heresies” (as in “heretical doctrines”).

36. John assumes that αἱρέσεις involve false δόγματα.

37. In modern times this view has been reprised by, e.g., Gerd Theissen, *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity: Essays on Corinth*, trans. John H. Schütz (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982), 121–74. The assumption that socioeconomic factors contributed to the Corinthian conflicts is held by most contemporary scholars in some form.

38. John takes on the voice of Paul in 2 Cor 11:1.

39. σαφές; John promises to “solve” the “problem” by clarifying the meaning of the text.

40. With οὐδεὶς for οὐδὲ εἷς (but see the next quotation of the verse, which reads the latter); minus αὐτῶν after ὑπαρχόντων; transposition of ἔλεγεν and ἴδιον; αὐτῶν for αὐτοῖς before ἅπαντα.

esies cannot harm you one bit.” So then, from these arguments, it’s clear that even if Paul’s statement were about “heresies,” what he said still doesn’t contain a problem,³³ because it is prophecy, not advice; prediction, not prescription.³⁴ And the word *hina* refers to the result, not the purpose.

However,³⁵ Paul’s statement here actually isn’t about doctrinal teachings,³⁶ but about the poor and the rich, eating and not eating, the debauchery and gluttony of the rich, and the forsaking of the poor that was taking place among them.³⁷ Please put up with my speaking³⁸ a bit longer once again, for in no other way could this statement become clear³⁹ to you. When the apostles began to sow the word of piety, immediately three thousand people came forward (cf. Acts 2:41) and again five thousand (cf. Acts 4:4), and “*the heart and soul of all of them were as one*” (Acts 4:32). And the cause of their concord and what bound their love together and gathered so many souls into one was disdain for possessions. For, it says, “*No one said that any of their possessions was their private property, but everything was the common property of all of them*” (Acts 4:32).⁴⁰ When “*the root of evils*” (1 Tim 6:10)⁴¹—I mean, the love of money⁴²—was eradicated, then all good things came in as well, and, in the end, they were joined closely with one another, since there was nothing dividing them. Indeed, this simple word “mine” or “yours,”⁴³ which has brought countless battles into the world, was banished from that holy church assembly, and they inhabited the earth like the angels do the heavens. Neither were the poor jealous of the rich, for there were no rich, nor did the rich disdain the poor, for there were no poor. But everything was “*common property*,” and “*no one said that any of their possessions was their private property*” (Acts 4:32).⁴⁴ What happened back then wasn’t like what happens now. Nowadays, people give to those in

41. Minus γὰρ πάντων before τῶν κακῶν.

42. φιλαργυρία, continuing the quotation of 1 Tim 6:10.

43. That the possessive adjective is to blame is a common complaint for John. See discussion and further examples in Margaret M. Mitchell, “Silver Chamberpots and Other Goods Which Are Not Good: John Chrysostom’s Discourse against Wealth and Possessions,” in *Having: Property and Possession in Religious and Social Life*, ed. William Schweiker and Charles Mathewes (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 88–121, esp. 95 and 120, and bibliography on the considerable scholarly literature on Chrysostom, possessions, and the social order, including the dialogue between Adolf Martin Ritter and Elizabeth A. Clark, as republished and updated in Ritter, *Studia Chrysostomica*, 34–93.

44. Minus αὐτῶν after ὑπαρχόντων; transposition of ἔλεγεν and ἴδιον.

οὐδὲ τοῦτο ἦν, ἀλλ' ἀποστάντες τῆς δεσποτείας τῶν οἰκείων χρημάτων, καὶ εἰς μέσον αὐτὰ καταθέντες καὶ ἀνα-[256]μίξαντες, οὐδὲ δῆλοι λοιπὸν ἦσαν οἱ πρώην ὄντες εὐποροί· ὥστε καὶ εἴ τις ἐκ τῆς ὑπεροψίας τῶν χρημάτων ἐγένετο τυφός, καὶ οὗτος ἀνήρητο παντάπασιν, πάντων ὄντων ἐν ἰσότητι μιᾷ, καὶ τῶν χρημάτων ἀναμιχθέντων ἀπάντων. Οὐκ ἐκ τούτου δὲ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐξ αὐτοῦ τοῦ τρόπου τῆς καταβολῆς ἔστιν αὐτῶν ἰδεῖν τὴν εὐλάβειαν. Ὅσοι γὰρ κτήτορες χωρίων ἢ οἰκιῶν ὑπῆρχον, παλοῦντες ἔφερον τὰς τιμὰς, καὶ ἐτίθουν παρὰ τοὺς πόδας τῶν ἀποστόλων. Οὐκ εἶπεν, ὅτι εἰς τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν ἐνέβαλλον, ἀλλὰ, Παρὰ τοὺς πόδας αὐτῶν ἐτίθесαν, τὴν αἰδῶ καὶ τὴν εὐλάβειαν καὶ τὸν φόβον, ὃν περὶ τοὺς ἀποστόλους εἶχον, διὰ τούτου δεικνύντες· οὐ γὰρ διδόναι μᾶλλον, ἢ λαμβάνειν ἐνόμιζον. Καὶ τοῦτο γὰρ μάλιστα ἔστιν ὑπεριδεῖν χρημάτων· τοῦτο θρέψαι γνησίως ἐστὶ Χριστὸν, ὅταν μὴ μετὰ ἀπονοίας καὶ τύφου τοῦτο ποιῇς, ὅταν ὡς σαυτὸν μᾶλλον, ἢ τὸν λαμβάνοντα εὐεργετῶν, οὕτω παρέχῃς. Εἰ γὰρ μὴ οὕτω διάκεισαι, μὴδὲ δῶς· εἰ μὴ νομίζεις λαμβάνειν μᾶλλον ἢ διδόναι, μὴ παράσχῃς. Τοῦτο καὶ ἐτέροις λοιπὸν ὁ Παῦλος ἐμαρτύρησεν, οὕτω λέγων· Γνωρίζω δὲ ὑμῖν, ἀδελφοί, τὴν χάριν τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὴν δεδομένην ἐν ταῖς Ἐκκλησίαις τῆς Μακεδονίας, ὅτι ἡ κατὰ βάθος πτωχεῖα αὐτῶν ἐπερίσσευσεν εἰς τὸν πλοῦτον τῆς ἀπλότητος αὐτῶν, ὅτι κατὰ δύναμιν, μαρτυρῶ, καὶ ὑπὲρ δύναμιν, αὐθαίρετοι μετὰ πολλῆς παρακλήσεως δεόμενοι ἡμῶν, τὴν χάριν καὶ τὴν κοινωνίαν τῆς διακονίας τῆς εἰς τοὺς ἁγίους ἐπλήρωσαν. Ὅρᾳς πῶς αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ τούτῳ μᾶλλον θαυμάζει, ὅτι χάριν εἰδότες, καὶ δεόμενοι, καὶ παρακαλοῦντες, οὕτω τὴν ἐπὶ τῶν χρημάτων ἀψίλειαν ἐπεδείκνυντο;

γ'. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ τὸν Ἀβραάμ θαυμάζομεν, οὐχ ὅτι μόσχον ἔθυσσε μόνον, οὐδὲ ὅτι ἄλευρα ἐφύρασεν, ἀλλ' ὅτι μετὰ πολλῆς ἡδονῆς καὶ ταπεινοφροσύνης τοὺς ξένους ὑπέδεχeto, προστρέχων, θεραπεύων, κυρίους. καλῶν, θησαυρὸν μυρίων ἀγαθῶν εὐρηκέναι νομίζων, εἴ ποτε ἴδοι παριόντα ξένον. Οὕτω γὰρ διπλῇ ἐλεημοσύνη γίνεται, ὅταν καὶ διδῶμεν, καὶ διδόντες μετὰ προθυμίας παρέχωμεν. Ἰλαρὸν γὰρ δότην, φησὶν, ἀγαπᾷ ὁ Θεός. Ἐπεὶ κὰν μυρία καταβάλλῃς τάλαντα μετὰ ἀπονοίας καὶ τύφου καὶ κενοδοξίας, τὰ πάντα ἀπώλεσας· καθάπερ ἐκεῖνος ὁ Φαρισαῖος, ὃς ἀποδεκατῶν αὐτοῦ τὰ ὑπάρχοντα,

45. τοῖς δεομένοις, also “those who ask.”

46. Minus τῶν πιπρασκομένων after τιμὰς.

47. With αὐτῶν for τῶν ἀποστόλων after πόδας.

48. With γνωρίζω for γνωρίζομεν; ellipsis of ἐν πολλῇ δοκιμῇ ... τῆς χαρᾶς αὐτῶν καί after ὅτι (2 Cor 8:2), as marked in the translation; with βάθος for βάθους; plus ἐπλήρωσαν after ἁγίους to render a complete sentence.

need⁴⁵ but hold onto their own possessions, whereas this wasn't the state of things back then, but they gave up ownership of their own property, deposited it all in the public space and [256] mixed it all together, so in the end it wasn't even clear who was wealthy beforehand. As a result, if there was any arrogance arising from disdain for possessions, even this was eradicated completely, since all lived in full equality and all the possessions were mixed together. One can observe their piety not only from this fact but also from the manner in which they deposited their goods. *"For all those who owned fields or houses used to sell them and bring the sale amount and place it at the feet of the apostles"* (Acts 4:34–35).⁴⁶ He didn't say, "They put it into their hands," but, they placed it *"at their feet"* (Acts 4:35;⁴⁷ cf. 4:37), in this way showing the respect, piety, and fear they had for the apostles. For they didn't consider that they were giving rather than receiving (cf. Acts 20:35), and this is especially what disdain for possessions involves. A genuine act of feeding Christ (cf. Matt 25:37) looks like this: when you don't do it with foolish conceit or arrogance, when you provide it in such a way that you perform a benefaction more for yourself than for the one who receives it. And if you're not disposed in this way, then don't give. If you don't consider that you're receiving rather than giving, then don't provide it. Paul later also gave a testimony about this type of giving to others, putting it like this: *"And I make known to you, brothers and sisters, the grace of God that has been given among the assemblies of Macedonia, because ... their abysmal poverty has abounded in the wealth of their generosity, because to their abilities and beyond their abilities, I attest, of their own accord, begging us by a strong appeal, they completed this gift and partnership of service to the saints"* (2 Cor 8:1–4).⁴⁸ Do you see how he marveled all the more at the fact that through learning about the gift, and begging and making that appeal, they displayed their liberality with their possessions?

3. Likewise, we marvel at Abraham, not only for the fact that he sacrificed a calf or that he kneaded the flour, but because he received the strangers with great delight and humility, running toward them, serving them, calling them "my lords" (cf. Gen 18:1–8). This was because he thought that anytime he saw a stranger approaching he'd discovered a treasure of endless goods. This is how a double almsgiving takes place—when we both give and in the act of giving make the provision with eagerness. *"For,"* he says, *"God loves a cheerful giver"* (2 Cor 9:7; cf. Prov 8:22a). Since even if you deposit thousands of talents, but do so with foolish conceit, arrogance and vainglory, you've lost everything. This is just like that Pharisee who despite tithing his belongings came away from the temple having lost

ἐπειδὴ καὶ μέγα ἐφρόνει καὶ ἐφυσᾶτο, πάντα ἀπολέσας, οὕτω κατήλθεν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱεροῦ. Οὐκ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων δὲ οὕτως· ἀλλὰ χαίροντες, ἀγαλλόμενοι, κερδαίνειν τὰ μέγιστα νομίζοντες, οὕτως ἔφερον τὰ χρήματα, καὶ ἀγαπητὸν εἶναι ἐνόμιζον, εἰ καταξιώσειεν οἱ ἀπόστολοι δέξασθαι. Καὶ καθάπερ πρὸς τὰς μεγάλας τινὲς ἀρχὰς καλούμενοι, καὶ τὰς βασιλικωτέρας τῶν πόλεων μέλλοντες οἰκεῖν, διαπαντὸς τὴν οὐσίαν αὐτῶν πᾶσαν ἐξαργυρίσαντες, οὕτω μεθίστανται· οὕτω δὴ καὶ οἱ ἄνθρωποι τότε ἐποιοῦν ἐκεῖνοι, πρὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν κληθέντες, εἰς τὴν ἄνω μητρόπολιν καὶ τὴν ἐκεῖ βασιλείαν. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ᾔδεσαν, ὅτι ἐκεῖνη ὄντως αὐτῶν ἐστὶν ἡ πατρίς, ἐξαργυρίσαντες τὴν ἑαυτῶν οὐσίαν, διὰ τῶν ἀποστολικῶν αὐτὴν χειρῶν ἐκεῖ προέπεμπον. Καὶ γὰρ ἐσχάτης ἀνοίας ἐστὶν ἀφεῖναι τι τῶν ἡμετέρων ἐναπομεῖναι ἐνταῦθα, ἡμῶν μικρὸν ὕστερον μελλόντων ἐντεῦθεν ἀποδημεῖν· καὶ γὰρ ὅπερ ἀπολειφθῆ, ζημία [257] γίνεται. Πάντα τοίνυν ἐκεῖ προπεμπέσθω, ἔνθα καὶ ἡμεῖς διαπαντὸς διατρίβειν μέλλομεν λοιπόν. Ταῦτα γὰρ καὶ αὐτοὶ λογισάμενοι, πᾶσαν ἀπεδύσαντο τὴν οὐσίαν, καὶ διπλοῦν ἐγένετο τὸ κατόρθωμα· καὶ γὰρ τοῖς δεομένοις τὴν πενίαν διώρθουν, καὶ πλείω καὶ ἀσφαλεστέραν τὴν αὐτῶν οὐσίαν ἐποιοῦν, εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν τοὺς ἑαυτῶν μετατιθέντες θησαυρούς.

Ἐκ τούτου τοίνυν τοῦ νόμου καὶ τοῦ ἔθους ἐγένετό τις συνήθεια θαυμαστὴ τότε ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις· συνιόντες γὰρ οἱ πιστοὶ πάντες μετὰ τὴν τῆς διδασκαλίας ἀκρόασιν, μετὰ τὰς εὐχὰς, μετὰ τὴν τῶν μυστηρίων κοινωνίαν, τῆς συνάξεως λυθείσης, οὐκ ἀνεχώρουν εὐθέως οἴκαδε, ἀλλ' οἱ πλούσιοι καὶ εὐπορώτεροι φέροντες οἴκοθεν τροφὰς καὶ ἐδέσματα, τοὺς πένητας ἐκάλουν, καὶ κοινὰς ἐποιοῦντο τραπέζας, κοινὰς ἐστιάσεις, κοινὰ συμπόσια ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ· ὥστε καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς κοινωνίας τῆς κατὰ τὴν τράπεζαν, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς εὐλαβείας τῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ τόπου, καὶ πανταχόθεν τὴν ἀγάπην αὐτοῖς ἐπισφίγγεσθαι, καὶ πολλὴν μὲν τὴν ἡδονὴν, πολλὴν δὲ αὐτοῖς γίνεσθαι τὴν ὠφέλειαν. Οἱ τε γὰρ πένητες παραμυθίας ἀπέλαυνον οὐ τῆς τυχοῦσης, καὶ οἱ πλουτοῦντες πολλὴν εὐνοίαν καὶ παρὰ τῶν τρεφομένων, καὶ παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ, δι' ὃν ταῦτα ἐποιοῦν, καρπωσάμενοι πολλὴν τὴν χάριν, οὕτως ἀπῆγαν οἴκαδε. Καὶ μυρία ἐκ τοῦ πράγματος τούτου ἐγένετο τὰ ἀγαθὰ, καὶ τὸ πάντων κεφάλαιον,

49. For both Paul and John, the ἐκκλησία refers to the local group of believers, their action in assembly together, and (even more so for John, but also already for Paul) a translocal phenomenon. For a cogent discussion of the issues, see Young-ho Park, *Paul's Ekklesia As a Civic Assembly: Understanding the People of God in Their Politico-Social World*, WUNT 2/393 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015). For John, however, unlike Paul, it can also refer to the dedicated architecture where believers meet.

50. That is, the period described in Acts 2 and 4 among the early believers in

everything due to the fact that he'd been boastful and puffed up (cf. Luke 18:10–14). But it wasn't like this at the time of the apostles. Instead, they brought their possessions with rejoicing and jubilation, considering that they were receiving the greatest of benefits, and they considered it to be a precious thing if the apostles deemed their possessions worthy of receipt. People who are called to high positions of leadership and who are going off to live in the choicest cities of the empire always liquidate all their property and then move away. The people back then acted in the exact same way after they'd been called to heaven and to the metropolis above and the kingdom that's there. Since they knew that it's their real fatherland, they liquidated their own property and sent it on ahead there by the hands of the apostles. After all, it's the height of folly to allow any of our possessions to remain here when a little while later we're going to depart from here. Indeed, whatever's leftover is an outright loss. [257] So then, let all our possessions be sent on ahead to the place where we're finally going to live forever. For it was in consideration of these things that they stripped themselves of all property (cf. Acts 4:32–35), and the good deed had a double effect, for they corrected the penury of those in need, and they made their own property both larger and more secure by transferring their own treasures to heaven (cf. Matt 6:20).

Out of this law and habit came a marvelous custom in the churches⁴⁹ in the early days.⁵⁰ All the believers used to come together after they heard the teaching, after the prayers, after the communion of the sacramental mysteries, after the liturgical assembly had been dismissed, and they didn't go home immediately, but the rich and wealthy, bringing provisions and food from their homes, invited the poor and made common meals, common feasts, common⁵¹ banquets in the church assembly itself. As a result, from the communion at the table, and from the piety adhering to the place, love was binding them together from all directions, and they had both great pleasure and great benefit. The poor enjoyed no meager comfort, and the rich went back to their houses having reaped a great gift—tremendous goodwill both from those they fed and from God, who was the reason they did these things. Countless good things come from this action, and chief of them all was that the friendship in every liturgical assembly was

Jerusalem. John will soon make a contrast with the later period at Corinth that Paul addresses in 1 Corinthians.

51. John punctuates this point (in implied contrast to τὸ ἴδιον δέειπνον in 1 Cor 11:21) with anaphora of κοινός.

ἡ φιλία θερμότερα ἦν καθ' ἐκάστην σύναξιν, μετὰ τοσαύτης φιλοφροσύνης ἀλλήλοις συνηνωμένων αὐτῶν εὐεργετούντων τε αὐτῶν καὶ εὐεργετουμένων. Τοῦτο τοίνυν τὸ ἔθος Κορίνθιοι, τοῦ χρόνου προϊόντος, διέφθειρον, καὶ καθ' ἑαυτοὺς ἐστιώμενοι οἱ εὐπορώτεροι τοὺς πένητας παρεώρων, καὶ οὐκ ἀνέμενον ὑστερίζοντας πολλάκις, καὶ ὑπὸ βιωτικῶν χρειῶν, οἷα τὰ τῶν πενήτων, κατεχομένους καὶ βραδύνοντας. Ἐκ δὲ τούτου συνέβαινε παραγενομένους αὐτοὺς ὕστερον μετὰ αἰσχύνης ἀναχωρεῖν, τῆς τραπέζης ἀναιρεθείσης, φθανόντων τούτων, κακείνων ὑστερίζόντων. Ὅρῶν τοίνυν ὁ Παῦλος ἐκ τοῦ πράγματος τούτου πολλὰ κακὰ, τὰ μὲν γινόμενα, τὰ δὲ μέλλοντα (καὶ γὰρ καταφρόνησις τῶν πενήτων τοῖς πλουσίοις ἐγένετο καὶ ὑπεροψία πλείων, καὶ τοῖς πένησιν ἀθυμία καὶ ἀπέχθεια πρὸς τοὺς πλουτοῦντας, καὶ ὅσα ἄλλα εἰκὸς ἦν ἀπὸ τούτων τεχθῆναι τῶν κακῶν), διορθοῦται τὴν πονηρὰν ταύτην καὶ πικρὰν συνήθειαν. Καὶ ὅρα μεθ' ὅσης συνέσεως καὶ ἐπεικειᾶς εἰς τὴν διόρθωσιν ἐνέβαλεν. Ἀρχόμενος γὰρ οὕτω φησί· Τοῦτο δὲ παραγγέλλων οὐκ ἐπαινώ, ὅτι οὐκ εἰς τὸ κρεῖττον, ἀλλ' εἰς τὸ ἥττον συνέρχεσθε. Τί δέ ἐστιν, Οὐκ εἰς τὸ κρεῖττον; Οἱ πρόγονοι, φησὶν, οἱ ὑμέτεροι καὶ οἱ πατέρες καὶ τὰς ἑαυτῶν οὐσίας ἐπώλουν καὶ τὰ κτήματα καὶ τὰς ὑπάρξεις, καὶ κοινὰ πάντα εἶχον, καὶ πολλὴν πρὸς ἀλλήλους τὴν ἀγάπην· ὑμεῖς δὲ ὀφείλοντες ἐκείνους ζηλοῦν, οὐ μόνον οὐδὲν ἐποιήσατε τοιοῦτον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὅπερ εἶχετε μόνον, καὶ τοῦτο ἀπωλέσατε, τὰ συμπόσια τὰ κατὰ σύναξιν γινόμενα· διὰ τοῦτό φησιν, Ὅτι οὐκ εἰς τὸ κρεῖττον, ἀλλ' εἰς τὸ ἥττον συνέρχεσθε. Καὶ ἐκεῖνοι μὲν καὶ τῶν κτημάτων ἀπάντων τοῖς πένησι παρεχώρησαν· ὑμεῖς δὲ τραπέζης αὐτοῖς μεταδιδόντες, καὶ ταύτης ἀπεστερήσατε.

Πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ, συνερχομένων ὑμῶν ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ, ἀκούω σχίσματα ἐν ὑμῖν ὑπάρχειν, καὶ μέρος τι πιστεύω. δ'. "Ὅρα πῶς πάλιν συνετῶς ποιεῖται τὴν διόρθωσιν. Οὐκ εἶπεν, οὔτε Ἀπιστῶ, οὔτε Πιστεύω· ἀλλὰ μέσον ἀφήκε τὸ ῥῆμα, ὅτι Μέρος τι καὶ πιστεύω· οὐ πι-[258]στεύω τέλεον, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἀπιστῶ τέλεον· τοῦ δὲ ἡ τοῦτο, ἡ ἐκεῖνο συμβῆναι παντελῶς ὑμεῖς κύριοι. Ἄν μὲν γὰρ διορθώσθητε, οὐ πιστεύω· ἂν δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν αὐτῶν μείνητε, πιστεύω. Οὔτε οὖν κατηγόρησε, καὶ κατηγόρησεν. Οὐ κατηγόρησεν ἀπρητισμένως, ἵνα αὐτοῖς ἐλπίδα δῶ διορθώσεως καὶ προθεσμίαν μετανοίας· οὐκ ἀφήκεν ἀνεγκλήτους,

all the warmer, as the benefactors and those who received the benefactions were united with one another with such friendly affection. However, as time passed, the Corinthians degenerated this custom, and the rich dined among themselves and neglected the poor, and often didn't wait for those who came late (cf. 1 Cor 11:33) because they were detained and delayed by the needs of daily life such as the poor have. Due to this, it happened that when the latter arrived later they withdrew in shame because the meal had been devoured, since the former had arrived earlier and they later. Paul saw that from this action came many bad things—both in the present and in the future, since the rich people had disdain and greater contempt for the poor, while the poor had despondency and enmity toward the rich, and likely many other bad things were born from these dispositions as well. For this reason, he took it upon himself to correct this wicked and vindictive way of doing things. Note the great intelligence and fairness with which Paul brought this correction. For at the start he puts it this way, saying, *“In commanding this, I am not offering praise, because it is not for the better but for the worse that you come together”* (1 Cor 11:17). What does *“not for the better”* mean? “Your ancestors and your fathers in the faith,” he means, “sold their own property and possessions and belongings, held all things in common, and had tremendous love for one another. But you, though you ought to emulate them, not only don't do any such thing, but you've destroyed even the practice that you alone held—the banquets held in conjunction with the liturgical assembly.” That's the reason he says, *“because it is not for the better but for the worse that you come together”* (1 Cor 11:17). They⁵² shared all their possessions with the poor, but you, sharing just a meal with them, even deprive them of that.

“For first of all, when you come together in assembly, I hear that there are factions among you, and in part I even believe it” (1 Cor 11:18). **4.** Do you see once again how intelligently he frames his correction? He didn't say either “I don't believe it” or “I believe it,” but he leaves the statement in the middle, *“in part I even believe it”* (1 Cor 11:18).⁵³ “I don't believe [258] it completely, nor do I disbelieve it completely. Whether it will be the former or the latter is entirely in your hands. For if you'll correct your behavior, then I don't believe it; but if you remain in the same actions, then I do believe it.” Hence Paul didn't bring an accusation, and yet he did accuse. He didn't accuse them completely, so that he might offer them the hope of

53. John has added *καί* before *πιστεύω* here, which modulates Paul's statement further. Note again the use of the rewording topos (see p. 318 n. 24).

ἵνα μὴ ἐπὶ τῆς αὐτῆς μείνωσι ῥαθυμίας. Οὕτω τέλεον ἐπίστευσα, φησί· τοῦτο γὰρ ἐστὶ τὸ εἰπεῖν, Μέρος τι πιστεύω. Τοῦτο δὲ ἔλεγε προτρέπων μεταβαλέσθαι καὶ διορθώσασθαι καὶ ἀπαγαγεῖν αὐτὸν τοῦ καὶ ἐκ μέρους πιστεῦσαι τι κατ' αὐτῶν τοιοῦτον. Δεῖ γὰρ καὶ αἱρέσεις εἶναι, ἵνα οἱ δόκιμοι φανεροὶ γένωνται ἐν ὑμῖν.

Εἶπε οὖν τὰς αἱρέσεις. Ἐνταῦθα προσέχετε, ὅτι οὐ περὶ δογμάτων ἐστὶ τὸ, Δεῖ αἱρέσεις ἐν ὑμῖν εἶναι· ἀλλὰ περὶ τῆς διχονομίας τῆς κατὰ τὰς τραπέζας. Εἰπὼν γὰρ, Δεῖ δὲ καὶ αἱρέσεις εἶναι, ἐπήγαγε καὶ τὸν τρόπον τῶν αἱρέσεων· Συνερχομένων γὰρ ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ, οὐκ ἐστὶ κυριακὸν δεῖπνον φαγεῖν. Τί ἐστὶ, Κυριακὸν δεῖπνον φαγεῖν; Δεσποτικὸν δεῖπνον, φησὶν, οὐκ ἐστὶ φαγεῖν· ἐκεῖνο λέγων τὸ δεῖπνον, ὃ τῇ ἐσχάτῃ νυκτὶ παρέδωκεν ὁ Χριστὸς, ὅτε οἱ μαθηταὶ μετ' αὐτοῦ πάντες ἦσαν. Ἐν ἐκείνῳ γὰρ τῷ δείπνῳ καὶ Δεσπότης καὶ δοῦλοι πάντες ὁμοῦ κατέκειντο· ὑμεῖς δὲ σύνδουλοι ὄντες ἀλλήλους διεστήσατε καὶ ἀπεσχίσατε. Κάκεῖνος μὲν οὐδὲ τὸν προδότην ἀπήλασε· καὶ γὰρ ὁ Ἰούδας μετ' αὐτῶν ἦν τότε· σὺ δὲ τὸν ἀδελφὸν διακρούῃ. Διὰ τοῦτό φησιν, Οὐκ ἐστὶ κυριακὸν δεῖπνον φαγεῖν, κυριακὸν δεῖπνον καλῶν, τὸ μεθ' ὁμονομίας, τὸ κοινῇ πάντων συγκεκλημένων. Ἐκαστος γὰρ τὸ ἴδιον δεῖπνον προλαμβάνει φαγεῖν· καὶ ὃς μὲν πεινᾷ, ὃς δὲ μεθύει. Καὶ οὐκ εἶπεν, Ὅς μὲν πεινᾷ, ὃς δὲ ἐσθίει, ἀλλὰ τῷ τῆς μέθης ὀνόματι μᾶλλον αὐτῶν καθήψατο. Κάκεῖ καὶ ἐνταῦθα ἀμετρία, φησί. Σὺ μὲν ὑπὸ τῆς ἀδηφαγίας διαρρήγνυσαι, ἐκεῖνος δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ λιμοῦ τήκεται· σὺ καὶ τῶν ὑπὲρ τὴν χρεῖαν μετέχεις, ἐκεῖνος δὲ οὐδὲ τῶν ἀναγκαίων ἀπέλαυσε. Διπλοῦν τὸ δεινόν, τῆς ἰσότητος διαφθαρείσης, τοῦτο αἱρέσεις καλεῖ· ἐπειδὴ φιλονεικῶς πρὸς ἀλλήλους διέκειντο καὶ διεστασίαζον, καὶ ὃς μὲν ἐπείνα, ὃς δὲ ἐμέθυε. Καὶ καλῶς εἶπε, Συνερχομένων ὑμῶν ἐπὶ

54. Minus ἐν ὑμῖν before εἶναι. This time Chrysostom has quoted the lemma as starting with δεῖ γὰρ καὶ (with \mathfrak{M}), unlike above (and below).

55. John does not take one other possible solution and dispute that the term here means “heresies”—by, e.g., arguing that it means “choices” (LSJ I.B) or “schools” (LSJ II.2). Instead, he will make an argument about the cause and nature of these “heresies,” understood here as more akin to “dissension” or “factions” (BDAG 1c, for 1 Cor 11:19).

56. With δεῖ for δεῖ γὰρ καὶ.

57. With δέ for γάρ.

58. Or, “at one place” (ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό), probably a double entendre by Paul. John emphasizes the former sense in what follows. John also understands the double sense of συνέρχεσθαι as “coming together” physically and as a metaphor for unity (see Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation*, 151–57).

59. With γάρ for οὖν after συνερχομένων.

60. Equally possibly, we can take this as an unmarked interrogative.

61. With φαγεῖν for ἐν τῷ φαγεῖν.

self-correction and some time for repentance. He didn't leave them blameless, lest they might remain in the same state of indolence. "In that sense, I believed it completely," he says, for that is what saying "*in part I believe it*" means. He said this as a means of persuading them to change and correct themselves and induce him not to believe any such thing about them, even in part. "*For it is necessary for there even to be heresies so that those who meet with approval might be made manifest*" (1 Cor 11:19).⁵⁴

And then he spoke about "heresies."⁵⁵ Yet note carefully that here the statement "*it is necessary for there to be heresies among you*" (1 Cor 11:19)⁵⁶ doesn't concern doctrinal teachings but rather the discord at the meals. For after he'd said, "*But it is necessary for there even to be heresies among you*" (1 Cor 11:19),⁵⁷ he added also the form the "heresies" took: "*for when you come together as one,*⁵⁸ *it is not to eat the Lord's meal*" (1 Cor 11:20).⁵⁹ What does "*to eat the Lord's meal*" mean? He says, "It is not to eat the master's meal," meaning the meal that Christ handed over on his final night, when all the disciples were with him (cf. Matt 26:17–30 and parr.; 1 Cor 11:23–26). For in that meal, both the master and all the slaves reclined together (cf. John 13:1–17; 15:12–17). But you, being fellow slaves with one another, have fallen into discord and division. Whereas Christ didn't even send away his betrayer—for even Judas was with them then (cf. John 13:21–30; Matt 26:20–25 and parr.)—you drive away your brother or sister!⁶⁰ That's why Paul says, "*It is not to eat the Lord's meal,*" calling "*the Lord's meal*" the meal of concord, the meal to which all have been invited in common. "*For each takes his or her own private meal in advance to eat; and one is hungry, and another drunk*" (1 Cor 11:21).⁶¹ Now, he didn't say, "one is hungry and another eats," but with the word "drunkenness" he upbraids them all the more.⁶² In both the former and latter cases, he says, there is asymmetry. "You are full to bursting because of your gluttony, and the other is wasting away of famine. You partake of what is beyond your needs, and the other doesn't even enjoy the bare necessities."⁶³ There's a double danger when equality is demolished. This is what Paul calls "heresies": when they were contentiously disposed to one another and were factionalized, then "*one was hungry, and another was drunk.*"⁶⁴ And well he said, "*when you come*

62. Cf. 1 Cor 6:10; Rom 13:13; Gal 5:21 on drunkenness as a vice Paul routinely rebukes.

63. The quotation marks signal this as likely a Pauline *προσωποποιία* expanding on 1 Cor 11:21, but, as so often with John, these words are also his own address to his congregation.

64. John has rendered both Paul's present tense verbs in the past tense.

τὸ αὐτό. Τίνος γὰρ ἔνεκεν συνέρχεσθε; φησί· τί βούλεται ἡ σύνοδος; τίνος ἔνεκεν ἡ συλλογὴ κοινή, ὅταν ἡ τράπεζα μὴ γίνεται κοινή; Δεσποτικά ἐστι τὰ χρήματα, ἅπερ ἐλάβομεν· κοινὰ προκείσθω τοίνυν τοῖς συνδούλοις τοῖς ἡμετέροις. Μὴ γὰρ οἰκίας οὐκ ἔχετε εἰς τὸ ἐσθίειν, καὶ πίνειν; ἢ τῆς ἐκκλησίας τοῦ Θεοῦ καταφρονεῖτε, φησί, καὶ καταισχύnete τοὺς μὴ ἔχοντας; Σὺ μὲν νομίζεις, φησί, τὸν ἀδελφὸν ὑβρίζειν μόνον, κοινωνεῖ δὲ καὶ ὁ τόπος τῆς ὕβρεως. Ἐκκλησίας γὰρ ὀλοκλήρου καταφρονεῖς. Ἐκκλησία γὰρ διὰ τοῦτο λέγεται, ὅτι κοινὴ πάντας ὑποδέχεται. Τί τοίνυν τῆς οἰκίας σου τὴν εὐτέλειαν εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν εἰσάγεις; Εἰ γὰρ καταφρονεῖς τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ, αἰδέσθητι τὸν τόπον· καὶ γὰρ ἡ ἐκκλησία ὑβρίζεται. Καὶ οὐκ εἶπεν, Ἀποστερεῖτε τοὺς μὴ ἔχοντας, ἢ, Οὐκ ἐλεεῖτε τοὺς μὴ ἔχοντας, ἀλλὰ τί; Καταισχύnete τοὺς μὴ ἔχοντας. Ἐντρεπτικώτατα τὴν ἀσωτίαν αὐτῶν ἐτραγώδησεν. Οὐ γὰρ οὕτω μέλει τῷ πένητι, φησὶν, ὑπὲρ τῆς τροφῆς, ὥς ὑπὲρ τῆς ὕβρεως. Ὅρα πῶς καὶ ὑπὲρ τούτου σεμνῶς ἀπελογήσατο, κάκεῖνων σφοδρότερον καθήψατο. Τί ὑμῖν εἶπω; ἐπαινέσω ὑμᾶς; Ἐν τούτῳ οὐκ ἐπαινῶ. Τί τοῦτο;

Μετὰ τὴν ἀπόδειξιν τῆς ἀτοπίας ὑφειμένη ἡ [259] κατηγορία, καὶ μάλα εἰκότως, ἵνα μὴ ἀναισχυντότεροι γένωνται. Πρὶν ἢ μὲν γὰρ ἀποδείξει τὸ πρᾶγμα ἄτοπον, ἀπηρτισμένην ἐξήνεγκε τὴν ἀπόφασιν, εἰπών· Τοῦτο δὲ παραγγέλλων οὐκ ἐπαινῶ· ὅτε δὲ ἀπέδειξεν ἀκριβῶς πολλῶν ὄντας ἐγκλημάτων ἀξίους, ὑφειμένη κέχρηται τῇ διαβολῇ, τῇ τῶν εἰρημένων κατασκευῇ καὶ ἀποδείξει τὸ σφοδρότερον τῆς κατηγορίας ἀφεις ἐναποκεῖσθαι. Εἶτα ἐπὶ τὴν μυστικὴν τράπεζαν ἐξάγει τὸν λόγον, μειζόνως αὐτοὺς φοβῆσαι βουλόμενος. Ἐγὼ γὰρ, φησί, παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου, ὃ καὶ παρέδωκα ὑμῖν. Ποία ἀκολουθία αὕτη; Περὶ ἀρίστου διαλέγῃ κοινοῦ, καὶ μυστηρίων φρικτῶν μέμνησαι; Ναί,

65. Minus οὖν after συνερχομένων.

66. τράπεζα refers both to the table on which the meal is set and the meal itself. Sharing in the meal is sharing in the food and the presence at the table (table fellowship).

67. Behind this statement (but not in the wording itself) may be an assumed play on ἐκ-κλησία and καλεῖν, as also in τὸ (δεῖπνον) κοινῇ πάντων συγκεκλημένων previously in this paragraph.

68. The punctuation in PG places ἐν τούτῳ with the clause that follows (as translated above). Note that RP puts it with the prior clause: "Shall I praise you for this?"

69. John is referring to Paul's use of litotes in saying οὐκ ἐπαινῶ, rather than κατηγορῶ ("I accuse"); he regards the former as softer because less direct.

70. ἐγκλήματα, a properly forensic term meaning charges or accusations, here in contrast to the epideictic term ἐπαινέειν/ἔπαινος (the opposite of which is καταισχύνειν, which is in the Pauline passage itself). This whole passage (including what follows), in which John insists upon the studied rhetorical progression of Paul's argument in 1 Cor

together as one" (1 Cor 11:20),⁶⁵ for why is it that "you come together?" (1 Cor 11:17), he says. What's the purpose of gathering together? Why this common meeting together, when the meal⁶⁶ isn't held in common? The things we've received belong to the Lord. Therefore, let these common possessions be set before our fellow slaves. "After all, don't you have houses for eating and drinking? Or do you despise the assembly of God," he says, "and shame the have-nots?" (1 Cor 11:22). "You suppose," Paul says, "that you're only insulting your sister or brother; but the place also shares in this insult, because you despise the entire assembly." For it is called "assembly" because it welcomes all in common.⁶⁷ Why have you brought the penny-pinching ways of your own household into the church's assembly? If you despise your brother or sister, have respect for the place! After all, it's the church that is insulted. And he didn't say, "You're depriving the have-nots," or "You show no mercy to the have-nots," but what? "*You shame the have-nots.*" He dramatized their dissoluteness in the most disgraceful terms. "What concerns the poor person most," he says, "isn't the food, but the insult." See how he honorably defended the latter concerning this and upbraided the former all the more vehemently. "What should I say to you? Shall I praise you? I don't praise you for this!" (1 Cor 11:22).⁶⁸ Why does he say this?

After the proof of their inappropriate behavior, the accusation is softened,⁶⁹ [259] and with good reason, lest they become all the more shameless. Before he proved that their actions were inappropriate, he extended the declaration in full form, saying, "*In commanding this, I am not offering praise*" (1 Cor 11:17). But then when he had shown in detailed fashion that they deserved heaps of blame,⁷⁰ he used a softened form of the accusation, offered confirmatory proof for all that he'd said and allowed the more severe form of the charge to be implicit in that demonstration. Then, wishing to incite even more fear in them, he brings his argument to the mystical table.⁷¹ "For," he says, "*I received from the Lord what also I handed on to you*" (1 Cor 11:23). "What's the logical progression⁷² here? You're speaking about a common meal, and you bring to mind the awe-

11:17–26, is replete with rhetorical terms: κατηγορία ("accusation," "charge"); ἀπόδειξις ("proof," "demonstration"); διαβολή ("accusation," also "slander"); κατασκευή ("confirmatory proof," as in the *progymnasma* by that name).

71. τράπεζα, including, by metonymy, the meal served on the table (as noted in p. 249 n. 12 above).

72. As indicated above (p. 316 n. 13), ἀκολουθία refers to both logical and rhetorical progression in any argument.

φησίν. Εἰ γὰρ τὰ πνευματικὰ ἐκεῖνα, εἰ γὰρ ἡ τράπεζα ἡ φρικώδης κοινὴ πᾶσι πρόκειται, καὶ πλουσίῳ καὶ πένητι, καὶ οὐχὶ δαψιλέστερον ἀπολαύει ταύτης ὁ πλούσιος, οὐδὲ ἔλαττον ὁ πένης, ἀλλὰ μία τιμὴ, καὶ πρόσδοδος μία· καὶ ἔως ἂν πάντες μετασχῶσι καὶ κοινωνήσωσι τῆς πνευματικῆς καὶ ἱερᾶς ταύτης τραπέζης, οὐ συστέλλεται τὰ προκείμενα, ἀλλ' ἐστήκασιν οἱ ἱερεῖς ἅπαντες, καὶ τὸν πάντων πενέστερον καὶ εὐτελέστερον ἀναμένοντες· πολλῶ μᾶλλον ἐπὶ τῆς αἰσθητῆς τοῦτο χρή ποιεῖν. Διὰ τοῦτο ἐμνήσθην ἐκείνου τοῦ κυριακοῦ δείπνου. Ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου, ὃ καὶ παρέδωκα ὑμῖν, ὅτι ὁ Κύριος Ἰησοῦς ἐν τῇ νυκτί, ἣ παρεδίδото, ἔλαβεν ἄρτον, καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασε, καὶ εἶπε· Τοῦτό μού ἐστι τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ πολλῶν κλώμενον εἰς ἅφεςιν ἁμαρτιῶν. Τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. Ὡσαύτως καὶ τὸ ποτήριον μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι, λέγων· Τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι.

ε'. Εἶτα πολλὰ διαλεχθεὶς περὶ τῶν ἀναξίως κοινωνούντων τοῖς μυστηρίοις, καὶ σφόδρα αὐτῶν καθαψάμενος καὶ διελέγξας, διδάξας τε ὅτι τοῖς τὸν Χριστὸν ἀποκτείναντι τὴν αὐτὴν ὑποστήσονται τιμωρίαν οἱ τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸ σῶμα ἀπλῶς καὶ ὡς ἔτυχε λαμβάνοντες, πάλιν εἰς τὴν προκειμένην ὑπόθεσιν τὸν λόγον ἐξήγαγεν, εἰπών· Ὡστε, ἀδελφοί, συνερχόμενοι εἰς τὸ φαγεῖν, ἀλλήλους ἐκδέχεσθε. Εἰ δέ τις πεινᾷ, ἐν οἴκῳ ἐσθιέτω, ἵνα μὴ εἰς κρίμα συνέρχησθε. Ὅρα πῶς λανθανόντως καὶ λαιμαργίαν αὐτῶν κατέγνω, καὶ οὐκ εἶπεν, Εἰ δέ πεινᾶτε, ἀλλ', Εἰ δέ τις πεινᾷ, ἵνα ἕκαστος αἰσχυνόμενος αὐτὸς ὑπεύθυνος φανῇ τοῖς ἐγκλήμασι, προλαβὼν διορθώσεται. Καὶ εἰς κολάσεως δὲ φόβον τὸν λόγον κατέκλεισεν, [260] εἰπών· Ἵνα μὴ εἰς κρίμα συνέρχησθε, τουτέστιν, εἰς κατάκριμα καὶ εἰς ὀνειδισμόν. Οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶ τροφή, φησίν, οὐδὲ τράπεζα ἢ μετὰ αἰσχύνης τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ, ἢ μετὰ καταφρονήσεως τῆς ἐκκλησίας, ἢ μετὰ λαιμαργίας ἢ ἀσωτίας γινομένη. Οὐκ ἔστιν εὐφροσύνη ταῦτα, ἀλλὰ κόλασις καὶ τιμωρία. Μεγάλην γὰρ ἐπισπᾶσθε καθ' ἑαυτῶν δίκην τοὺς ἀδελφούς ὑβρίζοντες, τῆς ἐκκλησίας καταφρονοῦντες, οἰκίαν ἰδιωτικὴν τὸν ἅγιον τρόπον ποιοῦντες διὰ τὸ καθ' ἑαυτοὺς ἐσθίειν.

73. The conditional introduced here with εἰ γάρ has its apodosis two lines later.

74. This statement appears to be John's own (not inside the Pauline *προσωποποιία*) because it apparently refers to the liturgical practice of his day.

75. An *a maiore ad minus* argument. The contrast is between an αἰσθητὴ and a πνευματικὴ τράπεζα.

76. Minus λάβετε, φάγετε before τοῦτό μού ἐστιν τὸ σῶμα; with ὑπὲρ πολλῶν for ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν before κλώμενον (cf. Mark 14:24, περὶ πολλῶν, of the blood poured out); plus εἰς ἅφεςιν ἁμαρτιῶν before τοῦτο ποιεῖτε (cf. Matt 26:28, of the blood poured out).

77. This is how John understands ἔνοχος ἔσται τοῦ σώματος καὶ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ κυρίου.

inducing mysteries?” “Yes,” Paul says, “after all,⁷³ those spiritual goods, that awe-inducing table, is set in common before all, both rich and poor; the rich don’t enjoy a greater share of it, nor the poor a lesser, but there’s a single measure of honor, a single mode of access.” And while all are partaking and sharing of this spiritual and holy table, the things set forth on it aren’t restricted, but all the priests stand there awaiting the most poor and lowly of all.⁷⁴ If that’s the case, then it’s all the more necessary to do this in the case of the physical meal.⁷⁵ That’s the reason Paul brought to mind that meal of the Lord. “*For I received from the Lord what also I handed on to you, that the Lord Jesus on the night on which he was handed over took bread, and after giving thanks, he broke it and said, ‘This is my body that is broken for all of you for forgiveness of sins. Do this in remembrance of me.’ Likewise also the cup after dining, saying, ‘This cup is the new covenant in my blood’*” (1 Cor 11:23–25).⁷⁶

5. Then he spoke at length about those partaking of the mysteries unworthily, and he upbraided and reproved them harshly, and taught them that those who receive the blood and body of Christ in a casual way and as some ordinary thing will stand under the same chastisement as those who killed him (cf. 1 Cor 11:27).⁷⁷ After that, again he brings his argument to the main point he was setting forth,⁷⁸ saying, “*Therefore, brothers and sisters, when you come together to eat, wait for one another. And if someone is hungry, they should eat at home, lest you come together for judgment*” (1 Cor 11:33–34).⁷⁹ Notice how he also surreptitiously condemns their gluttony, and he didn’t say, “if you all⁸⁰ are hungry,” but “*and if someone is hungry,*” so each individual person might feel ashamed to appear liable to those charges and might take the initiative to correct themselves. And he concludes his argument with fear of punishment, [260] saying, “*lest you might come together for judgment,*” that is, for condemnation and for reproach. “For there is no food or table,” he says, “that comes with shame for the sister or brother, or with contempt for the church assembly, or with gluttony and dissoluteness. These things don’t mean enjoyment, but punishment and chastisement. You bring a weighty reprisal on yourselves when you insult the brothers and sisters, despise the church assembly, and make the holy place your private home by eating with only yourself in view.”

78. ἡ προκειμένη υπόθεσις; also “the subject at hand” or “the subject under discussion.”

79. Μίνος μου after ἀδελφοί.

80. The verb is second-person plural (πεινᾶτε).

Ταῦτα καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀκούσαντες, ἀγαπητοὶ, ἐπιστομίζετε τοὺς ἀπλῶς τῇ ἀποστολικῇ κεκρημένους ῥήσει καὶ διδασκαλίᾳ· διορθοῦτε τοὺς ἐπὶ βλάβῃ τῇ ἑαυτῶν καὶ τῇ ἐτέρων ταῖς Γραφαῖς κεκρημένους. "Εγνώτε γὰρ περὶ τίνος φησὶ τὸ, Δεῖ δὲ καὶ αἰρέσεις εἶναι ἐν ὑμῖν, περὶ τῆς διχοστασίας τῆς ἐν ταῖς τραπέζαις γινομένης, ἐπειδὴ Ὁ μὲν πεινᾷ, ὁ δὲ μεθύει. Καὶ μετὰ τῆς ὀρθῆς πίστεως καὶ πολιτείας συμβαίνουσιν τοῖς δόγμασιν ἐπιδεικνόμεθα, πολλὴν περὶ τοὺς πένητας φιλοφροσύνην, πολλὴν ὑπὲρ τῶν δεομένων ποιούμενοι πρόνοιαν· ἐμπορίαν πνευματικὴν ἐμπορευσόμεθα, μηδὲν πλέον τῆς χρείας ἐπιζητῶμεν. Τοῦτο πλοῦτος, τοῦτο ἐμπορία, τοῦτο θησαυρὸς ἀνελλιπής, τὸ πάντα τὰ ὄντα εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν μετατιθέσθαι, καὶ θαρρεῖν λοιπὸν ὑπὲρ τῆς φυλακῆς τῶν ἀποκειμένων. Διπλοῦν γὰρ ἡμῖν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐλεημοσύνης ἔσται τὸ κέρδος, ὅτι τε οὐκέτι δεδοίκαμεν ὑπὲρ τῶν καταβληθέντων χρημάτων, μήποτε ληστὰὶ καὶ τοιχωρύχοι καὶ οἰκετῶν κακουργία αὐτὰ λυμῆνται, καὶ ὅτι κείμενα οὐχ ἀπλῶς κατορώρυκται ἄκαρπα· ἀλλ' ὥσπερ ῥίζα ἐν λιπαρῷ φυτευθεῖσα χωρίῳ, καθ' ἕκαστον ἐνιαυτὸν ὠρίμους φέρει τοὺς καρπούς, οὕτω καὶ ἀργύριον ἐν ταῖς τῶν πενήτων χερσὶ φυτευθὲν, οὐ καθ' ἕκαστον ἐνιαυτὸν μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν πνευματικούς ἡμῖν φέρει τοὺς καρπούς, παρρησίαν πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν, ἀμαρτημάτων συγχώρησιν, ἀγγέλων ἐγγύτητα, συνειδὸς ἀγαθόν, εὐφροσύνην πνευματικῆς ἀγαλλιάσεως, ἐλπίδα ἀκαταίσχυντον, τὰ θαυμαζόμενα ἀγαθὰ, ἅπερ ἡτοίμασεν ὁ Θεὸς τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν αὐτόν, καὶ τοῖς ἐν θερμῇ καὶ ζεούσῃ ψυχῇ ἐκζητοῦσι τὸ ἔλεος τῆς ἐπιφανείας αὐτοῦ· ἥς γένοιτο πάντας ἡμᾶς τὸν παρόντα βίον εὐαρέστως διανύσαντας ἐπιτυχεῖν, τῆς αἰωνίου τῶν σωζομένων χαρᾶς, χάριτι καὶ οἰκτιρμοῖς τοῦ ἀληθινοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ᾧ ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος σὺν τῷ Πατρὶ καὶ τῷ παναγίῳ αὐτοῦ Πνεύματι, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Ἀμήν.

81. John turns to address his own audience.

82. ἀπλῶς, including nuances of the "simple" or "literal" sense (with PGL E). In this homily John has sought to contest one possible "literal" reading (i.e., that Paul was saying "heresies" *are in fact necessary* or even desirable) by means of a contextual reading of the full passage in its unfolding argument, as well as by lexical and grammatical arguments earlier about δεῖ and ἵνα.

83. With δέ for γάρ; transposition of ἐν ὑμῖν and εἶναι (as above).

And after you've heard these things, my beloved,⁸¹ muzzle those who use this statement and teaching of the apostle in a simpleminded way.⁸² Correct those who use the Scriptures to harm themselves and others. For you now know that the reason Paul says, "*But it is necessary for there even to be heresies among you*" (1 Cor 11:19)⁸³ is the discord that took place at the meals when "*one person is hungry and another drunk*" (1 Cor 11:21).⁸⁴ Along with the correct faith, let's display the way of life corresponding to our doctrinal teachings, that is, kind concern for the poor and the exertion of tremendous forethought for those in need. Let's engage in spiritual commerce; let's not seek anything more than we need. What makes for wealth, what makes for merchandise, what makes for a treasure that doesn't give out (cf. Luke 12:33) is transferring everything we have to heaven and in the end remaining confident in the safe deposit of what has been stored up there. For the gain we shall have from almsgiving is double, because we are no longer consumed by fear for the possessions we've deposited, lest robbers, burglars, and the perfidy of household slaves might bring ruin on them, and because the deposits haven't simply been buried somewhere without an ability to yield a profit (cf. Matt 25:14–30). But just as a root that's been planted in rich soil bears ripe fruits every single year, thus also money planted in the hands of the poor bears—not only every single year but every single day—fruits for us that are spiritual: confidence before God, forbearance for our sins, nearness to the angels, a good conscience, the gladness of spiritual jubilation, a hope that cannot be put to shame, the marvelous good things that "*God has prepared for those who love him*" (1 Cor 2:9), and for those who with a warm and fervent soul seek the mercy that comes from his epiphanic presence.⁸⁵ May we all be worthy to attain that presence, which is the eternal joy that belongs to those who are saved, once we have brought the present life to an acceptable conclusion, by the grace and mercy of the true God and our Savior Jesus Christ, to whom be glory and power together with the Father and his All-Holy Spirit, forever and ever. Amen.

84. With *ὁ μὲν ... ὁ δὲ* for *ὁς μὲν ... ὁς δὲ*, the latter being read above in §4 (PG 51:258).

85. A favored phrase of John's—see also, e.g., *Hom. 1 Tim.* 5:9 §12 (PG 51:332); *Anna* 4.4 (PG 54:665). For possible scriptural echoes in this clause, see Ps 24:10; 2 Tim 4:8; Titus 2:13.

ΕΙΣ ΤΗΝ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΙΚΗΝ ΡΗΣΙΝ Τὴν λέγουσαν, «Ἐχοντες δὲ τὸ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα τῆς πίστεως, κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον» καὶ εἰς τὸ, «Ἐπίστευσα, διὸ ἐλάλησα,» καὶ περὶ ἐλεημοσύνης.

α'. [271] Οἱ σοφώτατοι τῶν ἱατρῶν ἐπειδὴν ἴδωσιν ἔλκος σιδήρου δεόμενον, ἐπάγουσι μὲν τὴν τομὴν, ἐπάγουσι δὲ οὐκ ἀναλγήτως, οὐδὲ ἀσυμπαθῶς, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀλγοῦσι καὶ χαίρουσιν αὐτῶν οὐχ ἥττον τῶν τεμνομένων· καὶ ἀλγοῦσι μὲν διὰ τὴν ἐκ τῆς πληγῆς γινομένην ὀδύνην, χαίρουσι δὲ διὰ τὴν ἐξ αὐτῆς τικτομένην ὑγίειαν. Τοῦτο καὶ ὁ Παῦλος ἐποίησεν ὁ σοφὸς τῶν ψυχῶν ἱατρός. Κορινθίους γάρ ποτε δεομένοις ἐπιτιμῆσεως σφοδροτέρας ἐπιτιμῆσας, καὶ

1. Provenance: as Mayer chronicles, Mf regarded Antioch as the place of delivery of these three homilies, due to the reference in the first one §9 (PG 51:279): Οὐχ ὁρᾷς τοὺς μοναχοὺς τοὺς τὸν μονήρῃ βίον ἐπιθυμοῦντας καὶ εἰς τὰς κορυφὰς τῶν ὀρέων ἀναχωροῦντας, ὅσῃν ὑπομένουσι σκληραγωγίαν; ("Don't you see what austerity the monks who desire the solitary life and withdraw to the tops of mountains endure?"). Mayer is herself skeptical about the widespread application of this criterion to date John's homilies: "While there is evidence that extra-urban forms of monasticism existed at Antioch and urban forms at Constantinople, it is likely that these were not mutually exclusive. It is also likely that phrases such as 'those seated on mountains' or 'those situated in the *eremos*' are not to be interpreted literally, but are rhetorical in character. These factors considerably diminish the effectiveness of the criterion as posited.... The only secure use of the criterion in its present form occurs when it is clear that the monks or ascetics in question live on mountains or in caves that are real, and that those monks or ascetics are also local" (*Provenance*, 434; references to earlier scholarship, before and after Mf, on pp. 59, 86, 119). In the present case, it does seem that real monks on real mountaintops are in view, but John doesn't necessarily indicate that they are local, except that he does point to their visibility. While that criterion does not allow for certainty, one can conclude that these three homilies form a series preached in this order—as is very clear from the openings to the following two homilies and their direct reference to the previous, not just thematically, but in terms of the argument and even its phrasing (as the notes to each homily will document). If Kelly,

Hom. 2 Cor. 4:13 A
(*In illud: habentes eundem spiritum*, sermo 1)
CPG 4383 (PG 51:271–82)¹

On the passage of the apostle that says, “*But having the same Spirit of faith, according to what is written*” (2 Cor 4:13), and the statement “*I believed, therefore I spoke*” (2 Cor 4:13), and concerning almsgiving.²

1. [271] The wisest doctors, when they see a festering wound that requires the knife, make the incision. Yet they don’t do so unfeelingly or unsympathetically, but they experience both pain and joy no less than the patients under their knife. They are pained at the hurt that comes from the blow of the knife, but rejoice at the health that is born of it. This is what Paul, the wise doctor of souls, did too. For after he gave the Corinthians a severe

Golden Mouth, 134, is right that anti-Manichaean polemic is confined to the Antiochene homilies, then the references to Manicheans in *Hom. 2 Cor. 4:13 B* §§4–5 (PG 51:284–85) would be another sign we should locate the three homilies there.

Text: Mf PE (1837) as reprinted by JPM (PG, 1862). PG contains also Mf’s original text-critical notes (1721) on ME, based on his collation of two manuscripts, *Colbertinus* 970 (= Paris. gr. 748 [XI]) and *Colbertinus* 1030 (= Paris. gr. 768 [XIII]), as was the case with *Hom. 1 Cor. 7:2–4* and *Hom. 1 Cor. 7:39–40*. The PE editors added three notes from their fresh reading of Paris. gr. 748 (as indicated in our notes below). As usual, JPM does not differentiate the authors of the notes. Pinakes lists twenty-seven manuscripts (inclusive of HS’s two manuscripts, Oxon. Coll. Nov. 80 and Monac. gr. 6) containing these homilies largely in full, aside from lacunae; all these witnesses (to which can be added the two Paris codices listed above) contain all three homilies, with the exception of Turin, Biblioteca Nazionale Universitaria B.V.40 and Cantab. Trin. Coll. B.08.11, which have only homilies one and two.

2. Mf acknowledged that some before him doubted the authenticity of these homilies for perhaps treading over the line theologically into semi-Pelagianism, on the one hand, and because of the chronological error in the third homily that places Paul five hundred years earlier than the preacher’s time in §1 (PG 51:291), but he does not find either argument sufficient reason to countermand the overwhelmingly Chrysostomic style and treatment of favored subjects (especially, but not only, almsgiving).

ἦσθη καὶ ἐλυπήθη· ἐλυπήθη μὲν, ὅτι ὠδύνησεν, ἦσθη δὲ, ὅτι ὠφέλησε. Καὶ ἀμφοτέρω ταῦτα δηλῶν, ἔλεγεν· “Ὡστε εἰ καὶ ἐλύπησα ὑμᾶς ἐν τῇ προτέρᾳ ἐπιστολῇ, οὐ [272] μεταμέλομαι, εἰ καὶ μετεμελόμην. Διὰ τί μετεμέλου; διὰ τί δὲ πάλιν οὐ μεταμέλῃ; Μετεμελόμην, ἐπειδὴ σφοδρότερον ἔπληξα· οὐ μεταμέλομαι, ἐπειδὴ διώρθωσα. Καὶ ἵνα μάθῃς ὅτι διὰ τοῦτο, ἄκουσον τῶν ἐξῆς· Βλέπω γάρ, ὅτι ἡ ἐπιστολὴ ἐκείνη, εἰ καὶ πρὸς ὦραν, ἐλύπησεν ὑμᾶς· νῦν χαίρω, οὐχ ὅτι ἐλυπήθητε, ἀλλ’ ὅτι ἐλυπήθητε εἰς μετάνοιαν. Εἰ καὶ πρὸς ὦραν ἐλύπησα ὑμᾶς, τὸ λυπητήριον πρόσκαιρον, φησί, τὸ δὲ ὠφέλιμον διηνεκές.

Δότε δὴ καὶ ταῦτα τὰ ῥήματα, παρακαλῶ, πρὸς τὴν ἀγά- [273] πην τὴν ὑμετέραν εἰπεῖν· ὥστε εἰ καὶ ἐλύπησα ὑμᾶς ἐπὶ τῇ προτέρᾳ παραινέσει, οὐ μεταμέλομαι, εἰ καὶ μετεμελόμην· βλέπω γάρ, ὅτι ἡ παραίνεσις ἐκείνη καὶ ἡ συμβουλὴ, εἰ καὶ πρὸς ὦραν ὑμᾶς ἐλύπησεν, ἀλλ’ ἡμᾶς μεζόνως ἠψφρανεν, Οὐχ ὅτι ἐλυπήθητε, ἀλλ’ ὅτι ἐλυπήθητε εἰς μετάνοιαν. Ἴδου γὰρ αὐτὸ τοῦτο τὸ κατὰ Θεὸν λυπηθῆναι ὑμᾶς πόσῃν κατειργάσατο ἐν ὑμῖν σπουδὴν; Λαμπρότερος ἡμῖν σήμερον ὁ σύλλογος, φαιδρότερον τὸ θέατρον, πλείων τῶν ἀδελφῶν ὁ χορός. Αὕτη ἡ σπουδὴ τῆς λύπης ἐκείνης καρπός.

Διὰ τοῦτο, ὅσον ὠδυνήθην τότε, τοσοῦτον νῦν χαίρω, ὁρῶν τὴν ἄμπελον ἡμῖν τὴν πνευματικὴν τῷ καρπῷ βριθομένην. Εἰ γὰρ ἐπὶ τῶν ἐδεσμάτων τῶν αἰσθητῶν φέρει τινὰ φιλοτιμίαν καὶ εὐφροσύνην τῷ καλοῦντι τῶν δαιτυμόνων τὸ πλῆθος, πολλῷ μᾶλλον ἐπὶ τῶν ἐδεσμάτων τῶν πνευματικῶν τοῦτο γένοιτ’ ἂν· καίτοι γε ἐκεῖ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν κεκλημένων μᾶλλον ἀναλίσκει τὰ παρακείμενα, καὶ δαπάνην ἐργάζεται πλείω· ἐνταῦθα δὲ τοῦναντίον, οὐ μόνον οὐκ ἀναλίσκει τὸ πλῆθος τῶν κεκλημένων, ἀλλὰ καὶ πλεονάζει τὴν τράπεζαν· εἰ δὲ ἐκεῖ ἡ δαπάνη ἡδονὴν ἐργάζεται, πολλῷ μᾶλλον ἐνταῦθα

3. With ὥστε for ὅτι before the initial εἰ δέ; plus προτέρᾳ before ἐπιστολῇ. Although John often in his homilies on 2 Corinthians refers to what Paul had written ἐν τῇ προτέρᾳ ἐπιστολῇ (by which he means 1 Corinthians), only here does he insert that adjective into the lemma.

4. John engages Paul in dialogue.

5. διορθοῦν, “straightened them out.”

6. Although the sense is not in doubt, the term λυπητήριον is otherwise not attested in Greek literature or inscriptions prior to or contemporary with John—the only other usage in TLG is in a tenth-century CE hagiography, *Vit. Greg.* 3.507 (ed. Berger). As Mf noted, one of his two manuscripts reads the more common term, λυπηρόν.

7. παραίνεσις, in reference to the prior homily (or a part of it). John parrots the exact Pauline phrasing in his address to his own congregation about the prior homily; I have marked this above in italics, with his adaptations in roman font. He begins with a purported “problem” of the reception of his previous homily—perhaps one of many in which he excoriates them for low attendance, as in *Hom. Rom.* 12:20 §§1–4 (PG

rebuke at a time when they needed it, Paul was both pleased and grieved. He was grieved because he'd caused pain but pleased because he'd benefited them. He revealed both these things when he said, "Therefore, *although I caused you grief in the previous letter, [272] I do not repent, although I did repent*" (2 Cor 7:8).³ "Why were you repenting? And why don't you repent again now?"⁴ "I was repenting since I struck them severely; but I don't repent now, since I corrected their behavior."⁵ So you might learn that this was the reason, listen to what comes next: "*For I see that that letter, although for a short time, caused you grief, now I rejoice—not because you were grieved, but because you were grieved to repentance*" (2 Cor 7:8–9). "Although I grieved you '*for a short time*'" (2 Cor 7:8), he says, the incident of grief⁶ was temporary, whereas the benefit was permanent."

Now then, I beg you, allow me, too, [273] to say these words to you, my beloved. Here goes: "*Although I caused you grief*" (2 Cor 7:8) in my prior exhortation,⁷ "*I do not repent, although I did repent. For I see that that*" (2 Cor 7:8) exhortation and advice,⁸ "*although for a short time it caused you grief*" (2 Cor 7:8),⁹ cheered us all the more—"not because you were grieved, but because you were grieved to repentance" (2 Cor 7:9). "*For look at the great zeal that this act of your being grieved in a godly way has produced in you!*" (2 Cor 7:9).¹⁰ Today we have an assembly that is more illustrious, a spectacle that is more splendid, a chorus of brothers and sisters that is larger. This zeal is the fruit of that grief.

This is why I rejoice now as much as I was in pain then, for I see the spiritual vine laden with fruit for us. For if in the case of physical foods the crowd of guests brings honor and gladness to the host who invites them, how much more would that be so when it comes to spiritual foods? Although in the former case the crowd of invited guests eats up what's set before them and generates greater expense, in our case, to the contrary, not only does the crowd of invited guests not eat it all up, but they even cause the spread on the table to multiply. If in the former case the expense gener-

51:171–80)—that he will pronounce now "solved" by the robust attendance there today. In both the case of Paul and of John, the "problem" is that friends should share in the same joy and the same grief (discussion in *PCBCH* 99–105).

8. In his adoption of Paul's words for his own address, John substitutes ἡ παραίνεσις ἐκείνη, καὶ ἡ συμβουλή (a description of his prior homily) for ἡ ἐπιστολὴ ἐκείνη.

9. With transposition of ἐλύπησεν and ὑμᾶς.

10. Plus ἐν before ὑμῖν. John's use of this quotation here is a wonderful example of how the exact same words can take on new meanings when spoken in new contexts and by new voices.

πρόσοδος τοῦτο ἐργάζεται· καὶ γὰρ τοιαύτη τῶν πνευματικῶν ἡ φύσις, εἰς πολλοὺς διανεμομένη, μᾶλλον αὖξεται. Ἐπεὶ οὖν πλήρης ἡμῖν ἡ τράπεζα, προσδοκῶ καὶ τὴν τοῦ Πνεύματος χάριν ἐνηχῆσαι ἡμῶν τῇ διανοίᾳ. Ὅταν γὰρ ἴδῃ πολλοὺς παρόντας, τότε δαψιλεστέραν παρατίθεται τὴν ἐστίασιν· οὐκ ἐπειδὴ τῶν ὀλίγων καταφρονεῖ, ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ τῆς τῶν πολλῶν ἐφίεται σωτηρίας. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ τὸν Παῦλον παρατρέχοντα τὰς ἄλλας πόλεις, ἐν Κορίνθῳ μένειν ἐκέλευσε φανεῖς ὁ Χριστὸς, καὶ εἰπών· Μὴ φοβοῦ, ἀλλὰ λάλει, καὶ μὴ σιωπῆσης, διότι λαὸς πολὺς ἐστὶ μοι ἐν τῇ πόλει ταύτῃ. Εἰ γὰρ ὑπὲρ ἐνὸς προβάτου ὄρη καὶ νάπας καὶ τὴν ἄβατον ἔπεισι χώραν ὁ ποιμὴν, ὅταν πολλὰ πρόβατα μέλλῃ ῥαθυμίας καὶ πλάνης ἀπάγειν, πῶς οὐ πολλὴν ἐπιδείξεται σπουδὴν; Ὅτι γὰρ οὐδὲ τῶν ὀλίγων καταφρονεῖ, ἀκουσον αὐτοῦ λέγοντος· Οὐκ ἔστι θέλημα τοῦ Πατρὸς μου, ἵνα ἀπόληται ἐν τῶν μικρῶν τούτων. Οὔτε οὖν ἡ ὀλιγότης, φησὶν, οὔτε ἡ εὐτέλεια ὑπεριδεῖν αὐτὸν πείθει τῆς σωτηρίας ἡμῶν.

β'. Ἐπεὶ οὖν τοσαύτη μὲν αὐτῷ τῶν μικρῶν καὶ ἐλαχίστων ἡ πρόνοια, τοσαύτη δὲ τῶν πολλῶν, τὸ πᾶν ἐπὶ τὴν ἐκεῖθεν ῥοπὴν ῥίψαντες, ἐπὶ τὴν Παύλου ῥῆσιν τὴν σήμερον ἀναγνωσθεῖσαν τὸν λόγον ἀγάγωμεν. Τίς δὲ ἡ ῥῆσις; Οἶδαμεν γὰρ, ὅτι ἐὰν ἡ ἐπίγειος ἡμῶν οἰκία τοῦ σκήνους, φησί, καταλυθῇ μᾶλλον δὲ ἀνωτέρω καὶ ἐπ' αὐτὴν τὴν κεφαλὴν τοῦ νοήματος ἴωμεν. Καθάπερ γὰρ τινες πηγὴν ἀνιχνεύοντες, εἴτα διάβροχον ἰδόντες χωρίον, οὐκ ἐκεῖ διασκάπτουσι μόνον, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ τῆς νοτίδος αὐτῆς καὶ τῆς φλεβὸς χειραγωγούμενοι ἐνδοτέρω χωροῦσιν, ἕως ἂν ἐπὶ τὴν ῥίζαν καὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν τῶν ναμάτων ἔλθωσιν· οὕτω δὲ καὶ ἡμεῖς ποιήσωμεν. Πηγὴν εὐρόντες πνευματικὴν ἐκ τῆς Παύλου σοφίας ἐξιοῦσαν, ὥσπερ ὑπὸ τινος φλεβὸς τῆς ῥήσεως χειραγωγούμενοι, πρὸς τὴν ῥίζαν αὐτὴν ἀναβῶμεν τοῦ νοήματος. Τίς οὖν ἐστὶν ἡ κεφαλὴ καὶ ἡ ῥίζα; Ἐχοντες δὲ τὸ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα τῆς πίστεως, κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον· Ἐπίστευσα, διὸ [274] ἐλάλησα· καὶ ἡμεῖς πιστεύομεν, διὸ

11. Mf notes that other manuscripts read *πρόσοδον* for *πρόσοδος*, which is perhaps an easier reading ("how much more will this generate revenue in our case!"). The problem with the reading Mf adopted is that there is no clear antecedent for the neuter *τοῦτο*. One should also note that perhaps John is playing on the senses of the term *πρόσοδος* here, as both "revenue, income, profit" and the "approach to communion" (PGL 3 and 1.b, respectively).

12. John's rhetorical flourish about "more is more" when it comes to the Spirit leads him to this self-correction.

13. Ellipsis from *διότι ἐγὼ* to *διότι λαὸς* in Acts 18:10, as marked in the text; transposition of *ἐστὶν μοι πολὺς* to *πολὺς ἐστὶ μοι* after *διότι λαὸς*.

14. Minus *ἐμπροσθεν* after *θέλημα*; with *πατὴρ μου* for *πατὴρ ὑμῶν τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς*; *ἐν* for *εἰς* before *τῶν μικρῶν τούτων*.

ates pleasure, how much more will the revenue¹¹ generate this in our case? For it is the very nature of spiritual foods that when they are distributed to many, they increase all the more. Thus, when our table is full, I expect also the grace of the Spirit to echo resoundingly in our minds. For when the Spirit sees many people present, it sets forth an even more lavish feast. This is not because it despises the few,¹² but because it desires the salvation of the many. That's why also in the case of Paul, when he was running on to other cities, Christ appeared and commanded him to remain in Corinth, saying, "*Don't fear, but speak, and don't be silent, because ... I have a large number of people in this city*" (Acts 18:9–10).¹³ For if the shepherd crosses mountains, glens, and uncharted terrain on behalf of one sheep (cf. Luke 15:3–7), how will he not show great zeal when he's going to lead many sheep away from sloth and error? For as proof that Christ doesn't at all despise the few, hear him saying: "*It is not my Father's will that a single one of these little ones be lost*" (Matt 18:14).¹⁴ Consequently, Christ says, neither small numbers nor lowliness of station persuades him to overlook our salvation.

2. Now then, since God's providence extends in such great measure toward the small and the least, and with such great care for the many, let's commit everything to the powerful assistance it provides,¹⁵ and let's direct our homily to the passage from Paul that was read today. What is that passage?¹⁶ "*For we know,*" he says, "*that if our earthly house of dwelling is destroyed*" (2 Cor 5:1). Or rather let's go further back in the text to the very source of this thought.¹⁷ After all, people who are tracking down the source of a spring, when they see a damp area, don't just dig there, but, guided further in by the moisture and the channel, they proceed until they come to the root and origin of the streams. And so this is precisely what we should do as well. After we find the spiritual spring that comes forth from Paul's wisdom, then, guided by the passage as though by a channel, let's go back to the very root of the thought. What, then, is its source and root? "*But having the same Spirit of faith, according to what is written, 'I believed, therefore [274] I spoke'* (Ps 115:1). *We, too, believe, therefore we also speak*"

15. Translating ῥοπή with PGL 5 and 6.

16. The PE editors note that this sentence is lacking in Paris. gr. 748 and in the Greek manuscript used by the sixteenth-century Latin translation of Sigismund Gelenus.

17. After quoting the lemma of 2 Cor 5:1, John insists (via metaphor) on the principle that literary context is one key to meaning, justifying his return to 2 Cor 4:13.

καὶ λαλοῦμεν. Τί λέγεις; ἂν μὴ πιστεύσης, οὐ λαλεῖς, ἀλλὰ ἄφωνος ἔστηκας; Ναί, φησίν· οὐδὲ διᾶραι στόμα δύναμαι χωρὶς πίστεως, οὐδὲ κινῆσαι γλῶτταν, οὐδὲ ἀνοῖξαι χεῖλη, ἄφωνος ὁ λογικὸς ἔστηκα χωρὶς τῆς ἐκεῖθεν διδασκαλίας. Καθάπερ γάρ, ρίζης μὴ πεφυτευμένης, οὐκ ἂν βλαστήσειε καρπός· οὕτω, πίστεως μὴ προκαταβεβλημένης, οὐκ ἂν προέλθοι διδασκαλίας λόγος. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἀλλαχοῦ φησι· Καρδίᾳ πιστεύεται εἰς δικαιοσύνην, στόματι δὲ ὁμολογεῖται εἰς σωτηρίαν.

Τί τοῦ δένδρου τούτου βέλτιον, ἢ ἴσον γένοιτ' ἂν, ὅταν μὴ οἱ κλάδοι μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὴ ἡ ρίζα φέρῃ καρπὸν, ἢ μὲν δικαιοσύνην, οἱ δὲ σωτηρίαν; Διὰ τοῦτό φησι· Πιστεύομεν, διὸ καὶ λαλοῦμεν. Καθάπερ γάρ τὰ ὑπότρομα μέλη καὶ τῷ γήρᾳ παρειμένα βακτηρία μετὰ ἀσφαλείας χειραγωγούσα οὐκ ἀφήσιν ὀλισθῆσαι καὶ καταπεσεῖν, οὕτω δὴ καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν τὴν ἡμετέραν σεσαλευμένην καὶ περιφερομένην ὑπὸ τῆς τῶν λογισμῶν ἀσθενείας, βακτηρίας ἀσφαλέστερον ἢ πίστις ἔλκουσα, καὶ τῇ τῆς οἰκείας ἰσχύος ἐπαναπαύουσα δυνάμει, στηρίζει μετὰ ἀκριβείας, καὶ οὐκ ἀφήσιν ὑποσκελισθῆναι ποτε, τὸ τῶν λογισμῶν ἀσθενὲς τῇ τῆς οἰκείας ἰσχύος περιουσίᾳ διορθουμένη, καὶ τὸν ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἀπελαύνουσα ζόφον, καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν, ὥσπερ ἐν οἴκῳ σκοτεινῷ, τῷ θορύβῳ τῶν λογισμῶν καθημένην τῷ οἰκίῳ φωτὶ καταυγάζουσα. Διὰ τοῦτο οἱ ταύτης ἀπεστερημένοι, τῶν ἐν σκότει διατριβόντων οὐδὲν ἄμεινον διάκεινται, ἀλλ' ὥσπερ ἐκεῖνοι καὶ τοίχοις προσπταίουσι, καὶ τοῖς ἀπαντῶσι προσρῆγγυνται, καὶ εἰς βάραθρα καὶ κρημνοὺς καταφέρονται, καὶ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αὐτοῖς ὀφελος οὐδὲν, οὐκ ὄντος τοῦ χειραγωγούντος φωτός· οὕτω καὶ οἱ τῆς πίστεως ἀπεστερημένοι, καὶ ἀλλήλοις προσερράγησαν, καὶ τοίχοις προσέπταισαν, καὶ τέλος εἰς τὸ τῆς ἀπωλείας βάραθρον φέροντες ἑαυτοὺς κατεκρήμνισαν.

γ'. Καὶ μάρτυρες τῶν λόγων τούτων οἱ τὴν ἔξωθεν αὐχοῦντες σοφίαν, οἱ μέγα ἐπὶ τῷ πώγωνι, καὶ τῷ τρίβωνι, καὶ τῇ βακτηρίᾳ φρονοῦντες.

18. With these two questions John addresses Paul, who in return will answer next (through the voice of Chrysostom, of course).

19. Minus γάρ before πιστεύεται—but later in this homily, in §5 (PG 51:276), John will cite this passage with γάρ.

20. John is mapping εἰς δικαιοσύνην and εἰς σωτηρίαν from Rom 10:10 onto his metaphor of the root of the tree being faith, leading to righteousness, and the branches being salvation; this appears to be for him more a rhetorical flourish than a systematic account of the economy of salvation in relation to faith and works.

21. λογισμοί, “thoughts” or “reasonings”; it is a key term in the argument that follows, referring both to the process and the product of cognition (see BDAG). The same is true of the cognate, διαλογισμός, used below.

22. Another key theme of this homily is blindness; see p. 382 n. 34 below on Chrysostom’s favored phrase, οἱ τῆς πίστεως ὀφθαλμοί (“the eyes of faith”).

(2 Cor 4:13). “What are you saying, Paul? If you don’t believe, you don’t speak but stand voiceless?”¹⁸ “Yes,” he says. “Apart from faith, I am able neither to open my mouth nor move my tongue nor open my lips; I, a man of words, stand voiceless apart from the teaching that comes from faith. Just as no fruit can sprout if there’s no root planted there, so the word of teaching cannot go forth if faith hasn’t been sown first.” That’s why he says elsewhere also, “*It is believed in the heart for righteousness and confessed in the mouth for salvation*” (Rom 10:10).¹⁹

What could be better than this tree, or even be its equal, when not only its branches but even its very root bears fruit—from the latter righteousness, and the former salvation?²⁰ That’s why he says, “*We believe, therefore we also speak.*” In the case of limbs that tremble and are weakened by advanced age, if a cane guides them with care, it doesn’t allow them to slip and fall. In the same way our soul, when it’s shaken and spun around every which way by a weakness in its thoughts,²¹ has faith to direct it even more securely than a cane and, relying on the power of its own strength, to steady the soul with care, and not allow it ever to be tripped up. Faith does this by correcting the weakness in our thoughts by the superiority of its own strength; it draws out the darkness that weakness brings on and, with its own light, illuminates the soul as it sits in the confusion of its thoughts as though in a dark house. That’s why people who lack faith are no better situated than those who dwell in darkness. No, they go headlong into walls and crash into all they meet, and they’re led into pits or over cliffs, because their eyes are no help to them and there’s no light to give them direction. In just the same way, those who lack faith²² crash into one another and go headlong into walls and in the end bring themselves to the pit of destruction and throw themselves over the edge.

3. Even those who take pride in “pagan”²³ wisdom, who boast in the beard,²⁴ the cloak, and the staff,²⁵ are witnesses to these things. For after

23. Literally, the “wisdom that comes from outside” (ἡ ἔξωθεν σοφία), a rhetoric of distancing, despite the many modes of incorporation and appropriation of Hellenistic philosophy deeply “inside” of Christian culture.

24. An unveiled reference to the emperor Julian (whose famous self-satire, *Misogogon*, was written at Antioch and directed at its populace).

25. Associated with Socrates and Cynics; there are ample examples among the Cynic Epistles, such as Crates, *Ep.* 23, to Ganymede (ed. Malherbe), which in its first line refers to the *τρίβων* (cloak), *βακτηρία* (staff), *πήρα* (small purse), and *λόμη* (long hair) as characteristic of the Cynic philosopher.

Μετὰ γὰρ μακροὺς καὶ πολλοὺς διαύλους λόγων, τοὺς πρὸ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν κειμένους λίθους οὐκ εἶδον· εἰ γὰρ ὡς λίθους αὐτοὺς ἐώρων, οὐκ ἂν αὐτοὺς ἐνόμισαν εἶναι θεοὺς. Καὶ ἀλλήλοις δὲ προσερράγησαν, καὶ εἰς αὐτὸν τῆς ἀσεβείας τὸν βαθύτατον κρημνὸν κατηνέχθησαν, οὐδαμῶθεν ἄλλοθεν, ἀλλ' ἢ διὰ τὸ λογισμοῖς ἐπιτρέψαι τὰ καθ' ἑαυτοὺς ἅπαντα. Καὶ τοῦτο ὁ Παῦλος δηλῶν ἔλεγεν· Ἐματαιώθησαν ἐν τοῖς διαλογισμοῖς αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐσκοτίσθη ἡ ἀσύνετος αὐτῶν καρδιά· φάσκοντες εἶναι σοφοί, ἐμωράνθησαν. Εἴτα λέγων τοῦ σκότους καὶ τῆς μωρίας τὴν ἀπόδειξιν, ἐπήγαγεν· Ἦλλαξαν τὴν δόξαν τοῦ ἀφθάρτου Θεοῦ ἐν ὁμοιώματι εἰκόνης φθαρτοῦ ἀνθρώπου, καὶ πετεινῶν, καὶ τετραπόδων, καὶ ἐρπετῶν. Ἀλλὰ τοῦτο ἅπαν τὸ σκότος ἐπεισελθοῦσα ἡ πίστις διεσκέδασεν ἐκ τῆς ψυχῆς τοῦ ὑποδεξαμένου αὐτήν· καὶ καθάπερ πλοῖον ὑπὸ τῆς τῶν πνευμάτων ἐμβολῆς κλυδωνιζόμενον καὶ ταῖς τῶν κυμάτων ἐπαναστάσεσι περιαντλούμενον ἐξαρτηθεῖσα ἄγκυρα πάντοθεν ἴστησι, καὶ ἐν μέσῳ ῥιζοῖ τῷ πελάγει· οὕτω δὲ καὶ τὸν νοῦν τὸν ἡμέτερον ὅταν οἱ προσπίπτοντες ἔξωθεν λογισμοὶ κλυδωνίζωσιν, ἀγκύρας ἀσφαλέστερον ἐπεισ-[275]ελθοῦσα ἡ πίστις ἀπαλλάττει τοῦ ναυαγίου, ὥσπερ ἐν γαληνῷ λιμένι, τῇ τοῦ συνειδότος πληροφορία τὸ σκάφος ὁρμίζουσα. Καὶ αὐτὸ τοῦτο πάλιν ὁ Παῦλος δηλῶν ἔλεγεν, ὅτι Διὰ τοῦτο ἔδωκεν ἀποστόλους ὁ Θεὸς πρὸς καταρτισμὸν τῶν ἁγίων, μέχρι καταντήσωμεν οἱ πάντες εἰς τὴν ἐνότητα τῆς πίστεως καὶ τῆς ἐπιγνώσεως τοῦ Υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ· ἵνα μηκέτι ὦμεν νήπιοι κλυδωνιζόμενοι καὶ περιφερόμενοι παντὶ ἀνέμῳ. Ὅρᾳς τῆς πίστεως τὸ κατόρθωμα, ὅτι ὡς ἄγκυρά τις ἀσφαλῆς, οὕτως ἐκβάλλει τὸν σάλον· ὅπερ οὖν καὶ αὐτὸς πάλιν Ἑβραίοις ἐπιστέλλει, οὕτωςί λέγων περὶ τῆς πίστεως· Ἦν ὡς ἄγκυραν ἔχομεν τῆς ψυχῆς ἀσφαλῆ, καὶ βεβαίαν, καὶ εἰσερχομένην εἰς τὸ ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος. Ἵνα γὰρ ἀκούσας ἄγκυραν, μὴ νομίσης κάτω καθέλκεσθαι, δείκνυσιν, ὅτι καινὴ τις αὕτη τῆς ἀγκύρας ἡ φύσις, οὐ κάτω πιέζουσα, ἀλλ' ἄνω κουφίζουσα τὴν διάνοιαν, καὶ πρὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν μεθιστώσα, καὶ εἰς τὸ ἐσώτερον τοῦ καταπετάσματος χειραγωγοῦσα· καταπέτασμα γὰρ ἐνταῦθα τὸν οὐρανὸν ἐκάλεσε. Τίνος ἔνεκα, καὶ διὰ τί; Ὅτι καθάπερ τὸ καταπέτασμα ἀπὸ τῆς ἔξω σκηνῆς διεῖργε τὰ ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων, οὕτω δὲ καὶ ὁ οὐρανὸς οὗτος, ὥσπερ καταπέτασμα, μέσος τῆς κτίσεως παρεμβεβλημένος

26. Mf confirmed that his two manuscripts read ὑπὲρ τῆς τῶν πνευμάτων ἐμβολῆς (as is found in HS's text). He made a conjectural reading of ὑπό for ὑπέρ, as is translated above. The sense of the manuscripts' reading is not intolerable: "like a boat buffeted on account of assaulting winds."

27. With διὰ τοῦτο ἔδωκεν for καὶ αὐτὸς ἔδωκεν; ἀποστόλους for τοὺς μὲν ἀποστόλους; plus ὁ θεός after ἀποστόλους; three ellipses, as marked in the text.

28. Minus τε after ἀσφαλῆ.

repeated philosophical discourses they didn't see the stones placed right before their eyes; for if they'd seen that they were, after all, stones, they wouldn't have considered them to be gods. But they crashed into one another and were hurled down the very steepest cliff—that of impiety—for no other reason than that they had entrusted all their affairs to their thoughts. Paul made this point clearly, too, when he said, *“They were rendered foolish by their thoughts, and their senseless heart was darkened. Saying they were wise, they became foolish”* (Rom 1:21–22). Then to give a proof of their darkness and foolishness, he added, *“They exchanged the glory of the imperishable God for the likeness of an image of a perishable human being, and birds, and four-legged creatures, and reptiles”* (Rom 1:23). But faith rushed into this terrible darkness and dispersed it from the soul of the one who had taken it in. This is like a boat buffeted by²⁶ assaulting winds and taking on water from swells of waves; when an anchor is hung over the side, it stops moving in any direction and is rooted in the middle of the sea. In the same way with our mind, when thoughts attack and buffet it from the outside, faith comes in more securely than an anchor [275] and rescues it from shipwreck, docking that vessel in the conviction of conscience as though in a calm harbor. Paul made this very point clearly once again when he said, *“This is why God gave apostles ... for the perfecting of the saints ... until we all arrive at the unity of faith and knowledge of the Son of God ... so that we might no longer be children who are wave-tossed and borne about by every wind”* (Eph 4:11–14).²⁷ Do you see what faith accomplishes, how like a secure anchor it quells the tossing sea? And this is what Paul also wrote another time in his letter to the Hebrews, saying the following about faith: *“which we have as an anchor of the soul, secure and firm, that enters into what is inside the curtain”* (Heb 6:19).²⁸ Now, lest on hearing “anchor” you suppose that it drags things down,²⁹ Paul shows that this is a new species of anchor that doesn't weigh the mind down but lifts it up and moves it toward heaven, guiding it *“to what is inside the curtain.”* Here he calls heaven “a curtain.” Why and for what reason? Because just as the curtain separated the holy of holies from the outer tent-sanctuary, thus also this heaven, like a curtain positioned in the midst of creation, sepa-

29. John issues a preemptive response to this potentially problematic use of the metaphor. He wishes to show that faith is a novel kind of anchor, one that raises up rather than pulls down, through a selective interpretation of Heb 4–11 (see also the following note).

ἀπὸ τῆς ἔξω σκηνῆς, τοῦτ' ἔστι, τοῦ κόσμου τούτου τοῦ βλεπομένου, διείργει τὰ ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων, τὰ ἄνω λέγων καὶ τὰ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν, ὅπου πρόδρομος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν εἰσῆλθε Χριστός.

δ'. "Ὁ δὲ λέγει τοιοῦτόν ἐστιν. Ἐκεῖ μετεωρίζει τὴν ψυχὴν τὴν ἡμετέραν, φησὶν, ἢ πίστις, οὐκ ἀφιεῖσα οὐδενὶ τῶν παρόντων δεινῶν ταπεινωθῆναι, ἀνακουφίζουσα τοὺς πόνους τῇ τῶν μελλόντων ἐλπίδι. Ὁ γὰρ πρὸς τὰ μέλλοντα ἀφορῶν, καὶ τὴν ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν ἀναμένων ἐλπίδα, καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τῆς διανοίας ἐκεῖ μετὰγων, οὐδὲ αἰσθάνεται τῆς ὀδύνης τῶν ἐν τῷ παρόντι δεινῶν, ὥσπερ οὐκ οὐδὲ Παῦλος ἡσθάνετο, καὶ τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς φιλοσοφίας ἐδίδασκε, λέγων. Τὸ γὰρ παραυτίκα ἐλαφρόν τῆς θλίψεως καθ' ὑπερβολὴν εἰς ὑπερβολὴν αἰώνιον βάρος δόξης ἡμῖν κατεργάζεται. Πῶς, καὶ τίνι τρόπῳ; Μὴ σκοπούντων ἡμῶν τὰ βλεπόμενα, ἀλλὰ τὰ μὴ βλεπόμενα διὰ τῶν τῆς πίστεως ὀφθαλμῶν. Ὡςπερ γὰρ οἱ τοῦ σώματος οὐδὲν βλέπουσι νοητὸν, οὕτως οἱ τῆς πίστεως οὐδὲν βλέπουσιν αἰσθητόν.

Ἀλλὰ ποίαν πίστιν ἐνταῦθα λέγει ὁ Παῦλος; τὸ γὰρ τῆς πίστεως ὄνομα διπλῆν ἔχει τὴν σημασίαν. Καὶ γὰρ πίστις λέγεται, καθ' ἣν τὰ σημεῖα ἐποιοῦν τότε οἱ ἀπόστολοι, περὶ ἧς ὁ Χριστὸς ἔλεγεν. Ἐὰν ἔχητε πίστιν, ὡς κόκκον σινάπεως, ἐρεῖτε τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ, Μετάβηθι, καὶ μεταβήσεται. Καὶ πάλιν, ὅτε τὸν σεληνιαζόμενον οὐκ ἴσχυσαν ἀπαλλάξαι τοῦ δαίμονος οἱ μαθηταί, καὶ τὴν αἰτίαν ἐβούλοντο μαθεῖν, ταύτην αὐτοῖς ἠνίξατο τὴν ἔλλειψιν τῆς πίστεως,

30. With Χριστός for Ἰησοῦς. In making this argument John has in mind the full context of Heb 4–10, but see especially 9:1–5 (on the first and second *σκηναί* separated by the *καταπέτασμα* and the *ἅγια ἁγίων*); 9:11 (Christ passing *διὰ τῆς μείζονος καὶ τελειοτέρας σκηνῆς οὐ χειροποιήτου, τοῦτ' ἔστιν οὐ ταύτης τῆς κτίσεως*); and 9:24 (Christ *εἰσῆλθεν ... εἰς αὐτὸν τὸν οὐρανόν*).

31. Although there is no exact citation here, John likely has Heb 11:1 in mind: *ἔστιν δὲ πίστις ἐλπίζομένων ὑπόστασις, πραγμάτων ἔλεγχος οὐ βλεπομένων*.

32. In his description of Paul's lack of pain in the face of dangers Chrysostom invokes one of his favored terms for the Christian life and teaching as a *φιλοσοφία*. He has in mind a counterposition to that of Stoics, for instance, while not acknowledging the degree to which he has absorbed a kind of popular Stoic thinking himself.

33. Minus *ἡμῶν* after *θλίψεως*; transposition of *κατεργάζεται* and *ἡμῖν*.

34. Although rarely found before him, the phrase *οἱ τῆς πίστεως ὀφθαλμοί*, "the eyes of faith," is commonly used by John—e.g., *Hom. princ. Ac.* 3.6 (PG 51:106). A similar argument by appeal to 2 Cor 4:18 is made in *Hom. 2 Tim.* 3:1 §§1–2 (PG 56:271–72), and the phrase seems keyed by the combination of this verse and Heb 11:1; he then connects it with the eyes that see Christ crucified in Gal 3:1. In *Hom. Act.* 9:1 2.2 (PG 51:126), John connects the eyes of faith with those able to grasp not just the surface meaning but also the figurative sense of Scripture, and in *Hom. Gen.* 12.4 (PG 53:102)

rates the holy of holies from the outer tent-sanctuary, that is, this visible world; what he means by the holy of holies is the area above and the region beyond it, “where Christ entered as a forerunner for us” (Heb 6:20).³⁰

4. What he means is something like this. “Faith,” he says, “lifts up our soul, not allowing it to be brought low by any of the present dangers, lightening the labors by the hope of things to come.”³¹ The one who looks off toward the future and awaits the hope that comes from heaven and diverts their mind’s eyes in that direction doesn’t even feel the pain of dangers in the present moment. In just the same way Paul didn’t even feel that pain, and he taught the reason for this philosophical bearing³² when he said, “For the momentary lightness of affliction is accomplishing an eternal weight of glory for us beyond all measure and proportion” (2 Cor 4:17).³³ How and in what way? “Because we focus our attention not on things that are seen but on those that are unseen” (2 Cor 4:18) through the eyes of faith.³⁴ For just as the eyes of the body see nothing that’s perceptible to the intellect, so in turn the eyes of faith see nothing that the senses do.³⁵

But what kind of faith is Paul speaking of here?³⁶ The word “faith” has a double meaning. For indeed, what is called “faith” is the power by which the apostles used to do signs.³⁷ Christ spoke about this when he said, “If you have faith like a mustard seed, you will say to this mountain, ‘be moved,’ and it will be moved” (Matt 17:20).³⁸ And again, when the disciples weren’t able to free the moonstruck boy from the demon and they wanted to learn the reason, Christ hinted to them that it was this lack of faith saying, “Because

he aligns them with those who must realize that the text of the second creation story in Gen 2 is not to be taken literally, but that it was written by way of *συγκατάβασις* to human weakness. The phrase is used frequently in *Catecheses ad illuminandos* to refer to the meaning in the rituals beyond what physical sight suggests. See Georgia Frank, “‘Taste and See’: The Eucharist and the Eyes of Faith in the Fourth Century,” *CH* 70 (2001): 619–43, esp. 630–36. John’s phrase may also deliberately evoke the Platonic idea of τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς ὄμμα (cf. Plato, *Resp.* 7.533d; Plotinus, *Enn.* 6.8.19), which is also contrasted with the eyes of the body, as John will do next.

35. The traditional Platonic and Aristotelian opposition between νοητός and αἰσθητός, of matters “accessible to the intellect” and “accessible to the senses,” respectively, or, more pithily, “conceptual ... perceptual.”

36. Now we have arrived at what is in many ways the chief question or quandary addressed in this homily: What does Paul mean by πίστις in 2 Cor 4:13? As we shall see, John will first make the question more complex (by granting the multivalence of πίστις) before providing his answer to this question.

37. The first meaning (σημασία) of πίστις.

38. Minus ἐντεῦθεν ἐκεῖ after μετὰβῆθι.

λέγων· Διὰ τὴν ἀπιστίαν ὑμῶν. Καὶ ὁ Παῦλος δὲ περὶ αὐτῆς ἔλεγεν· Ἐὰν ἔχω πίστιν, ὥστε ὅρη μεθιστάνειν. Καὶ ὅτε δὲ καταποντίζεσθαι ἔμελλε πεζῇ βαδίζων ἐπὶ τῆς θαλάσσης ὁ Πέτρος, αὐτὸ τοῦτο πάλιν ἐνεκάλεσεν ὁ Χριστὸς, εἰπὼν· Εἰς τί ἐδίστασας, ὀλιγόπιστε; Λέγεται τοίνυν πίστις ἡ τῶν σημείων καὶ τῶν θαυμάτων ποιητική· λέγεται δὲ πίστις καὶ ἡ τῆς εἰς τὸν Θεὸν γνώσεως παρασκευαστική, καθ' ἣν ἕκαστος ἡμῶν ἐστι πιστός· ὡς ὅταν λέγῃ γράφων Ῥωμαίοις· Εὐχαριστῶ τῷ Θεῷ μου διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅτι ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ καταγγέλλεται· καὶ Θεσσαλονικεῦσι πάλιν· Ἀφ' ὑμῶν γὰρ ἐξήχηται ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ, οὐ μόνον ἐν τῇ Μακεδονίᾳ, [276] ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἀχαΐᾳ, καὶ ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν ἡ πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν ἐξελέλυθε.

Ποίαν οὖν αἰνίσσεται ἐνταῦθα πίστιν; Εὐδὴλον, ὅτι τὴν τῆς γνώσεως· καὶ δηλοῖ τὰ ἐξῆς. Πιστεύομεν γὰρ, φησὶ, διὸ καὶ λαλοῦμεν. Τί πιστεύομεν; Ὅτι ὁ ἐγεῖρας Ἰησοῦν, καὶ ἡμᾶς ἐγερεῖ διὰ τῆς δυνάμεως. Ἀλλὰ διὰ τί Πνεῦμα πίστεως αὐτὴν καλεῖ, καὶ εἰς τὴν τῶν χαρισμάτων καταλέγει τάξιν; Εἰ γὰρ χάριμά ἐστιν ἡ πίστις, καὶ τῆς τοῦ Πνεύματος δωρεᾶς μόνον, ἀλλ' οὐχ ἡμέτερον κατόρθωμα, οὔτε οἱ ἀπιστοῦντες κολασθήσονται, οὔτε οἱ πιστεύοντες ἐπαινεθήσονται. Τοιαύτη γὰρ τῶν χαρισμάτων ἡ φύσις, οὐκ ἔχει στεφάνους, οὔτε ἀμοιβάς. Οὐ γὰρ τῶν δεξαμένων τὸ δῶρόν ἐστι κατόρθωμα, ἀλλὰ τῆς τοῦ παρεσχηκότος φιλοφροσύνης χάρισμα. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἐκέλευσε μὴ χαίρειν ἐπὶ τῷ δαίμονας ἐκβάλλειν, καὶ τοὺς ἐπὶ τῷ

39. Minus πᾶσαν τὴν before πίστιν.

40. With transposition of ὀλιγόπιστε and εἰς τί ἐδίστασας.

41. The second meaning (σημασία) of πίστις.

42. Minus περὶ πάντων ὑμῶν after διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ; with transposition of καταγγέλλεται and ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ.

43. With τοῦ θεοῦ for τοῦ κυρίου after ὁ λόγος; transposition of ἀλλὰ from before καὶ ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ to before καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἀχαΐᾳ.

44. Minus τὸν κύριον before Ἰησοῦν. In the second part of the sentence, although he presents this as the continuity of thought in 2 Cor 4:13–14, John has conflated 2 Cor 4:14 and 1 Cor 6:14, at the similar point of καὶ ἡμᾶς (ἐξ)εγερεῖ.

45. John registers this as a problem of theodicy.

46. Literally, “crowns” (στεφάνοι); in a Pauline sense, of eschatological reward (cf. 1 Thess 2:19; 1 Cor 9:25; 2 Tim 4:8).

47. κατόρθωμα; also “an exercise of virtue” (PGL B.1; the translation in the text above follows PGL A.2). John here wishes to emphasize the human role in faith; that in turn can lead to its own “problem,” of downplaying the role of the Spirit. In defense of Chrysostom against the charge of being a “semi-Pelagianist,” see Anthony Kenny, “Was St. John Chrysostom a Semi-Pelagian?” *ITQ* 27 (1960): 16–29, discussing our text among others. His conclusion: “It would be wrong to call Chrysostom a semi-Pelagian, because, for lack of the necessary distinctions, he never posed himself the problem

of your lack of faith" (Matt 17:20). Paul, too, speaks of this when he said, "If I have faith so that I might move mountains" (1 Cor 13:2).³⁹ And when Peter was about to be drowned as he was walking upon the sea, Christ accused him of this very thing, saying, "Why did you doubt, man of little faith?" (Matt 14:31).⁴⁰ So we see that the force active in signs and wonders is called "faith." But the force that provides knowledge that leads to God, in accordance with which each of us is called "faithful," is also called "faith."⁴¹ Thus Paul says when he writes to the Romans, "I give thanks to my God through Jesus Christ that your faith is proclaimed in the whole world" (Rom 1:8),⁴² and again he says to the Thessalonians, "For the word of God has echoed forth from you not only in Macedonia [276] but also in Achaia and in every place your faith in God has gone out" (1 Thess 1:8).⁴³

So which kind of "faith" is he hinting at in our passage (2 Cor 4:13)? Clearly the faith that is knowledge. The words that follow make this clear. For he says, "We believe, therefore we also speak" (2 Cor 4:13). What do we believe? "That the one who raised Jesus will raise us, too, through his power" (2 Cor 4:14; 1 Cor 6:14).⁴⁴ But why does he call it "the Spirit of faith" and include it in the list of spiritual gifts (cf. 1 Cor 12:9; Gal 5:22)? For if faith is a spiritual gift and it is solely granted by the Spirit rather than being our own accomplishment, then neither will those who lack faith be punished nor will those who have faith earn praise.⁴⁵ Because it's the nature of spiritual gifts that they don't entitle one to rewards⁴⁶ or recompense. The gift is not a virtuous accomplishment⁴⁷ of those who have received it; no, a spiritual gift is due to the kindness of the one who provided it. That's why he commanded the disciples not to rejoice when they cast out demons (cf. Luke 10:20), and he cast out of the kingdom of heaven those who had

about the *initium fidei* in the way in which they [semi-Pelagians] did. However, this too seems to be true: that there is nothing in his works with which the Massilienses would have disagreed, while there is a great deal which no Catholic, after the Council of Orange [529 CE], would dare to say" (p. 29). Chrysostom predates those full-blown controversies, as, for instance, in the writings between Augustine and Julian of Eclanum, each of whom cited Chrysostom for their own position, ca. 418–430 CE. See François-Joseph Thonnard, "Saint Jean Chrysostome et saint Augustine dans la controverse pélagienne," *Revue des études byzantines* 25 (1967): 189–218. But Chrysostom is clearly already aware of the "problem" of insisting too firmly on only one side of the debate between human volition and divine assistance, even as for him it is less an issue of systematic theology than a pastoral problem of wishing to combat both moral lassitude, on the one hand, and despondency in the face of trials, on the other. For further discussion see, e.g., *Laud. Paul.* hom. 2, in this volume, and HT 152–59, etc.

ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ προφητεύσαντας καὶ δυνάμεις πολλὰς ποιήσαντας ἐξέβαλε τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν, ἐπειδὴ ἀπὸ κατορθωμάτων μὲν οἰκείων οὐδεμίαν εἶχον παρρησίαν, ἀπὸ δὲ χαρισμάτων ἐβούλοντο σώζεσθαι μόνον.

ε'. Εἰ τοίνυν καὶ ἡ πίστις τοιοῦτόν ἐστι, καὶ οὐδὲν ἡμεῖς εἰσηγέκαμεν, ἀλλὰ τὸ πᾶν τῆς τοῦ Πνεύματος ἐστὶ χάριτος, καὶ ἐκείνη ταῖς ἡμετέραις αὐτὴν ἐγκατέβαλε ψυχαῖς, καὶ οὐδένα ἀντὶ τούτων ληψόμεθα μισθόν, πῶς οὖν ἔλεγε, *Καρδίᾳ γὰρ πιστεύεται εἰς δικαιοσύνην, στόματι δὲ ὁμολογεῖται εἰς σωτηρίαν*; "Ὅτι καὶ τῆς τοῦ πεπιστευκότος ἀρετῆς ἐστὶ κατόρθωμα ἡ πίστις. Πῶς δὲ ἀλλαχοῦ τοῦτο αὐτὸ πάλιν αἰνίττεται λέγων, *Τῷ δὲ μὴ ἐργαζομένῳ, πιστεύοντι δὲ ἐπὶ τὸν δικαιοῦντα τὸν ἀσεβῆ, λογίζεται ἡ πίστις εἰς δικαιοσύνην*, εἰ τῆς τοῦ Πνεύματος χάριτος τὸ πᾶν ἐστὶ; πῶς δὲ καὶ τὸν πατριάρχην Ἀβραὰμ δι' αὐτῆς μυρίοις ἀνέδωκεν ἐγκωμίων στεφάνοις, ὅτι τὰ παρόντα πάντα παραδραμῶν, παρ' ἐλπίδα ἐπ' ἐλπίδι ἐπίστευσε; Τίνος οὖν ἕνεκα Πνεῦμα πίστεως αὐτὴν καλεῖ; Ἐκεῖνο δεῖξαι βουλόμενος, ὅτι τὸ μὲν παρὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν πιστεῦσαι, τῆς ἡμετέρας εὐγνωμοσύνης ἐστὶ, καὶ τὸ ὑπακοῦσαι κληθέντας· μετὰ δὲ τὸ καταβληθῆναι τὴν πίστιν, τῆς τοῦ Πνεύματος δεόμεθα βοηθείας, ὥστε μένειν αὐτὴν διηνεκῶς ἄσειστον καὶ ἀπερίτρεπτον. Οὕτε γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς, οὔτε ἡ τοῦ Πνεύματος χάρις τὴν ἡμετέραν προφθάνει προαίρεσιν· ἀλλὰ καλεῖ μὲν, ἀναμένει δὲ ὥστε ἐκόντας καὶ βουληθέντας οἰκοθεν προσελθεῖν· εἴτα, ἐπειδὴν προσέλθωμεν, τότε τὴν παρ' ἑαυτοῦ παρέχει συμμαχίαν ἅπασαν. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ καὶ ὁ διάβολος μετὰ τὸ τῇ πίστει προσελθεῖν ἡμᾶς, εὐθέως ἐπεισέρχεται, τὴν καλὴν ταύτην ῥίζαν ἀνασπᾶσαι βουλόμενος, καὶ τὰ ζιζάνια σπεῖραι ἐπειγόμενος, καὶ τοῖς γνησίοις καὶ καθαροῖς λυμῆνασθαι σπέρμασι, δεόμεθα τῆς τοῦ Πνεύματος βοηθείας τότε, ἵνα, καθάπερ γεωργὸς φιλόπονος, ἐγκαθεζόμενος ἡμῶν

48. παρρησία, "confidence" of a positive verdict in the eschatological trial to come (cf. Eph 3:12; Heb 4:16; 10:19).

49. Minus αὐτοῦ after πίστις.

50. Mf noted that his two manuscripts read δι' αὐτὴν for δι' αὐτῆς, but he did not adopt that reading in the text. JPM does not reproduce the note of the PE indicating that Paris. gr. 748 (*pace* Mf) in fact omits the phrase entirely. The translation above adopts the reading of the other of the two manuscripts, Paris. gr. 768, but the minus may be the preferable reading—note that it was also apparently missing in the Greek manuscript used by Gelenius: "*qui enim etiam patriarcham Abraham plurimis redimit laudum coronis*."

51. πνεῦμα πίστεως; not an exact quotation (sc. τὸ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα τῆς πίστεως) but a clear reference to the lemma.

52. εὐγνωμοσύνη, or "right-mindedness" (PGL 1).

53. Translation of καταβάλλεσθαι with LSJ II.7; alternatively, with II.6 one would translate, "after faith has been sown." John is playing on both the architectural and

prophesied in his name and done many miracles (cf. Matt 7:21–23), since they had no basis for confidence⁴⁸ from their own virtuous accomplishments, but wished to be saved for their spiritual gifts alone.

5. So then, if faith is like this, and we've contributed nothing, but it all belongs to the grace of the Spirit, and grace has implanted faith in our souls, and we shall receive no reward for any of these things, then how does he say, "*For it is believed in the heart for righteousness and confessed in the mouth for salvation*" (Rom 10:10)? Because faith is an accomplishment that's due to the virtue of the person who has faith. In another place Paul hints at the very same thing again when he says, "*To the one who does not do works but has faith in the one who makes the impious righteous, faith is reckoned as righteousness*" (Rom 4:5).⁴⁹ How can that be if it all belongs to the grace of the Spirit? And how was it that he garlanded the patriarch Abraham with countless wreaths of praise on account of faith⁵⁰ since he ran past all the things of the present life and, "*against hope, put his faith in hope*" (Rom 4:18)? So then, why does he call it "the Spirit of faith" (cf. 2 Cor 4:13)?⁵¹ Because he wishes to show that coming to faith at the beginning and obeying when called is due to our good judgment;⁵² but after faith has been set down as a foundation,⁵³ then we need the assistance of the Spirit for faith to remain continually unshaken and immutable. For neither God nor the grace of the Spirit takes precedence over our free choice,⁵⁴ but he⁵⁵ issues the call and he waits so that on our own, willingly and by choice, we come to it.⁵⁶ And then after we've done so, God provides the full force of his own power as our ally. For truly, when the devil sneaks in immediately after we've come to faith, wishing to pull up this salutary root and rushing to plant weeds and cause harm to the genuine and pure seeds (cf. Matt 13:24–30, 36–43), we need the help of the Spirit at that moment so that, like a diligent⁵⁷ farmer encamped

the agricultural metaphors in this argument—see above, προκαταβάλλεσθαι §2 (PG 51:274) and what follows.

54. προαίρεσις, a critical term for John's view of ethics as rooted in well-attuned human moral decision-making as both a faculty and as the exercise of that faculty in any given moment.

55. The verbs in this and the following sentence do not have explicit subjects, but I take them to refer to God, who then provides the Spirit as "the full force of his own power as our ally" (ἡ παρ' ἐαυτοῦ συμμαχία ἅπασα).

56. Or, possibly, "come toward" (or "approach") God; but in the next sentence John adds the referent τῇ πίστει to the infinitive προσελθεῖν.

57. Mf notes that his two manuscripts here read the adverb φιλοπόνως, "like a farmer diligently encamped."

τῇ ψυχῇ, πολλῇ τῇ φειδοῖ καὶ προνοίᾳ τειχίζῃ πάντοθεν τὸ νεοπαγὲς τῆς πίστεως φυτόν. Διὰ τοῦτο Θεσσαλονικεῦσιν ἐπέστελλε λέγων, Τὸ Πνεῦμα μὴ σβέννυτε, δηλῶν ὅτι τῆς τοῦ Πνεύματος χάριτος ἐπεισελθούσης, ἀκαταγώνιστοι τῷ πονηρῷ δαίμονι λοιπὸν καὶ ταῖς μεθοδεῖαις αὐτοῦ πάσαις ἐσόμεθα. Εἰ γὰρ οὐδεὶς δύναται εἰπεῖν Κύριον Ἰησοῦν, εἰ μὴ ἐν Πνεύματι ἁγίῳ, πολλῷ μᾶλλον τὴν πίστιν ἀσφαλῇ καὶ ἐρριζωμένην οὐ δυνήσεται κατασχεῖν, εἰ μὴ ἐν Πνεύματι ἁγίῳ.

ζ'. Πῶς δὲ δυνησόμεθα τὴν τοῦ Πνεύματος ἐπισπάσασθαι βοήθειαν, καὶ πεῖσαι μέναι παρ' ἑαυτοῖς; [277] Δι' ἔργων ἀγαθῶν καὶ πολιτείας ἀρίστης. Καθάπερ γὰρ τὸ λυχνιαῖον φῶς ἐλαίῳ κατέχεται, καὶ ἀναλωθέντος τούτου κάκεῖνο συναλωθὲν ἄπεισιν. οὕτω δὴ καὶ ἡ τοῦ Πνεύματος χάρις, παρόντων μὲν ἡμῖν ἔργων ἀγαθῶν, καὶ ἐλεημοσύνης πολλῆς ἐπιχομένης τῇ ψυχῇ, μένει καθάπερ ἐλαίῳ κατεχομένη ἢ φλόξ· ταύτης δὲ οὐκ οὔσης, ἄπεισι καὶ ἀναχωρεῖ· ὅπερ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν πέντε παρθένων ἐγένετο. Καὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖναι μετὰ τοὺς πολλοὺς πόνους καὶ τοὺς ἰδρώτας, ἐπειδὴ τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς φιλανθρωπίας οὐκ εἶχον βοήθειαν, οὐκ ἴσχυσαν παρ' ἑαυταῖς κατασχεῖν τὸ τοῦ Πνεύματος χάρισμα· διὸ καὶ τοῦ νυμφῶνος ἐξεβλήθησαν, καὶ τῆς φοβερᾶς ἐκεῖνης ἤκουσαν φωνῆς, Ὑπάγετε, οὐκ οἶδα ὑμᾶς· ἢ καὶ τῆς γέεννης ἣν χαλεπωτέρα· διὰ τοῦτο καὶ μωρὰς αὐτὰς ὠνόμασεν· εἰκότως· ὅτι τυραννικωτέρας ἐπιθυμίας περιγενόμεναι, ὑπὸ τῆς ἀσθενεστέρας ἐάλωσαν.

Ὅρα γάρ· φύσεως βίαν ἐνίκησαν, λυττώσαν μανίαν ἐχαλίνωσαν, τὰ τῆς ἐπιθυμίας ἐστόρεσαν κύματα, ἐν γῇ διατρίβουσαι ἀγγελικὸν ἐπεδείξαντο βίον, σῶμα περικείμεναι πρὸς τὰς ἀσωμάτους ἡμιλλήθησαν δυνάμεις· καὶ μετὰ τοσοῦτον πόνον χρημάτων ἐπιθυμίας οὐκ ἐκράτησαν, ὄντως μωραὶ καὶ ἀνόητοι· διὰ τοῦτο καὶ οὐδὲ συγγνώμης ἠξιώθησαν. Ῥαθυμίας γὰρ τὸ πτώμα γέγονε μόνον· αἱ γὰρ ἐν τοσαύτῃ φλογὶ κάμινον ἐπιθυμίας δυνηθεῖσαι σβέσαι, καὶ ὑπὲρ

58. The question is asked and crisply answered, with an embellishment of the answer to follow that focuses upon John's characteristic concern for almsgiving as a chief act of virtue. On the role of sermons in "the promotion of Christian almsgiving," with due attention to Chrysostom, see Richard Finn, *Almsgiving in the Later Roman Empire: Christian Promotion and Practice (313–450)* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 137–75 (though he does not treat any of the occasional homilies in this volume); and the essays on Chrysostom in Susan R. Holman, ed., *Wealth and Poverty in Early Church and Society* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic; Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology, 2008), 127–208.

59. φιλανθρωπία.

60. Plus ὑπάγετε before οὐκ οἶδα ὑμᾶς.

in our souls, the Spirit might fortify the newly planted seedling of faith from every direction with its abundant care and foresight. For this reason, when writing to the Thessalonians, he said, “*Don’t extinguish the Spirit*” (1 Thess 5:19), showing that when the grace of the Spirit has entered in, we shall finally be invincible to the evil demon and all his machinations. If “*no one is able to say ‘Jesus is Lord’ except in the Holy Spirit*” (1 Cor 12:3), how much more will no one be able to hold faith secure and rooted “*except in the Holy Spirit*” (1 Cor 12:3).

6. But how shall we be able to draw upon the help of the Spirit and convince it to remain with us? [277] Through good works and virtuous living.⁵⁸ For example, the light that comes from a lamp is sustained by the oil, and when it’s expended, the light goes away along with it. In the same way also with the grace of the Spirit, when our good works are present, and generous almsgiving is being poured over the soul, the flame stays lit just as if it were sustained by lamp oil. But if almsgiving isn’t present it goes off and withdraws. This is what happened with the five virgins (cf. Matt 25:1–13). After so many labors and strenuous exertions, even these women weren’t able to hold onto the grace of the Spirit from their own resources, since they didn’t have the help that comes from generosity to others.⁵⁹ As a consequence, they were thrown out of the bridal chamber and they heard that frightening statement, “Go away; *I do not know you*” (Matt 25:12)⁶⁰—something that was worse even than Gehenna. That is why he called them “foolish” (cf. Matt 25:3, 8). And rightly so, because although they’d overcome the more dominant desire, they were conquered by the weaker one.⁶¹

Look at this! They’d conquered the force of nature, they’d bridled the raging madness, they’d calmed the waves of desire; while living on earth, they showed forth the angelic life;⁶² while clad in a body, they rivaled incorporeal powers!⁶³ And after this extensive effort, what they didn’t master was the desire for possessions, because they were truly foolish and senseless. That’s why they weren’t deemed worthy of leniency, because their downfall was due solely to indolence. For what could be more pitiable than women who were able to extinguish the furnace of desire kindled by such a hot flame

61. I.e. (as John sees it) although they conquered sexual lust, they were defeated by their lack of generosity with their possessions.

62. ἀγγελικὸς βίος was by John’s time already a commonplace for the monastic life (with a biblical warrant in Matt 22:30).

63. I.e., the angels (with PGL D.1.a).

τὰ σκάμματα πηδήσασαι, καὶ πλείω τῶν προσταχθέντων ἐπιδειξάμεναι (οὐ γάρ ἐστι νόμος ἡ παρθενία, ἀλλὰ τῇ προαιρέσει τῶν ἀκουόντων ἐπιτέτραπται), εἴτα ὑπὸ χρημάτων ἡττηθεῖσαι, τίνος οὐκ ἂν εἶεν ἐλεεινότεραι, δι' ὀλίγων ἀργυρίων τὸν στέφανον ἀπὸ τῆς κεφαλῆς ῥίψασαι; Ταῦτα λέγω, οὐχὶ τὰς χεῖρας τῶν παρθένων ἐκλύων, οὐδὲ τὴν παρθενίαν σβέσαι βουλόμενος, ἀλλ' ἵνα μὴ ἀνόνητα δράμωσιν, ἵνα μὴ μετὰ μυρίους ἰδρῶτας ἀστεφάνωτοι καὶ αἰσχύνῃς γέμουσαι ἐκ τῶν σκαμμάτων ἀναχωρήσωσι. Καλὸν ἡ παρθενία καὶ ὑπὲρ τὴν φύσιν τὸ κατόρθωμα· ἀλλὰ τὸ καλὸν τοῦτο καὶ μέγα καὶ ὑπὲρ τὴν φύσιν, ἂν μὴ φιλανθρωπίαν ἔχῃ συνεζευγμένην, οὐδὲ ἐπιβαίνειν τῶν τοῦ νυμφῶνος προθύρων δυνήσεται. Καὶ σκόπει μοι τῆς φιλανθρωπίας τὴν ἰσχύν, καὶ τῆς ἐλεημοσύνης τὴν δύναμιν. Παρθενία μὲν χωρὶς ἐλεημοσύνης οὐκ ἴσχυεν οὐδὲ μέχρι τῶν προθύρων τοῦ νυμφῶνος ἀγαγεῖν· ἐλεημοσύνη δὲ χωρὶς παρθενίας, τοὺς ἑαυτῆς τροφίμους μετὰ πολλῶν ἐγκωμίων εἰς τὴν πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου βασιλείαν ἡτοιμασμένην ἐχειραγώγησεν. Αὗται μὲν γὰρ, ἐπειδὴ ἐλεημοσύνην οὐκ ἐπεδείξαντο δαψιλῇ, ἤκουσαν, Ὑπάγετε, οὐκ οἶδα ὑμᾶς· ἐκεῖνοι δὲ οἱ διψῶντα ποτίσαντες, καὶ πεινῶντα θρέψαντες τὸν Χριστὸν, καίτοι παρθενίαν μὴ προβαλλόμενοι, ἤκουσαν, Δεῦτε, οἱ εὐλογημένοι τοῦ Πατρὸς μου, κληρονομήσατε τὴν ἡτοιμασμένην ὑμῖν βασιλείαν ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου. Καὶ μάλα εἰκότως· ὁ μὲν γὰρ παρθενεύων καὶ νηστεύων, ἑαυτῷ χρήσιμος· ὁ δὲ ἐλεῶν, κοινός ἐστι τῶν ναυαγούντων λιμὴν, τὰς τῶν πλησίον διορθούμενος πενίας, καὶ τὰς ἐτέρων λύων ἀνάγκας. Τῶν δὲ κατορθωμάτων ἐκεῖνα μάλιστα εὐδοκιμεῖν εἴωθεν, ἅπερ ἂν πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον ἐτέροις γίνεται.

ζ'. Καὶ ἵνα μάθῃς, ὅτι αὗται μᾶλλον τῷ Θεῷ περισπούδαστοι τῶν ἄλλων αἱ ἐντολαί, περὶ μὲν νηστείας καὶ παρθενίας διαλεγόμενος, βασιλείας οὐρα-[278]νῶν μέμνηται· περὶ δὲ ἐλεημοσύνης καὶ φιλανθρωπίας καὶ τοῦ

64. For this favored athletic metaphor of the long-jump for transcending ethical expectations, see p. 212 n. 21.

65. Again Chrysostom tries both to uphold virginity and protect marriage by insisting that virginity is not a universal requirement. Cf. his treatise, *De virginitate* (SC 125, ed. Musurillo), and many other ascetic and exegetical works in his oeuvre treading this line, on which see Clark, *Reading Renunciation*, 156–62, 322.

66. Having heaped opprobrium on the virgins in the parable, John self-corrects to ensure he doesn't invite another problem of disparaging the practice of παρθενία entirely. On the dynamic of virginity and marriage within Chrysostom's vision of the Christianized polis, see the classic work of Peter Brown, *The Body and Society: Men, Women, and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity*, 2nd ed., Lectures on the History of Religions 13 (New York: Columbia University Press, 2008), 305–22.

67. The σκάμματα, “long-jump pits,” as in the previous sentence (translated “out-jump the prescribed limits”).

and to outjump the prescribed limits,⁶⁴ who exhibited deeds far greater than what had been commanded—for virginity isn't a legal requirement, but it's left up to the free choice of those who obey it⁶⁵—but then were defeated by possessions and cast the wreath down off their own heads for a few pieces of silver? I'm not saying these things to undermine the actions of virgins or because I want to extinguish virginity,⁶⁶ but I do so in order that they might not do fruitless things or, after such strenuous exertions, withdraw from the field of contest⁶⁷ without a wreath and filled with shame. Virginity is a good thing and an accomplishment over nature. But this good thing, so great and surpassing of nature, if it's not yoked with generous giving, won't allow one to enter the outer doors of the bridal chamber. Look at the force of generosity and the power of almsgiving. Virginity without almsgiving wasn't able to bring one even up to the outer doors of the bridal chamber; almsgiving without virginity led those who fed others with great songs of praise into the kingdom prepared before the foundation of the world (cf. Matt 25:34).⁶⁸ The former are the virgins who, since they hadn't displayed liberal almsgiving, heard, "*Go away; I do not know you*" (Matt 25:12).⁶⁹ But the second group, people who gave Christ drink when he was thirsty and food when he was hungry, even though they couldn't claim virginity, heard, "*Come, you who are blessed by my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world*" (Matt 25:34). And rightly so. After all, people who practice virginity and fasting are useful to themselves; but those who give alms⁷⁰ are a port in the storm for the shipwrecked, they remediate the poverty suffered by their neighbors, and free others from necessity. The virtuous deeds that customarily earn praise are especially those that are⁷¹ "*for the advantage*" (1 Cor 12:7) of others.

7. Now, so you might learn that God desires these commandments more than the others, when Christ speaks about fasting and virginity, he mentions the kingdom of heaven;⁷² [278] but when he lays down laws

68. The wording is close, but it is not an exact quotation: εἰς τὴν πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου βασιλείαν ἡτοιμασμένην as compared to Matt 25:34 (Μ) κληρονομήσατε τὴν ἡτοιμασμένην ὑμῖν βασιλείαν ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου.

69. Plus ὑπάγετε before οὐκ οἶδα ὑμᾶς (as above).

70. Literally "show pity," but linked etymologically and semantically with ἐλεημοσύνη, "almsgiving," and hence, "to give alms" (with PGL C.2.).

71. The PE editors note that Paris. gr. 748 reads γίνηται here (as expected after ἄν, "those that would be to the advantage").

72. Likely for virginity John is thinking of Matt 19:12 (εὐνοῦχοι ... διὰ τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν). But the teaching on fasting in Matt 6:16–18 doesn't include a reference

ποιεῖν ἑαυτοὺς οἰκτίρμονας νομοθετῶν, πολὺ μείζον τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν τέθεικεν ἔπαθλον, Ὅπως γένησθε ὅμοιοι τοῦ Πατρὸς ὑμῶν τοῦ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, λέγων. Ἐκεῖνοι γὰρ μάλιστα τῶν νόμων ὁμοίους ποιοῦσι τοὺς ἀνθρώπους τῷ Θεῷ, ὡς ἀνθρώπους εἰκὸς γενέσθαι ὁμοίους τοῦ Θεοῦ, οἱ πρὸς τὸ κοινῇ συμφέρον ἐκβαίνοντες. Καὶ δηλῶν αὐτὸ τοῦτο ὁ Χριστὸς ἔλεγεν· Ὅτι τὸν ἥλιον αὐτοῦ ἀνατέλλει ἐπὶ πονηροὺς καὶ ἀγαθοὺς, καὶ βρέχει ἐπὶ δικαίους καὶ ἀδίκους. Οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς τοῖς οὖσι κατὰ δύναμιν εἰς τὸ κοινῇ συμφέρον τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἀποκεχημένοι, μιμήσασθε τὸν τὰ ἀγαθὰ αὐτοῦ προτιθέντα πᾶσιν ὁμοίως. Μέγα τὸ τῆς παρθενίας ἀξίωμα, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο μᾶλλον συγκροτηθῆναι αὐτὸ βούλομαι. Παρθενίας γὰρ ἀξίωμα οὐκ ἀποσχέσθαι γάμων μόνον, ἀλλὰ τὸ φιλάνθρωπον εἶναι καὶ φιλάδελφον καὶ συμπαθητικόν. Τί γὰρ ὄφελος παρθενία μετὰ ὠμότητος; τί δὲ κέρδος σωφροσύνης μετὰ ἀπανθρωπίας; Οὐχ ἑάλως σωμάτων ἐπιθυμία, ἀλλ' ἑάλως χρημάτων ἐπιθυμία· οὐκ ἐθαύμασας χρυσοῦ κάλλος· τὸν μείζονα ἐνίκησας ἀνταγωνιστὴν, ἀλλ' ὁ ἐλάττων καὶ ἀσθενέστερος ἐκράτησέ σου καὶ περιεγένετο. Διὰ τοῦτο αἰσχροτέραν ἐποίησέ σου τὴν ἡτταν· διὰ τοῦτο οὐδὲ συγγνώμης ἔτυχες, τοσαύτης μὲν περιγενομένη βίας, καὶ πρὸς τὴν φύσιν αὐτὴν ἀποδυσαμένη, ὑπὸ δὲ φιλαργυρίας ἀλοῦσα, ἣν καὶ οἰκέται πολλάκις καὶ βάρβαροι ἀπονητὶ νικῆσαι ἠδυνήθησαν.

ἦ'. Ταῦτ' οὖν ἅπαντα εἰδότες, ἀγαπητοί, καὶ οἱ γάμοις ὁμιλοῦντες, καὶ οἱ παρθενίαν ἀσκοῦντες, πολλὴν ἐπιδειξώμεθα περὶ τὴν ἐλεημοσύνην σπουδὴν, ἐπειδὴ μηδὲ ἑτέρως ἔστι τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν ἐπιτυχεῖν. Εἰ γὰρ παρθενία χωρὶς ἐλεημοσύνης οὐκ ἴσχυσεν εἰς βασιλείαν εἰσαγαγεῖν, ποῖον ἕτερον κατόρθωμα τοῦτο ἰσχύσει, ἢ δυνήσεται ταύτης χωρὶς; Οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδέν. Πάσῃ τοίνυν ψυχῇ καὶ δυνάμει τὸ ἔλαιον ἐγχέωμεν ταῖς λαμπάσι, καὶ

to the kingdom. Beyond that, this contrast stumbles against the fact that almsgiving is itself included in the Beatitudes of Matt 5:7 that are framed with the promise of inheritance of ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν, and, moreover, the passage in Matt 5:43–48 that Chrysostom does cite relates to the reward for love of enemy, not almsgiving, per se.

73. On this textual reading of Matt 5:45 in Chrysostom, see p. 166 n. 116 above (on *Hom. Rom.* 12:20).

74. The biblical theme of imitation of God was also a philosophical question among and between Middle Platonists and Stoics about how and in what ways likeness to God might be possible; see Gretchen Reydam-Schils, “‘Becoming like God’ in Platonism and Stoicism,” in *From Stoicism to Platonism: The Development of Philosophy, 100 BCE–100 CE*, ed. Troels Engberg-Pedersen (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017), 142–58.

75. Chrysostom is, as often, walking a fine line here of upholding individual ascetic disciplines but also emphasizing that the superior virtues are those that assist others.

about almsgiving and generosity, and making oneself merciful, he offers a reward greater than the kingdom of heaven, saying, “*So that you might be like your father in heaven*” (Matt 5:45).⁷³ For the laws that especially make people like God—to the extent that human beings can reasonably be like God⁷⁴—are those that accrue to the common advantage⁷⁵ (cf. 1 Cor 10:33; 1 Cor 12:7). Christ made this clear when he said, “*Because he makes his sun to rise on the evil and the good, and he brings rain down on the just and the unjust*” (Matt 5:45). Thus you, too, imitate in the same way God, who provided his good things to all, by fully using your belongings as you’re able for the common advantage of your brothers and sisters. The honorable state⁷⁶ of virginity is great, and I wish it to receive all the more acclaim for this reason. This is because the state of virginity doesn’t solely consist in abstaining from marriage but in being charitable, loving of one’s brothers and sisters, and compassionate. After all, what good is virginity when it comes with a hateful disposition? What’s the gain of chastity when it comes with misanthropy? “You weren’t conquered by bodily desire, but you were conquered by the desire for possessions?”⁷⁷ You marveled at the beauty of gold?⁷⁸ You vanquished the greater foe, but the lesser and weaker one gained mastery over you and prevailed. This is why God made your defeat all the more shameful. This is why you didn’t meet with any leniency: although you’d prevailed over a tremendous force and stripped yourself down in order to battle⁷⁹ nature itself, you were conquered by the love of money—a vice that even household slaves and the uncivilized often have been able to overcome without undue effort.”

8. Knowing all these things, beloved—both those who are joined in marriage and those practicing the discipline of virginity—let’s show great zeal for almsgiving, since it’s not possible to attain the kingdom of heaven in any other way. Indeed, if virginity without almsgiving cannot lead one into the kingdom, then what other good deed will possibly do this or will be able to do it without almsgiving? There is none. Therefore, with all our

76. ἀξίωμα here meaning both the worthiness and honor and the rank or station (PGL 1, 3, 4).

77. John is addressing one of the foolish virgins of Matt 25:1–12 with this speech that extends to the end of this section, with his congregation serving as witnesses to the imagined encounter.

78. Unlike the punctuation in PG, I take these last two sentences as οὐ(χ) rhetorical questions (with Smyth §2651).

79. ἀποδυσσμένη, an athletic metaphor for stripping down for a wrestling match (LSJ II, 2).

δαψιλές ἔστω καὶ διηνεκές τοῦτο, ἵνα παιδρὸν καὶ πλούσιον μείνῃ τὸ φῶς. Μὴ γὰρ δὴ τὸν πένητα ἴδῃς τὸν λαμβάνοντα, ἀλλὰ τὸν Θεὸν τὸν ἀποδιδόντα· μὴ τὸν δεχόμενον τὸ ἀργύριον, ἀλλὰ τὸν ὑπεύθυνον γινόμενον τῷ ὀφλήματι. Διὰ γὰρ τοῦτο ἕτερος λαμβάνει, καὶ ἕτερος ἀποδίδωσιν, ἵνα ἡ μὲν τοῦ δεχομένου πενία καὶ ἡ συμφορὰ πρὸς ἔλεον ἐπικάμψῃ καὶ συμπάθειαν· ὁ δὲ τοῦ μέλλοντος ἀποδιδόναι πλοῦτος τὴν καταβολὴν ἐγγυώμενος, καὶ τὴν μετὰ πολλῆς προσθήκης ἔκτισιν ἐπομένην, θαρρήσαι παρασκευάσῃ περὶ τοῦ δανείου καὶ τοῦ τέλους, καὶ μετὰ πλείονος δαψιλείας ἐκκαλέσῃται τὴν ἐλεημοσύνην. Τίς γὰρ, εἰπέ μοι, μέλλων ἑκατονταπλασίονα λαμβάνειν, καὶ θαρρῶν πάντως ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀποδόσεως, οὐχὶ τὰ πάντα προήσεται;

Μὴ τοίνυν φειδόμεθα χρημάτων, μᾶλλον δὲ φειδόμεθα τῶν χρημάτων· ὁ γὰρ φειδόμενος τῶν ὄντων, εἰς τὰς τῶν πενήτων χεῖρας αὐτὰ ἐναποτίθεται, εἰς τὸν ἄστυλον θησαυρὸν, καὶ λησταῖς καὶ οἰκέταις καὶ συκοφάνταις κακούργοις καὶ πάσαις ἐφόδοις ἀνάλωτον. Εἰ δὲ καὶ ταῦτα ἀκούων ὀκνεῖς προέσθαι τι τῶν ὄντων, καὶ οὔτε τὸ ἑκατονταπλασίονα ἀπολαβεῖν, οὔτε ἡ τοῦ πένητος συμφορὰ, οὔτε ἄλλο οὐδὲν ἐπικάμψαι σε δυνήσεται, ἀναλόγισαι τὰ πεπλημμελημένα σοι· εἴσελθε εἰς τὸ συνειδὸς τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων, πᾶσαν ἐξέτασόν σου τὴν ζωὴν· κατὰμαθέ σου τὰ παραπτώματα [279] μετὰ ἀκριβείας· κἂν ἀπάντων ἀνθρώπων ἀπηνέστερος ᾖς, πάντως ὑπὸ τοῦ φόβου τῶν ἡμαρτημένων σοι παρὰ πάντα τὸν χρόνον ὠθούμενος, καὶ διὰ τῆς ἐλεημοσύνης ἄφεσίν σοι προσδοκῶν γενέσθαι τούτων, καὶ τὸ σῶμα ἐπιδώσεις σαυτοῦ, μήτι γε χρήματα. Εἰ γὰρ τραύματα ἔχοντες, καὶ νοσήματα σωματικὰ ἀποκρούσασθαι βουλόμενοι, οὐδενὸς τῶν ὄντων φειδόμεθα, κἂν αὐτὸ τὸ ἱμάτιον ἀποδόσθαι δεοί, ὥστε τῆς ἀρρωστίας ἀπαλλαγῆναι ἐκείνης· πολλῷ μᾶλλον τῆς ψυχῆς ἀρρωστίαν ἀποτίθεσθαι μέλλοντες καὶ τὰ χαλεπὰ τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων τραύματα διὰ τῆς ἐλεημοσύνης, μετὰ πάσης προθυμίας αὐτὴν ἐργασώμεθα. Καίτοι γε ἐπὶ μὲν τῶν νοσημάτων οὐκ ἔστιν εὐθέως καταβαλόντα ἀργύριον ἀπαλλαγῆναι τῆς νόσου, ἀλλὰ δεῖ καὶ τομῆς πολλάκις καὶ καύσεως καὶ πικρῶν φαρμάκων, καὶ λιμοῦ, καὶ ψύχους, καὶ ἐτέρων φορτικωτέρων ἐπιταγμάτων· ἐνταῦθα δὲ οὐχ οὕτως, ἀλλ' ἀρκεῖ καταβαλεῖν τὸ ἀργύριον εἰς τὰς τῶν πενήτων χεῖρας, καὶ

80. John's wordplay on the senses of φείδεσθαι (compare LSJ glosses IV, "draw back from, refrain from," and II.2., "use sparingly, be sparing, live thriftily") works also in English. For the first instance, see *OED* s.v. "spare" II.6.a., "To abstain or refrain from using, employing, exercising," etc.; for the second, II.5.a., "To refrain from using or consuming; to use in a frugal or economical manner. Now rare."

soul and might, let's pour the oil into the lamps, and it will be plentiful and continual so the light might remain bright and abundant. So then, don't see the poor person who gains it, but God who repays it; not the person who receives the money, but the one who makes good on the debt. There are reasons why the one receives and the other repays. First this is so that the poverty and misfortune of the one who receives might move you to pity and compassion. And, in turn, so that the wealth of the one who is going to repay—because it guarantees the safety of that deposit and the full payment plus bonus that will accompany it—may make you confident about the loan and the interest, and thereby incite you to give alms even more abundantly. After all, tell me, who wouldn't give away all their possessions when they're going to receive back a hundredfold (cf. Matt 19:27–29 and parr.), and are completely confident of repayment?

So let's not be sparing with our possessions, or, rather, let's be sparing when it comes to possessions.⁸⁰ For those who spare their belongings store them up in the hands of the poor—a treasury that is inviolable and invulnerable to robbers, slaves, mischievous swindlers, or any schemes. Now, if on hearing these things you have hesitations about giving away any of your possessions, and neither the prospect of gaining a hundredfold in return nor the misfortune of the poor nor anything else will move you, then consider your own faults. Delve into the conscious awareness of your sins; scrutinize your entire life. Examine your sins [279] with close attention. Even if you might be the cruelest person of all, nonetheless, propelled by the fear of the sins you've committed over such a long time and out of the hope that through almsgiving you'll have forgiveness for them, you'll give over your own body, let alone your possessions (cf. 1 Cor 13:3). If we have injuries and we want to drive out our bodily illnesses, let's spare none of our possessions, even if it might be necessary to give up our own cloak (cf. Matt 5:40) to be freed from that sickness. Let's do this all the more willingly when it comes to the sickness of the soul, given that through almsgiving we're going to divest ourselves of the painful injuries caused by sin. As we know, with illnesses in the body, the one who puts down⁸¹ the money doesn't immediately get freed from the illness, but often needs lacerations, cauterization, bitter medicines, starvation, cold packs, and other onerous prescriptions. However, with illnesses in the soul, it's not like this, but it's sufficient to put the money into the

81. Here and in the next sentence, John uses the verb *καταβάλλειν* (now active), with its various metaphorical resonances (i.e., both making the down payment and sowing the seed), as noted above, p. 386 n. 53.

πάντα εὐθέως ἀπολούσασθαι τὰ πεπλημμελημένα χωρὶς ὀδύνης καὶ πόνου. Ὁ γὰρ τὴν ψυχὴν θεραπεύων ἰατρός, οὐ δεῖται μεθόδων καὶ ὀργάνων, καὶ σιδήρου καὶ πυρός· ἀλλ' ἄρκει νεῦσαι μόνον, καὶ πάντα ἐκρεῖ τῆς ἡμετέρας ψυχῆς τὰ πλημμελήματα, καὶ εἰς τὸ μὴ ὄν ἀφανίζεται.

θ'. Οὐχ ὁρᾷς τοὺς μοναχοὺς τοὺς τὸν μονήρην βίον ἐπιθυμοῦντας καὶ εἰς τὰς κορυφὰς τῶν ὀρέων ἀναχωροῦντας, ὅσῃν ὑπομένουσι σκληραγωγίαν; Καὶ γὰρ σποδὸν ὑποστρωννύμενοι, καὶ σάκκον περιβαλλόμενοι, καὶ κλοιὰ παντὶ τῷ σώματι περιτιθέντες, καὶ ἐν οἴκῳ καθεύξαντες ἑαυτοὺς, λιμῶ παλαίουσι διηνεκεῖ, θρήνοις συζῶσι καὶ ἀγρυπνίαις ἀφορήτοις, ἵνα δυνηθῶσι μικρὸν γοῦν μέρος τῶν ἡμαρτημένων ἀπορρίψασθαι· σοὶ δὲ ἔξεστι χωρὶς τῆς σκληραγωγίας ἀπάσης ἐκείνης τὴν εὐκολον ταύτην καὶ ῥαδίαν εὐλάβειαν ἐπιδείξασθαι. Ποῖος γὰρ πόνος, εἰπέ μοι, τῶν ὄντων ἀπολαύοντας, τὰ περιττὰ τῆς χρείας εἰς τοὺς δεομένους ἀναλώσαι; Εἰ γὰρ μὴ μισθὸς ἔκειτο, εἰ γὰρ μὴ ἀμοιβὴ τοσαύτη ὥριστο, αὕτῃ τοῦ πράγματος ἢ φύσις οὐχ ἱκανὴ καὶ τοὺς σφόδρα ἀνημέρους πείσαι, τοῖς περιττεύουσιν εἰς παραμυθίαν τῶν δεομένων ἀποχρήσασθαι; Ὅταν δὲ καὶ τοσοῦτοι στέφανοι, καὶ τοσαῦται ἀμοιβαί, καὶ τοσαύτη ἀμαρτημάτων ἀμνηστία διὰ τῆς ἐλεημοσύνης γίνηται, ποῖαν ἔξουσιν ἀπολογίαν, εἰπέ μοι, οἱ χρημάτων φειδόμενοι καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν τὴν ἑαυτῶν καταποντίζοντες τοῖς ἀμαρτήμασιν;

Εἰ γὰρ καὶ μὴδὲν σε ἕτερον κινεῖ καὶ διανίστησι πρὸς συμπάθειαν καὶ πρὸς ἐλεημοσύνην, τῆς τελευτῆς τὴν ἀδηλίαν ἀναλόγισαι· καὶ ἐνθυμηθεῖς, ὅτι καὶ μὴ πένησι δῶς, ἐπελθόντος τοῦ θανάτου καὶ ἄκων ἐκστήσῃ ἐτέροις αὐτῶν, καὶ οὕτω γενοῦ φιλάνθρωπος νῦν. Καὶ γὰρ ἐσχάτης ἀνοίας ἂν εἴη, ὣν καὶ ἄκοντες ἐξίστασθαι μέλλομεν, ἐτέροις τούτων μὴ μεταδοῦναι ἐκόντας τοῖς δεομένοις, καὶ ταῦτα μέλλοντας τοσαῦτα ἀπὸ τῆς φιλοφροσύνης ταύτης καρποῦσθαι καλὰ. Τὸ ὑμῶν περίσσευμα, φησὶ, γενέσθω εἰς τὸ ἐκείνων ὑστέρημα. Τί δέ ἐστιν ὃ λέγει; Μείζονα λαμβάνεις, ἢ δίδως. Δίδως αἰσθητὰ, καὶ λαμβάνεις νοητὰ καὶ πνευματικά· δίδως ἀργύριον, καὶ λαμβάνεις ἀμαρτημάτων ἄφεσιν· λύεις σὺ τῷ πένητι λιμὸν, ἐκεῖνος δὲ σοὶ λύει τοῦ Θεοῦ τὴν ὀργήν. Ἀντίδοσίς

82. A favored image of Chrysostom's for the ease of divine action—see, e.g., *Laud. Paul.* 5.8 (AP 244); *Hom. Act.* 9:1 4.1 (PG 51:146); *Anna* 3.1 (PG 54:654).

83. As noted above (p. 372 n. 1), this has been taken to indicate an Antiochene provenance for this homily. For vivid descriptions of Chrysostom's own experience as a monk ca. 372–378 CE, see Kelly, *Golden Mouth*, 24–35 (“Retreat to the Mountains”) and Brändle, *John Chrysostom*, 15–17.

84. κλοιὰ (plural of κλοιός), an ascetic collar used for mortification (PGL).

85. I adopt the reading of Mf's two manuscripts, ἐνθυμήθητι for ἐνθυμηθεῖς. One would translate the latter reading much the same, as the participle would be dependent upon the prior imperative, ἀναλόγισαι (“consider ... because you keep in mind”).

hands of the poor, and immediately all the faults are washed away without pain and trouble. The physician who heals the soul has no need of procedures and implements, of scalpel and fire; he has only to give a nod,⁸² and all the faults flow out of our souls and vanish into nothingness.

9. Don't you see what austerity the monks who desire the solitary life and withdraw to the tops of mountains endure?⁸³ Indeed, they're covered in ashes, wear sackcloth, place restrictive bands all over their bodies,⁸⁴ and, confined in their residence, they wrestle with perpetual hunger, live in laments and unbearable sleeplessness, all so they might be able to cast off from themselves at least a small part of their sins. And it's possible for you to display this satisfying and easy piety without all that harsh austerity. Tell me, what kind of trouble is it for those who enjoy possessions to spend the things that go beyond their basic needs on those who lack them? If there were no reward in store, if no great recompense had been assigned, wouldn't the very nature of the reality be enough to persuade even the most heartless people to use their overabundance for the comfort of those in need? But when in fact such great reward, recompense, and amnesty for sins come about through almsgiving, what kind of excuse will there be for people who are sparing with their possessions and drown their own souls in sins?

Although nothing else moves you and stirs you to compassion and to almsgiving, consider the uncertainty of when our life will come to an end. And keep in mind⁸⁵ that even if you don't give to the poor, when death comes, you'll involuntarily give up your possessions to others; so, if that's the case, be generous to others now! After all, it would be the most extreme folly not to share voluntarily with others who are in need the things we're going to give up involuntarily, even as these are the very things that reap for us such good returns from this act of kindness. "*For let your abundance,*" he says, "*be for the wants of others*" (2 Cor 8:14).⁸⁶ What does he mean? You receive more than you give. You give material things, and you receive immaterial⁸⁷ and spiritual ones; you give money, and you receive forgiveness of sins. You free the poor man from hunger, and he frees you from the wrath of God. It's a kind of exchange⁸⁸ and transaction that generates

86. Plus γενέσθω before εἰς τὸ ἐκείνων ὑστέρημα (presumably John's own addition to punctuate Paul's verbless sentence).

87. See p. 383 n. 35 above on this Platonic terminology, which literally means "things perceptible to the senses" and "things perceptible to the intellect."

88. Here Chrysostom may be playing on the ancient Athenian custom of the

τίς ἐστι καὶ πραγματεία πολὺ τῆς δαπάνης μείζω καὶ χρησιμωτέραν τὴν πρόσδοτον ἔχουσα. Ἡ μὲν γὰρ δαπάνη ἐν χρήμασι γίνεται· ἡ πρόσδοτος δὲ οὐκ ἔτι ἐν χρήμασι μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ [280] ἐν ἀμαρτημάτων ἀφέσει, καὶ παρρησίᾳ τῇ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, καὶ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν, καὶ τῇ τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἀπολαύσει, ἃ μῆτε ὀφθαλμὸς εἶδε, μῆτε οὖς ἤκουσε, μῆτε ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου ἀνέβη. Πῶς οὖν οὐκ ἄτοπον, τοὺς μὲν ἐμπόρους μηδενὸς φείδεσθαι τῶν ὄντων, καὶ ταῦτα οὐχ ἑτέρας τινὸς καινοτέρας, ἀλλ' ὁμοίας τῇ ἐνθῆκῃ τῆς ἐμπορίας αὐτῶν μελλούσης ἔσσεσθαι· ἡμᾶς δὲ διὰ φθαρτῶν καὶ ἐπικήρων οὐχὶ φθαρτὰ καὶ ἐπίκηρα, ἀλλ' ἄφθαρτα καὶ ἀθάνατα καρποῦσθαι μέλλοντας ἀγαθὰ, μὴδὲ τὴν αὐτὴν ἐκείνοις φιλοτιμίαν περὶ τὰ ὄντα ἐπιδείκνυσθαι; Μὴ, ἀδελφοί, μὴ οὕτω κακῶς περὶ τῆς ἑαυτῶν βουλευώμεθα σωτηρίας· ἀλλὰ τὸ παράδειγμα τῶν παρθένων εἰδότες, καὶ τοὺς εἰς τὸ πῦρ ἀπαγομένους τὸ ἡτοιμασμένον τῷ διαβόλῳ καὶ τοῖς ἀγγέλοις αὐτοῦ, ἐπειδὴ μὴ ἔθρεψαν, μὴδὲ ἐπότισαν τὸν Χριστὸν, κατέχωμεν τοῦ Πνεύματος τὸ πῦρ διὰ φιλάνθρωπίας δαψιλοῦς καὶ ἐπιτεταμένης ἐλεημοσύνης, ἵνα μὴ περὶ τὴν πίστιν ναυαγῇσωμεν. Ἡ μὲν γὰρ πίστις τῆς τοῦ Πνεύματος δεῖται βοηθείας καὶ τῆς παραμονῆς, ἵνα ἄσειστος μένῃ· ἡ δὲ τοῦ Πνεύματος βοήθεια διὰ βίου καθαροῦ καὶ πολιτείας ἀρίστης ἡμῖν εἴωθεν παραμένειν. Ὡστε εἰ μέλλοιμεν ἐρριζωμένην ἔχειν τὴν πίστιν, πολιτείας ἡμῖν δεῖ καθαρᾶς τῆς τοῦ Πνεύματος πειθούσης μένειν καὶ συνέχειν ἐκείνης τὴν δύναμιν. Οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν, οὐκ ἔστι βίον ἀκάθαρτον ἔχοντα, μὴ καὶ περὶ τὴν πίστιν σαλεύεσθαι.

ι'. Οἱ γοῦν περὶ εἰμαρμένης ληροῦντες, καὶ τῷ σωτηριῳδῇ τῆς ἀναστάσεως διαπιστοῦντες λόγῳ, ἀπὸ συνειδότης πονηροῦ καὶ πράξεων διεφθαρμένων ἐπὶ τὸ βάραθρον τῆς ἀπιστίας ταύτης κατέπεσον. Καὶ καθάπερ οἱ πυρέττοντες

ἀντίδοσις, known famously, for instance, in the speech by that name of the orator Isocrates, in which “a citizen charged with a *λειτουργία* or *εἰσφορά* might call upon any other citizen, whom he thought richer than himself, either to exchange properties, or to submit to the charge himself” (LSJ II). It is a kind of dare proposition whereby the wealthy are either called to account or they avoid a prescribed benefaction. John has inverted and amplified the convention such that the exchange of properties involves not relative degrees of wealth but rather a stark contrast between the wealthy and the destitute. And he adds to the comparison an extension about what is “exchanged,” changing from silver currency to the kingdom of heaven, from earthly goods to heavenly ones, from goods that perish to those that last forever.

89. With *μήτε* for *οὐκ* (three times), and transposition of negative (*μήτε*) to the front of each of the three clauses rather than before the verb (as in *Μ*). John cites the verse in this form again in *Hom. 2 Cor. 4:13 B* §7 (PG 51:287), and elsewhere, as in *Compunct. Dem.* 1.6 (47:403) and *Stag.* 1.5 (47:436), but in accord with *Μ* elsewhere, as when he quotes the lemma in *Hom. 1 Cor. 7:3* (PG 61:57); *Hom. Matt.* 11.6; 55.6

revenue that's larger than the expense and all the more useful. The expense is in possessions; but the revenue isn't only in possessions, but also [280] in the forgiveness of sins, in confidence when facing God, in the kingdom of heaven, and in the enjoyment of good things *"that no eye has seen, nor ear heard, nor that have dawned on any human heart"* (1 Cor 2:9).⁸⁹ After all, merchants spare none of their assets when they'll be an investment accruing the same kind of merchandise they have, and not something improved. So how is it not crazy, then, that we don't even show the same liberality as merchants do dealing with their possessions, despite the fact that from our corruptible and perishable possessions we're going to reap fruits that aren't corruptible and perishable but rather goods that are incorruptible and immortal? No, brothers and sisters, let's not plan so poorly for our own salvation. Instead, knowing the example of the virgins and that of the people who, because they didn't feed Christ or give him to drink, are led *"into the fire that has been prepared for the devil and his angels"* (Matt 25:41),⁹⁰ let's hold fast to the fire of the Spirit through continual generosity and the almsgiving that he commanded, lest we be *"shipwrecked in our faith"* (1 Tim 1:19).⁹¹ For faith requires the help and abiding presence of the Spirit so it might remain unshakable (cf. 1 Thess 3:2–3). And the help of the Spirit customarily abides with us through a pure life and virtuous conduct. Therefore, if we're going to have a faith that's deeply rooted, we must have pure conduct that persuades the Spirit to abide and to hold fast to the power of faith. For it's impossible—impossible!—for those who have an impure life not to be shaken in their faith, as well.

10. Those who foolishly speak about fate⁹² and refuse to put their faith in the saving message of the resurrection have fallen into the pit of faithlessness because of a wicked conscience and corrupt deeds. People struck

(PG 57:199, 540), etc. Whether we regard the present version as a quotation or a paraphrase, the allusion to 1 Cor 2:9 is unmistakable.

90. Minus τὸ αἰώνιον after τὸ πῦρ.

91. With ναυαγῶμεν for ἐνανάγησαν. John has changed the indicative statement in 1 Tim 1:19 into a first-person ἵνα μη clause. Again, whether a quotation or a paraphrase, the allusion is undeniable (and he will cite the verse again and in more full and precise form below in §10 (PG 51:280).

92. John sets up a stark comparison between what he regards as "pagan" views of fate or destiny (εἰμαρμένη; see PGL C. for brief notes on Platonic, Stoic and Epicurean views) and the Christian teaching of the resurrection of believers (after that of Christ). John associates these "pagan" views of fate with immorality (PGL D).

βουλόμενοι τὸ πνῖγος ἀποτινάξασθαι, κατὰ ψυχρῶν ἑαυτοὺς πολλακίς ἔρριψαν ὑδάτων, καὶ πρὸς βραχὺ παραμυθησάμενοι τὴν νόσον, χαλεπωτέραν ὕστερον ἀνῆψαν τὴν φλόγα· οὕτω δὴ καὶ οἱ πονηρῶ συνεχόμενοι συνειδότε, εἴτα παραμυθίαν ζητοῦντες εὐρεῖν καὶ μὴ βουλόμενοι μετανοεῖν τὰ ἁμαρτήματα ἀπονίψασθαι, τὴν τῆς εἰμαρμένης ἐπεισήγαγον τυραννίδα, καὶ τὴν τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἀπιστίαν. Διὰ τοῦτο ἐνταῦθα ἑαυτοὺς διὰ τῶν ψυχρῶν λογισμῶν πρὸς βραχὺ παραμυθησάμενοι, μείζονα τῆς γεέννης ἀνάψουσιν ἑαυτοῖς τὴν φλόγα, ὅταν γενόμενοι ῥαθυμότεροι, εἴτα ἀπελθόντες ἐκεῖ θεάσωνται τῶν ἑαυτοῖς πεπλημμελημένων ἕκαστον αὐτὸν διδόντα εὐθύνας. Καὶ ἵνα μάθητε ὅτι τοῦτο ἐστὶν ἀληθές, καὶ πράξεις πονηραὶ τῇ τῆς πίστεως λυμαίνονται στερρότητι, ἄκουσον τί φησιν ὁ Παῦλος τῷ Τιμοθέῳ γράφων· Ἵνα στρατεύσῃ, φησὶ, τὴν καλὴν στρατείαν, ἔχων πίστιν καὶ ἀγαθὴν συνειδήσιν (ἡ δὲ ἀγαθὴ συνειδήσις ἀπὸ βίου καὶ πράξεων ὀρθῶν γένοιτ' ἂν)· ἦν τινες ἀπώσάμενοι, περὶ τὴν πίστιν, φησὶν, ἐναυάγησαν. Καὶ πάλιν ἀλλαχοῦ· Ρίζα πάντων τῶν κακῶν ἐστὶν ἡ φιλαργυρία, ἧς τινες ὀρεγόμενοι ἀπεπλανήθησαν τῆς πίστεως. Εἶδες ὅτι κάκεῖνοι ἐναυάγησαν διὰ τοῦτο, καὶ οὗτοι διὰ τοῦτο ἀπεπλανήθησαν, ἐπειδὴ οἱ μὲν τὴν ἀγαθὴν συνειδήσιν ἀπώσαντο, οὗτοι δὲ τῆς φιλαργυρίας ἐπελάβοντο; Ἀπερ ἅπαντα λογισάμενοι μετ' ἀκριβείας, ἐπιμελώμεθα πολιτείας ἀρίστης, ὥστε γενέσθαι διπλοῦν ἡμῖν τὸν μισθόν, ἓνα μὲν, τὸν ἐκ τῆς τῶν ἔργων ἀμοιβῆς ἡτοιμασμένον, ἕτερον δὲ, τὸν ἐκ τῆς κατὰ πίστιν στερρότητος. Ὅπερ γάρ ἐστιν ἡ τροφή τῷ σώματι, τοῦτο ἡ πολιτεία τῇ πίστει· καὶ καθάπερ ἡ τῆς σαρκὸς φύσις τῆς ἡμετέρας οὐκ ἂν διακρα- [281] τηθείη χωρὶς τροφῆς, οὕτως οὐδὲ ἡ πίστις χωρὶς ἔργων ἀγαθῶν. Χωρὶς γὰρ ἔργων ἡ πίστις νεκρά.

Ἐν ὑπολέλειπται λοιπὸν εἰπεῖν, τι ποτέ ἐστι, τὸ αὐτό; Οὐ γὰρ εἶπεν ἀπλῶς, ἔχοντες τὸ Πνεῦμα τῆς πίστεως, ἀλλὰ τί; Ἐχοντες τὸ αὐτὸ Πνεῦμα τῆς πίστεως. Καὶ ἐβουλόμην μὲν ἐπεξελεῖν καὶ τοῦτο τῷ λόγῳ· ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ πολλοὺς ποταμοὺς ὁρῶ νοημάτων ἐκ τῆς ψιλῆς ταύτης ῥήσεως ἐξιόντας,

93. ψυχροὶ λογισμοί, i.e., of the fecklessness of fate (and denial of the resurrection), aligned by John with the cold water baths the febrile use to no ultimate avail. The adjective also means metaphorically (as here) “ineffectual, vain,” and “cold-hearted, heartless, indifferent” (LSJ II.1, 3).

94. Minus ἐν αὐταῖς before τὴν καλὴν στρατείαν.

95. Minus γάρ before πάντων; minus ἀπό before τῆς πίστεως.

96. Mf notes that his two manuscripts read λογιζόμενοι, “as we consider.”

97. The James text reads οὕτως καὶ ἡ πίστις χωρὶς τῶν ἔργων νεκρά ἐστίν. John's statement is perhaps closer to a paraphrase than a quotation, because the word order has been altered for the context of his own argument. This was presumably to accent

down with a fever often plunge themselves into cold water in their wish to shake off the intense heat; but after receiving short-term relief from the illness, they ignite an even worse flame later. In the same way also, those who are beset by a bad conscience and then seek to find consolation but don't wish to wash themselves of their sins by repentance have added to their bad conscience the tyranny of fate and denial of faith in the resurrection. As a consequence, in their case, after briefly consoling themselves with cold reasonings,⁹³ they will ignite for themselves a fire worse than Gehenna when, having become all the more filled with indolence, they make their journey there and see every person giving an account of their own mistakes. So you might learn that this is truly the case and that wicked deeds damage the steadfastness of faith, listen to what Paul says to Timothy when he writes, "*So that you might fight the good fight,*" he says, "*having faith and a good conscience*" (the "good conscience" would come from one's way of life and upright actions), "*the rejection of which has led some to be shipwrecked in the faith*" (1 Tim 1:18–19).⁹⁴ And again elsewhere: "*The love of money is the root of all evils; by striving after it, some have been led astray from the faith*" (1 Tim 6:10).⁹⁵ Have you seen that the first group mentioned were shipwrecked because they rejected the good conscience, and the second were led astray because they embraced the love of money? Now that we've considered⁹⁶ all these things with care, let's cultivate a virtuous life so we might have a double reward: one part being the reward that has been prepared as recompense for our deeds, and the other the reward that comes from steadfastness in faith. For good conduct is to faith what nourishment is to the body. Just as our bodily nature cannot be [281] sustained without nourishment, neither can faith apart from good works; for "*apart from works faith is dead*" (Jas 2:26).⁹⁷

There's one thing left to speak about: What is "*the same*" (2 Cor 4:13)?⁹⁸ For he didn't simply say, "having the Spirit of faith," but what? "*Having the same Spirit of faith*" (2 Cor 4:13).⁹⁹ I would have wished to develop this point in my homily as well, but since I see many streams of thoughts

the rhetorical figures of antistrophe (two clauses ending with *χωρίς* plus noun) and of anastrophe (with *χωρίς* *ἐργων* ending one sentence and beginning the next), which align differently from the original antithesis of Jas 2:26, which places the *χωρίς* phrase in the middle.

98. An abrupt return to the focal passage of the homily.

99. Minus *δέ* after *ἔχοντες*.

δέδοικα μὴ τῷ πλήθει τῶν ῥηθήσεσθαι μελλόντων τὰ εἰρημένα ἐπικλύσας ἅπαντα, ἄχρηστον ὑμῖν ποιήσω τὴν διδασκαλίαν διὰ τῆς ἀμετρίας ὑμῖν λυμηνάμενος. Διόπερ ἐνταῦθα στήσας τὸν λόγον, παρακαλῶ καὶ δέομαι τὰ τε εἰρημένα μετ' ἀκριβείας φυλάττειν, ὅσα περὶ πολιτείας, [282] καὶ πίστεως, καὶ παρθενίας, καὶ φιланθρωπίας, καὶ ἐλεημοσύνης ἠκούσατε, καὶ ταῦτα κατέχοντας ἀσφαλῶς, πρὸς τὴν τῶν μελλόντων ἀκρόασιν ἀπαντῆσαι. Οὕτω γὰρ ἡμῖν στεργὰ καὶ ἄσειστος ἔσται ἡ τῶν εἰρημένων οἰκοδομή, ὅταν, τῶν προτέρων καλῶς πεπηγότων ἐν ταῖς ὑμετέραις διανοίαις, τὰ δεύτερα ἐπεμβάλωμεν. Ὁ δὲ Θεὸς ὁ καὶ ἡμῖν ταῦτα εἰπεῖν δοὺς, καὶ ὑμῖν μετὰ προθυμίας ἀκοῦσαι, καταξιώσειε καὶ τὸν διὰ τῶν ἔργων ἐπιδείξασθαι καρπὸν, χάριτι καὶ φιλανθρωπία τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅτι αὐτῷ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων Ἀμήν.

100. ῥῆσις; or, perhaps focalized on the single word, αὐτό. One can imagine this passage as a part of the live oratory, even as in the written form (perhaps edited in this direction) it clearly prepares for the homily that will follow.

coming out from this simple statement,¹⁰⁰ I'm afraid that if I attend to all that Paul said, in the torrent of things that are going to flow forth I shall render the teaching useless to you because I've irritated you by going on too long. Therefore, stopping my homily here, I urge and implore you to guard with careful attention the things that have been said, which you have heard, about good conduct, [282] faith, virginity, generosity, and almsgiving and that you hold securely fast to them and come back to hear the things I shall say later. For in this way the edifice of what's been said today will be firm and unshakable for you when we add the second story onto the things that have been well fixed in your minds. And may the God who granted both for us to say these things and for you to hear them eagerly deem us worthy also by our works to show the fruit of them, by the grace and magnanimity¹⁰¹ of our Lord Jesus Christ, because to him belongs the glory forever and ever. Amen.

101. The same *φιλανθρωπία* to which John has just exhorted his audience.

ΕΙΣ ΤΗΝ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΙΚΗΝ ΡΗΣΙΝ Τὴν λέγουσαν, «Ἐχοντες δὲ τὸ αὐτὸ Πνεῦμα τῆς πίστεως, κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον·» καὶ πρὸς Μανιχαίους, καὶ πάντας τοὺς διαβάλλοντας τὴν Παλαιὰν καὶ διαιροῦντας αὐτὴν ἀπὸ τῆς Καινῆς, καὶ περὶ ἐλεημοσύνης.

α'. [281] Ἀποστολικῆς ὑμῖν ἐξηγήσεως χρέος ὀφείλω παλαιόν· ἀλλὰ τοῦτο τὸ χρέος ὑμεῖς μὲν ἴσως ἐπιλέλησθε διὰ τὸν χρόνον, ἐγὼ δὲ οὐκ ἐπιλέλυσμαι διὰ τὸν περὶ ὑμᾶς πόθον. Τοιοῦτον γὰρ ἡ ἀγάπη· ἄγρυπνόν τι χρῆμα, καὶ μεμεριμνημένον ἐστί· καὶ οὐχὶ τοὺς φιλοῦντας μόνον ἐπὶ τῆς διανοίας περιφέρουσιν οἱ φιλοῦντες, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὅσα ἂν αὐτοῖς ὑπόσχωται δώσειν, τῶν μελλόντων ἀπολαμβάνειν ἀκριβέστερον τὴν μνήμην ἔχουσιν. Οὕτω καὶ μήτηρ φιλόστοργος τοῖς παισὶ τοῖς ἑαυτῆς λείψανα τραπέζης διατηρήσασα, καὶ ἐκεῖνοι τύχωσιν ἐπιλαθόμενοι, αὕτη γε οὐκ ἐπιλήσεται, ἀλλὰ μετὰ σπουδῆς αὐτὰ διαφυλάξασα πάσης, εἰς μέσον φέρει καὶ διατρέφει πεινῶντας. Εἰ δὲ μητέρες οὕτω περὶ τὰ ἔκγονα φιλόστοργοι, πολλῶ μᾶλλον ἡμᾶς περὶ τὴν ὑμετέραν ἀγάπην πλεονα σπουδὴν καὶ ἐπιμέλειαν ἐπιδείκνυσθαι χρή, ὅσῳ τῶν τῆς φύσεως ὠδίνων αἱ τοῦ πνεύματός εἰσι δυνατώτεραι. Τίς οὖν ἡ

1. Provenance: this homily clearly follows directly on the previous (see above, p. 372 n. 1), even as the preacher refers to an interval of time between the two, though perhaps with some rhetorical exaggeration of how long the interval of a week (or more?) between the sermons may have felt.

Text: Mf PE (1837) as reprinted by JPM (PG, 1862). PG contains also Mf's original text-critical notes (1721) on ME, based on Mf's collation of two manuscripts, *Colbertinus* 970 (= Paris. gr. 748 [XI]) and *Colbertinus* 1030 (= Paris. gr. 768 [XIII]), as with the previous homily and some earlier homilies in this volume. The editors of PE added seven notes from their fresh reading of Paris. gr. 748 (as indicated in our notes below). As usual, JPM does not differentiate the authors of the notes. (See also pp. 372–73 n. 1 on the first homily for further manuscript witnesses for this homily.)

2. Mf notes that his two manuscripts have a different title: τοῦ αὐτοῦ. Τῇ προτέρᾳ

Hom. 2 Cor. 4:13 B
(In illud: habentes eundem spiritum, sermo 2)
CPG 4383 (PG 51:281–90)¹

On the passage of the apostle that says, “*But having the same Spirit of faith, according to what is written*” (2 Cor 4:13),² and against the Manichaeans and all those who calumniate the Old Testament and divide it from the New, and concerning almsgiving.

1. [281] I am obligated to pay you an old debt of apostolic interpretation. While you’ve perhaps forgotten this debt because of the length of time, I haven’t forgotten it, because of my ardent love for you. For this is what love is like: it’s something that keeps you up at night and in a state of anxious concern.³ Those who love don’t only carry around those they love in their minds, but they have an even more accurate memory of all the things they’ve promised to give them than do those who are going to receive them. Thus also a mother loves her own children so much, that even if they should happen to forget, she won’t forget, but she saves leftovers from the table and, after safeguarding them with much care, brings the leftovers out and feeds them when they’re hungry. Now, if mothers love their progeny in this way, how much more should we show greater zeal and care for you, our beloved, inasmuch as the birth pangs of the Spirit are more powerful than physical ones?⁴ And what’s the table from which we’ve saved the

διαλεχθεῖς εἰς τὴν ἀποστ. ... γεγραμμένον, πάλιν εἰς τὴν αὐτὴν εἶπε (“By the same author. Having spoken in the former sermon about the apostolic ... written, again he spoke about the same passage”). The editors of PE added the note (not retained by JPM) that Paris. gr. 748 reads εἰς αὐτὴν εἶπε (“he spoke about it”), but they apparently missed that there is also a minus in the wording of the lemma earlier, of τῆς πίστεως after πνᾶ [πνεῦμα] and before κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον (fol. 78^v, on which the title is visibly in lighter ink than the rest of the homily but still legible).

3. John is alluding to Paul in 2 Cor 11:27–28: ἐν ἀγρυπνίαις πολλάκις ... ἡ μέριμνα πασῶν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν.

4. Again, a Pauline echo, with Gal 4:19.

τράπεζα ἦν, ἥς τὰ λείψανα διετηρήσαμεν ὑμῖν; Ῥῆσις ἦν ἀποστολική, πολλὴν ἡμῖν τότε παρασχούσα τροφήν πνευματικὴν, ἥς μέρος μὲν ἐνεθήκαμεν ὑμῶν τῇ διανοίᾳ, μέρος δὲ εἰς τὴν παροῦσαν ἡμέραν ἀνεβαλλόμεθα, ὥστε μὴ τῷ πλήθει τῶν λεγομένων καταχῶσαι τῆς μνήμης τῆς ὑμετέρας τὴν δύναμιν.

Τίς οὖν ἐστὶν ἡ ῥῆσις; Ἔχοντες δὲ τὸ αὐτὸ Πνεῦμα τῆς πίστεως, κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον· Ἐπίστευσα, διὸ ἐλάλησα· καὶ ἡμεῖς πιστεύομεν, διὸ καὶ λαλοῦμεν. Περὶ ποίας μὲν οὖν πίστεως εἴρηται, πότερον τῆς τῶν σημείων ποιητικῆς, περὶ ἧς ὁ Χριστὸς φησιν· Ἐὰν ἔχετε πίστιν, ὡς κόκκον σινάπεως, ἐρεῖτε τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ, Μετάβηθι, καὶ μεταβήσεται· ἢ τῆς τὴν γνώσιν ἐμποιοῦσης ἡμῖν, καθ' ἣν πάντες ἐσμέν πιστοί· καὶ τίνος ἕνεκα Πνεῦμα πίστεως εἴρηται, καὶ τί ποτὲ ἐστὶν ἡ πίστις αὕτη, καὶ πάντα δὴ ταῦτα κατὰ δύναμιν τότε πρὸς τὴν ὑμετέραν διελέχθημεν ἀγάπην, ὅτε καὶ τοὺς περὶ ἐλεημοσύνης ἐκινήσαμεν λόγους. Ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἐλείπετο εἰπεῖν καὶ τίνος ἕνεκεν εἴρηται, Πνεῦμα πίστεως τὸ αὐτὸ, καὶ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν τότε λεχθέντων οὐκ ἐπέτρεπε καὶ ταύτῃ μετ' ἀκριβείας ἐπεξελθεῖν τῇ ῥήσει· τούτου χάριν εἰς τὴν παροῦσαν ἡμέραν αὐτὴν ἐταμιεύσαμεθα, καὶ νῦν τοῦτο ἀνέστημεν ἀποδώσοντες ὑμῖν τὸ χρέος. Τίνος οὖν ἕνεκεν εἴρηκε, Τὸ αὐτό; [282] Πολλὴν συγγένειαν τῆς Καινῆς Διαθήκης πρὸς τὴν Παλαιὰν ἐπιδείξει βούλεται· διὰ τοῦτο καὶ προφητικῆς ἡμᾶς ἀνέμνησε ῥήσεως, εἰπὼν, Ἔχοντες δὲ τὸ αὐτὸ Πνεῦμα, καὶ ἐπαγαγὼν, Κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον· Ἐπίστευσα, διὸ ἐλάλησα. Τοῦτο δὲ ἄνωθεν καὶ πρὸ πολλῶν χρόνων ὁ Δαυὶδ ἦν εἰρηκῶς, ὅπερ ὁ Παῦλος παρήγαγε νῦν, δηλῶν ὅτι τοῦ Πνεύματος ἡ χάρις ἡ αὕτη καὶ ἐν ἐκείνῳ τότε, καὶ νῦν ἐν ἡμῖν τὴν τῆς πίστεως ἐρρίζωσε δύναμιν· ὡσεὶ ἔλεγε, Τὸ αὐτὸ Πνεῦμα τῆς πίστεως, τὸ καὶ ἐν ἐκείνῳ λαλῆσαν, καὶ ἐν ἡμῖν ἐνήργησε.

β'. Ποῦ νῦν εἰσιν οἱ τὴν Παλαιὰν διαβάλλοντες, οἱ τὸ σῶμα τῆς Γραφῆς διασπῶντες, οἱ τῇ Καινῇ μὲν ἄλλον, ἕτερον δὲ τῇ Παλαιᾷ Θεὸν ἀπονέμοντες;

5. A deliberate reverberation of the ending of the prior homily, *Hom. 2 Cor. 4:13 A §10* (PG 51:281). In the next paragraph John will highlight the main κεφάλαια, or headings, of the arguments in that prior sermon to refresh their memories.

6. With ἔχετε for ἔχρητε after ἐάν; minus ἐντεῦθεν ἐκεῖ after μετάβηθι.

7. *Hom. 2 Cor. 4:13 A §4* (PG 51:274–76).

8. For the quotation, minus τῆς before πίστεως. The reference to the earlier homily corresponds with *Hom. 2 Cor. 4:13 A §§4–5* (PG 51:274–76).

9. *Hom. 2 Cor. 4:13 A §5* (PG 51:276).

10. *Hom. 2 Cor. 4:13 A §§6–10* (PG 51:276–82).

11. John has reordered the phrase to draw attention to τὸ αὐτό as the subject he wishes to engage now (πνεῦμα πίστεως τὸ αὐτό for the textual reading of *Ἐν τῷ πνεύματι τῆς πίστεως*).

12. As stated in *Hom. 2 Cor. 4:13 A §10* (PG 51:281).

leftovers for you? An apostolic passage that at that time provided you with much spiritual nourishment, part of which we deposited into your minds, but another part we put off for the present day so as not to overwhelm the capacity of your memories by the great number of things said.⁵

So then, what is the passage? “*But having the same Spirit of faith, according to what is written, ‘I believed, therefore I spoke.’ We, too, believe, therefore also we speak*” (2 Cor 4:13; Ps 115:1). At that time we spoke to you as best we could about all these things: what sort of faith was being mentioned—whether the faith that performs signs, about which Christ says, “*If you have faith like a mustard seed, you will say to this mountain, ‘Be moved’ and it will be moved*” (Matt 17:20),⁶ or the faith that generates knowledge in us, in accordance with which we’re all people of faith.⁷ And we spoke about why it’s called “*Spirit of faith*” (2 Cor 4:13),⁸ and what this faith might consist in,⁹ and we also said some words then about almsgiving.¹⁰ But when it still remained for us to speak about why it is said, “*the same Spirit of faith*” (2 Cor 4:13),¹¹ the plethora of things already said at that time didn’t allow us to go into this phrase, too, in close detail.¹² On account of this, we stored it up¹³ for the present day, and now we’ve risen to repay this debt to you. So then, why was it that he said, “*the same*”?¹⁴ [282] He wanted to show the intimate kinship¹⁵ the New Testament has with the Old. That’s why he also reminded us of the prophetic statement; once he’d said, “*But having the same Spirit,*” he added, “*according to what is written, ‘I believed, therefore I spoke’*” (2 Cor 4:13; Ps 115:1). Earlier and long ago, David had said the statement that Paul now brought forward, showing clearly that the same grace of the Spirit firmly established the power of faith, both in David then and in us now. It’s as if he were saying, “The same Spirit of faith that spoke in him has been active also in us.”

2. Where are they now, those who calumniate the Old Testament,¹⁶ who tear apart the body of Scripture, who assign one god to the New Testa-

13. ταμιεύεσθαι; see p. 425 n. 96 below.

14. A statement of the governing question or problem in the most general terms.

15. συγγένεια, “intimate kinship,” “close relationship.”

16. Throughout this homily, John uses *παλαιά* and *καινή* often without *διαθήκη* (which are capitalized in PE PG, but not in HS or, of course, the manuscripts) for economy of expression, but the sense of “Old Testament” and “New Testament” (and “Old Covenant” and “New Covenant”) is clear. The translation sometimes uses the capitalized adjectives to render this and, at other times, in order to clarify the meaning, adds the presumed noun, “Testament.”

Ἀκουέτωσαν Παύλου τὰ στόματα τὰ ἄθεα ἐμφράττοντος, καὶ ἐπιστομίζοντος τὴν θεομάχον γλῶτταν, καὶ διὰ τῆς ῥήσεως ταύτης δεικνύοντος, ὅτι τὸ αὐτὸ Πνεῦμα καὶ ἐν τῇ Παλαιᾷ, καὶ ἐν τῇ Καινῇ. Καὶ γὰρ αὐτὰ τὰ ὀνόματα πολλὴν ἡμῖν τῶν Διαθηκῶν δείκνυσιν τὴν συμφωνίαν. Ἡ γὰρ Καινὴ διὰ τὴν Παλαιάν εἴρηται, καὶ ἡ Παλαιὰ διὰ τὴν Καινὴν· καθάπερ οὖν καὶ ὁ Παῦλος φησιν, Ἐν τῷ λέγειν Καινὴν πεπαλαίωκε τὴν προτέραν. Εἰ δὲ μὴ τοῦ αὐτοῦ εἶεν Δεσπότης, οὔτε αὕτη Καινὴ, οὔτ' ἐκείνη Παλαιὰ δύναται ἂν λέγεσθαι. Ὡστε αὕτη ἡ ἐν τοῖς ὀνόμασι διαφορὰ τὴν συγγένειαν ἐκατέρας ἐκδείκνυται, καὶ ἡ διαφορὰ δὲ αὕτη οὐ κατὰ τὴν οὐσίαν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὴν τῶν χρόνων ἐναλλαγὴν ἐστὶ· καὶ γὰρ τὸ καινὸν τῷ παλαιῷ κατὰ τοῦτο ἀντιδιαστέλλεται μόνον· ἡ δὲ τῶν χρόνων ἐναλλαγὴ οὐδὲ διαφορὰν δεσποτείας οὐδὲ μείωσιν εἰσάγει. Καὶ τοῦτο πάλιν ὁ Χριστὸς ἐνέφηεν, εἰπὼν· Διὰ τοῦτο λέγω ὑμῖν, Πᾶς γραμματεὺς μαθητευθεὶς ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τῶν οὐρανῶν ὁμοίος ἐστὶν ἀνθρώπῳ οἰκοδεσπότη, ὅστις ἐκβάλλει ἐκ τοῦ θησαυροῦ αὐτοῦ καινὰ καὶ παλαιά. Ὅρᾳς διάφορα μὲν τὰ κτήματα, μίαν δὲ τὴν δεσποτείαν; Ὡσπερ οὖν ἐκεῖνος δύναται ἐκβάλλειν καινὰ καὶ παλαιὰ εἰς ὧν οἰκοδεσπότης, οὕτω δὴ καὶ ἐνταῦθα δυνατόν ἐνός εἶναι Θεοῦ τὴν Καινὴν καὶ τὴν Παλαιάν· αὐτὸ γὰρ τοῦτο μάλιστα δείκνυσιν αὐτοῦ τὸν πλοῦτον καὶ τὴν περιουσίαν, τὸ μὴ μόνον καινὰ κεκτῆσθαι, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τοῖς παλαιοῖς τὴν περιουσίαν ἐνδείκνυσθαι.

Ὡστε διαφορὰ μόνον ἐστὶν ὀνομάτων ἐν ταῖς Διαθή-^[283]καις οὐ μάχῃ, οὐδὲ ἐναντίωσις. Τὸ γὰρ παλαιὸν ἐκ τοῦ καινοῦ γίνεται παλαιόν· τοῦτο δὲ οὐ μάχης, οὐδὲ ἐναντιώσεως, ἀλλὰ διαφορᾶς ὀνόματος μόνης. Ἐγὼ δὲ τοσαύτην ὑπερβολὴν ποιούμεαι, ὅτι, εἰ καὶ ἐναντίοι ἦσαν οἱ νόμοι τῆς Παλαιᾶς τοῖς τῆς Καινῆς, σφόδρα ἂν διισχυρισάμην, ὡς οὐδὲ οὕτως ἕτερον ἐπεισάγειν Θεὸν ἐχρῆν. Εἰ μὲν γὰρ κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν καιρὸν, τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἀνθρώποις, περὶ τὰ

17. Now the “problem” becomes more contentious. John first introduces his adversaries by invective as calumniators with godless mouths. In §4 (PG 51:284) and §5 (PG 51:285) below he will identify them directly as Manichaeans. In this homily, the liturgical lemma of 2 Cor 4:13 is used to “solve” a “problem” generated by other Pauline texts, perhaps most conspicuously and proximately to this one, 2 Cor 4:4 and the reference to ὁ θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, regarded by the Manichaeans as a reference to the evil god of the Old Testament (see John’s response to that “problem” in *Hom. 2 Cor.* 8.2 [PG 61:455]). On Manichaeans and the Old Testament (with particular reference to sources citing Gal 3:13; 2 Cor 3:6 and 1 Cor 15:56 as Pauline support for their case), see Evgeniia Moiseeva, “The Old Testament in Fourth-Century Christian-Manichaean Polemic,” *Journal of Late Antiquity* 11 (2018): 274–97, esp. 283–85.

18. Mf noted that some manuscripts (I have confirmed Paris. gr. 748 as one of them) read ἄθεα ἐνδιαβάλλοντος, ἐμφράττοντος, ἐπιστομίζοντος (“calumniating, stopping up, muzzling their godless ways”).

ment and another to the Old?¹⁷ Let them hear Paul stopping up their godless mouths and muzzling¹⁸ their God-assailing tongue and, with this passage, demonstrating that the same Spirit is in both the Old and the New. In fact, the names themselves show the great harmony of the Testaments, for “New” is said on account of the Old, and “Old” on account of the New. This is just as Paul says, “*In saying new, he has rendered the former old*” (Heb 8:13).¹⁹ If they don’t belong to the same Lord, then neither could the latter be called “New,” nor the former “Old.” Therefore, this difference in names indicates²⁰ the close kinship each has with the other, and, furthermore, this difference isn’t in substance, but it has to do with the variation in time. For in fact, it is in this respect alone that what’s new is distinguished from what’s old. And the variation in time doesn’t introduce a different lord, nor a diminution. Christ made this point again when he said, “*For this reason, I say to you, every scribe educated for the kingdom of heaven is like a man who is head of a household who brings forth from his treasury things new and old*” (Matt 13:52).²¹ Do you see that while the possessions are different, they have a single owner? Just as he, being a single householder, is able to bring forth things new and old, thus also in this case, the New Testament and the Old can belong to one God. Because the very thing that demonstrates his wealth and abundance is the fact that he not only possesses “*new things*,” but he showed abundance in the old, as well.

Hence with the Testaments there’s only a difference in names, [283] not conflict or opposition.²² For what’s old becomes old because of the new. This isn’t a matter of conflict or opposition, but only a difference of name. Positing an extreme case, I would say that even if the laws of the Old Testament were opposed to those of the New, I would vehemently affirm that there would be absolutely no reason to bring in another god because of this. Now, if he were commanding contradictory laws at the same time,

19. With προτέραν for πρώτην (“the first”).

20. The PE editors noted that Paris. gr. 748 reads ἐνδείκνυται for ἐκδείκνυται. JPM did not reprint this note, presumably because the terms have a large degree of synonymy.

21. Plus λέγω ὑμῖν after διὰ τοῦτο; with ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ for εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν. I translate ἄνθρωπος here as “man” since John will be insisting on the analogy with God on the assumption that both are male.

22. Chrysostom solves the “problem” of the relationship between the Testaments by categorization: “difference” (διαφορά) is one thing, he argues, but μάχη and ἐναντίωσις (“conflict” or “opposition”) are something else. When it comes to the two Testaments, he can allow for the former, but not the latter.

αὐτὰ διατρίβουσιν, ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῖς οὗσι πράγμασιν, ἐναντίους ἐπέταττε νόμους, εἶχεν ἂν τινα αὐτοῖς λόγον ἴσως τὸ σόφισμα· εἰ δὲ ἐτέροις μὲν ἐκεῖνοι, ἐτέροις δὲ ἐγράφησαν οὗτοι, καὶ ἐν ἐτέρῳ μὲν ἐκείνοις καιρῷ, ἐν ἐτέρῳ δὲ τούτοις, ἄλλως ἐκείνοις διακειμένοις, καὶ ἐτέρως τούτοις, ποία ἀνάγκη διὰ τὴν τῶν νόμων διαφορὰν ἐναντίους εἰσάγειν νομοθέτας δύο; Ἐγὼ μὲν οὐδεμίαν ὁρῶ, εἰ δὲ αὐτοὶ λέγουν ἔχουσι, εἰπάτωσαν· ἀλλ' οὐκ ἂν ἔχοιεν. Καὶ γὰρ καὶ ἰατρὸς ἐναντία πολλὰ ποιεῖ πολλάκις· ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀπὸ ἐναντίας τῆς γνώμης, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ μιᾶς καὶ συμφώνου. Καὶ γὰρ καίει καὶ οὐ καίει, τέμνει καὶ οὐ τέμνει τὸ αὐτὸ σῶμα πολλάκις· καὶ νῦν μὲν πικρὰ, νῦν δὲ γλυκέα δίδωσι πίνειν φάρμακα· καὶ τὰ μὲν γινόμενα ἐναντία, ἢ γνώμη δὲ, ἀφ' ἧς ταῦτα γίνεται, σύμφωνος καὶ μία· πρὸς γὰρ ἓν τέλος βλέπει, τὴν τοῦ κάμνοντος ὑγίειαν. Πῶς οὖν οὐκ ἄτοπον ἰατρῷ μὲν μὴ ἐγκαλεῖν ἐναντία ποιοῦντι πολλὰ καὶ περὶ σώματος ἐνὸς φύσιν, τῷ Θεῷ δὲ μέμψιν ἐπάγειν, εἰ κατὰ διαφόρους καιροὺς διαφόροις ἀνθρώποις διάφορα ἔδωκε τὰ προστάγματα; γ'. "Οτι μὲν οὖν, εἰ καὶ ἐναντίοι ἦσαν οἱ νόμοι, οὐδὲ οὕτως ἐγκαλεῖν ἔδει, δῆλον ἐκ τούτων.

ὅτι δὲ οὐδὲ εἰσιν ἐναντίοι, ἀλλὰ διάφοροι μόνον, φέρε, τοὺς νόμους εἰς μέσον προχειρισώμεθα. Ἠκούσατε, φησὶν, ὅτι ἐρρέθη τοῖς ἀρχαίοις, Οὐ φονεύσεις. Οὗτος παλαιὸς ὁ νόμος· ἴδωμεν τὸν τῆς Καινῆς. Ἐγὼ δὲ λέγω ὑμῖν, Ὁ ὀργιζόμενος τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ εἰκῇ, ἔνοχος ἐστὶν εἰς τὴν γέενναν τοῦ πυρός. Ταῦτα ἐναντία, εἰπέ μοι, τὰ προστάγματα; Καὶ τίς ἀνθρώπων, καὶ ὅπως οὖν διανοίας μετέχων, τοῦτο ἂν εἴποι; Εἰ μὲν γὰρ τοῦ προτέρου κελεύσαντος μὴ φονεύειν, οὗτος ἐκέλευσεν, ἴσως ἂν τις ἀντινομίαν ἔφησεν

23. Or possibly, “engaged in the same pursuits.”

24. As elsewhere, Chrysostom is invoking the rules of ancient historical criticism: who, what, when, where, and why, to insist that variance in divine laws can be explained contextually, in a way that preserves a unified divine intent and hence a single God.

25. John assumes “the Jews” of the Old Testament and “the Christians” (who for him are “gentiles”) of the New Testament and its later adherents are two different peoples—the rest of this sentence spells out all that involves.

26. Or, possibly, “to people disposed in one way in the former and in another way in the latter.”

27. Mf adopted the reading plus ποία before ἀνάγκη from his two manuscripts, which he regards as superior to the minus (as printed by HS ME). With the minus we would translate, “Is there a necessity to introduce two contradicting lawgivers?” In either case, the sentence semantically seems to be an interrogative (marked or unmarked).

28. This “solution” to the problem of variance by appeal to the example of the doctor is a standard topos of Hellenistic moralists, one that John invokes often for Paul himself, as well as for the deity—e.g., *Laud. Paul.* 5.5–8 (AP 238–44) in this volume, and many further examples.

to the same people, living in the same region,²³ about matters that were the same,²⁴ then their sophistic claim might perhaps have some logic to it. But if the former laws were written to one group of people and the latter to another,²⁵ at one time to the former and at another time to the latter, to people situated in one place in the former and another place in the latter,²⁶ then what need²⁷ is there to introduce two contradicting lawgivers on account of the difference between the laws? I certainly see no such necessity, but if others can give one, let them declare it. But they couldn't do so. After all, a doctor often does many conflicting things,²⁸ but this doesn't come from a self-contradictory purpose, but one that is unified and harmonious. He often burns and doesn't burn, cuts and doesn't cut the very same body. At one time he gives a bitter potion to drink and at another a sweet one. These things, too, are contradictory, but the intent from which they spring is harmonious and unified. The doctor looks to a single goal, the health of the sick patient. Then how isn't it absurd that we don't accuse a doctor of doing many contradictory things for the physical state of a single body, but we cast blame on God if he gave different commands to different people at different times? 3. Now, it's clear from this that even if the laws were contradictory, that wouldn't be a cause for blame.²⁹

But to the further point—that they aren't even contradictory, just different—come on, let's bring forward some laws for examination. He says, “*You have heard that it was said to the ancients, you shall not murder*” (Matt 5:21). This is the Old law. Let's look at the law of the New: “*And³⁰ I say to you, the person who is angry with their brother or sister for no reason is liable... to the Gehenna of fire*” (Matt 5:21–22).³¹ Tell me, are these commands contradictory? What person of even a minimum level of intelligence would say this? Now, if the former had given a command not to murder and the latter a

29. ἐγκαλεῖν; cf. ἐγκλημα and κατηγορία below in §§5–6 (PG 51:285–87), forensic language for “accusation” or “charge” or “blame.”

30. Translating δέ as conjunctive rather than adversative, in line with John's argument here. Of course, the problem of whether the so-called antitheses of the Sermon on the Mount (Matt 5:21–48) are to be understood as contrastive or complementary is still debated in NT scholarship. See W. D. Davies and Dale C. Allison, Jr., *Matthew 1–7*, ICC (London: T & T Clark, 1988), 505–9. The position John is arguing for is the second they catalogue: “although Jesus' words are contrasted with the words of Torah, the two are not contradictory”; “the contrast involves not contradiction but transcendence” (507).

31. With ellipsis as marked (from the first ἐνοχος in the verse to the third); minus ὅτι πᾶς before ὁ ὀργιζόμενος; with ἐστὶν for ἔσται after ἐνοχος.

εἶναι τὸ λεγόμενον· εἰ δὲ ἐκείνου κελεύοντος μὴ φονεύειν, οὗτος ἐκέλευσε μὴδὲ ὀργίζεσθαι, ἐπίτασις, οὐκ ἐναντίωσις ὁ πρότερος τοῦ δευτέρου νόμος ἐστίν· ὁ μὲν γὰρ τὸν καρπὸν τῆς κακίας ἐξέτεμε, τὸν φόνον, οὗτος δὲ καὶ τὴν ῥίζαν ἀνέσπασε, τὴν ὀργήν· ἐκεῖνος τὸ ρεῦμα τῆς πονηρίας ἐξέκοψεν, οὗτος καὶ τὴν πηγὴν αὐτὴν ἐξήρανε. Πηγὴ γὰρ καὶ ῥίζα τοῦ φόνου θυμὸς καὶ ὀργή· Ἐκεῖνος τοῦτο προπαρεσκεύασεν ὁ νόμος τὴν φύσιν τὴν ἡμετέραν, οὗτος ἐλθὼν τὸ λείπον ἐπλήρωσε. Ποία ἐναντιότης, ὅταν ὁ μὲν τὸ τέλος τῶν κακῶν, ὁ δὲ καὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐκκόπῃ; Ἐκεῖνος τὴν χεῖρα καθαρὰν ἐποίησεν αἵματος, οὗτος καὶ τὴν διάνοιαν αὐτὴν ἀπήλλαξε τῶν πονηρῶν βουλευμάτων. Ταῦτα δὲ συμφωνούντων ἀλλήλοις νόμων, οὐχὶ μαχομένων ἐστίν· ὅπερ ἄνω καὶ κάτω σπουδάζουσι κατασκευάζειν οἱ τῆς ἀληθείας ἐχθροὶ, μὴ συνορῶντες, ὅτι ἐκ τούτου μεγάλη ραθυμία καὶ ὑπεροψίας αἰτία τὸν τῆς Καινῆς Θεὸν ὑποβάλλουσιν· εὐρεθήσεται γὰρ (ἢ δὲ βλασφημία εἰς τὴν τῶν ταῦτα ἀναγκάζοντων [284] ἡμᾶς λέγειν περιτραπιεῖ κεφαλὴν) ἀκαίρως τὰ καθ' ἡμᾶς οἰκονομήσας.

τὸ δὲ πῶς, ἐγὼ λέγω. Γαλακτοτροφία προσέοικεν ἡ τῆς Παλαιᾶς Διαθήκης παιδαγωγία, στερεὰ δὲ τροφὴ τῆς Καινῆς Διαθήκης ἡ φιλοσοφία· οὐδεὶς δὲ πρὶν ἢ θρέψαι γάλακτι, πρὸς τὴν στερεὰν ἄγει τροφήν. Ὅπερ ἔσται πεποικῶς ὁ τῆς Καινῆς Θεὸς ἄνθρωπος μὴ αὐτὸς ἢ ὁ τὴν Παλαιὰν δεδωκώς· πρὸ γὰρ τοῦ θρέψαι γάλακτι καὶ τῇ διὰ τοῦ νόμου παιδαγωγίᾳ, ἐπὶ τὴν στερεὰν ἡμᾶς ἤγαγε τροφήν. Οὐ τούτῳ δὲ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἑτέρῳ μείζονι τούτου πάλιν αὐτὸν ὑποβάλλουσιν ἐγκλήματι, εἴ γε μετὰ πεντακισχίλια καὶ πλείονα ἔτη τοῦ γένους ἤκε προνοήσων τοῦ ἡμετέρου. Εἰ γὰρ μὴ αὐτὸς ἦν, ὁ διὰ τῶν προφητῶν καὶ τῶν πατριαρχῶν καὶ τῶν δικαίων ἀνθρώπων τὰ καθ' ἡμᾶς ἅπαντα οἰκονομῶν, ἀλλ' ἕτερός τις παρὰ τοῦτον ὁψέ ποτε καὶ βραδέως εὐρεθήσεται τῆς ἡμετέρας ἐπειλημμένος προνοίας, ὥσπερ ἐκ τινος μετανοίας ἀνευγκών· ὅπερ οὐ Θεοῦ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀνθρώπου τοῦ τυχόντος ἀνάξιον

32. I adopt the conjectural emendation of HS, ὁ δεύτερος τοῦ προτέρου, for ὁ πρότερος τοῦ δευτέρου (as noted, but not adopted, by PE and PG). Alternatively, one could retain the text of the manuscripts and understand the predication differently: “it is an extension; the first law is not a contradiction of the second.”

33. A bit of a wordplay in the Greek: not ἐναντίωσις but ἐπίτασις.

34. Because τοῦτο can be an accusative of respect, there is no need for recourse to the conjectural emendation τούτῳ (as was done by HS and carried forward in the notes by Mf and JPM).

35. Chrysostom blames the Manichaeans for making him personify their point of view in order to refute it.

36. παιδαγωγία, or “tutelage”; John has in mind the παιδαγωγός in Gal 3:24.

37. John adds to the Pauline metaphor of 1 Cor 3:1–2 (in part influenced by

command to do so, then perhaps someone might say that what's said constitutes a legal contradiction. But if the former issued a command not to murder and the latter a command not to get angry, then the second law³² is an extension and not a contradiction³³ of the former law. For the former law cut off the fruit of evil, murder, while the latter pulled up even the root of it, anger. The former law cut off what flows from evil; the latter even dried up its very source. For the source and root of murder is anger and wrath. The former law prepared our nature in this respect,³⁴ but the latter came to complete what was still lacking. What kind of contradiction is it when one law cuts off the end result of evil actions and the other their beginning, as well? The former made the hand clean of blood; the latter even freed the mind itself from wicked intentions. These laws are harmonious with one another and not conflicting. This is what the enemies of truth are so eager to render in a topsy-turvy way—because they don't comprehend that in doing this they're hurling a momentous charge of sloth and contempt against the God of the New Testament, for he will be found to have ordered his dealings with us in an inopportune way. (May the blasphemy rebound onto the heads of those who compel [284] us to say these things!)³⁵

Let me explain how this is so. The preparatory training³⁶ of the Old Testament is like breast milk, whereas the philosophy³⁷ of the New Testament is like solid food. No one introduces a child to solid food before nursing them with milk. This is what the God of the New Testament would've done if he himself hadn't first given the Old, for before nursing us with milk and the preparatory training of the law, he would've introduced us to solid food. And this isn't the only charge they hurl against him, but there's another even worse than this, if indeed it's the case that after more than five thousand years he suddenly decided to care for our people.³⁸ For if he wasn't the one who ordered all our affairs through the prophets and the patriarchs and the righteous ones, but some other god besides him did that, then it was only sometime afterward and belatedly that he'll be found opting to take on providential care for us, as though he came to his senses by some act of repentance.³⁹ Such a thing would be unworthy not only of God but of any

Gal 3:24–25, cf. Heb 5:12–14) the graduated curriculum of ancient education, which he condenses as extending from *παιδαγωγία* to *φιλοσοφία*.

38. I.e., Christians, regarded as “gentiles.”

39. Chrysostom sidesteps the fact that the God of the Old Testament is portrayed as repenting (as, e.g., in Gen 6:6, though the LXX translation *ἐνεθυμήθη* is less overt than the Hebrew *וינחם*).

ἂν εἴη, τοσούτους ἀφέντος ἀπολέσθαι ἐν τοσούτῳ χρόνῳ, ὅψέ ποτε ἐν ἐσχάτῳ τῶν καιρῶν τῆς τῶν ὀλίγων ἐπιλαβέσθαι προνοίας.

δ'. Ὁρᾷς ὅσαις τὸν Θεὸν ὑποβάλλουσι βλασφημίαις ἐκεῖνοι, ἕτερον μὲν τῆς Καινῆς, ἕτερον δὲ τῆς Παλαιᾶς λέγοντες εἶναι νομοθέτην; Ἄπερ ἅπαντα λύεται, ἂν ἓνα ἐκατέρας τῆς Διαθήκης δῶμεν εἶναι Θεόν. Εὐρεθήσεται γὰρ κατὰ λόγον τὰ καθ' ἡμᾶς οἰκονομῶν, τότε μὲν διὰ τοῦ νόμου, νῦν δὲ διὰ τῆς χάριτος, καὶ οὐ προσφάτως, οὐδὲ νεωστὶ, ἀλλ' ἄνωθεν καὶ ἐκ πρώτης ἡμέρας τῆς ἡμετέρας ἐπιλημμένους προνοίας. Ἵνα δὲ μειζόνως αὐτῶν τὰ στόματα ἀπορράψωμεν, φέρε, καὶ αὐτὰς τὰς ῥήσεις παραγάγωμεν, καὶ προφήτας, καὶ ἀποστόλους βοῶντας, ὅτι Καινῆς καὶ Παλαιᾶς εἷς ἐστὶν ὁ νομοθέτης. Παρίτω τοίνυν εἰς μέσον ὁ ἐκ κοιλίας ἀγιασθεὶς Ἰερεμίας, καὶ αὐτὸ τοῦτο δεικνύτω σαφῶς ἓνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν ἐκατέρας ὄντα τῆς Διαθήκης Θεόν. Τί οὖν οὗτός φησιν, ἐκ προσώπου τοῦ νομοθέτου κηρύττων; Διαθήσομαι ὑμῖν διαθήκην καινὴν, οὐ κατὰ τὴν διαθήκην, ἣν διεθέμην τοῖς πατράσιν ὑμῶν. Ὡστε ὁ τὴν Καινὴν αὐτοῖς διαθέμενος, αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ καὶ τὴν Παλαιὰν δοὺς Θεός. Ἐνταῦθα καὶ τοὺς ἀπὸ Παύλου τοῦ Σαμοσατέως ἐπεστόμισεν ἱκανῶς, οἱ τὴν προαιώνιον ὑπαρξὶν ἀναιροῦσι τοῦ Μονογενοῦς. Εἰ γὰρ πρὸ τοῦ τόκου τῆς Μαρίας οὐκ ἦν, οὐδὲ ὑπῆρχε πρὶν ἢ φανῆναι ἐν σαρκί, πῶς ἐνομοθέτει ὁ μὴ ὢν; πῶς δὲ ἔλεγε, Διαθήσομαι ὑμῖν διαθήκην καινὴν, οὐ κατὰ τὴν διαθήκην, ἣν διεθέμην τοῖς πατράσιν ὑμῶν; πῶς διέθετο τοῖς πατράσιν αὐτῶν μὴ ὑπάρχων, μηδὲ ὢν, κατὰ τὸν ἐκείνων λόγον; Ἀλλὰ πρὸς Ἰουδαίους μὲν καὶ τοὺς τὰ Ἰουδαίων νοσοῦντας Παυλιανούς ἱκανῇ στήναι ἢ τοῦ προφήτου μαρτυρία· ἵνα δὲ καὶ Μανιχαίους ἐπιστομίσωμεν, ἀπὸ τῆς Καινῆς τὴν μαρτυρίαν παραγάγωμεν,

40. ἅπερ ἅπαντα λύεται (cf. λύσις); John avers that it is the heretics who make problems, not the orthodox.

41. John understands the New Testament to refer to the period of bestowal of χάρις (cf. the νόμος/χάρις contrast in John 1:17).

42. Literally, “sew up their mouths again.”

43. παράγειν, with LSJ III.a, is forensic language, “bring forward witnesses.”

44. Chrysostom recognizes the use of prosopopoeia by the prophets, in this case identifying Christ as the one for whom the prophet intones this statement in the first person. This is the exegetical strategy of λύσις ἐκ προσώπου, “solution by appeal to the persona that is speaking.”

45. With ὑμῖν for τῷ οἴκῳ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ τῷ οἴκῳ Ἰουδα after διαθήσομαι; ὑμῶν for αὐτῶν after τοῖς πατράσιν. By these changes John has transferred the prophecy to his audience.

46. It is important to recognize throughout this argument that διαθήκη (for Paul and for Chrysostom) means both the covenantal proceeding and relationship, and, by John's time, it refers also and often simultaneously to the Testaments as canonical literary corpora.

human being, if he allowed so many people to be destroyed for so long and then sometime later, at the very last minute, came to exert care for the few.

4. Do you see what blasphemies they hurl against God by saying that there's one lawgiver of the New Testament and another of the Old? But all these problems are solved⁴⁰ if we allow that there is a single God of both Testaments. He'll be found to have ordered our affairs in a reasoned way—back then through the law and now through grace⁴¹—and not recently and at the eleventh hour, but from the beginning and from day one exerting providential care for us. In order to zip their lips⁴² all the more, come on, let's bring forward⁴³ these very passages, both the prophets and the apostles, who loudly declare that there's a single lawgiver of the New Testament and the Old. Let Jeremiah, the one sanctified from the time he was in the womb (cf. Jer 1:5), come forward to speak, and let him demonstrate clearly this very point: that each of the two Testaments belongs to the one and the same God. What does he say, making his announcement in the persona⁴⁴ of the lawgiver? "*I shall make a new covenant with you, not in accordance with the covenant that I made with your ancestors*" (Jer 38:31–32).⁴⁵ Consequently, the God who made the New covenant⁴⁶ with them is the very same God who also gave the Old. Here Jeremiah also ably muzzled the followers of Paul of Samosata,⁴⁷ those who deny the eternal preexistence of the only begotten Son. For if the Son didn't exist before Mary gave birth to him, or if he weren't already in existence before he was manifest in the flesh, then how could one who wasn't alive lay down a law? How could he have said, "*I shall make a new covenant with you, not in accordance with the covenant that I made with your ancestors*" (Jer 38:31–32)?⁴⁸ How did he make a covenant with their ancestors if he wasn't already in existence, wasn't alive, as their argument has it? On the contrary, the prophet's testimony is all that's needed to put a stop to Jews⁴⁹ and those who are sick with Jewish diseases, that is, the Paulianists.⁵⁰ But to muzzle the Manichaeans as

47. For Chrysostom, a notorious fellow Antiochene and bishop (see p. 336 n. 95).

48. In the same text-form as previously in this paragraph.

49. John maintains that he is arguing with Jews on the basis of a prophet found in their own recognized Scriptures.

50. On Christian heresiologists characterizing Christian "heretics" as "Jews," see Daniel Boyarin, *Borderlines: The Partition of Judaeo-Christianity*, *Divinations: Rereading Late Ancient Religion* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006). Epiphanius famously said that the followers of Paul of Samosata should be called "second-order Jews and Samosatians" (δεύτεροι Ἰουδαῖοι κληθήσονται καὶ Σαμοσατῖται)

ἐπειδὴ τῆς Παλαιᾶς οὐδεὶς αὐτοῖς ἐστι λόγος, μᾶλλον δὲ οὐδὲ τῆς Καινῆς· ἀλλὰ καὶ ταύτην, ἣν δοκοῦσι τιμᾶν, οὐχ ἥττον ἐκείνης καθυβρίζουσιν· ἐνὶ μὲν τρόπῳ, τῷ τῆς Παλαιᾶς ἐκκόψαι, καὶ τὸ ἀξιόπιστον αὐτῆς λυμῆνασθαι. Οὐ γὰρ μικρὰ τῶν ἐν αὐτῇ κειμένων τῆς ἀληθείας ἀπόδειξις, τῶν ἐν τῇ Παλαιᾷ [285] προφητειῶν ἢ προαναφώνησις ἦν, οὓς ἀποστραφέντες οὗτοι οὐκ αἰσθάνονται τῶν προφητῶν μᾶλλον τοὺς ἀποστόλους ἀτιμάσαντες. Ἐνὶ μὲν οὖν τρόπῳ τούτῳ τὴν Καινὴν καθυβρίζουσιν, ἐτέρῳ δὲ πάλιν δευτέρῳ, τῷ τὰ πλείονα αὐτῆς ἐκκόψαι. Πλὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὴ τῶν ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ κειμένων ἢ δύναμις τοσαύτη, ὥς καὶ ἀπ’ αὐτῶν τῶν λειψάνων εὐφώρατον αὐτῶν γενέσθαι ποιεῖ τὴν κακουργίαν· τὰ γὰρ ἀποκοπέντα μέλη κράζει καὶ βοᾷ, τὴν πρὸς τὰ οἰκεῖα μέλη συμφωνίαν ἐπιζητοῦντα.

ε’. Πῶς οὖν ἀποδείξομεν, ὅτι Καινῆς καὶ Παλαιᾶς εἷς ἐστὶν ὁ νομοθέτης; Ἀπὸ τούτων τῶν παρ’ αὐτοῖς ὑπολειμμένων ῥημάτων τῶν ἀποστολικῶν, ἃ δοκεῖ μὲν ἔχειν τοῦ νόμου κατηγορίαν, συνίστησι δὲ αὐτὸν μάλιστα, καὶ δεικνύει θεῖον ὄντα χρησμὸν καὶ ἄνωθεν ἥκοντα. Καὶ τοῦτο δὲ τῆς τοῦ Πνεύματος ἐγένετο σοφίας, ὥστε τῇ προχείρῳ ῥήσει δελεασθέντας τοὺς τοῦ νόμου κατηγοροῦντας ἄκοντας καὶ ἀγνοοῦντας δέξασθαι τὴν ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ

in *Pan.* 5.65.2 (GCS 37:4, ed. Holl). John stands fully within this rhetorical tradition of heresiological invective.

51. Chrysostom is with some bravado fighting on two fronts, using the same scriptural passages as his evidence and, in forensic fashion, tailoring his proofs to the warrants that will work for each audience (on this agonistic paradigm of interpretation see *PCBCH* 1–36).

52. Chrysostom here directs against Manichaeans standard invective that Christian authors had used first (and recurrently) against Marcionites, for “mutilating” the New Testament both in terms of the list of authorized books in the canon and the editing (or recension) within books—see, e.g., Tertullian, *Marc.* 4.4.1, etc.; Origen, *Hom. Ps.* 77(78) 1.1 (GCS NS 19, ed. Perrone et al.). Chrysostom is likely merging the two groups (Marcionites and Manichaeans) in his heresiological thinking; he often treats them (by reference to the founders or the groups) in tandem—see, e.g., *Hom. 1 Cor.* 10:1–11 §3 (PG 51:245) and *Hom. Gal.* 2:11–14 §9 (PG 51:379), in this volume; among other passages see *Hom. Gen.* 2.3 (PG 53:29); *Hom. Matt.* 26.6; 49.2 (PG 57:341; PG 58:498); *Hom. 2 Cor.* 21.4 (PG 61:545), etc.

53. Reading with the conjectural emendation *τοσαύτη*, as adopted by JPM (from Mf). The PE editors note that Paris. gr. 748 reads *δύναμις. ἱκανὴ ὥς κτλ.* (“the very power of the passages that are in the New is sufficient so as to make their malevolence easily detectable”).

54. John asserts that he can refute the Manichaeans solely from the New Testament texts that he and they share. On the development of the charge that Manicheans reject the Old Testament, see further Moiseeva, “The Old Testament in Christian Manichaean Polemic.”

well, let's bring forward the testimony from the New Testament, since they hold the Old to be of no account.⁵¹ Or, rather, they don't even hold the New to be of any account, but they also inflict insult on it—which they suppose they honor—no less than on the Old. In a single move, chopping off the Old Testament, they demolish also the credibility of the New. For the prophetic predictions in the Old Testament were no small proof of the truth of what's found in the New. [285] The Manichaeans don't perceive that by rejecting the prophetic writings they're actually dishonoring the apostles more than they are the prophets. So, in this one move they heap insult on the New Testament, and in a second turn they do it again, by chopping off the greater part of it.⁵² But nonetheless, the power that's inherent in the passages of the New Testament is so great⁵³ that it makes the Manichaeans' malevolence easily detectable even from the portions that are left.⁵⁴ For the chopped-off parts cry out and loudly holler as they seek a harmonious reunion⁵⁵ with the parts that belong to them.

5. So, how shall we prove that the New and Old Testaments belong to a single lawgiver? From these⁵⁶ words left by the apostle Paul that the Manichaeans themselves cite, which *seem* to contain an accusation against the law⁵⁷ but instead all the more commend it and show that it is a divine oracle and has come from above. This was due to the Spirit's wisdom, so that, enticed by the surface sense of the passage,⁵⁸ those who bring an accusation against the law might unwillingly and unwittingly receive the defense of the law that stands written there.⁵⁹ This is so that if they wish

55. Again *συμφωνία*, the term John uses for the “harmony” of the two Testaments.

56. Mf notes that his two manuscripts read ἀπ' αὐτῶν ... ῥημάτων (“from the very words”) for ἀπὸ τούτων ... ῥημάτων.

57. As often, the “problem” is presented as merely “apparent” (ἀ δοκεῖ). This rhetoric involves at least granting that it *could* look like the Manichaeans have a textual case here—one that they did in fact make—only to go on to argue vehemently that they actually do not have any case at all.

58. τῇ προχείρῳ ῥήσει, part of the rhetoric of the “literal sense,” i.e., the meaning that is “at hand” (PGL) on a first reading. In John's view, the “apparent” sense of the text is an alluring trap set by the Holy Spirit, who seeks to lead the reader to the true, deeper sense—a view not unlike Origen's theory of *προσκόμματα*, “stumbling-blocks,” that the Holy Spirit wove into Scripture (*Princ.* 4.2.9).

59. John uses the forensic language of “accusation” (*κατηγορία*) and “self-defense” (*ἀπολογία*) as though the Law (= OT) were being put on trial by the Manichaeans and Paul himself is defending it (via his spokesman, John).

γεγραμμένην ἀπολογίαν· ἵνα, ἂν μὲν θελήσωσι πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἰδεῖν, ἔχωσι τὴν ῥῆσιν τὴν χειραγωγούσαν αὐτούς· ἂν δὲ ἐπιμένωσι τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ, μηδεμιᾶς συγγνώμης λοιπὸν τύχωσι, καὶ αὐτοῖς, οἷς δοκοῦσι πιστεύειν, ἀπιστοῦντες κατὰ τῆς ἑαυτῶν σωτηρίας. Ποῦ τοίνυν ἡ Καινὴ ἑαυτῆς καὶ τῆς Παλαιᾶς ἓνα τὸν νομοθέτην εἶναί φησι; Πολλαχοῦ μὲν καὶ ἀλλαχοῦ· ἡμεῖς δὲ ἐκείνην τέως σπουδάζομεν τὴν περικοπὴν εἰς μέσον ἀγαγεῖν, τὴν καὶ παρὰ τοῖς Μανιχαίοις σωζομένην ἔτι καὶ νῦν. Τίς οὖν ἐστὶν αὕτη; Λέγετέ μοι, οἱ ὑπὸ νόμον θέλοντες εἶναι, φησὶ, τὸν νόμον οὐκ ἀκούετε, ὅτι Ἀβραὰμ δύο υἱοὺς ἔσχεν, ἓνα ἐκ τῆς παιδίσκης, καὶ ἓνα ἐκ τῆς ἐλευθέρας; Ἦκουσαν οἱ αἰρετικοί, ὅτι ἓνα ἐκ τῆς παιδίσκης, καὶ εὐθέως ἐπεπήδησαν· ἐνόμισαν γὰρ κατηγορίαν εἶναι τοῦ νόμου τὸ λεγόμενον· καὶ ἐκκόψαντες αὐτὴν τῆς λοιπῆς ἀκολουθίας, ὡς συνηγοροῦσαν αὐτοῖς κατέχουσι.

Φέρε οὖν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ δεῖξωμεν ἓνα ὄντα τὸν νομοθέτην. Ἀβραὰμ δύο υἱοὺς ἔσχεν, ἓνα ἐκ τῆς παιδίσκης, καὶ ἓνα ἐκ τῆς ἐλευθέρας· ταῦτα δὲ ἐστὶ, φησὶν, ἀλληγορούμενα. Τί δὲ ἐστὶν, Ἀλληγορούμενα; Τύποι τῶν ἐν τῇ χάριτι γενομένων ἦσαν τὰ ἐν τῇ Παλαιᾷ Διαθήκῃ γινόμενα. Ὡσπερ γὰρ ἐκεῖ δύο γυναῖκες, οὕτως ἐνταῦθα δύο Διαθήκαι. Πρῶτον μὲν ἐν τούτῳ δείκνυσι τὴν

60. Minus γέγραπται γάρ before ὅτι Ἀβραὰμ (marked as an ellipsis in the translation).

61. Chrysostom seeks to explain away the Manichaeian interpretation as a misreading that divorces one part of the text from its broader literary context; he uses the same term, ἐκκόπτειν, which he had used to refer to the “chopping off” of the Old Testament above in §4 (PG 51:285), as a way to connect what he regards as the two faulty modes of reading.

62. I.e., of the Old and New Testaments.

63. Again John seeks to prove his case from the very evidence cited by his opponents.

64. Chrysostom has replaced ἄτινα with ταῦτα to embed this quotation in his argument. For an entry into the extensive ancient Christian debates on the meanings and import of the term ἀλληγορούμενα (“allegorical” or “allegorically interpreted,” or “spiritual” or “spiritually interpreted”) in Gal 4:24, see Martin Meiser, *Galater*, *Novum Testamentum Patristicum* 9 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007), 214–22, with references.

65. As often, the “solution” generates another possible “problem.” While the Manichaeans, John avers, are reading the text “literally” and in a fragmented way, Paul himself is designating his reading of the Genesis passage as either “allegorical” or to be “allegorically interpreted.” But for John, going too far into allowing for scriptural “allegory” is a problem of its own. John’s teacher, Diodore of Tarsus, addressing both the threat that Christian “allegory” was too close to “pagan” readings (by Stoics, Platonists) of the Homeric epics and other texts, on the one hand, and what he deemed excesses of allegorical readings by some Christian intellectuals, on the other, taught his students

to look toward the truth, they'd have the passage that leads them to it. But if they remain in unbelief, in the end they'd receive no pardon because, to the detriment of their own salvation, they didn't believe in the things they should. So then, where does the New Testament say that it and the Old have a single lawgiver? Everywhere and in all sorts of places. We're eager now to bring forward that very passage that's preserved also by the Manichaeans down to the present day. Which passage is that? "*Tell me, you who wish to be under the law,*" Paul says, "*do you not hear the law.... that Abraham had two sons, one from the maidservant and one from the free woman?*" (Gal 4:21–22).⁶⁰ The heretics heard, "*one from the maidservant,*" and immediately they leapt upon it, for they supposed this statement was an accusation against the law. After chopping this part off from the rest of what follows,⁶¹ they hold fast to it as though it advocated their cause.

Come then, let's prove that there's a single lawgiver⁶² from this very passage⁶³: "*Abraham had two sons, one from the maidservant and one from the free woman*" (Gal 4:22). "*These things,*" he says, "*are allegorical*" (Gal 4:24).⁶⁴ What does "*allegorical*" mean?⁶⁵ The things that took place in the Old Testament were "*figurative renderings*"⁶⁶ of those that happened in grace. For just as in the former there were two women, so in the latter two Testaments. First of all, in this passage, Paul shows the close kinship the

that the figural reading was properly denominated by the term *θεωρία*, not by *ἀλληγορία*. When Paul used the corresponding participle in Gal 4:24, then, he was not using the term to refer to what "Greeks" do in allegorizing, Diodore insisted in *comm. in Psalm.*, Prologue (CCSG 6:7–8, ed. Olivier). Chrysostom does not in the present homily invoke his famous solution to the problem of Paul seeming to endorse "allegory" by maintaining that, while Paul did use the term, he did so as a deliberate misuse, the rhetorical figure *κατάχρησις*, as in *Comm. in Gal.* on 4:24 (PG 61:662). But John here is seeking to insist upon a balance between the "literal" and the "figurative," choosing instead the other Pauline language of *τύπος* (see next note).

66. John is alluding to 1 Cor 10:6 (cf. 10:11). The term means "figure," "impression," "example," but via the influence of the Pauline passage (and cognates in Paulinist literature like *ἀντίτυπα* in Heb 9:24), it becomes one of the host of terms used widely by early Christian interpreters for a figurative reading of Scripture. The word is used by the Alexandrine Origen as well as by the Antiochenes. See Peter W. Martens, "Revisiting the Typology/Allegory Distinction: The Case of Origen," *J ECS* 16 (2008): 283–317. Later in Christian thought down to the present, there will be extensive debates about whether "typology" (a modern term of the nineteenth century) is a distinct form of reading in which a figurative sense is fused with actual historical events. See Frances Young, "Typology," in *Crossing the Boundaries: Essays in Biblical Interpretation in Honour of Michael D. Goulder*, ed. Stanley E. Porter et al., *BibInt* 8 (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 29–48.

συγγένειαν τῆς Καινῆς πρὸς τὴν Παλαιάν, ὅταν ἐκεῖνα τούτων ᾗ τύπος. Ὁ γὰρ τύπος τῆς ἀληθείας οὐκ ἐναντίον, ἀλλὰ συγγενές. Εἰ δὲ ἐναντίος ἦν ὁ Θεὸς τῆς Παλαιᾶς τῷ Θεῷ τῆς Καινῆς, οὐκ ἔμελλε διὰ τῶν γυναικῶν προδιατυποῦν τῆς Καινῆς Διαθήκης τὴν ὑπεροχὴν. Εἰ δὲ καὶ ἐκεῖνος προδιετύπωσε, τὸν Παῦλον ἐχρῆν μὴ ἀποχρήσασθαι τῷ τύπῳ. Εἰ δὲ λέγοιεν, ὅτι Ἰουδαϊκῇ συγκαταβαίνων ἀσθενεία, τοῦτο ἐποίει, ἐχρῆν καὶ Ἑλλήσι κηρύττοντα τύπους Ἑλληνικοὺς εἰσάγειν, καὶ ἱστορίας μεμνήσθαι τῶν παρ' Ἑλλήσι γεγενημένων πραγμάτων. Ἀλλὰ οὐκ ἐποίησε τοῦτο· καὶ μάλα εἰκότως. Ἐκεῖνα μὲν γὰρ οὐδὲν κοινὸν εἶχε πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν, ταῦτα δὲ Θεοῦ χρησμοὶ καὶ νό-[286]μοι· διὸ καὶ πολλὴν συγγένειαν ἔχει τὰ παλαιὰ πρὸς τὴν Καινὴν Διαθήκην.

ς'. Πρῶτον μὲν οὖν τοῦτο δείκνυσιν, ὅτι πολλὴ ἡ συμφωνία τῆς Καινῆς πρὸς τὴν Παλαιάν· δεύτερον δὲ οὐκ ἔλαττον τούτου, καὶ αὐτῇ τῇ ἱστορίᾳ. "Ὡςπερ γὰρ τότε δύο γυναῖκες ἦσαν ἐνὸς ἀνδρός, οὕτω καὶ νῦν δύο Διαθήκαι ἐνὸς νομοθέτου· ἐπεὶ, ἂν ἄλλος ᾗ τῆς Καινῆς, καὶ ἄλλος τῆς Παλαιᾶς, περιττῶς τὴν ἱστορίαν εἰσήγαγεν. Οὐ γὰρ ἄλλος μὲν ἦν τῆς Σάρρας ἀνὴρ, ἄλλος δὲ τῆς Ἀγαρ, ἄλλ' εἷς καὶ ὁ αὐτός. "Ὡστε, ὅταν λέγῃ, Αὐταὶ γὰρ εἰσι δύο διαθήκαι, οὐδὲν ἕτερον λέγει, ἀλλ' ἡ, ὅτι ἓνα ἔχουσι νομοθέτην, καθάπερ ἐκεῖναί ἓνα ἄνδρα τὸν Ἀβραάμ. Ἀλλ' ἡ μὲν δούλη, φησὶν, ἡ δὲ ἐλευτέρα ἦν. Καὶ τί τοῦτο; τέως γὰρ ζητούμενον ἦν, εἰ εἷς ἐκατέρων νομοθέτης. Καταδεξάσθωσαν τοίνυν τοῦτο πρότερον, καὶ τότε πρὸς ἐκεῖνο αὐτοῖς ἀποκρινοῦμεθα. Ἄν γὰρ τοῦτο καταναγκάζῃς αὐτοὺς δέξασθαι, καὶ πεισθῶσιν, ἅπαν αὐτῶν τὸ δόγμα οἰχήσεται. "Ὅταν γὰρ εὐρεθῇ τοῦ αὐτοῦ νομοθέτου καὶ ἡ Παλαιὰ οὔσα, καθάπερ οὖν καὶ ἔστι, πᾶσα λέλυται ἡμῖν ἢ πρὸς ἐκείνους ἀμφισβήτησις.

67. I.e., using the figures of the two women in Genesis, Sarah and Hagar, as his examples.

68. Cf. 1 Cor 9:20, and further discussion in Mitchell, "Pauline Accommodation and 'Condescension' (συγκατάβασις)."

69. John is thinking of texts like Gal 2:7; Rom 11:13; 15:16, etc., and of "Greeks" as "gentiles."

70. See n. 15 above on this central theme of the homily.

71. I.e., Sarah and Hagar as both "belonging" to Abraham.

72. I.e., Abraham.

73. Ironically, in unpacking Paul's ἀλληγορεῖν (the claim that the text "says something other"), Chrysostom denies that it is "saying anything other" (οὐδὲν ἕτερον λέγει) than what John regards as its heresiological sense of subverting Manichaeans.

74. Or "testaments," as in "covenants" (John means both).

75. Understanding φησὶν here as referring to a hypothetical interlocutor.

76. Another "problem": Why did the same God, especially a good God, create some

New Testament has with the Old, since the latter are a figure of the former. This is because the figure isn't contradictory to the truth, but akin to it. If the God of the Old Testament were contrary to the God of the New, he wouldn't have prefigured the superiority of the New Testament by means of the two women! And if that God did indeed do such prefiguring, then it was necessary that Paul not misconstrue the figurative meaning. If they were to allege that Paul was doing this⁶⁷ by way of accommodation to the weakness of the Jews,⁶⁸ then a man who preached to Greeks⁶⁹ should've invoked Greek figures and made mention of stories about things that took place among the Greeks. But Paul didn't do this, and for good reasons. Those Greek stories have no share in the truth, but the Old Testament events are the oracles and [286] laws of God. Therefore, the events of the Old Testament have a very close kinship⁷⁰ with the New Testament.

6. So then, the first thing this shows is that the New Testament has a harmonious relationship with the Old. The second point is no less important than this, as is shown in the story itself. For just as back then there were two women who belonged to one man,⁷¹ so also now there are two Testaments belonging to one lawgiver. After all, if there were one lawgiver for the New Testament and a different one for the Old, then it would've been irrelevant for Paul to have introduced this story. For Sarah didn't have one man and Hagar another, but he⁷² was one and the same person. Consequently, when Paul says, "*These women are two testaments*" (Gal 4:24), he's saying nothing other⁷³ than that the Testaments⁷⁴ have a single lawgiver, just as the two women have a single man, Abraham. But, someone might⁷⁵ say, "why was it that one woman was a slave, and the other was free (cf. Gal 4:22)?"⁷⁶ So far the problem we've engaged⁷⁷ was whether there was a single lawgiver for both Testaments. Now, let them⁷⁸ accept this point first, and then we'll answer them on the next. After all, if you force them to accept the first point, and they're persuaded, then their entire teaching will be undone. This is because when the Old Testament, too, is found to belong to the same lawgiver—as indeed is the case—then our entire dispute with them will have been resolved.⁷⁹

people as slaves and some as free? And, beyond that, if people are created as slave or free, can the former be responsible for their actions and thus be morally culpable and deserving of punishment?

77. ζητούμενον.

78. I.e., the Manichaeans.

79. λέλυται (i.e., the λύσις will have been found).

“Ἴνα δὲ μὴδὲ τοῦτο ὑμᾶς θορυβῇ, πρόσχωμεν ἀκριβῶς τῇ ῥήσει. Οὐ γὰρ εἶπε, Μία μὲν δούλη, μία δὲ ἐλευθέρα· ἀλλὰ, Μία μὲν εἰς δουλείαν γεννῶσα· οὐ πάντως δὲ ἡ εἰς δουλείαν γεννήσασα, δούλη· καὶ αὐτὸ δὲ τὸ εἰς δουλείαν τεχθῆναι, οὐ τῆς τεκούσης ἔγκλημα, ἀλλὰ τῶν τεχθέντων παιδίων. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ τῆς ἐλευθερίας διὰ τὴν κακίαν ἑαυτοὺς ἀπεστέρησαν, καὶ τῆς εὐγενείας ἐξέπεσον, ὡς δούλους αὐτοὺς ἀγνώμονας ἐπαίδευσεν ὁ Θεὸς φόβῳ διηνεκεῖ, κολάζων τιμωρίαις καὶ ἀπειλαῖς. Πολλοὶ γοῦν καὶ νῦν πατέρες τοὺς ἑαυτῶν υἱοὺς, οὐχ ὡς υἱοὺς ἐνάγουσιν, ἀλλὰ μετὰ τοῦ πρέποντος οἰκέταις φόβου· καὶ τὸ ἔγκλημα οὐχὶ τῶν πατέρων ἐστίν, ἀλλὰ τῶν τοὺς πατέρας παρασκευασάντων παιδίων, ὡς δούλοις κεχρῆσθαι τοῖς ἐλευθέροις. Οὕτω καὶ ὁ Θεὸς τὸν λαὸν τότε ἐκείνον μετὰ τοσούτου φόβου καὶ τιμωρίας τοσαύτης ἐνήγε, μεθ’ ὅσης εἰκὸς ἦν οἰκέτην ἀγνώμονα· ἀλλ’ οὐ κατηγορία τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸ γινόμενον, οὐδὲ ἔγκλημα τοῦ νόμου, ἀλλὰ τῶν ἀφηνιαζόντων Ἰουδαίων, σφοδροτέρου δεηθέντων χαλινοῦ. Ἐν αὐτῇ γοῦν τῇ Παλαιᾷ εὐρεθήσονται πολλοὶ οὐχ οὕτως ἀχθέντες, οἷον ὁ Ἀβελ, ὁ Νῶε, ὁ Ἀβραάμ, ὁ Ἰσαὰκ, ὁ Ἰακώβ, ὁ Ἰωσήφ, ὁ Μωϋσῆς, ὁ Ἡλίας, ὁ Ἐλισσαῖος, οἱ ἄλλοι πάντες, ὅσοι τὴν ἐν τῇ Καινῇ φιλοσοφίαν ἐζήλωσαν. Οὐ γὰρ φόβῳ καὶ κολάσει, οὐδὲ ἀπειλῇ καὶ τιμωρίᾳ, ἀλλ’ ἀγάπῃ θεία καὶ φίλτρῳ ζέοντι τῷ περὶ Θεὸν ἐγένοντο τοιοῦτοι, οἳ δὴ καὶ ἐγένοντο. Οὐ γὰρ ἐδεήθησαν προσταγμάτων, οὐδὲ ἐντολῶν καὶ νόμων, ὥστε ἀρετὴν ἐλέσθαι καὶ φεύγειν κακίαν, ἀλλ’ ὥσπερ εὐγενεῖς παῖδες καὶ ἐλεύθεροι, τὴν οἰκείαν ἐπιγνόντες ἀξίαν, χωρὶς φόβου τινὸς καὶ κολάσεως ἡυτομόλησαν πρὸς τὴν ἀρετὴν· οἱ δὲ λοιποὶ πάντες Ἰουδαῖοι, ἐπειδὴ πρὸς κακίαν ἀπέκλιναν, τοῦ κατὰ τὸν νόμον ἐδεήθησαν χαλινοῦ. Ὅτε γοῦν ἐποίησαν τὸν μόσχον, καὶ τὸ γλυπτὸν προσεκύνησαν, τότε ἤκουσαν· Κύριος ὁ Θεός σου, Κύριος εἷς ἐστίν·

80. I.e., the second disputed point (ζητούμενον), of why the slave/free distinction between the two women.

81. John uses the rewording topos to deflect the contrary interpretation of the text.

82. This is just a slight rewording of the paraphrased objection given by the interlocutor, above.

83. Minus ἀπὸ ὅρου Σινᾶ (ellipsis). Translation follows RSV and NRSV (see following note).

84. John is interpreting the prepositional phrase εἰς δουλείαν as referring to the children’s destiny, not to the state in which they were born. Among English translations, the RSV and NRSV translate the phrase (as I have above) “for slavery,” but the NIV (and NASB) translations come closest to John’s own interpretation that follows: “children who are to be slaves.”

85. ἐνάγω, “urge,” “impel,” “instruct” (PGL 1, 2).

86. ἔγκλημα; or, a reason to assign blame to the law.

87. Although John’s terms are different (ἀφηνιάζειν, χαλινός), he is likely thinking with the related Pauline image of the law as a ζυγὸς δουλείας in Gal 5:1.

Now, lest this question⁸⁰ trouble you, let's attend carefully to the passage. For Paul didn't say,⁸¹ "one woman is a slave, and one is free,"⁸² but instead, "*one woman bearing children for slavery*" (Gal 4:24).⁸³ But by no means is a woman who has given birth "*for slavery*" a slave herself. And the blame for the fact that they were born "*for slavery*,"⁸⁴ doesn't belong to the mother, but to the children who were born to her. Because they deprived themselves of freedom and fell from their noble birth due to their wicked behavior, God disciplined them with constant fear like senseless slaves, chastising them with reprisals and threats. Even now many fathers goad⁸⁵ their own sons, not like sons, but with a fear that's proper for household slaves. And the blame for this doesn't belong to the fathers, but to the children who caused their fathers to treat their freeborn sons as though they were slaves. In the same way, too, God used to goad that people back then with fear and reprisals of a magnitude that would likely be suitable for a senseless slave. But what happened isn't a matter of accusation against God or a charge⁸⁶ against the law but against the Jews who refused the rein, even as they were in need of a more severe bridle.⁸⁷ And yet in the Old Testament itself will be found many who were not induced in this way, like Abel, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, Moses, Elijah, Elisha, and all the others who were eager for the philosophy⁸⁸ that is found in the New. For they became the caliber of people they were not because of fear and chastisement, or threat and reprisal, but due to divine love and ardent desire for God. For they didn't require ordinances or commandments and laws to choose virtue and flee vice, but, like nobly born and free children, recognizing their own worthiness, they were self-motivated toward virtue without any fear or chastisement. But all the rest of the Jews,⁸⁹ since they were inclined toward vice, had need of the bridle that the law provided. For instance, it was at the time they made the calf (Exod 32:1–6) and worshipped the carved image (cf. Deut 4:16, 23, 25) that they heard, "*The Lord your God, the Lord is one*" (Deut 6:4).⁹⁰ It was when they committed

88. Also "way of life." With the logic of supersessionism, Chrysostom thinks the New Testament contains the higher teaching and standards of conduct, but these Old Testament notables looked ahead to it and in some sense already proleptically participated in it.

89. John thinks of the Israelites of the wilderness generation as "Jews." Part of his argument is to pillory those "Jews" while upholding the patriarchs and prophets as a contrasting portrait of virtue.

90. John has changed ἡμῶν to σοῦ to sharpen the connection with the narrative he seeks to tell of action and response.

ὅτε ἐφόνευσαν, καὶ τὰς γυναῖκας τῶν πλησίον διέφθειραν, τότε ἤκουσαν, [287] Οὐ φονεύσεις, οὐ μοιχεύσεις, καὶ τὰ ἄλλα δὲ πάντα ὁμοίως.

ζ'. Ὡστε οὐκ ἔγκλημα τοῦ νόμου τὸ κόλασιν ἐπάγειν καὶ τιμωρίαν, καὶ καθάπερ οἰκέτας ἀγνώμονας παιδεύειν καὶ σωφρονίζειν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐγκώμιον μέγιστον, καὶ οὐχ ὁ τυχὼν ἔπαινος, ὅτι τοὺς πρὸς τοσαύτην κατενεχθέντας κακίαν ἡδυνήθη διὰ τῆς οἰκείας σφοδρότητος ἀπαλλάξαι τῆς πονηρίας, μαλάξαι τε καὶ ποιῆσαι καταπειθεῖς τῇ χάριτι, καὶ πρὸς τὴν τῆς Καινῆς ὁδηγῆσαι φιλοσοφίαν. Τὸ γὰρ αὐτὸ Πνεῦμα καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ Παλαιᾷ, καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ Καινῇ πάντα ὠκονόμει, εἰ καὶ διαφόρως. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ Παῦλος ἔλεγεν· Ἔχοντες δὲ τὸ αὐτὸ Πνεῦμα τῆς πίστεως κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον· Ἐπίστευσα, διὸ ἐλάλησα.

Οὐ διὰ τοῦτο δὲ μόνον ἔλεγε, Τὸ αὐτὸ Πνεῦμα, ἀλλὰ καὶ δι' ἑτέραν αἰτίαν οὐκ ἐλάττονα τῆς εἰρημένης, ἣν ἐβουλόμην μὲν νῦν εἰπεῖν, δεδοικῶς δὲ μὴ τὰ εἰρημένα ἐκβλύσῃτε, εἰς ἑτέραν ὑμῖν διάλεξιν ταύτην ταμιεύσομαι, τέως ταύτης μεμνησθαι πάσης παρακαλέσας ὑμᾶς, καὶ μετὰ ἀκριβείας φυλάττειν αὐτήν, καὶ τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς πολιτείας ἀρετὴν προστιθέναι, καὶ τῇ τῶν δογμάτων συνυφαίνειν αὐτὴν καθαρότητι· Ἵνα ἄρτιος ὁ ἄνθρωπος ᾗ τοῦ Θεοῦ, πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἐξηρτισμένος· ἐπεὶ κέρδος οὐδὲν ἔσται ἡμῖν τῶν ὀρθῶν δογμάτων, ὅταν ὁ βίος διεφθαρμένος ᾗ· ὥσπερ οὖν οὐδὲ πολιτείας ἀρίστης ὄφελος, πίστεως οὐκ οὔσης ὑγιοῦς. Ἵνα οὖν ἀπηρτισμένην ἔχωμεν τὴν ὠφέλειαν, ἐκατέρωθεν ἑαυτοὺς ἀσφαλιζώμεθα, ἐν τε τοῖς ἄλλοις ἅπασι καρποῦς ἐπιδεικνύμενοι γενναίους, καὶ μετὰ τῶν ἄλλων τὴν ἐλεημοσύνην, περὶ ἧς καὶ πρῶην ὑμῖν διελέχθην, μετὰ πολλῆς μὲν τῆς προθυμίας, μετὰ πολλῆς δὲ αὐτὴν ἐπιτελοῦντες τῆς δαψιλείας. Ὁ γὰρ σπείρων φειδομένως,

91. John is still on the “problem” posed by Gal 4:21–31 of why Paul (as John understands this argument) said that the law conferred the status of slavery on “the Jews.” The historical-epistolary Paul was actually making an argument about gentile converts who adopt Torah observance, but that is not how Chrysostom understands the text, which he regards as teaching that God instituted two covenants, one with “Jews” (slaves) and one with Christians (free).

92. Mf notes that his two manuscripts have variants here with cognates of κατασκευάζειν (“prepared them to be obedient to grace”), with Paris. gr. 748 reading καταπειθεῖς κατασκευάσαι τῇ χάριτι and Paris. gr. 768 reading καταπειθεῖς προκατασκευάσαι τῇ χάριτι.

93. While there are not verbal correspondences here, as is clear from his use of the term παιδαγωγία above in §3 (PG 51:284), Chrysostom has in mind Paul’s image of the law as a παιδαγωγός in Gal 3:24.

94. Part of this “philosophy” of the New Testament, in John’s view, is the “law of Christ” (cf. Gal 6:2), which he regards as internal and “spiritual,” in contrast to the law

murder and raped the wives of their neighbors (cf. Num 31:17–18) that they heard, [287] “*You shall not murder; you shall not commit adultery*” (Deut 5:18, 17; cf. Exod 20: 15, 13), and all the other statements like this.

7. Therefore, no blame should be laid against the law for imposing chastisement and reprisal, and for punishing and chastising them like senseless slaves.⁹¹ On the contrary, it’s the greatest commendation of it and no slight matter of praise, because in its proper severity the law is able to free from wickedness those who’ve been dragged down into vice, and to soften them and make⁹² them obedient to grace, and lead them toward⁹³ the philosophy of the New Testament.⁹⁴ For it is “*the same Spirit*” that providentially orders everything, both in the Old Testament and in the New, although in a different fashion.⁹⁵ That’s why Paul said, “*But having the same Spirit of faith, according to what is written, ‘I believed, therefore I spoke’*” (2 Cor 4:13; Ps 115:1).

Now, it wasn’t only on account of this that Paul said, “*the same Spirit*,” but there’s also another reason no less important than the one I’ve spoken of. I would wish to tell you about it now, but I’m afraid lest the words will come cascading out. So I shall store up⁹⁶ discussion of it with you for another homily, after I urge you at this point to remember all of today’s homily, and to guard it carefully, and to add to it a life of virtue, and interweave that virtue with your purity of doctrine. “*So the godly person might be prepared, equipped for every good work*” (2 Tim 3:17).⁹⁷ After all, you’ll have no gain from correct doctrines if your life is corrupt. In the same regard, there’s no benefit from a virtuous life if one’s faith isn’t sound. Therefore, so that we might have the complete benefit, let’s secure ourselves from both directions by showing genuine fruits in all our other actions and, along with those, as I said to you also on the earlier occasion, by performing almsgiving with great eagerness and with great abundance as well. “*For the one who sows sparingly*,” he says, “*will also reap sparingly; and the*

of Moses. This is the balancing act of his argument: seeking to maintain the integrity of the law of Moses while retaining unflinchingly his assumption that, while it was inferior to the law of Christ, it was its prefiguration. Chrysostom is by no means unique or innovative in these views by his time.

95. An encapsulation of the entire argument of this homily.

96. ταμιεύσομαι: the same wording as at the opening of this homily in §1 (PG 51:281) about its own occasion being due to what John had stored up from the ending of the previous homily.

97. With transposition of ἤ ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ ἄνθρωπος to ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἤ τοῦ θεοῦ.

φησί, φειδομένως καὶ θερίσει· καὶ ὁ σπείρων ἐπ' εὐλογίαις, ἐπ' εὐλογίαις καὶ θερίσει. Τί ἐστίν, Ἐπ' εὐλογίαις; Μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς ἀφθονίας. Ἐνταῦθα μὲν οὖν ἐπὶ τῶν βιωτικῶν πραγμάτων καὶ ὁ ἀμητὸς καὶ ὁ σπόρος τῶν αὐτῶν ἐστὶ σπερμάτων· καὶ γὰρ ὁ σπείρων, πυρὸν ἢ κριθὰς καταβάλλει, ἢ καὶ ἄλλο τι τῶν τοιούτων, καὶ ὁ θερίζων τὸ αὐτὸ θερίζει πάλιν· ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς ἐλεημοσύνης οὐχ οὕτως, ἀλλὰ ἐτέρως. Σὺ μὲν γὰρ καταβάλλεις ἀργύριον, συλλέγεις δὲ παρρησίαν τὴν πρὸς τὸν Θεόν· δίδως χρήματα, καὶ λαμβάνεις ἀμαρτημάτων λύσιν· παρέχεις ἄρτον καὶ ἱμάτιον, καὶ ἀντὶ τούτων σοι ἡ τῶν οὐρανῶν εὐτρεπίζεται βασιλεία, καὶ τὰ μυρία ἀγαθὰ, ἃ μήτε ὀφθαλμὸς εἶδε, μήτε οὖς ἤκουσε, μήτε ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου ἀνέβη· τὸ δὲ πάντων κεφάλαιον τῶν ἀγαθῶν, ὅμοιος γίνῃ τῷ Θεῷ, κατὰ δύναμιν τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην. Περὶ γὰρ ἐλεημοσύνης καὶ φιланθρωπίας διαλεχθεὶς ὁ Χριστὸς ἐπήγαγεν· Ὅπως γένησθε ὅμοιοι τοῦ Πατρὸς ὑμῶν τοῦ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, ὅτι τὸν ἥλιον αὐτοῦ ἀνατέλλει ἐπὶ πονηροὺς καὶ ἀγαθοὺς, καὶ βρέχει ἐπὶ δικαίους καὶ ἀδίκους. Οὐ δύνασαι ἀνατεῖλαι ἥλιον, οὐδὲ ὄμβρους ἀφεῖναι σὺ, οὐδὲ οἰκουμένην εὐεργετῆσαι τοσαύτην· τοῖς οὖσι χρήμασιν ἀπόχρησαι πρὸς τὴν φιλοφροσύνην, καὶ γέγονας ὅμοιος τῷ τὸν ἥλιον ἀνατέλλοντι, ὡς ἄνθρωπον ὅμοιον Θεῷ γενέσθαι δυνατόν.

ἡ'. Προσέχετε μετὰ ἀκριβείας τοῖς εἰρημένοις. Ἐπὶ [288] πονηροὺς καὶ ἀγαθοὺς, φησί. Καὶ σὺ τοίνυν, ὅτε ἐλεημοσύνην ποιεῖς, μὴ βίον ἐξετάσης, μηδὲ τρόπων εὐθύνas ἀπáιτει. Ἐλεημοσύνη γὰρ διὰ τοῦτο λέγεται, ἵνα καὶ τοῖς ἀναξίους παρέχωμεν· ὁ γὰρ ἐλεῶν, οὐ τὸν κατωρθωκότα, ἀλλὰ τὸν ἡμαρτηκότα ἐλεεῖ· ὁ μὲν γὰρ κατορθῶν, ἐπαίνων ἄξιος καὶ στεφάνων ἐστίν· ὁ δὲ ἁμαρτάνων, ἐλέου καὶ συγγνώμης. Ὡστε καὶ κατὰ τοῦτο μιμησόμεθα τὸν Θεόν, ἐὰν καὶ πονηροῖς παρέχωμεν. Ἐννόησον γὰρ ὅσοι τὴν οἰκουμένην οἰκοῦσι βλάσφημοι, μιανοὶ, γόητες, πάσης ἐμπεπλησμένοι κακίας· ἀλλὰ καὶ τούτους καθ' ἑκάστην τρέφει τὴν ἡμέραν ὁ Θεός, ἡμᾶς παιδεύων τὴν φιλοφροσύνην ἐπὶ πάντας ἐκτείνειν. Ἡμεῖς δὲ ἅπαν τούναντίον ποιοῦμεν.

98. Plus γάρ before σπείρων.

99. Chrysostom is playing on terms spanning the agricultural and monetary realms, with καταβάλλειν and συλλέγειν, which also mean “sowing” and “reaping.”

100. παρρησία, referring to confidence at the eschatological judgment (e.g., Heb 4:16).

101. This is a quotation, with John substituting μήτε for οὐκ three times. Cf. the citation of this verse in *Hom. 2 Cor. 4:13 A* §9 (PG 51:280), on p. 399 n. 89.

102. For the same theme, see *Hom. 2 Cor. 4:13 A* §7 (PG 51:278), on p. 392 n. 74.

103. Again, with ὅμοιοι for υἱοί after γένησθε (a consistent variant text of this passage for Chrysostom; see p. 166 n. 116 above).

one sowing bountifully will also reap bountifully” (2 Cor 9:6).⁹⁸ What does “bountifully” mean? With unstinting generosity. In everyday affairs here in this life, both the reaper and the sower are concerned with the same seeds. As we know, the sower puts down wheat or barley or some other seed, and the one who reaps harvests the same species again. But in the case of almsgiving, it’s not like this, but it’s different. You put down money, you collect⁹⁹ confidence¹⁰⁰ before God. You give material things, and you receive remission of sins. You provide food and clothing, and in return for them the kingdom of heaven is prepared for you, along with the countless good things “that no eye has seen, nor ear heard, nor that have dawned on any human heart” (1 Cor 2:9).¹⁰¹ And the pinnacle of all these good things is that you become like God, inasmuch as that is humanly possible.¹⁰² Christ, when he was speaking about almsgiving and generosity, added, “so that you might become like your father who is in the heavens, because he makes his sun rise on the wicked and the good, and sends rain upon the righteous and unrighteous” (Matt 5:45).¹⁰³ You are not able to make the sun rise or send down rain showers or provide benefactions to a world that is so vast. Use the possessions you have for acts of kindness, and you’ll have become as close as it is possible for a human being to become like God who causes the sun to rise.

8. Pay close attention to what’s been said. “On [288] *the evil and the good*” (Matt 5:45), he says. So you in turn, when you give alms, don’t investigate the livelihood¹⁰⁴ of the one who asks, nor demand a public examination¹⁰⁵ of character. For it’s called almsgiving¹⁰⁶ for the very reason that we provide even for those who are unworthy. The person who’s merciful bestows mercy not on the virtuous but on the sinner. After all, the one who’s upright is worthy of praises and honors, but the one who sins is worthy of mercy and forbearance. Therefore, we shall imitate God in this respect as well if we provide even for the wicked. Consider how many who live in this world are blasphemers, people who have blood on their hands, charlatans, filled with every vice. And yet God feeds even these people every single day, thereby instructing us to extend acts of kindness to all. But we do the

104. βίος; or, “lifestyle.”

105. εὔθυναι in ancient Athens referred to “a public examination of the conduct of officials” (LSJ II; cf. *PGL* 1: “rendering of account, public examination”). In using the term in this context John is deliberately exaggerating for effect the impact and force of these sidewalk conversations.

106. I.e., “acts of mercy.”

οὐ γὰρ πονηροὺς, οὐδὲ φαύλους ἀνθρώπους ἀποστρεφόμεθα μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑγιαίνων τις ἡμῖν προσέλθῃ ἢ δι' ἐπιείκειαν, ἢ δι' ἐλευθερίαν, ἢ καὶ δι' ἀργίαν ἴσως (καὶ γὰρ καὶ τοῦτο τίθημι), πενία συζῶν, λοιδορίας, ὕβρεις, μυρία κατ' αὐτοῦ συνείροντες σκώμματα, κεναῖς αὐτὸν ἀποπέμπομεν χερσὶ, τὴν ὑγίαν ὀνειδίζοντες, τὴν ἀργίαν προσφέροντες. εὐθύνας ἀπαιτοῦντες. Μὴ γὰρ τοῦτο προσετάγῃς, ἄνθρωπε, ἐγκαλεῖν καὶ ἐπιτιμᾶν ἀπλῶς τοῖς δεομένοις; Ἐλεεῖν καὶ διορθοῦσθαι τὴν πενίαν αὐτῶν ὁ Θεὸς ἐκέλευσεν, οὐχὶ εὐθύνας ἀπαιτεῖν καὶ ὑβρίζειν. Ἀλλὰ βούλει διορθῶσαι τὸν τρόπον, καὶ τῆς ἀργίας ἀπαγαγεῖν, καὶ εἰς ἔργον ἐμβαλεῖν τὸν ἀργοῦντα; Δὸς πρότερον, καὶ τότε ἐπιτίμησον, ἵνα μὴ ὠμότητος ὑποψίαν, ἐγκληθεῖς βαρύτητα, ἀλλὰ κηδεμονίας δόξαν λάβῃς. Τὸν μὲν γὰρ μὴ δόντα, ἀλλ' ἐγκαλοῦντα μόνον ἀποστρέφεται, καὶ ἀηδίζει, καὶ οὐδὲ ἰδεῖν ἀνάσχοιτ' ἂν ὁ πένης· καὶ μάλα εἰκότως. Οὐ γὰρ διὰ κηδεμονίαν, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ μὴ βούλεσθαι δοῦναι νομίζει τὰ ἐγκλήματα γίνεσθαι· ὅπερ οὖν καὶ ἔστιν ἀληθές. Ὁ δὲ μετὰ τὸ δοῦναι ἐγκαλῶν, εὐπαράδεκτον ποιεῖ τὴν παραίνεσιν· οὐ γὰρ ἐξ ἀπανθρωπίας, ἀλλ' ἐκ κηδεμονίας ποιεῖται τὴν ἐπιτίμησιν.

Οὕτω καὶ Παῦλος ἐποίησεν· εἰπὼν γὰρ, *Εἴ τις οὐ θέλει ἐργάζεσθαι, μὴδὲ ἐσθιέτω, ἐπάγει λέγων· Ὑμεῖς δὲ τὸ καλὸν ποιοῦντες μὴ ἐκκακήσητε*. Καίτοι δοκεῖ ταῦτα ἐναντία εἶναι τὰ προστάγματα. Εἰ γὰρ οὐ δεῖ τοὺς ἀργοῦντας ἐσθίειν, πῶς τούτοις κελεύεις τὸ καλὸν ποιεῖν; Ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔστιν ἐναντίον· μὴ γένοιτο. Διὰ γὰρ τοῦτο, φησὶν, εἶπον, ὅτι *Εἴ τις οὐ θέλει ἐργάζεσθαι, μὴδὲ ἐσθιέτω*, οὐχ ἵνα τοὺς μέλλοντας διδόναι ἀπαγάγω τῆς ἐλεημοσύνης, ἀλλ' ἵνα τοὺς ἐν ἀργίᾳ ζῶντας ἀπαγάγω τῆς ἀργίας. Τὸ μὲν οὖν εἰπεῖν, *Μὴδὲ ἐσθιέτω*, ἐκείνους διανίστησι πρὸς ἐργασίαν, τῷ φόβῳ τῆς ἀπειλῆς· τὸ δὲ εἰπεῖν, *Τὸ καλὸν ποιοῦντες μὴ ἐκκακεῖτε*, τούτους διεγείρει πρὸς ἐλεημοσύνην τῷ χρησίμῳ τῆς παραινέσεως. Ἵνα γὰρ μὴ, ἀκούσαντες τῆς κατ' ἐκείνων γεγεννημένης ἀπειλῆς, συστειλῶσι τὰς χεῖράς τινες, ἐκκαλεῖται

107. ἀργία means both “idleness” and the character trait that gives rise to it, i.e., “laziness.” Throughout I have translated “indolence” to try to capture both senses.

108. I adopt the reading of Paris. gr. 748, as noted (but not adopted) by PE, ἐγκληθῆς καὶ βαρύτητα for ἐγκληθεῖς βαρύτητα, as is read by Mf and PG. Those editors pronounced the reading of 748 “*Recte*”; JPM rephrases: “*quae lectio non est spernenda*.”

109. Minus ἀδελφοί after ὑμεῖς δέ; paraphrasing (by conflation with Gal 5:9) with τὸ καλὸν ποιοῦντες μὴ ἐκκακήσητε for μὴ ἐκκακήσητε καλοποιοῦντες.

110. Another “problem” of apparent scriptural self-contradiction arises in the exhortation to almsgiving, generated by 2 Thess 3, which is seen as perhaps a Pauline self-contradiction as well as a strong rebuttal to what the preacher has just said.

111. Chrysostom addresses Paul directly.

112. Taking this as perhaps where the prosopopoeia of Paul the self-exegete (in the voice of John) ends, but there is a merging of voices within this part of the oration.

complete opposite. For we don't only turn ourselves away from wicked or mean people, but even from someone who approaches who's healthy and lives in poverty—whether out of virtue, free choice, or even indolence.¹⁰⁷ Perhaps—for I submit that this can happen—stringing together insults, humiliations and countless acts of ridicule, we send them away with empty hands, rebuking their healthy state, attacking their indolence, demanding a public examination. Were you commanded, human being that you are, to accuse and rebuke those who've simply asked for help? No! God commanded you to show mercy and to remediate their poverty, not to ask for public examinations and offer insults. Yet is it your wish to remediate their character and lead them from indolence and to set the indolent to work? Then give first and rebuke afterward, so you might not stand accused¹⁰⁸ on suspicion of cruelty and harshness, but instead you might gain a reputation for solicitude. For poor persons turn themselves away from someone who just accuses but doesn't give, and they express disgust and wouldn't even bear to look at the one who accused them. And rightly so. For they think the accusations come not from solicitude but from not wanting to give—which is in fact true. But someone who brings accusations after they give makes the advice easier to accept, because they issue the rebuke not out of hatred but solicitude.

This is what Paul also did. For after he said, "*If anyone doesn't wish to work, let them not eat*" (2 Thess 3:10), he adds, "*Don't grow tired of doing what is good*" (2 Thess 3:13).¹⁰⁹ And yet, these commands seem to be contradictory.¹¹⁰ After all, if those who are indolent shouldn't eat, then how do you¹¹¹ command us to do good for them? "But it's not contradictory. No way! My purpose in saying, '*If anyone doesn't wish to work, let them not eat*' (2 Thess 3:10)," Paul says, "wasn't to exhort away from almsgiving those who were inclined to give, but to lead those living indolently away from their indolence."¹¹² To say, "*let them not eat*," rouses the latter to work by the fear this threat induces. But saying, "*Don't grow tired of doing what is good*" (2 Thess 3:13)¹¹³ incites the former to almsgiving by the utility of this advice. To ensure that some people not become tightfisted¹¹⁴ after hearing the threat made against those who don't work, he beckons them to acts of

113. Paraphrased as previously (see p. 428 n. 109), but with ἐκκακεῖτε for ἐκκακήσητε (here and later in this paragraph).

114. The idiom has further power because the verb συστέλλειν itself can mean "deprive of all food and drink" (LSJ A.2.b).

πρὸς φιλοφροσύνην αὐτοὺς, λέγων· Τὸ καλὸν ποιοῦντες μὴ ἐκκακεῖτε. “Ὡστε καὶ ἀργοῦντι ἐὰν δῶς, καλὸν πεποίηκας.

θ'. Τοῦτο καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐξῆς δῆλον ἐποίησεν. Εἰπὼν γάρ, *Εἴ τις οὐχ ὑπακούει τῷ λόγῳ ἡμῶν διὰ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς, τοῦτον σημειοῦσθε, καὶ μὴ συναναμίγνυσθε αὐτῷ· καὶ ἐκκόψας αὐτὸν τῆς ἱερᾶς αὐλῆς, πάλιν αὐτὸν ἐτέρῳ συνάπτει τρόπῳ, τὰς τῶν ἐκτεμόντων διανοίας οἰκειῶν αὐτῷ καὶ συνάγων· ἐπ-[289] ἤγαγε γοῦν λέγων· Μὴ ὡς ἐχθρόν, φησὶν, ἡγεῖσθε, ἀλλ' ὡς ἀδελφόν.* “Ὡσπερ οὖν εἰπὼν, *Εἴ τις οὐ θέλει ἐργάζεσθαι, μηδὲ ἐσθιέτω, τοῖς κυρίοις ἐκέλευσε πολλὴν αὐτῶν ποιεῖσθαι πρόνοιαν πάλιν· οὕτω καὶ ἐνταῦθα εἰπὼν, Μὴ συναναμίγνυσθε αὐτῷ, οὐκ ἀπέστησεν αὐτοῦ τῆς ἐπιμελείας τοὺς ἀκούοντας, ἀλλὰ καὶ σφόδρα αὐτοῖς ἀντιλαβέσθαι παρεκελεύσατο, προσθεὶς καὶ εἰπὼν, Καὶ μὴ ὡς ἐχθρόν ἡγεῖσθε, ἀλλ' ὡς ἀδελφόν.* Ἐχωρίσθης αὐτοῦ τῆς συνουσίας, ἀλλὰ μὴ χωρισθῆς τῆς κηδεμονίας· ἀπέκοψας αὐτὸν τῆς συνόδου, μὴ ἀποκόψῃς αὐτὸν τῆς ἀγάπης. Καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸ τοῦτο δι' ἀγάπην ἐκέλευσα γίνεσθαι, ἵνα τῷ χωρισμῷ γενόμενος βελτίων, πρὸς τὸ λοιπὸν ἐπανέλθῃ σῶμα· ἐπεὶ καὶ οἱ πατέρες τῆς οἰκίας τῆς ἑαυτῶν ἐκβάλλουσι τοὺς παῖδας, οὐχ ἵνα ἔξω μένωσι διηνεκῶς, ἀλλ' ἵνα τῷ τῆς οἰκίας ἐκπεσεῖν γενόμενοι σωφρονέστεροι, πρὸς τὴν οἰκίαν ἐπανέλθωσι πάλιν. Πρὸς μὲν οὖν τοὺς ἀργίαν ἐγκαλοῦντας ἱκανὰ τὰ εἰρημένα.

Ἐπειδὴ δὲ καὶ ἕτερός ἐστι πολλοῖς μεμελετημένος λόγος πρὸς ἀπολογίαν, ἀπανθρωπίας καὶ ὠμότητος γέμων, ἀνάγκη καὶ τοῦτον διεξελέγξαι πάλιν, οὐχ ἵνα ἀπολογίας αὐτοὺς ἀποστερήσωμεν, ἀλλ' ἵνα πείσωμεν τὴν οὐκ οὔσαν, οὐδὲ ὠφελοῦσαν ἀπολογίαν ἀποθέσθαι, τὴν δὲ οὔσαν καὶ προστῆναι δυναμένην ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ταύτην διὰ τῶν ἔργων μελετᾶν διηνεκῶς.

115. Mf notes that some manuscripts read *κατεσκευάσεν* for *δῆλον ἐποίησεν* after ἐν τοῖς ἐξῆς and before *εἰπὼν*. One would then translate, “Paul fashioned the proof for this.”

116. *Μinus νουθετεῖτε* after *ἀλλὰ* and before *ὡς ἀδελφόν*, which renders the second clause the object of the verb in the first (*ἡγεῖσθε*).

117. John understands the injunction to do good works in 2 Thess 3:13 as a call to those who have food to share it with those who do not.

118. One might put this sentence in quotation marks also as John's *prosopopoeia* of Paul's self-exegesis.

119. I.e., against the poor who ask for alms, which is one reason that wealthier Christians give for withholding benefactions to them.

120. John continually repeats the forensic term *ἀπολογία* in this last part of the argument in order to link earthly excuses for not giving alms with the “self-defense” to be given at the eschatological judgment.

121. Chrysostom's allusion seems to depend upon both Rom 14:10 and 2 Cor 5:10.

kindness by saying, “*Don’t grow tired of doing what is good*” (2 Thess 3:13). Therefore, if you give to the indolent as well, you’ve done a good thing.

9. Paul made this clear¹¹⁵ also in what follows. For once he said, “*If someone doesn’t obey our word through the letter, take note of this person and don’t associate with them*” (2 Thess 3:14), and cut that person off from the holy flock of the church, Paul reconnects them once again in another way, reconciling and uniting them in fellow-feeling with those who were cutting them off. [289] And so he went on to say, “*Don’t consider them as an enemy,*” I mean, “*but consider them as a brother or sister*” (2 Thess 3:15).¹¹⁶ And after Paul had said, “*If anyone doesn’t wish to work, let them not eat*” (2 Thess 3:10), he issued instructions to those who have the power to provide a great deal of care for such people (cf. 2 Thess 3:13).¹¹⁷ In the same way here, too, after he said, “*Don’t associate with them,*” Paul didn’t remove the hearers from the responsibility to care for those people, but he forcefully encouraged them to help the others by adding the following and saying, “*Don’t consider them as an enemy, but consider them as a brother or sister.*” You’ve been separated from their fellowship, but you weren’t separated from solicitude; you’ve cut them off from your fellowship, but don’t cut them off from your love.¹¹⁸ Paul commanded this very thing to take place because of love, so that after being ameliorated by the separation, they might return to the rest of the body. After all, even fathers don’t toss their own children out of the house so they might continually remain outside, but in order that, after gaining more self-discipline by being banished from the house, they might return home again. What I’ve said is sufficient to handle those who hurl an accusation of indolence.¹¹⁹

But there’s also another line of argument recited by many to defend¹²⁰ themselves, one that is full of inhumanity and cruelty. We must speak again about this as well, not so that we might deprive them of their self-defense, but so we might persuade them to reject the defense that is no defense and gives no benefit, and instead continually to practice the defense that is real and enables us to approach the tribunal of Christ,¹²¹ that is, the defense that comes through deeds.¹²²

122. λόγος in this paragraph refers both to “line of argument” for the rhetoric of self-defense (ἀπολογία) and to “speech” as opposed to “deeds,” a long-standing topos (λόγος/ἔργον). The latter emphasis is also made by Paul in the context of 2 Cor 5:10, to which John alludes here: τοὺς γὰρ πάντας ἡμᾶς φανερωθῆναι δεῖ ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ βήματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἵνα κομίσῃται ἕκαστος τὰ διὰ τοῦ σώματος πρὸς ἃ ἔπραξεν, εἴτε ἀγαθὸν εἴτε φαῦλον.

Τίς οὖν ἐστὶν ἡ ψυχρά καὶ ἀνόνητος τῶν πολλῶν ἀπολογία; Παιδοτροφία συζῶ, φησὶν, οἰκίας προϊσταμαι, γυναῖκα τρέφω, πολλὰς ἔχω δαπάνης ἀνάγκας· ὅθεν οὐκ εὐπορῶ τοὺς προσιόντας μοι ἐλεεῖν. Τί λέγεις; Παιδιά τρέφεις, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τοὺς προσιόντας οὐκ ἐλεεῖς; Δι' αὐτὰ μὲν οὖν ταῦτα τοὺς δεομένους ἐλεεῖν δεῖ, διὰ τὰ παιδιά, καὶ τὴν αὐτῶν προστασίαν, ἵνα ἀπὸ ὀλίγων χρημάτων ἴλεω τὸν δόντα αὐτὰ Θεὸν ποιήσης, ἵνα καταλίπῃς αὐτοῖς προστάτην ἐκεῖνον καὶ μετὰ τὸν σὸν θάνατον, ἵνα πολλὴν αὐτοῖς ἄνωθεν εὐνοίαν ἐπισπάσῃ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐκείνων χρημάτων τῷ Θεῷ δαπανῶν. Οὐχ ὀρᾷς, ὅτι πολλοὶ ἀνθρώπους πλουτοῦντας καὶ ἐν δυναστείαις ὄντας, οὐδαμῶθεν αὐτοῖς προσήκοντας, εἰς τὰς διαθήκας πολλάκις εἰσήγαγον τὰς ἑαυτῶν, καὶ τοῖς ἑαυτῶν παισὶ συγκληρονόμους ἐποίησαν, δι' ἄλλο μὲν οὐδὲν, ἵνα δὲ ἀσφάλειαν τοῖς ἑαυτῶν κτήσωνται παισὶν ἀπὸ ὀλίγων χρημάτων; καὶ ταῦτα, οὐκ εἰδότες πῶς διακείσονται μετὰ τὴν αὐτῶν τελευτὴν περὶ τοὺς αὐτῶν παῖδας οἱ τοῦ κλήρου γενόμενοι κοινωνοί; Σὺ δὲ εἰδὼς τὸ φιλάνθρωπον καὶ χρηστὸν καὶ ἐπεικὲς τοῦ σοῦ Δεσπότης [290] τοῦ, οὐ ποιήσεις αὐτὸν κοινωνὸν τῆς διαθήκης τῆς σῆς; οὐ ποιήσεις αὐτὸν συγκληρονόμον τῶν παίδων τῶν σῶν; καὶ ποῦ ταῦτα πατὴρ, εἰπέ μοι, παῖδας φιλοῦντος; Εἰ γὰρ κήδη τῶν τεχθέντων παίδων, κατάλειπε γραμματεῖον αὐτοῖς, ἐν ᾧ τὸν Θεὸν ἔχεις ὑπεύθυνον. Τοῦτο μεγίστη κληρονομία, τοῦτο κόσμος, τοῦτο ἀσφάλεια. Εἰσάγαγε αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν κληρονομίαν τὴν ἐνταῦθα, ἵνα σε μετὰ τῶν παίδων εἰς τὴν κληρονομίαν ἀντεισαγάγῃ τὴν ἐκεῖ. Οὗτος ὁ κληρονόμος γενναῖος, φιλάνθρωπος, χρηστὸς, δυνατὸς, πλούσιος· ὥστε κατ' οὐδὲν ἔστιν ὑποπτεῦσαι τὴν κοινωνίαν αὐτοῦ. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ σπόρος ἡ ἐλεημοσύνη καλεῖται, ἐπειδὴ οὐκ ἔστι δαπάνη τὸ πρᾶγμα, ἀλλὰ πρόσδοσις· σὺ δὲ, ὅταν μὲν σπείρῃς δέη, οὐ προσέχεις, ὅτι κενοῖς τὰ ταμιεῖα τῶν παλαιῶν γεννημάτων, ἀλλὰ προσέχεις τῷ μηδέπω παρόντι τῶν γεννημάτων ἀμητῷ· καὶ ταῦτα, οὐκ εἰδὼς, ὅτι πάντως ἐκβήσεται. Καὶ γὰρ καὶ ἐρυσίβη, καὶ χάλαζα, καὶ ἀκρίς, καὶ ἀέρων

123. I.e., alms.

124. αὐτὰ could refer either to the παιδιά or the χρήματα; though in context it appears to be the former, it is perhaps deliberately ambiguous, as John sees God as the bestower of both children and material goods.

125. κοινωνοί, literally “partners” or “business partners”; in the case of the will, they are co-beneficiaries. Below I translate the same term as “shareholder.”

126. διαθήκη, as used earlier in this homily for “Testament” or “covenant.” John may be imitating Paul in Gal 3:15 when speaking κατὰ ἄνθρωπον of the everyday human practice of “last wills” and “testaments” on analogy with the divine covenants, and in his discussion of sons (υἱοί) and heirs (κληρονόμοι) in Gal 3:29–4:7. At the least there is strong thematic concurrence.

127. I.e., in heaven.

So, what is this cold-hearted and useless argument of self-defense that many use? “I spend my life in child-rearing,” someone says. “I’m responsible for my household, I feed a wife, and I have many necessary expenses. Hence I’m not wealthy enough to provide gifts of mercy¹²³ to those who approach me.” What are you saying? You’re feeding children, and that’s why you don’t show mercy to those who approach? Well, it’s for this very reason that you should give to those in need—on account of your children and your responsibility for them. By means of a few possessions you might make the God who gave them¹²⁴ to you propitious, and so you can leave him as the one responsible for them even after you’re dead, so that you might draw his goodwill down upon them from above by spending some of those possessions for God. Don’t you see that many people have often put into their wills those who are rich and have power, although they’re not even related to them, and they’ve made them co-heirs with their children, for the sole reason of gaining security for their own children by means of a few possessions? And they do this despite not knowing how those who’ve gained a share of¹²⁵ the inheritance will be disposed to their children after they die. You, on the other hand, although you know the magnanimous, kind, and equitable nature of your Lord, [290] won’t give him a share of your last will and testament?¹²⁶ You’ll not make him a co-heir of your children? Tell me, how is this state of affairs suited to a father who loves his children? For if you care for the children born to you, leave them a written will in which you’ve secured God as the responsible party. This is the greatest inheritance, this is a salutary arrangement, this is security. Bring God into the inheritance here and now, so that he might in turn bring you and your children into the inheritance there.¹²⁷ God is an heir who is noble, magnanimous, kind, powerful, rich. So there’s no possible reason for being suspicious of him as a shareholder. That’s also why almsgiving is called a “seed,”¹²⁸ since it’s not a matter of payment but profit. When you have to sow, you don’t put your attention on the fact that you must empty the storehouses of old produce,¹²⁹ but you put your attention on the harvest of produce that lies in the future. And you don’t know that the latter will fully come to fruition. After all, rot and hail and locusts and irregular weather and many things stand in the way of your hopes for the future. But

128. Cf. in English: “seed money.”

129. Mf notes that one of his manuscripts (I have confirmed it is Paris. gr. 768) reads *γενημάτων* for *γεννημάτων* here and in the next clause. The terms are synonymous in this context.

ἀνωμαλία, καὶ πολλὰ τῆς ἐλπίδος ἡμᾶς ἀντικρούει τῆς μελλούσης· εἰς δὲ τὸν οὐρανὸν μέλλων σπείρειν, ὅπου πᾶσα μὲν ἀνωμαλία ἀέρων ἐκβέβληται, πάσης δὲ λύπης καὶ ἐπιβουλῆς ἀνήρηται πρόφασις, ὁκνεῖς καὶ ἀναδύη; Καὶ ποίαν εὐρήσεις συγγνώμην, ὅταν εἰς μὲν τὴν γῆν καταβάλλων θαρρῆς, καὶ μετὰ προθυμίας τοῦτο ποιῇς, εἰς δὲ τὴν χεῖρα τοῦ Θεοῦ μέλλων καταβάλλειν, ὁκνεῖς καὶ ἀμελεῖς; Εἰ γὰρ ἡ γῆ τὰ καταβληθέντα ἀποδίδωσι, πολλῶ μᾶλλον ἢ τοῦ Θεοῦ χεῖρ, ἅπερ ἂν δέξηται, μετὰ πάσης ἀποδώσει σοι τῆς περιουσίας.

ι'. Ταῦτ' οὖν εἰδότες, μὴ τῇ δαπάνῃ προσέχωμεν, ὅταν ἐλεημοσύνην ποιῶμεν, ἀλλὰ τῇ προσόδῳ καὶ ταῖς μελλούσαις ἐλπίσι, καὶ τῷ παρόντι δὲ κέρδει· οὐ γὰρ βασιλείαν οὐρανῶν ἐλεημοσύνη προξενεῖ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν κατὰ τὸν παρόντα βίον ἀσφάλειάν τε καὶ ἀφθονίαν. Τίς ταῦτά φησιν; Αὐτὸς ὁ ταῦτα δοῦναι κύριος. Ὁ γὰρ τὰ αὐτοῦ πένησι, φησί, δοῦς, ἑκατονταπλασίονα λήψεται ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ, καὶ ζωὴν αἰώνιον κληρονομήσει. Ὅρᾳς ἐν ἑκατέρᾳ τῇ ζωῇ τὰς ἀμοιβὰς διδομένας μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς περιουσίας; Μὴ τοίνυν ὁκνῶμεν, μηδὲ ἀναβαλλώμεθα, ἀλλὰ καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν τὸν τῆς ἐλεημοσύνης καρπὸν φέρωμεν, ἵνα καὶ τὰ παρόντα ἡμῖν πράγματα κατὰ ῥοὴν φέρηται, καὶ τῆς μελλούσης ἐπιτύχωμεν ζωῆς· ἥς γένοιτο πάντας ἡμᾶς μετασχεῖν, χάριτι καὶ φιланθρωπία τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, μεθ' οὗ τῷ Πατρὶ, ἅμα τῷ ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι, δόξα, τιμὴ, κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Ἀμήν.

130. Matthew does not explicitly say this, but the Markan and Lukan parallels have the contrast ἐν καιρῷ τούτῳ/ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τῷ ἐρχομένῳ.

when it comes to sowing into heaven, where every weather irregularity is cast out and the occasion of all grief and subterfuge has been obliterated, you hesitate and shrink away? What sort of forbearance will you find when you put seed into the earth in confidence and do it eagerly, but when you're about to put seed into God's hand, you're hesitant and neglectful? If the earth gives back what's sown into it, how much more does the hand of God; whatever it receives it will give back to you with a bountiful surplus.

10. So then, because we know this, when we give alms let's not put our attention on the expense, but rather on the profit and the future hopes, as well as the present gain. For almsgiving secures not only the kingdom of heaven, but also security and abundance in the present life. Who says this? The Lord himself says he'll give these things. For, he says, the ones who've given of their possessions to the poor "*will receive a hundredfold*" in this age (Matt 19:29)¹³⁰ and "*will inherit eternal life*" (Matt 19:29). Do you see that in both the present and future life, the remunerations are given with a huge surplus?¹³¹ So then, let's neither hesitate nor delay, but let's produce the fruit of almsgiving every day, so that all our present affairs might be conducted swimmingly and we might attain the future life, in which may it be possible for us all to share by the grace and loving-kindness of our Lord Jesus Christ, with whom be glory, honor, and power to the Father, together with the Holy Spirit, forever and ever. Amen.

131. *περιουσία* also means "abundance" (as translated above, §2). "Surplus" here captures better the economic metaphors in play.

ΠΑΛΙΝ ΕΙΣ ΤΗΝ ΑΥΤΗΝ ΡΗΣΙΝ «Ἐχοντες δὲ τὸ αὐτὸ Πνεῦμα
τῆς πίστεως, κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον·» καὶ διὰ τί κοινῇ πάντες
ἀπολαμβάνουσι τὰ ἀγαθὰ, καὶ περὶ ἐλεημοσύνης.

α'. [289] Τῇ προτέρᾳ συνάξει καὶ τῇ πρὸ ἐκείνης μίαν τοῦ Ἀποστόλου ῥῆσιν ἀπολαβόντες, εἰς τὴν ἐξήγησιν ταύτης ἅπαντα τὸν λόγον ἀνηλώσαμεν· καὶ τήμερον δὲ τῇ αὐτῇ ταύτῃ πάλιν ἐνδιατρίψαι σπουδάζομεν· ποιοῦμεν δὲ τοῦτο ἐπίτηδες πρὸς ὠφέλειαν τῆς ὑμετέρας ἀγάπης, οὐ πρὸς ἐπίδειξιν τὴν ἡμετέραν. Οὐ γὰρ ἵνα γόνιμόν τινα καὶ πολύνουν ἑμαυτὸν ἀποφῆνω, ἀλλ' ἵνα καὶ τὴν Παύλου σοφίαν ὑμῖν ἐκκα-[290]λύψω, καὶ τὴν ὑμετέραν διεγείρω προθυμίαν, οὕτω μεταχειρίζω τὸν λόγον. Τό τε γὰρ βάθος τῆς ἐκείνου συνέσεως φαίνεται μειζρόνως, ὅταν ἐκ μιᾶς ῥήσεως τοσούτους ἡμῖν τίκτη ποταμοὺς νοημάτων· ὑμεῖς τε μαθόντες, ὅτι καὶ ἀπὸ μιᾶς λέξεως ἀποστολικῆς ἄφατον ἔστι καρπώσασθαι φιλοσοφίας πλοῦτον, οὐ παραδραμεῖσθε τὰς Ἐπιστολὰς ἀπλῶς, ἀλλὰ προαχθήσεσθε, ταῖς ἐλπίσι ταύταις τρεφόμενοι, τῶν ἐγκειμένων ῥήσεων ἐκάστην μετὰ πολλῆς περιεργάζεσθαι [291] τῆς σπουδῆς. Εἰ γὰρ μία λέξις τριῶν ἡμερῶν διάλεξιν ἡμῖν ἔτεκε, πόσον ἡμῖν ἀναβλύσει θησαυρὸν ὁλόκληρος περικοπὴ μετὰ ἀκριβείας θεωρουμένη; Μὴ τοίνυν

1. Provenance: this homily clearly follows directly on the previous (see above, p. 272 n. 1, and nn. 10–11 and 19 within that show deliberate self-reference and argumentative continuity).

Text: Mf PE (1837) as reprinted by JPM (PG, 1862). PG contains also Mf's original text-critical notes (1721) on ME, based on his collation of two manuscripts, *Colbertinus* 970 (= Paris. gr. 748 [XI]) and *Colbertinus* 1030 (= Paris. gr. 768 [XIII]), as with the earlier two homilies on 2 Cor. 4:13, though with the sparsest set of notes of the three. The editors of PE added just one note from their fresh reading of Paris. gr. 748 (as indicated in our notes below). As usual, JPM does not differentiate the authors of the notes. (See also p. 272 n. 1 on the first homily for further manuscript witnesses to the text of this homily.)

2. Mf noted that one of his manuscripts (I have confirmed that it is Paris. gr. 768,

Hom. 2 Cor. 4:13 Γ
(*In illud: habentes eundem spiritum*, sermo 3)
CPG 4383 (PG 51:289–302)¹

Once again on the same passage, “*But having the same Spirit of faith, according to what is written*” (2 Cor 4:13), and why it is that all receive good things in common, and concerning almsgiving.

1. [289] At the prior liturgical assembly and the one before that, taking up a single sentence of the apostle Paul’s, we spent our whole homily in interpretation of it. Today, too, we’re eager to dwell upon this same passage yet again. Now, we do this by design, with a view to your benefit, beloved, and not a display of our own abilities. For I don’t practice my homiletic art in order to show myself off as someone who has a fertile² and intelligent mind, but so I might both reveal to you the wisdom of Paul [290] and rouse you to eagerness for it. Indeed, the depth of Paul’s sagacity is shown all the more when, from a single sentence, it gives birth to such tremendous streams of thought. And in turn, once you’ve learned that an indescribable wealth of philosophy can be harvested from a single statement of the apostle, you’ll not run through the epistles in a simplistic way,³ but, fed by these hopes, you’ll be persuaded to be eagerly curious about each of the sentences residing there. [291] For if a single statement gave birth to three days’ worth of sermons⁴ for us, how much treasure will cascade⁵ from the entire passage if it is contemplated⁶ with careful attention?

fol. 77^v) reads γνώριμον, “notable,” for γόνιμον, “fertile.” The latter seems preferable in context since John is referring to his prolixity (or fecundity) in commentary on this single verse.

3. ἀπλῶς, “simple”; in textual interpretation, also “literal” (PGL B.3).

4. Note the wordplay between λέξις and διάλεξις.

5. ἀνάβλυσις, a deliberate play on the previous homily, at §7 (PG 51:291), when John cut short his discussion of this theme (δεδοικώς δὲ μὴ τὰ εἰρημένα ἐκβλύσῃτε), to which he now returns.

6. θεωροῦσθαι, “viewed,” “contemplated”; also (with PGL 2) of Scripture, “understand the hidden sense,” “interpret allegorically.”

ἀποκάμωμεν, ἕως ἂν τὸ πᾶν ἀποτρυγήσωμεν. Εἰ γὰρ οἱ μέταλλα διορύττοντες χρυσίου, ὅσον ἂν ἐκεῖθεν κενώσωσι πλοῦτον, οὐ πρότερον ἀφίστανται, ἕως ἂν τὸ πᾶν ἀνέλωνται χρυσίον· πολλῶ μᾶλλον ἡμᾶς μείζονι προθυμία κεκρῆσθαι δεῖ καὶ σπουδῇ περὶ τὴν τῶν θείων λογίων ἔρευναν. Καὶ γὰρ καὶ ἡμεῖς χρυσίον οὔρυστον, οὐκ αἰσθητὸν, ἀλλὰ πνευματικόν· οὐ γὰρ μέταλλα γῆς, ἀλλὰ μέταλλα τοῦ Πνεύματος ἐργαζόμεθα. Αἱ γὰρ ἐπιστολαὶ τοῦ Παύλου τοῦ Πνεύματός εἰσι μέταλλα καὶ πηγαί· μέταλλα μὲν, ὅτι χρυσίου παντὸς τιμιώτερον ἡμῖν παρέχουσι πλοῦτον· πηγαὶ δὲ, ὅτι οὐδέποτε ἐπιλείπουσιν· ἀλλ' ὅσον ἂν κενώσης ἐκεῖθεν, τοσοῦτον καὶ πολλῶ πλεον ἐπιρρεῖ πάλιν. Καὶ τούτου γένοιτ' ἂν ἀπόδειξις σαφῆς ὁ χρόνος ὁ παρελθὼν ἅπας. Ἐξ οὗ γοῦν Παῦλος ἐγένετο, πεντακόσια λοιπὸν ἔτη παρήλθε· καὶ τοῦτον ἅπαντα τὸν χρόνον πολλοὶ μὲν συγγραφεῖς, πολλοὶ δὲ διδάσκαλοι καὶ ἐξηγηταὶ πολλὰ πολλάκις ἐκεῖθεν ἐξήντησαν, καὶ τὸν ἀποκείμενον οὐκ ἐκένωσαν πλοῦτον. Οὐ γὰρ αἰσθητὸς ὁ θησαυρός· διὰ τοῦτο οὐκ ἀναλίσκεται τῇ τῶν οὔρυστων πολυχειρίᾳ, ἀλλ' αὖξεται καὶ πλεονάζει. Καὶ τί λέγω τοὺς ἔμπροσθεν; Πόσοι μεθ' ἡμᾶς ἐροῦσι καὶ μετ' ἐκείνους ἕτεροι πάλιν, καὶ οὐ παύσεται πηγάζων ὁ πλοῦτος, οὐδὲ ἐπιλείψει ταύτη τὰ μέταλλα; πνευματικὰ γὰρ ἐστι, καὶ οὐ πέφυκε δαπανᾶσθαι ποτε. Τίς οὖν ἐστὶν ἡ ῥῆσις ἡ ἀποστολική, περὶ ἧς καὶ πρώην πρὸς τὴν ὑμετέραν ἀγάπην διελέχθημεν; Ἐχόντες δὲ τὸ αὐτὸ Πνεῦμα τῆς πίστεως, κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον· Ἐπίστευσα, διὸ ἐλάλησα.

β'. Τότε μὲν οὖν ἐζητοῦμεν, τίνος ἕνεκεν εἶρηκε, Πνεῦμα πίστεως τὸ αὐτό· καὶ μίαν αἰτίαν τέως εἰρήκαμεν· αὕτη δὲ ἦν, τὸ δεῖξαι σύμφωνον τῇ Καινῇ τὴν Παλαιὰν οὔσαν. Ὅταν γὰρ φαίνεται τὸ Πνεῦμα τῆς πίστεως τὸ αὐτὸ καὶ τὴν τοῦ Δαυὶδ κινήσαν γλῶτταν τὴν λέγουσαν, Ἐπίστευσα, διὸ ἐλάλησα, καὶ εἰς τὴν τοῦ Παύλου ψυχὴν ἐνεργοῦν, εὐδὴλον ὅτι πολλὴ συγγένεια προφητῶν καὶ ἀποστόλων, καὶ ἀνάγκη πολλὴν Παλαιᾶς καὶ Καινῆς εἶναι τὴν συμφωνίαν. Ἄλλ' ἵνα μὴ πάλιν τὰ αὐτὰ ἀνακινοῦντες ἐνοχλῶμεν ὑμῖν, φέρε, καὶ τὴν ἐτέραν αἰτίαν εἴπωμεν, δι' ἣν εἶρηκε, Τὸ αὐτό· καὶ γὰρ καὶ τότε ὑμῖν ὑπεσχόμεθα ἐτέραν αἰτίαν εἶναι τῆς ῥήσεως ταύτης. Ἀλλὰ διανίστητε·

7. ἐρευνᾶν, “searching (after),” “scrutinizing,” “inquiring”; for its use of the Scriptures, see John 5:39.

8. John overestimates the time from Paul’s lifetime to his own by approximately 180 years (counting from Paul’s death, which we might place ca. 68 CE).

9. As in the prior homily, *Hom. 2 Cor. 4:13 B* §1 (PG 51:281), John has altered the word order to emphasize the main question (ζητούμενον) that he will engage once more in this one: What is meant by τὸ αὐτό modifying πνεῦμα [τῆς] πίστεως?

10. A reiteration of the thesis argued in a sustained way in the previous homily, *Hom. 2 Cor. 4:13 B* §§1–8 (PG 51:281–87).

So let's not grow tired until we've gathered the whole of it. If those who dig gold mines empty as much wealth as they can from one spot, not moving on from there until they've brought up the whole lode of gold, how much more must we employ even greater eagerness and zeal when it comes to spelunking⁷ Scripture, which is full of divine utterances. And indeed it is the case that we're digging for gold, yet not material but spiritual gold; we don't work mines of dirt, but mines of the Spirit. For the letters of Paul are mines and fountains of the Spirit. They are mines, in that they provide us with a wealth that is more precious than any gold; fountains, in that they never run dry. No, as much as you empty out of them, all the more flows out again. And clear proof of this may be found in the length of time that has passed. In truth, fully five hundred years⁸ have passed since Paul was alive. And for all this time, many writers, many teachers, and interpreters have drawn out many things at various times from there, and they haven't emptied the wealth that's stored up there. Because the treasure isn't material. That's why it's not expended by the multiplicity of the miners who've had a hand in it, but instead it increases and multiplies. For that matter, why should I mention those who came before us? Many of our contemporaries will speak, and others again after them, and the wealth won't stop flowing, nor will the mines dry up because of this. For they're spiritual mines and hence by nature don't ever get expended. So, what is the passage of the apostle about which we spoke to you earlier, beloved? "*But having the same Spirit of faith, according to what is written: 'I believed, therefore I spoke'*" (2 Cor 4:13; Ps 115:1).

2. So then, on the earlier occasion we were seeking to find out why Paul had said, "*the same Spirit of faith*" (2 Cor 4:13).⁹ And at that point we'd spoken of one reason, and it was this: to show the harmony that the Old Testament has with the New. For when "*the same Spirit of faith*" appears to have moved David's tongue that said, "*I believed, therefore I spoke*" (Ps 115:1), and to be at work in Paul's soul, it is abundantly clear that there's a very close kinship between the prophets and the apostles, and there's necessarily a great measure of harmony between Old and New.¹⁰ Now, lest we cause you annoyance by raising the same topics once more, come on, let's speak of the second reason why Paul said, "*the same*." Indeed, back then we promised to tell you another reason for this statement.¹¹ So keep awake!

11. Hom. 2 Cor. 4:13 B, §7 (PG 51:287).

βαθὺ γὰρ τὸ νόημα τοῦτό ἐστιν, ὃ μέλλω λέγειν πρὸς τὴν ὑμετέραν ἀγάπην, καὶ διορατικῆς δεόμενον διανοίας, καὶ ὀξυτάτης ψυχῆς· διὸ παρακαλῶ μετὰ ἀκριβείας παρακολουθεῖν τοῖς ῥηθήσεσθαι μέλλουσιν. Εἰ γὰρ ἡμέτερος ὁ πόνος, ἀλλ' ὑμέτερον τὸ κέρδος, μᾶλλον δὲ οὐδὲ ἡμέτερος ὁ πόνος ἀλλὰ τῆς τοῦ Πνεύματος χάριτος ἡ δωρεά· ὅταν δὲ ἀποκαλύψῃ, οὔτε ὁ λέγων, οὔτε οἱ ἀκούοντες κάμνουσι· πολλὴ γὰρ τῆς ἀποκαλύψεως ἡ εὐκολία. Πρόσχωμεν τοίνυν μετὰ ἀκριβείας· κἂν γὰρ τοῖς πλείοσι παρακολουθήσητε, περὶ δὲ βραχὺ μέρος ἀπονυστάζητε, τὸ πᾶν ἀγνοήσετε τοῦ κάλλους, διακοπείσης τῆς ἀκολουθίας λοιπόν. Καὶ καθάπερ οἱ τὰς ὁδοὺς ἀγνοοῦντες καὶ ἐτέρων δεόμενοι τῶν ὁδηγούντων, κἂν πολὺ προέλθωσιν ἀκολουθοῦντες αὐτοῖς, μικρὸν δὲ ἀπορραθυμήσαντες ἀπολέσωσι τὸν ἡγούμενον, οὐδὲν αὐτοῖς ὄφελος ἔσται τῆς προτέρας ἀκολουθήσεως, ἀλλ' ἴστανται λοιπόν, οὐκ εἰδότες ὅπου προέλθωσιν· οὕτω καὶ οἱ τῷ λέγοντι παρακολουθοῦν-[292]τες, ἐὰν παρὰ πᾶσαν τὴν διδασκαλίαν προσέχοντες μικρὸν ῥαθυμῆσωσιν, ἅπασαν τὴν ἀκολουθίαν ῥίψαντες, οὐκ ἔτι λοιπόν ἐπιστῆναι τῷ τέλει τῶν νοημάτων δυνήσονται. “Ἰν’ οὖν μὴ τοῦτο πάθητε, διὰ πάντων τῶν μελλόντων ῥηθήσεσθαι τὴν ἴσιν μοι παρέχετε σπουδὴν, ἕως ἂν εἰς αὐτὸ τὸ τέλος ἔλθωμεν.

γ'. Τίνος οὖν ἕνεκεν εἶρηκεν, “Ἐχοντες δὲ τὸ αὐτὸ Πνεῦμα τῆς πίστεως, καὶ σπουδάζει δεῖξαι καὶ ἐν τῇ Παλαιᾷ καὶ ἐν τῇ Καινῇ πίστιν οὔσαν τὴν μητέρα τῶν ἀγαθῶν, μικρὸν ἄνωθεν ἀναγκαῖον εἰπεῖν· οὕτω γὰρ ἔσται κατὰδηλος ἡμῖν ἡ αἰτία μᾶλλον. Τίς οὖν ἐστὶν ἡ αἰτία; Πολὺς πόλεμος περιεστῆκει τοὺς πιστοὺς, ἡνίκα ταῦτα ἐλέγετο, πόλεμος χαλεπὸς καὶ ἀκήρυκτος. Καὶ γὰρ καὶ πόλεις αὐτοῖς ὁλόκληροι καὶ δῆμοι πάντοθεν ἐπανίσταντο, καὶ τύραννοι πάντες ἐπεβούλευον, καὶ βασιλεῖς παρεσκευάζοντο, καὶ ὅπλα ἐκινεῖτο, καὶ ξίφη ἠκονᾶτο, καὶ στρατόπεδα ἡγυρεπίζετο, καὶ πᾶν εἶδος κολάσεως καὶ τιμωρίας ἐπενοεῖτο· ὅθεν ὑπαρχόντων ἀρπαγαὶ καὶ δημεύσεις, καὶ ἀπαγωγαὶ καὶ θάνατοι καθημερινοὶ, καὶ στρεβλώσεις, καὶ δεσμωτήρια,

12. This disposition of the best listener is a recurrent theme of this homily—cf. especially §9 (PG 51:298)—and others, a form of pedagogical goading and exhortation to follow the speaker.

13. Cf. Luke 1:3.

14. εὐκολία, “ease”; or, “with simplicity, intelligibility” (see PGL 3 for the former translation and 5 for the latter). This may be a double entendre.

15. ἀκολουθία, in reference to the flow of the argument in the speech; literally the term means “following” (per the exemplification that comes next, with the verb ἀκολουθεῖν).

16. τέλος here refers both to the “end” (i.e., the end point or goal) and the “culmination” (cf. at the end of this paragraph, where τέλος has a similar multivalence).

For this meaning that we're about to convey to you, beloved, is profound, and it requires a perceptive mind and the sharpest of souls.¹² Therefore, I urge you to follow closely and with careful attention¹³ the things that are going to be said. If the labor is ours, the profit is yours. Or, rather, the labor isn't ours, but it's a free gift of the grace of the Spirit. And when the Spirit does the revealing, neither the one conveying it nor those listening grow tired from the labor. For the revelation comes with ease.¹⁴ So now, let's pay careful attention. For even if you follow closely the majority of things said, if you nod off for just a short part, you'll not comprehend the beauty of the whole, because the train of thought¹⁵ has been interrupted from that point forward. For example, people who don't know the roads and need others to guide them, even if they progress a long distance by following them, will have no benefit at all from following early on if, when they slacken off the pace just a bit, they lose their guide. But from that point, they just stand there, not knowing where to go. It's just the same with those who follow the speaker closely. [292] Even if they'd attended closely to the entire lesson, if they slacken off just a bit, they lose the whole train of thought and from that point on will no longer be able to understand the final conclusion¹⁶ to which the thoughts¹⁷ were leading. So then, lest you suffer this fate, give equal attention throughout to all the things that are going to be said, until we arrive at the very end.

3. And so it's necessary once again to speak a little bit about why Paul said, "*but having the same Spirit of faith*" (2 Cor 4:13), and why he is zealous to demonstrate that in both the Old and the New Testaments faith is the mother¹⁸ of all good things. For by doing so, his motive¹⁹ will be clearer to us. And what is that motive? At the time these things were said a great war enveloped the faithful,²⁰ a horrible and undeclared war. Indeed, whole cities and peoples from all over were rising up against the faithful, all the tyrants were making plots, kings were making plans, weapons were being deployed, swords sharpened, armies readied, and every form of punishment and reprisal was being planned. As a result, stealing and confiscation of property, daily being hauled into court and sentenced to death,

17. νοήματα ("thoughts," "meanings," "senses"), both those of the speaker and of the biblical text he is interpreting.

18. On this usage of μήτηρ see PGL 5.

19. αἰτία, "reason" or "motive"; a deliberate reference to the language of the prior homily, Hom. 2 Cor. 4:13 B §7 (PG 51:287).

20. John means the Christians of the first Pauline generation.

καὶ πῦρ, καὶ σίδηρος, καὶ θηρία, καὶ ξύλον, καὶ τροχὸς, καὶ βάραθρα, καὶ κρημνοὶ, καὶ πάντα τὰ εἰς ἐπίνοιαν πρὸς τὸν τῶν πιστῶν ὄλεθρον ἐκινεῖτο· καὶ οὐδὲ μέχρι τούτων ὁ πόλεμος εἰστήκει. Οὐδὲ γὰρ παρὰ τῶν ἐχθρῶν ἀνερριπίζετο μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὴ καθ' ἑαυτῆς ἡ φύσις ἐσχίζετο. Καὶ γὰρ παισὶν ἐπολέμουν πατέρες, καὶ θυγατέρες ἐμίσουν τὰς κυησάσας, καὶ φίλοι φίλους ἀπεστρέφοντο, καὶ εἰς τὰς συγγενείας καὶ εἰς τὰς οἰκίας ὁ πόλεμος οὗτος ἔρπων εἰσῆει, καὶ θόρυβος ἦν τότε πολὺς κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην. Καὶ καθάπερ πλοῖον, κυμάτων διανισταμένων, νεφῶν συρρηγνυμένων, βροντῶν καταρρηγνυμένων, ζόφου πάντοθεν κυκλοῦντος τὸ σκάφος, τῆς θαλάσσης μαινομένης, θηρίων ἐπανισταμένων, πειρατῶν προσβαλλόντων, αὐτῶν τῶν ἔνδον στασιαζόντων, οὐκ ἂν διαφύγοι τὸν κίνδυνον, εἰ μὴ ἡ ἄνω χεὶρ, ἡ κραταιὰ καὶ μεγάλη, ἀποκρούσαιο τὸν πόλεμον, καὶ λύσσασα τὸν χειμῶνα καταστήσειεν ἐν γαλήνῃ τοὺς πλέοντας· οὕτω δὲ καὶ τότε ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ κηρύγματος γέγονεν. Οὐ γὰρ ἔξωθεν προσέβαλλεν ὁ χειμῶν μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ ἔνδον πολλάκις πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἐστασίαζον. Τίς τοῦτο φησιν; Αὐτὸς ὁ Παῦλος γράφων, "Ἐξωθεν μάχαι, ἔσωθεν φόβοι. Καὶ ὅτι ταῦτ' ἔστιν ἀληθὴ, καὶ διδασκάλους καὶ μαθητὰς μυρία περιστοίχιστο κακὰ, καὶ πάντας ὁ πόλεμος ἐπενέμετο, αὐτοῦ ἄλιν τοῦ Παύλου τὴν μαρτυρίαν παράγω. Ὑμεῖς δὲ μνημονεύετε τῶν λεγομένων ἀπάντων, ἵν' ὅταν μάθητε τοὺς κινδύνους, τοὺς πειρασμοὺς, τὰ μυρία κακὰ, ἅπερ οἱ τότε πιστεύοντες ὑπέμενον, μεζώνως καὶ διὰ τοῦτο εὐχαριστῆτε τῷ Θεῷ, τῷ λύσαντι πάντα ἐκεῖνα τὰ δεινὰ, καὶ εἰρήνην εἰσαγαγόντι βαθεῖαν, καὶ τὸν πόλεμον ἀπελάσαντι, καὶ πολλὴν κατασκευάσαντι τὴν γαλήνην· ἵνα μηδεὶς μήτε ῥαθυμῶν νομίζῃ διαφεύγειν τὴν κόλασιν, μήτε κατορθῶν ἐπαίρηται νῦν.

δ'. Οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν ἴσον πανταχόθεν πολεμούμενον καὶ μυρίους περιαντλούμενον κακοῖς δυνηθῆναι στήναι γενναίως, καὶ καθάπερ ἐν λιμένι καθημέμον νῦν καὶ πάσης ἀπολαύοντα ἀδείας τὴν αὐτὴν ἐπιδείξασθαι προθυμίαν. Ἐκεῖνοι μὲν γὰρ τῶν ἐν πελάγει σαλευόντων τότε καὶ κλυδωνιζομένων οὐδὲν ἄμεινον διέκειντο· ἡμεῖς δὲ τῶν ἐν λιμένι καθημένων ἀδεέστερον [293] διάγομεν νῦν. Μὴ τοίνυν μήτε ἐπὶ τοῖς κατορθώμασι μέγα φρονῶμεν, μήτε ἐπὶ τοῖς συμπύπτουσι πειρασμοῖς καταπίπτωμεν, μήτε εἰς ῥαθυμίαν τῇ τῆς εἰρήνης ἀδείᾳ ἀποχρώμεθα· ἀλλὰ νήφωμεν αἰεὶ καὶ

21. The boat is a topos for the need for unity (over against factionalism) for survival (see Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation*, 163–64, with references).

22. Once more, a reference both to the scriptural text and to Chrysostom's homiletic exposition.

tortures, prisons, fire, fetters, beasts, clubs, torture-wheels, pits, precipices, and every conceivable action was being set in motion to annihilate the saints. And the war didn't even stop there, for not only were these things stirred up by enemies, but nature was even divided against herself. Indeed, fathers were making war on their children, and daughters hating the mothers who bore them in the womb, friends turning away from friends (cf. Luke 12:53); this war snaked its way right into families and into homes, and there was tremendous tumult at that time across the entire world. It was just like what happens with a boat when waves rise up, clouds collide, thunder clashes, darkness encircles the hull from all sides, the sea madly thrashes, sea-monsters rise up, pirates attack, and those inside the boat rebel against one another.²¹ That boat will not escape the danger unless a hand from above, strong and mighty, beats back the onslaught and, putting an end to the storm, sets the sailors down in a calm sea (cf. Matt 8:26 and parr.). This is just how it was back then at the beginning of the mission to proclaim the gospel, for not only did the storm attack from the outside, but also those inside often rebelled against one another. Who says this? Paul himself, when he writes, "*battles from outside, fears from inside*" (2 Cor 7:5). And to show that these things are true, that countless evil forces were closing in on both teachers and disciples, and war was encroaching upon all, once again I bring forward the testimony of Paul himself. Remember all the things that are said,²² so when you learn about the dangers, the trials, and the countless evils that the believers back then used to endure, you might for this very reason give all the more thanks to God, who put an end to all those terrible things, brought in a profound peace, banished war, and established a great calm. Let no one think they'll escape punishment for slacking off, nor let them be overconfident even if they're doing good works now.

4. After all, when a person under attack from all directions and on the verge of drowning under the weight of countless evil onslaughts was able to stand nobly, that's not the same as when someone nowadays exhibits the same strong will²³ when they're sitting in a harbor free from fear. For the faithful in the past were no better situated than people carried to and fro by the sea and tossed by waves, while we today [293] live with more freedom from fear than those stationed in the harbor. So let's not boast about our good deeds, nor fail in the trials that befall us, nor misuse the freedom

23. *προθυμία* is a favored term for Chrysostom. It refers to ethics and can emphasize will as volition, will as desire, goodwill, and the exercise of that will in zeal, eagerness, and readiness.

γρηγορώμεν. Ἔστι γὰρ καὶ ἡμῖν πάλῃ πρὸς τὰς ἐπιθυμίας τῆς φύσεως. Οὐκ ἐπανίστανται νῦν ἡμῖν ἄνθρωποι, ἀλλ' ἐπανίστανται αἱ τῆς σαρκὸς ἡδοναί· οὐ πολεμοῦσι τύραννοι καὶ βασιλεῖς, ἀλλὰ πολεμεῖ θυμὸς, κενοδοξίας ἔρως, φθόνος, βασκανίαι, καὶ τὰ μυρία τῆς ψυχῆς πάθη. Ἐπεὶ οὖν ἐκείνων τῶν πειρασμῶν ἀπηλλάγμεθα, τούτων περιγενώμεθα. Διὰ γὰρ τοῦτο ἀνέμνησα ὑμᾶς τῶν καιρῶν ἐκείνων τὰ προσοχθίσματα, ἵνα καὶ ὁ ἐν θλίψει νῦν ὢν, ἱκανὴν ἐκεῖθεν λαμβάνῃ παράκλησιν, καὶ ὁ πολλῆς ἀπολαύων ἀδείας, ἀντὶ τῆς ἀτεχνίας τῶν κινδύνων ἐκείνων πολλὴν εἰσάξῃ προθυμίαν εἰς τὴν τῶν ἀτόπων λογισμῶν μάχην. Εἰς γὰρ ἡμετέραν νοθεσίαν καὶ παράκλησιν καὶ ὑπομονὴν πάντα ἐκεῖνα ἐγράφετο· ἅπερ ἀναγκαῖον νῦν πρὸς ὑμᾶς εἰπεῖν, καὶ διδάξαι τὸ μέγεθος τῶν τότε τοὺς πιστοὺς περιεστηκότων δεινῶν, οὐχὶ τοὺς διδασκάλους μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς μαθητάς. Ἀκουσον γοῦν τί φησιν ὁ Παῦλος γράφων Ἑβραίοις· Ἀναμιμνήσκεσθε τὰς προτέρας ἡμέρας, ἐν αἷς φωτισθέντες πολλὴν ἀθλήσιν ὑπεμείνατε παθημάτων. Οὐδὲ γὰρ βραχὺς διεγένετο χρόνος, ἀλλ' ἐν αὐτοῖς εὐθύς τοῖς προοιμίῳ τῆς κατηχήσεως καὶ τῆς διδασκαλίας ἐπανέστησαν αὐτοῖς πειρασμοί, καὶ βαπτισθέντες εὐθέως ἐκινδύνεον· τί πάσχοντες, ἄκουε· Τοῦτο μὲν, ὀνειδισμοὶς καὶ θλίψεσι θεατριζόμενοι. Πάντες γὰρ ἐνέπτουν, ὕβριζον, κατεγέλων, ἐχλεύαζον, μωροὺς ἐκάλουν, ἀνοήτους, ὅτι τῆς πατρῴας ἀποστάντες πολιτείας, καινὸν δόγμα κατεδέξαντο. Οὐ μικρὸν δὲ τοῦτο πρὸς τὸ παρασαλεῦσαι ψυχὴν, ἐὰν μὴ ἐρριζωμένη κατὰ βάθους ἢ πίστις ᾗ. Καὶ γὰρ οὐδὲν οὕτω δάκνει ψυχὴν, ὥς ὄνειδος· οὐδὲν οὕτω τῇκει ψυχὴν καὶ διάνοιαν, ὥς σκώμματα καὶ λοιδορίαί· πολλοὶ γὰρ πολλὰκις ἄνδρες ὑπεσκελίσθησαν ὀνειδιζόμενοι. Ταῦτα δὲ λέγω νῦν, ἵνα ἐν παρρησίᾳ τὴν πίστιν ἔχωμεν. Εἰ γὰρ τότε, ὅτε πᾶσα αὐτοῖς ὠνειδίξεν οἰκουμένη, οὐχ ὑπεσκελίσθησαν, πολλῶ μᾶλλον νῦν ἐν παρρησίᾳ τὸ κήρυγμα τῆς ἀληθείας ἔχειν δεῖ, ὅτε πᾶσα ἡ οἰκουμένη πρὸς ἡμᾶς μετετάξατο. Ὅτι δὲ οὐ μέχρι κατηγορίας καὶ ὀνειδισμῶν καὶ λοιδορίας ἴσαντο ἐκεῖνοι, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἔχαιρον οἱ ταῦτα πάσχοντες, ἄκουσον τῶν ἐξῆς. Καὶ γὰρ τὴν ἀρπαγὴν τῶν ὑπαρχόντων ὑμῶν, φησί, μετὰ χαρᾶς προσεδέξασθε. Ὅρᾳς ὅτι καὶ αἱ οὐσίαι αὐτῶν ἐδημεύοντο τὸ παλαιόν, καὶ πᾶσιν εἰς ἀρπαγὴν προέκειντο τοῖς βουλομένοις ἐπηρεάζειν. Καὶ ταῦτα μὲν Ἑβραίοις ἐπιστέλλων ἔλεγε.

24. Cf. 1 Thess 5:6: ἀλλὰ γρηγορώμεν καὶ νήφωμεν.

25. John makes a transference from the problems of the past (persecution by foes) to the problems of the present (the metaphorical battles against sinful desires).

26. Minus δέ after ἀναμιμνήσκεσθε.

27. Minus τε after ὀνειδισμοῖς.

28. With καὶ γάρ for καί before τὴν ἀρπαγὴν (cf. at the beginning of Heb 10:34: καὶ γὰρ τοῖς δεσμοῖς).

from fear we have in peacetime as a pretext for sloth. Instead, let's stay sober always and stay awake!²⁴ For we, too, have a struggle—against the desires of nature. It's not people who are rising up to attack us now, but the pleasures of the flesh rising up.²⁵ It's not tyrants and kings who are inciting the war, but wrath, passion for vainglory, jealousy, malice, and countless desires of the soul that are inciting the war. So then, since we've been freed from the former trials, let's prevail over the latter. The reason I've reminded you of the abominations of those times is so the person who's afflicted now might receive sufficient comfort from this example, and in turn the one who is enjoying much freedom from fear might bring a strong will to their battle with wicked thoughts, instead of being without resources against those dangers. All those things were being written for our admonition (cf. 1 Cor 10:11), our comfort and endurance. It's necessary to speak about them to you now, and to teach you the magnitude of the terrible things that enveloped the people of faith back then—not only the teachers but also the disciples. So listen to what Paul says when writing to the Hebrews: "*Remember the former days in which, after you were enlightened, you endured a great contest of sufferings*" (Heb 10:32).²⁶ For not even a short period of time had passed, but trials came upon them immediately in the very earliest stages of catechesis and teaching, and they began to be in danger immediately after being baptized. Listen to what they suffered: "*sometimes publicly exposed to reviling and afflictions*" (Heb 10:33).²⁷ Indeed, everyone was spitting on them, abusing, ridiculing, laughing at them, calling them fools and idiots because they'd left their ancestral way of life and accepted a new teaching. This is no minor impetus for shaking a soul to its core if the faith isn't deeply rooted. For indeed nothing so vexes a soul as being reviled; nothing so melts a soul and a mind as being scoffed at and insulted. Many people on multiple occasions have been overthrown by being reviled. I say these things right now so we might hold onto our faith with bold confidence. If they weren't overthrown at that time when the whole world was reviling them, how much more is it necessary for us to embrace the proclamation of truth with boldness at the present time, when all the world has come over to us? As proof that they stood fast not only to the point of accusation, reviling, and insults, but that those who suffered these things even used to rejoice, listen to what comes next: "*For you accepted with joy,*" Paul says, "*even the snatching up of your belongings*" (Heb 10:34).²⁸ So you see that back then even their property was confiscated, and it was set out to be snatched up by all the people who wanted to maltreat them. These are the things Paul said when writing his letter to the Hebrews.

ε'. Θεσσαλονικεῦσι δὲ ἕτερα τοιαῦτα μαρτυρεῖ πάλιν λέγων· Ὑμεῖς γὰρ μιμηταί, φησὶν, ἐγενήθητε τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ ἡμῶν, δεξάμενοι τὸν λόγον ἐν θλίψει πολλῇ. Ὅρα καὶ τούτους θλιβομένους, καὶ οὐχ ἀπλῶς, ἀλλ' ἐν θλίψει πολλῇ. Μετ' ἐπιτάσεως γὰρ ἦν ὁ πειρασμός, διηνεχῆς ὁ κίνδυνος, οὐδὲ μικρὸν ἀναπνεῦσαι παρέχων τοῖς ἀγωνιζομένοις τότε. Ἀλλ' [294] ὅμως καὶ ταῦτα πάσχοντες οὐκ ἐδυσχέραινον, οὐδὲ ἀπεδυσπέτουν, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον καὶ ἔχαιρον. Πόθεν τοῦτο δῆλον; Ἀπ' αὐτῶν τῶν τοῦ Παύλου ῥημάτων· εἰπὼν γάρ, Ἐν θλίψει πολλῇ, προσέθηκε, Μετὰ χαρᾶς Πνεύματος ἁγίου· δηλῶν ὅτι οἱ μὲν πειρασμοὶ τὴν θλίψιν ἐποιοῦν, ἡ δὲ τῶν πειρασμῶν ὑπόθεσις τὴν χαρὰν αὐτοῖς ἔτικτεν. Ἦρκει γὰρ εἰς παραμυθίαν τὸ συνειδέναι ἑαυτοῖς, ὅτι ταῦτα διὰ τὸν Χριστὸν ἔπασχον. Διότι οὐχ οὕτω θαυμάζω τοὺς τότε, ὅτι ἐθλίβοντο, ὡς θαυμάζω, ὅτι θλιβόμενοι διὰ τὸν Θεὸν ἔχαιρον. Τοῦτο γὰρ γενναίας καὶ φιλοθέου ψυχῆς, τὸ θλίβεσθαι καὶ κακῶς πάσχειν· τὸ δὲ γενναίως φέρειν τὸν πειρασμόν, καὶ τῷ συγχωροῦντι τὰς θλίψεις εὐχαριστεῖν, τοῦτο μεγίστης ἀνδρείας, τοῦτο διεγερμένης ψυχῆς καὶ τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων ἀπηλλαγμένης ἀπάντων.

Οὐκ ἐνταῦθα δὲ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐτέρωθι δηλῶν, ὅσα ἔπασχον οἱ πιστεύοντες τότε κακὰ παρὰ τῶν οἰκείων καὶ συγγενῶν (τοῦτο γὰρ ἦν τὸ χαλεπώτατον), οὕτωςί πῶς φησιν· Ὑμεῖς γὰρ μιμηταί ἐγενήθητε, ἀδελφοί, τῶν Ἐκκλησιῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ τῶν οὐσῶν ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ. Κατὰ τί μιμηταί; Ὅτι καὶ ὑμεῖς τὰ αὐτὰ ἐπάθετε ἀπὸ τῶν ἰδίων συμφυλετῶν, καθὼς καὶ αὐτοὶ ὑπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων. Ἰδοὺ καὶ πόλεμος, ἀλλὰ καὶ πόλεμος ἐμφύλιος, ὃ μείζω ποιεῖ τὴν ὁδύνην. Εἰ γὰρ ἐχθρὸς ἀνείδισέ με, ὑπήνεγκα ἂν, φησί· σὺ δὲ, ἀνθρώπε ἰσόψυχε, ἡγεμὼν μου καὶ γνωστὴ μου· ὅπερ τότε συνέβαινε συμβολικῶς. Διὸ καὶ πολλῆς ἐδέοντο τῆς παρακλήσεως. Ὅπερ οὖν καὶ Παῦλος συνορῶν, καὶ

29. With ὑμεῖς γὰρ μιμηταί for ὑμεῖς μιμηταί ἡμῶν; minus καὶ before τοῦ κυρίου.

30. Mf notes that his two manuscripts lack γὰρ ἦν after μετ' ἐπιτάσεως: "The trial was extensive" (still a nonverbal predication).

31. Mf notes that other manuscripts read διόπερ οὐχ for διότι οὐχ (with no appreciable difference of meaning).

32. I.e., God.

33. With transposition of ὅτι τὰ αὐτὰ ἐπάθετε καὶ ὑμεῖς τὸ ὅτι καὶ ὑμεῖς τὰ αὐτὰ ἐπάθετε; with ἀπὸ for ὑπὸ before τῶν ἰδίων συμφυλετῶν. I translate Ἰουδαῖοι as "Jews," since that is how Chrysostom understands it (rather than "Judeans," as I would translate when referring to the sense of the historical-epistolary Paul).

34. With ellipsis of Ps 54:13b LXX, καὶ εἰ ὁ μισῶν ... ἀπ' αὐτοῦ.

5. And he gives similar testimonies again to the Thessalonians, saying: “*For you became imitators,*” he says, “*of the Lord and of us, having welcomed the word in all affliction*” (1 Thess 1:6).²⁹ Look at how they were afflicted: not in some simple way, but “*in great affliction.*” For the trial was extensive,³⁰ the danger constant, not allowing those who were embattled at that time even a tiny respite. [294] But nevertheless, despite suffering these things they were neither despondent nor despairing, but all the more they rejoiced. Where is this made clear? In the very words of Paul; for after saying, “*in great affliction,*” he added, “*with the joy of the Holy Spirit*” (1 Thess 1:6). In this way he made it clear that although the trials produced affliction, the occasion of the trials gave birth to joy for them. For the fact that they knew in themselves that they were suffering these things for the sake of Christ was sufficient cause of consolation. That’s why³¹ I don’t admire the believers of those days so much because they suffered affliction, as I admire the fact that when afflicted they rejoiced on account of God. It’s characteristic of a genuine and god-loving soul to be afflicted and suffer terribly. And nobly bearing the trial and giving thanks to the one³² who allows the afflictions to take place is something characteristic of the highest level of bravery, of a soul that is raised up and set free from all human concerns.

Now this isn’t the only place, but in others also Paul makes it clear that the believers in those days suffered terrible things from their own people and their relatives (the latter being the worst thing). For instance, he put it this way: “*For you became imitators, brothers and sisters, of the churches of God that are in Judea*” (1 Thess 2:14). Imitators in what respect? “*Because you, too, suffered the same things from your own compatriots, just as we did also at the hands of the Jews*” (1 Thess 2:14).³³ See, it was war, but even more, civil war, which makes the distress even greater. For “*If an enemy had reviled me, I would have endured it,*” David says, “*but it was you—a human being like me, my ruler and my friend!*” (Ps 54:13–14 LXX).³⁴ This is precisely what took place—in a figurative fashion—at that time.³⁵ That’s why the Thessalonians, too, had need of much comfort. And so Paul, well aware

35. John’s phrasing evokes 1 Cor 10:11: ταῦτα δὲ τυπικῶς συνέβαινεν ἐκείνοις. Like other early Christian interpreters, he regards τυπικῶς as overlapping or synonymous with συμβολικῶς, meaning, “*symbolically, by means of symbols*”; “*in type, under a figure*”; “*with symbolic significance*”; “*in symbolic language, figuratively*” (so PGL 1.a–c). John is arguing that the verse from Ps 54 LXX was prefiguring the suffering of the early Christians at Thessalonica (and perhaps others fitting the description οἱ τότε πιστεύοντες).

τοὺς ὑπ' αὐτῷ ταπτομένους βλέπων κάμνοντας καὶ ἰδροῦντας, βαρυνομένους τῷ μεγέθει τῶν συμφορῶν καὶ ταῖς ἐπαλλήλοις ὀδυνωμένους πληγαῖς, πολυτρόπως αὐτῶν διανίστησι τὰ φρονήματα, νῦν μὲν λέγων, Εἴπερ δίκαιον παρὰ Θεοῦ ἀνταποδοῦναι τοῖς θλίβουσιν ὑμᾶς θλίψιν, καὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς θλιβομένοις ἀνεσιν μεθ' ἡμῶν· νῦν δὲ λέγων, Ὁ Κύριος ἐγγὺς, μηδὲν μεριμνᾶτε· καὶ πάλιν, Μὴ ἀποβάλητε τὴν παρρησίαν ὑμῶν· ὑπομονῆς γὰρ ἔχετε χρεῖαν, ἵνα τὸ θέλημα τοῦ Θεοῦ ποιήσαντες, κομίσησθε τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν. Εἴτα πρὸς τὴν ὑπομονὴν ἀλείφω αὐτοὺς, ἐπάγει· Ἔτι γὰρ μικρὸν ὅσον, ὅσον, ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἤξει, καὶ οὐ χρονεῖ. Καὶ καθάπερ παιδίον κλαυθμυρίζον, δυσχεραίνον, καὶ τὴν μητέρα ἐπιζητοῦν παρακαθήμενός τις παραμυθεῖται λέγων, ὅτι Ἔτι μικρὸν ἀνάμεινον, καὶ ἀπαντήσεται πάντως ἡ μήτηρ· οὕτω καὶ Παῦλος ὁρῶν δυσανασχετοῦντας, ὀδυρομένους, τὴν παρουσίαν ἐπιζητοῦντας τοῦ Χριστοῦ τοὺς τότε πιστεύοντας διὰ τὴν ἀφόρητον τῶν κακῶν ἐπαγωγὴν, παραμυθούμενος ἔλεγεν· Ἔτι μικρὸν ὅσον, ὅσον, ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἤξει, καὶ οὐ χρονεῖ.

ς'. Ὅτι μὲν οὖν οἱ μαθηταὶ ἐθλίβοντο, καὶ μυρία ἔπασχον δεινὰ, καὶ καθάπερ ἐν μέσοις ἐπειλημμένοι λύκοις ἄρνες, οὕτω πάντοθεν ἡλαύνοντο, δῆλον ἐκ τούτων· ἵνα δὲ μάθῃς ὅτι καὶ οἱ διδάσκαλοι οὐκ ἐλάττονα τούτων, ἀλλὰ καὶ πολλῷ χαλεπώτερα τότε ὑπέμενον (ὅσω γὰρ μειζόνως ἐλύπουν τοὺς ἐχθροὺς [295] τῆς ἀληθείας, τοσούτω καὶ παρὰ πλείονων ἐβάλλοντο), καὶ ταῦτα παρὰ τοῦ τὰ πρότερα εἰρηκότος ἀκούσωμεν. Κορινθίοις γὰρ γράφων, οὕτως ἔλεγε· Μηδεμίαν ἐν μηδενὶ διδόντες προσκοπήν, ἵνα μὴ μωμασθῇ ἡ διακονία ὑμῶν, ἀλλ' ἐν παντὶ συνιστῶντες ἑαυτοὺς, ὡς Θεοῦ διάκονοι, ἐν ὑπομονῇ πολλῇ, ἐν θλίψεσιν, ἐν ἀνάγκαις, ἐν στενοχωρίαις, ἐν πληγαῖς, ἐν φυλακαῖς, ἐν ἀκαταστασίαις, ἐν κόποις, ἐν ἀγρυπνίαις, ἐν νηστείαις. Εἶδες πόσους ἄθλους ἠρίθμησε, πόσας πειρασμῶν νιφάδας; Πάλιν τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἐπιστέλλων, Διάκονοι Χριστοῦ εἰσι, φησὶ, παραφρονῶν λαλῶ, ὑπὲρ ἐγώ. Εἴτα βουλόμενος ἡμᾶς πείσαι, ὅτι τοῦ σημεῖα ποιεῖν πολλῷ λαμπρότερον τὸ διὰ τὸν Χριστὸν θλίβεσθαι, καὶ ποιούμενος ἀπόδειξιν ἀποστολῆς, καὶ δεικνὺς ὅτι

36. Minus οὖν after ἀποβάλητε; ellipsis of Heb 10:35b: ἥτις ἔχει μισθαποδοσίαν μεγάλην.

37. The Hebrews text is quoting Isa 26:20 and Hab 2:3 (but Chrysostom introduces this as a Pauline utterance).

38. Minus γὰρ before μικρόν.

39. With μωμασθῇ for μωμηθῇ before ἡ διακονία; ἡ διακονία ὑμῶν for ἡ διακονία.

40. John glances toward a "problem"—that Paul may be defending himself in 2 Cor 10–13 against those who were really ἀπόστολοι or διάκονοι Χριστοῦ (e.g., 2 Cor 11:23; cf. 11:5; 12:11, οἱ ὑπερλίαν ἀπόστολοι). But he does so only to deny it in the same breath

of this and seeing the people in his charge exhausted, sweat-soaked, and oppressed by the enormity of their troubles and in the pain of continual onslaughts, rouses their spirits in diverse ways. At one time, he says, “*if indeed it is just for God to repay those who are afflicting you with affliction, and you who are being afflicted with rest alongside us*” (2 Thess 1:6–7). And at another time, he says, “*The Lord is near, don’t be anxious!*” (Phil 4:5–6). And once again, “*Don’t lose your confidence.... For you have need of endurance so that by doing the will of God you might receive the promise for yourselves*” (Heb 10:35–36).³⁶ Then, as a way of anointing them for endurance, he adds: “*For in a very short time, the one who is coming will arrive and will not delay*” (Heb 10:37).³⁷ When a child is weeping and upset and eagerly seeking their mother, someone sitting nearby offers consolation by saying, “Wait just a bit longer, and your mother surely will come.” In the same way when Paul saw the believers back then greatly vexed and lamenting and eagerly seeking the parousia of Christ because of the unbearable onslaught of hardships, he said by way of consolation, “*in a very short time, the one who is coming will arrive and will not delay*” (Heb 10:37).³⁸

6. From all this it’s clear that the disciples were being afflicted, suffering many terrible things, and being harassed from all directions, just like lambs under siege when surrounded by wolves. The teachers at that time, too, were enduring things no easier than these, but even more horrible (for the more grief they caused the enemies [295] of truth, the more they were continually attacked by those in the majority). So you might learn this, let’s listen to the following words from the author of those just quoted. For when writing to the Corinthians, Paul said as follows: “*Giving no obstacle to anyone, lest the ministry for you be the object of blame, but in everything recommending ourselves as ministers of God, in great endurance, in afflictions, under torture, in dire straits, in blows, in imprisonments, in insurrections, in labors, in sleepless nights, in repeated fasting*” (2 Cor 6:3–5).³⁹ Have you seen how many battles he enumerated, how many barrages of trials? When writing again to the same recipients, he says, “*Are they ministers of Christ? I am speaking out of my mind! More so me!*” (2 Cor 11:23). Then, wishing to persuade us that enduring affliction for the sake of Christ is so much more magnificent than performing signs, when Paul was giving proof of his status as an apostle and demonstrating that he’s better than they—I don’t mean than the apostles but the false apostles!⁴⁰—he constructs the

and to insist (with the Paul of 2 Cor 11:13–15) that Paul’s self-defense is only against ψευδαπόστολοι.

βελτίων αὐτῶν ἐστίν, οὐχὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων λέγω, ἀλλὰ τῶν ψευδαποστόλων, οὐκ ἀπὸ θαυμάτων καὶ σημείων, ἀλλ' ἀπὸ κινδύνων ἐπαλλήλων ποιεῖται τὸν τῆς ὑπεροχῆς ἔλεγχον, οὕτωςί λέγων. Ἐν κόποις περισσοτέρως, ἐν πληγαῖς ὑπερβαλλόντως, ἐν φυλακαῖς περισσοτέρως, ἐν θανάτοις πολλάκις· πεντάκις τεσσαράκοντα παρὰ μίαν ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων ἔλαβον, τρίς ἐρραβδίσθην, ἅπαξ ἐλιθάσθην, τρίς ἐναυάγησα, νυχθήμερον ἐν τῷ βυθῷ πεποίηκα· ὁδοιπορίαις πολλάκις, κινδύνοις ποταμῶν, κινδύνοις ληστῶν, κινδύνοις ἐκ γένους, κινδύνοις ἐξ ἐθνῶν, κινδύνοις ἐν πόλει, κινδύνοις ἐν ἐρημίᾳ, κινδύνοις ἐν θαλάσῃ, κινδύνοις ἐν ψευδαδέλφοις· ἐν κόπῳ καὶ μόχθῳ, ἐν ἀγρυπνίαις πολλάκις, ἐν λιμῷ καὶ δίψει, ἐν ψύχει καὶ γυμνότητι, χωρὶς τῶν παρεκτός. Οὗτοι τῆς ἀκριβοῦς ἀποστολῆς οἱ χαρακτῆρες. Σημεῖα μὲν γὰρ καὶ ἕτεροι πολλοὶ πολλάκις ἐποίησαν, καὶ οὐδὲν ἀπώναντο τῶν θαυμάτων, ἀλλὰ μετὰ πάντα ἐκεῖνα ἤκουσαν. Ὑπάγετε, οὐκ οἶδα ὑμᾶς, οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι τὴν ἀνομίαν· τῶν δὲ ταῦτα δυναμένων εἰπεῖν, ἅπερ ὁ Παῦλος ἀπρηιθμήσατο νῦν, οὐδεὶς ἐκείνης ἀκούσεται τῆς φωνῆς· ἀλλὰ μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς παρρησίας τῶν οὐρανῶν ἐπιβήσεται καὶ τῶν ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς ἀγαθῶν ἀπολαύσεται πάντων.

ζ'. Τάχα μακρότερος ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος ἐγένετο· ἀλλὰ μὴ δείσῃτε· οὐκ ἐπιλελήσμεθα τῆς ὑποσχέσεως, ἀλλ' αὐτίκα δὴ πρὸς αὐτὴν πάλιν ἐπανήξομεν. Καὶ ταῦτα δὲ οὐ μάτην ἐμηκύναμεν, ἀλλὰ διὰ πλείονος κατασκευῆς ἀναμφισβήτητον καὶ σαφέστερον βουλόμενοι ποιήσασθαι τὴν ἀπόδειξιν, ὁμοῦ δὲ τὰς θλιβομένας παρακαλέσαι ψυχὰς, ἵν' ἕκαστος τῶν ἐν πειρασμοῖς ὄντων καὶ κινδύνοις ἱκανὴν λαβὼν παραμυθίαν ἀπέλθῃ, μαθὼν ὅτι Παύλου κοινωνὸς διὰ τῶν παθημάτων γίνεται, μᾶλλον δὲ τοῦ τῶν ἀγγέλων Δεσπότου Χριστοῦ· κοινωνῶν δὲ αὐτοῦ τῶν παθημάτων ἐνταῦθα κοινωνήσῃ τῆς δόξης ἐκεῖ. Εἴπερ γὰρ, φησὶ, συμπάσχομεν, ἵνα καὶ συνδοξασθῶμεν· καὶ πάλιν· Εἰ ὑπομένομεν, ἵνα καὶ συμβασιλεύσωμεν. Ἀνάγκη γὰρ τὸν πιστὸν θλίβεσθαι πάντως. Πάντες γὰρ οἱ θέλοντες ζῆν εὐσεβῶς ἐν Χριστῷ, διωχθήσονται· καὶ πάλιν· Τέκνον, εἰ προσέρχῃ δουλεύειν Κυρίῳ, ἐτοίμασον τὴν ψυχὴν σου εἰς πει-[296]ρασμὸν, εὐθυνον καὶ καρτέρησον. Καλαὶ αἱ ἐπαγγελίαι ἐκ προοιμίων

41. With transposition of ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων from before πεντάκις τεσσαράκοντα to before ἔλαβον; minus ἐν νηστείαις πολλάκις before ἐν ψύχει.

42. See LSJ s.v. ἀκριβής II.1 on the adverb ἀκριβῶς being used of a precise drawing as contrasted with a rough sketch or outline (the artistic metaphor here suggested by χαρακτήρ).

43. The first two clauses are paraphrased by John: ὑπάγετε for ἀποχωρεῖτε ἀπ' ἐμοῦ; οὐκ οἶδα ὑμᾶς for οὐδέποτε ἔγνω ὑμᾶς.

44. ὑπόσχεσις also means “undertaking”; hence, “what we set out to speak upon”—as promised twice now, in the earlier homily and in the opening to this one in §2 (PG 51:291).

argument defending his superiority not on the basis of miracles and signs but of continual dangers. This is what he says: *“In labors all the more, in blows exceedingly, in imprisonments all the more, at death’s door repeatedly. Five times I received the thirty-nine lashes from Jews, three times I was beaten with rods, once I was pelted with stones, three times shipwrecked, I have spent night and day in the depths of the sea; in journeys repeatedly, in dangers from rivers, dangers from robbers, dangers from my people, dangers from gentiles, dangers in the city, dangers in the desert, dangers in the sea, dangers among false brothers; in labor and toil, in sleepless nights repeatedly, in famine and thirst, in cold and nakedness, besides other things”* (2 Cor 11:23–28).⁴¹ These are the characteristic features of the apostolic office when it is accurately depicted.⁴² For many others often did signs too, and they got no benefit from the miracles, but after all those signs they heard: *“Go away. I do not know you, you workers of lawlessness”* (Matt 7:23).⁴³ Yet none of those who could tell of the kinds of sufferings Paul just now catalogued will hear that statement; but instead they’ll arrive at heaven with great confidence and will enjoy all the good things that heaven holds.

7. Perhaps our homily has gone on too long. But don’t worry; we haven’t forgotten our promise,⁴⁴ but now we shall immediately turn back again to it. And yet we’ve not protracted our discussion of these things in vain, but because we wish to offer the most indisputable and clearest proof with abundant confirming evidence, while at the same time giving comfort to souls that are afflicted. Our goal is that all who are in trials and dangers might depart from here having gained sufficient consolation because they’ve learned that it’s through sufferings that they become partners of Paul or, even more, of Christ, the Lord of the angels. And by being in partnership with his sufferings here, they’ll be partners in glory there.⁴⁵ For he says, *“If we suffer with him, it is so that we might also be glorified along with him”* (Rom 8:17). And again, *“If we endure, it is so that we might rule along with him”* (2 Tim 2:12).⁴⁶ The person who has faith must always suffer affliction. For *“all those who wish to live piously in Christ will be persecuted”* (2 Tim 3:12).⁴⁷ And again, *“My child, if you approach to serve the Lord, prepare your soul for a trial, [296] straighten up and give your*

45. Cf. 2 Cor 1:5–7.

46. John has paraphrased, using a *ἵνα* clause (with *συμβασιλεύσωμεν*) instead of the future indicative *συμβασιλεύσομεν*.

47. Minus *Ἰησοῦ* after *Χριστῷ*.

εἰς πειρασμούς ἐμπεσεῖν· μεγάλη προτροπή καὶ παράκλησις ἐναργῆς τῆς δουλείας κινδύνων εὐθέως ἀπογεύσασθαι. Μεγίστη οὖν καὶ θαυμασία, καὶ κέρδος ἔχουσα μέγιστον. Ποῖον δὲ τοῦτο; Ἀκουσον τῶν ἐξῆς· Ὡςπερ γὰρ ἐν πυρὶ δοκιμάζεται χρυσός, οὕτως ἄνθρωποι δεκτοὶ ἐν καμίνῳ ταπεινώσεως. Ὁ δὲ λέγει τοιοῦτόν ἐστιν· Ὡςπερ τὸ χρυσίον τῷ πυρὶ βασανιζόμενον καθαρώτερον γίνεται, οὕτω καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ, θλίψεσιν ὁμιλοῦσα καὶ κινδύνους, φαιδρότερα καὶ λαμπρότερα ἄνεισι, καὶ πᾶσαν ἁμαρτημάτων ἀπορρίψεται κηλίδα. Ὅθεν καὶ πρὸς τὸν πλούσιον ἔλεγε ὁ Ἀβραάμ, ὅτι Λάζαρος ἀπέλαβε τὰ κακὰ, καὶ ἐνταῦθα παρακαλεῖται. Καὶ Παῦλος Κορινθίοις ἐπιστέλλων ἔγραφε· Διὰ τοῦτο ἐν ὑμῖν πολλοὶ ἀσθενεῖς καὶ ἄρρωστοι. Εἰ γὰρ ἑαυτοὺς ἐκρίνομεν, οὐκ ἂν ἐκρινόμεθα· κρινόμενοι δὲ ὑπὸ Κυρίου παιδεύομεθα, ἵνα μὴ σὺν τῷ κόσμῳ κατακριθῶμεν. Καὶ τὸν πεπορνευκότα δὲ δι' αὐτὸ τοῦτο παρέδωκεν εἰς ὄλεθρον τῆς σαρκός, ἵνα τὸ πνεῦμα σωθῇ· δεικνὺς ὅτι σωτηρίαν ὁ παρὼν ἐργάζεται πειρασμός, καὶ οἱ κίνδυνοι τοῖς μετ' εὐχαριστίας αὐτοὺς φέρουσι, καθάρσιον ψυχῆς εἰσι μέγιστον. Ὅτι μὲν οὖν ἐθλίβοντο οἱ πιστοὶ, καὶ μυρία ἔπασχον δεινὰ καὶ μαθηταὶ καὶ διδάσκαλοι καὶ οὐδὲ μικρὸν ἀνέπνεον, ποικίλοις τισὶ καὶ παντοδαποῖς πάντοθεν περιεστοιχισμένοι πολέμοις, ἱκανῶς ὁ λόγος ἀπέδειξε, καὶ πλείω δὲ τῶν εἰρημένων τοῖς φιλοπόνοις ἔξεστιν ἀναλέξασθαι ἐκ τῶν θείων Γραφῶν.

ἡ'. Λοιπὸν δὲ ἐπὶ τὸ προκείμενον τὸν λόγον ἀγάγωμεν. Τί δὲ τὸ προκείμενον ἦν εἰπεῖν; Τίνος ἕνεκεν εἶπεν ὁ Παῦλος, Ἐχοντες Πνεῦμα πίστεως τὸ αὐτό. Τίνος οὖν ἕνεκεν εἶπεν; Ἐθορύβει τοῦτο τοὺς μαθητάς, ὅτι τὰ μὲν δεινὰ ἐν πείρᾳ, τὰ δὲ χρηστὰ ἐν ἐλπίσι· καὶ τὰ μὲν παρῆν, τὰ δὲ ἀφειστήκει· καὶ τὰ μὲν ἐγίνετο, τὰ δὲ ἡλπίζετο. Καὶ τί θαυμαστὸν, εἰ τότε ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ κηρύγματος τοῦτο ἔπασχόν τινες, ὅπου γε καὶ νῦν μετὰ τοσοῦτον

48. Minus τὴν καρδίαν σου after εὐθύνον ("set your heart straight").

49. With ὥςπερ γὰρ for ὅτι before ἐν πυρὶ; οὕτως for καὶ before ἄνθρωποι.

50. John has paraphrased the sense of the first clause by ellipsis of the main verb (μνησθῆναι ὅτι ἀπέλαβες [sc. ὁ πλούσιος] τὰ ἀγαθὰ σου ἐν τῇ ζωῇ σου, καὶ Λάζαρος ὁμοίως τὰ κακὰ); minus ὁμοίως before τὰ κακὰ; with καὶ ἐνταῦθα for ὧδε before παρακαλεῖται.

51. Minus καὶ κοιμῶνται ἱκανοὶ after ἄρρωστοι and before εἰ γάρ; ἐκρίνομεν for διεκρίνομεν after ἑαυτοὺς.

52. John's quotation does not continue to the final clause in 1 Cor 5:5: ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τοῦ κυρίου ("on the day of the Lord").

53. With the same inversion of word order with τὸ αὐτό as in §2 (PG 51:291) above, where John promised to explain the second reason Paul said this statement (ἐχοντες δὲ τὸ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα τῆς πίστεως); minus τῆς before πίστεως.

54. John is identifying the "problem" that he thinks Paul was seeking to solve in 2 Cor 4:13.

full devotion” (Sir 2:1–2).⁴⁸ The good promises lead to trials right from the beginning; tasting for oneself immediately what it means to be subject to dangers is a great inducement and palpable form of encouragement. Then comes the greatest and most marvelous promise, the one that holds the greatest gain. What kind of gain? Listen to what follows: “*For just as gold is tested in fire, so human beings are made acceptable in the furnace of humility*” (Sir 2:5).⁴⁹ What this means is something like the following: just as gold becomes purified when it is refined by fire, so also the soul, when it battles afflictions and dangers, comes out brighter and more resplendent, and it will cast off all stain of sin. That’s why Abraham said to the rich man, “*Lazarus received back evil things, and here he is comforted*” (Luke 16:25).⁵⁰ And Paul wrote in a letter to the Corinthians, “*This is why many among you are sick and weak. For if we would judge ourselves, we would not be judged. And when we are judged by the Lord we are instructed, so that we might not be judged guilty along with the world*” (1 Cor 11:30–32).⁵¹ It was for this very reason that Paul also “handed over” the man who had committed the sexual sin (1 Cor 5:1–11)—“*for the destruction of the flesh, so that the spirit might be saved*” (1 Cor 5:5).⁵² He was demonstrating that the present trial works salvation, and that dangers are the greatest purifier of the soul for those who bear them with gratitude. And so then, our argument has been sufficient to prove that the faithful—both disciples and teachers—were being afflicted and were suffering countless terrible things without even a momentary respite, surrounded on all sides by all kinds and sorts of battles. Nonetheless, it’s possible for those who are industrious to collect still many more examples from the divine Scriptures than those I’ve mentioned.

8. Now at last, let’s bring our homily to the topic before us. What was it that we set out to speak on? Why did Paul say, “*the same Spirit of faith*” (2 Cor 4:13)?⁵³ So why did he say that? What was throwing the disciples into tumult⁵⁴ was that, while their immediate experience contained terrible things, they had hope for good things; the former were present, the latter were far off; the first were taking place, the second were still hoped for. And what wonder is it that some were feeling this at the beginning of the gospel proclamation when many still feel this way,⁵⁵ even now after such

55. Paul’s “problem” becomes John’s contemporary “problem,” a theological and pastoral one, of theodicy. Compare the similar argument in *Hom. Rom. 5:3 §§1–3* (PG 51:157–62).

χρόνον, μετὰ τὸ πανταχοῦ τῆς οἰκουμένης ἐκταθῆναι τὸ κήρυγμα, μετὰ τὸ λαβεῖν ἀποδείξεις τοσαύτας τῶν ὑποσχέσεων, πολλοὶ οἱ τοῦτο πάσχοντές εἰσιν;

Οὐ τοῦτο δὲ μόνον αὐτοὺς διετάραττεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἕτερον οὐκ ἔλαττον τούτου. Ποῖον δὴ τοῦτο; Ἐνενόουν πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς, ὅτι ἐν τῇ Παλαιᾷ Διαθήκῃ οὐχ οὕτω τὰ πράγματα ὠκονομήθη, ἀλλὰ τῆς ἀρετῆς τοὺς ἄθλους καὶ τοὺς μισθοὺς εὐθέως ἀπελάμβανον οἱ μετ' ἐπεικειας καὶ σωφροσύνης προηρημένοι ζῆν. Οὐ γὰρ μετὰ τὴν τῶν σωμάτων ἀνάστασιν, οὐδὲ ἐν τῇ μελλούσῃ ζωῇ, ἀλλ' ἐνταῦθα, καὶ κατὰ τὸν παρόντα βίον πᾶσαι αὐτοῖς ἐπληροῦντο αἱ ὑποσχέσεις. Ἐὰν γὰρ ἀγαπήσῃς, φησὶ, Κύριον τὸν Θεόν σου, εὖ σοι ἔσται, καὶ πληθυνεῖ ὁ Θεὸς τὰ βουκόλια τῶν βοῶν σου, καὶ τὰ ποίμνια τῶν προβάτων σου· οὐκ ἔσται ἐν σοὶ ἄγονον, οὐδὲ στεῖρον· οὐκ ἔσται ἐν σοὶ μαλακία, φησὶν, οὐδὲ νόσος. Ἐξαποστελεῖ ὁ Θεὸς τὴν εὐλογίαν αὐτοῦ εἰς τὰ ταμεία τῶν ἀποθηκῶν σου· ἀνοίξει τὸν οὐρανόν, καὶ δώσει [297] σοι ὑετὸν πρῶμιον καὶ ὄψιμον. Καταλήψεται ὁ ἀλοητὸς τὸν τρυγητὸν καὶ ὁ τρυγητὸς τὸν σπῆρον. Καὶ πολλὰ ἕτερα τοιαῦτα αὐτοῖς ἐπηγγελάτο, ἅπερ ἅπαντα κατὰ τὴν παροῦσαν ζωὴν αὐτοῖς ἀπεδίδοτο. Εἴ τις ὀξύτερος, ἤδη προβλέπει τὴν λύσιν. Ἐπεὶ οὖν σώματος υἰγία, καὶ γῆς εὐκληρία, καὶ πολυπαιδία καὶ εὐπαιδία, καὶ λιπαρὸν γῆρας, καὶ ὥρων κρᾶσις ἀρίστη, καὶ εὐετηρία, καὶ ὄμβρων εὐκαιρία, καὶ πολλὰ ποίμνια καὶ βουκόλια, καὶ πάντα ἀπλῶς τὰ ἀγαθὰ κατὰ τὴν παροῦσαν αὐτοῖς ἐπληροῦτο ζωὴν, καὶ οὐδὲν ἐν ἐλπίσιν ἦν, οὐδὲ μετὰ τὴν ἐντεῦθεν ἀποδημίαν· ἀναλογιζόμενοι οὖν ταῦτα οἱ πιστοὶ, ὅτι τοῖς προγόνοις τοῖς ἑαυτῶν παρὰ πόδας ἅπαντα τὰ ἀγαθὰ ἀπῆντα, αὐτοῖς δὲ εἰς τὴν μέλλουσαν ζωὴν τὰ ἔπαθλα καὶ οἱ στέφανοι πάντες εἰσὶ τεταμειυμένοι, καὶ ἐν πίστει τὰ τῶν ἐπαγγελιῶν,

56. The quotation marker φησὶ here could refer to Moses as author of the Pentateuch, or it could mean more impersonally “it [Scripture] says.”

57. Although introduced as quotations, these last three sentences are a paraphrase of segments of several pentateuchal verses containing covenantal promises, as follows (key terms found in Chrysostom's rendering placed in bold): εὐλογῇ σε καὶ πληθυνεῖ σε καὶ εὐλογήσει τὰ ἔκγονα τῆς κοιλίας σου καὶ τὸν καρπὸν τῆς γῆς σου, τὸν σῖτόν σου καὶ τὸν οἶνόν σου καὶ τὸ ἔλαιόν σου, **τὰ βουκόλια τῶν βοῶν σου καὶ τὰ ποίμνια τῶν προβάτων σου** ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ἧς ὤμοσεν κύριος τοῖς πατράσιν σου δοῦναί σοι. εὐλογητὸς ἔσθι παρὰ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη· **οὐκ ἔσται ἐν ὑμῖν ἄγονος οὐδὲ στεῖρα** καὶ ἐν τοῖς κτήνεσιν σου. καὶ περιελεῖ κύριος ἀπὸ σοῦ πᾶσαν **μαλακίαν**· καὶ πάσας **νόσους** Αἰγύπτου τὰς πονηράς, ἃς ἐώρακας καὶ ὅσα ἔγνως (Deut 7:13–15); εὐλογημένα τὰ ἔκγονα τῆς κοιλίας σου καὶ τὰ γενήματα τῆς γῆς σου, **τὰ βουκόλια τῶν βοῶν σου καὶ τὰ ποίμνια τῶν προβάτων σου· εὐλογημένοι αἱ ἀποθήκαι σου** καὶ τὰ ἐγκαταλείμματά σου· ... **ἀποστελεῖται κύριος ἐπὶ σὲ τὴν εὐλογίαν** ἐν τοῖς **ταμείοις σου** καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν, οὗ ἂν ἐπιβάλλῃς τὴν χεῖρά σου, ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ἧς κύριος ὁ θεὸς σου δίδωσιν ... **ἀνοίξαι** σοι κύριος τὸν θησαυρὸν αὐτοῦ τὸν ἀγαθόν, **τὸν οὐρανόν, δοῦναι τὸν ὑετὸν** τῇ γῇ σου ἐπὶ καιροῦ αὐτοῦ εὐλογῆσαι πάντα τὰ ἔργα

a great length of time, after the gospel proclamation has been extended throughout the entire world, and after receiving such dramatic proofs of the promises?

However, this wasn't the only thing that was confusing them, but there was something else no less than this. What was the nature of their concern? They were thinking to themselves that events weren't providentially ordered this way in the Old Testament, but the people who chose to live in fairness and self-control used to receive the prizes and rewards of virtue immediately—not, that is, after the resurrection of their bodies or in the future life, but all the promises were fulfilled for them right here and in the present life. For he says,⁵⁶ “If you love the Lord your God, it will be well for you, and God will multiply the herds of your cattle and the flocks of your sheep, and no one among you will be barren or sterile.” And he says, “There shall not be weakness or illness among you. God will send out his blessing into the storehouses of your granaries; he will open heaven, and he will give [297] you early and late rain. *Threshing time will overtake the harvest, and the harvest the seedtime*” (cf. Deut 7:12–14; 28:4–12; Lev 26:4–5).⁵⁷ And many other such things God promised them, all of which were given as recompense to them during the present life. One who has a keen mind will already have foreseen the solution to this problem.⁵⁸ At that time, bodily health, fertile land, loads of healthy children, comfort in old age,⁵⁹ temperate climate, prosperous years, timely rains, abundant flocks of sheep and cattle⁶⁰ and, in sum, all good things, were fully supplied to them during the present life, and nothing was held in hope for the future or for after departure from this life. So then, the faithful—considering that for their ancestors all the good things came at once, but for them all the prizes and crowns are stored up for the life to come, and that the realization of the promises is “*in faith*” (cf. 1 Tim 1:4)⁶¹—were distressed and despondent as they were

τῶν χειρῶν σου (Deut 28:4–5, 8, 12); καὶ δώσω τὸν ὑετὸν ὑμῖν ἐν καιρῷ αὐτοῦ (cf. Deut 11:14: καὶ δώσει τὸν ὑετὸν τῇ γῇ σου καθ' ὥραν πρόμιον καὶ ὄψιμον), καὶ ἡ γῇ δώσει τὰ γενήματα αὐτῆς, καὶ τὰ ξύλα τῶν πεδίων ἀποδώσει τὸν καρπὸν αὐτῶν· καὶ καταλήμψεται ὑμῖν ὁ ἀλοητὸς τὸν τρύγητον, καὶ ὁ τρύγητος καταλήμψεται τὸν σπῆρον (Lev 26:4–5).

58. The λύσις, now on the horizon.

59. λιπαρὸν γῆρας, as in *Od.* 11.136; 19.368 (“a sleek old age”). See p. 260 n. 57.

60. Mf notes that some manuscripts (and PE confirms Paris. gr. 748 among them) read καὶ πολυποίμνια καὶ βουκόλια for καὶ πολλὰ ποίμνια καὶ βουκόλια (as indicated earlier by HS in a marginal note). The word πολυποίμνια (written as a single word with one accent, as in Paris. gr. 748, fol. 92^r) is unattested in TLG.

61. The connection with 1 Tim 1:4, ἡ οἰκονομία θεοῦ ἣ ἐν πίστει, is also perhaps

ἔκαμνον, ἐξελύοντο, τὴν παροῦσαν ζωὴν ἅπασαν διὰ πειρασμῶν ἔλκειν ἀναγκαζόμενοι. Ταῦτα οὖν ἐννοῶν ὁ Παῦλος καὶ τὸ μέγεθος τῶν ἐπηρητημένων αὐτοῖς δεινῶν, καὶ ὅτι τούτοις μὲν τὸν μισθὸν τῶν πόνων μετὰ τὴν ἐντεῦθεν αὐτοῖς ἀποδημίαν ὁ Θεὸς ἐπηγγείλατο, τοὺς δὲ προγόνους αὐτῶν ἐντεῦθεν ἡμεῖψατο, καὶ συνορῶν πολλὴν ἐκ τῶν λογισμῶν τούτων ἀκηδῖαν ἐγγινομένην αὐτοῖς, βουλόμενος αὐτοὺς ἀναστήσαι καὶ διδάξαι, ὅτι καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν πατέρων τῶν αὐτῶν οὕτω τὰ πράγματα ὤκονόμητο, καὶ ἐν πίστει πολλοὶ τὸν μισθὸν ἔλαβον, οὐκ ἐν τῇ πείρᾳ, ἀνέμνησεν αὐτοὺς τῆς προφητικῆς ῥήσεως, εἰπών· Ἔχοντες τὸ αὐτὸ Πνεῦμα τῆς πίστεως, κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον· Ἐπίστευσα, διὸ ἐλάλησα· μονονουχὶ λέγων, ὅτι καὶ ὁ μέγας Δαβὶδ, ὁ θαυμαστὸς καὶ γενναῖος προφῆτης ἐκεῖνος, πίστει τὴν ἀμοιβὴν ἐκομίσαστο, οὐχὶ τῇ πείρᾳ· οὐ γὰρ ἂν, εἰ μὴ τοῦτο ἦν, εἶπεν, Ἐπίστευσα, διὸ καὶ ἐλάλησα. Ἡ γὰρ πίστις ἐλπιζομένων ἐστὶν ὑπόστασις πραγμάτων, οὐ βλεπομένων· ὁ δὲ βλέπει τις, οὐ πάντως καὶ ἐλπίζει. Εἰ τοίνυν ἐπίστευσε, τοῖς ἐλπιζομένοις ἐπίστευσεν. Εἰ δὲ τοῖς ἐλπιζομένοις ἐπίστευσε, τὰ δὲ ἐλπιζόμενα οὐδέπω βλέπεται, οὕτω ἦν ἀπειληφῶς ταῦτα, εἰς ἅπερ ἐπίστευσε· διὰ τοῦτό φησιν, Ἔχοντες τὸ αὐτὸ Πνεῦμα τῆς πίστεως, τοῦτ' ἐστὶ, τὴν αὐτὴν πίστιν, τὴν ἐν τῇ Παλαιᾷ, καὶ ἡμεῖς ἔχομεν. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἄλλαχοῦ φησι, περὶ τῶν τότε ἁγίων λέγων· Περιῆλθον ἐν μηλωταῖς, ἐν αἰγείοις δέρμασιν, ὑστερούμενοι, θλιβόμενοι, κακουχούμενοι, ὧν οὐκ ἦν ἄξιος ὁ κόσμος· εἴτα διδάσκων, ὅτι τὰ δεινὰ μὲν ὑπέμειναν, τοὺς δὲ μισθοὺς οὐδέπω καὶ νῦν ἀπέλαβον, ἐπήγαγε λέγων· Κατὰ τὴν πίστιν ἀπέθανον οὗτοι πάντες, μὴ κομισάμενοι τὰς ἐπαγγελίας, ἀλλὰ πόρρωθεν αὐτὰς ἰδόντες καὶ ἀσπασάμενοι. Καὶ πῶς εἶδον, εἰπέ μοι, τὰς μηδέπω παρούσας; Τοῖς τῆς πίστεως ὀφθαλμοῖς, τοῖς ὑπερβαίνουσι τὸν οὐρανὸν, καὶ τὰ ἐκεῖ κατασκοποῦσιν ἅπαντα. θ'. Σὺ δέ μοι σκόπει Θεοῦ σοφίαν, πῶς καὶ ἔδειξεν αὐτοῖς τὰ βραβεῖα πόρρωθεν, καὶ οὐκ ἔδωκε μὲν εὐθέως, ἵνα μείζονα αὐτῶν ἐργάσῃται τὴν ὑπομονήν· ἔδειξε δὲ πόρρωθεν, ἵνα ταῖς ἐλπίσι ταύταις τρεφόμενοι, μηδὲ αἴσθησιν τῶν παρόντων λάβωσι πόνων.

established with the opening statement in this paragraph of the quandary to which John says Paul is responding: ὅτι ἐν τῇ παλαιᾷ διαθήκῃ οὐχ οὕτω τὰ πράγματα ὤκονομήθη in §8 (PG 51:296). The question is why this seems to be the divinely ordained plan (οἰκονομία).

62. Translation of ζωὴν ... ἔλκειν with LSJ II.6 on the latter.

63. ὤκονόμητο, continuing the theme (see n. 61 above).

64. Minus δέ after ἔχοντες.

65. Plus καὶ before ἐλάλησα; in his rendering of the Psalm verse John has mimicked Paul's διὸ καὶ λαλοῦμεν ("therefore we also speak") in the final clause of 2 Cor 4:13.

66. With transposition of ἐστὶν πίστις ἐλπιζομένων to πίστις ἐλπιζομένων ἐστὶν; minus ἔλεγχος before οὐ βλεπομένων (which changes the syntax and sense).

compelled to drag themselves wearily⁶² through the whole of the present life amidst trials. Now, Paul understood these concerns—both the enormity of the terrible things hanging over their heads, and that God had promised them the reward of their labors after their departure from this life, while he'd rewarded their ancestors in this life. He perceived the despondency that had arisen in them from these considerations, and wished to rouse their spirits and teach them that even in the case of those same ancestors, things were providentially ordered⁶³ this way, and many had received their reward “*in faith*” and not in immediate experience. Hence Paul reminded them of the prophetic statement, saying, “*having the same Spirit of faith, according to what is written, ‘I believed, therefore I spoke’*” (2 Cor 4:13;⁶⁴ Ps 115:1). He was as much as saying that the great David, that marvelous and noble prophet, also received his reward “*in faith*” and not in his immediate experience. For if that hadn't been the case, David wouldn't have said, “*I believed, therefore I also spoke*” (Ps 115:1).⁶⁵ For “*faith is the basis for things hoped for but not seen*” (Heb 11:1).⁶⁶ Surely one doesn't hope for things that one sees. Hence, if a person had faith,⁶⁷ they had faith in things hoped for; and if they had faith in things hoped for, but the things hoped for aren't yet seen, then they hadn't yet received the things in which they had faith. That's why he said, “*having the same Spirit of faith*” (2 Cor 4:13)⁶⁸—that is, we, too, have the same faith that was in the Old Testament. That's why elsewhere, too, Paul spoke about the saints of those days, saying, “*They went about in sheepskin, in goatskin, deprived, afflicted, maltreated, people of whom the world was not worthy*” (Heb 11:37–38). Then, to teach that while they endured terrible things, they hadn't yet received the rewards in their time, Paul said in addition, “*According to faith, all these died without having received the promises, but they saw them from afar and greeted them*” (Heb 11:13).⁶⁹ How, tell me, did they see things not yet present? With the eyes of faith,⁷⁰ the eyes that ascend to heaven and scope out all the things there. **9.** Observe carefully God's wisdom: how God both showed them the prizes from afar and didn't give them immediately, so he might magnify their power of endurance. But he showed them from afar so that, nourished by these hopes, they might not even perceive the present troubles.

67. I.e., οἱ πιστοὶ to whom Paul wrote 2 Corinthians.

68. Minus δέ after ἔχοντες.

69. Plus τήν before πίστιν; with κομισάμενοι for λαβόντες before τὰς ἐπαγγελίας (cf. Heb. 11:39).

70. οἱ τῆς πίστεως ὀφθαλμοί; on this favored Chrysostomic phrase see *Hom. 2 Cor. 4:13 A* §4 (PG 51:275) and p. 382 n. 34.

[298] Ἀλλὰ τάχα τις τῶν ὀξύτερον προσεχόντων ἑαυτῷ περιπεπτωκένας τὸν λόγον ἡγήσεται. Εἰ γὰρ οὐδὲ οἱ πρότεροι, φησὶν, ἀπελάμβανον παρὰ πόδας τὰ ἀγαθὰ καὶ τὰς ἀμοιβὰς, πῶς ἡμῖν μακρὸν ἀπέτεινας λόγον, ἀπαριθμούμενος ὥρων εὐκρασίαν, σώματος ὑγίειαν, εὐπαιδίαν, πολυπαιδίαν, εὐετηρίαν, καρπῶν ἀφθονίαν, βουκόλια, ποίμνια, ἅπασαν τὴν βιωτικὴν εὐπραγίαν; Τί οὖν ἂν εἴποιμεν πρὸς τοῦτο; Ὅτι ἐτέρως μὲν τὸ πλῆθος καὶ τὸν ἀσθενέστερον δῆμον, ἐτέρως δὲ τοὺς γενναίους καὶ τὴν ἐν τῇ Καινῇ φιλοσοφίᾳ ἤδη μετιόντας ἦγεν ὁ Θεὸς τότε. Τοῖς μὲν γὰρ πολλοῖς καὶ χαμαὶ ἐρπομένοις καὶ οὐδὲν μέγα δυναμένοις ἰδεῖν, οὐδὲ ἐκτείνειν τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς ἐλπίδα πρὸς τὴν τῶν μελλόντων ἀπόλαυσιν ἀγαθῶν, ταῦτα τὰ παρόντα παρεῖχεν ἀγαθὰ, τὴν ἀσθενείαν τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτῶν παραμυθούμενος, καὶ διὰ τούτων αὐτοὺς ὁδηγῶν ἐπὶ τὴν τῆς ἀρετῆς ἐργασίαν, καὶ εἰς τὴν τῶν καλῶν ἐπιθυμίαν ἐμβάλλων· τὸν δὲ Ἡλίαν καὶ τὸν Ἐλισσαῖον, τὸν Ἰερεμίαν, τὸν Ἡσαΐαν, καὶ πάντας δὴ ἀπλῶς τοὺς προφῆτας, καὶ ὅσοι τοῦ χοροῦ γεγέννηται τῶν ἁγίων καὶ μεγάλων ἀνδρῶν, ἐπὶ τοὺς οὐρανοὺς ἐκάλει καὶ τὰ ἐκεῖ παρεσκευασμένα τοῖς εὐδοκιμηκόσιν ἀγαθὰ. Διὸ καὶ ὁ Παῦλος οὐχ ἀπλῶς πάντας ἀπηριθμήσατο, ἀλλὰ τοὺς ἐν μνηλωταῖς, ἐν αἰγείοις δέρμασι, τοὺς ἐν καμίνῳ, τοὺς ἐν δεσμοτηρίῳ, τοὺς ἀποτυμπανισθέντας, τοὺς καταλευσθέντας, τοὺς ἐν λιμῷ, τοὺς ἐν πενίᾳ, τοὺς ἐν ἐρημίαις, τοὺς ἐν σπηλαίοις, τοὺς ἐν ταῖς ὁπαῖς τῆς γῆς, τοὺς τὰ μυρία παθόντας δεινά. Καὶ τότε εἶπε κατὰ πίστιν πάντας τετελευτηκέναι, καὶ μηδέπω κεκομίσθαι τὰς ἐπαγγελίας· οὐχὶ τὸ πλῆθος τὸ Ἰουδαϊκόν, ἀλλὰ τοὺς κατὰ τὸν Ἡλίαν ἡμῖν αἰνιττόμενος.

Εἰ δὲ λέγοι τις· Αὐτοὶ δὲ οὗτοι τίνος ἔνεκεν οὐδέπω καὶ νῦν ἀπέλαβον τοὺς ὀφειλομένους αὐτοῖς στεφάνους; μανθανέτω καὶ ταύτην παρὰ Παύλου τὴν αἰτίαν. Εἰπὼν γὰρ, Κατὰ πίστιν ἀπέθανον οὗτοι πάντες, μὴ κομισάμενοι τὰς ἐπαγγελίας, ἐπήγαγε, Τοῦ Θεοῦ κρεῖττόν τι προβλεψαμένου περὶ ἡμῶν, ἵνα μὴ χωρὶς ἡμῶν τελειωθῶσι. Κοινὴ γάρ ἐστι, φησὶν, ἡ πανήγυρις, ἐπειδὴ καὶ μείζων ἡδονή, ὅταν κοινῇ στεφανώμεθα πάντες. Τοῦτο καὶ ἐν

71. A new problem, introduced as coming from a would-be objector (only to be set up for refutation and pronounced solved).

72. Once again, a solution based on the concept of beneficent divine variability.

73. πάντας; cf. πάντες in Heb 11:13.

74. John uses an exceptionalist argument to reconcile his negative assessment of “Jews” with the biblical praise of them.

75. Another ζήτημα from a hypothetical interlocutor.

76. As earlier (see p. 457 n. 69), with κομισάμενοι for λαβόντες before τὰς ἐπαγγελίας (cf. Heb 11:39).

[298] But perhaps one of you who is paying keen-minded attention will think that our homily is now at odds with itself?⁷¹ For someone might say, “If even the former ones didn’t receive the benefactions and the rewards immediately, then how is it that you stretch out this lengthy homily for us, enumerating every aspect of success in life: temperate climate, bodily health, loads of healthy children, prosperous years, plentiful fruits, cattle, sheep?” What should we say to this objection? That God at that time treated the masses and the weaker people in one way, and the noble and those already pursuing the philosophical life that’s in the New Testament in another way.⁷² In the case of the *hoi polloi* and those who crawl on the ground and aren’t able to see anything lofty or to extend their soul’s hope toward the enjoyment of future good things, God provided them these present goods, thereby giving solace to their soul’s weakness, and through these blessings leading them to the exercise of virtue and implanting in them the desire for good things. But when it came to Elijah and Elisha, Jeremiah, Isaiah, and indeed all the prophets and those in the chorus of the saints and the great men, God beckoned them to heaven and to the good things that have been prepared there for the people who have lived honorable lives. That’s why Paul, too, didn’t simply include *all* the people in his enumerated list—but those “*in sheepskins*,” “*in goatskins*” (Heb 11:37), those in the furnace, those in prison, those who were beaten, those who were stoned to death, those in famine, those in poverty, those “*in deserts*,” those “*in caves*,” those “*in holes in the ground*” (Heb 11:38), those suffering countless hardships. And when he said that they all⁷³ had died “*in accordance with faith*” and had not yet received “*the promises*” (Heb 11:13; cf. 11:39), he was giving us a hint that he didn’t mean the masses of the Jewish people, but people like Elijah.⁷⁴

But what if someone should say,⁷⁵ “Why was it that these very illustrious persons even now haven’t received the crowns that are due to them?” Let that person learn the reason for this from Paul, as well. For after Paul said, “*In accordance with faith they all died without having received the promises*” (Heb 11:13),⁷⁶ he added, “*because God foresaw something greater for us, lest they be perfected apart from us*” (Heb 11:40).⁷⁷ For the festival of praise⁷⁸ is held in common, he says, since there’s even greater pleasure when all are crowned in common. The same thing happens in the

77. With transposition of *περὶ ἡμῶν* and *κρεῖττον τι προβλεψαμένου*.

78. *πανήγυρις*; cf. Heb 12:23.

τοῖς Ὀλυμπιακοῖς ἀγῶσι γίνεται· ὁ παλαίσας, ὁ πυκτεύσας, ὁ παγκρατιάσας ἐν διαφόροις μὲν καιροῖς τοὺς ἀγῶνας ὑπομένουσιν, ἐν μιᾷ δὲ καιροῦ ῥοπῇ πάντες ἀνακηρύττονται. Οὕτω καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀρίστοις γίνεται. Ὅταν γὰρ τῶν δαιτυμόνων οἱ μὲν φθάσῃσι προαπαντήσαντες, οἱ δὲ ἔτι μέλλωσι, τιμῶντες τοὺς ἀπολειφθέντας οἱ ἐστιάτορες, τοὺς φθάσαντας ἤδη καὶ παραγενομένους κελεύουσιν ἀναμένειν τοὺς ὑστερήσαντας. Τοῦτο καὶ ὁ Θεὸς πεποίηκεν· ἐπειδὴ γὰρ τοὺς ἐκ τῆς οἰκουμένης ἀπάσης κατὰ διαφόρους καιροὺς εὐδοκιμηκότας ἐπὶ κοινὴν τε καὶ πνευματικὴν εὐωχίαν ἐκάλεσε, τοὺς ἤδη φθάσαντας καὶ προαπελθόντας κελεύει τοὺς μετὰ ταῦτα ἀπιέναι μέλλοντας ἀναμένειν, ἵν' οὕτω κοινῇ παραγενομένων ἀπάντων, καὶ ἡ τιμὴ καὶ ἡ ἡδονὴ μία ᾗσιν γένηται.

ἰ'. Ἐννόησον γὰρ ἡλικίον ἐστὶν εἰς τιμῆς λόγον, Παῦλον καὶ τοὺς κατ' ἐκεῖνον ἅπαντας, τὸν Ἀβραάμ, καὶ τοὺς κατ' ἐκεῖνον, καὶ τοὺς πρὸ ἐκείνου πάλιν πρὸ τοσούτων ἐτῶν ἀθλήσαντας καὶ νικῆσαντας καθῆσθαι νῦν τὴν ἡμετέραν ἀναμένοντας εὐδοκίμησιν. Ὅτι γὰρ οὐδέπω τὸν στέφανον Παῦλος ἀπείληφεν, οὐδὲ ἄλλος οὐδεὶς τῶν ἐξ ἀρχῆς εὐηρεσθηκότων, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἀπολήφονται, ἕως ἂν ἅπαντες οἱ μέχρι τέλους στεφα-[299]νοῦσθαι μέλλοντες ἀφίκωνται, ἄκουσον αὐτοῦ τοῦ Παύλου λέγοντος· Τὸν ἀγῶνα τὸν καλὸν ἠγωνίσμαι, τὸν δρόμον τετέλεκα, τὴν πίστιν τετήρηκα· λοιπὸν ἀπόκειται μοι ὁ τῆς δικαιοσύνης στέφανος, ὃν ἀποδώσει μοι ὁ δίκαιος κριτής. Πότε; Ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ· οὐ μόνον δὲ ἐμοί, ἀλλὰ καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς ἡγαπηκόσι τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν αὐτοῦ. Καὶ πάλιν ἀλλαχοῦ δεικνύς, ὅτι κοινῇ πᾶσιν ἡ τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἀπόλαυσις δίδοται, Θεσσαλονικεῦσι γράφων ἔλεγεν· Εἴπερ δίκαιον παρὰ Θεῷ ἀποδοῦναι τοῖς θλίβουσιν ὑμᾶς θλίψιν, καὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς θλιβομένοις ἄνεσιν μεθ' ἡμῶν. Καὶ πάλιν· Ὅτι ἡμεῖς οἱ ζῶντες, οἱ περιλειπόμενοι εἰς τὴν παρουσίαν τοῦ Κυρίου, οὐ μὴ φθάσωμεν τοὺς κοιμηθέντας· διὰ πάντων τούτων δηλῶν, ὅτι κοινῇ πάντας καὶ ὁμοῦ παραγενομένους τῶν οὐρανίων τιμῶν ἀπολαύειν χρή. Τοῦτο καὶ τοῖς φθάσασι πολλὴν φέρει τὴν ἡδονήν, ὅταν μετὰ τῶν οἰκείων μελῶν τῶν ἀπορρήτων ἐκείνων ἀπολαύσωσιν ἀγαθῶν. Καὶ γὰρ πατὴρ τραπέζης μετέχων λαμπρᾶς καὶ πολυτελοῦς, τότε μετὰ πλείονος αὐτῆς ἀπολαύσεται τῆς εὐφροσύνης, ὅταν μετὰ τῶν αὐτοῦ παιδίων μετέχῃ τῆς εὐωχίας καὶ εὐφροσύνης. Οὕτω καὶ Παῦλος καὶ οἱ κατ' ἐκεῖνον ἅπαντες

79. See p. 104 n. 62.

80. ἐξ ἀρχῆς, perhaps a reference to Genesis and hence the history of all human-kind.

81. Ellipsis of ὁ κύριος ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ after ἀποδώσει μοι (which is held back until the next sentence).

82. With ἀποδοῦναι for ἀνταποδοῦναι.

Olympian Games competitions. The wrestler, the boxer, and the pancratiast⁷⁹ endure their contests at different times, but all are proclaimed victors in a single moment. That's the case also in meals. For when some of the invited guests who've arrived early come in, but others are still coming, the hosts, out of respect for those who are absent, instruct those who've already arrived and are present to wait for those who are missing. This is what God also has done. Since he invited people who've lived honorable lives from all over the world and from different time periods to a single spiritual feast that is held in common, God instructs those who preceded them there and have arrived first to wait for the ones who are going to attend later. This is so that when all are present together, a single measure of both honor and delight might belong to all.

10. Consider what a momentous thing it is that when it comes to the conferral of honor, Paul and all his contemporaries, Abraham and his, and those before him who for so many years contended and were victorious, sit even now awaiting our moment of honor. Neither Paul nor anyone else who has lived an acceptable life from the beginning⁸⁰ has yet received their crown, nor will they receive it until all the people down to the end [299] of time who are going to be crowned arrive. As proof of this, listen to Paul himself saying, *"I have fought the good fight, I have completed the race, I have kept the faith. Finally, the crown of righteousness lies in wait for me, the crown that the just judge will give to me"* (2 Tim 4:7–8).⁸¹ When? *"On that day ... and not only to me but also to all those who have longed for his visible manifestation"* (2 Tim 4:8). And again, elsewhere, to show that the enjoyment of good things is given to all in common, when writing to the Thesalonians he said: *"if indeed it is just for God to repay those who are afflicting you with affliction, and you who are being afflicted with rest alongside us"* (2 Thess 1:6–7).⁸² And again, *"that we, the living, who remain for the parousia of the Lord, shall in no way precede those who have gone to sleep"* (1 Thess 4:15). Through all these statements he was making clear that it's necessary for all in common and together to enjoy the heavenly honors once they've arrived there. This brings much pleasure to those who've preceded, as well, when they'll enjoy those indescribable goods with their fellow members.⁸³ After all, a father who partakes of a splendid and lavish table will enjoy it with greater merriment when he partakes of the feast and merriment with his children. In the same way Paul and all those like him will experience a

83. I.e., "members of one's household"; John likely also has in mind Paul's reference to the μέλη of the σῶμα Χριστοῦ in Rom 12:4–5 and 1 Cor 12:12–27.

μείζονος αἰσθήσονται τῆς θυμηδίας, ὅταν μετὰ τῶν οἰκείων μελῶν ὄντες ἀπολαύσωσιν αὐτῆς. Οὐ γὰρ τοσαύτην πατέρες περὶ παῖδας ἐπιδείκνυνται φιλοστοργίαν, ὅσην ἐκεῖνοι περὶ τοὺς τὰ αὐτὰ κατωρθωκότας αὐτοῖς ἔχουσι κηδεμονίαν.

“ὼν καὶ ἡμεῖς τῶν τότε τιμωμένων γενώμεθα, σπουδάζωμεν καταλαβεῖν τοὺς ἁγίους ἐκείνους. Καὶ πῶς δυνησόμεθα, φησί, αὐτοὺς καταλαβεῖν; τίς ἡμῖν δείξει τὴν ἐκεῖ φέρουσαν ὁδόν; Αὐτὸς ὁ τῶν ἁγίων ἐκείνων Δεσπότης, ὃς οὐχ ὅπως αὐτοὺς καταληψόμεθα μόνον διδάσκει, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὅπως ὁμωρόφιοι καὶ σύσκηνοι γενώμεθα πᾶσιν αὐτοῖς. Ποιήσατε γὰρ ὑμῖν φίλους ἐκ τοῦ μαμμωνᾶ τῆς ἀδικίας, φησὶν, ἵν’ ὅταν ἐκλίπητε, δέξωνται ὑμᾶς εἰς τὰς αἰωνίους αὐτῶν σκηνάς. Καλῶς εἶπεν, Αἰωνίους. Ἐνταῦθα μὲν γὰρ καὶ λαμπρὰν ἔχῃς οἰκίαν, ἀπολείται πάντως φθειρομένη τῷ χρόνῳ· μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ πρὸ τῆς κατὰ τὸν χρόνον φθορᾶς, θάνατος ἐμπεσὼν ἐκβάλλει σε τῆς λαμπρᾶς ταύτης οἰκήσεως· πολλάκις δὲ καὶ πρὸ τοῦ θανάτου πραγμάτων τινῶν δυσκολίαι καὶ συκοφαντῶν ἔφοδοι καὶ ἐπιβουλαὶ ἐκπεσεῖν αὐτῆς παρεσκεύασαν. Ἐκεῖ δὲ οὐδὲν τούτων ἐστὶν ὑποπτεῦσαι, οὐ φθορὰν, οὐ θάνατον, οὐ κατὰπτωσιν, οὐ συκοφαντῶν ἐπήρειαν, οὐκ ἄλλο οὐδὲν, ἀλλ’ ἀκίνητος καὶ ἀθάνατός ἐστιν ἡ οἴκησις. Διὰ τοῦτο αἰωνίους αὐτὰς ἐκάλεσε. Ποιήσατε ὑμῖν φίλους, φησὶν, ἐκ τοῦ μαμμωνᾶ τῆς ἀδικίας.

ια’ .“Ὁρα πόση φιланθρωπία τοῦ Δεσπότη, πόση χρηστότης καὶ ἐπιείκεια οὐ γὰρ ἀπλῶς ταύτην τέθεικε τὴν προσθήκην· ἀλλ’ ἐπειδὴ πολλοῖς πλουσίοις πλοῦτος συνείλεται ἐξ ἀρπαγῆς καὶ πλεονεξίας, Κακῶς μὲν, φησί, καὶ οὐκ ἐχρῆν σε οὕτω συλλέξαι τὰ χρήματα· πλὴν ἀλλ’ ἐπειδὴ συνέλεξας, στῆθι τῆς ἀρπαγῆς καὶ τῆς πλεονεξίας, καὶ χρῆσαι εἰς δέον τοῖς χρήμασιν. Οὐ λέγω, ἵνα ἀρπάζων ἐλεῇς, ἀλλ’ ἵνα τῆς πλεονεξίας ἀποστὰς, πρὸς ἐλεημοσύνην καὶ φιλανθρωπίαν ἀποχρήσῃ τῷ πλούτῳ. Εἰ γάρ τις μὴ παύσαιτο τῆς ἀρπαγῆς, οὐδὲ ἐλεημοσύνην ἐργάσεται· ἀλλὰ καὶ μυρία καταβάλλῃ χρήματα εἰς τὰς τῶν δεομένων χεῖρας, τὰ ἐτέρων ἀρπάζων καὶ πλεονεκτῶν, τοῖς ἀνδροφόνοις

84. Chrysostom makes an *a minore ad maius* argument from everyday fathers to Paul as exemplary father (cf. 1 Cor 4:15; 1 Thess 2:11).

85. Another ζήτημα from a hypothetical interlocutor.

86. Plus γάρ after ποιήσατε; with ὑμῖν for ἑαυτοῖς; plus αὐτῶν before σκηνάς.

87. With ὑμῖν for ἑαυτοῖς, as above.

88. I.e., to the parable of Luke 16:1–8.

89. φησί, “he said”; also, “think,” “deem,” “suppose” (LSJ II.b.), perhaps, “in effect he was saying,” a formula by which John introduces an interpretation via *prosopopoeia*, recasting the statement for Christ.

90. Where the voice of the Lord ends and that of John returns is perhaps open to question; the translation takes οὐ λέγω to mark the shift.

greater delight when they enjoy it with their own fellow members. For the love that fathers display toward their children isn't as great as the solicitous care that Paul⁸⁴ and the others have for those who've done the same virtuous deeds as they.

Therefore, so that we, too, might be among those who will receive honor at that future time, let's be eager to follow those saints closely. "And how," someone might say, "shall we be able to follow them? Who will show us the path that brings us there?"⁸⁵ The very Lord of those saints, who teaches not only how we might follow them closely, but even how we might come to be in the same dwelling and under the same roof with all of them. "So *make friends for yourselves by means of wicked mammon*," Christ said, "so that when you leave this life they might welcome you into their *eternal dwellings*" (Luke 16:9).⁸⁶ Rightly he said, "*eternal*." For here on earth, even if you have a splendid house, it will be completely destroyed, deteriorating with time. Moreover, even before the deterioration that comes with time, death will toss you out and banish you from this splendid home. And often even before death, the troubles of business affairs and the schemes and ploys of swindlers have contrived to banish you from it. But in heaven there's not even a hint of these things, neither deterioration, nor death, nor collapse, nor abuse by swindlers, nor anything else, but the home is permanent and immortal. That's why he called the dwellings "*eternal*." "*Make friends for yourselves by means of wicked mammon*" (Luke 16:9),⁸⁷ he said.

11. Look at how great the Lord's love for us is, how great his kindness and fairness! For he didn't append this statement⁸⁸ in a casual way. But since a rich man had amassed plentiful riches from stealing and greed, what he meant in saying this was,⁸⁹ "It was wrong and unseemly for you to have amassed possessions in this way. But since you have amassed them, leave off the stealing and the greed, and make use of these possessions as you should." I don't say⁹⁰ this so you might steal to give alms but so that, abstaining from greed, you might use your wealth for almsgiving and philanthropy. Anyone who doesn't stop stealing won't be performing almsgiving. On the contrary, if a person were to drop⁹¹ tons of cash into the hands of the needy while stealing and defrauding the possessions of others, that person has been reckoned by God as the equivalent of those who commit

91. καταβάλλειν, as in the previous homilies, a favored verb for giving money to the poor for John because of its multiple resonances, both literal and metaphorical: "drop," "throw," "sow" (as in seed), "lay down" (in storage), "invest," and "pay," even as in the passive voice, what is "thrown down" is "deposited" (see LSJ).

ἐξίσης λελόγισται τῷ Θεῷ. Διὸ χρὴ πλεονεξίας ἀποστάντα πρότερον, οὕτω τοὺς δεομένους [300] ἐλεεῖν. Πολλὴ γὰρ τῆς ἐλεημοσύνης ἡ δύναμις, περὶ ἧς καὶ τῇ προτεραίᾳ συνάξει πρὸς ὑμᾶς διελέχθημεν, καὶ νῦν διαλέξομαι. Ἀλλὰ μηδεὶς τὴν συνέχειαν τῆς ὑπομνήσεως κατηγορίαν ἡγείσθω τῶν ἀκουόντων. Καὶ γὰρ ἐν τοῖς ἀγῶσιν ἐκείνους τῶν δρομέων διεγείρουσιν οἱ θεαταί, οὓς ἂν ἴδωσιν ἐγγὺς τοῦ βραβείου γενομένους, καὶ πολλὰς τῆς νίκης ἐλπίδας ἔχοντας. Καὶ ἐγὼ τοῖνυν, ἐπειδὴ μετὰ πολλῆς αἰεὶ προθυμίας ὀρῶ τοὺς περὶ ἐλεημοσύνης δεχομένους λόγους ὑμᾶς, διὰ τοῦτο καὶ αὐτοὺς συνεχέστερον τὴν ὑπὲρ τούτων κινῶ παραίνεσιν. Ἰατροὶ τῶν ψυχῶν ἡμῶν εἰσιν οἱ πένητες, εὐεργέται καὶ προστάται· οὐ γὰρ τοσοῦτον δίδως, ὅσον λαμβάνεις· δίδως ἀργύριον, καὶ λαμβάνεις βασιλείαν οὐρανῶν· λύεις πενίαν, καὶ καταλλάττεταις σεαυτῷ τὸν Δεσπότην. Ὅρας ὅτι οὐκ ἴση ἡ ἀντίδοσις; Ταῦτα ἐπὶ γῆς, ἐκεῖνα ἐν οὐρανῷ· ταῦτα ἀπόλλυται, ἐκεῖνα διαμένει· ταῦτα φθείρεται, ἐκεῖνα πάσης ἐστὶν ἀνώτερα ἀπωλείας. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν τῶν οἰκῶν τῶν εὐκτηρίων ἔστησαν τοὺς πένητας οἱ πατέρες οἱ ἡμέτεροι, ἵνα καὶ τὸν νωθρότατον καὶ ἀπανθρωπότατον αὐτῇ τῶν πενήτων ἡ ὄψις πρὸς ὑπόμνησιν ἐγείρῃ τῆς ἐλεημοσύνης. Ὅταν γὰρ ἐστήκῃ χορὸς γερόντων, συγκεκυφότων, ῥάκια περιβεβλημένων, αὐχμώντων, ῥυπώντων, βακτηρίας ἐχόντων, μόλις στηρίζεσθαι δυναμένων, πολλάκις δὲ καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἐκκεκομμένων, καὶ τὸ σῶμα ὅλον ἀναπήρων. τίς οὕτω λίθινος, τίς οὕτως ἀδάμας, ὥς καὶ τῆς ἡλικίας, καὶ τῆς ἀσθενείας, καὶ τῆς πηρώσεως, καὶ τῆς πενίας, καὶ τῆς εὐτελοῦς στολῆς, καὶ πάντων ἀπλῶς πρὸς συμπάθειαν ἐπικλῶντων αὐτὸν, ἀντιστήναι καὶ μεῖναι πρὸς ἅπαντα ταῦτα ἀνένδοτος; Διὰ ταῦτα πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν ἡμῶν ἐστήκασιν παντὸς λόγου δυνατώτεροι, διὰ τῆς ὄψεως ἐπισπώμενοι, πρὸς φιланθρωπίαν τοὺς εἰσιόντας ἐκκαλούμενοι. Καθάπερ γὰρ κρῆνας εἶναι ἐν ταῖς αὐλαῖς τῶν εὐκτηρίων οἰκῶν νενόμισται, ἵνα οἱ μέλλοντες εὐχεσθαι τῷ Θεῷ, πρότερον ἀπονιψάμενοι τὰς χεῖρας, οὕτως αὐτὰς εἰς εὐχὴν ἀνατείνωσιν·

92. *Hom. 2 Cor. 4:13 B* §§7–10 (PG 51:287–90).

93. On the ubiquitous and impassioned theme of almsgiving in Chrysostom's sermons, which conspicuously unites all three homilies in this series on 2 Cor 4:13, see Mitchell, "Silver Chamber Pots and Other Goods Which are Not Good"; multiple essays in Holman, *Wealth and Poverty in Early Church and Society*, 127–86.

94. On the ancient custom of the ἀντίδοσις, see pp. 397–98 n. 88 above.

95. οἱ πατέρες οἱ ἡμέτεροι; likely here it refers to "ecclesiastical officials" (see PGL A.2). Also conceivable is that John means more generally "fathers of the church" (A.3), or "ancestors." One question this raises is whether the poor are by the doors by ecclesial order or customary practice; see, e.g., Wendy Mayer, "John Chrysostom: Extraordinary Preacher, Ordinary Audience," in *Preacher and Audience: Studies in Early Christian and Byzantine Homiletics*, ed. Mary B. Cunningham and Pauline Allen, *A New History of the Sermon 1* (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 105–37, 124–25: "It is probable that some [of the

murder. Therefore, it's necessary for one to abstain from greed first, and in that way to show mercy through alms to those in need. [300] For the power of almsgiving is great! We spoke of this power to you also in the former liturgical assembly,⁹² and I shall speak on it now as well. However, let no one listening consider my continual mention of this topic a cause for censure.⁹³ After all, in athletic contests the spectators lift the spirits of the runners whom they see to be close to attaining the prize and with great hopes for victory. Correspondingly, I, too, seeing you receiving my sermons about almsgiving always with great eagerness, have reason myself to be all the more continually motivated to give advice about these matters. The poor are the doctors of our souls, our benefactors and patrons. For what you receive isn't commensurate with what you give. You give silver, and you receive the kingdom of heaven. You loosen the bond of poverty, and you reconcile yourself to the Lord. Do you see that the exchange⁹⁴ isn't equivalent? The former goods are on earth; the latter are in heaven. The former perish; the latter remain. The former deteriorate; the latter are beyond all power of destruction. That's why our fathers⁹⁵ positioned the poor right before the doors of houses of prayer, so the very sight of the poor might rouse even the most apathetic and misanthropic to remember almsgiving. For when the chorus of the old, bent double, dressed in rags, squalid, filthy, holding canes, hardly able to keep on their feet, often with their very eyes cut out, crippled in their whole body, are standing there, who is so stone-cold, who so hard-hearted, to resist and not give in when faced with all these things—when their age, illness, disability, poverty, threadbare garments, and everything at once is moving that person to compassion? For these reasons they stand before the doors⁹⁶ as something more powerful than any homily of ours, through the very sight of them pulling and summoning those who enter to acts of generosity. As we know, it's customary for fountains to be situated in the courtyards of houses of prayer, so those who are going to pray to God might extend their hands in prayer after washing them first. In just the same way, our fathers stationed

involuntary poor] were instead located around the entrances of the church at times of synaxis, waiting to importune the audience as they entered or departed," with further references in John's sermons. See also Finn, *Almsgiving in the Later Roman Empire*, 19, 99–101; Susan R. Holman, *The Hungry are Dying: Beggars and Bishops in Roman Cappadocia* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2001), 32–65 ("Leitourgia and the Poor in the Early Christian World").

96. Through his prior ekphrasis, John has brought "the poor" into the sanctuary before the eyes and ears of his congregation.

οὕτω καὶ τοὺς πένητας ἀντὶ πηγῶν καὶ κρηνῶν ἔστησαν οἱ πατέρες πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν, ἵν', ὥσπερ ὕδατι τὰς χεῖρας ἀπονίπτομεν, οὕτω φιλανθρωπία τὴν ψυχὴν ἀποσμήχοντες πρότερον, οὕτως εὐχώμεθα.

ιβ'. Οὐδὲ γὰρ οὕτως ὕδατος φύσις ἀπονίπτει κηλίδας σώματος, ὡς ἐλεημοσύνης δύναμις ἀποσμήχει ῥύπον ψυχῆς. Ὡσπερ οὖν οὐ τολμᾷς ἀνίπτοις χερσὶν εἰσελθὼν εὐξασθαι, καίτοι ἔλαττον τὸ ἔγκλημα ἐκεῖνο, οὕτω μήτε χωρὶς ἐλεημοσύνης ἐπ' εὐχὴν ἔλθης ποτέ. Καίτοι καὶ καθαρὰς πολλάκις ἔχοντες τὰς χεῖρας, ἂν μὴ πρότερον αὐτὰς ἀποπλύνωμεν ὕδατι, οὐκ ἀνατείνωμεν εἰς εὐχὴν· τοσοῦτόν ἐστιν ἡ συνήθεια. Τοῦτο τοίνυν καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς ἐλεημοσύνης ποιῶμεν· κἂν μηδὲν ἑαυτοῖς ὦμεν συνειδότες μέγα ἀμάρτημα, ὅμως ἀποσμήχωμεν τὸ συνειδὸς διὰ τῆς ἐλεημοσύνης. Πολλὰ ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγορᾶς ἐπεσπάσω δεινά· ἐχθρὸς παρώξυνε, δικαστὴς ἠνάγκασέ τι ποιῆσαι τῶν οὐ προσηκόντων πραγμάτων, ῥήματα πολλάκις ἐξέβαλες ἄτοπα, φίλος ἐδυσώπησεν ἐργάσασθαι τι τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν ἐχόντων, ἕτερα προσετρίψω πολλὰ, οἷα εἰκὸς ἀνθρωπὸν ὄντα προστρίβεσθαι, ἐν ἀγορᾷ στρεφόμενον, δικαστηρίοις προσεδρεύοντα, τὰ τῆς πόλεως πράττοντα πράγματα· ὑπὲρ τούτων ἀπάντων εἰσέρχῃ τὸν Θεὸν αἰτήσων συγγνώμην καὶ ἀπολογησόμενος. Κατάβαλε τοίνυν ἀργύριον εἰς τὰς τῶν πενήτων χεῖρας, καὶ ἀπόσμηξον τὰς κηλίδας ἐκεῖνας, ἵνα μετὰ παρρησίας καλέσης [301] αἰτούμενος τὸν δυνάμενόν σοι ταῦτα ἀφεῖναι τὰ ἀμαρτήματα. Ἄν ἐν συνηθείᾳ καταστήσης σαυτὸν μηδέποτε χωρὶς ἐλεημοσύνης τῶν ἱερῶν τούτων προθύρων ἐπιβαίνειν, οὐδέποτε, οὔτε ἐκῶν, οὔτε ἄκων, ὑστερήσεις τῆς καλῆς ταύτης ἐργασίας, τοιοῦτον γὰρ ἡ συνήθεια. Καὶ ὥσπερ οὖν αἰεὶ, ὃ τι οὖν γένοιτο, χερσὶν ἀνίπτοις οὐχ ὑπομένεις εὐξασθαι, ἐπειδὴ κατέστης εἰς συνηθειαν ἅπαξ· οὕτω καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς ἐλεημοσύνης, ἂν τοῦτον σαυτῷ ἐπιθήσης τὸν νόμον, καὶ ἐκῶν καὶ ἄκων αὐτὸν καθ' ἐκάστην ἐκπληρώσεις ἡμέραν ὑπὸ τῆς συνηθείας ἐλκόμενος.

Πῦρ ἐστὶν ἡ εὐχὴ, μάλιστα ὅταν ἀπὸ νηφούσης καὶ διεγυγερμένης ἀναπέμπηται ψυχῆς· ἀλλὰ τὸ πῦρ τοῦτο καὶ ἐλαίου δεῖται, ἵνα αὐτῶν ἄψῃται τῶν οὐρανίων ἀψίδων· ἔλαιον δὲ τοῦ πυρὸς τούτου οὐδὲν ἕτερόν ἐστιν, ἀλλ' ἡ ἐλεημοσύνη. Ἐπῆχεε τοίνυν τὸ ἔλαιον δαψιλές, ἵνα εὐφραϊνόμενος ἐπὶ τῷ

97. Cf. 1 Cor 4:4 on having consciousness of a sin in oneself.

98. The participle *συνειδός* means both "conscience" and "consciousness" (see LSJ s.v. *σύννοια* V.1–2). Both senses are in view here.

99. The *ἀγορά*, both the marketplace and a metonymy for the broader realm of commerce, law and public life, as shown by the context.

100. I.e., God.

101. As with wedding receptions in *Hom. 1 Cor. 7:2–4* §2 (PG 51:210–12), Chrysostom is trying to establish new, Christianized social and ritual practices, and rationales

the poor before the doors opposite the springs and fountains so that, just as we wash off our hands in water, so also, after having first wiped off our soul by generous giving, we might pray in this manner.

12. Yet the power of almsgiving wipes dirt off the soul in a different manner than water naturally washes stains off the body. Therefore, just as you don't dare to come in to pray with unwashed hands—although that is a lesser offense—neither should you ever come to prayer without giving alms. Indeed often even when our hands are clean we don't extend them in prayer if we haven't washed them off with water first. This habit is very strong. So then, let's do the same in the case of almsgiving as well. Even if we have no great sin on our conscience,⁹⁷ nevertheless, let's wipe off our conscience⁹⁸ by almsgiving. You've contracted many awful things from the public square.⁹⁹ An adversary has provoked you, a judge has forced you to do something unsavory, you've frequently uttered foul language, a friend has convinced you to do something that sinners do, you rub up against many other things that a person is likely to rub up against as you take your turn about the public square, attending the law courts, doing your city business. About all these things, you come to ask God's pardon and to offer your self-defense. Well then, drop some money into the hands of the poor and wipe off those stains, so you might call out with confidence [301] as you beg the one who is able to forgive you for these sins.¹⁰⁰ If you establish it as a custom for yourself never to set foot inside the front doors of this holy place without almsgiving, then never, neither willingly nor unwillingly, will you fail to do this good deed. For that's what a custom is like.¹⁰¹ And this being always the case, whatever may happen, you don't dare to pray with unwashed hands, since you've established this as a custom once and for all time. Thus also in the case of almsgiving, if you establish this as a law for yourself, then you will fulfill it every single day, both willingly and unwillingly, drawn to it by custom.

Prayer is a fire, especially when it is sent up from a soul that is vigilant and has been roused up. But this fire has need of fuel¹⁰² so it might reach the very vaults of heaven. And the fuel for this fire is none other than almsgiving. So now, pour out the fuel liberally, so that in the joy that

for them, likely against considerable resistance. In general on Chrysostom's responses to "the tyranny of custom," see Maxwell, *Christianization and Communication*, 144–68, chap. 6, "Habits and the Christianization of Daily Life."

102. ἔλαιον, "olive oil," used in lamps.

κατορθώματι, μετὰ παρρησίας πλείονος καὶ προθυμίας μείζονος τὰς εὐχὰς σου ἐπιτελῆς. Ὡσπερ γὰρ οἱ μηδὲν ἑαυτοῖς συνειδότες ἀγαθὸν, οὐδὲ εὖξασθαι μετὰ παρ-[302]ρησίας δύνανται, οὕτως οἱ κατορθώσαντές τι, καὶ μετὰ τὴν δικαιοσύνην ἐκείνην ἐπὶ τὴν εὐχὴν ἐρχόμενοι, τῇ μνήμῃ τοῦ κατορθώματος εὐφραινόμενοι, μετὰ πλείονος τῆς προθυμίας ποιοῦνται τὴν ἱκετηρίαν. Ἴν' οὖν καὶ κατὰ τοῦτο δυνατωτέρα ἡμῖν ἡ εὐχὴ γένηται, γρηγορούσης ἡμῖν τῆς διανοίας ἐν ταῖς δεήσεσιν ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν κατορθωμάτων μνήμης, μετὰ τῆς ἐλεημοσύνης ἐπὶ τὰς εὐχὰς ἐρχώμεθα, καὶ μνημονεύωμεν μετὰ ἀκριβείας ἅπαντα τὰ εἰρημένα· καὶ πρό γε τῶν ἄλλων ἀπάντων ἐκείνην μοι τὴν εἰκόνα διατηρεῖτε διηνεκῶς, καθ' ἣν εἶπον τοὺς πένητας πρὸ τῶν θυρῶν ἐστάναι τῶν εὐκτηρίων οἴκων, ταύτην ἐπὶ τῆς ψυχῆς ἀναπληροῦντες τὴν χρεῖαν, ἣν ἐπὶ τοῦ σώματος ἡ κρήνη. Ἄν γὰρ τοῦτο ὤμεν διηνεκῶς μεμνημένοι, συνεχῶς ἀπονιπτόμενοι τὸν λογισμὸν, καθαρὰς μὲν δυνησόμεθα τὰς εὐχὰς ἐπιτελεῖν. πολλὴν δὲ ἐπισπάσασθαι παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ τὴν παρρησίαν, καὶ τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν ἐπιτυχεῖν, χάριτι καὶ φιλανθρωπία τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ᾧ ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Ἀμήν.

accompanies this good deed you might perform your prayers with more confidence and greater fervor. For just as those who have no good deed on their conscience aren't able to pray with [302] confidence, thus also those who've done some good deed and come to prayer after that righteous act in the joyful memory of that good deed offer their supplication with even greater fervor. Therefore, so our prayer might be even more powerful, for this reason, with our mind wide awake as we make our petitions in the remembrance of good deeds, let's come to prayer accompanied by alms-giving, and let's remember in careful detail all the things that've been said here. Above all else, continually retain that image of which I spoke, of the poor standing before the doors of the houses of prayer. In this way, you will fulfill the same need for the soul as the fountain does for the body. For if we are perpetually mindful of this, by continually washing off our powers of reasoning, we shall be able to perform prayers that are pure and draw to ourselves great confidence from God, and to attain the kingdom of heaven by the grace and loving-kindness of our Lord Jesus Christ, to whom be the glory and the power forever and ever. Amen.

ΕΙΣ ΤΟ ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΙΚΟΝ ΡΗΤΟΝ, «Ὁφελον ἀνείχεσθέ μου
μικρὸν τῇ ἀφροσύνῃ.»

α'. [301] Ἀπαντας μὲν φιλῶ τοὺς ἁγίους, μάλιστα δὲ τὸν μακάριον Παῦλον, τὸ σκεῦος τῆς ἐκλογῆς, τὴν σάλπιγγα τὴν οὐράνιον, τὸν νυμφαγωγὸν τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Τοῦτο δὲ εἶπον, καὶ ὃν περὶ αὐτὸν ἔρωτα ἔχω, εἰς μέσον ἐξήνεγκα, ἵνα καὶ ὑμεῖς κοινωνοὺς ποιήσω τοῦ φίλτρου. Οἱ μὲν γὰρ τὸν σωματικὸν ἔρωτα ἐρῶντες εἰκότως αἰσχύνονται ὁμολογεῖν, ἅτε καὶ ἑαυτοὺς καταισχύνοντες, καὶ τοὺς ἀκούοντας βλάπτοντες· οἱ δὲ τὸν πνευματικὸν, μηδέποτε ὁμολογοῦντες παυέσθωσαν· καὶ γὰρ καὶ ἑαυτοὺς καὶ τοὺς ἀκούοντας ὠφελοῦσι διὰ τῆς καλῆς ταύτης ὁμολογίας. Ἐκεῖνος μὲν γὰρ ὁ ἔρως ἐγκλημα, οὗτος δὲ ἐγκώμιον· ἐκεῖνος μὲν πάθος ψυχῆς διαβεβλημένον ἐστίν, οὗτος δὲ εὐφροσύνη ψυχῆς, καὶ ἀγαλλίαμα, καὶ κόσμος ἄριστος· ἐκεῖνος εἰσάγει πόλεμον εἰς τὴν τῶν ἐρώωντων διάνοιαν, οὗτος καὶ τὸν ὄντα πόλεμον ἐκβάλλει, καὶ ἐν εἰρήνῃ πολλῇ

1. Provenance: according to Mayer, *Provenance*, 119 (with chart on 265), Jean Stilting was the only scholar to hazard a date for this sermon, assigning it to a period between October 387 and Lent 388, following the three *Hom. 2 Cor. 4:13*. A common theme uniting *Hom. 2 Cor. 4:13 Γ* and this homily, according to Stilting, is Paul's humility. See Jean Stilting, "De S. Joanne Chrysostomo, episcopo Constantinopolitano et ecclesiae doctore, prope Comana in Ponto, commentarius historicus," in *Acta Sanctorum Septembris IV* (Antwerp: Bernard Albert van der Plassche, 1753), 481–82. But this is a rather common topic for John and hence not a clear marker of chronological proximity. Mf (3:291) is right that there are no indications by which one can ascertain either date or place.

Text: Mf PE (1837) as reprinted by JPM (PG, 1862). Mf (1721) included no text-critical notes on this homily and added no readings from the Paris manuscripts. The editors of PE added two notes pointing to conjectures of HS; PG prints both of those notes (as indicated in our footnotes below). Pinakes lists ten manuscripts containing this homily inclusive of Monac. gr. 352 and Monac. gr. 6, which were the basis of HS's text.

2. Literally, "one who presents Christ with his bride," i.e., the church, an allusion to 2 Cor 11:2 (see PGL 2). The noun νυμφαγωγός can also mean "friend" (LSJ 2); hence,

Hom. 2 Cor. 11:1
(*In illud: utinam sustineretis modicum*)
CPG 4384 (PG 51:301–10)¹

On the passage of the apostle, “*Would that you would put up with me in a little bit of foolishness*” (2 Cor 11:1).

1. [301] I love all the saints, but I love most the blessed Paul, the chosen vessel, the heavenly trumpet, the leader of the bride of Christ.² And I have said this and brought the love I have for him out into the public eye so that I might make you, too, partners in this love charm.³ Now, those who have a physical love are reasonably ashamed to confess it, inasmuch as they both bring shame on themselves and harm to those who hear it. But those who have a spiritual love never stop confessing it, and indeed they benefit both themselves and those who hear it by this good confession, because the former type of love involves recrimination, but the latter acclamation.⁴ The former is a discredited passion of the soul; the latter happiness, elation, and fine adornment for the soul. The first brings strife into the minds of the lovers, the second casts out the strife that’s there and settles the lovers

“the friend of the bridegroom, Christ.” On Chrysostom’s use of this epithet for Paul, see HT 84 n. 110 with further references.

3. Chrysostom uses *ἐρᾶν*, *φιλεῖν*, and *ἀγαπᾶν* throughout this argument and appeal in §§1–2 (PG 51:301–303). There is a long-standing discussion about the various nuances of the three terms, including, famously, Anders Nygren, *Agape and Eros*, trans. Philip S. Watson (London: SPCK, 1953); Ceslas Spicq, *Agapè dans le nouveau testament*, 3 vols. (Paris: Gabalda, 1958–1959); Robert Joly, *Le vocabulaire chrétien de l’amour est-il original? Φιλεῖν et Ἀγαπᾶν dans le grec antique* (Brussels: Presses universitaires de Bruxelles, 1968). Debate on New Testament lexical usage is often focused on the variation of the terms in John 21:15–17. As in that passage, Chrysostom appears here to be using the words largely interchangeably (so the translation), varying the terms for stylistic reasons. Yet perhaps one might translate *ἔρω* as “ardor” to get a sense of the depth of emotion and why he compares his *ἔρω* for Paul with the *ἔρω* that romantic partners have with one another (along with the antithesis he invokes between *σωματικὸς ἔρω*, “physical/bodily love,” and *πνευματικὸς ἔρω*, “spiritual love”).

4. Trying to capture the wordplay in Greek: *ἐγκλημα/ἐγκώμιον*.

τοὺς ἐρώντας καθίστησι. Κάκειῖθεν μὲν οὐδὲν ὄφελος γίνεται, ἀλλὰ καὶ πολλὴ ζημία χρημάτων καὶ δαπάνη τις ἀνόητος, καὶ ζωῆς ἀνατροπὴ, καὶ οἰκιῶν ὁλόκληροι διαφθοραί· ἐντεῦθεν δὲ πολὺς ὁ πλοῦτος τῶν κατορθωμάτων, πολλὴ ἡ περιουσία τῆς ἀρετῆς.

Πρὸς δὲ τοῖς εἰρημένοις, οἱ μὲν σωμάτων εὐμόρφων ἐρώντες, καὶ πρὸς τὰς λαμπράς τῶν [302] ὄψεων κεχηνότες, ἂν ὥσιν αἰσχροὶ καὶ δυσειδεῖς, οὐδὲν ἐκ τῆς ἐκείνων ἐπιθυμίας εἰς ἀπαλλαγὴν τῆς οἰκείας κερδαίνουσιν ἀμορφίας, ἀλλὰ καὶ αἰσχροτέροι κρίνονται καὶ εἰδεχθέστεροι· ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ ἔρωτος τούτου τούναντίον ἅπαν. Ὁ γὰρ ψυχῆς ἀγίας ἐρῶν, καὶ εὐμόρφου, καὶ λαμπρᾶς, καὶ περικαλοῦς, κἂν αὐτὸς αἰσχυρὸς ᾗ καὶ δυσειδής, κἂν ἀπάντων ἀνθρώπων αἰσχιστος, ἐμμένων τῷ ἔρωτι τῶν ἀγίων, ταχέως ἔσται τοιοῦτος, οἷος ὁ ἐρώμενος. Καὶ γὰρ καὶ τοῦτο τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ φιланθρωπίας ἔργον, τὸ σῶμα μὲν ἀμορφον καὶ πεπηρωμένον μὴ δύνασθαι διορθοῦν, ψυχὴν δὲ αἰσχυρὰν καὶ δυσειδῆ δύνασθαι λαμπρὰν καὶ περικαλλῆ ποιεῖν. Ἀπὸ γὰρ τῆς εὐμορφίας τῆς ἐκείνου οὐδὲν ἂν γένοιτο κέρδος· ἀπὸ δὲ τοῦ κάλλους τοῦ ταύτης τοσαῦτα ἔξεστι καρπώσασθαι ἀγαθὰ, ὅσα εἰκὸς κεκτῆσθαι τὸν ἐραστὴν ἔχοντα τὸν Θεόν. Περὶ ταύτης τῆς εὐμορφίας καὶ ὁ Δαυὶδ ἐν ψαλμοῖς ᾄδων, Ἄκουσον, φησί, θύγατερ, καὶ ἴδε, καὶ κλῖνον τὸ οὖς σου, καὶ ἐπιλάθου τοῦ λαοῦ σου καὶ τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ πατρός σου, καὶ ἐπιθυμήσει ὁ βασιλεὺς τοῦ κάλλους σου· κάλλος ἐνταῦθα λέγων τὸ κατὰ ψυχὴν, ὅπερ δι' ἀρετῆς καὶ εὐλαβείας συνίσταται.

β'. [303] Ἐπεὶ οὖν τοσοῦτόν ἐστι τὸ κέρδος τοῖς κοινωνοῦσι τῶν ἀγίων, κοινωνήσατέ μοι τοῦ ἔρωτος, καὶ φιλήσωμεν τὸν ἅγιον τοῦτον μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς ὑπερβολῆς. Ἄν γὰρ οὗτος εἰς τὴν ψυχὴν τὴν ἡμετέραν ὁ ἔρως εἰσέλθῃ καὶ φλόγα ἀνάψῃ λαμπρὰν, κἂν ἀκανθῶδες, κἂν λιθῶδες τι καὶ σκληρόν καὶ ἀναίσθητον ἐν τοῖς λογισμοῖς εὖρη τοῖς ἡμετέροις, τὸ μὲν ἀναλώσας, τὸ δὲ μαλάξας, βαθεῖάν τινα καὶ λιπαρὰν ἄρουραν τὴν ἡμετέραν ἐργάσεται ψυχὴν, καὶ πρὸς τὴν τῶν θείων σπερμάτων καταβολὴν ἐπιτηδεῖαν. Καὶ μή μοι λεγέτω τις, ὅτι Νῦν οὐ πάρεστιν, οὐδὲ ὁρᾶται τοῖς ἡμετέροις ὀφθαλμοῖς ὁ Παῦλος· καὶ πῶς δυνατόν φιλεῖν τὸν μὴ βλεπόμενον; Οὐδὲν γὰρ τῷ ἔρωτι τούτῳ κάλυμμα γίνεται· ἔξεστι γὰρ καὶ ἀπελθόντα φιλεῖν, καὶ μὴ ὁρώμενον ἀγαπᾶν, καὶ μάλιστα ὅταν τοσαῦτα καὶ τοιαῦτα τῆς ἀρετῆς ἐκείνου καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν ὑπομνήματα βλέπωμεν, τὰς πανταχοῦ τῆς γῆς Ἐκκλησίας, τῆς ἀσεβείας τὴν

5. Reading καὶ ἐπιθυμήσει (with A), rather than ὅτι ἐπεθύμησεν (with 8 and B).

6. Paul, of course, as in the opening.

7. An introduction of a "problem" that, John insists, is not a problem.

8. ὑπομνήματα, also "reminders." John is playing on the consolation topos of being able to retain love for a deceased person through memories, but he is transferring it to

in a profound peace. From the former comes no benefit, but even great loss of possessions, mindless expenditures, the upending of one's life, and complete destruction of families; but from the latter comes the wealth of good deeds and the profit of virtue.

In addition to what's been mentioned already, people who are enamored of lovely bodies and who ogle at gorgeous faces, [302] if they are themselves shameful and disfigured, gain nothing from their desire for a lovely body that allows them to escape their own disfigurement. But, indeed, they're judged all the more shameful and ugly to look at. Yet it's completely the opposite in the case of spiritual love. Those who love a soul that's holy, lovely, gorgeous and beautiful, even if they're shameful and disfigured and ugliest of all, by remaining in the love of the saints, will quickly become like their beloved. And indeed, this is the work of God's love for us, that while it's impossible to correct a disfigured and maimed body, it is possible to make a soul that is shameful and disfigured gorgeous and beautiful. No gain at all can come from the loveliness of the body, but from the beauty of the soul it's possible to glean the fruit of as many good things as the person who has God as the object of their love can possess. David, too, sang of this kind of loveliness in the Book of Psalms: "*Listen, oh daughter,*" he says, "*and see, and incline your ear, and forget your people and the house of your father, and the king will desire your beauty*" (Ps 44:11–12a).⁵ In saying "beauty" here, he meant the beauty of the soul, which takes its shape from virtue and piety.

2. [303] So then, since partners of the saints have such tremendous gain, join me in partnership with this love, and let's love this saint⁶ to the highest degree possible! For if this love enters into our soul and ignites a shimmering flame, even if it finds in our mind ground that is thorny and rocky (cf. Matt 13:3–8 and pars), or hard and unfeeling, it will destroy the former and soften the latter and, in this way, make our soul a deep and rich place for cultivation, well-suited for the sowing of divine seeds. Let no one tell me, "Paul's not here, nor is he visible to our eyes. How is it possible to love one who is unseen?"⁷ In fact, there's no hindrance at all to this love. After all, one can indeed love a person who's gone away and love one who's not seen. And this is especially the case when we see such numerous and commendable memorials⁸ of his virtue every single day: the churches

what he regards as public monuments to Paul in the success of the Christian proclamation and its imperial institutionalization.

ἀνατροπήν, τοῦ πονηροῦ βίου τὴν ἐπὶ τὸ βέλτιον μεταβολήν, τῆς πλάνης τὴν ἀπαλλαγὴν, τοὺς ἀνατραπέντας βωμούς, τοὺς ἀποκεκλεισμένους ναοὺς, τὴν τῶν δαιμόνων σιγήν. Πάντα γὰρ ταῦτα καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα τῆς Παύλου γλώττης ἢ δύναμις ὑπὸ τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ χάριτος ἐμπνεομένη κατέβαλε, καὶ λαμπρὰν πανταχοῦ τῆς εὐσεβείας ἀνῆψε τὴν φλόγα. "Ἐχομεν μετὰ τῶν κατορθωμάτων τούτων καὶ τὰς ἐπιστολὰς ἐκείνου τὰς ἀγίας, αἱ τὸν χαρακτήρα τῆς μακαρίας ἐκείνης ψυχῆς ἀκριβῶς ἡμῖν ὑπογράφουσιν. Ὡς οὖν αὐτῷ τῷ Παύλῳ διαλεγόμενοι παρόντι καὶ συγγινομένῳ, οὕτω μετὰ προθυμίας πειθώμεθα τοῖς γεγραμμένοις, ἀναπτύξωμεν τὰ ἔνδον εἰρημένα, μάθωμεν τί ποτέ ἐστιν ὅπερ σήμερον ἐβόα λέγων· "Ὁφελον ἀνείχεσθέ μου μικρὸν τῇ ἀφροσύνῃ· ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀνέχεσθέ μου· ζηλῶ γὰρ ὑμᾶς Θεοῦ ζηλῶ. Τί λέγεις, ὦ Παῦλε; ὁ κελεύων τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἐν σοφίᾳ περιπατεῖν πρὸς τοὺς ἔξω, ὁ λέγων, Ὁ λόγος ὑμῶν πάντοτε ἐν χάριτι, ἅλατι ἡρτυμένος, εἰδέναι πῶς δεῖ ὑμᾶς ἐνὶ ἐκάστῳ ἀποκρίνεσθαι· ὁ πᾶσιν ἐπευχόμενος, ἵνα σοφίας πληρωθῶσι πνευματικῆς, αὐτὸς λέγεις, ὅτι Εἴθε ἀνείχεσθέ μου μικρὸν τῆς ἀνοίας; Οὐκ ἔρκει σοι τὸ φθέγγασθαι τι ἀφροσύνης ῥῆμα, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰς τοὺς μαθητὰς τοῦτο ἐκφέρεις; καὶ οὐκ εἰς τοὺς μαθητὰς ἐκφέρεις μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς μετὰ ταῦτα πᾶσι γινομένοις ἀνθρώποις διὰ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς τοῦτο δῆλον ποιεῖς; Ὁρᾶτε πῶς οὐχ ἀπλῶς δεῖ παρατρέχειν τὰ λεγόμενα, ἀλλ' ἕκαστον περισκοπεῖν ἀκριβῶς; Τοῦτο μὲν γὰρ ἀπλῶς μὲν ἀναγινωσκόμενον περίσταται τοῖς ἀκροαταῖς, ἐρευνηθὲν δὲ πολλὴν δείκνυσι τοῦ Παύλου τὴν σοφίαν, μεγάλην τὴν σύνεσιν, ἄφατον τὴν κηδεμονίαν.

γ'. Τί ποτ' οὖν ἐστὶ τὸ λεγόμενον; Ψευδαπόστολοι πολλοὶ ἦσαν παρὰ τοῖς Κορινθίοις, διαφθείροντες αὐτοὺς, κατηγοροῦντες τοῦ Παύλου, ὑπορύττοντες αὐτοῦ τὴν δόξαν, ἣν παρὰ τοῖς μαθηταῖς εἶχεν, εἰς εἰρωνείαν αὐτὸν

9. On John's view of Paul's letters as containing a portrait sketch of the apostle, and of Paul as simultaneously dead and still alive in his words, see *HT*, esp. 34–68.

10. ἀναπτύσσειν, part of the rhetoric Chrysostom uses for finding the "deeper sense" of Scripture.

11. As often, John addresses his author directly, which is meant to (re)create the Pauline presence he has just invoked.

12. 2 Cor 11:1–2, partially paraphrased, with two differences from the previous citation: εἴθε for ὅφελον; τῆς ἀνοίας for τῇ ἀφροσύνῃ.

13. Translating in this way to mark the shift Chrysostom makes to the plural from his second-person singular address to Paul.

14. ἀπλῶς; also "literally."

15. Accepting HS's conjectural reading *προσίσταται* (translated with LSJ II.3.b), as was pointed to by the PE editors in their note, for *περίσταται*, the reading of Mf PE PG. If one accepts the latter textual reading, one might translate with LSJ II.3, "it turns out for the worse in the eyes of the hearers."

all over the earth, the overthrow of impiety, the transformation from a wicked to a better life, the deliverance from error, the altars overturned, the temples shut, the silencing of the demons. It was the power of Paul's tongue, inspired by the grace of the Spirit, that brought down all these things and others like them, and ignited the bright flame of piety everywhere. And along with these emblems of his success, we have his holy letters, which give us a detailed sketch of the character of that blessed soul. So, as though speaking with Paul himself present and with us,⁹ let's listen eagerly to what he wrote, let's unfurl¹⁰ the things said within them, let's learn what it is that he cries out to us today when he says, "*Would that you would put up with me in a little bit of foolishness. But indeed you do put up with me! For I am zealous for you with God's own zeal*" (2 Cor 11:1–2). "What are you saying, Paul?"¹¹ You who command your disciples to walk in wisdom before the outsiders, you who say, '*Let your word always be gracious, seasoned with salt, to know how you should answer each question*' (Col 4:6), you who pray for all to be filled with spiritual wisdom, you're the one who says, '*If only you would put up with a little lunacy from me*'?¹² And it wasn't enough for you to utter a foolish statement, but you publicize it to your disciples? And not only do you publicize it to your disciples, but through the epistle you make it known also to all the people who come after?" Do you who are listening¹³ see how one shouldn't simply run past the statements that are made, but should examine each of them most carefully? For when this is read at the surface level,¹⁴ it causes offense¹⁵ to the hearers, but when it's carefully investigated, it shows the depth of Paul's wisdom, the magnitude of his intelligence, and the indescribable extent of his solicitous care.¹⁶

3. So then, what does this statement mean? There were many false apostles residing with¹⁷ the Corinthians, corrupting them, hurling accusations against Paul, undermining the reputation he had among his disciples,

16. John introduces the "problem" along with his diagnosis of it (which will lead to the "solution"): the text is only irksome as written if one reads ἀπλῶς, but not if one investigates the text with careful scrutiny (ἐρευνηθέν). As often, John will seek to turn a problem text into a praise of Paul; here, he claims, Paul's adoption of foolishness (ἀφροσύνη) redounds to its exact opposite, his wisdom (σοφία).

17. With παρὰ τοῖς Κορινθίοις (translated with LSJ s.v. παρὰ B.II.2), John is indicating he assumes the false apostles came from elsewhere but were now staying among the Corinthians.

σκάπτοντες, ὡς ἀλαζόνος κατηγοροῦντες. Πρὸς τούτους καὶ διατεινόμενος πολλαχοῦ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς φαίνεται. Καὶ γὰρ ὅταν λέγη, Οὐκ ἔσμεν ὥσπερ οἱ λοιποὶ, καπηλεύοντες τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ· καὶ πάλιν εἰπὼν, Ἀβαρὴ ὑμῖν ἑμαυτὸν ἐτήρησα, καὶ ὑποσχόμενος διαπαντὸς τοῦτον ἀκίνητον διατηρῆσαι τὸν νόμον ("Ἔστι γὰρ, φησὶν, ἀλήθεια Χριστοῦ ἐν ἐμοί, ὅτι ἡ καύχησίς μου αὕτη οὐ φραγῆσεται ἐν τοῖς κλίμασι τῆς Ἀχαΐας), ἐν τῇ τῆς αἰτίας ἐπαγωγῇ ἡνίκα τοὺς μιαροὺς ἐκείνους οὕτως [304] εἰπὼν· Διὰ τί; ὅτι οὐκ ἀγαπῶ ὑμᾶς; Ὁ Θεὸς οἶδεν. Ἀλλ' ὁ ποιῶ, καὶ ποιήσω, ἵνα ἐκκόψω τὴν ἀφορμὴν τῶν θελόντων ἀφορμὴν· καὶ ἀνωτέρω δὲ τούτων παρακαλεῖ τοὺς μαθητάς μὴ καταστῆσαι αὐτὸν εἰς ἀνάγκην τοῦ τὴν οἰκειὰν ἐπιδείξει δύναμιν αὐτοῖς, οὕτως λέγων· Δέομαι δὲ τὸ μὴ παρὼν θαρρῆσαι τῇ πεποιθήσει, ἣ λογίζομαι τολμῆσαι ἐπὶ τινας τοὺς λογιζομένους ἡμᾶς ὡς κατὰ σάρκα περιπατοῦντας. Αὐτοὶ γὰρ οὗτοι, περὶ ὧν ταῦτά φησιν, εἰς εἰρωνείαν αὐτὸν διαβάλλοντες, οὕτως ἔλεγον, ὅτι αἱ μὲν ἐπιστολαὶ Παύλου πολὺν ἔχουσιν ὄγκον καὶ ῥημάτων ἀπόνοιαν, αὐτὸς δὲ οὐδαμινὸς καὶ εὐτελής καὶ ἀπερριμμένος. Ἐπειδὴν γοῦν ἐνταῦθα παραγένηται, οὐδενὸς ἄξιος φαίνεται λόγου· ὅπερ οὖν καὶ αὐτὸ πάλιν ἐμφαίνων ἔλεγεν, "Ἵνα δὲ μὴ δόξω ὡς ἂν ἐκφοβεῖν ὑμᾶς διὰ τῶν ἐπιστολῶν· ὅτι αἱ μὲν ἐπιστολαί, φησὶ, βαρεῖαι καὶ ἰσχυραί, ἡ δὲ παρουσία τοῦ σώματος ἀσθενής, καὶ ὁ λόγος ἐξουθενημένος. Εἴτα αὐτοῖς ἐγκαλῶν τοῖς Κορινθίοις τοῖς ἀναπειθομένοις, φησὶν· "Ἡ ἀμαρτίαν ἐποίησα ἑμαυτὸν ταπεινῶν, ἵν' ὑμεῖς ὑψωθῆτε; Καὶ ἀποδιδόμενος δὲ τὸ ἐγκλημα αὐτὸ ἐκεῖνο πάλιν λέγει· "Ὅτι

18. εἰρωνεία, a much-discussed term in ancient literary criticism. (For references in rhetorical theory see Anderson, *Glossary of Greek Rhetorical Terms*, 39–40, to which one should add the famous and much-contested εἰρωνεία of Socrates.) The term can mean "saying one thing and meaning another," "feigned ignorance," "pretense," and "dissembling" (LSJ). When he defines the term later in this paragraph (PG 51:304), John accents the pretentiousness. He may also have in view the charge against Paul for inconsistency in saying one thing and meaning another, or saying one thing and acting the opposite way (cf. 2 Cor 10:1–11, etc.). The options should be kept in mind.

19. Minus γὰρ before ἔσμεν; with ὥσπερ for ὡς. Note that Chrysostom reads οἱ λοιποὶ (not οἱ πολλοί) here, and also in *Hom. 2 Cor.* 5.2 (PG 61:431), the only other place John cites the verse. The former is the adopted reading of RP, but they note that the witnesses to \mathfrak{M} are split between the two readings, "near-equal alternatives to that appearing in the main Byzantine text" (p. vii).

20. Plus μου after καύχησης and before αὕτη; minus εἰς ἐμέ before ἐν τοῖς κλίμασι, as also in *Hom. 2 Cor.* 23.4 (PG 61:559) and 27.2 (PG 61:585).

21. I.e., the ψευδαπόστολοι.

22. With ἀλλ' ὁ ποιῶ for ὁ δὲ ποιῶ.

23. Here is the definition of εἰρωνεία.

24. The translation takes ὅτι as introducing direct discourse, with John personify-

ridiculing him for dissimulation,¹⁸ and accusing him of being a braggado-cious fool. Paul appears to be addressing them in many places in the letter. For example, he says, “We are not like the rest, peddling the word of God” (2 Cor 2:17).¹⁹ And again he said, “I have kept myself from being a burden to you” (2 Cor 11:9). And he promised to keep this rule unwaveringly and continually, for he said, “It is the truth of Christ in me that this boast of mine will not be stopped in the regions of Achaia” (2 Cor 11:10).²⁰ And after these statements he made a veiled reference to those awful characters²¹ when he addressed the charge in this way: [304] “Why? Because I don’t love you? God knows! But what I am doing I shall also do in the future so I might cut off the opportunity of those who wish an opportunity” (2 Cor 11:11–12).²² And before he said these things he urges his disciples not to put him in a position where he’s compelled to show them his own power, putting it this way, “And I beg you that when present I not have to act boldly using the confidence by which I presume to act boldly against some people who presume that we are walking according to the flesh” (2 Cor 10:2). For the very characters about whom he says these things were calumniating him for dissimulation,²³ saying in effect, “The letters of Paul are filled with much pretention and foolish words, while he himself is a good-for-nothing, lowlife, detestable man” (cf. 2 Cor 10:10).²⁴ And, after all, when these events took place, Paul did appear to be worthy of little regard. He stated this very thing emphatically once again when he said, “Lest I appear to be frightening you with the letters. Because, someone says, ‘his letters are weighty and strong, but the presence of his body is weak, and his oral speech is contemptible’” (2 Cor 10:10).²⁵ Then when bringing an accusation against the Corinthians, who were being led astray, he says, “Or did I commit a sin by humbling myself so you might be exalted?” (2 Cor 11:7). And in clearing himself²⁶ of this very

ing the speech of the ψευδαπόστολοι; it could also grammatically be indirect discourse. Much would depend on voice tone and gestures in the oral delivery, but the impact in any case is to enhance the “problem” that Paul faced at Corinth by revoicing the objection in alternate wording before quoting it directly from Paul’s version in 2 Cor 10:10. While Paul’s personification of the charge of the Corinthian opponent includes a contrast between what might be commendable features of the letters (αἱ ἐπιστολαὶ ... βαρεῖαι καὶ ἰσχυραὶ) in the μέν clause, with disparagement of Paul’s personal presence (παρουσία τοῦ σώματος) and oral speech (λόγος) in the δέ clause (in line with the framing contrast of παρών and ἀπών in 10:1–2, 11), John interprets both parts of the μέν ... δέ as unambiguously negative.

25. Plus δέ after ἵνα and before μὴ δόξω.

26. For this sense of ἀποδύεσθαι, see PGL 5, citing other Chrysostom passages.

οἱοί ἐσμεν δι' ἐπιστολῶν ἀπόντες, τοιοῦτοι καὶ παρόντες τῷ ἔργῳ. Ἐπεὶ οὖν πολλοὶ παρ' αὐτοῖς ἦσαν ψευδαπόστολοι, οὓς καὶ ἐργάτας δολίους καλεῖ, οὕτω λέγων. Οἱ γὰρ τοιοῦτοι ψευδαπόστολοι, ἐργάται δόλιοι, μετασχηματιζόμενοι εἰς ἀποστόλους Χριστοῦ. Καὶ οὐ θαυμαστόν· καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸς ὁ Σατανᾶς μετασχηματίζεται εἰς ἄγγελον φωτός. Οὐ μέγα οὖν, εἰ καὶ οἱ διάκονοι αὐτοῦ μετασχηματίζονται ὡς διάκονοι δικαιοσύνης. Ἐπεὶ οὖν οὗτοι μυρίας εὐρόντες κατ' αὐτοῦ διαβολὰς, τοὺς μαθητὰς ἔβλαπτον, οὐ τὴν προσήκουσαν περὶ αὐτοῦ πείθοντες αὐτοὺς ἔχειν δόξαν, ἀναγκάζεται λοιπὸν εἰς διήγησιν τῶν οἰκείων ἐγκωμίων ἐμπεσεῖν· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἦν τὸ σιγᾶν λοιπὸν ἀσφαλές. Ἐπεὶ οὖν μέλλει τοὺς οἰκείους ἄθλους ἡμῖν ἐξηγεῖσθαι, καὶ τὰς ἀποκαλύψεις, ἃς εἶδε, καὶ τοὺς μόχθους, οὓς ἐμόχθησε, βουλόμενος δεῖξαι πᾶσιν, ὅτι ἄκων καὶ βιαζόμενος τοῦτο ποιεῖ, καὶ ἀνάγκην οὔσαν ὁρῶν, ὅμως ἀφροσύνης αὐτὸ πρᾶγμα ἐκάλεσεν, οὕτως εἰπὼν· "Οφελον ἀνείχεσθέ μου μικρὸν τῇ ἀφροσύνῃ. Μέλλω, φησὶ, πρᾶγμα ἀνόητον ποιεῖν, καὶ ἐγκωμιάζειν καὶ ἐπαινεῖν· ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐγὼ τούτων αἷτιος, ἀλλ' οἱ εἰς τοιαύτην με ἀνάγκην ἐμβαλόντες· διὰ τοῦτο παρακαλῶ ὑμᾶς ἀνασχέσθαι, κἀκεῖνοις τὴν αἰτίαν λογίσασθαι.

δ'. Καὶ ὅρα τὴν Παύλου σύνεσιν· εἰπὼν, "Οφελον ἀνείχεσθέ μου μικρὸν τῇ ἀφροσύνῃ· ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀνέχεσθέ μου· ζηλῶ γὰρ ὑμᾶς Θεοῦ ζήλῳ, οὐκ εὐθέως ἦλθεν ἐπὶ τὴν διήγησιν τῶν ἐγκωμίων, ἀλλὰ μεταξὺ πάλιν ἐνθεῖς ῥήματα, οὕτω πῶς φησιν. Πάλιν λέγω, μὴ τίς με δόξῃ ἄφρονα εἶναι· εἰ δὲ μὴ γε, κἂν ὡς ἄφρονα δέξασθέ με. Καὶ οὐδὲ οὕτως ἤψατο τῆς διηγέσεως, ἀλλὰ πάλιν ἐπάγει καὶ λέγει· "Ὁ λαλῶ, οὐ λαλῶ κατὰ Κύριον, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐν ἀφροσύνῃ, ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ ὑποστάσει τῆς καυχέσεως. Καὶ οὐδὲ μετὰ ταῦτα τὰ ῥήματα ἐτόλμησε καθεῖναι, ἀλλὰ πάλιν ὁρμήσας ἀνακρούεται καὶ φησιν· Ἐπειδὴ πολλοὶ καυχῶνται κατὰ τὴν σάρκα, κἀγὼ καυχήσομαι· ἡδέως γὰρ ἀνέχεσθε τῶν ἀφρόνων, φρόνιμοι ὄντες. Εἴτα πάλιν ἀναδύεται καὶ ὀκνεῖ, καὶ ἕτερά τινα εἰπὼν, πάλιν ἐπάγει· Ἐν ᾧ δ' ἂν τις τολμᾷ, ἐν ἀφροσύνῃ λέγω, τολμῶ κἀγώ. Καὶ τότε μόλις [305] μετὰ τοσαύτας προδιορθώσεις κατετόλμησε τῆς διηγέσεως τῶν ἐγκωμίων. Καὶ καθάπερ ἵππος κρημνὸν ἀπότομον

27. Minus τῷ λόγῳ after ἐσμεν and before δι' ἐπιστολῶν.

28. With καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸς for αὐτὸς γὰρ before ὁ Σατανᾶς.

29. In arguing that self-praise is justified when there is a necessity (ἀνάγκη), John is echoing an argument made by Plutarch in *De laude ipsius* (see the fuller analysis in Mitchell, "A Patristic Perspective on Pauline περιαντολογία," 361–63). See also *Laud. Paul.* hom. 5, below.

30. With ἐπειδὴ for ἐπεὶ before πολλοί, though John reads the latter in the next citation of this verse later in this paragraph, in §4 (PG 51:305).

31. For this image of Paul's hesitation and other expressions found in this paragraph that John uses for Paul's boasting in 2 Cor 11–12 (like the rearing horse, the term

charge, again he says, “*Because we are just the same in letters when absent as we are in our actions when present*” (2 Cor 10:11).²⁷ Then, since resident among them were many false apostles, whom he calls “workers of guile” (2 Cor 11:13), he puts it this way: “*For such people are false apostles, workers of guile, disguised as apostles of Christ. And no wonder! For even Satan himself disguises himself as an angel of light. So, it’s not a big surprise if his servants also disguise themselves as servants of righteousness*” (2 Cor 11:13–15).²⁸ Since by inventing countless slanders against him these people were harming his disciples, persuading them not to hold a fitting estimation of him, Paul was compelled finally to fall into recounting his own praises. Because ultimately it wasn’t safe to remain silent. Therefore, when he was going to tell us of his victorious contests and the revelations he saw and the labors he expended, he wanted to show everyone that he does this unwillingly and by compulsion, because he recognized the present necessity.²⁹ Despite all that, he called it a matter of “foolishness,” putting it this way: “*Would that you would put up with me in a little bit of foolishness*” (2 Cor 11:1). “I’m going to do a crazy thing,” he says, “in lauding and praising myself. Yet I am not the cause of this, but rather those who pressed me into this necessity are (cf. 2 Cor 12:11). That’s why I beg you to put up with it and to consider them the cause for it.”

4. Observe Paul’s intelligence. After saying, “*Would that you would put up with me in a little bit of foolishness. But indeed you do put up with me! For I am zealous for you with God’s own zeal*” (2 Cor 11:1–2), he didn’t embark immediately on the recital of praises, but in the interval he again includes such statements as the following when he says, “*Again I say, let no one suppose me to be a fool. And if not, then if you must, receive me as a fool*” (2 Cor 11:16). And not even then did he start in on the recital, but again he advances the point and says, “*What I say I do not say in a fashion suiting the Lord but as in foolishness, in this matter of boasting*” (2 Cor 11:17). And yet he didn’t dare to leave off after these words, but after starting in again, he pulls himself back and says, “*Since many boast according to the flesh, I, too, shall boast. For readily you put up with fools, being wise?*” (2 Cor 11:18–19).³⁰ Then again he shrinks back and hesitates,³¹ and, after mentioning a few other things, he furthers the point again, “*In whatever one might dare—I speak in foolishness—I, too, dare*” (2 Cor 11:21). And then it is only [305] after such anticipatory self-correction that he dared to tell of his praises.

προδιόρθωσις, “anticipatory self-correction”), see *Laud. Paul.* 5.12 (AP 252) below in this volume and Mitchell, “A Patristic Perspective on Pauline περιαντολογία,” 363–64.

ὑπερβαίνειν μέλλων, ὁρμᾷ μὲν ὡς ὑπερβάλλεσθαι μέλλων, τὸ δὲ βάθος ἰδὼν ναρκᾷ καὶ συστέλλεται, εἴτα τὸν ἐπιβάτην ὁρῶν σφοδρότερον ἀναγκάζοντα, πάλιν ἐπιχειρεῖ, καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ τοῦτο πάσχει, καὶ τὴν ἀνάγκην ἐνδεικνύμενος καὶ τὴν βίαν, ἴσταται ἐπὶ πολὺ χρεμετίζων ἐπὶ τοῦ χείλους τῆς φάραγγος, ὅπως παραθαρρύνας ἑαυτὸν κατατολμήσῃ. οὕτω καὶ ὁ μακάριος Παῦλος καθάπερ ἐπὶ κρημνὸν τινα μέλλων ἑαυτὸν ἀφιέναι, τῶν οἰκείων ἐγκωμίων τὴν διήγησιν, καὶ ἅπαξ καὶ δις καὶ τρίς καὶ πολλάκις ἀναδύεται οὕτω λέγων. "Οφελον ἀνείχεσθέ μου μικρὸν τῇ ἀφροσύνῃ· καὶ πάλιν, Μή τις με δόξη ἄφρονα εἶναι· εἰ δὲ μή γε, κἂν ὡς ἄφρονα δέξασθέ με· καὶ, "Ο λαλῶ, οὐ λαλῶ κατὰ Κύριον, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐν ἀφροσύνῃ, ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ ὑποστάσει τῆς καυχήσεως· καὶ πάλιν, Ἐπεὶ πολλοὶ καυχῶνται κατὰ σάρκα, κἀγὼ καυχῆσομαι· ἡδέως γὰρ ἀνέχεσθε τῶν ἀφρόνων, φρόνιμοι ὄντες· καὶ πάλιν, Ἐν ᾧ δ' ἂν τις τολμᾷ, ἐν ἀφροσύνῃ λέγω, τολμῶ κἀγώ. Καὶ μυριάκις ἑαυτὸν ἄφρονα καλέσας καὶ ἀνόητον, τότε μόλις ἐτόλμησεν ἐλθεῖν εἰς τοὺς ἐπαίνους τοὺς ἑαυτοῦ· Ἐβραῖοί εἰσι; κἀγώ· Ἰσραηλῖται εἰσι; κἀγώ· σπέρμα Ἀβραάμ εἰσι; κἀγώ· διάκονοι Χριστοῦ εἰσι; κἀγώ. Καὶ οὐδὲ ἐνταῦθα ἐπελάβετο ἑαυτοῦ, ἀλλὰ πάλιν τίθησι τὴν προδιόρθωσιν, οὕτως ἐπάγων· Παραφρονῶν λαλῶ, ὑπὲρ ἐγώ. Καὶ οὐδὲ ἐνταῦθα ἔστη, ἀλλὰ μετὰ τὸ διηγῆσασθαι πάντα αὐτοῦ τὰ ἐγκώμια, λέγει· Γέγονα ἄφρων καυχώμενος· ὑμεῖς με ἠναγκάσατε. Ὡσεὶ ἔλεγεν, Ἐκείνων μοι λόγος οὐδεὶς ἦν, εἰ τὰ ὑμέτερα ἦν ἐρρωμένα, εἰ μὴ παρετρέπεσθε, μηδὲ ἐσαλεύεσθε. Καὶ γὰρ εἰ διαπαντὸς ἡμᾶς ἔλεγον ἐκεῖνοι κακῶς, οὐδεμία μοι βλάβη διὰ τῆς ἐκείνων ἐγένετο κακηγορίας. Ἐπειδὴ δὲ εἶδον τὸ ποίμνιον διαφθειρόμενον, τοὺς μαθητὰς ἀποπηδῶντας, κατεφρόνησα φορτικοῦ πράγματος καὶ ἐπαχθοῦς, καὶ ἠναγκάσθην ἄφρων γενέσθαι, τὰ ἑμαυτοῦ λέγων ἐγκώμια δι' ὑμᾶς καὶ τὴν ὑμετέραν σωτηρίαν.

ε'. Τοιοῦτον γὰρ τῶν ἀγίων τὸ ἔθος· εἰ μὲν τι πράττειν φαῦλον, ἐκπομπεύουσιν αὐτὸ, καὶ καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν θρηνοῦσι καὶ πᾶσι ποιοῦσι κατάδηλον· εἰ δέ τι γενναῖον καὶ μέγα, ἀποκρύπτουσι καὶ λήθῃ παραπέμπουσιν. Αὐτὸς γοῦν οὗτος ὁ ἅγιος τὰ μὲν ἀμαρτήματα καὶ μηδενὸς βιαζομένου, συνεχῶς ἔστρεφε καὶ ἐξεπόμπευε, νῦν μὲν λέγων, Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς ἦλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἀμαρτωλοὺς σῶσαι, ὧν πρῶτός εἰμι ἐγώ· νῦν δὲ λέγων, Χάριν ἔχω

32. Minus τὴν before σάρκα, in contrast to the previous citation in §4 (PG 51:304).

33. John has replaced παραφρονῶν λαλῶ, ὑπὲρ ἐγώ after διάκονοι Χριστοῦ εἰσι with κἀγώ for symmetry here. That he has the former reading in his biblical text is not in doubt, as he quotes it next and elsewhere in his oeuvre as, e.g., in *Hom. 2 Cor.* 25.1 (PG 61:569); *Hom. Gen.* 11.5 (PG 53:96).

34. This long speech is John's prosopopoeia of Paul's intended meaning and intention in what he wrote.

A horse about to jump across a steep riverbank starts right in when he is about to cross it, but when he sees how deep it is he stops, stiff with fright. And then when he sees his rider all the more fiercely compelling him, he tries again, and he experiences the very same thing. Then, in a display of compulsion and force of his own, he stands a long time, neighing at the edge of the crevasse to spur himself on to dare to do it. In the same way, the blessed Paul, as though he were going to lower himself down a certain precipice—that of telling of his own praises—once, twice, three times and repeatedly shrinks back, saying, “*Would that you would put up with me in a little bit of foolishness* (2 Cor 11:1). And again, “*Let no one suppose me to be a fool. And if not, then if you must, receive me as a fool*” (2 Cor 11:16), and “*What I say I do not say in a fashion suiting the Lord but as in foolishness, in this matter of boasting*” (2 Cor 11:17). And again, “*Since many boast according to the flesh, I, too, shall boast. For readily you put up with fools, being wise!*” (2 Cor 11:18–19).³² And again, “*In whatever one might dare—I speak in foolishness—I, too, dare*” (2 Cor 11:21). After calling himself a fool and a madman countless times, even then he hardly dared to embark on his own praises: “*Are they Hebrews? So am I. Are they Israelites? So am I. Are they seed of Abraham? So am I. Are they servants of Christ? So am I*” (2 Cor 11:22–23).³³ And even here he doesn’t catch himself, but again he adds the anticipatory self-correction when he goes on to say, “*I am speaking out of my mind, how much more I!*” (2 Cor 11:23). Nor did he stop there; but after he’d recited all his praiseworthy deeds, he says, “*I have been a fool by boasting. But you compelled me*” (2 Cor 12:11). It’s as if he’d said, “I wouldn’t have given an account of those things if your affections had been strong, if you hadn’t been turned away, if you hadn’t been shaken. For even if those characters continually spoke ill of us, I wouldn’t have received any harm from their slander. But when I saw the flock being corrupted and my disciples turning away I overlooked the burdensome and offensive nature of the act and I was compelled to become a fool by telling of my own praises—for your sakes and for the sake of your salvation.”³⁴

5. This is the kind of thing the saints customarily do. If they were to do something slightly wrong, they parade it around and rue it every single day and make it manifest to all. But if they do something noble and grand, they hide it and send it off into oblivion. Indeed, this very saint, when it came to his sins, continually harped on them and paraded them around openly, even when no one was forcing him, saying at one point, “*Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners, of whom I am the foremost*” (1 Tim 1:15), and

τῷ ἐνδυναμώσαντί με Χριστῷ, ὅτι πιστόν με ἡγήσατο, θέμενος εἰς διακονίαν τὸν πρότερον ὄντα βλάσφημον καὶ διώκτην καὶ ὑβριστήν· ἀλλ' ἡλεήθην, ὅτι ἀγνοῶν ἐποίησα ἐν ἀπιστίᾳ· καὶ πάλιν, Ἔσχατον δὲ πάντων ὡσπερὶ τῷ ἐκτρώματι ὥφθη ἀμοί· ἐγὼ γάρ εἰμι ὁ ἐλάχιστος τῶν ἀποστόλων, ὃς οὐκ εἰμὶ ἰκανὸς καλεῖσθαι ἀπόστολος, ὅτι ἐδίωξα τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ· καὶ πάλιν, Ἐμοὶ τῷ ἐλαχιστοτέρῳ πάντων ἁγίων ἐδόθη ἡ χάρις αὕτη. Ὅρᾳς πῶς οὐ τῶν ἀποστόλων μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀπλῶς τῶν πιστῶν ἀπάντων ἔσχατον ἑαυτὸν καλεῖ, Ἐμοὶ τῷ ἐλαχιστοτέρῳ, εἰπὼν, πάντων τῶν ἁγίων ἐδόθη ἡ χάρις αὕτη; Οὕτως οὐδὲ [306] τῆς σωτηρίας, δι' ἧς ἐσώθη, ἄξιός εἶναι φησιν· εἰπὼν γὰρ ὅτι Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς ἦλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἁμαρτωλοὺς σῶσαι, ὧν πρῶτός εἰμι ἐγώ· ἄκουσον καὶ διὰ ποίαν αἰτίαν τοῦτο λέγει· Ἀλλὰ διὰ τοῦτο ἡλεήθην, ἵνα ἐν ἐμοὶ πρῶτον ἐνδείξῃται Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς τὴν πᾶσαν μακροθυμίαν πρὸς ὑποτύπωσιν τῶν μελλόντων πιστεύειν ἐπ' αὐτῷ εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον. Ὁ δὲ λέγει, τοῦτό ἐστιν· Οὐ διὰ τὴν ἀξίαν μετέθεσιν τοῦ βίου ἡλεήθην, μὴ τοῦτο νομίσης· ἀλλ' ἵνα μηδεὶς ἀπογνῶ τῶν ἐν κακίᾳ βεβιωκότων, μηδὲ τῶν τῷ Χριστῷ πολεμησάντων, τὸν πάντων ἔσχατον, καὶ μεθ' ὃν οὐδεὶς ἦν ἕτερος οὕτω πολέμιος τῷ Χριστῷ, σωθέντα ὁρῶν. Καὶ ὁ μὲν Χριστὸς φησιν, Ὅτι σκευὸς ἐκλογῆς μοί ἐστι τοῦ βαστάσαι τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐνώπιον ἑθνῶν καὶ βασιλέων· οὗτος δὲ οὐδὲν ὑπὸ τῶν ἐγκωμίων ἐκείνων φυσηθεὶς, μένει ταλανίζων ἑαυτὸν μετὰ τοσαύτην παρρησίαν, πρῶτον τῶν ἁμαρτωλῶν ἑαυτὸν καλῶν, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἡλεῆσθαι λέγων, ἵνα μηδεὶς τῶν πρὸς ἐσχάτην ἐλθλακότην κακίαν ἀπογνῶ τῆς οἰκείας σωτηρίας, πρὸς αὐτὸν καὶ τὴν εἰς αὐτὸν γενομένην φιλανθρωπίαν βλέπων.

ς'. Τὰ μὲν οὖν ἁμαρτήματα, καὶ μηδεμιᾶς οὔσης ἀνάγκης, ἐκπομπεύει καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν ἐν ταῖς ἐπιστολαῖς αὐτοῦ πάσαις, στηλιτεύων καὶ δῆλα ποιῶν οὐχὶ τοῖς τότε μόνον ἀνθρώποις, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς μετὰ ταῦτα ἐσομένοις πᾶσι· τὰ δὲ ἐγκώμια, καὶ ἀνάγκην οὔσαν ὁρῶν, ὅμως ὀκνεῖ καὶ ἀναδύεται

35. Minus Ἰησοῦ τῷ κυρίῳ after Χριστῷ and before ὅτι.

36. With ὅτι for διότι.

37. Plus τῶν before ἁγίων (unlike in the previous quotation in this paragraph).

38. With πρῶτον for πρῶτῳ.

39. Paraphrased (πάντων ἔσχατον for ἔσχατον δὲ πάντων), but an unmistakable reference to what has just been quoted.

40. Minus οὗτος after ἐστι and before τοῦ βαστάσαι (but note οὗτος in the introduction to the δέ clause that follows answering the μὲν).

41. John resumes the μὲν ... δέ contrast he had begun in §5 (PG 51:305, 44), Αὐτὸς γοῦν οὗτος ὁ ἅγιος τὰ μὲν ἁμαρτήματα, but which had gotten away from him in the tumble of examples of Paul's unprompted confessions. Next comes the expected δέ clause: τὰ δὲ ἐγκώμια.

at another, “I give thanks to the one who has empowered me, Christ, because he considered me trustworthy and selected for ministry one who was formerly a blasphemer and persecutor and violent agitator. But I was granted mercy because I acted ignorantly due to my lack of faith” (1 Tim 1:12–13).³⁵ And again, “Last of all, as though to one untimely born, he appeared also to me; for I am the least of the apostles, who am not worthy to be called an apostle, because I persecuted the church of God” (1 Cor 15:8–9).³⁶ And again, “This grace was given to me, the very least of all the saints” (Eph 3:8). Do you see how he calls himself not only the last of the apostles, but fully the last of all the believers when he says, “This grace was given to me, the very least of all the saints” (Eph 3:8)?³⁷ This is how [306] he says he’s not even worthy of the salvation by which he was saved, for he stated, “Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners, of whom I am the foremost” (1 Tim 1:15). Hear also the motivation for why he says this: “But for this reason I was granted mercy: that Jesus Christ might show in me first and foremost his full forbearance as an example for those who are going to believe in him for eternal life” (1 Tim 1:16).³⁸ What he means is this: “I wasn’t granted mercy because I made a worthy change in my life; don’t think that.” This was so that none of those who live wickedly nor even those who wage war against Christ would despair, since they see that the man who was “last of all” (1 Cor 15:8),³⁹ an enemy of Christ whom no one else could match, was saved. Christ even said, “because he is my chosen vessel to bear my name before nations and kings” (Acts 9:15).⁴⁰ But nonetheless this man, not at all inflated by those praises, continues to deprecate himself in such a shockingly bold fashion, calling himself the “foremost of sinners,” and saying he “had been granted mercy” (1 Tim 1:15–16). This was for the very purpose that none of those who’ve been dragged down to the lowest level of wickedness might despair over their own salvation when they look at him and the loving-kindness that was extended to him.

6. So then, when it comes to his sins,⁴¹ even when there’s no necessity to do so, he parades them every single day in all his letters, as though engraving them on a monument⁴² and making them known not only to the people alive then but also to all those who will come afterward. But when it comes to his praises, even when he sees the necessity, neverthe-

42. στήλιτεύειν; see p. 509 n. 47 in the next homily (Hom. Gal. 2:11–14) on Chrysostom’s view of Paul’s letters as public monuments, like those engraved on στήλαι for all later generations to see.

διηγῆσασθαι. Καὶ τοῦτο δῆλον μὲν ἐξ ὧν μυριάκις ἀφροσύνην τὸ πρᾶγμα ἐκάλεσε, δῆλον δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ χρόνου παντός, ὃν ἐσίγησε τὴν θαυμαστὴν καὶ θεῖαν ἀποκάλυψιν ἐκείνην· οὐ γὰρ δὴ τότε, οὐδὲ πρὸ δύο καὶ τριῶν καὶ δέκα ἐτῶν, ἀλλὰ πολλῶ πλείονων ἦν αὐτὴν ἐωρακώς. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ τὸν χρόνον αὐτὸν τίθησιν οὕτω λέγων· Οἶδα ἄνθρωπον πρὸ ἐτῶν δεκατεσσάρων ἀρπαγέντα ἕως τρίτου οὐρανοῦ· ἵνα σὺ μάθῃς, ὅτι οὐκ ἂν οὐδὲ τότε ἐφθέγξατο, εἰ μὴ πολλὴν εἶδεν ἀνάγκην ἐπικειμένην. Εἰ γὰρ ἐβούλετο τοὺς οἰκίους ἐπαίνους διεξιέναι, εὐθέως ἂν αὐτὴν εἶπεν, ὅτε εἶδεν, ἢ τῷ πρώτῳ καὶ δευτέρῳ καὶ τρίτῳ ἔτει· νυνὶ δὲ ἔτη δεκατέσσαρα ἐκαρτέρησε καὶ ἐσίγησε καὶ πρὸς οὐδένα ἐξεῖπεν, ἀλλὰ πρὸς Κορινθίους μόνον. Καὶ πότε; “Ὅτε τοὺς ψευδαποστόλους εἶδεν ἐπιφύεντας, δεικνύς ὅτι οὐδ’ ἂν τότε ἐφθέγξατο, εἰ μὴ τοσαύτην ἑώρα διαφθορὰν ἐν τοῖς μαθηταῖς γενομένην. Ἄλλ’ οὐχ ἡμεῖς οὕτως, ἀλλὰ τοὺναντίον ἅπαν ποιοῦμεν· τῶν μὲν ἀμαρτημάτων οὐδὲ μίαν μεμνήμεθα ἡμέραν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐτέρων μνησθέντων ἀκούσωμεν, ἀγανακτοῦμεν, δυσχεραίνομεν, ὕβριν τὸ πρᾶγμα λογιζόμεθα, μυρίαις αὐτοὺς πλύνομεν λοιδορίαις· εἰ δέ τι μικρὸν ἐργασώμεθα ἀγαθὸν, τοῦτο συνεχῶς στρέφομεν, καὶ τοῖς μεμνημένοις αὐτὸ χάριν ἴσμεν, καὶ φίλους τοὺς τοιοῦτους εἶναι νομίζομεν· καίτοι γε ὁ Χριστὸς τὸ ἐναντίον ἐπέταξε, κατορθωμάτων μὲν ἐπιλελῆσθαι, ἀμαρτημάτων δὲ μεμνησθαι. Καὶ τοῦτο δῆλον μὲν ἡμῖν ἐποίησε καὶ δι’ ὧν τοῖς μαθηταῖς παρήγει λέγων· “Ὅταν πάντα ποιήσητε, λέγετε, ὅτι Ἀχρεῖοι δοῦλοι ἐσμεν· καὶ διὰ τῆς τοῦ Φαρισαίου παραβολῆς, τὸν τελώνην αὐτοῦ προθείς. “Ὡσπερ γὰρ τοῦτον ἡ μνήμη τῶν ἀμαρτημάτων ἐδικαίωσεν, οὕτως ἐκείνον ἡ μνήμη τῶν κατορθωμάτων ἀπόλεσε. Καὶ Ἰουδαίους δὲ ὁ Θεὸς τὰ αὐτὰ δὴ ταῦτα παραινεῖ, λέγων [307] οὕτως· Ἐγὼ εἰμι αὐτὸς ὁ ἐξαλείφων τὰς ἀμαρτίας σου, καὶ οὐ μὴ μνησθῶ· σὺ δὲ μνήσθητι.

ζ'. Τοιοῦτον τῶν ἀποστόλων τὸ ἦθος ἦν, τοιοῦτον τῶν προφητῶν καὶ τῶν δικαίων ἀπάντων. Ὁ γοῦν Δαυῖδ τῆς μὲν ἀμαρτίας τῆς ἑαυτοῦ συνεχῶς

43. Ellipses of ἐν Χριστῷ; εἴτε ἐν σώματι οὐκ οἶδα, εἴτε ἐκτὸς τοῦ σώματος οὐκ οἶδα, ὁ θεὸς οἶδεν; and τὸν τοιοῦτον, as marked in the translation.

44. The text of PE PG is syntactically irregular here. HS conjectured the reading ἐργασώμεθα (after εἰ); the PE editors in a note suggest reading ἂν ... ἐργασώμεθα. We adopt a conjectural reading for the conditional clause as ἐάν ... ἐργασώμεθα, as translated above.

45. With transposition of ποιήσητε and πάντα; minus (or ellipsis) τὰ διαταχθέντα ὑμῖν before λέγετε; transposition of δοῦλοι ἀχρεῖοι to ἀχρεῖοι δοῦλοι. Chrysostom quotes this verse fifteen times in his oeuvre, always in this form —e.g., *Paenit.* 1.2 (PG 49:280); *Hom. Gen.* 31.2 (PG 53:284), etc.

46. Addition of αὐτός, with the Lucianic text and catenae and Origen sub * (Rahlf's); with τὰς ἀμαρτίας for τὰς ἀνομίας; μνησθῶ for μνησθήσομαι. Elsewhere Chrys-

less he hesitates and shrinks back from telling of them. This is clear from the myriad times he called the act “foolishness” (2 Cor 11:1, 17, 21) and it’s clear from the length of time he remained silent about that marvelous and divine revelation. For certainly at that point it wasn’t two or three or ten years prior that he had seen the revelation, but a great deal longer. The reason he affirmed the precise extent of time, putting it this way, “*I know a man ... who more than fourteen years ago ... was snatched up ... into the third heaven*” (2 Cor 12:2),⁴³ was so you might learn that he wouldn’t ever have uttered a word unless he’d seen an urgently pressing necessity. For if he’d wished to recount his own praises, he would’ve spoken of the vision right away at the time when he had it, or a year or two or three later. But as it was, he held onto it for fourteen years, and remained silent and told it only to the Corinthians, and no one else. And when did he do that? When he saw the false apostles interloping, which shows that he wouldn’t have ever uttered a word if he hadn’t seen such serious corruption taking place among his disciples. Yet we aren’t like this, but we do completely the opposite. When it comes to our sins, we don’t remember them even for the length of a single day, and yet if we hear others mentioning them we’re annoyed, we’re displeased, we consider it an insult, and we dress them down with heaps of abuse. But if we do some tiny good deed,⁴⁴ we continually harp on it, and we’re grateful to those who mention it and consider them friends. And yet Christ commanded us to do the exact opposite: to forget our virtuous deeds and remember our sins. He made this clear to us in the words of advice he gave to the disciples when he said, “*When you do anything, say, ‘We are useless slaves’*” (Luke 17:10),⁴⁵ and also in the parable of the Pharisee, when Christ placed the tax collector ahead of him (cf. Luke 18:9–14). For just as remembrance of sins made the former righteous, so also remembrance of good deeds brought ruin upon the latter. And in fact God advises these same things also to the Jews, saying [307] as follows: “*I am the one who wipes away your sins, and in no way do I remember them. But you, remember!*” (Isa 43:25).⁴⁶

7. Such was the moral disposition of the apostles, such was that of the prophets and all the righteous. David, for instance, made continual men-

ostom cites the verse without αὐτός and with τὰς ἀνομίας in *Paenit.* 7.4 (PG 49:328); *Exp. Ps.* Ψ 129 §3 (PG 55:375); Ψ 144 §3 (PG 55:468). Τὰς ἁμαρτίας here seems both adapted to the context of John’s exhortation and assimilated from the prior verse, Isa 43:24: ἀλλὰ ἐν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις σου καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἀδικίαις σου προέστην σου (the two verses are combined also in the second text cited above from *Exp. Ps.*).

ἐμέμνητο, τῶν δὲ κατορθωμάτων οὐδαμοῦ, πλὴν εἴ ποτε κατηναγκάσθη. "Ὅτε γοῦν ὁ βαρβαρικὸς ἐκεῖνος πόλεμος τὴν Ἰουδαίαν κατέλαβε, καὶ πάντα κινδύνων ἦν μεστὰ, νέος ὢν ἔτι καὶ πολέμων ἄπειρος, καταλιπὼν τὰ πρόβατα, καὶ εἰς τὴν παράταξιν ἐλθὼν, πάντας κατεπτηχότας βλέπων καὶ δεδοικότας καὶ τρέμοντας, οὐδὲν ἔπαθεν ἀνθρώπινον, οὐδὲ ἐγένετο δειλότερος τοὺς οἰκείους τεταπεινωμένους ὁρῶν· ἀλλὰ τῇ πίστει πάντα τὰ βλεπόμενα ὑπερβὰς, καὶ πρὸς τὸν Βασιλέα τῶν οὐρανῶν ἰδὼν, καὶ πολλῆς ἑαυτὸν ἐμπλήσας προθυμίας, προσῆλθε τοῖς στρατιώταις καὶ τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς, ἐπαγγελλόμενος ἀπαλλάσσειν αὐτοὺς τοῦ κατέχοντος κινδύνου. Ὡς δὲ ἐγέλασαν τὸ εἰρημένον οἱ ἀδελφοὶ (οὐ γὰρ ἐώρων τὸν ἔνδον αὐτὸν ἀλείφοντα Θεὸν, οὐδὲ τὴν ψυχὴν τὴν γενναίαν ἐκείνην, καὶ οὐρανομήκη, καὶ πολλῆς γέμουσαν φιλοσοφίας), καταλιπὼν ἐκείνους, πρὸς ἑτέρους ἀπῆλθεν. Ὡς δὲ πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα αὐτὸν εἰσήγαγον, καὶ εὗρεν αὐτὸν ἀποτεθνηκότα τῷ δέει, πρῶτον αὐτοῦ διανίστησι τὸ φρόνημα, οὕτω λέγων· Μὴ συμπεσέτω ἡ καρδιά τοῦ κυρίου μου ἐπ' αὐτόν, ὅτι ὁ δοῦλός σου πορεύσεται καὶ πολεμήσει μετὰ τοῦ ἀλλοφύλου τούτου. Ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἐκεῖνος ἡπίσται λέγων, Οὐ δυνήσῃ πορευθῆναι· σὺ παιδάριον εἶ, αὐτὸς δὲ ἀνὴρ πολεμιστῆς ἐκ νεότητος αὐτοῦ, ἐν ἀπορίᾳ ὢν λοιπὸν ὁ Δαυῖδ ἀναγκάζεται τὰ οἰκεῖα διηγείσθαι ἐγκώμια. "Ὅτι γὰρ οὐκ ἐβούλετο, διὰ τῶν προτέρων ἔδειξεν, οὔτε πρὸς τοὺς ἀδελφούς εἰπὼν τι τῶν αὐτοῦ κατορθωμάτων, οὔτε πρὸς τοὺς στρατιώτας, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ πρὸς αὐτὸν τὸν βασιλέα, ἕως εἶδεν αὐτὸν ἀπιστοῦντα καὶ ἀγωνιῶντα καὶ κωλύοντα τὴν ἔφοδον τὴν κατ' ἐκείνου. Τί γὰρ ἔδει πρᾶξι λοιπόν; σιγῆσαι τὰ ἐγκώμια; Ἀλλ' οὐκ ἂν ἐπέτρεψεν ἀπελθεῖν, οὐδὲ ἀπαλλάξαι τῶν κατεχόντων κινδύνων. Διὰ τοῦτο σιγῆσας ἡνίκα ἔδει, ἐπειδὴ τὸν καιρὸν εἶδε καταναγκάζοντα εἰπεῖν,

47. War with the Philistines.

48. Cf. Heb 11:1–2; 2 Cor 4:13, 18.

49. No version of 1 Kgdms 17/1 Sam 17 has David's brothers laugh at him. But in 17:28–29 Eliab becomes angry with David and accuses him of arrogance (ὕπερηφάνια) and wickedness of heart (καχία τῆς καρδίας).

50. According to 1 Kgdms 16:13, David's brothers were present when David was anointed (καὶ ἔλαβεν Σαμουὴλ τὸ κέρας τοῦ ἐλαίου καὶ ἔχρισεν αὐτὸν ἐν μέσῳ τῶν ἀδελφῶν αὐτοῦ), but John is emphasizing the unseen hand of God, who looks not at appearances, according to 1 Kgdms 16:7, in the anointing by Samuel and the invisible "Spirit of the Lord" that it conferred on David (1 Kgdms 16:13).

51. οὐρανομήκη, a play on 1 Kgdms 16:6–7 and the visible height of David's older brother Eliab. John insists that David, the shortest son, was tall inwardly, in his soul.

52. These episodes to which Chrysostom refers are within the great omission of 1 Kgdms 17:12–31 in Codex Vaticanus (B), verses which clearly John's text has. For the complicated textual history of the entire Saul cycle, see Emanuel Tov, "The Composition of 1 Samuel 16–18 in Light of the Septuagint," in *The Greek and Hebrew Bible*:

tion of his own sin but never of his virtuous deeds, except when he was compelled. For example, when that barbarian war took hold of Judea and everything was full of danger (1 Kgdms 17),⁴⁷ while he was still young and without combat experience, he left the sheep and went onto the front line and saw them all in abject fear, frightened, and trembling (1 Kgdms 17:11, 24). Yet David experienced no mortal fear, nor did he become more frightened when seeing his kinsmen brought low. But by means of faith, transcending all visible realities⁴⁸ and looking toward the King of heaven and filling himself with great zeal for action, he approached the soldiers and his brothers, promising to rescue them from the pressing danger. Yet his brothers laughed at what he said,⁴⁹ for they didn't see God, the one who had anointed him inwardly,⁵⁰ nor that noble soul of his, which was as tall as the heavens⁵¹ and full of tremendous wisdom. So he left them and went off to others (1 Kgdms 17:3).⁵² And when they brought him to the king⁵³ and found him scared to death, the first thing he did was to lift the king's spirits, speaking to him in this way: "*Don't let the heart of my master fall in on him, because your servant will go and do battle with this foreigner*" (1 Kgdms 17:32).⁵⁴ But the king had doubts, saying, "*you'll not be able to go. You're a child, but he is an adult, a warrior since his youth!*" (1 Kgdms 17:33).⁵⁵ Then finally, in these straits, David is compelled to recite his own praises. And yet he showed from what happened previously that he hadn't wanted to do this, since he told neither his brothers nor the soldiers any of his successful exploits, nor even the king himself until he saw the king doubting and in distress and preventing him from going out to attack the foreigner. After all, what was left for him to do? Remain silent about his praiseworthy deeds? But then the king wouldn't have allowed him to head out or to rescue them from the pressing dangers. For this reason, having remained silent when there was a necessity, when he saw that the occasion compelled him to speak, he didn't remain silent but he said to the king: "I,

Collected Essays on the Septuagint, ed. Emanuel Tov, VTSup 72 (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 333–62.

53. 1 Kgdms 17:31 (Lucianic): καὶ ἀνηγγέλσαν ἐνώπιον Σαουλ καὶ παρέλαβον αὐτὸν καὶ εἰσήγαγον πρὸς Σαουλ.

54. Minus δὴ before συμπεσέτω; plus ὅτι before ὁ δοῦλος. The foreigner in question is of course Goliath the Philistine.

55. Minus μὴ after οὐ and before δυνήσῃ; minus/ellipsis of πρὸς τὸν ἀλλόφυλον τοῦ πολεμεῖν μετ' αὐτοῦ, ὅτι; with transposition of παιδάριον εἰ σύ το σὺ παιδάριον εἰ; αὐτὸς δὲ ἀνὴρ for καὶ αὐτὸς ἀνὴρ.

οὐκ ἔτι σιγᾷ, ἀλλὰ φησι πρὸς αὐτόν· Ποιμαίνων ἡμῖν ὁ δοῦλός σου ἐν τῷ ποιμνίῳ τοῦ πατρός μου, καὶ ὅταν ἤρχετο λέων ἢ ἄρκτος, καὶ ἐλάμβανε πρόβατον ἐκ τῆς ἀγέλης, ἐξηρχόμεν κατόπισθεν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐπάτασσον αὐτόν, καὶ ἐξέσπων ἐκ τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐκράτουν τοῦ φάρυγγος αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐθανάτουν αὐτόν· καὶ τὸν λέοντα καὶ τὴν ἄρκτον ἔτυπεν ὁ δοῦλός σου· καὶ ἔσται ὁ ἀλλόφυλος οὗτος καὶ ἀπερίτμητος, ὡς ἐν τούτων. Ὁρᾷς πῶς ἐδήλωσε, τίνος ἕνεκεν εἶπε τὰ οἰκεῖα κατορθώματα; Τότε δὴ, τότε θαρρήσας ὁ βασιλεὺς λοιπὸν ἐκέλευσεν ἀπελθεῖν. Καὶ ἀπῆλθε, καὶ παρετάξατο, καὶ ἐνίκησεν. Εἰ δὲ μὴ ἐγκώμια εἶπεν, οὐκ ἂν αὐτῷ τὴν μονομαχίαν ἐκείνην ἐπίστευσεν ὁ βασιλεὺς· μὴ πιστεύσας δὲ, οὐκ ἂν ἀφῆκεν αὐτόν εἰς τὴν παράταξιν ἀπελθεῖν· μὴ ἀφείδων δὲ, διεκώλυσεν ἂν τὸ κατόρθωμα· τοῦ δὲ κατορθώματος κωλυθέντος, οὔτε ὁ Θεὸς ἂν ἐδοξάσθη τότε, οὔτε ἡ πόλις τῶν ἐπικειμένων ἀπηλλάγη κινδύνων. Ἰν' οὖν μὴ τοσαῦτα γένηται ἄτοπα, μηδὲ οἰκονομίας μέγεθος κωλυθῇ τοσοῦτον, ἡναγκάσθη τοὺς οἰκείους ἄθλους εἰπεῖν ὁ Δαυὶδ. Ὡσπερ γὰρ σιγᾷ ἴσασιν, οὐδεμιᾶς οὔσης ἀνάγκης, οὕτω καὶ λέγειν ἐπίστανται, ἐπειδὴν πολλὴν ἴδωσι βίαν ἐπικειμένην.

η'. Οὐκ ἐπὶ τούτου δὲ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ Σαμουὴλ [308] τὸ αὐτὸ τοῦτο γεγεννημένον ἴδοι τις ἂν. Καὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖνος ἔτη τοσαῦτα προστάς τοῦ δήμου τῶν Ἰουδαίων οὕτως, ὡς ὁ Θεὸς ἤθελε, καὶ μηδὲν μηδέποτε μέγα περὶ ἑαυτοῦ φθεγγάμενος, καίτοι πολλὰ ἔχων, εἶπερ ἐβούλετο, λέγειν, τὴν ἐκ πρώτης ἡλικίας ἀνατροφήν, τὴν ἐν τῷ ναῷ διατριβήν, τὴν ἐκ σπαργάνων αὐτοῦ προφητεῖαν, τοὺς μετὰ ταῦτα πολέμους, τὰς νίκας ἃς ἐνίκησεν, οὐχ ὅπλοις χρώμενος, ἀλλὰ μετὰ τῆς εὐνοίας τοῦ Θεοῦ παραταττόμενος, ἐν τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν χρόνοις οὐδὲν τούτων εἶπεν. Ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἔμελλεν ἀφίστασθαι τῆς προστασίας, καὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐγχειρίζειν ἐτέρῳ, τότε λοιπὸν ἡναγκάσθη τὰ ἐγκώμια αὐτοῦ διεξελθεῖν, καὶ ταῦτα ὑφειμένως. Καὶ καλέσας τὸν δῆμον ἅπαντα, παρόντος καὶ τοῦ Σαοὺλ, οὕτω πῶς φησιν· Ἰδοὺ ἤκουσα τῆς φωνῆς ὑμῶν, καὶ ἐβασίλευσα ἐφ' ὑμᾶς βασιλέα· καὶ ἐγὼ ἰδοὺ ἀνέστραμμαι ἐνώπιον ὑμῶν ἐκ νεότητός μου, καὶ ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης, καὶ γεγήρακα. Ἀποκρίθητε κατ' ἐμοῦ ἐνώπιον τοῦ Κυρίου, καὶ ἐνώπιον χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ· μόσχον τίνος

56. ἀπερίτμητος, "uncircumcised."

57. Although introduced as a quotation, there is a host of minor variances: with ἡμῖν for ἡν after ποιμαίνων; minus definite articles before λέων and ἄρκτος; ἐξηρχόμεν for ἐξεπορευόμεν; series of finite verbs in imperfect rather than aorist; minus καὶ ἐπάταξα before καὶ ἐθανάτουν (for ἐθανάτωσα); οὗτος καὶ for ὁ before ἀπερίτμητος.

58. I.e., the prophets, righteous ones and apostles mentioned at the beginning of this paragraph, of whom David is the first example (after Paul).

your servant, was shepherding among the flock of my father, and when a lion or a bear would come and take a sheep from the flock, I would go out after it, strike it down, draw the sheep out of its mouth, seize it by the throat, and kill it. Your servant slew both the lion and the bear; and this foreigner and gentile⁵⁶ will be like one of these!” (1 Kgdms 17:34–36).⁵⁷ Do you see how he showed clearly why it was that he told of his own successful deeds? And indeed, it was then and only then that the king had the confidence finally to command him to head out. And he did head out, and he went to the front lines and was victorious. But if he hadn’t told of his praiseworthy deeds, the king wouldn’t have entrusted him with the man-to-man combat. And if he hadn’t trusted him, he wouldn’t have allowed him to head out to the front lines. And if he hadn’t allowed it, he would’ve prevented the successful deed from taking place. And if the deed had been prevented, then God wouldn’t have been glorified in that moment, nor would the city have escaped the pressing dangers. David was compelled to tell of his own victories in order that such harmful results not ensue, nor the tremendous power of the divine plan be blocked. For just as they⁵⁸ know to remain silent when there’s no compulsion, so, too, do they know to speak when they see a powerful force exerting urgent pressure.

8. And not only was this the case with David, but one can that this same thing happened also with Samuel. [308] Indeed, Samuel presided over the people of the Jews for as many years as God wished, and he never, ever uttered praises of himself. And yet if he’d wished to, he had lots of things to speak of: his rearing from earliest age, his living in the temple, his ability to prophesy from the time he was in diapers, the wars that took place later, and the victories he won, not by using weapons, but because he was well outfitted with divine favor. In earlier times he didn’t say a word about any of these things, but it was at the moment when he was about to relinquish his presiding role and put the rulership in the hands of another⁵⁹ that he was finally compelled to recount his own praises—and at that, in a low-key way. After he summoned all the people, and Saul was there, too, he said something like the following: *“Look, I have heard your voice, and I have put in place a king over you. And look, I have been reared in your presence from my youth up until the present day, and I have become an old man. Answer against me in the presence of the Lord and in the presence of his anointed one. Have I taken a calf that belongs to any of you? Or have I*

59. I.e., Saul (1 Kgdms 11:14–15).

ὕμῶν εἴληφα; ἢ ὄνον τίνος εἴληφα; ἢ τίνα ὑμῶν κατεδυνάστευσα; ἢ τίνα ἐξεπίεσα ὑμῶν; ἢ ἐκ χειρὸς τίνος ὑμῶν εἴληφα ἐξίλασμα ἢ ὑπόδημα, καὶ ἀπέκρυψα τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς μου ἐν αὐτῷ; Εἶπατε κατ' ἐμοῦ, καὶ ἀποδώσω ὑμῖν. Καὶ ποία ἦν ἀνάγκη ταῦτα λέγειν, φησί; Πολλή καὶ μεγάλη. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἄρχοντα ἔμελλεν εἰσάγειν αὐτοῖς τὸν Σαοῦλ, ἐν τῇ καθ' ἑαυτὸν ἀπολογία διδάξει βουλόμενος ἐκεῖνον, πῶς προΐστασθαι δεῖ καὶ κήδεσθαι τῶν ἀρχομένων, αὐτοὺς τοὺς ὑπηκόους μάρτυρας αὐτοῦ τῆς φιλοσοφίας παράγει. Καὶ οὐ ποιεῖ τοῦτο ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τῆς ἀρχῆς, ἵνα μὴ τις εἴπῃ, ὅτι δεδοικότες αὐτὸν καὶ φοβούμενοι, τὰ μὴ ὄντα ἐμαρτύρησαν· ἀλλ' ὅτε παρελύθη τὰ τῆς δημαγωγίας, καὶ εἰς ἕτερον μετέστη τὰ τῆς προστασίας, καὶ κίνδυνος οὐδεὶς ἦν τῷ κατηγοροῦντι λοιπὸν, τότε δικάζεται πρὸς αὐτούς. Καίτοι γε εἰ ἕτερός τις ἦν, ἐμνησικάκησεν ἂν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις, καὶ οὐκ ἂν ἠθέλησε τὸν ἄρχοντα τὸν μετ' αὐτὸν ἐπεικὴ γενέσθαι καὶ μέτριον, οὐ διὰ μνησικακίαν δὲ μόνον, ἀλλ' ἵνα καὶ αὐτὸς ἐπαινῇται μειζόνως.

θ'. Καὶ γὰρ νόσημα τοῦτο δεινὸν τοῖς ἄρχουσιν ἔνεστι· τοὺς μετ' αὐτούς ἐπὶ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐρχομένους εὐχονται φαύλους εἶναι καὶ πονηρούς. Ἄν τε γὰρ γενναῖοι τύχωσιν ὄντες, λαμπροτέρους αὐτοὺς φανείσθαι νομίζουσι, τῶν διαδεξαμένων τὴν ἀρχὴν οὐκ ὄντων τοιούτων· ἂν τε σκαιοὶ καὶ διεφθαρμένοι, ἀπολογίαν τῆς οἰκειᾶς ἔσσεσθαι πονηρίας τοῦ μετὰ ταῦτα ἄρχοντος τὴν κακίαν. Ἀλλ' οὐχ ὁ μακάριος οὗτος τοιοῦτος· ἀλλ' ἠβούλετο καὶ ἠὔχετο καὶ ἐπεθύμει πολλῷ βελτίονος αὐτοὺς ἀπολαῦσαι τῆς προστασίας· οὕτω φιλόστοργος ἦν, οὕτω φθόνου καθαρὸς, οὕτω κενοδοξίας ἀπηλλαγμένος. Καίτοι γε ἐν μόνον ἐξήτει, τῶν ἀνθρώπων τὴν σωτηρίαν. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ τὸν ἄρχοντα αὐτοῖς ἐν τῇ καθ' ἑαυτὸν ἐρρύθμιζεν ἀπολογία. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ τὸ μὲν καλέσαι τὸν βασιλέα

60. With significant variances. Verse 1: with τῆς before φωνῆς; minus εἰς πάντα after φωνῆς ὑμῶν. Verse 2: ellipsis of καὶ νῦν ἰδοὺ ὁ βασιλεὺς ... [first] ἐνώπιον ὑμῶν, and καὶ καθήσομαι ... ἐν ὑμῖν; with καὶ ἐγὼ ἰδοὺ ἀνέστραμμαι for ἀγὰρ ἰδοὺ διελήλυθα; transposition of clauses with γεγῆρακα and ἐνώπιον ... τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης. Verse 3: plus τοῦ before κυρίου; plus ὑμῶν after μόσχον τίνος; with τίνος ὑμῶν κατεδυνάστευσα for τίνα κατεδυνάστευσα ὑμῶν; plus ὑμῶν after ἐξεπίεσα; plus ὑμῶν after ἐκ χειρὸς τίνος; ἢ for καὶ before ὑπόδημα; plus ἀπέκρυψα τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς μου ἐν αὐτῷ after ὑπόδημα; with εἶπατε for ἀποκρίθητε before κατ' ἐμοῦ. Variations from LXX in 1 Kgdms 12:2 result in part from Chrysostom adapting the LXX text to encomiastic expectations, both in terminology (e.g., ἀνέστραμμαι for διελήλυθα) and in the sequence of the standard κεφάλαια, such as καὶ γεγῆρακα, which he has moved into its place in a more natural chronological order. Variations in 1 Kgdms 12:3 are at least in part textual, as shown by similarities with Theodoret, *Quaest.* 16 (PG 80:549): Μόσχον γὰρ, φησὶ, τίνος ὑμῶν εἴληφα; ἢ τίνα ὑμῶν καταδεδυνάστευκα; ἢ τίνα ἐξεπίεσα ὑμῶν; ἢ ἐκ χειρὸς τίνος ὑμῶν εἴληφα ἐξίλασμα, ἢ ὑπόδημα, καὶ ἀπέκρυψα τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς μου ἐν αὐτῷ; εἶπατε κάμοι, καὶ ἀποδώσω ὑμῖν.

taken anyone's ass? Or have I used my power to abuse any of you? Or have I oppressed any of you? Or have I taken a bribe or a sandal from the hand of any of you and hidden my eyes in it? Declare it against me, and I will repay it to you" (1 Kgdms 12:1–3).⁶⁰ What kind of compulsion was there to tell of these things? A huge and great one. For since Samuel was about to introduce Saul as their ruler, he wished to use a speech in defense of himself to instruct Saul about how he should preside and care for those under his rule. By doing this Samuel brought forward those who were under his authority as witnesses of his sage conduct (cf. 1 Kgdms 12:5).⁶¹ And he doesn't do this in the time of his own rulership, lest someone might say that it was because they were terrified and afraid of him that they testified to things that weren't the case. But it was at the very moment when the duties of leading the people had passed on from him and those of presiding were transferred to another, and there was no further risk for someone who brought an accusation, that Samuel pleaded his case before them. And yet, if he were another kind of person, he would've had grievances against the Jews and wouldn't have wished the ruler who came after him to be fair and measured—not only out of resentment, but also so he himself might receive all the more praise.

9. Indeed, this terrible sickness befalls rulers: they pray that the men who assume the rule after them are mean and wicked. If the rulers in question happen to be noble, they think they'll appear all the more illustrious if those who succeed them in ruling aren't as noble as they are; and if they're stupid and corrupt, that the evil behavior of those who rule after them will serve as a defense for their own wickedness. But not so with this blessed and fine man!⁶² On the contrary he wished, prayed, and desired that they would enjoy leadership that was even better than his. This is how loving, uncontaminated by envy, and free of vainglory he was. Indeed, there was only one thing that he continually sought: peoples' well-being.⁶³ That's why in this speech of defense for himself he sought to educate their ruler on their behalf. Because to summon the king and say, "Be fair, measured, and

61. Καὶ εἶπεν Σαμουὴλ πρὸς τὸν λαόν Μάρτυς κύριος ἐν ὑμῖν καὶ μάρτυς χριστὸς αὐτοῦ σήμερον ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ὅτι οὐχ εὐρήκατε ἐν χειρὶ μου οὐθέν. John approves of Samuel's forensic strategy.

62. I.e., Samuel.

63. It is hard to capture the full resonances of σωτηρία for John with just one English equivalent, especially when contexts of military, political, and religious "well-being," "health," "salvation," or "rescue" are all in view.

καὶ εἰπεῖν, Ἐπεικῆς ἔσο καὶ μέτριος καὶ ἀδωροδόκητος, καὶ μηδένα βιάζου, μηδὲ ἀδίκει, μηδὲ πλεονέκτει, φορτικὸν ἦν καὶ ἐπαχθὲς τῷ μέλλοντι ταῦτα ἀκούειν· τὸ δὲ σιγῆσαι πάλιν προδοσία τοῦ δήμου ἐγένετο· ἐν ἀπολογίας προσχῆματι ἀμφότερα ταῦτα κατώρθωσε, ἀκακῆιν ἐδίδαξεν ὅποιον εἶναι χρὴ τὸν βασιλεύοντα, καὶ τὴν ἐκ τοῦ διδάσκειν ἐπάχθειαν ἔφυγε. Καὶ δοκεῖ μὲν ὑπὲρ τῶν [309] καθ' ἑαυτὸν ἀγωνίζεσθαι· παιδεύει δὲ ἐκείνον, πῶς καὶ τίνι τρόπῳ τῶν ἀρχομένων ἐπιμελεῖσθαι χρὴ. Σὺ δέ μοι σκόπει πῶς μετὰ ἀκριβείας ἀπάσης καθαρὸν ἑαυτὸν ἔδειξε λημμάτων. Οὐδὲ γὰρ εἶπε, Μὴ ἀγροὺς τίνος ὑμῶν ἔλαβον; μὴ χρυσίον; ἀλλ' ὁ πάντων εὐτελέστερον ἦν, Μὴ ὑπόδημα; φησίν. Εἴτα καὶ ἑτέραν ἑαυτοῦ πολλὴν ἡμῖν ἐδήλωσεν ἀρετὴν. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ πολλοὶ τῶν ἀρχόντων, ὅταν μὲν κλέπτωσιν, ἐπεικεῖς εἰσι καὶ μέτριοι καὶ προσηνεῖς οὐκ οἴκοθεν, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὴν ἀνάγκην τοῦ συνειδότητος, ἐκ τῶν κλεμμάτων περιηρημένοι τὴν παρρησίαν· οἱ δὲ ἀδωροδόκητοι, φορτικοὶ καὶ ἐπαχθεῖς, οὐδὲ αὐτοὶ πάλιν οἴκοθεν, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ τίνος κενοδοξίας καὶ τοῦ καθαρὸν λημμάτων εἶναι· ἀμφότερα δὲ οὐκ ἂν τις ἴδοι ῥαδίως συνελθόντα εἰς ἓνα· δεῖξαι βουλόμενος ὁ ἅγιος οὗτος, ὅτι ἀμφοτέρων περιεγένετο, καὶ λημμάτων ἐκράτει καὶ ὀργῆς, εἰπὼν, Μὴ μόσχον τινὸς ὑμῶν εἴληφα; οὐκ ἐσίγησεν, ἀλλ' ἐπήγαγεν, Ἡ κατεδυνάστευσά τινα ὑμῶν ἢ ἐξεπίεσα; τοῦτ' ἔστιν, ἐξέθλιψα; Ὁ δὲ λέγει τοιοῦτόν ἐστιν· Οὐδεὶς ἂν ἔχοι τοῦτο εἰπεῖν, ὅτι οὐκ ἔλαβον μὲν, ἐπειδὴ δὲ οὐκ ἔλαβον, φορτικὸς ἐγενόμην καὶ ἐπαχθὴς καὶ ὠμὸς καὶ ἄγριος. Διὰ τοῦτο ἔλεγεν, Ἡ κατεδυνάστευσά τινα ὑμῶν; Τί οὖν ἐκείνοι; Οὔτε κατεδυνάστευσας ἡμᾶς, οὔτε ἐξεπίεσας, οὐδὲ εἴληφας ἐκ χειρὸς ὑμῶν οὐδέν. Καὶ ἵνα μάθῃς, ὅτι καὶ τὸν βασιλέα αὐτὸν παιδεύων ταῦτα ἔλεγεν, ἐπήγαγε· Μάρτυς Κύριος, καὶ μάρτυς ὁ χριστὸς αὐτοῦ· τοῦτο

64. The topic of the qualities of a good king or ruler was a conventional one in ancient philosophy and oratory (see, e.g., Dio Chrysostom, *Or.* 1–4; Philodemus, *De bono rege secundum Homerum*).

65. John seeks to argue that in 2 Cor 11–12 Paul was offering a pretended self-defense for the purpose of fashioning a moral exemplar for others. This neat solution tries to solve both the problem that, if Paul had to address the charges made against him, it might be that he was in fact guilty, and, in turn, the problem of the opprobrium that attaches to self-praise.

66. *παρρησία*, here probably in reference to their standing at the eschatological judgment.

67. Plus *μή* before *μόσχον*; plus *ὑμῶν* after *τίνος*, to effect John's reenactment of Samuel's speech.

68. With transposition of *τίνα* and *κατεδυνάστευσα*; minus *τίνα* before *ἐξεπίεσα*.

69. A lexical gloss by John for a word in the LXX text he assumes his audience may not know (*ἐκπιέζειν*).

70. John presents Samuel as preempting this "problem."

impervious to bribes, and don't do violence or harm or defraud anyone," would be unbearable and offensive to the one who will hear it; but to remain silent once more would be to betray the people. So Samuel solved both problems by means of a pretended speech of self-defense. That way, he both taught Saul what the good king should be like,⁶⁴ and he avoided the offense of being pedantic. So, while he seems [309] to be arguing in defense of himself,⁶⁵ he is actually educating Saul about how and in what way he should care for those who are under his rule. Look at the precise detail Samuel offers to prove he's clean from bribes! For he didn't say, "Did I take fields that belong to any of you?" Or "gold?" No, something that was much less expensive than all these things: "Did I take a 'sandal'?" he says (cf. 1 Kgdms 12:3). Then he revealed yet another of his great virtues to us. Many rulers while they're in the very act of thievery are fair, measured, and gentle, not out of their own nature, but because of the compulsion of their conscience, since they've been stripped of their confidence⁶⁶ because of the thefts. Yet on the other hand, the ones who are impervious to bribes are unbearable and offensive, but again not of their own nature, but due to vainglory and their keeping clean from bribes. And one couldn't readily see in either case how both things could be reconciled in one person. But this holy man wished to demonstrate that he had overcome both faults, having prevailed over both bribes and harsh temperament. Hence after saying, "*Have I taken a calf that belongs to any of you?*" (1 Kgdms 12:3),⁶⁷ he wasn't silent but added, "*Or have I used my power to abuse any of you? Or have I oppressed any of you?*" (1 Kgdms 12:3)⁶⁸—which means, "have I crushed?"⁶⁹ What he meant is something like this: "No one could say that I didn't take anything, but because I hadn't taken anything I became unbearable, offensive, harsh, and rude."⁷⁰ That's why he said, "*Or have I used my power to abuse any of you?*" (1 Kgdms 12:3).⁷¹ And what did they reply? "*You neither used your power to abuse us, nor oppressed us, nor took anything from our hand*" (1 Kgdms 12:4).⁷² And, so you might learn that in saying these things he was instructing the king as well, he added, "*The Lord is witness, and his anointed is witness*" (1 Kgdms 12:5).⁷³ To make this abun-

71. With transposition of *τίνα* and *κατεδυνάστευσα* (as previously in this paragraph).

72. Much paraphrased for this dramatic reenactment, with *οὔτε* for *οὐ* before *κατεδυνάστευσας*; *καὶ οὐκ* for *οὔτε* before *ἐξεπίεσας*; *ἐξεπίεσας* (cf. 12:3) for *ἔθλασας*; plus *ἡμᾶς* after *ἐξεπίεσας*; *καὶ οὐκ* for *οὐδέ* before *εἰληφας*; *ἡμῶν* for *οὐδενός* after *χειρός*.

73. Minus *ἐν ὑμῖν* after *μάρτυς κύριος*; plus *ὁ* before *Χριστός*.

δὲ ἡμῖν αὐτὸ παραδηλῶν καὶ δεικνὺς, ὡς οὐκ ἦν ἡ μαρτυρία κεχαρισμένη, αὐτὸν ἐκάλεσε μάρτυρα τὸν τὰ ἀπόρρητα τῆς διανοίας εἰδότα, ὅπερ ἐστὶ καθαροῦ συνειδότος ἀπόδειξις. Οὐδεὶς γάρ, οὐδεὶς, εἰ μὴ σφόδρα ἦν μεμηνῶς καὶ ἐξεστηκῶς, τοῦ συνειδότος τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ καλέσειεν ἂν ποτε μάρτυρα τὸν Θεόν, εἰ μὴ σφόδρα ἑαυτῷ θαρροίη. Μαρτυρησάντων τοίνυν ἐκείνων ἐπὶ τοῖς εἰρημένοις αὐτῷ, καὶ ἐτέραν ἑαυτοῦ δείκνυσιν αὐτὸς ἀρετὴν· καὶ τῶν παλαιῶν ἀναμνήσας ἀπάντων τῶν κατὰ τὴν Αἴγυπτον, καὶ τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ προστασίας, καὶ τῶν μετ' ἐκείνους πολέμων, ἀναμιμνήσκει τῆς μάχης τῆς ἐπ' αὐτοῦ γενομένης καὶ τῆς νίκης τῆς παραδόξου· καὶ εἰπὼν πῶς πολλάκις διὰ τὰς οἰκειάς ἀμαρτίας τοῖς πολεμίοις παραδοθέντων, ἐκάλεσεν [310] αὐτὸς τὸν Θεόν, καὶ ἀπήλλαξεν αὐτοὺς τῶν πολεμίων, συνάπτων τοῖς παλαιοῖς τὰ νέα, ἐπάγει καὶ λέγει· Ἐξαπέστειλε Κύριος τὸν Ἱεροβάαλ, τὸν Γεδεών, καὶ τὸν Βαράκ, καὶ τὸν Ἰεφθάε, καὶ τὸν Σαμουὴλ, καὶ ἐξείλετο ὑμᾶς κύκλωθεν ἐκ χειρὸς τῶν ἐχθρῶν ὑμῶν, καὶ κατοικεῖτε πεποιοῦτες.

ἰ'. Ὁρᾷς πῶς ἔθος τοῖς ἀγίοις μὴ τὰ ἑαυτῶν κατορθώματα λέγειν, εἰ μὴ ποτε καταναγκασθεῖεν; Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ὁ Παῦλος πρὸς τούτους βλέπων, καὶ παιδευόμενος ἀκριβῶς, ὅτι τὸ αὐτόν τινα περὶ ἑαυτοῦ λέγειν ἐπαχθὲς καὶ φορτικόν, ἔλεγεν· Ὁφελον ἀνείχεσθέ μου μικρὸν τῇ ἀφροσύνῃ· οὐ μέγα, ἀλλὰ μικρὸν τι. Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀνάγκης οὔσης μετὰ δασιλείας ἐκχεῖν ἑαυτὸν εἰς τὴν διήγησιν τῶν ἐγκωμίων παρεσκευάσται, ἀλλὰ διὰ βραχέων αὐτὰ παρατρέχει· καὶ αὐτὸ δὴ τοῦτο δι' ἐκείνους καὶ τὴν ἐκείνων σωτηρίαν. Ὡςπερ γάρ, οὐκ οὔσης ἀνάγκης λέγειν τὰ οἰκεῖα κατορθώματα, ἀνοίας ἐστὶν ἐσχάτης, οὕτως ἀνάγκης ἐπικειμένης καὶ βίας ὠθούσης, πάλιν προδοσία ἐστὶ τὸ σιγᾶν τὰ αὐτῶν πεπραγμένα. Ἄλλ' ὅμως ὁ Παῦλος καὶ ἀνάγκην οὔσαν ὀρῶν, ἀπώκνει, καὶ τὸ πρᾶγμα ἀφροσύνην ἐκάλει, ἵνα μάθῃς αὐτοῦ τὴν σύνεσιν καὶ τὴν σοφίαν καὶ τὴν πολλὴν ἀσφάλειαν. Καὶ γὰρ εἰπὼν, Ὁ λαλῶ, οὐ λαλῶ κατὰ Κύριον, προσέθηκεν, Ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ ὑποστάσει τῆς καυχήσεως. Μὴ νομίσῃς, φησὶ, καθόλου με τοῦτο λέγειν. Ὡστε διὰ τοῦτο αὐτὸν μάλιστα

74. I.e., that the people's response was not just flattery or an act of graciousness to the departing ruler.

75. I.e., when the Hebrews were in Egypt and during the exodus.

76. 1 Kgdms 12:6–10.

77. τὸν Γεδεών is John's addition, modeled on Judg 7:1: Ἱεροβααλ (αὐτός ἐστιν Γεδεών), to clarify the referent of the sobriquet.

78. With ἐξαπέστειλε for ἀπέστειλεν; transposition of ἐκ χειρὸς ἐχθρῶν ὑμῶν τῶν κυκλόθεν to κύκλωθεν [minus τῶν] ἐκ χειρὸς τῶν ἐχθρῶν ὑμῶν.

79. After the biblical exempla of David and Samuel—found also, in much briefer form, in *Laud. Paul.* 5.14 (AP 254–56)—John returns to Paul, and the lemma, as he concludes this homily.

dantly clear and to demonstrate to us that the testimony wasn't gratuitous,⁷⁴ Samuel called upon the one who knows the unexpressed thoughts of the mind as a witness, which is proof of his clean conscience. For nobody—nobody—unless utterly mad and out of their mind, would ever call upon God as witness against their own conscience unless they had tremendous confidence in their own probity. And then, after the people testified to the things he'd said, Samuel showed yet another of his virtues. Having called to mind all the people long ago who were in Egypt and the presiding presence of God,⁷⁵ and the battles that came after that generation, he brings up the battle that took place in his own time and the marvelous victory.⁷⁶ And he told of how repeatedly, when they were handed over to their enemies because of their sins, he himself called upon God [310] and God set them free from their enemies. And then Samuel linked the recent events with those that happened long ago, and went on to say, "*The Lord sent Jerubbaal (Gideon)*⁷⁷ *and Barak, and Jephthah and Samuel, and he rescued you from the hand of your enemies from every direction, and you dwell now in confidence*" (1 Kgdms 12:11).⁷⁸

10. You see how saints customarily don't tell of their own virtuous deeds unless they're compelled? Because of this, Paul, too, having looked at these examples and been carefully instructed that it is offensive and unbearable for any person to praise themselves, said, "*Would that you would put up with me in a little bit of foolishness*" (2 Cor 11:1).⁷⁹ Not a lot, but "*a little bit*." For even when there was a necessity, he wasn't prepared to pour himself into an abundant recital of his praises, but he would run through them in brief. This was for their sake and their well-being.⁸⁰ Just as it's an act of utter lunacy⁸¹ to tell of one's own successful deeds when there's no necessity, so also when there's an urgent necessity and violent threat, it is, I repeat, an act of betrayal to be silent about one's own deeds. But nevertheless, though he saw that the present moment compelled it, Paul hesitated and called the act "foolishness" (cf. 2 Cor 11:1) so you might learn his intelligence, wisdom, and abundant caution. For after saying, "*What I say I do not say in a fashion suiting the Lord*," he added, "*in this matter of boasting*" (2 Cor 11:17). "Don't think," he says, "that I am saying this as a general

80. σωτηρία, or "salvation" (see p. 491 n. 63 above).

81. ἄνοια, the term Chrysostom had substituted for ἀφροσύνη at the outset of the homily in §2 (PG 51:303).

ἐπαινώ καὶ θαυμάζω καὶ σοφώτατον καλῶ, ὅτι πρᾶγμα ἀφροσύνης εἶναι ἐνόμισε τὸ ἑαυτὸν ἐγκωμιάζειν καὶ ἐπαινεῖν. Εἰ δὲ οὗτος ἀνάγκην οὕσαν ὁρῶν, ἀφροσύνην τοῦτο ἐκάλει, τίνος ἂν εἶεν συγγνώμης ἄξιοι, ποίας ἀπολογίας, οἱ μὴδὲ ἀνάγκης οὔσης περὶ ἑαυτῶν λέγοντες μεγάλα, ἢ καὶ ἐτέρους λέγειν καταναγκάζοντες; Ταῦτ' οὖν εἰδότες, μὴ ἐπαινώμεν τὰ λεγόμενα μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ μιμησώμεθα καὶ ζηλώσωμεν, καὶ κατορθωμάτων ἐπιλανθανόμενοι, τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων ἀεὶ μνημονεύωμεν, ἵνα καὶ μετριάξιν δυνώμεθα, καὶ πρὸς τὰ ἔμπροσθεν ἐπεκτεινόμενοι, τὸ βραβεῖον λάβωμεν τῆς ἄνω κλήσεως, χάριτι καὶ φιλανθρωπία τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, μεθ' οὗ τῷ Πατρὶ ἅμα τῷ ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι δόξα, κράτος, τιμὴ, νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ, καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Ἀμήν.

rule.”⁸² Hence it is for this reason especially that I praise and admire Paul and call him the wisest man of all: because he considered heaping encomia and praises on himself to be a matter of “foolishness.” If this man, despite seeing that the present moment compelled it, would call the act “foolishness,” then what kind of excuse or self-defense would there be for those who tell of their great exploits when there’s no necessity, or who even compel others to declare them? Therefore, knowing these realities, let’s not only praise the things that’ve been said, but let’s also imitate and emulate them, and, losing sight of our virtuous deeds, let’s always call to mind our sins, so we might be able to exercise moderation in our speech, as well. And reaching out to the things that lie before us (cf. Phil 3:13), let’s receive “*the prize of the higher calling*” (Phil 3:14), by the grace and loving-kindness of our Lord Jesus Christ, to whom be glory, power, and honor with the Father, together with the Holy Spirit, now and always, and forever and ever. Amen.

82. By this rephrasing Chrysostom has Paul utter the solution to the potential problem—that one might take Paul’s example to indicate that boasting is worthy behavior in all circumstances. John insists, to the contrary, that in 2 Cor 11–12 Paul gave a master class in how and when to boast or not boast. See the same argument in *Laud. Paul.* 5.13–15 (AP 252–56).

Τῇ προτέρᾳ συνάξει ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τῇ καινῇ συναχθεὶς μετὰ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου, ταύτην ἐν τῇ παλαιᾷ εἶπεν εἰς τὴν περικοπὴν τοῦ Ἀποστόλου· «Ὅτε δὲ ἦλθε Πέτρος εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν, κατὰ πρόσωπον

1. Provenance: the Antiochene setting of this homily is universally acknowledged. Mayer, *Provenance*, 511, includes it among homilies she judges to be of “certain provenance.” The title given in the manuscripts is not probative for Mayer, because the authorship and reliability of these titles, and independence of the evidence in the homily itself, cannot be guaranteed (see Mayer, *Provenance*, 319, 379 n. 315). However, there is “clear indication within the homily that another is bishop (§1 [PG 51, 371 3 a.i.–372 9 a.i.]), and that the city is directly linked to events which took place in the book of Acts” (Mayer, *Provenance*, 319 n. 21). Actually, the Acts of the Apostles is not what is in view, but the event to which John refers in §2 (PG 51:374) is the “Antioch incident” recounted by Paul in Gal 2:11–14 (and notably lacking in Acts!): Αὕτη γὰρ τὸν ἀγῶνα ἐδέξατο, αὕτη τὴν μάχην (“This city [Antioch] accepted the contest, this city accepted the battle”). John’s challenge in this homily is to demonstrate that this apparent apostolic conflict—when properly understood—was not a disgrace for the local populace at Antioch but actually a ground for praise, as again in §2 (PG 51:374): Ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς πόλεως ὑμῶν ἐγκώμιον τὰ ῥηθισόμενα (“But the things I shall say even constitute an encomium to your city”). This homily by Chrysostom was already known by Jerome ca. 404, as he refers to it in his *Ep.* 112.6 (CSEL 55:373, ed. Hilberg): *quid dicam de Iohanne, qui dudum in pontificali gradu Constantinopolitanam rexit ecclesiam et proprie super hoc capitulo latissimum exaravit librum, in quo Origenis et ueterum sententiam est secutus?* (“And what should I say about John, who for some time has ruled with pontifical status over the church in Constantinople and appropriately composed a very long work on this passage, in which he has followed the view of Origen and other ancients?”). The present, very lengthy homily fits both the description of *latissimus liber* and offers a solution to the problem of Gal 2:11–14 quite consonant with Jerome’s own. For an analysis of the argument of this homily, see Mitchell, “Peter’s ‘Hypocrisy’ and Paul’s.”

Text: Mf PE (1837) as reprinted by JPM (PG, 1862), containing also Mf’s original text-critical notes (1721) on ME based on his collation of three manuscripts, *Regius* 2343 (= Paris. gr. 759 [X]), *Colbertinus* 970 (= Paris. gr. 748 [XI]) and *Colbertinus* 1030 (= Paris. gr. 768 [XIII]). Most significantly, Mf incorporated in his text (but he did

Hom. Gal. 2:11–14
(*In illud: in faciem ei restiti*)
CPG 4391 (PG 51:371–88)¹

After gathering in worship at the prior liturgical assembly with the bishop in the New Church,² Chrysostom spoke this homily in the Old Church³ on the passage of the apostle, “*But when Peter came*

not indicate this in the notes) the readings of the Constantinopolitan manuscript that arrived too late for HS’s edition but that HS had printed and discussed in his “Notae” (8:732–33). Mf adopted a large number of these readings; see 3:830–31, “*Selecta ex notis H. Savilii, et Frontonis Ducae*,” which lists readings he did not accept, and the general note, “*Variae lectiones hujusce codicis Constantinopolitani, sic ad editionis nostrae numeros aptantur*.” PE (1837) included seven new notes (or additions to Mf’s notes) by the editor, L. de Sinner, to indicate readings from Paris. gr. 748. In the footnotes on the translation below all these textual notes from Mf and PE are included, along with the source of each, and I have included also a few of the significant readings of C (Savile’s designation for the Constantinople manuscript transcribed by Samuel Slade), but by no means exhaustively. Pinakes lists twenty-two manuscripts containing this homily, inclusive of the two manuscripts we are sure were drawn upon by HS, Paris. gr. 759 and Monac. gr. 6, and the other two Paris codices also incorporated by Mf. For the composite nature of HS’s *editio princeps* of this homily, see introduction, pp. 23–24 n. 68.

2. Mayer-Allen, *John Chrysostom*, 18 identify this with the “Great Church”; Kelly, *Golden Mouth*, 57, thinks it is “probably a recent building in the suburbs.” Mayer contests Kelly’s proposal in Mayer-Allen, *Churches of Syrian Antioch*, 76 n. 137, in favor of the “Great Church,” not solely on the information in the title, but on the *prooimion* to the homily.

3. See Mayer-Allen, *Churches of Syrian Antioch*, 100–101. Mayer draws attention to *Hom. princ. Ac. 2.1* (PG 51:77), where Chrysostom referred to the Παλαιά church as “the mother of the Antiochene (Nicene) Christians and the mother of all its churches, adding that it is not just older but also founded by apostolic hands” (*Churches of Syrian Antioch*, 101). It is important to recognize this spatial context to appreciate why John will argue in his homily that Gal 2:11–14 is an especially problematic text there, for it threatens to call into question the claims so insistently proclaimed in and by that place, as well as its people.

αὐτῷ ἀντέστην·» καὶ δείκνυσιν, ὅτι οὐκ ἀντίστασις ἦν, ἀλλ' οἰκονομία τὰ γινόμενα.

α'. [371] Μίαν ὑμῶν ἀπελείφθην ἡμέραν, καὶ ὡς ἐνιαυτὸν ὁλόκληρον ὑμῶν χωρισθεῖς, οὕτως ἀσχάλλων καὶ ἀλύων διετέλουν. Καθάπερ γὰρ παῖς ὑπομάζιος τῆς μητρικῆς θηλῆς ἀποσπασθεῖς, ὅπουπερ ἂν ἀπενεχθῇ, πυκνὰ περιστρέφεται, περιβλεπόμενος τὴν ἑαυτοῦ μητέρα· οὕτω δὴ κἀγὼ τῶν κόλπων τῶν μητρικῶν ἀπενεχθεὶς πορρωτέρω, πυκνὰ περισκόπου, πανταχοῦ τὴν ἁγίαν ὑμῶν ἐπιζητῶν σύνοδον. Πλὴν ἀλλ' εἶχον ἱκανὴν τούτων παραμυθίαν, τῷ πατρὶ φιλοστόργῳ πειθόμενος ταῦτα ἀσχεῖν, καὶ ὁ τῆς ὑπακοῆς μισθὸς τὴν ἀκηδῖαν τὴν ἐπὶ τῷ ξενισμῷ γινομένην ἀπείργε. Τοῦτο γὰρ ἐμοὶ καὶ διαδήματος παν-[372]τὸς λαμπρότερον, καὶ στεφάνου σεμνότερον, τὸ πανταχοῦ μετὰ τοῦ γεγεννηκότος περιάγεσθαι· τοῦτο ἐμοὶ καὶ κόσμος, καὶ ἀσφάλεια· κόσμος μὲν, ὅτι οὕτως αὐτὸν ἐχειρωσάμην, καὶ πρὸς τὸν ἔρωτα ἐπεσπασάμην τὸν ἐμὸν, ὡς μηδαμοῦ μηδέποτε ἀνέχεσθαι χωρὶς τοῦ παιδὸς φαίνεσθαι· ἀσφάλεια δὲ, ὅτι παρὼν καὶ ἀγωνιζόμενον βλέπων, πάντως καὶ τὴν παρὰ τῶν εὐχῶν συμμαχίαν ἡμῖν παρέξει. Καὶ καθάπερ πλοῖον κυβερνητῶν χεῖρες, καὶ οἶακες, καὶ

4. As expected, Chrysostom reads Πέτρος with \mathfrak{M} (instead of $\text{K}\eta\phi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$, with \mathfrak{N} A B C H P Ψ etc., adopted by NA²⁸) in both Gal 2:11 and 14. This means that one possible “solution” to the problem of the two apostles colliding, i.e., that Cephas is a different person from Peter—on which see below, §15 (PG 51:383–84)—is not available to him.

5. This title articulates the “apparent problem” (ἀντίστασις, “opposition”) in language that is resonant with that of the Pauline lemma, Gal 2:11 (ἀντέστην). In this homily Chrysostom will find ingenious ways to deny the “plain sense” of the text, i.e., that there was a conflict between Paul and Peter at Antioch, about which Paul writes later so openly to the Galatians.

6. οἰκονομία has many senses in early Christian texts: “management,” “dispensation,” “divine plan,” “prudent handling of any matter,” “arrangement,” “consideration,” “concession,” “accommodation” (see the lengthy entry in *PGL*). Here it means a combination of the last five glosses, since in this homily John argues that Peter and Paul had prudently “arranged” the pretended fight in advance, and that it was by way of “accommodation” to the “weak” who did not yet understand that the time of observance of the law had passed. See especially below in §13 (PG 51:382), ἀλλ' οὐχὶ τῆς γνώμης, ἀλλὰ τῆς οἰκονομίας τὸ γινόμενον ἦν, and in §20, the conclusion to the homily: Τοῦτο τῆς οἰκονομίας τὸ κέρδος (PG 51:388). On the latter sense, οἰκονομία is roughly synonymous with Chrysostom's other favored term, συγκατάβασις, “accommodating others by lowering oneself to their level and needs,” even as it also means that Peter “accommodated” himself to the plan by his willingness to be rebuked by Paul and remain silent—see especially throughout §§12–13 (PG 51:381–83). Rightly, therefore, does FD double-gloss the term in his Latin translation of the title: *verum ex pacto convento et*

to Antioch, I opposed him to his face” (Gal 2:11)⁴ and he demonstrates that the events were not a matter of opposition,⁵ but strategic accommodation.⁶

1. [371] I was away from you for a single day, and during that time I was as distressed and distraught as if I’d been separated from you for an entire year. And you know this is true from what you yourself also suffered. Just as a nursing child who’s been pulled away from their mother’s nipple twists around frantically looking for her wherever they’re taken, in the same way when I was taken so far away from my mother’s breasts,⁷ I was frantically keeping an eye out, everywhere seeking your holy assembly. However, I had as a considerable consolation for these things the fact that it was at the bidding of my loving father⁸ that I suffered these things, and the reward for my obedience fended off my despondency at our estrangement. For what is more splendid than any diadem [372] and more noble than any crown, in my view, is always to be in the company of the parent who begot us. This is for me both the order of nature and a source of safety. It’s the order of nature,⁹ in that I conquered his affection and so drew him to my love that he wouldn’t ever endure appearing without his child. And it’s a source of safety, in that when he’s present and sees me in the midst of conflict, he’ll always supply his prayers as our ally. The hands of ship captains, and tillers,

per dispensationem, and the translation above follows his lead in that respect. Note also that Paris. gr. 748 adds σοφωτάτη (“the wisest”) to οἰκονομία.

7. Mf notes that one of his manuscripts reads τῶν πατρικῶν here (“my father’s breasts”); PE adds confirmation that that manuscript is Paris. gr. 748. This reference (with the adopted reading) may be an allusion to the epithet of “mother” for Antioch’s “Old Church” (see Mayer-Allen, *Churches of Syrian Antioch*, 101–2; discussion and further references in Shepardson, *Controlling Contested Places*, 20).

8. While he casts the church as his mother, John is referring here to his bishop, Flavian, as his (spiritual) father. As the context will make clear, it was Flavian who the prior week had called away the presbyter, John, from his usual preaching assignment (see Mayer, *Provenance*, 338: “another acts as John’s locum tenens when he is called away by Flavian from normal preaching duties at the *synaxis* prior to *In illud: In faciem ei restiti*”).

9. Translation of κόσμος with LSJ A.1. However, given the role of the στέφανος earlier, one might alternatively translate “adornment.” But here John seems to be characterizing the fictive family relationship with his bishop as replicating the role of natural familial bonded relationships.

ζεφύρου πνοαὶ μετὰ ἀσφαλείας εἰς λιμένα παραπέμπουσιν· οὕτω δὴ καὶ ἡ εὐνοία τούτου, καὶ ἡ ἀγάπη, καὶ ἡ τῶν εὐχῶν βοήθεια, καὶ ζεφύρου καὶ κυβερνήτου κρεῖττον καὶ τῶν οἰάκων κατευθύνει τὸν λόγον ἡμῶν. Ἐμὲ δὲ πρὸς τούτοις κάκεῖνο παρεμυθεῖτο, τὸ λαμ-[373]πρᾶς ὑμᾶς ἀπολαῦσαι τότε τραπέζης, καὶ φιλότιμον καὶ πολυτελῆ τὸν ἐστιάτορα σχεῖν. Ἐγνωμεν δὲ τοῦτο οὐκ ἐξ ἀκοῆς μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐξ αὐτῆς τῆς πείρας. Καὶ γὰρ ἦσαν οἱ διακομίζοντες ἡμῖν τὰ εἰρημένα, καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν λειψάνων ὁλόκληρον τὴν εὐωχίαν ἐστοχασάμεθα. Ἐπήνεσα μὲν οὖν τὸν ἐστιάσαντα, καὶ ἐθαύμασα τῆς πολυτελείας καὶ τοῦ πλούτου· ἐμακάρισα δὲ καὶ ὑμᾶς τῆς εὐνοίας, καὶ τῆς ἀκριβείας, ὅτι μετὰ τοσαύτης φυλακῆς τὰ εἰρημένα κατέχετε, ὥς καὶ ἐτέρῳ διακομίσαι. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἡμεῖς πρὸς τὴν ὑμετέραν ἀγάπην προθύμως διαλεγόμεθα. Ὁ γὰρ καταβάλλων ἐνταῦθα τὰ σπέρματα, οὐ ρίπτει αὐτὰ παρὰ τὴν ὁδόν, οὐδὲ εἰς τὰς ἀκάνθας ἐκχεῖ, οὐδὲ ἐπὶ τὴν πέτραν σπείρει· οὕτω λιπαρὰ καὶ βαθύγειος ὑμῶν ἐστὶν ἡ ἄρουρα, καὶ πάντα εἰς τοὺς οἰκείους δεχομένη κόλπους, πολυπλασιάζει τὰ σπέρματα.

Ἄλλ' εἴπερ ποτὲ προθυμίαν μοι παρέσχετε καὶ πολλὴν σπουδὴν ἐπὶ τὴν ἀκρόασιν, ὥσπερ οὖν αἰεὶ παρεσχέκατε, ταύτην αἰτῶ καὶ τήμερον ἐμοὶ δοῦναι τὴν χάριν. Οὐδὲ μὲν ὑπὲρ τῶν τυχόντων ἡμῖν ἐστὶν ὁ λόγος, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ μεγάλων πραγμάτων. Διόπερ ὀφθαλμῶν δέομαι πανταχόθεν ὁξὺ βλεπόντων, διανοίας διεγερμένης, διανεστηκότος φρονήματος, συντεταμένων λογισμῶν, ψυχῆς ἀγρύπνου καὶ ἐγρηγορίας. Καὶ γὰρ ἠκούσατε τοῦ ἀναγνώσματος πάντες τοῦ ἀποστολικοῦ· καὶ εἴ τις ὁξέως προσέσχε τοῖς ἀναγνωσθεῖσιν, οἶδεν ὅτι μεγάλοι ἡμῖν ἀγῶνες καὶ ἰδρώτες πρόκεινται τήμερον. Ὅτε γὰρ ἦλθε Πέτρος, φησὶν, εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν, κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτῷ ἀντέστην.

10. John is conducting this homily, as well, in the presence of bishop Flavian.

11. Mf notes that two of his manuscripts read κυβερνήτου χειρῶν καὶ οἰάκων, “the hands of a ship captain and tillers,” and, as PE indicates, Paris. gr. 748 adds ταχύτερον, “more quickly.”

12. A reference to the preacher who took his place at the last *synaxis*.

13. C (the Constantinopolitan manuscript): ἐγὼ μὲν αἰεὶ τούτου ἐγγνωμεν δὲ τοῦτο; plus ἀπήλαυσα after πείρας (“Indeed I have always had the enjoyment of this, not only from what was reported to us but also from our own experience”).

14. John is referring to the “feast” of words offered by the guest preacher’s homily while deliberately using language that evokes the Eucharist as well.

15. Mf’s note here reads: *omnes Mss. ὡς καὶ ἐτέρῳθι διακομίσαι* [i.e., “as also to convey it elsewhere”]. *Editi ὡς καὶ ἐτέρῳ διακομίσαι* (the reading adopted and translated above). This note is strange, however, since Mf would have seen in HS’s “*Notae*” (8:733) that C (the Constantinopolitan manuscript) in fact reads ἐτέρῳ here.

and gusts of westerly winds conduct a ship safely into harbor. In the very same way, my spiritual father's goodwill, his love, and the assistance of his prayers set our homily on the right course¹⁰ even more effectively than a westerly wind, ship captain, or tillers.¹¹ And in addition, the fact that at that very moment you were enjoying a splendid [373] banquet and had a lavish and extravagant host¹² was a consolation to me. We know this not only from what was reported to us, but also from our own experience,¹³ for there were people who conveyed to us what was said, and we had a good approximation of the whole feast from its leftovers.¹⁴ Hence I gave praise to the one who hosted and I marveled at his extravagance and riches even as I declared a blessing also on you for your goodwill and close attention, because you held onto what was said with such watchfulness as also to convey it to others.¹⁵ On account of this, we, too, eagerly offer our speech to you, our beloved. Because the one who plants seeds in this church doesn't throw them along the road, or sprinkle them among the thorns, or sow them upon the rock (cf. Matt 13:1–23 and parr.). Your plot of land is so rich and its soil so deep, that, when it receives all the seeds into its billowing hills,¹⁶ it multiplies them.¹⁷

Since on that occasion you provided me with tremendous eagerness and zeal for listening,¹⁸ I ask you to grant me this favor yet again today, just as you've always shown. For our homily isn't on any ordinary topics, but it concerns matters of great magnitude. Therefore, I ask that, all throughout, your eyes be keen of sight, your minds alert, your thoughts awake, your reasoning powers focused, your souls sleepless and vigilant. Indeed, you've all heard the apostolic reading, and if anyone's given keen attention to what was just read, they know that we have great trials¹⁹ and exertions before us today. For, he says, "*when Peter came to Antioch, I opposed him to his face*" (Gal 2:11).²⁰

16. John is playing on the senses of κόλπος, meaning "breast" (as above, the opening metaphor of the nursing child deprived of the mother's breast) and also "any bosom-like hollow," "vale" (LSJ III.3; cf. PGL B).

17. C (the Constantinopolitan manuscript): ὥστε ὑποδέχεσθαι καὶ πολυπλασιάζειν ("so that it receives and multiplies [the seeds]") for καὶ πάντα εἰς τοὺς οἰκίους δεχομένη κόλπους, πολυπλασιάζει.

18. Mf notes that other manuscripts read περί for ἐπί (though there does not seem to be a significant difference in sense).

19. ἀγών: "trial," "contest," "struggle," "battle" (forensic, athletic, and military). See in general LSJ III.1–3. For biblical interpretation as an ἀγών in early Christian writers and "the agonistic paradigm of interpretation," see PC BCH 9, 16, 21, etc.

β'. Ἄρα οὖν οὐ θορυβεῖ ἕκαστον τῶν ἀκουόντων τοῦτο, ὅτι Παῦλος ἀντέστη τῷ Πέτρῳ, ὅτι οἱ στῦλοι τῆς Ἐκκλησίας συγκρούονται καὶ ἀλλήλοις προσπίπτουσι; Στῦλοι γὰρ ὄντως εἰσὶν οὗτοι, τὴν ὁροφὴν τῆς πίστεως ἀνέχοντες καὶ διαβαστάζοντες, καὶ στῦλοι, καὶ πρόβολοι, καὶ ὀφθαλμοὶ τοῦ σώματος τῆς Ἐκκλησίας, καὶ πηγαὶ τῶν ἀγαθῶν, καὶ θησαυροὶ, καὶ λιμένες, καὶ πᾶν ὅπερ ἂν εἴποι τις, οὐδέπω τῆς ἀξίας αὐτῶν ἐφίξεται· ἀλλ' ὅσῳπερ ἂν ᾗ μεγάλα αὐτῶν τὰ ἐγκώμια, τοσοῦτ' αὖ πλείων ἡμῖν ὁ ἀγών. Διανάστητε τοίνυν· ὑπὲρ πατέρων γὰρ ἡμῖν ἐστὶν ὁ λόγος, ὥστε ἀποκρούσασθαι τὰ κατ' ἐκείνων φερόμενα ἐγκλήματα παρὰ τῶν ἔξωθεν, καὶ τῶν τῆς πίστεως ἀλλοτρίων. Ὅτε δὲ ᾗλθε Πέτρος εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν, κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτῷ ἀντέστην, ὅτι κατεγνωσμένος ἦν. Εἶτα καὶ ἡ αἰτία τῆς καταγνώσεως. Πρὸ τοῦ γὰρ ἐλθεῖν τινὰς ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου, μετὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν συνήσθιεν· ὅτε δὲ ᾗλθον, ὑπέστελλε καὶ ἀφώριζεν ἑαυτὸν, φοβούμενος τοὺς ἐκ περιτομῆς. Καὶ συνανекρίθησαν αὐτῷ καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ Ἰουδαῖοι· ὥστε καὶ Βαρναβᾶς συναπήχθη αὐτῶν τῇ ὑποκρίσει. Ἀλλ' ὅτε εἶδον, ὅτι οὐκ ὀρθοποδοῦσι πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ Εὐαγγελίου, εἶπον τῷ Πέτρῳ ἔμπροσθεν πάντων. Καὶ ἄνω λέγει, ὅτι Κατὰ πρόσωπον· καὶ ἐνταῦθα, Ἐμπροσθεν πάντων. Παρατηρεῖτε τοῦτο, τὸ εἰπεῖν, Ἐμπροσθεν πάντων. Εἰ σὺ, Ἰουδαῖος ὑπάρχων. ἐθνικῶς ζῆς, καὶ οὐχὶ Ἰουδαϊκῶς, τί καὶ τὰ ἔθνη ἀναγκάζεις ἰουδαΐζειν;

Τάχα ἐπηνέσατε τὸν Παῦλον [374] τῆς παρρησίας, ὅτι οὐκ ᾗδέσθη τὸ ἀξίωμα τοῦ προσώπου, διὰ τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ Εὐαγγελίου οὐκ ἠρυθρίασε τοὺς παρόντας. Ἀλλ' εἰ καὶ Παύλου ἐγκώμιον τοῦτο, ἡμετέρα δὲ αἰσχύνη γίνεται. Τί γὰρ, εἰ Παῦλος καλῶς ἐποίησεν; Ἀλλ' ὁ Πέτρος κακῶς, εἴ γε οὐκ ὠρθοπόδει. Τί οὖν ἐμοὶ τὸ ὄφελος, ὅταν τῆς ξυνωρίδος θάτερος ἵππος

20. With γάρ for δέ before ᾗλθε.

21. John is deliberately using Paul's language in Gal 2:9, here in reference to Peter (as Paul had used it) and, moreover, to Paul himself.

22. Although lacking in C, Paris. gr. 748, and Paris. gr. 768, Paris. gr. 759 adds καὶ περίβολοι after πρόβολοι and before καὶ ὀφθαλμοί ("bulwarks, retaining walls, the eyes").

23. Chrysostom famously uses this image to refer to the tombs of Peter and Paul at Rome in *Hom. Rom.* 32.2 (PG 60:678): καὶ καθάπερ σῶμα μέγα καὶ ἰσχυρὸν, ὀφθαλμοὺς ἔχει δύο λάμποντας, τῶν ἁγίων τούτων τὰ σώματα (further discussion in HT 122).

24. On the abundant use of epithets in Chrysostom's oeuvre for Paul (and also for Peter), see HT 69–93.

25. The Greek reads simply πατέρων (see PGL A.1–2 on its use for the apostles).

26. For "pagan" criticisms of this passage, see Cook, *Interpretation of the New Testament in Greco-Roman Paganism*, 158–59 (Porphyry), 315–16 (Julian); and Mitchell, "Peter's 'Hypocrisy' and Paul's," esp. 214–17.

2. So then, doesn't it disturb each of you who hears it that Paul opposed Peter? That the pillars²¹ of the church were knocking heads and attacking one another? For truly they are pillars, bearing and holding up the roof of the faith, pillars, bulwarks,²² the eyes of the body of the church,²³ fountains of good things, treasures, and harbors,²⁴ and anything else one might mention still won't meet their true worth. But the more magnificent their praises, the more difficult the trial that's before us. So stay awake! For our homily concerns our fathers in the faith,²⁵ with our goal being to refute the accusations being circulated against them by the outsiders²⁶ and those who are strangers to the faith. *"But when Peter came to Antioch, I opposed him to his face, because he stood condemned"* (Gal 2:11). And then follows the reason for the condemnation: *"For before some people came from James, he used to eat with the gentiles, but when they came, he was withdrawing and separating himself out of fear concerning²⁷ those from the circumcision. And the rest of the Jews were acting the hypocrite with him also, so that even Barnabas was led astray by their hypocrisy. But when I saw that they were not behaving rightly toward the truth of the gospel, I said to Peter in the presence of all"* (Gal 2:11–14).²⁸ Earlier he says, *"to his face"* (Gal 2:11), and here, *"in the presence of all"* (Gal 2:14). Attend carefully to this act of speaking *"in the presence of all"*: *"If you, being a Jew, live like a gentile and not like a Jew, why is it that you compel the gentiles also to live like Jews?"* (Gal 2:14).²⁹

Perhaps you praised Paul [374] for his boldness because he didn't stand in awe of a person's rank, and for the sake of the truth of the gospel he wasn't embarrassed before those who were present? But if this is indeed to Paul's praise, it is to our shame. "Why," one asks, "if Paul acted rightly?" Because then Peter acted wrongly, if he wasn't behaving rightly. What ben-

27. Later, in §14 (PG 51:383) John will argue that φοβούμενος τοὺς ἐκ περιτομῆς should be taken to mean "fear for those from the circumcision" (i.e., grammatically, as an accusative of respect) rather than "fear of" (direct object, as virtually all current English translations take it). On the respective lexical meanings, see LSJ II.5 and 6. Since this is still John's articulation of the "apparent problem," I translate here at the first citation as neutrally as possible ("fear concerning") to allow the reader to see the options play out (but not because I am convinced of John's solution!).

28. συνανεπρίθησαν sic Migne (from PE 3:433), apparently a typo for HS's correct reading, συνυπεπρίθησαν (5:399), as adopted and translated above.

29. With οὐχί for οὐκ, but see the quotation in §18 (PG 51:386) below; plus καί before τὰ ἔθνη.

χωλεύη; Οὐ γὰρ πρὸς Παῦλόν μοι νῦν ὁ λόγος, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τοὺς ἔξωθεν. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ παρακαλῶ προσέχειν. Καὶ γὰρ αὖξω τὴν κατηγορίαν, καὶ μείζονα ποιῶ, ἵνα ἐπιτείνω ὑμῶν τὴν σπουδὴν. Ὁ γὰρ ἀγωνιῶν νήφει, καὶ ὁ δεδοικῶς ὑπὲρ πατρὸς, προσέχει· ὁ ἀκούων τῆς κατηγορίας, ἐπιθυμεῖ δέξασθαι τὴν ἀπολογίαν. Ἄν τοίνυν ἄρξωμαι αὖξειν τὴν κατηγορίαν, μὴ ἀπὸ γνώμης τῆς ἐμῆς νομίσητε εἶναι τὰ λεγόμενα. Βαθύνω γὰρ ὑμῶν τῷ λόγῳ τὴν διάνοιαν, διασκάπτω τὸν νοῦν, ἵνα ἐν τῷ βάθει τὰ νοήματα καταθέμενος, ἄσυλον αὐτῶν ἐργάσωμαι τὴν φυλακὴν. Ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς πόλεως ὑμῶν ἐγκώμιον τὰ ῥηθησόμενα. Αὕτη γὰρ τὸν ἀγῶνα ἐδέξατο, αὕτη τὴν μάχην, μᾶλλον δὲ οὐ τὴν μάχην, ἀλλὰ τὴν δοκοῦσαν μὲν εἶναι μάχην, πάσης δὲ εἰρήνης γενομένην χρησιμωτέραν. Οὐ γὰρ οὕτως ἡμῶν τὰ μέλη πρὸς ἀλλήλα συνέσφιγκται ταῖς τῶν νεύρων περιβολαῖς, ὥς οἱ ἀπόστολοι πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἦσαν συνδεδεμένοι τοῖς τῆς ἀγάπης δεσμοῖς.

γ'. Ἐπηνέσατε τὸν Παῦλον; Ἀκούσατε τοίνυν πῶς κατηγορία ἐστὶ Παύλου τὰ εἰρημένα, ἂν μὴ τὸν ἐναποκεκρυμμένον τοῖς ῥήμασι θηρεύσωμεν νοῦν. Τί λέγεις, ὦ Παῦλε; ἐπετίμησας Πέτρῳ, ὅτε εἶδες οὐκ ὀρθοποδοῦντα πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ Εὐαγγελίου; Καλῶς. Τίνος οὖν ἕνεκεν Κατὰ πρόσωπον; τίνος ἕνεκεν Ἐμπροσθεν πάντων; οὐκ ἔδει ἀμάρτυρον γίνεσθαι τὸν ἔλεγχον; Σὺ δὲ πῶς δημοσιεύεις τὸ δικαστήριον, καὶ πολλοὺς τῆς κατηγορίας μάρτυρας ποιεῖς; καὶ τίς οὐκ ἂν εἴποι, ὅτι ἐξ ἀπεχθείας τοῦτο ποιεῖς, καὶ φθόνου, καὶ

30. This is John's reply to the imagined interlocutor, emphasizing that praise of Paul at Peter's expense is not an option because they are a yoked pair, both of whom are essential to pulling the cart of the church.

31. αὖξάνειν, i.e., employing the rhetorical form of αὖξησις, "amplification." For sources and examples, see Anderson, *Glossary of Greek Rhetorical Terms*, 26–29. John uses αὖξησις in his rhetorical gambit of rendering the problem worse before providing its λύσις ("solution"), thus aiming at a conclusion that is all the more marvelous in overcoming a weightier calamity.

32. John is playing on the coordination of ἀγωνιᾶν and ἀγῶν above (cf. the verb ἀγωνίζεσθαι).

33. γνώμη, or "conviction," a key term for this homily (see below, especially §§13 and 18). In the exposition that follows, John will himself practice the very "pretense" that he argues Paul and Peter engaged in at Antioch, in service of the deeper sense.

34. βαθύνω (cf. βάθος later in the sentence), a use of the present tense for future (Smyth §1879).

35. The PG text represents Mf's emendation of HS's text, βαθύνω γὰρ ὑμῶν τῷ λόγῳ διὰ πάντων τὸν νοῦν, to read, with Paris. gr. 748, βαθύνω γὰρ ὑμῶν τῷ λόγῳ τὴν διάνοιαν, διασκάπτω τὸν νοῦν. Note that C reads διασκάπτων τὸν θεμέλιον τοῦ νοῦ ("excavating the very foundation of the sense").

efit is it to me if either one of my team of horses³⁰ is hobbled? Now, my speech here isn't actually directed at Paul but at "the outsiders." That's why I'm urging you to pay close attention, for I'm going to amplify³¹ the accusation and make it worse, so I might heighten your attention. The person in duress under trial³² stays awake, and the one who is afraid because of his father pays attention. The person who hears the accusation desires to ascertain the line of defense. So now, if I begin to amplify the accusation, don't think the statements made represent my own opinion.³³ For by my homily I'm going to deepen³⁴ your understanding, I'm going to excavate the sense,³⁵ so that by fixing the meanings at this deep level,³⁶ I might safeguard their retention. Yet the things I shall say even redound to the praise of your city!³⁷ This city accepted the contest, this city accepted the battle—or, rather, not the battle, but what appears to be a battle,³⁸ but was actually more beneficial than any peace. Indeed, the members of our bodies aren't as closely tied by the bands of our tendons as the two apostles were bound to one another with the bonds of love.³⁹

3. Did you all praise Paul? Then listen to how these statements constitute an accusation against Paul—unless, that is, we hunt down the meaning hidden in the words. "What are you saying, Paul?"⁴⁰ Did you rebuke⁴¹ Peter when you saw he wasn't behaving rightly '*toward the truth of the gospel*' (Gal 2:14)? Good enough. But why '*to his face*' (Gal 2:11)? Why '*in the presence of all*' (Gal 2:14)? Shouldn't the reproof have taken place without any witnesses? (cf. Matt 18:15). But how is it that you conduct the trial in public instead, and make many witnesses of the accusation?⁴² Who wouldn't say

36. Because the "literal" sense of the passage is so problematic, John will seek out a "deeper," more figurative sense.

37. Antioch, per Gal 2:11, and also the location of John's homily (as discussed above, p. 498 n. 1).

38. As often in the rhetoric of *ζητήματα καὶ λύσεις*, Chrysostom allows that there might *appear* to be a conflict here (*ἡ δοκοῦσα μάχη*) only later to deny it completely by his proposed solution.

39. This is the overriding *πρόθεσις* or thesis of the homily, that John will pronounce proven in the *ἐπίλογος* in §20 (PG 51:388).

40. Here John addresses Paul directly at length, questioning him as though a trial witness.

41. *ἐπιτιμᾶν*, pointedly the same verb used in Jesus's rebuke of Peter in Mark 8:33 (softened in Matt 16:23).

42. John uses a cluster of forensic terms here: *ἐλεγχος*, *δικαστήριον*, *κατηγορία*, *μάρτυρες*.

φιλονεικίας; οὐ σὺ ἤσθα ὁ λέγων, Ἐγενόμην τοῖς ἀσθενέσιν ὡς ἀσθενής; Τί δέ ἐστι, Τοῖς ἀσθενέσιν ὡς ἀσθενής; Συγκαταβαίνων καὶ περιστέλλων αὐτῶν τὰ τραύματα, φησί, καὶ οὐκ ἀφίεις εἰς ἀναισχυντίαν ἐκπεσεῖν. Εἶτα περὶ τοὺς μαθητὰς οὕτω κηδεμῶν καὶ φιλάνθρωπος ὢν, περὶ τὸν συναπόστολον ἀπάνθρωπος ἐγένου; Οὐκ ἤκουσας τοῦ Χριστοῦ λέγοντος, Ὅταν ἀμάρτη ὁ ἀδελφός σου, ὕπαγε, ἔλεγχον αὐτὸν μετὰ σοῦ καὶ αὐτοῦ μόνου; Σὺ δὲ καὶ δημοσίᾳ ἐλέγχεις, καὶ μέγα φρονεῖς ἐπὶ τῷ πράγματι. Ὅτε γὰρ ἦλθε Πέτρος, φησὶν, εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν, κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτῷ ἀντέστην. Καὶ οὐκ ἐλέγχεις δημοσίᾳ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ, καθάπερ ἐν στήλῃ, τοῖς γράμμασι τὴν μάχην ἐγχαράξας, ἀθάνατον ποιεῖς τὴν μνήμην· ἵνα μὴ οἱ τότε παρόντες μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ πάντες οἱ τὴν οἰκουμένην οἰκοῦντες ἄνθρωποι μάθωσι διὰ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς τὸ γεγενημένον. Οὕτω σοι ἐποίησαν οἱ ἀπόστολοι ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις, ὅτε ἀνῆλθες διὰ δεκατεσσάρων ἐτῶν ἀναθέσθαι αὐτοῖς τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον; Οὐ σὺ λέγεις, ὅτι Διὰ δεκατεσσάρων ἐτῶν ἀνέβην, καὶ ἀνεθέμην αὐτοῖς τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον, κατ' ἰδίαν δὲ τοῖς δοκοῦσί τι εἶναι; Τί οὖν; βουλόμενόν σε κατ' ἰδίαν ἀναθέσθαι, ἐκώλυσαν καὶ εἰς μέσον ἤγαγον, καὶ δῆλον ἅπασιν ἐποίησαν; Οὐκ ἔστιν εἰπεῖν. Εἶτα σὺ μὲν κατ' ἰδίαν ἀνατίθης, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἀντιλέγει· τὸν δὲ ἀπόστολον ἐκπομπεύεις; Ἄρα οὖν ἐκεῖ μόνον ταύτης ἀπήλαυσας τῆς εὐνοίας; [375] ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ ὅτε δὲ μυριάδες τοσαῦται Ἰουδαίων ἦσαν, οὐ μετὰ τῆς αὐτῆς ἐχρήσαντό σοι σοφίας; οὐ κατ' ἰδίαν λαβόντες σε ἔλεγον· Θεωρεῖς, ἀδελφέ, πόσαι μυριάδες εἰσὶν Ἰουδαίων τῶν συνεληλυθότων, καὶ οὗτοι πάντες ζηλωταὶ τοῦ νόμου εἰσὶ, καὶ κατήχηνται περὶ σοῦ, ὅτι ἀποστασίαν ἀπὸ τοῦ

43. It is all the worse for Paul to appear to fit this characterization in Gal 2:11–14 given that, as John is acutely aware, later in the same letter (Gal 5:19–21), Paul excoriates precisely these behaviors. Compare the similar argumentative move in *Hom. Gal.* 1.1 (PG 61:612), where Chrysostom acknowledges from the outset: Ἄλλ' ὅτι μὲν θυμοῦ ἢ ἐπιστολὴ γέμει παντὶ που δῆλον καὶ ἐκ πρώτης ἀναγνώσεως (“that the epistle is full of wrath is, I suppose, clear to everyone, even from a first reading”), which is made all the more problematic by the presence of θυμοί in the vice catalogue of Gal 5:20.

44. On the importance of *συγκατάβασις* (“accommodation,” “condescension,” “lowering oneself to the level of another”) for Chrysostom, see Robert C. Hill, “On Looking Again at Synkatabasis,” *Prudentia* 13 (1981): 3–11; on the use of the terminology and concept in early Christian interpretation of 1 Cor 9:19–23, including by Chrysostom, see Mitchell, “Pauline Accommodation and ‘Condescension’ (*συγκατάβασις*),” 197–214.

45. With *ὅταν ἀμάρτη* for *ἐὰν δὲ ἀμαρτήσῃ*; minus *εἰς σέ* before *ὁ ἀδελφός σου*; minus *δέ* before *ἔλεγχον*. Elsewhere Chrysostom cites the verse with *εἰς σέ* in *Hom. Matt.* 60.1 (PG 58:583); *Pecc.* §4 (PG 51:357); *Hom. Matt.* 18:23 §3 (PG 51:20); but also without the prepositional phrase in *Exp. Ps.* Ψ 49 §6 (PG 55:251).

that you do this from enmity, jealousy, and rivalry?⁴³ Weren't you the one who said, '*I have been to the weak as weak*' (1 Cor 9:22)? What does '*to the weak as weak*' mean?" "Accommodating⁴⁴ and binding their wounds," Paul says, "and not allowing them to fall into shameless behavior." "Then were you so solicitous and humane with your disciples, but inhumane to your fellow apostle? Didn't you hear Christ say, '*When your brother sins, reprove him between you and him alone*' (Matt 18:15).⁴⁵ But you both issue the rebuke in public and you boast about doing it! For, you say, '*when Peter came to Antioch, I opposed him to his face*' (Gal 2:11).⁴⁶ And you not only issue the rebuke in public, but you even make the memory of it everlasting by engraving the battle in letters,⁴⁷ as though on a public monument, so that⁴⁸ not only those who were present then, but all the inhabitants of the earth might learn of what had happened through the epistle. Did the apostles in Jerusalem act this way to you, when you went up '*after fourteen years*' to '*set the gospel before them*'? Don't you yourself say, '*After fourteen years ... I went up ... and I set before them the gospel ... privately to those who are thought ... to be something*' (Gal 2:1–6).⁴⁹ Why then was this? When you wished to set it before them '*privately*,' did they prevent it and bring you out in public and reveal it to everyone? One cannot say that. So you set it forth '*privately*' and no one objects, while you in turn make your fellow apostle the object of a public spectacle? And was it only in this case that you enjoyed such goodwill? [375] No indeed. Also, when there were so many thousands of Jews, didn't they⁵⁰ treat you in the same wise manner? Didn't they take you aside privately⁵¹ and say, '*You see, brother, how many thousands of Jews have come together, and these men are all zealous for the law,*⁵² *and they have been*

46. Minus δέ before ἦλθεν. The γάρ is John's addition to knit the text into his argument, presuming the continuing direct address to Paul.

47. John plays here on the meanings of γράμματα as individual alphabetic letters (as in epigraphy on a στήλη, a pillar serving as a public monument) and, in the plural, for an epistle (see LSJ II and III.1).

48. As in *Hom. 1 Cor. 11:19* §1 (PG 51:253–54), where there is a question about whether Paul's ἵνα clause signifies purpose or result, we might ask here about John's usage; both possibilities are likely in view for him (i.e., referring to Paul's intention and its realization).

49. A composite quotation from Gal 2:1, 2, and 6, with ellipses as marked.

50. James and the elders (per Acts 21:18).

51. The text of Acts 21 does not say this explicitly.

52. Here and throughout this homily I translate νόμος as "law" when for Chrysostom it refers to the torah, the law of Moses, viewed by him as a singular construct (as contrasted with νόμοι, "laws," in reference to particular commandments).

νόμου διδάσκεις. Τί οὖν ἐστι; Ποίησον ὃ σοι λέγομεν. Εἰσὶν ἄνδρες ἐν ἡμῖν ἔχοντες εὐχὴν ἐφ' ἑαυτοῖς· τούτους λαβὼν ξύρησαι σὺν αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἀγνίσθητι μετ' αὐτῶν, ἵνα μάθωσιν, ὅτι ὢν κατήχηνται περὶ σοῦ, οὐδέν ἐστιν. Εἶδες πῶς φείδονται σου τῆς ὑπολήψεως; πῶς κρύπτουσί σε τῷ προσωπείῳ τῆς οἰκονομίας ἐκείνης, τῇ θυσίᾳ, τοῖς ἀγνισμοῖς σε περιστέλλοντες; Διὰ τί μὴ τοσαύτην κηδεμονίαν ἐπεδείξω καὶ σύ;

δ'. Ἄλλ' εἰ ἦν ἀληθῶς μάχη τὰ γενόμενα καὶ φιλονεικία, εἶχεν ἂν λόγον τὰ κατηγορήματα ταῦτα· νῦν δὲ οὐκ ἔστι μάχη, ἀλλὰ δοκεῖ μὲν εἶναι, μεγάλην δὲ καὶ τοῦ Παύλου καὶ τοῦ Πέτρου σοφίαν καὶ εὐνοίαν πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἐπιδείκνυται. Πλὴν τέως αὐτῆς τῆς δοκούσης εἶναι κατηγορίας ἀκούσωμεν. Ὅτε δὲ ἦλθε Πέτρος εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν, κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτῷ ἀντέστην. Διὰ τί; Ὅτι κατεγνωσμένος ἦν. Καὶ τίς ὁ τρόπος τῆς καταγνώσεως; Πρὸ τοῦ γὰρ ἐλθεῖν τινὰς ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου, μετὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν συνήσθιεν· ὅτε δὲ ἦλθον, ὑπέστελλε καὶ ἀφώριζεν ἑαυτὸν, φοβούμενος τοὺς ἐκ περιτομῆς. Τί λέγεις; δειλὸς ὁ Πέτρος καὶ ἄνανδρος; οὐ διὰ τοῦτο Πέτρος ἐκλήθη, ἐπειδὴ ἄσειστος ἦν κατὰ τὴν πίστιν; Τί ποιεῖς, ἄνθρωπε; Αἰδέσθητι τὴν προσηγορίαν τοῦ Δεσπότου, ἣν ἔθηκε τῷ μαθητῇ. Δειλὸς ὁ Πέτρος καὶ ἄνανδρος; καὶ τίς σου ταῦτα ἀνέξεται λέγοντος; Οὐ ταῦτα σύνοιδεν αὐτῷ τὰ Ἱεροσόλυμα, καὶ τὸ πρῶτον ἐκεῖνο θέατρον, καὶ ἡ Ἐκκλησία, εἰς ἣν πρῶτος ἐπεπῆδησε, καὶ τὴν μακαρίαν ἐκείνην πρῶτος ἀφῆκε φωνὴν, καὶ εἶπε· Τοῦτον τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀνέστησεν ὁ Θεὸς, λύσας τὰς ὠδῖνας τοῦ θανάτου. Καὶ πάλιν· Οὐ γὰρ Δαυὶδ ἀνέβη εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν. Αὐτὸς δὲ λέγει, φησὶν, Εἶπεν ὁ Κύριος τῷ

53. A mix of exact quotation and paraphrase. Acts 21:20: τῶν συνεληλυθότων for τῶν πεπιστευκότων after Ἰουδαίων; plus οὗτοι before πάντες; εἰσὶ for ὑπάρχουσιν. Acts 21:21: καὶ κατήχηνται for κατηχήθησαν δέ; ἀποστασίαν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου διδάσκεις for ἀποστασίαν διδάσκεις ἀπὸ Μωϋσέως. Acts 21:23: εἰσὶν ἄνδρες ἐν ἡμῖν ἔχοντες εὐχὴν for εἰσὶν ἡμῖν ἄνδρες τέσσαρες εὐχὴν ἔχοντες; ἐφ' ἑαυτοῖς for ἐφ' ἑαυτῶν. Acts 21:24: λαβὼν for παραλαβὼν after τούτους; ξύρησα for ἀγνίσθητι before σὺν αὐτοῖς; paraphrase of καὶ δαπάνησον ... ὢν κατήχηνται. Ellipses as marked.

54. προσωπεῖον, "mask."

55. οἰκονομία here in the sense of accommodation (cf. συγκαταβαίνειν above, and p. 292 n. 37 and p. 500 n. 6) to the requirements of the law, or perhaps to the "arrangement" made on Paul's behalf. (The same multivalence of the term will be in view later in the homily, as, e.g., in §§8, 13, and 20, when John argues his thesis that Peter and Paul did the same thing at Antioch.) See p. 522 n. 108 and p. 533 n. 153 below.

56. περιστέλλειν, the same verb translated "bind" (their wounds) above, §3 (PG 51:374).

57. This is John's counterproposition, which seeks not only to deflect the accusations but also to turn them around into the highest praise for both apostles.

instructed about you that you teach apostasy from the law.... What then should be done?... Do what we tell you. There are men among us who have taken a vow upon themselves. Taking them along, shave yourself with them and be sanctified with them so they might learn that there is nothing to what they were instructed about you’ (Acts 21:20–24).⁵³ Have you seen how they refrain from suspicion of you? How they hide you in the disguise⁵⁴ of that act of accommodation,⁵⁵ cloaking you⁵⁶ in sacrifice and the purification rituals? Why was it that you didn’t show such solicitude as well?”

4. Now, if what took place were truly a battle and a clash of rivals, then these accusations mentioned earlier would be reasonable; but in fact, it’s not a battle. While it appears to be a battle, actually it’s a demonstration of the wisdom of both Paul and Peter, and the goodwill they had toward one another.⁵⁷ Let’s listen now to this statement that seems to constitute an accusation: “*But when Peter came to Antioch, I opposed him to his face*” (Gal 2:11). Why? “*Because he stood condemned*” (Gal 2:11). What is the nature of the condemnation? “*For before some people came from James, he used to eat with the gentiles, but when they came, he was withdrawing and separating himself out of fear of*⁵⁸ *those from the circumcision*” (Gal 2:12). “What are you saying, Paul? Peter was cowardly and unmanly? Was he not named Peter precisely for the fact that he was unshakable in the faith? What are you doing, man? Have some respect for the moniker the Lord gave his disciple (cf. Matt 16:18).⁵⁹ Peter—cowardly and unmanly? Who’ll put up with you saying these things? Did the city of Jerusalem—that first audience⁶⁰—give testimony like this⁶¹ about him? Or did the church, to whose aid he was the first to rush and the first to sound forth with his blessed voice,⁶² when he said, “*This Jesus ... God raised up, destroying the pains of death*” (Acts 2:24)?⁶³ And once more, Peter says, “*For David did not go up into heaven. And David himself says, ‘The Lord said to my Lord, sit at my*

58. John grants this possible interpretation of the phrase φοβούμενος τοὺς ἐκ περιτομῆς (see p. 505 n. 27 above) but will seek to refute it, first on characterological and historical grounds.

59. This verse provides the etymology of the name Πέτρος as πέτρα, “the rock.”

60. Translation of θέατρον with LSJ A.2.

61. Mf notes that two of his manuscripts lack οὐ ταῦτα after λέγοντος and before συνοιδεν.

62. Cf. Acts 2:14: Σταθεὶς δὲ ὁ Πέτρος σὺν τοῖς ἑνδεκά ἐπῆρεν τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ.

63. With τοῦτον τὸν Ἰησοῦν (cf. Acts 2:22) for ὃν; transposition of ὁ θεός and ἀνέστησεν.

Κυρίῳ μου, Κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου, ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθροὺς σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου.

Οὗτος οὖν, εἰπέ μοι, δειλὸς καὶ ἄνανδρος, ὁ τοσούτου φόβου καὶ τοσούτων κινδύνων ἐπικρεμαμένων, μετὰ τοσαύτης παρρησίας πρὸς τοὺς αἰμοβόρους κύνας ἐκείνους, καὶ τῷ θυμῷ ζέοντας ἔτι, καὶ φόνου πνέοντας εἰσελθὼν καὶ εἰπὼν, ὅτι ὁ σταυρωθεὶς ὑπ' αὐτῶν, καὶ ἀνέστη, καὶ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς ἐστι, καὶ ἐκ δεξιῶν κάθηται τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ μυρίοις τοὺς ἐχθροὺς αὐτοῦ περιβάλλει κακοῖς; Ὅτι γὰρ διᾶραι στόμα, ὅτι γὰρ ἀνοῖξαι χεῖλη, ὅτι στήναι, ὅτι φανῆναι μόνον μεταξύ τῶν σταυρωσάντων αὐτὸν ἰσχυρεν, οὐ θαυμάζεις αὐτὸν καὶ στεφανοῖς, εἰπέ μοι; Ποῖος γὰρ λόγος, τίς διάνοια τὴν παρρησίαν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ καὶ τὴν ἐλευθεροστομίαν παραστήσαι δυνήσεται; Οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδεὶς. Εἰ γὰρ πρὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ συνέθεντο οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, ἐάν τις αὐτὸν ὁμολογήσῃ Χριστὸν, ἀποσυνάγωγον ποιεῖν, μετὰ τὸν σταυρὸν καὶ τὴν ταφὴν ἀκούοντες οὐχὶ Χριστὸν ὁμολογοῦντος μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ πᾶσαν ὁμοῦ τὴν οἰκονομίαν μετὰ πάσης φιλοσοφίας ἀνακηρύττοντος, πῶς οὐ διεσπᾶσαντο, καὶ μεληδὸν [376] αὐτὸν διείλοντο πάντες, πρῶτον πάντων τῆς μανίας αὐτῶν κατατολμήσαντα;

ε'. Τὸ γὰρ δὴ μέγα τοῦτο ἐστίν, οὐχ ὅτι Χριστὸν ὡμολόγησεν, ἀλλ' ὅτι πρὸ τῶν ἄλλων ἀπάντων μαινομένων αὐτῶν καὶ οἰδούντων ἀπὸ τοῦ φόνου, ὡμολόγησε μετὰ παρρησίας. Ὡσπερ οὖν ἐν πολέμῳ καὶ παρατάξει, φάλαγγος συμπεφραγμένης, ἐκείνον μάλιστα θαυμάζομεν τὸν πρὸ τῶν ἄλλων πηδῶντα, καὶ τὸ μέτωπον αὐτῆς διαρρηγνύντα (οὐ γὰρ δὴ τούτου μόνου, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν μετὰ ταῦτα ὑφ' ἐτέρων γινομένων κατορθωμάτων οὗτος ἂν εἴῃ πάντων αἴτιος, ὁ τὴν ἀρχὴν καὶ τὴν εἴσοδον παρασχών), οὕτω δὴ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ Πέτρου λογίζεσθαι χρὴ, ὅτι πρῶτος εἰσελθὼν, καὶ τὸ μέτωπον τῆς φάλαγγος τῆς Ἰουδαϊκῆς διαρρήξας, καὶ τὴν μακρὰν ἐκείνην δημηγορίαν κατατείνας, οὕτω

64. With τὸν οὐρανόν for τοὺς οὐρανοὺς; αὐτὸς δὲ λέγει for λέγει δὲ αὐτός.

65. The imperative εἰπέ in the singular may still refer to Paul, or it is shading over into John's address to his own congregation as individuals; the addressees meld in this long section of Chrysostom's interrogative defense of Peter.

66. John gets the theme of Peter's παρρησία from Acts (see 2:29; cf. 4:13).

67. Part of this stereotypical characterization of hostile "Jews" is built on Acts, such as the contention that it was the Jews of Jerusalem who had ultimate responsibility for the crucifixion of Jesus (see τοῦτον τὸν Ἰησοῦν ὃν ὑμεῖς ἐσταυρώσατε in Acts 2:36; 4:10, and, earlier, 2:23; cf. Luke 23:18–23) and who were in a mad frenzy against the Christ-believing "way" (cf. Acts 9:1 of Paul the persecutor ἐμπνέων ἀπειλῆς καὶ φόνου). Other parts are amplified and embellished anti-Judaistic rhetoric going beyond the biblical *topoi*, which John suffuses into his interpretation (such as οἱ αἰμοβόροι κύνες, though perhaps Phil 3:2 is partly in view in this slur).

right hand until I place your enemies under the footstool of your feet” (Acts 2:34–45; Ps 109:1).⁶⁴

So tell me,⁶⁵ was this man cowardly and unmanly? Someone who, with tremendous fear and dangers hanging over him, marched right in and with such great boldness⁶⁶ spoke to those bloodthirsty dogs who were still boiling mad and breathing murder,⁶⁷ and told them that the one who had been crucified by them was raised and is in heaven and sits at the right hand of the Father and surrounds his enemies with countless adversities (cf. Acts 2:24–36)? Tell me, don’t you marvel and honor him with a crown for the fact that he was strong enough to open his mouth, that he was strong enough to part his lips and stand his ground and appear alone in the midst of those who had crucified Christ? What sort of eloquence or intelligence will be able to express the boldness and freedom of speech he exerted on that day? There is none! After all, even before the crucifixion the Jews agreed, “*if anyone confessed him to be the Christ*” (John 9:22) they would force that person out of the synagogue. Then after the crucifixion and the burial, when they hear someone not only confessing Christ, but also proclaiming the entire story of the divine plan with consummate virtue,⁶⁸ how did they all not rip him apart and [376] tear him limb from limb, since he was the first of them all to launch a daring counterattack against their madness?

5. What is especially great isn’t that he confessed Christ, but that he confessed Christ boldly before all the others did, at the moment when the Jews were crazed and inflamed from the murder.⁶⁹ In a battle and on the front line, when a brigade has closed its ranks, we especially admire the man who rushes out before the others and breaks its front line, for surely this man who provides the first step and the inroad is responsible not only for this, but also for all the deeds of valor done later by others.⁷⁰ This is exactly how we should regard what Peter did, too, because by going out first and breaching the Jews’ front line and giving that extensive and lengthy public address (Acts 2:14–36), he thus made an inroad for the rest

68. φιλοσοφία, as always, with multiple resonances for John (see p. 298 n. 64 and p. 424 n. 94). Here it means Peter’s virtuous life and self-controlled demeanor (with PGL B.4.b), but there is also perhaps a hint of the transformation of the unlettered fisherman (cf. Acts 4:13) into one who teaches the message of truth.

69. I.e., the murder of Christ (see p. 512 n. 67).

70. Removing the parentheses in PG (which go back to HS) since the statement is not really parenthetical to the argument. That this results in a long sentence doesn’t make it unusual for Chrysostom.

καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀποστόλοις ἔδωκεν εἴσοδον. Καὶ Ἰωάννης, καὶ Ἰάκωβος, καὶ Παῦλος, καὶ ἄλλος ὅστισοῦν μετὰ ταῦτα μέγα τι ποιῶν φαίνεται, ἀπάντων οὗτος πλεονεκτεῖ, ὁ προοδοποιήσας αὐτῶν τῇ παρρησίᾳ, καὶ διανοίξας τὴν εἴσοδον, καὶ δούς αὐτοῖς, καθάπερ ποταμῷ πολλῷ φερομένῳ ρεύματι, μετὰ πολλῆς ἀδείας ἐπεισελθεῖν, καὶ τοὺς μὲν ἐναντιουμένους παρασύρειν, τῶν δὲ μετ' εὐνοίας ἀκούοντων τὰς ψυχὰς ἄρδεν διηνεκῶς.

Ἄρ' οὖν μετὰ τὸν σταυρὸν τοιοῦτος; πρὸ δὲ τοῦ σταυροῦ οὐ πάντων θερμότερος; οὐχὶ τὸ στόμα τῶν ἀποστόλων ἦν; οὐχὶ πάντων σιγόντων αὐτὸς ἐφθέγγετο; Τίνα με λέγουσιν οἱ ἄνθρωποι εἶναι τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου; φησὶν ὁ Χριστός· καὶ οἱ μὲν Ἠλίαν ἔλεγον, οἱ δὲ Ἰερεμίαν, οἱ δὲ ἓνα τῶν προφητῶν. Ὑμεῖς δὲ τίνα με λέγετε, φησὶν, εἶναι; Εἴτα ἀποκριθεὶς Πέτρος εἶπε· Σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος. Ὑμεῖς, εἶπε, καὶ ἀντὶ πάντων τοῦ σώματος φθέγγεται, οὕτως ἡ γλῶττα τῶν ἀποστόλων Πέτρος ἦν, καὶ ἀντὶ πάντων αὐτὸς ἀπεκρίνατο. Ἄρ' οὖν ἐνταῦθα μόνον τοιοῦτος, ἀλλαχοῦ δὲ καθυφίησι τῆς σπουδῆς; Οὐδαμῶς· ἀλλὰ διὰ πάντων καὶ ἐν πᾶσι τὴν αὐτὴν ἐμφαίνει θερμότητα. Καὶ γὰρ εἰπόντος τοῦ Χριστοῦ· Παραδώσουσι τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, καὶ μαστιγώσουσι, καὶ σταυρώσουσιν, αὐτὸς φησιν· Ἰλεώς σοι, Κύριε· οὐ μὴ ἔσται σοι τοῦτο. Μὴ γὰρ δὴ τοῦτο ἐξετάσωμεν, ὅτι ἀπερίσκεπτος ἡ ἀπόκρισις, ἀλλ' ὅτι γνησίῳ πόθῳ ἦν καὶ ζέοντος. Πάλιν ἀνέβη εἰς τὸ ὄρος, καὶ μετεμορφώθη· ὥφθη μετὰ τὴν Ἠλίαν ἐκεῖ καὶ Μωϋσῆς διαλεγόμενος. Πάλιν κακεῖ ὁ Πέτρος· Εἰ θέλεις, ποιήσωμεν ὧδε τρεῖς σκηνάς.

ς'. "Ορα πῶς ἐφίλει τὸν διδάσκαλον, καὶ σκόπει τὴν ἀκρίβειαν, καὶ τὴν σύνεσιν. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ τότε ἀπλῶς ἀποκριθεὶς ἐπεστομίσθη, ἐνταῦθα τῇ ἐξουσίᾳ τοῦ διδασκάλου ἐπιτρέπει τὸ πρᾶγμα· Εἰ θέλεις, λέγων. Συμβαίνει γὰρ, φησί, καὶ νῦν ἀπερίσκεπτως με πόθῳ κινούμενον εἰπεῖν. "Ὅν οὖν μὴ τὴν αὐτὴν ἐπιτίμησιν δέξεται· Εἰ θέλεις, φησί. Συμπόσιον ἦν ἐκεῖνο πάλιν τὸ ἅγιον καὶ φρικτῶδες· καὶ τότε λέγοντος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ· Εἰς ἐξ ὑμῶν παραδώσει

71. Although citing some of the words verbatim, Chrysostom has provided his own sentence structure (and has also inexplicably left off John the Baptist at the start).

72. ὑμεῖς, plural, for John meaning the group of all the apostles.

73. With John's connective εἴτα replacing δέ; minus Σίμων before Πέτρος.

74. ὑμεῖς, plural, as in Matt 16:15: ὑμεῖς δὲ τίνα με λέγετε εἶναι;

75. Although introduced by John as a quotation, this is a paraphrase, and it is from the third passion prediction (Matt 20:19), rather than the first (Matt 16:21), to which Peter's reply, cited next, is appended.

76. Chrysostom wishes to skirt this "problem."

77. While these are exact words in the Synoptic accounts, it is not precisely clear that John intends them as quotations within his narration.

78. As this succession of quotations shows, Chrysostom engages in strategic

of the apostles as well. If John, or James, or Paul, or any other of them is seen at a later time doing anything great, Peter outdoes them all. This is because he's the one who prepared the way for their boldness and opened up the inroad and allowed them, like a river produced by a mighty stream, to enter without fear and to sweep away the opposing force and continually water the souls of those who listen with goodwill.

So then, he was like this after the crucifixion, right? Yet wasn't he the most fervent of all before the crucifixion? Wasn't he the mouthpiece for the apostles? Didn't he speak when they were all silent? "*Who do people say I, the Son of Man, am?*" Christ says (Matt 16:13). And some were saying, "*Elijah,*" some, "*Jeremiah,*" and some, "*one of the prophets*" (cf. Matt 16:14).⁷¹ "*But who do all of you*"⁷² *say that I am?*" he says (Matt 16:15). Then "*Peter answered and said, 'You are the Christ, the Son of the living God'*" (Matt 16:16).⁷³ "*All of you,*"⁷⁴ Christ said, and then Peter spoke for the entire corps, and thus he was the mouthpiece of the apostles, and it was he who gave the answer for all of them. Or was it only in this instance that Peter was like that, while elsewhere he surrendered this zeal? Not in the least! But in all cases and among all people, he showed the same fervency. For example, when Christ said, "*They will hand over the Son of Man, and they will whip and crucify him*" (cf. Matt 20:19),⁷⁵ Peter said, "*Far be it from you, Lord! No way will this happen to you!*" (Matt 16:22). Now, let's not focus our attention on the fact that his reply was ill-considered,⁷⁶ but rather that it was born of genuine and fiery devotion. Again, "*he went up into the mountain*" (Luke 9:28) and "*he was transfigured*" (Matt 17:2//Mark 9:2),⁷⁷ and he appeared there between Elijah and Moses in active discussion. And here once again is Peter: "*If you wish, let us make three tents*" (Matt 17:4).⁷⁸

6. Look at how Peter loved his teacher, and take note of his precision and intelligence. Because he was muzzled on the earlier occasion when he answered rashly (cf. Matt 16:23), here he turns the matter over to the authority of his teacher, saying, "*If you wish*" (Matt 17:4). "For it happened," he said, "that just now moved by devotion I spoke in a way that was ill-considered." And so, lest he receive another rebuke, he says, "*If you wish*" (Matt 17:4).⁷⁹ And again there was that banquet so holy and full of foreboding. At

harmonization and selective quotation of the three Synoptic accounts of the transfiguration.

79. John is arguing that Peter was chastened by the discussion at Caesarea Philippi (Matt 16:13–28) and applied that learning to the following event, the transfiguration (Matt 17:1–8).

με, πάλιν ὁ Πέτρος διὰ μὲν τὴν ἐπιτίμησιν τὴν ἤδη γενομένην ἐρωτῆσαι τὸν διδάσκαλον οὐκ ἐτόλμησε· διὰ δὲ τὸν πόθον, ὃν εἶχε, σιγῆσαι οὐκ ἠνέσχετο· ἀλλ' ἐσπούδασε καὶ μαθεῖν, καὶ μὴ δόξαι προπετής τις εἶναι καὶ ἀπερίσκεπτος. [377] Πῶς οὖν καὶ τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν ἐπλήρωσε, καὶ ἀσφάλειαν ἐαυτῷ προωκονόμησεν; Ἵνα τῷ μὲν βουλευθῆναι μαθεῖν τὸν ἀκάθεκτον δείξῃ πόθον, τῷ δὲ μὴ δι' ἑαυτοῦ τοῦτο ποιῆσαι, ἀλλ' ἕτερον προβαλέσθαι, τὴν εὐλάβειαν ἐμφαίνῃ καὶ τὴν ἐπιείκειαν ἅπασαν. Καὶ γὰρ στενά μοι πάντοθεν, φησί· περὶ προδοσίας ἐστὶ λόγος τοῦ Δεσπότη· μέγας ὁ κίνδυνος, ὁ κρημνὸς ἐκατέρωθεν. Ἄν σιγῶ, ἡ μέριμνα κατεσθίει μου τὴν ψυχὴν· ἂν εἴπω, δέδοικα μὴ ποτε ἐπιτίμησιν δέξωμαι πάλιν. Μέσσην οὖν ἦλθεν ὁδὸν, καὶ ὁ πανταχοῦ προπηδῶν, τότε τῆς Ἰωάννου παρρησίας ἐδεῖτο, ὥστε μαθεῖν τὸ λεγόμενον. Οὐδὲν γὰρ ἕτερον ἀνέπνει. καὶ εἶχεν ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ διηνεκῶς, ἀλλ' ἢ τὸν διδάσκαλον μόνον. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ δεσμωτηρίων καὶ μυρίων μετὰ ταῦτα κατετόλμα θανάτων, καὶ πάσης τῆς παρούσης κατεγέλα ζωῆς. Δι' ἐκεῖνον καὶ μαστίγας λαβὼν, καὶ τοὺς μώλωπας ἔχων ἐπὶ τοῦ νώτου, πρὸς τοὺς μαστιζάντας ἔλεγεν· Οὐ δυνάμεθα ἡμεῖς ἃ εἶδομεν καὶ ἠκούσαμεν μὴ λαλεῖν.

Εἶδες φρόνημα ἀδοúlωντον; εἶδες παρρησίαν ἀχειρώτον; εἶδες ψυχὴν οὐρανίου πόθου καὶ ἔρωτος γέμουσαν; Πῶς οὖν τολμᾷς λέγειν, ὅτι φοβούμενος τοὺς ἐκ περιτομῆς, ὑπέστελλεν ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἀφώρισε; Καὶ πολλὰ δὲ ἕτερα ἐνῆν εἰπεῖν περὶ Πέτρου, δεικνύντα αὐτοῦ τὴν θερμότητα, καὶ τὴν ἀνδρείαν, καὶ τὸν πόθον, ὃν εἶχε περὶ τὸν Χριστόν· ἀλλ' ἵνα μὴ μακύνωμεν ἀκαίρως τὸν λόγον, ἀρκεῖ τὰ εἰρημένα. Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐγκώμιον αὐτοῦ τήμερον εἰπεῖν πρόκειται, ἀλλὰ τὴν δοκοῦσαν εἶναι ζήτησιν λύσαι, καὶ εἰς πέρας ἀγαγεῖν.

ζ'. Σὺ δὲ καὶ ἐτέρωθεν σκόπει, πῶς οὐκ ἔστι πιθανὴ ἡ κατηγορία. Τότε μὲν γὰρ παρὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν, ὅτε ἔλεγε· Τοῦτον τὸν Ἰησοῦν, ὃν ὑμεῖς ἐσταυρώσατε, ἀνέστησεν ὁ Θεός, λύσας τὰς ὠδῖνας τοῦ θανάτου, τότε μεταξὺ ἐχθρῶν ἦν, ἔτι

80. I.e., the answer to the question of who would betray Jesus.

81. John gives voice to Peter's inner dialogue via prosopopoeia.

82. Chrysostom assumes that the "beloved disciple" of John 13:23–25 is the apostle John.

83. Minus γάρ after δυνάμεθα. In context, this statement is actually not preceded by a whipping, specifically, as John tells it (but perhaps he is inferring it from 4:3: ἐπέβαλον αὐτοῖς τὰς χεῖρας).

84. John returns to his direct address of Paul, perhaps at the start of the refrain of rhetorical questions in this paragraph, but, if not, certainly here in the second person singular and with the quotation.

85. With ὑπέστελλεν ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἀφώρισε for ὑπέστελλεν καὶ ἀφώριζεν ἑαυτόν.

86. ἀλλὰ τὴν δοκοῦσαν εἶναι ζήτησιν λύσαι (with all the key terms of ζητήματα καὶ λύσεις).

that time, when Jesus said, “*One of you will betray me*” (Matt 26:21), Peter didn’t dare to ask his teacher, because of the rebuke he’d already received; but because of the devotion he had, he couldn’t stand to remain silent. He was eager both to learn⁸⁰ and not to appear rash and ill-considered. [377] How then might he fulfill his desire to know and provide for his own security at the same time? By his desire to learn he might show his indomitable devotion, but by not doing it himself and instead putting another forward, he might show piety and complete modesty. “I have a narrow path on all sides,” Peter says. “The Lord speaks about betrayal; the danger is severe, a steep cliff on all sides. If I keep silent, the worry will devour my soul; if I speak, I fear I might receive another rebuke.”⁸¹ And so he took the middle path. The man who rushed forward in all other times, in that particular moment asked John to speak boldly so he could learn what Christ said (cf. John 13:24).⁸² For he had no recourse. He had a single preoccupation in his soul, and that was his teacher. That’s why, after this, Peter continually braved imprisonments and countless forms of death, and why he laughed in the face of the present life. That’s why after he received whippings and had welts on his back, he said to those who had whipped him, “*We are unable not to speak of what we have seen and heard*” (Acts 4:20).⁸³

Have you seen this indomitable spirit? Have you seen this irrepressible boldness? Have you seen this soul filled with heavenly devotion and love? Then how do you⁸⁴ dare to say, “It was ‘*out of fear of those from the circumcision*’ that ‘*he was withdrawing and separating himself*’” (Gal 2:12)?⁸⁵ Now, one could tell many other things about Peter that demonstrate his fervency, his bravery, and the devotion he had for Christ. But lest I extend my homily beyond our time limit, what I’ve said will be sufficient. After all, the task before us today isn’t to give a speech in praise of Peter, but to provide a solution for what appears to be a vexing problem,⁸⁶ and to put an end to it.

7. Now watch closely from another line of inquiry⁸⁷ how the accusation⁸⁸ isn’t credible. Back at the beginning when he said, “This Jesus *whom you crucified ... God raised up, destroying the pains of death*” (Acts 4:10; 2:24),⁸⁹ Peter was in the midst of enemies who were still murderously dis-

87. Chiefly in what follows John will appeal to the “then-and-now” topos, as well as a geographical version thereof (here-and-there).

88. Against Peter for being cowardly and unmanly (as is the apparent sense of Gal 2:12, φοβούμενος).

89. A conflation of the two verses, in the order indicated and the connection marked by ellipsis. Plus τοῦτον τὸν Ἰησοῦν before ὃν in 4:10.

φονώντων, ἔτι τῷ θυμῷ ζέοντων, ἔτι βουλομένων διασπάσασθαι τοὺς μαθητάς. Ἦκμαζε γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἔτι τὸ πάθος, καὶ ᾧδαι ἢ διάνοια τῷ θυμῷ. Νυνὶ δὲ, ὅτε ταῦτα Παῦλος ἔγραφεν, ἑπτὰ καὶ δέκατον ἔτος εἶχε τὸ κήρυγμα. Εἰπὼν γάρ· Μετὰ τρία ἔτη ἀνέβην εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα, λέγει ἄλιν, ὅτι Μετὰ δεκατέσσαρα ἔτη ἀνέβην εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα. Ὁ τοίνυν τότε ἐν προοιμίῳ τοῦ κηρύγματος μὴ φοβηθεὶς, νῦν μετὰ χρόνον τοσοῦτον φοβεῖται; ὁ ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις μὴ δέσας, ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ δέδοικεν; ὁ, πολέμιων κυκλωσάντων αὐτόν, μὴ πτοηθεὶς τότε, νῦν οὐδὲ πολέμιων παρόντων, ἀλλὰ πιστῶν καὶ μαθητῶν, ἀγωνιᾷ, καὶ δέδοικε, καὶ οὐκ ὀρθοποδεῖ; Καὶ πῶς ἂν ἔχοι ταῦτα λόγον, ἀναπτομένης μὲν τῆς πυρᾶς καὶ εἰς ὕψος ἐγειρομένης κατατολμᾷ, σβεσθεῖσαν δὲ καὶ γενομένην τέφραν δεδοικέναι καὶ τρέμειν; Εἰ δειλὸς ἦν καὶ ἄνθρωπος ὁ Πέτρος, ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ κηρύγματος, ἐν τῇ μητροπόλει τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ὅπου πάντες ἦσαν οἱ πολέμιοι, τότε ἂν ἔδεισεν, οὐ μετὰ χρόνον τοσοῦτον ἐν τῇ χριστιανικωτάτῃ πόλει, οὐδὲ φίλων καὶ γνησίων παρόντων. Ὡστε οὔτε ὁ καιρὸς, οὔτε ὁ τόπος, οὔτε ἡ ποιότης τῶν προσώπων ἀφήσιν ἡμᾶς πιστεῦσαι τοῖς λεγομένοις οὕτως ὡς εἴρηται, καὶ καταγνῶναι τοῦ Πέτρου δειλίαν.

Ἐπηνέσατε τὰ εἰρημένα; Καίτοι γε ἐν ἀρχῇ τὸν [378] Παῦλον ἐθαυμάζετε, καὶ τῆς παρρησίας αὐτὸν ἐξεπλήττεσθε· ἀλλ' ἰδοὺ περιέτρεψε τὴν κατηγορίαν ὁ λόγος. Ἀλλ' ὥσπερ ἀρχόμενος ἔλεγον, ὅτι οὐδέν μοι ὄφελος, ἐὰν Παύλου καλῶς ποιῶντος, ὁ Πέτρος δειχθῇ μὴ καλῶς ποιῶν (τὰ γὰρ ἐγκλήματα καὶ ἡ καθ' ἡμῶν αἰσχύνη μένει, ἂν τε οὗτος, ἂν τε ἐκεῖνος διημαρτηκῶς τύχη), οὕτω καὶ νῦν τὸ αὐτὸ λέγω ἄλιν, ὡς οὐδέν μοι ὄφελος, ἂν Πέτρου τὴν κατηγορίαν ἀποσκευασαμένου, ὁ Παῦλος φαίνεται θαρσαλέως καὶ ἀπερισκέπτως τοῦ συναποστόλου κατηγορῶν. Φέρε οὖν, καὶ τοῦτον τῶν ἐγκλημάτων ἀπολύσωμεν. Τί οὖν; ὁ μὲν Πέτρος τοιοῦτος, ὁ δὲ Παῦλος οὐ τοιοῦτος; καὶ τί Παύλου θερμότερον γένοιτ' ἂν, ὅς καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν ἀπέθνησκε διὰ τὸν Χριστόν; Ἀλλὰ νῦν οὐ περὶ ἀνδρείας ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος, (τί γὰρ πρὸς τὸ προκείμενον τοῦτο;) ἀλλ' εἰ ἀπεχθῶς πρὸς τὸν ἀπόστολον

90. With transposition of μετὰ ἔτη τρία to μετὰ τρία ἔτη; with ἀνέβην (cf. 2:1) for ἀνῆλθον. John is conflating Gal 1:18 and 2:1 in both citations.

91. With μετὰ (cf. 1:18) δεκατέσσαρα ἔτη for διὰ δεκατεσσάρων ἐτῶν.

92. Mf notes that two manuscripts read καταφρονήσας, “was sneering.”

93. ἡ Χριστιανικωτάτη πόλις, a bit of local pride, to be sure (according to TLG, Chrysostom here registers the first extant use of the superlative adjective), but also perhaps a nod to Acts 11:26: χρηματίσαι τε πρῶτον ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ τοὺς μαθητάς Χριστιανούς.

94. John is appealing to the basic rules of ancient historical criticism (who, what, when, where, why) to show that it is implausible that Peter acted in a cowardly way.

95. §2 (PG 51:374).

posed, still boiling mad, still wanting to tear the disciples apart. For their passion was at its height then, and their minds were inflamed with anger. But at the time that Paul was writing these things down, the gospel proclamation had been around for seventeen years, as he wrote, “*After three years, I went up to Jerusalem*” (Gal 1:18),⁹⁰ and again he says, “*After fourteen years, I went up to Jerusalem*” (Gal 2:1).⁹¹ So, is it the case that the man who at the beginning of the gospel proclamation wasn’t afraid, now is afraid after such a long period of time? The man who wasn’t fearful in Jerusalem became afraid in Antioch? The one who wasn’t scared⁹² when enemies surrounded him, now in the presence not of enemies, but believers and disciples, experiences duress under trial and is fearful and doesn’t behave rightly? How could it possibly make sense to brave dangers when the fire is ignited and at its height, but to be fearful and trembling when its cinders have been extinguished? If Peter were cowardly and unmanly, then the time when he should’ve been fearful is at the beginning of the gospel proclamation in the capital city of the Jews, where all were his enemies, not after such a long period of time in the most Christian of cities,⁹³ and not with friends and intimates present. Therefore, neither the time nor the place nor the caliber of the persons involved allows us to believe the things said as worded and to condemn Peter for cowardice.⁹⁴

Did you praise the things I’ve just said? Although at the beginning you [378] marveled at Paul and were astounded at his boldness, now you see that our homily has turned the accusation around! And yet, as I said at the beginning,⁹⁵ it’s no benefit to me if, while Paul acts virtuously, Peter is shown not to have acted virtuously, for the accusations and shame against us remain whether the latter or the former happens to be at fault.⁹⁶ So now, once again I say the same thing: that it is no benefit to me if the accusation against Peter has been refuted, but Paul appears overconfident and ill-considered⁹⁷ in accusing his fellow apostle. So come, let’s free Paul, too, from these accusations.⁹⁸ Does it make sense? Peter was of such caliber, and Paul wasn’t? What could be more fervent than Paul, who every single day died for Christ (cf. 1 Cor 15:31)? However, our argument isn’t about his bravery (for what does that have to do with the subject before us?), but

96. Once again removing parentheses from PG that go back to HS.

97. ἀπερισκέπτως, the same term John used earlier for Peter’s rash actions in the Gospels in §6 (PG 51:376).

98. As John clearly signposts, he is turning now from defending Peter to an ἀπολογία for Paul.

διέκειτο, ἢ εἰ κενοδοξίας τινὸς καὶ φιλονεικίας ἦν αὕτη ἡ μάχη. Ἄλλ' οὐδὲ τοῦτο ἔστιν εἰπεῖν· μὴ γένοιτο· Οὐδὲ γὰρ Πέτρου τοῦ κορυφαίου τῶν ἁγίων ἐκείνων μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ πάντων δοῦλος ἦν ἀπλῶς τῶν ἀποστόλων ὁ Παῦλος, καὶ ταῦτα πλεονεκτῶν ἀπάντων κατὰ τοὺς κόπους· ἀλλ' ὅμως πάντων ἑαυτὸν ἔσχατον εἶναι ἐνόμιζεν. Ἐγὼ γάρ εἰμι, φησὶν, ὁ ἐλάχιστος τῶν ἀποστόλων, ὅς οὐκ εἰμὶ ἱκανὸς καλεῖσθαι ἀπόστολος· οὐ μόνον δὲ τῶν ἀποστόλων, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ἁγίων ἀπλῶς ἀπάντων. Ἐμοὶ γὰρ, φησὶ, τῷ ἐλαχίστῳ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων ἐδόθη ἡ χάρις αὕτη.

ἡ'. Εἶδες συντετριμμένην ψυχὴν; εἶδες πῶς ἑαυτὸν κατώτερον πάντων ἴστησι τῶν ἁγίων, οὐχὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων μόνον; Ὁ δὲ οὕτω περὶ πάντας διακείμενος, ἥδει καὶ πόσης τὸν Πέτρον προεδρίας ἀπολαβεῖν ἐχρῆν, καὶ ἡδεῖτο μάλιστα πάντων ἀνθρώπων τοῦτον, καὶ ὡς ἄξιός ἦν, οὕτω περὶ αὐτὸν διέκειτο. Καὶ τοῦτο ἐκεῖθεν δῆλον. Ἡ οἰκουμένη πᾶσα πρὸς αὐτὸν ἔβλεπεν, αἱ φροντίδες τῶν πανταχοῦ τῆς γῆς Ἐκκλησιῶν τῆς ἐκείνου ψυχῆς ἦσαν ἐξηρητημέναι, μυρία ἐμερίμνα καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν πράγματα, πάντοθεν αὐτὸν ἐκύκλουν κηδεμονίαι, προστασίαι, διορθώσεις, συμβουλαί, παραινέσεις, διδασκαλῖαι, μυρίων οἰκονομίαι πραγμάτων· καὶ πάντα ἐκεῖνα ἀφείς, ἀπῆλθεν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα, καὶ πρόφασις τῆς ὁδοῦ οὐδεμία ἑτέρα ἦν, ἀλλ' ἡ τὸ Πέτρον ἰδεῖν, καθὼς αὐτός φησιν· Ἀνέβην εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα ἱστορῆσαι Πέτρον· οὕτως αὐτὸν ἐτίμα, καὶ πρὸ πάντων ἤγε. Τί οὖν; ἰδὼν αὐτὸν εὐθέως ἀνεχώρησεν; Οὐδαμῶς· ἀλλ' ἐπέμεινε πρὸς αὐτὸν ἡμέρας δεκαπέντε. Εἴ τινα οὖν στρατηγὰν ἴδοις, εἰπέ μοι, γενναῖον καὶ θαυμαστὸν, τοῦ πολέμου συγκεκροτημένου, τῆς παρατάξεως συνεστῶσης, τῆς μάχης ζεούσης, μυρίων αὐτὸν πάντοθεν καλούντων πραγμάτων, ἀφέντα τὴν παράταξιν, καὶ πρὸς ἐπίσκεψίν τινος ἀπελθόντα φίλου, ἄρα ἑτέραν μείζονα ταύτης ζητεῖς ἀποδείξιν, εἰπέ μοι, τῆς πρὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐκεῖνον εὐνοίας; Οὐκ ἔγωγε οἶμαι. Τοῦτο τοίνυν καὶ ἐπὶ Παύλου καὶ Πέτρου λογίζου. Καὶ γὰρ καὶ ἐνταῦθα πόλεμος συνειστήκει χαλεπός, καὶ παράταξις ἦν, καὶ μάχη, οὐ πρὸς ἀνθρώπους μόνον, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὰς ἀρχάς, πρὸς τὰς ἐξουσίας, πρὸς τοὺς κοσμοκράτορας τοῦ σκότους τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, καὶ μάχη περὶ τῆς τῶν ἀνθρώπων σωτηρίας· ἀλλ' [379] ὅμως οὕτως ἡδεῖτο τὸν Πέτρον, ὥστε καὶ τοσαύτης ἀνάγκης ἐπικειμένης καὶ

99. These are the charges made against Paul (not cowardice, as with Peter).

100. Cf. 1 Cor 9:19.

101. With ἐλαχίστῳ for ἐλαχιστοτέρῳ (though Mf notes that other manuscripts read the latter). Elsewhere John does read the double comparative adjective, as in *Hom. Eph.* 7.1 (PG 62:49), four times, and *Hom. 2 Cor.* 11:1 §5 (PG 51:305), twice.

102. With ἀνέβην for ἀνῆλθον, as in the quotation of Gal 1:18 above in §7 (PG 51:377).

rather whether Paul had enmity for the apostle Peter or whether this had been a battle that was born of vainglory or rivalry.⁹⁹ But one can't say this either. No way! For Paul wasn't only the slave of Peter, the leader of all those saints, but he was the slave of all the apostles in general (cf. 1 Cor 9:19), even though he outdid them all when it came to his labors (cf. 1 Cor 15:10). Despite that, he used to consider himself the last of them all. "*I am the least of the apostles*," he says, "*who am not worthy to be called an apostle*" (1 Cor 15:9), and not only of the apostles but also of all the saints¹⁰⁰ in general: "*For this grace*," he says, "*was given to me, the least of all the saints*" (Eph 3:8).¹⁰¹

8. Have you seen this contrite soul? Have you seen how Paul places himself lower not only than the apostles but all the saints? A man who had this attitude with regard to all people knew what kind of preeminence Peter should enjoy. He had more respect for Peter than for anyone, and his attitude toward Peter was precisely what he worthily deserved. The whole world was looking to Paul, the cares of the churches throughout the whole world were hung on his soul, and he worried about countless things every single day (cf. 2 Cor 11:28); from all directions he was encompassed by cares, the demands of leadership, correction, counsel, advice, teaching, and the administration of countless matters. And yet leaving all these things he went off to Jerusalem. And the motivation for his trip was none other than to see Peter, as he himself says, "*I went up to Jerusalem to visit with Peter*" (Gal 1:18).¹⁰² Paul so honored him that he put going there before everything else. And what happened then? Did he depart immediately once he'd seen him? Not at all. Instead, he remained "*with him for fifteen days*" (Gal 1:18). Tell me this: if you see a noble and admirable general who leaves the front line and goes off to visit a friend when a war is raging, when the front line has been set up, when the battle is at fever pitch and countless concerns are summoning him from all directions, tell me, do you require any greater proof than this of the goodwill he had for the one he visited? I don't suppose so! Then consider this as well with regard to Paul and Peter. After all, in their case, too, a terrible war was being fought, and there was a front line and a battle,¹⁰³ yet not only with human beings, "*but with the principalities, the authorities, the rulers of this dark age*" (Eph 6:12), and it was a battle for the salvation of humankind. [379] Nevertheless, he so respected Peter that, despite such an urgent and pressing necessity, Paul

103. For Chrysostom this is the real μάχη, "battle," not the "apparent battle" between two apostles that some see witnessed to in Gal 2:11–14. See above, especially §§2–4 (PG 51:374–75).

κατεπειγούσης, ἐκδραμεῖν δι' ἐκεῖνον εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα, καὶ μεῖναι πρὸς αὐτὸν ἡμέρας δεκαπέντε, καὶ τότε ἐπανελθεῖν.

Ἔγνωτε τὴν ἀνδρείαν τοῦ Πέτρου, ἐμάθετε τὴν φιλοφροσύνην Παύλου, τὴν περὶ τοὺς ἀποστόλους πάντας, τὴν περὶ αὐτὸν τὸν Πέτρον· ἀνάγκη λοιπὸν ἐπὶ τὴν λύσιν ἐλθεῖν τοῦ ζητήματος. Εἰ γὰρ καὶ οὗτος ἐφίλει τὸν Πέτρον, κακείνος δειλὸς οὐκ ἦν καὶ ἄνανδρος, καὶ ἡ φιλονεικία καὶ ἡ ἀντίστασις οὐκ ἀπὸ ψυχῆς ἐγένετο, τί ποτέ ἐστι τὸ λεγόμενον; καὶ τίνος ἕνεκεν ταῦτα ὠκονομεῖτο;

θ'. Ἐνταῦθα προσέχετε, καὶ διανάστητέ μοι, καὶ συντεínaτε ἑαυτοὺς, ὥστε δέξασθαι σαφῆ τὴν ἀπολογίαν. Καὶ γὰρ ἄτοπον ἐμὲ μὲν τὸν διασκάπτοντα τοσοῦτον πόνον ὑπομένειν, ὑμᾶς δὲ τοὺς ἐξ εὐκολίας μέλλοντας τὸ χρυσίον ὀρᾶν, τῇ ῥαθυμίᾳ τὸ κέρδος τοῦτο παραδραμεῖν. Ἀνάγκη δὲ μικρὸν ἀνωτέρω τὸν λόγον ἀγαγεῖν, ὥστε σαφεστέραν ὑμῖν ποιῆσαι τὴν διδασκαλίαν. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἀνῆλθεν εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς ὁ Ἰησοῦς, τὴν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν οἰκονομίαν πληρώσας, τὸν λόγον τῆς διδασκαλίας κατέλιπε τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ ἀποστόλοις, καθὼς Παῦλός φησι· *Θέμενος ἐν ἡμῖν τὸν λόγον τῆς καταλλαγῆς· καὶ ἄλιν· Ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ πρεσβεύομεν, ὡς τοῦ Θεοῦ παρακαλοῦντος δι' ἡμῶν, τουτέστιν, ἀντὶ Χριστοῦ.* Τότε τοίνυν, ἡνίκα ἐκέρυττον οὗτοι κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην ἅπασαν, αἵρεσις οὐδεμία ἦν· πᾶσα δὲ ἡ φύσις τῶν ἀνθρώπων δύο ταῦτα δόγματα εἶχε, τὸ μὲν ὑγιές, τὸ δὲ διεφθαρμένον. Ἡ γὰρ Ἑλλήνες, ἡ Ἰουδαῖοι, οἱ τὴν γῆν οἰκοῦντες ἅπαντες ἦσαν· οὔτε δὲ Μανιχαῖος, οὔτε Μαρκίων, οὔτε δὲ Οὐαλεντίνος, οὐκ ἄλλος οὐδεὶς ἀπλῶς· τί γὰρ δεῖ πάσας καταλέγειν τὰς αἱρέσεις; καὶ γὰρ μετὰ τὸν σῆτον τότε τὰ ζιζάνια ἐσπάρη, ἡ παντοδαπὴ τῶν αἱρέσεων διαφθορά. Τοὺς μὲν οὖν Ἰουδαίους ἐπέτρεψε τῷ Πέτρῳ, τοῖς δὲ Ἑλλήσι τὸν Παῦλον ἐπέστησεν ὁ Χριστός. Καὶ τοῦτο οὐκ ἄφ' ἑαυτοῦ λέγω, ἀλλ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ Παύλου λέγοντος ἔστιν ἀκοῦσαι· Ὁ γὰρ ἐνεργήσας Πέτρῳ εἰς ἀποστολὴν τῆς

104. John pronounces these two, smaller ζητήματα (i.e., Peter's apparent cowardice and Paul's apparent enmity) solved via the arguments he has offered for his audience's hearing.

105. ἀντίστασις, as in the title of the homily (see p. 500 n. 5 above), translated as "opposition."

106. ἀπὸ ψυχῆς in the immediate context refers to Paul's soul, but in the wider argument it refers to the internal motivation, plan, and meaning, as opposed to how things looked on the outside in this confrontation; see also §17 (PG 51:386) on Peter's soul as the place where his genuine intent is to be found.

107. I.e., κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτῷ ἀντέστην.

108. Translation of οἰκονομεῖσθαι with PGL B.3 (cf. A.6): "med., effect, contrive by accommodation." On this translation, John is already signaling his λύσις, his "solution" to the apparent battle. This is also indicated in his use of the passive voice here, which, rather than attributing Paul's statement just to himself, links it to a joint plan.

ran off to Jerusalem because of him, and he remained “*with him for fifteen days*” and then went back.

You’ve recognized the bravery of Peter; you’ve learned about the solicitude¹⁰⁴ Paul had for all the apostles, and for Peter himself. So, finally, it’s necessary to arrive at the solution for the problem. If indeed Paul loved Peter, and Peter in turn wasn’t cowardly or unmanly, and the rivalry and confrontation¹⁰⁵ didn’t come from the soul,¹⁰⁶ then what does the statement¹⁰⁷ mean? And why were these things contrived¹⁰⁸ in this way?

9. Pay attention here, stay awake, and focus your attention so you can hear this argument of defense clearly. For it would be absurd for me to endure such labors in excavating the meaning¹⁰⁹ while you—who without expending any effort are going to catch sight of the gold!—run right past this profitable gain. It’s necessary to draw out our homily a bit further in order to make this teaching clearer to you. When Jesus went up into heaven after he’d fulfilled the divine plan on our behalf (cf. Acts 1:9), he left the word of teaching to his own apostles, as Paul says, “*We are ambassadors on behalf of Christ—meaning, “in place of Christ”—as if God were making an appeal through us*” (2 Cor 5:20).¹¹⁰ At the time when the apostles were preaching to the whole world there was no heresy.¹¹¹ The entire human race by nature had two sets of teachings, the healthy and the corrupt. For all the people who inhabited the earth were either Greeks or Jews. There wasn’t a Mani or a Marcion or a Valentinus or anyone else at all. And why is it necessary to give a list of all the heresies? Indeed, it’s after the wheat that the weeds—the manifold corruption of heresies—were sown (cf. Matt 13:24–30). At that time Christ put the Jews under the care of Peter, and he set Paul over the Greeks. I don’t say this on my own¹¹² authority, but one can hear Paul himself saying, “*For the one who was at work in Peter for*

109. διασκάπτειν, deliberately invoking §2 (PG 51:374) above: διασκάπτω τὸν νοῦν. The metaphor of mining works well with the idea that the “deeper sense” lies below the surface of the text. “The gold” (τὸ χρυσίον) is, of course, the λύσις, with perhaps a hint of the prize for winning the ἀγών—see §1 (PG 51:373).

110. Minus οὖν before πρεσβεύομεν; elsewhere when quoting this passage Chrysostom reads οὖν—e.g., *Hom. Rom.* 4.6 (PG 60:431); *Hom. 2 Cor.* 11.2 (PG 61:477); but cf. γάρ at *Hom. Rom.* 15.3 (PG 60:544); *Hom. 2 Cor.* 13.1 (PG 61:490), and other times no conjunction, as here, such as in *Hom. Rom.* 1.1 (PG 60:396), embedding the quotation.

111. Compare *Hom. 1 Cor.* 11:19 §2 (PG 51:255), where John also denies that the αἱρέσεις that Paul mentions to the Corinthians are doctrinal deviations.

112. Reading ἀπ’ ἐμαυτοῦ, with Paris. gr. 748 (as noted by PE), for ἀφ’ ἐαυτοῦ.

περιτομῆς, ἐνήργησε κάμοι, φησὶν, εἰς τὰ ἔθνη· περιτομὴν ἐνταῦθα αὐτὸ τὸ ἔθνος καλῶν. Καὶ πόθεν δῆλον; Ἐκ τῆς ἐπαγωγῆς. Εἰπὼν γάρ, Ὁ ἐνεργήσας Πέτρῳ εἰς ἀποστολὴν τῆς περιτομῆς, ἐνήργησε κάμοι, φησὶν, εἰς τὰ ἔθνη, δεικνύντος ἐστίν, ὅτι πρὸς ἀντιδιαστολὴν τῶν ἐθνῶν περιτομὴν εἶπε. Πρὸς δὲ ἀντιδιαστολὴν τῶν ἐθνῶν, οὐχὶ περιτομὴ, ἀλλ' Ἰουδαῖοί εἰσιν, οὓς διὰ τῆς περιτομῆς ἡνίξατο· ὥσανεὶ ἔλεγεν, Ὁ ἐνεργήσας Πέτρῳ εἰς ἀποστολὴν τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ἐνήργησε κάμοι εἰς τὰ ἔθνη. Καθάπερ γάρ τις βασιλεὺς σοφὸς, τὸν ἐπιτήδειον μετὰ ἀκριβείας εἰδὼς, ἐτέρῳ μὲν τοὺς ἰππεῖς, ἐτέρῳ δὲ τῶν πεζῶν ἐγχειρίζει τὴν προστασίαν· οὕτω δὴ καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς, τὸ στρατόπεδον τὸ ἑαυτοῦ διελὼν εἰς δύο ταῦτα μέρη, τοὺς μὲν Ἰουδαίους Πέτρῳ, τοὺς δὲ Ἕλληνας ἐπέτρεψε Παύλῳ. Εἰ δὲ διάφορα τὰ στρατόπεδα, ἀλλ' εἷς ὁ βασιλεὺς. Ὡςπερ γάρ ἐκεῖ ἡ διαφορά τῶν στρατοπέδων ἐν τῇ κατασκευῇ τῶν ὅπλων, οὐκ ἐν τῇ φύσει τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐστίν· οὕτω δὴ καὶ ἐνταῦθα ἡ διαφορά ἐν σχήματι μικρῷ τινι τῆς σαρκὸς, οὐκ ἐν τῇ τῆς οὐσίας ἐναλλαγῇ φαίνεται.

ι'. [380] Ὡςπερ οὖν ἔλεγον, ἦσαν ἀμφοτέροι τὰ στρατόπεδα ταῦτα ἐγχεχειρισμένοι. Καὶ εἰ μὴ μηκύνω τὸν λόγον, εἰ μὴ ἀπεκάμετε, ἐρῶ καὶ τὴν αἰτίαν ὑμῖν, δι' ἣν οὗτος μὲν τοὺς Ἰουδαίους, ἐκεῖνος δὲ τοὺς ἐξ ἐθνῶν ἐπιστεύθησαν. Καὶ γὰρ ἄξιον ζητήσεως, τίδήποτε Παῦλος μὲν, ὁ μετὰ ἀκριβείας τὸν πατρῶον νόμον παιδευθεὶς, ὁ παρὰ τοὺς πόδας Γαμαλιὴλ διατρίβων, ὁ κατὰ δικαιοσύνην τὴν ἐν νόμῳ γενόμενος ἄμεμπτος, οὐκ ἐγχειρίζεται τοὺς Ἰουδαίους, ἀλλὰ τοὺς Ἕλληνας· ὁ δὲ ἁλιεύς, καὶ ἀγράμματος, καὶ μηδὲν τοσοῦτον εἰδὼς Πέτρος, τὴν τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐνεπιστεύθη προστασίαν. Συντελεῖ γάρ τι καὶ πρὸς τὴν λύσιν ἡμῖν τὸ λεγόμενον, ἂν αὐτὸ δυνηθῶμεν φράσαι καλῶς. Οὐ γὰρ δὴ τοῦτο ἔστιν εἰπεῖν ὅτι ὀκνοῦντα καὶ ἀναδυόμενον ἰδὼν τὸν Παῦλον καὶ φεύγοντα τῶν οἰκείων τὴν προστασίαν, οὐκ ἠθέλησε βιάσασθαι καὶ ἀναγκάσαι. Τούναντίον μὲν οὖν ἅπαν ἐπεδείξατο. Οὐ γὰρ δὴ μόνον οὐκ

113. I.e., of the Jews (Ἰουδαῖοι).

114. As noted in PE, Paris. gr. 748 omits this φησὶν and reads δείκνυσσι ὅτι ("he shows that") for δεικνύντος ἐστίν.

115. Minus γάρ before ἐνεργήσας.

116. The sole distinction in John's reworded form of Paul's statement is the replacement of τῆς περιτομῆς with τῶν Ἰουδαίων.

117. I.e., in the two missions, to Jews and to gentiles.

118. I.e., the foreskin.

119. John introduces a new "problem" (ζήτησις) about why Paul was sent to gentiles and not Jews; he presents this as a subproblem of the larger vexing question of the apparent μάχη of Gal 2:11–14.

the apostolate of the circumcision was at work in me also,” he says, “*for the gentiles*” (Gal 2:8). Here he calls the nation itself¹¹³ “the circumcision.” And where do we find clear evidence of this? From what follows. For after he stated, “*For the one who was at work in Peter for the apostolate of the circumcision was at work in me also*,” he says,¹¹⁴ “*for the gentiles*” (Gal 2:8).¹¹⁵ This is a statement made by someone showing that he said “circumcision” as an antithesis of “the gentiles.” But the proper antithesis of “the gentiles” is not “circumcision,” but “Jews,” whom Paul is signifying with the term “circumcision.” It’s as if Paul were saying, “The one who was at work in Peter for the apostolate of the Jews was at work in me also for the gentiles.”¹¹⁶ A wise king who has accurate knowledge of the personnel in his service gives the charge of his cavalry to one person, and his infantry to another. In just the same way Christ also divided his squadron into these two parts, giving the Jews to Peter and the Greeks to Paul. Although the squadrons are distinct, there is a single king. In the former example there’s a distinction among the squadrons not in the nature of the people but in the type of weaponry. So here as well,¹¹⁷ the distinction appears to be in a minor feature of the flesh,¹¹⁸ not a substantial difference.

10. [380] Thus, as I was saying, both of these squadrons had been put under charge of a leader. Now, if I don’t make my homily tediously long, and you don’t flag in strength, I’ll tell you the reason Peter was entrusted with the Jews and Paul with those from the gentiles. After all, it’s a worthy question¹¹⁹ why Paul—who had been educated in detailed knowledge of the ancestral law (cf. Acts 22:3),¹²⁰ who had spent time “*at the feet of Gamaliel*” (Acts 22:3), who “*was blameless with respect to the righteousness that is in the law*” (Phil 3:6)—was placed not in charge of the Jews but the Greeks, whereas Peter, the man who was a fisherman and illiterate (cf. Acts 4:13) and had no such extensive knowledge, was entrusted with leadership of the Jews. What’s said even contributes something to our solution,¹²¹ if we are able to interpret¹²² it correctly. Indeed, one cannot say it was because he saw Paul hesitating, in retreat and fleeing from a leadership role over his own people, that Christ didn’t want to force or compel him. Actually, he showed the exact opposite. For not only was Paul not fleeing from the

120. A paraphrase using all the same vocabulary as Acts 22:3: πεπαιδευμένος κατὰ ἀκρίβειαν τοῦ πατρῷου νόμου.

121. I.e., the λύσις to the grand problem of apparent apostolic conflict.

122. Translation of φράζειν with BDAG (as in Matt 15:15, for giving the solution to the riddle of a parable), as fitting the mode of problem and solution John is adopting.

ἔφυγε τῶν Ἰουδαίων τὴν ἐπιστασίαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ πρῶτος ἐπεπήδησε, καὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ κελεύοντος ἀπελθεῖν εἰς τὰ ἔθνη, αὐτὸς ἀξιοῖ τὴν τῶν Ἰουδαίων οἰκονομίαν ἐγχειρισθῆναι· καὶ μυρία πολλαχοῦ πάσχων παρ' αὐτῶν δεινὰ, καὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν τὴν διδασκαλίαν πεπιστευμένος, οὐ παύεται παρακαλῶν ὑπὲρ ἐκείνων, καὶ λέγων, νῦν μὲν· *Ἡ χόρη ἀνάθεμα εἶναι ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου, τῶν συγγενῶν μου κατὰ σάρκα· νῦν δέ· Ἀδελφοί μου, ἡ μὲν εὐδοκία μου, καὶ ἡ δέησις ἡ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἐστὶν εἰς σωτηρίαν*. Τίνος οὖν ἔνεκεν βουλούμενον αὐτὸν καὶ ἐπιθυμοῦντα διδάσκειν ἐκείνους, οὐκ εἴασεν αὐτοῖς κηρύσσειν, ἀλλ' ἀντ' ἐκείνων διδάσκαλον αὐτὸν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἔπεμπε; Ἀκούσωμεν αὐτοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ λέγοντος, καὶ Παύλου τὸ πᾶν διηγουμένου· Ἐγένετο δέ μοι προσευχομένῳ, φησὶ, γενέσθαι με ἐν ἐκστάσει, καὶ εἰδέναι τὸν Χριστὸν λέγοντά μοι· *Σπεῦσον καὶ ἔξελθε ἐν τάχει, ὅτι οὐ παραδέξονται σου τὴν μαρτυρίαν περὶ ἐμοῦ*. Καὶ τὴν αἰτίαν εἶπε τῆς ἀποδημίας· *Μισήσουσί σε, φησὶ, καὶ ἀποστραφήσονται· διὰ τοῦτό σου διδάσκοντος οὐκ ἀνέχονται*.

Καὶ μὴν αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἦν ἱκανὸν, ἀξιόπιστον αὐτὸν ποιῆσαι διδάσκαλον, καὶ πείσαι ἐκείνους, ὅτι οὐκ ἀνθρωπίνη ἡ μετάθεσις ἐγένετο. Οὐ γὰρ ἂν τὸν οὕτω φαινόμενον, καὶ θυμῷ ζέοντα, καὶ φόνου πνέοντα, καὶ θαυματουργοῦντι μὴ πεισθέντα τῷ Χριστῷ, μηδὲ τοῖς ἀποστόλοις τοῖς ἐκείνου, νεκροὺς ἐγείρασιν, ἴσχυσεν ἂν ποτε ἀνθρωπος ἐν αὐτῇ μέσῃ τῇ μανίᾳ μεταθεῖναι, καὶ τὴν ὑπερβολὴν, ἣν κατὰ τοῦ κηρύγματος ἐπεδείκνυτο, ταύτην ὁλόκληρον καὶ πολλῷ πλείονα πείσαι πάλιν ὑπὲρ τῆς εἰς Χριστὸν ὁμολογίας ἐπιδείξασθαι· ἀλλὰ θείας ὄντως δυνάμεως ἔργον ἦν ἡ μετάστασις αὕτη καὶ ἡ μεταβολή.

ια'. "Ὅπερ οὖν καὶ ὁ Παῦλος, ἐπιθυμῶν αὐτῶν τὴν προστασίαν λαβεῖν, πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν προεβάλλετο λέγων· *Κύριε, αὐτοὶ ἐπίστανται, ὅτι ἐγὼ ἤμην φυλακίζων, καὶ δέρων τοὺς πιστεύοντας εἰς τὸ ὄνομά σου· καὶ ὅτε ἐξεχύνετο τὸ*

123. ἐπίστασις means both "care" and "dominion or authority" (LSJ I and II); John seems to have both notions in mind here.

124. John had used the exact same phrase, πρῶτος ἐπεπήδησε, of Peter above in §4 (PG 51:375).

125. Chrysostom is much influenced by the narrative of Acts, where Paul is called to be σκευὸς ἐκλογῆς ... τοῦ βαστάσαι τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐνώπιον ἐθνῶν τε καὶ βασιλέων υἰάν τε Ἰσραήλ, and Paul is presented within the narrative as bringing his ministry first to Jews in synagogues and elsewhere.

126. Minus γὰρ αὐτός before ἀνάθεμα; minus ἀπὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ before ὑπὲρ ἀδελφῶν μου (marked as an ellipsis in translation). This verse is very important to Chrysostom's view of Paul's relation to "Judaism," and it is cited by him often (see HT 532 for references).

127. Plus μου after ἀδελφοί; with μου for τῆς ἐμῆς καρδίας after εὐδοκία; ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν for ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ before ἐστὶν εἰς σωτηρίαν.

role of caring for¹²³ the Jews, but he was the first to rush in,¹²⁴ and when Christ commanded him to go off to the gentiles, he himself asked to be given charge of the stewardship for the Jews.¹²⁵ And after he'd suffered many terrible things everywhere at their hands and been entrusted with the teaching of gentiles (cf. Acts 13:45–48), he didn't stop interceding on their behalf, saying one time, "*I would pray to be anathema ... on behalf of my brothers and sisters, my kin according to the flesh*" (Rom 9:3),¹²⁶ and at another, "*My brothers and sisters, my desire and prayer to God is on behalf of their salvation*" (Rom 10:1).¹²⁷ So why was it that Christ didn't allow Paul to preach to the Jews, even though Paul wished and desired to teach them, but sent him as a teacher to the gentiles instead of them?¹²⁸ Let's hear Christ speaking and Paul recounting the whole story: "*And it happened to me ... as I was praying,*" he says, "*that I was in a trance, and I recognized Christ saying to me, 'Hurry and go forth quickly, because they will not accept your testimony about me'*" (Acts 22:17–18).¹²⁹ And Christ explained the reason for the departure: "They will hate you," he says, "and turn their backs on you. That's why they'll not put up with you teaching them."

And indeed, this very fact was sufficient to render him a credible teacher and to persuade them that the about-face was no human affair (cf. Gal 1:22–24). For no human being has ever had the power to cause an about-face of someone who seemed in the midst of madness like this, boiling mad and breathing murder (cf. Acts 9:1), refusing to believe in Christ when he worked miracles or in his disciples when they raised the dead, and yet again to persuade him to show the extraordinary passion he'd displayed against the gospel proclamation in a more complete and much greater form on behalf of the confession of Christ. No, this turnabout and transformation truly arose from a power that was divine (cf. Gal 1:23–24).

11. And so Paul, despite desiring to receive a position of leadership vis-à-vis the Jews,¹³⁰ made this very point to Jesus when he said, "*Lord, they themselves know that I was imprisoning and beating those who believe*

128. Cf. Acts 22:21, as will be quoted below. For the designation of Paul as teacher of the gentiles, see 1 Tim 2:7; 2 Tim 1:11 (cf. Rom 11:13; Gal 2:7–9).

129. A combination of exact quotation and paraphrase. Acts 22:17: minus ὑποστρέψαντι εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ, καί after ἐγένετο δέ μοι; with προσευχομένῳ for προσευχομένου μου; minus ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ before γενέσθαι. Acts 22:18: εἰδέναι τὸν Χριστὸν for ἰδεῖν αὐτόν (itacism?); minus ἐξ Ἱερουσαλήμ after ἐν τάχει; with ὅτι for διότι. John seems to have removed the Jerusalem-specific references (the city, the temple) in order to generalize this dream-warning to apply to all Jews.

130. I.e., the Christ-believing mission to Jews.

αἶμα Στεφάνου, τοῦ μάρτυρός σου, ἐγὼ ἤμην συνευδοκῶν τῇ ἀναιρέσει αὐτοῦ. Καὶ ἡ πολλὴ μανία τὴν ἀθρόον γεγεννημένην ἐγγυᾶται μεταβολήν, ὡς οὐκ ἔστιν ἀνθρωπίνη τις, ἀλλ' ἀνωθεν, καὶ ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν ἔλαβε τὴν ἀρχήν. Τί οὖν ὁ Χριστός; Πορεύου, ὅτι εἰς ἔθνη μακρὰν ἐξαποστελῶ σε. Ταῦτ' οὖν οὐχ ἱκανά, φησί, [381] πείσαι καὶ τοὺς σφόδρα ἀναισθητοῦντας, ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἀνθρώπινον τοῦτο τὸ κήρυγμα, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ φύσιν ἀνθρωπίνην ἅπαντα τὰ γεγεννημένα, καὶ Θεὸς ὄντως ἐστὶν ὁ μεταθεὶς καὶ μεταβαλὼν; Ἰκανά μὲν οὖν, ὦ μακάριε Παῦλε, ἂν αὐτὴν τῶν πραγμάτων ἐξετάσης τὴν φύσιν· ἀλλ' Ἰουδαῖοι πάντων εἰσὶν ἀγνωμονέστεροι· οὐ φύσιν πραγμάτων ἐξετάζοντες, οὐ τὸ εἶκός καὶ τὸ εὐλογον καὶ τὸ ἀναγκαῖον σκοποῦντες, ἀλλ' εἰς ἓν μόνον βλέποντες, ὅπως τὴν φιλονεικίαν τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἐμπλήσωσι. Καὶ σὺ μὲν πρὸς τὴν τῶν πραγμάτων ἀκολουθίαν βλέπεις· ὁ δὲ Θεὸς τὰ ἀπόρρητα τῆς διανοίας αὐτῶν οἶδε. Διὰ τοῦτό φησι, Πορεύου, ὅτι εἰς ἔθνη μακρὰν ἐξαποστελῶ σε, ὥστε καὶ τῷ διαστήματι παραμυθῆσθαι τὸ μῖσος.

Διὰ τοῦτο τοῖς μὲν ἄλλοις ἅπασι γράφων, τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ προστίθισιν ἐν τῷ προοιμίῳ τῶν ἐπιστολῶν, Ἑβραίοις δὲ ἐπιστέλλων, οὐδὲν τοιοῦτον ἐποίησεν, ἀλλ' ἀπλῶς, οὐκ εἰπὼν τίς ἦν, ἢ πρὸς τίνας, ὥσπερ ἔθος εἶχε ποιεῖν, οὕτω πως ἤρξατο· Πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως πάλοι ὁ Θεὸς λαλήσας τοῖς πατράσιν ἡμῶν. Καὶ τοῦτο δὴ τῆς τοῦ Παύλου σοφίας. Ἵνα γὰρ μὴ μετασχῇ τοῦ μίσους τὰ γράμματα, καθάπερ προσωπεῖω τινὶ, τῇ τοῦ ὀνόματος ἀφαιρέσει κρύψας ἑαυτὸν, οὕτως αὐτοῖς λανθανόντως τὸ τῆς παραινέσεως ἐπιτίθησι φάρμακον.

131. Again, a mix of exact quotation and paraphrase. Acts 22:19: minus κατὰ τὰς συναγωγὰς before τοὺς πιστεύοντας; with εἰς τὸ ὄνομα for ἐπὶ σέ. Acts 22:20: with ἐξεχύνετο for ἐξεχεῖτο; ἐγὼ ἤμην for καὶ αὐτὸς ἤμην; minus ἐφεστῶς καὶ before συνευδοκῶν.

132. Minus ἐγὼ after ὅτι.

133. Here the preacher answers Paul's question that he has paraphrased for him.

134. Without apparent fear of self-contradiction, Chrysostom's "solution" combines a supernaturalist claim about Paul's "conversion" (divine revelation) with an insistence upon human rationality (reason).

135. ἀγνωμονέστεροι (translated with LSJ A.1); one might also translate, "head-strong" (with LSJ A.2), another anti-Jewish invective topos, but John appears here to be charging Jews with cognitive deficiency (perhaps with Rom 10:2 in view). He makes this same charge in other anti-Jewish arguments, such as *Adv. Jud.* 3.5; 5.5 (PG 48:869, 892); *Stat.* 12.2 (PG 49:130), citing the internal prophetic critiques in Isa 1:3 and Jer 8:7 in support of his condemnation; *Ep. Olymp.* 10.4b (SC 13^{bis}.256, ed. Malingrey).

136. In this bitter anti-Judaistic invective John is saying Jews are not philosophically minded but instead involve themselves only in petty feuds (as often, he may have John 12:37–43 in mind).

in your name, *and when the blood of your witness Stephen was poured out, I was approving of his murder*” (Acts 22:19–20).¹³¹ And this mad frenzy provides a guarantee that the sudden transformation that took place wasn’t a human reality but one that came from on high and its instigation was from heaven. What did Christ say then? “*Go, for I shall send you far away to the gentiles*” (Acts 22:21).¹³² “Weren’t these things enough,” Paul says, [381] “to persuade even people who are sorely lacking in perception that this gospel proclamation isn’t a human thing, but all the things that have happened transcend human nature, and God is truly the one who turned things around and brought about this transformation?” “Well, they would be sufficient, O blessed Paul,¹³³ if you investigate the very nature of things.¹³⁴ But Jews are more senseless¹³⁵ than all other peoples. They don’t investigate the nature of things; nor do they examine probability, reason, and necessity.¹³⁶ Instead,¹³⁷ they look to one thing alone: how they might satisfy their own love of contention. But you, Paul, do look at the logical sense of things, while God knows the unspoken secrets of their hearts. The reason Christ says, “*Go, for I shall send you far away to the gentiles*” (Acts 22:21)¹³⁸ is to assuage their hatred by means of distance.

This is why, although he puts his name first in the prescript of the letters when writing to all the others, Paul did no such thing when writing to the Hebrews.¹³⁹ But without stating who he was or to whom he was writing, as he customarily did, he simply began in this way, “*In various ways and by variable means in venerable times God spoke to our ancestors*” (Heb 1:1).¹⁴⁰ Surely this, too, is born of Paul’s wisdom. Lest the letter share in their hatred, he hides himself, as though with a mask, by leaving off his name; in this way he applies the salve of his advice to them incognito.

137. PE emended Mf (1721) here: “*Addidimus* [JPM: “*additum*”] ἂλλ’ *e* Morel. *et* Savil. *et* cod. 748.” (JPM adds “*Edit.*”)

138. Minus ἐγώ after ὅτι (as above in this paragraph).

139. This is a problem that all ancient interpreters have for what becomes the traditional attribution of this letter to Paul’s authorship (found in Clement of Alexandria, *apud* Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 6.141–44); accordingly, it is also the very first preoccupation of Chrysostom’s *argumentum* to *Hom. Heb.* §§1–2 (PG 63:9–14), citing most of the same passages referred to here to set up the problem.

140. Plus ἡμῶν after πατράσιν. Although John has the plus ἡμῶν reading also in other places, such as *Adv. Jud.* 7.2 (PG 48:919), when he cites the lemma in his *Hom. Heb.* 1.1 (PG 63:13), it is without ἡμῶν (with \mathfrak{M}).

“Όταν γὰρ πρὸς τινὰ ἀηδῶς ἔχωμεν, κἂν ὑγιές τι λέγῃ, οὐ προθύμως, οὐδὲ μεθ’ ἡδονῆς δεχόμεθα τὰ λεγόμενα· ὅπερ οὖν, ἵνα μὴ καὶ τότε συμβῇ, ἀφεῖλε τὴν ἰδίαν προσηγορίαν τῆς ἐπιστολῆς, ὥστε μηδὲν τοῦτο γενέσθαι κῶλυμα τῇ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς ἀκροάσει. Οὐδὲ γὰρ οἱ ἅπιοι μόνον Ἰουδαῖοι, ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ πιστεύσαντες αὐτοὶ ἐμίσουν αὐτὸν καὶ ἀπεστρέφοντο. “Ότε γοῦν ἀνῆλθεν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα, ἄκουσον τί φησι πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁ Ἰάκωβος, καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ ἅπαντες· Θεωρεῖς, ἀδελφε, πόσαι μυριάδες εἰσὶν Ἰουδαίων τῶν συνεληλυθότων· καὶ οὗτοι πάντες ζηλωταὶ τοῦ νόμου ὑπάρχουσι, καὶ κατήχηνται περὶ σοῦ, ὅτι ἀποστασίαν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου διδάσκεις. Διὰ τοῦτο αὐτὸν μάλιστα ἐμίσουν καὶ ἀπεστρέφοντο.

ιβ’. Ἡ μὲν οὖν αἰτία, δι’ ἣν οὐκ ἐπιστεύθη τοὺς Ἰουδαίους, ἀλλὰ τοὺς ἐξ ἐθνῶν, ἐστὶν αὕτη. Πιστευθεὶς δὲ λοιπὸν ἐκείνους, οὐχ ὁμοίως τῷ Πέτρῳ, οὐδὲ διὰ τῆς αὐτῆς ὁδοῦ πρὸς τὴν πίστιν αὐτοὺς ἐνήγεν, ἀλλὰ δι’ ἐτέρας. Ἐτέρας δὲ ὅταν ἀκούσης, μὴ διαφορὰν ἐν τῷ κηρύγματι νομίσης εἶναι. Τὰ γὰρ αὐτὰ ἀμφοτέροι καὶ Ἰουδαίοις καὶ Ἑλλήσιν ἐκήρυττον· οἷον, ὅτι Θεὸς ὁ Χριστὸς, ὅτι ἐσταυρώθη καὶ ἐτάφη, καὶ ἀνέστη, καὶ ἔστιν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ Πατρὸς, ὅτι μέλλει κρίνειν ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς, καὶ ὅσα τοιαῦτα ἦν, ὁμοίως καὶ Παῦλος καὶ Πέτρος ἐκήρυττον. Ἐν τίσιν οὖν ἦν ἡ διαφορά; Ἐν τῇ παρατηρήσει τῶν βρωμάτων, ἐν τῇ περιτομῇ, ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοις τοῖς Ἰουδαϊκοῖς ἔθεσιν. Ὁ μὲν γὰρ Πέτρος οὐκ ἐτόλμα τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ μαθηταῖς φανερώς λέγειν καὶ διαρρήδην, ὅτι δεῖ τούτων ἀποστῆναι καθάπαξ. Ἐδεδόκει γὰρ, μήποτε πρὸ καιροῦ τὴν συνήθειαν ταύτην ἀνασπάσαι βουλόμενος, καὶ τὴν εἰς τὸν Χριστὸν πίστιν συνανασπάσῃ μετ’ ἐκείνων, τῆς ψυχῆς τῶν Ἰουδαίων οὐκ ἀνεχομένης οὐδέπω, διὰ τὴν χρονίαν τὴν περὶ τὸν νόμον πρόληψιν, τῶν ῥημάτων ἀκούειν τούτων. Διὰ τοῦτο ἠενίχετο ὁ μακάριος Πέτρος ἰουδαϊζόντων αὐτῶν.

141. Despite reading τῶν συνεληλυθότων for τῶν πεπιστευκότων after Ἰουδαίων in the quotation of Acts 21:20 that follows, John still understands these to be Jewish Christ-believers, and he harmonizes that meaning onto the Letter to the Hebrews.

142. Cited in the same wording as in §3 (PG 51:375) above, with one exception: ὑπάρχουσι (with M) for εἰσὶ in Acts 21:20.

143. Chrysostom adopts the form of 1 Cor 15:3–8 with the repeated ὅτι introducing the elements of the εὐαγγέλιον that, Paul stresses, was held in common by all who preach and what all believed (1 Cor 15:11: εἶτε οὖν ἐγὼ εἶτε ἐκεῖνοι, οὕτως κηρύσσομεν καὶ οὕτως ἐπιστεύσατε). But he has filled it with articles of the Niceno-Constantinopolitan creed, which he imagines was already being preached by both Paul and Peter. The parallels are as follows (with John’s text first and the text of the creed second): θεὸς ὁ Χριστὸς/θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ; ἐσταυρώθη/σταυρωθέντα; ἐτάφη/ταφέντα; ἀνέστη/ἀναστάντα; ἔστιν ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ Πατρὸς/καθεζόμενον ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ Πατρὸς; μέλλει κρίνειν ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς/πάνιν ἐρχόμενον μετὰ δόξης κρῖνα ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς.

When we're not pleased with someone, we don't receive what they say eagerly or with pleasure, even if they say something salutary. Therefore, lest that happen in this case, he removes his own name from the epistle so this wouldn't be an obstacle to their reading of it. After all, it wasn't only the unbelieving Jews who hated and turned their backs on him, but even those who believed.¹⁴¹ Hear what James and all the others say to him that time when he went up to Jerusalem: "*You see, brother, how many thousands of Jews have come together, and these men are all zealous for the law, and they have been instructed about you that you teach apostasy from the law*" (Acts 21:20–21).¹⁴² This is why they hated and turned their backs on him most of all.

12. So that's the reason Paul wasn't entrusted with Jews but instead those from the gentiles. And once he'd been entrusted with the gentiles, he didn't bring them into the faith via the same route as Peter, but by a different way. Now when you hear of a "different way," don't suppose there's a distinction in the gospel proclamation. For they both used to preach the same things to both Jews and Greeks, such as that Christ is God, that he was crucified and buried and rose, and is at the right hand of the Father, that he is going to judge the living and the dead, and all the things like this that both Paul and Peter used to preach in the same way.¹⁴³ So where did the difference lie? In the observance of food laws, in circumcision, in other Jewish customs. Peter didn't dare to tell his own disciples openly and directly that they should once and for all leave off these things. This is because he was afraid,¹⁴⁴ lest in his wish to pluck out these customs too soon, he might pluck out their faith in Christ along with them. This is because the souls of the Jews couldn't yet put up with hearing these words, due to their long-held predispositions¹⁴⁵ about the law. For this reason the blessed Peter used to put up with their living like Jews.¹⁴⁶

144. ἐδεδοίκει, Peter's "real" fear for the sake of the Jewish Christ-believers who were still adhering to the law.

145. πρόληψις, meaning also "preconception" and "preoccupation" (see PGL 1–3). John has all these resonances in view in terms of ideas about the law, habits related to the law, and actual practices of the commandments of the law. The Greek word is singular, but more natural English seems to require the plural.

146. Here, as in Gal 2:14, *ἰουδαΐζειν* means "embrace, practice Judaism" (PGL) or "live as one bound by Mosaic ordinances or traditions, live in Judean or Jewish fashion" (BDAG).

Καὶ καθάπερ τις γεωργὸς ἄριστος φυτὸν ἀπαλὸν πλησίον δένδρου [382] γεγηρακότος καταθέμενος, οὐ τολμᾷ, οὐδὲ ὑπομένει τὸ γεγηρακὸς ἀνασπᾶσαι δένδρον, δεδοικῶς μὴ, τῶν ριζῶν ἐκείνων ἀνελκομένων, καὶ τὸ νεόφυτον συνανελκυσθῆ, ἀλλ' ἀναμένει πρότερον παγῆναι ἐκεῖνο καλῶς, καὶ ἐν αὐτοῖς κάτω ριζωθῆναι τοῖς κόλποις τῆς γῆς, καὶ τότε τὸ παλαιωθὲν μετὰ ἀδείας ἀνέλκει, οὐδὲν ἔτι δεδοικῶς περὶ τοῦ νεοφύτου· οὕτω δὴ καὶ ὁ μακάριος Πέτρος ἐποίει· τὴν πίστιν νεόφυτον οὔσαν ἔμενε παγῆναι καλῶς ἐν ταῖς τῶν ἀκούοντων ψυχαῖς, ἵνα ριζωθείσης ἐκείνης μετὰ ἀδείας λοιπὸν τὴν Ἰουδαϊκὴν ἀνέλῃ πρόληψιν ἄπασαν. Ἀλλ' οὐχ ὁ Παῦλος οὕτω· πάσης γὰρ ταύτης ἀπηλλαγμένος ἦν τῆς ἀνάγκης, Ἑλλησι κηρύττων, τοῖς οὐδέποτε μετεσχηκόσι νόμου, οὐδὲ Ἰουδαϊκῶν παρατηρήσεων ἀκηκοόσιν. Ὅτι γὰρ οὐκ ἀλλήλοις ἐναντιούμενοι ταῦτα ἐποιοῦν, ἀλλὰ τῇ τῶν μαθητῶν ἀσθενείᾳ συγκαταβαίνοντες, ἔστιν ἰδεῖν καὶ Παῦλον ὁμοίως Πέτρῳ ταῦτα αὐτὰ συγχωροῦντα, καὶ οὐ συγχωροῦντα μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸν συνεργοῦντα, καὶ Πέτρον πάλιν τὴν αὐτὴν ἐλευθερίαν νομοθετοῦντα, ἣν καὶ Παῦλος τοῖς ἔθνεσι πᾶσιν ἐκήρυττε. Καὶ ποῦ ταῦτα, φησὶν, ἀμφότερα ἔστιν ἰδεῖν; Ἐν αὐτοῖς τοῖς Ἱεροσολύμοις. Οὗτος μὲν γὰρ καὶ ἐξύρατο, καὶ ἔθυσε, καὶ ἀγνισμὸν ἐπετέλεσεν, ὁ τῶν ἐθνῶν διδάσκαλος. Τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ ὁ καιρὸς ἀπῆται, καὶ τὸ παρεῖναι πολλοὺς Ἰουδαίους. Θεωρεῖς γὰρ, φησὶν, ἀδελφε, πόσαι μυριάδες εἰσὶν Ἰουδαίων τῶν συνεληλυθότων, καὶ κατήχηνται περὶ σοῦ, ὅτι ἀποστασίαν ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου διδάσκεις.

ἰγ'. Ἐκεῖνος τοίνυν συγκαταβῆναι ἀναγκαζόμενος ἰουδαίζειν· ἀλλ' οὐχὶ τῆς γνώμης, ἀλλὰ τῆς οἰκονομίας τὸ γινόμενον ἦν. Πάλιν ὁ Πέτρος, ὁ τῶν Ἰουδαίων διδάσκαλος, καὶ πανταχοῦ συγχωρῶν περιτομὴν καὶ Ἰουδαϊκὰς παρατηρήσεις, διὰ τὴν ἀσθένειαν τῶν μαθητῶν, ἐπειδὴ καιρὸν εἶδεν ἀπαλλάττοντα αὐτὸν τῆς ἀνάγκης ταύτης, καὶ οὐκ ἦν ἀσφαλὲς μέχρι τοσούτου κεχρῆσθαι τῇ συγκαταβάσει, ἀλλὰ δογμάτων ἦν καιρὸς καὶ νόμων, ἀκουσον

147. νεόφυτος (cf. 1 Tim 3:6) is a technical term referring to one “newly converted, neophyte” (PGL B).

148. The voice of a hypothetical interlocutor.

149. Cf. 1 Tim 2:7.

150. In context this is spoken by the plural voice of James and the elders. The translation takes John's use of the singular φησὶν to be introducing the quote from Acts.

151. With ellipsis of καὶ πάντες ζηλωταὶ τοῦ νόμου, as marked in the translation; cf. the almost exact quotations of this passage in §3 (PG 51:375) and §11 (PG 51:381).

152. The term γνώμη is essential to John's λύσις of the ζήτημα of the apparent conflict between Paul and Peter. The word refers both to the apostles' “underlying intention or purpose” and to the substance of the “judgment, opinion, or ruling” that they make on law observance not being necessary for believers. By translating γνώμη as “true

A skilled farmer plants a tender sapling near [382] a tree that's grown old, not daring or venturing to pluck up the old tree out of fear that when its roots are plucked up the newly planted sapling might be pulled up with it. Instead, at first he waits for the sapling to become firmly established and rooted deeply in the bosom of the earth, and then he pulls up the old and worn tree without trepidation, with no fear about the young sapling. The blessed Peter used to act in the very same way as this. He was waiting for the newly planted¹⁴⁷ faith to be well established in the souls of those who heard it, so that, once it had been deeply rooted, he might remove all their "Jewish predispositions" without trepidation. But Paul wasn't like this. He'd been freed of this entire necessity because he was preaching to Greeks who'd never had a share in the law or heard about Jewish observances. So in doing these things the apostles were not in opposition to one another, but they were accommodating the weakness of their disciples. Because of this, one can see Paul just like Peter making these kinds of concessions, and not only see Paul making concessions, but even acting as Peter's collaborator. And, in turn, one can see Peter legislating the same freedom that Paul was preaching to all the gentiles. "Where can one see both of these things?" someone asks.¹⁴⁸ In Jerusalem itself. Indeed, this man—the teacher of the gentiles¹⁴⁹—shaved himself, sacrificed, and completed the rite of purification (cf. Acts 21:26). Both the occasion and the presence of many Jews demanded it. For it¹⁵⁰ says, "*You see, brother, how many thousands of Jews have come together ... and they have been instructed about you that you teach apostasy from the law* (Acts 21:20–21)."¹⁵¹

13. So then, Paul was compelled to accommodate to living like a Jew. But the action wasn't a matter of true conviction¹⁵² but of accommodation.¹⁵³ And Peter, the teacher of the Jews, though he made concessions everywhere for circumcision and Jewish observances on account of the weakness of his disciples, saw that time had freed him from this necessity, and that it wasn't safe to extend the accommodation for such a long period of time,¹⁵⁴ but that it was now the time for proper teaching and laws.¹⁵⁵

conviction" in these instances, I seek to render John's use of this word to emphasize both the unwavering and honest disposition each of the apostles had inside and the actual substance of each apostle's real view on the issue.

153. οἰκονομία, as above, or "prior arrangement." Both senses are in view.

154. μέχρι τοσούτου; or, "to such a degree" (see LSJ II.2–3).

155. There is an *anacolouthon* here. (John's syntax has gotten away from him in this long sentence.)

τί φησιν. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἀνέβησαν ἐξ Ἀντιοχείας οἱ περὶ Παῦλον καὶ Βαρνάβαν, περὶ τούτων αὐτῶν μαθησόμενοι τὸ σαφές, πολλῆς ζητήσεως γενομένης, ἀναστὰς ὁ Πέτρος ἔλεγεν· Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, ὑμεῖς ἐπίστασθε ἀφ' ἡμερῶν ἀρχαίων, ὡς ἐν ἡμῖν ἐξελέξατο ὁ Θεὸς ἀκοῦσαι τὰ ἔθνη διὰ τοῦ στόματός μου τὸν λόγον τοῦ Εὐαγγελίου, καὶ πιστεῦσαι. Εἶτα ἕτερα ἅπαντα εἰπὼν μεταξὺ, ἐπήγαγε λέγων· Τί οὖν πειράζετε τὸν Θεὸν ἐπιθεῖναι ζυγὸν ἐπὶ τὸν τράχηλον τῶν ἐθνῶν, ὃν οὔτε οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν, οὔτε ἡμεῖς ἰσχύσαμεν βαστάσαι; ἀλλὰ διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ πιστεύομεν σωθῆναι, ὃν τρόπον κἀκεῖνοι. Ὅρᾳς ὅτι ἡνίκα μὲν καιρὸς συγκαταβάσεως ἦν, καὶ Παῦλος ἰουδαῖζεν· ἡνίκα δὲ οὐχὶ συγκαταβάσεως καιρὸς ἦν, ἀλλὰ δογματίζειν ἔδει καὶ νομοθετεῖν, καὶ Πέτρος ἐκείνης τῆς συγκαταβάσεως ἀπαλλαγείς, εἰλικρινῆ καὶ καθαρά τὰ δόγματα παραδίδωσι· καὶ τούτων λεγομένων ὁ Παῦλος παρῆν, καὶ ἤκουε, καὶ τὴν ἐπιστολὴν αὐτὸς δεξάμενος, πανταχοῦ διεκόμισε, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν εἰπεῖν, ὡς ἡγνόει τὴν τοῦ ἀποστόλου γνώμην. Τίνος οὖν ἕνεκεν τοιαῦτα ἐγκαλεῖ νῦν, λέγων, ὅτι Φοβούμενος τοὺς ἐκ περιτομῆς;

ιδ'. Ἰνα δὲ καὶ τὴν ἱστορίαν αὐτὴν ἴδῃτε τῶν λεγομένων, μικρὸν ἄνωθεν ὑμῖν διηγῆσομαι· ἀλλὰ προσέχετε, παρακαλῶ· πρὸς γὰρ αὐτὸ τὸ βάθος τῆς λύσεως κατηντήσαμεν. Ἰάκωβος ὁ ἀδελφὸς τοῦ Κυρίου [383] τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν τότε ἐπεσκόπευεν ἐν ἀρχῇ, τὴν ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις, καὶ τῶν ἐξ Ἰουδαίων πιστευσάντων προειστήκει πάντων. Συνέβαινε δὲ εἶναι καὶ ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ

156. To Jerusalem, per Acts 15.

157. With πολλῆς ζητήσεως γενομένης for πολλῆς δὲ συζητήσεως γενομένης (NA²⁸ has the reading ζητήσεως here, without even listing the variant reading συζητήσεως in \mathfrak{M}). And yet rather than a textual variance, here Chrysostom has likely harmonized this verse with Acts 15:2 (γενομένης οὖν στάσεως καὶ ζητήσεως) since he cites the lemma in the \mathfrak{M} text-form in *Hom. Act.* 32.1 (PG 60:235).

158. With ἔλεγεν for εἶπεν; plus ὁ before Πέτρος; minus πρὸς αὐτούς (the opening is partial quotation, partial paraphrase); minus ὅτι before ἀφ' ἡμερῶν ἀρχαίων; plus ὡς before ἐν ἡμῖν; transposition of ὁ θεὸς ἐν ἡμῖν ἐξελέξατο διὰ τοῦ στόματός μου ἀκοῦσαι τὰ ἔθνη τὸν λόγον τοῦ εὐαγγελίου (\mathfrak{M}) to ἐν ἡμῖν ἐξελέξατο ὁ θεὸς ἀκοῦσαι τὰ ἔθνη διὰ τοῦ στόματός μου τὸν λόγον τοῦ εὐαγγελίου. However, when Chrysostom cites the lemma in *Hom. Act.* 22.1, his text reads ὅτι ἀφ' ἡμερῶν ἀρχαίων ὁ θεὸς ἐν ὑμῖν ἐξελέξατο διὰ τοῦ στόματός μου ἀκοῦσαι τὰ ἔθνη τὸν λόγον τοῦ εὐαγγελίου (PG 60:235), thus following \mathfrak{M} with one exception: ὑμῖν for ἡμῖν.

159. John has harmonized the Acts text with Gal 2:16. In terms of translation, an alternative is the subjective genitive, “the faith[fulness] of Jesus Christ,” as argued by Richard B. Hays and numerous others, in regard to Galatians. See Richard B. Hays, *The Faith of Jesus Christ: The Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1–4:11*, 2nd ed., The Biblical Resource Series 56 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002); Roy A. Harrisville III, “ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ: Witness of the Fathers,” *NovT* 36 (1994): 233–41, argues for

Hear what he said at that precise moment. For when Paul and Barnabas and their team went up from Antioch¹⁵⁶ in order to gain clear instructions about these very matters (cf. Acts 15:2), “*when there was a serious inquiry*”¹⁵⁷ Peter rose and said, ‘Men, brothers, you know from days of old how among us God chose for the gentiles to hear the word of the gospel from my mouth and come to have faith’” (Acts 15:7).¹⁵⁸ Then, after saying a few intervening things, he said in addition, “*Why then are you testing God by laying a yoke on the neck of the gentiles that neither our ancestors nor we were able to bear? But through faith in*”¹⁵⁹ Jesus Christ, we believe that we are saved in the same way as they are” (Acts 15:10–11).¹⁶⁰ You see that when it was time for accommodation, even Paul lived like a Jew, but when it wasn’t the right time for accommodation, but rather to offer proper teaching and legislation, even Peter was freed from that form of accommodation and handed on teachings that were uncompromising and pure.¹⁶¹ And Paul was present when these things were said and he heard them. And, once he’d received the letter (cf. Acts 15:22–29), he carried it around everywhere. Hence one cannot say that Paul was ignorant of the apostle Peter’s true conviction. So why does Paul hurl such accusations now, saying, “*out of fear concerning those from the circumcision*” (Gal 2:12)?

14. To allow you to see¹⁶² the particular historical context of these statements, I shall recount it for you in brief, going back to the beginning. But pay close attention, I beg you! For we’ve arrived at the very depths of the solution.¹⁶³ Back then, James the brother of the Lord [383] was exercising leadership over the church (that is, the church in Jerusalem), and he presided over all those from the Jews who believed. And it happened

the predominance of the objective genitive in patristic authors like Chrysostom. The debate on this, of course, continues.

160. With τί οὖν for νῦν οὖν τί; τῶν ἐθνῶν [ἐθνῶν sic PG; correct in PE Mf] for τῶν μαθητῶν; διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ for διὰ χάριτος τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ; ὅν for καθ’ ὅν before τρόπον. Every one of these variants is reversed in the citation of the lemma in *Hom. Act. 22.1* (PG 60:235), which follows 𐌆.

161. John assumes a supersessionist position such that true δόγματα (and the act of δογματίζειν) teach that the law is no longer operative after the Christ event (bolstered by, among other passages, his reading of Rom 10:4).

162. The PE added a note saying that FD appears to have read εἰδῆτε (rather than ἴδῆτε with Paris. gr. 748 and HS) because he translates “*cognoscatis*.”

163. John continues to press the congregation to alertness in pursuit of the promised λύσις.

Ἰουδαίους, οἵτινες πιστεύσαντες τῷ Χριστῷ, διὰ τὸ τῶν Ἱεροσολύμων εἶναι πόρρω, καὶ πολλοὺς ὁρᾶν τοὺς ἐξ ἐθνῶν πεπιστευκότας ἀδεῶς καὶ χωρὶς Ἰουδαϊκῶν παρατηρήσεων βιοῦντας, ἡρέμα καὶ κατὰ μικρὸν ἐνήγοντο καὶ αὐτοὶ τῆς Ἰουδαϊκῆς ἀφίστασθαι συνηθείας, καὶ καθαρὰν καὶ ἀνόθευτον ἔχειν τὴν τῆς πίστεως διδασκαλίαν. Κατελθὼν τοίνυν ὁ Πέτρος, καὶ ἰδὼν οὐκ οὔσαν ἀνάγκην οὐδεμίαν συγκαταβάσεως, ἐθνικῶς ἔζη λοιπόν. Τὸ δὲ, ἐθνικῶς ζῆν, τοῦτό φησιν ὁ Παῦλος, τὸ χωρὶς Ἰουδαϊκῆς παρατηρήσεως, τὸ μηδὲν τῶν νομίμων ἐκείνων παραφυλάττειν, οἶον, περιτομὴν, ἢ σάββατον, ἢ τι τῶν τοιούτων. Ζῶντος τοίνυν οὕτω τοῦ Πέτρου, κατῆλθόν τινες Ἰουδαῖοι ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου, τουτέστιν, ἐξ Ἱεροσολύμων, οἱ, διὰ τὸ διαπαντὸς ἐπὶ τῆς μητροπόλεως διατρίβειν, καὶ μηδένα ὁρᾶν ἐτέρως πολιτευόμενον, ἔτι τὴν πρόληψιν εἶχον τὴν Ἰουδαϊκὴν, καὶ πολλὰς τῶν παρατηρήσεων ἐκείνων ἐπεσύροντο. Τούτους ἰδὼν ὁ Πέτρος, τοὺς ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου καὶ ἐξ Ἱεροσολύμων κατελθόντας, ἀσθενέστερον διακειμένους ἔτι, καὶ φοβηθεὶς μὴ σκανδαλισθέντες τῆς πίστεως ἀποπηδήσωσι, μετετάξατο πάλιν, καὶ τὸ ζῆν ἐθνικῶς ἀφείλ, ἐπὶ τὴν προτέραν συγκατάβασιν ἦλθε, βρωμάτων παρατηρήσεις φυλάττων. Ἰδόντες οὖν αὐτὸν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, οἱ ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ διατρίβοντες, τοῦτο ποιοῦντα, καὶ οὐκ εἰδότες αὐτοῦ τὴν γνώμην, μεθ' ἧς ταῦτα ἔπραττε, συναπήχθησαν καὶ αὐτοὶ, καὶ ἡναγκάζοντο ἰουδαΐζειν διὰ τὸν διδάσκαλον. Καὶ τοῦτό ἐστιν, ὅπερ ὁ Παῦλος ἐγκαλεῖ· καὶ ἵνα σαφέστερον γένηται τὸ λεγόμενον, αὐτὰ ὑμῖν λοιπὸν ἀναγνώσομαι τὰ ἀποστολικά ῥήματα. “Οτε δὲ ἦλθε Πέτρος εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν, κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτῷ ἀντέστην, ὅτι κατεγνωσμένος ἦν. Πρὸ τοῦ γὰρ ἐλθεῖν τινας ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου, τουτέστιν, ἐξ Ἱεροσολύμων, μετὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν συνήσθιε, τουτέστι, τῶν ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ. “Οτε δὲ ἦλθόν τινες ἐξ Ἱεροσολύμων, νομομαθεῖς, ὑπέστελλε, καὶ ἀφώρισεν ἑαυτὸν ὁ Πέτρος φοβούμενος τοὺς ἐκ περιτομῆς. Ποίους; Τοὺς ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου κατελθόντας· Καὶ συναπήχθησαν αὐτῷ καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ Ἰουδαῖοι. Ποῖοι Ἰουδαῖοι; Οἱ πρὶν τοὺς ἐξ Ἱεροσολύμων

164. I.e., to keep the law, as they had been instructed from youth.

165. φοβηθείς; Chrysostom deliberately uses the language of Gal 2:12 in his argument about of what exactly was the object of Peter's fear (on which see below).

166. ἡναγκάζοντο; John is echoing the language of Paul in Gal 2:14.

167. Chrysostom characterizes the text in a single breath as both unclear (and hence in need of exposition) and clear in that all it needs is to be read again (with, however, interpretive clarifications). See also p. 540 n. 186 below on the poetics of this type of biblical interpretation.

168. I.e., that they might leave the faith if compelled to stop observing the law (on John's argument).

169. Plus ὁ Πέτρος before φοβούμενος. The text of Gal 2:11–12 is read with interspersed interpretive glosses added by John, placed in parentheses above: τουτέστιν, ἐξ

that there were also Jews in Antioch who had come to have faith in Christ. Because they were far away from Jerusalem and they saw many believers from the gentiles living freely and without Jewish observances, quietly and little by little, they, too, were persuaded to give up the Jewish customs and hold the teaching of the faith in its pure and genuine form. And then when Peter came down and he saw there was no necessity for accommodation, he at last was living like a gentile. What Paul calls “living like a gentile” (cf. Gal 2:14) is living without the observance of Jewish customs, keeping none of those legal stipulations such as circumcision, Sabbath, or any other such thing. And then as Peter was living this way, some Jews came down “*from James*” (Gal 2:12)—that is, from Jerusalem—and, since they had always lived in the Jews’ capital city and had never seen anyone conducting themselves differently, they still held their predisposition for Jewish customs¹⁶⁴ and they carried over many of those observances. When Peter saw that these people who had come down “*from James*” and from Jerusalem were still in this weaker disposition, and because he feared¹⁶⁵ that they might take offense and depart from the faith, he switched sides again, and, giving up living like a gentile, he returned to his former accommodation, keeping the observance of food laws. Then the Jews (that is, the ones who lived in Antioch), on seeing Peter doing this, because they didn’t know the true conviction underlying his behavior, were themselves also led astray and they were compelled¹⁶⁶ to live like Jews because of their teacher. And this is what Paul accuses. To make what he says clearer,¹⁶⁷ I shall now read the very words of the apostle to you: “*But when Peter came to Antioch, I opposed him to his face, because he stood condemned. For before some people came from James*” (that is, from Jerusalem), “*he used to eat with the gentiles*” (that is, the gentiles in Antioch), “*but when they*” (some from Jerusalem who were trained in the law) “*came, he (Peter) was withdrawing and separating himself out of fear concerning*¹⁶⁸ *those from the circumcision*” (Gal 2:11–12).¹⁶⁹ Fear concerning which people from the circumcision? The people “*from James*” who came down. “*And the rest of the Jews were led astray with him also* (Gal 2:13).¹⁷⁰ Which Jews? The Jews¹⁷¹ who were

¹⁶⁴ Ἱεροσολύμων after τινὰς ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου; τουτέστι, τῶν ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ after μετὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν συνήσθιε; τινες ἐξ Ἱεροσολύμων, νομομαθεῖς after ἤλθον. These of course would have been accompanied by verbal and visual cues in the oral presentation.

¹⁷⁰. With συναπήχθησαν for συνεπεκρίθησαν (cf. Βαρναβᾶς συναπήχθη in Gal 2:13), here and two more times later in this homily when citing this verse in §15 (PG 51:383) and §18 (PG 51:386).

¹⁷¹. I.e., Jewish Christ-believers.

καταβῆναι ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ διατρίβοντες, καὶ μηδεμίαν Ἰουδαϊκὴν παρατήρησιν φυλάττοντες. Ὡστε καὶ Βαρναβᾶς συναπήχθη αὐτῶν τῇ ὑποκρίσει. Καὶ τὸ μὲν δοκοῦν ἐγκλημα εἶναι, τοῦτο.

ιε'. Εἰ δὲ βούλεσθε, καὶ τὰς παρ' ἐτέρων ἀπολογίας ἐπινενοημένας πρότερον θείς, τότε καὶ τὸν ἐμμαντοῦ λόγον εἰσαγαγεῖν πειράσομαι, ἐφ' ὑμῖν τῶν λεγομένων τὴν αἵρεσιν ποιησάμενος. Πῶς οὖν τινες τὴν ζήτησιν ταύτην ἔλυσαν; Οὐκ ἦν οὗτος Πέτρος, φησὶν, ἐκεῖνος, ὁ τῶν ἀποστόλων πρῶτος, ὁ παρὰ τοῦ Κυρίου τὰ πρόβατα πιστευθεὶς, ἀλλ' ἕτερός τις εὐτελής καὶ ἀπερριμμένος, καὶ τῶν πολλῶν εἷς. Πόθεν τοῦτο δῆλον; Εἰπὼν ὁ Παῦλος, ὅτι συναπήχθησαν αὐτῷ καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ Ἰουδαῖοι, ἐπήγαγε, φησὶν, Ὡστε καὶ Βαρναβᾶς συναπήχθη αὐτῶν τῇ ὑποκρίσει. Τὸ δὲ εἰπεῖν, Ὡστε καὶ Βαρναβᾶς, δηλοῦντός ἐστιν, ὅτι πολὺ [384] τοῦτο θαυμαστότερον ἢν τοῦ Πέτρον ἀπαχθῆναι. Ὡς γὰρ μείζονα αὐτὸν τιθεῖς, οὕτως εἶπεν, ὅτι οὐ μόνον Πέτρος, ἀλλὰ καὶ Βαρναβᾶς.

Πέτρου δὲ ἐκείνου μείζων Βαρναβᾶς οὐκ ἦν. Ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔστι ταῦτα, οὐκ ἔστιν. Οὐ γὰρ, ἐπειδὴ μείζων ἦν ὁ Βαρναβᾶς, διὰ τοῦτο ἐπὶ τούτῳ θαυμάζει μᾶλλον, ἀλλὰ τίνος ἕνεκεν; Ὅτι ἐκεῖνος μὲν εἰς τὴν περιτομὴν ἀπεστάλη, Βαρναβᾶς δὲ μετὰ Παύλου τοῖς ἔθνεσιν ἐκήρυττε, καὶ πανταχοῦ τῷ Παύλῳ συνέζευκται· ὥσπερ οὖν ἀλλαχοῦ φησιν, Ἡ μόνος ἐγὼ καὶ Βαρναβᾶς οὐκ ἔχομεν ἐξουσίαν τοῦ μὴ ἐργάζεσθαι; καὶ ἄλιν, Ἀνέβην εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα μετὰ Βαρναβᾶ, καὶ πανταχοῦ μετὰ τοῦ Παύλου διδάσκοντα αὐτὸν ὁρᾷς. Οὐκ ἐπειδὴ οὖν μείζων ἦν Πέτρου, διὰ τοῦτο θαυμάζει, ὅτι καὶ αὐτὸς συναπήχθη· ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ μετ' αὐτοῦ κηρύττων αἰεὶ, καὶ οὐδὲν κοινὸν πρὸς Ἰουδαίους ἔχων, ἀλλ' ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσι διδάσκων, καὶ αὐτὸς συναπήχθη.

172. John will henceforward in the homily use the term Ἰουδαῖοι, “Jews,” according to this definition—i.e., Jewish Christ-believers at Antioch.

173. τὸ δοκοῦν ἐγκλημα (or, “the supposed accusation”) matches ἡ δοκοῦσα μάχη (“what appeared to be a battle,” “the supposed battle”) above in §2 (PG 51:374). The “accusation” is a double sword here, meaning both the accusation Paul leveled against Peter and the accusation leveled against Paul for his behavior (both in Antioch and in writing about it later).

174. ἀπολογία, both of the text and of Paul.

175. For the varieties of early Christian solutions to this crux, see Mitchell, “Peter’s ‘Hypocrisy’ and Paul’s,” 220–21, with references to further important secondary literature in note 20.

176. ζήτησις.

177. In *Hist. eccl.* 1.12.2 (SC 31:39, ed. Barty), Eusebius attributes the viewpoint that “Cephas” is not Peter to book five of Clement of Alexandria’s *Hypotyposesis*, but

living in Antioch and observing none of the Jewish observances before the people came down from Jerusalem.¹⁷² “*With the result that even Barnabas was led astray by their hypocrisy*” (Gal 2:13). So, this is what the “apparent accusation”¹⁷³ is.

15. But if you want, I’ll try to set forth the arguments of defense¹⁷⁴ that have been devised by others previously,¹⁷⁵ and then I’ll attempt to introduce my own argument as well, in that way putting into your hands the choice from among the options discussed. So then, how do some others solve this problem?¹⁷⁶ One says,¹⁷⁷ “This man wasn’t Peter. Peter was the first of the apostles, the one entrusted by the Lord with his sheep! (cf. John 21:15–19). No, this was another lowlife reject, some ordinary person. From where is this clear? After Paul said, ‘*And the rest of the Jews were led astray with him also*,’ he added, ‘*so that even Barnabas was led astray by their hypocrisy*’ (Gal 2:3).¹⁷⁸ But saying ‘*so that even Barnabas*’ is the act of someone who wishes to make it clear that this occurrence was much [384] more surprising than Peter being led astray. Since he places Barnabas in a more prestigious position, he says, ‘not only Peter but *even Barnabas*.’”¹⁷⁹

But Barnabas wasn’t a greater figure than the Peter mentioned here!¹⁸⁰ That can’t be, it just can’t be. So, since Barnabas wasn’t greater, the statement is all the more surprising in relation to him. So, what was the reason for that? Peter had been sent to the circumcision, but Barnabas preached to the gentiles with Paul (cf. Gal 2:8–9); everywhere he was joined at the hip with Paul. Hence elsewhere Paul says, “*Or do only I and Barnabas not have the freedom not to work?*” (1 Cor 9:6), and again, “*I went up to Jerusalem with Barnabas*” (Gal 2:1). Everywhere you see him teaching with Paul. Hence the reason Paul marvels that even he “*was led astray*” wasn’t that Barnabas was a greater figure than Peter, but that Barnabas always preached with Paul and, although he had no commonality with the Jews and taught among the gentiles, even he “*was led astray*.”

without this fulsomely negative characterization of the figure (Clement thought this Cephas was one of the seventy disciples of Luke 10:1). Chrysostom’s text does not read Κηφᾶς (see p. 500 n. 4 above), so this interpretation is less possible for him, though in what follows he does not argue the case on text-critical grounds.

178. John’s protagonist also quotes the text in support of his interpretation.

179. This is the end of the personification of the first possible solution, and what follows is John’s rebuttal of it.

180. Literally Πέτρος ἐχέϊνος, “that Peter.”

“Ὅτι δὲ Πέτρος ἐστὶ, περὶ οὗ ταῦτα πάντα φησὶ, δῆλον καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἀνωτέρω, καὶ ἐκ τῶν μετὰ ταῦτα. Τὸ γὰρ εἰπεῖν, ὅτι Κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτῷ ἀντέστην, καὶ ὡς μέγα θεῖναι τοῦτο, οὐδὲν ἕτερον δηλοῦντος ἦν, ἀλλ’ ἡ ὅτι οὐκ ἠδέσθη τοῦ προσώπου τὸ ἀξίωμα· οὐκ ἂν δὲ περὶ ἐτέρου λέγων, ὅτι Κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτῷ ἀντέστην, ὡς μέγα τι τοῦτο ἂν ἔθηκε. Πάλιν, εἰ ἄλλος ἦν Πέτρος, οὐκ ἂν ἡ μετὰστασις αὐτοῦ τοσοῦτον ἴσχυσεν, ὥστε καὶ τοὺς λοιποὺς ἐφελεύσασθαι Ἰουδαίους· οὔτε γὰρ παρήνεσέ τι, οὔτε συνεβούλευσεν, ἀλλὰ μόνον ὑπέστελλε, καὶ ἀφώριζεν ἑαυτόν· καὶ ἴσχυσεν ἡ ὑποστολὴ καὶ ὁ ἀφορισμὸς πάντας ἐπισπάσασθαι τοὺς μαθητὰς διὰ τὸ τοῦ προσώπου ἀξίωμα.

157. “Ὅτι μὲν οὖν Πέτρος ἦν, ἐκ τούτων δῆλον· εἰ δὲ βούλεσθε, καὶ τὴν ἐτέραν λύσιν ἐροῦμεν. Τίς οὖν ἐστὶν ἡ ἐτέρα; Καλῶς ἐνεκάλεσε Παῦλος, φησὶ, τῷ Πέτρῳ, ὅτι πέρα τοῦ μέτρου τῇ συγκαταβάσει ἐχρήσατο. Καὶ γὰρ ὃν τρόπον αὐτὸς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις γενόμενος συγκατέβη τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις, οὕτω κακέϊνον ἐχρῆν, φησὶν, εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν ἐλθόντα, μὴ πρὸς Ἰουδαίους ἰδεῖν, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τοὺς ἐξ ἐθνῶν. “Ὡσπερ γὰρ ἡνίκα πάντες Ἰουδαῖοι ἦσαν, καὶ Παῦλος ἠναγκάσθη ἰουδαΐζειν· οὕτως ἔνθα πλείους ἦσαν οἱ ἐξ ἐθνῶν, καὶ ἡ πόλις οὐδεμίαν ἀνάγκην παρείχε συγκαταβάσεως, οὐκ ἐχρῆν διὰ τοὺς ὀλίγους Ἰουδαίους σκανδαλίσαι τοὺς τοσοῦτους Ἕλληνας. Ἀλλὰ τοῦτο οὐκ ἔστι λύσις, ἀλλ’ ἐπίτασις τοῦ ζητήματος. “Ὁ γὰρ ἀρχόμενος εἶπον τοῦ λόγου, οὐ τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σπουδαζόμενον ἡμῖν, δεῖξαι ὅτι καλῶς ἐνεκάλεσε Παῦλος· ἐπεὶ οὕτω μενεῖ τὸ ζήτημα. Φανήσεται γὰρ ὑπεύθυνος ὢν ταῖς μέμψεσιν ὁ Πέτρος· τὸ δὲ ζητούμενον, καὶ τοῦτον κακέϊνον ἀπαλλάξαι τῶν ἐγκλημάτων. Πῶς οὖν ἔσται τοῦτο; Ἄν τὴν γνώμην, μεθ’ ἧς ὁ μὲν ἐπετίμησεν, ὁ δὲ ἐπετιμήθη, μάθωμεν, καὶ τὴν διάνοιαν αὐτὴν ἀναπτύξωμεν.

Τίς οὖν ἐστὶν ἡ διάνοια; Σφόδρα ὁ Πέτρος ἐπεθύμει καὶ τοὺς ἐξ Ἱεροσολύμων κατελθόντας, τοὺς ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου, ἀπαλλάξαι τῆς παρατηρήσεως

181. John continues through the various λύσεις that have been proposed for this notorious ζήτησις.

182. πέρα τοῦ μέτρου, i.e., “didn’t respect proper boundaries.” John perhaps has 2 Cor 10:13 in mind here, in terms of missionary boundaries (ἡμεῖς δὲ οὐχὶ εἰς τὰ ἄμετρα καυχησόμεθα, ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸ μέτρον τοῦ κανόνος οὐ ἐμέρισεν ἡμῖν ὁ θεός, μέτρον, ἐφικέσθαι ἄχρι καὶ ὑμῶν, 98, from RP).

183. ἀλλὰ τοῦτο οὐκ ἔστι λύσις, ἀλλ’ ἐπίτασις τοῦ ζητήματος; a turnabout taunt using the language of προβλήματα καὶ λύσεις.

184. ζητούμενον; cf. ζήτημα in the previous sentences.

185. γνώμη, a key part of John’s solution (see p. 532 n. 152 above).

186. διάνοια means both “purpose, intent” and, of a text, its “meaning, sense.” In rhetorical education, as exemplified by Hermogenes, *Stas.* (Περὶ στάσεων) 9 (ed. Rabe), a standard topic was the commonplace Περὶ ῥητοῦ καὶ διανοίας (“on the letter and the

Further, that Peter is the one about whom Paul says all these things is clear also from what comes before and what comes after. For saying “*I opposed him to his face*” and presenting it as a big deal was the action of someone who was showing nothing other than the fact that they weren’t afraid of the person’s rank. Paul wouldn’t have said “*I opposed him to his face*” about another Peter as though it were a big deal. Again, if it were another Peter, then his turn-about in behavior wouldn’t have had an effect so powerful that the rest of the Jews were led to follow him. After all, he didn’t offer any advice or counsel but only “*was withdrawing and separating himself*” (Gal 2:12). It was because of the rank this man held that his withdrawal and separation had the power to persuade the disciples.

16. So then, it’s clear from these arguments that the person in question was Peter. But if you want, we’ll tell you another solution¹⁸¹ as well. What’s the other solution? Another interpreter says: “Paul was right to accuse Peter, because he engaged in accommodating behavior that crossed the line.”¹⁸² For, that person says, “In the very same way that Paul accommodated the Jews when he was in Jerusalem (cf. Acts 21:20–26), when Peter came to Antioch he shouldn’t have had regard for the Jews, but rather for people from the gentiles. When they all were Jews, even Paul was compelled to live like a Jew; in the very same way, believers from the gentiles were the majority here, and the city of Antioch had no need for accommodation. It wasn’t necessary to place stumbling blocks in the way of the large numbers of Greeks for the sake of a small number of Jews.” Yet this isn’t a solution, but an amplification of the problem!¹⁸³ As I said at the beginning of this homily, our objective isn’t to show that Paul was right to accuse Peter, because in that way the problem remains, since Peter will appear to be liable to blame. The vexing problem¹⁸⁴ is how to free *both* Paul and Peter from the accusations. So how will this come about? If we learn the true conviction¹⁸⁵ with which the former issued the rebuke and the latter received the rebuke, and we unfurl its intended meaning.¹⁸⁶

What is that intended meaning? Peter greatly desired to free those who came down from Jerusalem, that is, those “*from James*,” from Jewish obser-

sense/intent”). Here in this homily John seems to refer to both purpose and meaning, in that he wishes to go behind the curtain of the action to the intention of the apostles, and he wishes to “unfurl” (ἀναπτύσσειν) the meaning of the text that is before him to find the deeper meaning below the surface of the conflict that appears in the plain sense of the passage, as promised in §2 (PG 51:374) and enacted now (see p. 536 n. 167 above).

τῆς Ἰουδαϊκῆς. Ἀλλ' εἰ μὲν αὐτὸς ταύτην εἰσηγήσατο τὴν γνώμην, καὶ παρελθὼν εἶπε, Παύσασθε τοῖς Ἰουδαϊκοῖς ἔθεσι χρώμενοι, ὡς ἐναντία ἑαυτῷ δημηγορῶν, καὶ τοῖς ὑπ' αὐτοῦ γεγενημένοις ἅπασι κατὰ τὸν ἔμπροσθεν χρό-**[385]**νον, ἐσκανδάλισεν ἂν τοὺς μαθητάς. Πάλιν, εἰ Παῦλος πρὸς αὐτοὺς τοῦτον ἀπέτεινε τὸν λόγον, οὐδ' ἂν προσέσχον, οὐδ' ἂν ἠνέσχοντο τῆς ἀκροάσεως. Οἱ γὰρ καὶ χωρὶς τούτου μισοῦντες αὐτὸν καὶ ἀποστρεφόμενοι διὰ τὴν τοιαύτην φήμην, πολλῶ μάλλον, εἰ καὶ συμβουλευόντος ταῦτα ἤκουσαν, ἀπεπήδησαν ἂν. Τί οὖν γίνεται; Ἰουδαίοις μὲν οὐδεὶς αὐτῶν ἐπετίμα τοῖς ἐξ Ἰακώβου, δέχεται δὲ τὴν ἐπιτίμησιν ὁ Πέτρος παρὰ τοῦ Παύλου, ἵνα ἐγκαλούμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ συναποστόλου, δικαίαν ἔχοι λοιπὸν τὴν παρρησίαν τοῦ καὶ τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἐπιπλῆξαι· καὶ ἐπιτιμᾶται μὲν ὁ Πέτρος, διορθοῦνται δὲ οἱ μαθηταί.

Τοῦτο δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ συναλλαγμάτων γίνεται βιωτικῶν. Ὅταν γάρ τινες ὀφείλωσι τινα ἐλλείμματα πολιτικῶν εἰσφορῶν, εἶτα οἱ μέλλοντες αὐτοὺς ἀπαιτεῖν, αἰσχύωνται καὶ ἐρυθριῶσι προσενεχθῆναι σφοδρότερον, βουλόμενοι πλείονα λαβεῖν ἀφορμὴν καὶ ἐξουσίαν τῆς κατ' αὐτῶν σφοδρότητος, παρασκευάζουσιν ἐτέρους τῶν συστρατιωτῶν ἀποδοῦσαι, λοιδορῆσασθαι, μυρία ἕτερα αὐτοῖς διαθεῖναι δεινὰ ὀρώντων ἐκείνων, ἵνα τούτων γενομένων, μηκέτι παρ' ἑαυτῶν, μηδὲ οἰκοθεν, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῆς ἐτέρων ἀνάγκης δοκῶσιν ἐκείνοις σφοδρότερον ἐπιτίθεσθαι· καὶ γίνεται ἢ ἐτέρων ὕβρις αὐτοῖς ἀπολογία πρὸς τοὺς ὑπευθύνους τοὺς ἑαυτῶν.

ιζ'. Τοῦτο καὶ ἐπὶ Παύλου καὶ ἐπὶ Πέτρου γέγονεν. Ὁφείλον γάρ τινα ἐλλείμματα οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι. Ποῖα δὲ ταῦτα; Τὸ παντελῶς ἀποστῆναι τοῦ Ἰουδαϊσμοῦ. Ἀπαιτῆσαι ταῦτα τὰ ἐλλείμματα σφοδρότερον ὁ Πέτρος ἐβούλετο, καὶ καθαρὰν εἰσπράξασθαι παρ' αὐτῶν τὴν πίστιν. Βουλόμενος τοίνυν πλείονα λαβεῖν ἐξουσίαν καὶ ἀφορμὴν τῆς τοιαύτης εἰσπράξεως, παρασκευάζει τὸν Παῦλον ἐπιτιμῆσαι μεθ' ὑπερβολῆς, καὶ ἐπιπλῆξαι, ἵνα ἢ

187. Acts 21:21; Gal 1:23; cf. Acts 9:1.

188. John is making an ironic or even paradoxical point here, as will be developed further below, that Peter's silence actually amounted to *παρρησία*, "boldness, outspokenness." John infers Peter's silence in the historical moment in the dining room at Antioch from the fact that Paul in his later letter to the Galatians does not record any response Peter made to Paul's rebuke. The text itself is silent about Peter's silence (or speech).

189. *παρασκευάζειν*, an important term for John's λύσις (see p. 543 n. 194 below).

190. John has chosen the term *συστρατιώτης* both because *στρατιώτης*, "soldier," can also mean "officer of imperial civil service, civil servant" (PGL 2), and for its specialized Pauline use for a partner in the gospel (Phil 2:25; Phlm 2).

191. A rather strained analogy, to be sure.

vances. But if Peter were the one who proposed this conviction and came forward and said, “Stop using Jewish customs,” he would’ve scandalized the disciples on the grounds that he was publicly proclaiming positions that contradict both himself and all his prior actions. [385] Yet again, if it were Paul who extended this argument to them, they wouldn’t have paid attention or even endured listening to it. For the people who even apart from this hated him and turned their backs on him because of his reputation¹⁸⁷ would’ve run away from him all the more if they’d heard him giving counsel about these matters. So what happened? Neither of them rebuked the Jews who came from James, but Peter accepts the rebuke from Paul, so that in being accused by his fellow apostle he might ultimately have a justifiable boldness¹⁸⁸ to reprove also his disciples. So it is Peter who is rebuked, but his disciples who are set straight.

This is what happens in everyday transactions as well. When some people have an overdue debt in their civic taxes, those who are going to ask them to settle it are ashamed and embarrassed to deal with them too forcefully. But, wishing to gain an opportunity and influence more effective than brute force against them, they arrange in advance¹⁸⁹ for their partners in the civil service¹⁹⁰ to strip, revile, and heap countless other troubles on their own persons while those who owe the debt look on. The goal is that, once these events have taken place, the debtors would resolve to give over their money even more eagerly to those they owe—and no longer from their own volition or their own initiative, but from the necessity imposed by others. So, the abuse that those who are owed money experience at the hands of others becomes their self-justification against those who are under liability for their debt to them.¹⁹¹

17. This is what happened in the case of both Paul and Peter. For the Jews¹⁹² had an overdue debt. What was that? To separate completely from Judaism. Peter was very eagerly wishing to ask them to settle this debt and to exact a pure faith from them.¹⁹³ Hence, wishing to gain more effective influence and an opportunity for exacting this, he arranges in advance¹⁹⁴ for Paul to rebuke him in an exaggerated fashion and issue a reproof, so

192. I.e., the Jewish Christ-believers, including those from Jerusalem and those at Antioch persuaded by them to return to observance of the practices of the law.

193. John employs a cluster of financial terms here, consistent with his earlier exemplum about the payment of taxes.

194. *παρασκευάζειν*, also fittingly here, “contrive” (see LSJ I.2 and 3) (see also p. 542 n. 189 above).

ἐπίπλαστος ἐπιτίμησις αὕτη δικαίαν αὐτῷ παρρησίας κατ' ἐκείνων ἀφορμὴν παρέχῃ καὶ πρόφασιν. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἀρχόμενός φησι, Κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτῷ ἀντέστην· καὶ ἐνταῦθα πάλιν, Εἶπον τῷ Πέτρῳ ἔμπροσθεν πάντων. Εἰ μὲν γὰρ τὸν ἀπόστολον διορθώσασθαι ἐβούλετο, κατ' ἰδίαν ἂν τοῦτο ἐποίησεν· ἐπειδὴ δὲ οὐ τοῦτο ἦν τὸ σπουδαζόμενον (ἥδει γὰρ τὴν γνώμην, μεθ' ἧς ἅπαντα ταῦτα ἐποίει), ἀλλ' ἐκείνους μέχρι πολλοῦ χωλεύοντας στηρίζαι ἐσπουδαζε, διὰ τοῦτο ἔμπροσθεν πάντων ποιεῖται τὴν ἐπιτίμησιν. Ὁ δὲ Πέτρος ἀνέχεται, καὶ σιγᾷ, καὶ οὐκ ἀντιλέγει. Ἦδει γὰρ τὴν γνώμην, μεθ' ἧς ὁ Παῦλος ἐπετίμα· καὶ τὸ πᾶν ὁ Πέτρος κατῴρθωσε σιγήσας. Ἡ γὰρ τούτου σιγὴ διδασκαλία τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ἐγένετο τοῦ μηκέτι τοῖς νομίμοις ἐνέχεσθαι.

Οὐ γὰρ ἂν ὁ διδάσκαλος ἐσίγησε, φησὶν, εἰ μὴ συνήδει δικαίως ἐπιτιμῶντι τῷ Παύλῳ. Ἀλλ' εἰ δοκεῖ, καὶ αὐτῆς τῆς ἐπιτιμήσεως ἀκούσωμεν. Εἶπον τῷ Πέτρῳ πάντων ἔμπροσθεν, φησὶν, Εἰ σὺ Ἰουδαῖος ὑπάρχων, ἐθνικῶς ζῆς. Σκόπει σύνεσιν· οὐκ εἶπεν αὐτῷ, ὅτι Κακῶς ποιεῖς Ἰουδαϊκῶς ζῶν· ἀλλ' ἐλέγχει αὐτοῦ τὴν προτέραν ἀναστροφὴν, ἵνα μὴ ἐκ τῆς Παύλου γνώμης ἢ παραίνεσις καὶ ἢ συμβουλή, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῆς Πέτρου κρίσεως τῆς ἡδὴ γεγεννημένης εἰσηγησθῆναι δοκῇ. Εἰ μὲν γὰρ εἶπε, Κακῶς ποιεῖς τὸν νόμον τηρῶν, ἐπετίμησαν ἂν οἱ μαθηταὶ οἱ Πέτρου. [386] νυνὶ δὲ ἀκούσαντες, ὅτι οὐ τῆς Παύλου γνώμης ἢ παραίνεσις ἦν καὶ ἡ διόρθωσις αὕτη, ἀλλ' αὐτὸς ὁ Πέτρος οὕτως ἔζη, καὶ ταῦτα εἶχεν ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ τὰ δόγματα, καὶ ἐκόντες καὶ ἄκοντες ἡσύχαζον. Διὰ τοῦτο οὔτε Πέτρος εἰσηγεῖται τὴν γνώμην, ἀλλ' ἀνέχεται παρ' ἐτέρου, τοῦ Παύλου λέγω, διελέγχεσθαι, καὶ σιγᾷ, ὥστε εὐπαράδεκτον γενέσθαι τὴν διδασκαλίαν.

195. A wordplay in the Greek: ἐπίπλαστος ἐπιτίμησις. On the Greek style of this sentence, see Mitchell, "Peter's 'Hypocrisy' and Paul's," 232 n. 72.

196. I.e., Peter.

197. Cf. discussion of this point above in §3 (PG 51:374–475).

198. I.e., by their continuing observance of the law.

199. Translating κατορθοῦν with PGL A.2. Alternatively (and perhaps chosen by John as deliberately ambiguous), the phrase could be rendered, "Peter accomplished the entire virtuous deed" (with PGL A.3). See also the same phrasing in the peroration, in §20 (PG 51:388).

200. Augustine argued vehemently that Peter deserved the rebuke. See his *Exp. Gal.* 1.15; text and translation in Eric Plumer, *Augustine's Commentary on Galatians: Introduction, Text, Translation, and Notes* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 142–47. See also Augustine's correspondence with Jerome, whose position was closer to Chrysostom's (as noted above, p. 498 n. 1). Augustine found their views problematic because they allowed for acts of dissimulation by the apostle Paul both in person and in writing. See *Ep.* 28.3–5; 40.3–7; 82.4–30 (CSEL 34.1–2, ed. Goldbacher). While this exact quotation cannot be found in Augustine's commentary on Galatians (and the work, dated ca. 394–396, most likely postdates this homily by John, as do the letters

this fake rebuke¹⁹⁵ might provide him¹⁹⁶ a justifiable opportunity and pretext for making a bold statement against them. That's why he said at the start, "*I opposed him to his face*" (Gal 2:11), and here again, "*I said to Peter in the presence of all*" (Gal 2:14). If Paul had wished to correct the apostle, he would've done it "*privately*" (Gal 2:2).¹⁹⁷ However, since this wasn't his objective (for Paul knew the true conviction with which Peter was doing all these things), but his plan was to strengthen those who had been handicapped for so long,¹⁹⁸ accordingly Paul made the rebuke "*in the presence of all*" (Gal 2:14). And Peter put up with it, and he was silent and didn't argue back. For he knew the true conviction with which Paul was issuing the rebuke. And Peter completely achieved his goal of correcting them¹⁹⁹ by remaining silent. It was his silence that was an instruction to the Jews that they were no longer subject to the requirements of the law.

"The teacher wouldn't be silent," someone says,²⁰⁰ "unless he acknowledged that Paul issued the rebuke justly." But, if you will, let's listen to the rebuke itself. "*I said to Peter in the presence of all*,"²⁰¹ he says, "*if you, being a Jew, live like a gentile*" (Gal 2:14). Look at Paul's intelligence. He didn't say to him, "You're doing wrong by living now like a Jew," but he exposes Peter's *former* behavior²⁰² so the advice and counsel would appear to have been introduced by the decision Peter had already made, rather than by Paul's opinion.²⁰³ For if he had said, "You're doing wrong²⁰⁴ by keeping the law," Peter's disciples would have rebuked him. [386] But now, once they'd heard that this advice and correction didn't come from Paul's own opinion but that Peter himself had lived this way and held these teachings in his soul, then they remained silent both voluntarily and involuntarily. The reason Peter didn't introduce his true conviction, but allowed for it to be spoken by another—I mean, Paul—and to remain silent, was to ensure that the teaching would be easily accepted.

exchanged with Jerome), Augustine would become the most famous exponent of the position personified here by Chrysostom.

201. With transposition of *ἐμπροσθεν* and *πάντων* here, but not in the quotations of the verse earlier in this homily.

202. I.e., *ἐθνικῶς ζῆς καὶ οὐκ Ἰουδαϊκῶς* ("you live like a gentile and not like a Jew") before the people from James arrived in Antioch.

203. *γνώμη* here refers to how the believers at Antioch would have perceived Paul's action, i.e., as his own idiosyncratic "opinion" or "viewpoint" and not, as John himself is using the term, to refer to Peter and Paul's "true conviction" underlying all appearances (see p. 532 n. 152 above).

204. Mf notes that some manuscripts (one of which is Paris. gr. 748, added in PE) read *καλῶς ποιεῖς*, "you're doing right."

ιη'. Οὐκ ἐντεῦθεν δὲ μόνον τὴν σύνεσιν ἔστιν ἰδεῖν τοῦ Παύλου, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἐξῆς εἰρημένων. Οὐ γὰρ εἶπεν, Εἰ σὺ Ἰουδαῖος ὑπάρχων, ἐθνικῶς ἔζης, καὶ οὐκ Ἰουδαϊκῶς, ἀλλ' ὅτι Ζῆς· ὥστε καὶ νῦν τὴν αὐτὴν γνώμην ἔχεις· καὶ τὸ πολλῆς γέμον συνέσεως, τὸ ἐπαγόμενόν ἐστιν. Εἰπὼν γὰρ, Ἐθνικῶς ζῆς, Ἰουδαῖος ὢν, οὐκ ἐπήγαγε· Τί τοὺς Ἰουδαίους ἀναγκάζεις ἰουδαῖζειν, ἀλλὰ πῶς; Τί τὰ ἔθνη, φησὶν, ἀναγκάζεις ἰουδαῖζειν, ἵνα τῷ δοκεῖν τῶν ἰδίων ἀντιποιεῖσθαι μαθητῶν, καὶ προσχήματι τῆς ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐθνῶν κηδεμονίας, πείσῃ τοὺς Ἰουδαίους ἀποστῆναι τῆς παλαιᾶς συνηθείας. "Οτι γὰρ πέπλασται τὰ ἐγκλήματα, ἐξ αὐτῶν τῶν εἰρημένων δῆλον. Ἀνωτέρω γὰρ εἰπὼν, Συναπήχθησαν αὐτῷ καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ Ἰουδαῖοι, ἐνταῦθα λέγει· Τί τὰ ἔθνη ἀναγκάζεις ἰουδαῖζειν; Καὶ μὴν ἐχρῆν εἰπεῖν, Τί τοὺς Ἰουδαίους ἀναγκάζεις ἰουδαῖζειν; Οἱ γὰρ συναπαχθέντες, οὐχ οἱ ἐξ ἐθνῶν ἦσαν, ἀλλ' Ἰουδαῖοι. Ἄλλ' εἰ μὲν τοῦτο εἶπεν, ἔδοξεν ἂν ὁ λόγος τραχὺς εἶναι, καὶ οὐδὲν αὐτῷ προσήκων· τῶν γὰρ ἐθνῶν διδάσκαλος ἦν· νῦν δὲ ἐν προσχήματι κηδεμονίας τῶν ἰδίων μαθητῶν ἀνεύθυνον καὶ ἐλευθέραν ποιεῖται τὴν ἐπιτίμησιν.

Καὶ ἵνα μάθητε, ὅτι οὐκ ἐπιτίμησις ἦν κατὰ Πέτρου τὰ λεγόμενα, ἀλλὰ παραίνεσις καὶ διδασκαλία τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ἐν τάξει τῆς ἐπιτιμήσεως τῆς κατὰ Πέτρου, ἄκουσον τῶν ἐξῆς· Ἡμεῖς φύσει Ἰουδαῖοι, καὶ οὐκ ἐξ ἐθνῶν ἁμαρτωλοί. Ταῦτα γὰρ λοιπὸν διδάσκοντός ἐστι, καὶ οὐκ ἔτι εἰς Πέτρον τὸ πᾶν περίστησιν, ἀλλὰ κοινοὶ τὸν λόγον. Εἰ μὲν γὰρ ὡς διδάσκων ἐξ ἀρχῆς εἰσέβαλεν, οὐκ ἂν ἠνέσχοντο Ἰουδαῖοι· νῦν δὲ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐξ ἐπιτιμήσεως λαβὼν, καὶ δόξας δικαίαν ποιεῖσθαι κατὰ τοῦ Πέτρου τὴν ἐπιτίμησιν, ὡς τοὺς ἐξ ἐθνῶν ἔλκοντος πρὸς τὴν τῶν νομίμων παρατήρησιν, ἐκβαίνει λοιπὸν ἀδεῶς εἰς παραίνεσιν καὶ συμβουλήν, ὡς τῆς ἀκολουθίας ἐπὶ τοῦτο ἀγούσης αὐτόν. "Ἵνα γὰρ μὴ τις ἀκούσας, ὅτι τὰ ἔθνη ἀναγκάζεις ἰουδαῖζειν, νομίσῃ ὅτι μόνοις ἐκείνοις οὐκ ἔξεστιν ἰουδαῖζειν, τοῖς δὲ Ἰουδαίοις ἐφεῖται, εἰς αὐτοὺς τοὺς διδασκάλους τὸν λόγον περίστησι. Τί λέγω, φησὶ, περὶ ἐθνῶν, ἢ τῶν

205. Using the rewording topos (of what Paul *did not* say), John gives an exact quotation of Gal 2:14c, except he replaces ζῆς with ἔζης.

206. Partial quotation and partial paraphrase, reversing the two clauses and reading Ἰουδαῖος ὢν for Ἰουδαῖος ὑπάρχων.

207. See p. 537 n. 170 above on the verb.

208. Καὶ μὴν ἐχρῆν εἰπεῖν, Τί τοὺς Ἰουδαίους ἀναγκάζεις ἰουδαῖζειν is lacking in both of HS's main witnesses—Monac. gr. 6, fol. 257^v and Paris. gr. 759, fol. 346^v—but present in C (the Constantinopolitan manuscript), a reading HS favored ("C. recte hoc loco interserit"). HS regarded the minus as a scribal error by homoioteleuton (ἰουδαῖζειν ending two successive sentences); Mf adopted the reading of C in his text.

209. Since John claims (implausibly) that Paul only pretended to be concerned for his own disciples, i.e., converts from the gentiles, in order to help Peter correct the

18. And it's not only here that one can see Paul's intelligence, but also in the things said next. For he didn't say, "If you, being a Jew, 'lived' like a gentile and not like a Jew,"²⁰⁵ but "*live*." "Consequently, you have the same conviction even now." And what's added next is filled with great intelligence. For after saying, "*You live like a gentile, although you are a Jew*" (Gal 2:14),²⁰⁶ Paul didn't add, "Why do you compel Jews to live like Jews?" But what did he add? "*Why do you compel gentiles to live like Jews?*" (Gal 2:14). He did this so that, in appearing to be contending about his own disciples, and in the pretense of concern for the gentiles, he might persuade the Jews to separate completely from their ancient customs. And the fact that the accusations were fabricated is clear from the very words that were said. For after stating earlier, "*And the rest of the Jews were led astray with him also*" (Gal 2:13),²⁰⁷ he says here, "*Why do you compel gentiles to live like Jews?*" (Gal 2:14). Shouldn't he have said, "Why do you compel Jews to live like Jews"?²⁰⁸ For the ones who were led astray weren't believers who were from the gentiles, but Jews. However, if he'd said this, then the statement would've appeared harsh and not appropriate to him. For he was the teacher of the gentiles (cf. 1 Tim 2:7). But instead, via the pretense of concern for his own disciples, Paul issued a rebuke without liability or obligation.²⁰⁹

Now, to learn that what Paul said wasn't a rebuke against Peter, but instead was advice and instruction for the Jews in the form of a rebuke against Peter, listen to what comes next: "*We are Jews by nature and not sinners from the gentiles*" (Gal 2:15). These words indeed belong to one who is issuing instructions; and he no longer refers at all to Peter, but he makes a common claim. If Paul had launched into teaching from the beginning, the Jews wouldn't have put up with it. But now, after beginning with a rebuke and after appearing to offer a justifiable rebuke against Peter on the purported grounds that he was dragging believers from the gentiles into observance of the requirements of the law, Paul finally launches fearlessly into advice and counsel, as the careful progression of the argument led him to it. Lest anyone hearing, "*You compel gentiles to live like Jews*" (Gal 2:14) supposes it's only the gentiles who aren't allowed to live like Jews but that it is permitted for Jews, Paul brings the argument around to the teachers themselves. "Why am I talking," Paul says, "about gentiles or 'the rest of the Jews'?"

behavior of the converts from among the Jews, the way Paul phrased the rebuke in Gal 2:14, John argues, meant that Paul was not in fact imposing any liability or obligation on the Jewish converts, since that would not have been appropriate to his status as "apostle to the gentiles."

λοιπῶν Ἰουδαίων; Ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡμεῖς οἱ διδάσκαλοι, ἡμεῖς οἱ ἀπόστολοι. Καὶ οὐ τοῦτο λέγει μόνον τὸ δικαίωμα, ὅτι Οἱ διδάσκαλοι καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι, ἀλλ' ὅτι Καὶ οἱ ἐκ προγόνων Ἰουδαῖοι καθάπαξ ἀπέστημεν τοῦ νόμου. Ποίαν οὖν ἔχομεν ἀπολογίαν, ἐτέρους εἰς τοῦτο ἔλκοντες; Ὁρᾷς πῶς λανθανόντως τῶν Ἰουδαίων καθάπτεται, καὶ τὴν διδασκαλίαν συντίθησιν ἀπηρτισμένην; Εἰπὼν γάρ, Ἡμεῖς φύσει Ἰουδαῖοι, καὶ οὐκ ἐξ ἐθνῶν ἁμαρτωλοί· καὶ αἰτίαν τίθησιν εὐλογον, δι' ἣν ἀπέστησαν τοῦ Ἰουδαϊσμοῦ· Εἰδότες ὅτι οὐ δικαιοῦται ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ἔργων νόμου, εἰ μὴ διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ· καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐπιστεύσαμεν, ἵνα δικαιωθῶμεν ἐκ πίστεως Χριστοῦ, καὶ οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων νόμου· διότι οὐ δικαιοῦται ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ἔργων νόμου, εἰ μὴ διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

ιβ'. Ὁρᾷς πῶς συνεχῶς καὶ τῆς ἀσθενείας τοῦ νόμου μνημονεύει, καὶ τῆς κατὰ τὴν πίστιν δικαιοσύνης; Καὶ πυκνῶς στρέφει τὰ ὀνόματα, ὅπερ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐπι-[387]τιμῶντος, ἀλλὰ διδάσκοντος, καὶ συμβουλευόντος. Ἀλλ', ὅπερ ἔφην, εἰ μὲν πρὸς Ἰουδαίους ἀποτεινόμενος ταῦτα ἔλεγε, τὸ πᾶν ἂν διερρῶν καὶ ἀπώλετο, οὐκ ἀνεχομένων ἐκείνων τῆς τούτου διδασκαλίας· ἐπειδὴ δὲ πρὸς Πέτρον τὸν λόγον ἐπέστρεψε, λανθανόντως ἐκείνοι τὴν ὠφέλειαν ἐκαρποῦντο, ἐπιτιμωμένου καὶ σιγῶντος τοῦ Πέτρου, καὶ τῆς γνώμης αὐτοῦ πάσης ἐκκαλυπτομένης, οὐχὶ παρ' ἑαυτοῦ, ἀλλὰ παρὰ τοῦ συναποστόλου, καὶ τῆς ἀναστροφῆς τῆς προτέρας εἰς μέσον ἀγομένης. Εἴτα, ἵνα μὴ λέγωσι παρ' ἑαυτοῖς, Τί οὖν εἰ καὶ Πέτρος καὶ Παῦλος κακῶς ἐποίησαν; αἰτίας δικαίας καὶ ἀναμφισβητήτους τίθησι, δι' ἃς οὐ δεῖ τῶν Ἰουδαϊκῶν ἐθνῶν ἔχεσθαι. Αὗται δὲ εἰσι, τὸ μὴ δύνασθαι τὸν νόμον δικαιοῦν, ἀλλὰ τὴν πίστιν μόνον. Καὶ ἐνταῦθα μὲν ἡμερώτερον κέχρηται τῷ λόγῳ· προῖων δὲ καταφορικώτερον ποιεῖ καὶ σφοδρότερον. Εἰ δὲ ζητοῦντες δικαιωθῆναι ἐν Χριστῷ ἠυρέθημεν καὶ αὐτοὶ ἁμαρτωλοί, ἄρα Χριστὸς ἁμαρτίας διάκονος;

210. John is restating in his own words what he understands to be Paul's claim.

211. John assumes anachronistically that both Peter and Paul had left "Judaism" for "Christianity."

212. See p. 534 n. 159 above on the translation issue of the genitive as objective or subjective in both instances in this passage.

213. Actually Gal 2:16a–f, b (repeated). With εἰ δὲ for ἐὰν δὲ before διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ; οὐ δικαιοῦται ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ἔργων νόμου for οὐ δικαιωθήσεται ἐξ ἔργων νόμου πᾶσα σὰρξ after διότι; εἰ δὲ for ἐὰν δὲ before διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

214. I.e., by Paul in his "rebuke." For John, the key revelation Paul makes about Peter's behavior is not the later "accommodation" to Jewish practices in Antioch but the earlier "living like a gentile" (εἰ σὺ Ἰουδαῖος ὑπάρχων ἐθνικῶς καὶ οὐχὶ Ἰουδαϊκῶς ζῇς; on the tense of this statement, see p. 546 n. 205 above).

215. Mf notes that other manuscripts read προῖων δὲ καὶ φορτικώτερον λοιπὸν καὶ

After all, we ourselves are the teachers, we are the apostles.” And he doesn’t express this stipulation alone, that is, that we are the teachers and apostles, but that “we who are Jews descended from our ancestors have once and for all separated from the law. So, what defense do we have if we drag others into this practice?”²¹⁰ Do you see how he secretly upbraids the Jews and formulates the teaching in a perfect way? For after he said, “*We are Jews by nature and not sinners from the gentiles*” (Gal 2:15), he added the rationale for why they separated from Judaism:²¹¹ “*Knowing that a human being is not justified by works of the law, except through faith in*²¹² *Jesus Christ; and we have come to have faith in Jesus Christ so that we might be justified by faith in Christ and not by works of the law. Because a human being is not justified by works of the law—except through faith in Jesus Christ*” (Gal 2:16).²¹³

19. Do you see how he continually makes mention of the weakness of the law and of the righteousness that accords with faith? How he continually harps on these terms, which are not suited to one who is issuing a rebuke, [387] but rather to one who is teaching and counseling? However, as I said, if he were extending these words to Jews, then the whole thing would’ve faded away and been lost, since they wouldn’t have put up with teaching from Paul. But when Paul directed his statement at Peter, they reaped the benefit surreptitiously as he received the rebuke and remained silent. And the fullness of Peter’s true conviction was revealed—not by himself but by his fellow apostle and by his own prior behavior, which was brought forward²¹⁴ into the public eye. At that point, lest they say to themselves, “What then does it mean if both Peter and Paul acted wrongly?” Paul adds the just and incontrovertible reasons why they shouldn’t hold fast to Jewish customs. The reasons are these: the fact that the law is not able to justify, but only faith can. In the passage just cited (Gal 2:16) he puts his statement more gently, but as he proceeds he renders it more vituperatively and vehemently:²¹⁵ “*If, seeking to be justified in Christ, we ourselves are found to be sinners, then is Christ a servant of sin?*” (Gal 2:17).²¹⁶ What

σφοδρότερον for προῖων δὲ καταφορικώτερον ποιεῖ καὶ σφοδρότερον. With that reading one would translate: “but as he proceeds it becomes more burdensome and vehement.”

216. HS (8:733) notes that C (the Constantinopolitan manuscript) reads ἄρα for ἄρα; hence not with an interrogative but an inferential meaning: “then Christ is a servant of sin” (see LSJ B.1). Interestingly, Paul never elsewhere uses ἄρα (according to modern critical texts), but ἄρα appears five other times in Galatians (Gal 2:21; 3:7; 3:29; 5:11; 6:10), so the witness of C may be onto something here against the traditional diacritical spelling.

“Ο δὲ λέγει, τοιοῦτόν ἐστιν· Ἡ πίστις δικαιοῖ, καὶ κελεύει ἀποστῆναι τῶν Ἰουδαϊκῶν ἐθῶν, ὡς πεπαυμένων λοιπόν· εἰ δὲ ἔτι κρατεῖ ὁ νόμος καὶ κύριός ἐστι, καὶ ὁ ἀφείς αὐτὸν παραβάσεως κρίνεται, εὐρεθήσεται ὁ Χριστὸς, ὁ κελεύσας ἡμῖν αὐτὸν ἀφιέναι, τῆς παραβάσεως ἡμῖν αἷτιος γεγεννημένος, καὶ οὐ μόνον οὐκ ἀπαλλάξας ἡμᾶς ἀμαρτίας, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐμβαλὼν εἰς ἀμαρτίαν. Εἰ γὰρ διὰ τὴν πίστιν τὸν νόμον ἀφήκαμεν, τὸ δὲ ἀφιέναι τὸν νόμον ἀμαρτία ἐστίν, ἡ πίστις, δι’ ἣν τὸν νόμον ἀφήκαμεν, αὕτη τῆς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν αἰτία ἐγένετο. Καὶ ἐπειδὴ λοιπὸν εἰς ἄτοπον τὸν λόγον περιέστησεν, οὐδὲ ἐδεήθη κατασκευῆς τινος πρὸς ἀνατροπὴν, ἀλλὰ τῷ Μὴ γένοιτο ἠρκέσθη, ὡς αὐτόθεν τῆς ἀτοπίας ὡμολογημένης· Εἰ γὰρ, φησὶν, ἃ κατέλυσα, ταῦτα πάλιν οἰκοδομῶ, παραβάτην ἐμαυτὸν συνίστημι· εἰς τὸ ἐναντίον περιέστησε τὸν λόγον, καὶ ἔδειξεν, ὅτι οὐ τὸ παραβῆναι νόμον, ἀλλὰ τὸ μὴ ἀφεῖναι νόμον, τοῦτο ποιεῖ παραβάτην· καὶ ἐν τάξει τοῦ οἰκείου προσώπου πάλιν τὸν Πέτρον αἰνίττεται. Τί γὰρ κατέλυσεν ὁ Πέτρος τὴν τῶν βρωμάτων παρατήρησιν, ἐθνικῶς ζῆν προηρημένους; Πάλιν οὖν πρὸς Ἰουδαίους ἐπανελθὼν, κἀκεῖνοις συζῶν, εὐρεθήσεται ἃ κατέλυσεν οἰκοδομῶν.

κ’. Ὅρας πῶς πανταχοῦ τῆς κρίσεως ἔχεται τοῦ Πέτρου, καὶ τὴν προτέραν αὐτοῦ ἐκκαλύπτει ἀναστροφὴν· ἵνα μὴ παρὰ τῆς τοῦ Παύλου γλώττης, ἀλλὰ [388] παρὰ τῆς τοῦ Πέτρου γνώμης, ἣν διὰ τῶν πραγμάτων ἐπεδείξατο, δοκῶσιν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι τὴν παραινέσιν δέχεσθαι; Διὰ ταῦτά φησι, Φοβούμενος τοὺς ἐκ περιτομῆς, καὶ “Ὅτι κατεγνωσμένος ἦν, καὶ “Ὅτι οὐκ ὀρθοποδεῖ πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ Εὐαγγελίου. Οὐχ οὕτως δὲ ἔχων· μὴ γένοιτο· διὰ γὰρ πολλῶν· τοῦτο ἀπεδείξαμεν· ἀλλ’ ὥσπερ τότε ἐπετίμα Παῦλος, καὶ ταῦτα ἀκούων ὁ Πέτρος ἐσίγα, ὥστε μὴ ἀνατρέψαι τὴν οἰκονομίαν Παύλου, καὶ κατεδέχετο, ὡς οὐκ ὀρθῶς πεποιηκῶς, δέχεσθαι τὴν ἐπίπληξιν, ἵνα ἀπολογία αὐτῷ γένηται

217. This is how Chrysostom understands Rom 10:4: τέλος γὰρ νόμου Χριστός.

218. This strong claim is hard to substantiate in the Gospels. One can see some of John’s contortions about Christ and the law, e.g., in his *Hom. Matt.* 16 on Matt 5:17 (PG 57:237–54).

219. αἰνίττεσθαι, part of the vocabulary of figurative and symbolic interpretation. See PC BCH 58; Peter T. Struck, *The Birth of the Symbol: Ancient Readers at the Limits of Their Texts* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004), 39–50, 171–77 et passim.

220. “declaration” and “conviction”: the wordplay in the Greek is much better, γλώττη and γνώμη.

221. John is playing on the λόγος/ἔργον topos: Peter’s true intent was in his deeds (even as his λόγος was in this case silent).

222. With ὀρθοποδεῖ for ὀρθοποδοῦσιν in John’s recasting of the sentence.

he means is something like this: faith justifies, and it commands us to separate ourselves from Jewish customs on the grounds that they have come to an end.²¹⁷ Yet if the law still holds sway and has sovereignty, and the person who has forsaken it is judged guilty of transgression, then Christ, the one who commanded us to forsake it,²¹⁸ will be found to have been the cause of our transgression. Not only will he not have rescued us from sin, but he'll even have catapulted us into sin! For if we've forsaken the law because of faith, and forsaking the law is a sin, then the faith that was the reason we've forsaken the law has become the cause of our sin. When finally Paul turns the argument to this absurdity, there's no need of any proof to effect the refutation. "*No way!*" (Gal 2:17) is all that's needed, since the absurdity is universally acknowledged in itself. "*For if,*" he says, "*I build up again the things I tore down, I commend myself as a sinner*" (Gal 2:18). He turned the argument around to its complete opposite and proved that it's not transgressing the law, but rather not forsaking it, that makes one a transgressor. And in the form of his own person, again he is figuratively²¹⁹ referring to Peter. For why did Peter tear down the observance of food laws by choosing to live like a gentile? And then again when once more he returned to the Jews by living the same way as them, he will be found building up again what he had torn down (cf. Gal 2:18).

20. Do you see how throughout the passage Paul keeps his focus on the judgment of Peter, and how he reveals Peter's prior behavior? This was so that the Jews might decide to accept the advice, not as coming from a declaration of Paul's but [388] from the true conviction²²⁰ of Peter, which he had displayed in his actions.²²¹ The reason Paul said, "*out of fear concerning those from the circumcision*" (Gal 2:12), and "*because he stood condemned*" (Gal 2:11), and he was "*not behaving rightly toward the truth of the gospel*" (Gal 2:14),²²² wasn't that this was actually the case. "*No way!*"²²³ For we've proven this from many lines of argument. At that time, Paul issued the rebuke, and Peter, on hearing it, was silent so as not to overturn Paul's plan,²²⁴ and he allowed himself to accept the rebuke as though he hadn't acted correctly, in order that he might have this as a defense in the eyes of

223. John joins Paul's *μὴ γένοιτο* (Gal 2:17) with his own.

224. As often noted above, within this homily the word *οἰκονομία* has multiple resonances here. It refers to Paul's "arrangement" but also alludes to his "accommodation" to the plan concocted with Peter, thus ironically mimicking the "accommodation" to the customs of Jewish believers, as the term is used above in §3 (PG 51:375), n. 55.

τοῦτο πρὸς τοὺς μαθητάς· οὕτω δὴ καὶ οὗτος νῦν μετὰ τῆς αὐτῆς γνώμης, μεθ' ἧς ἐπετίμησε Πέτρῳ, γράφει ταῦτα, ἅπερ ἔγραψε Γαλάταις. Εἰ γὰρ τότε τὸ ἐπιτιμηθῆναι Πέτρον, καὶ σιγῆσαι, χρήσιμον ἦν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις, πολλῶ μᾶλλον ἢ καὶ νῦν τὸ ταῦτα περὶ αὐτοῦ λεχθῆναι χρήσιμον ἦν τῶν Γαλατῶν τοῖς διεφθαρμένοις. Ὡσπερ γὰρ οἱ τότε ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ διατρίβοντες, ὁρῶντες Πέτρον ἐπιτιμώμενον μεθ' ὑπερβολῆς, καὶ σιγῶντα, διωρθοῦντο τῇ κατὰ τοῦ διδασκάλου κατηγορίᾳ, καὶ τῇ σιγῇ· οὕτω καὶ νῦν Γαλάται περὶ τὰ Ἰουδαϊκὰ νοσοῦντες, καὶ τοῦ Παύλου ταῦτα περὶ αὐτοῦ λέγοντος ἀκούοντες, οἷον ὅτι κατεγνωσμένος ἦν, καὶ οὐκ ὠρθοπόδησε πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ Εὐαγγελίου, καὶ ὅτι ἐπιτιμηθεὶς ἐπὶ τούτοις ἐσίγησε, μεγίστην ἀπὸ τῆς κατηγορίας ταύτης διδασκαλίαν ἐλάμβανον, εἰς τὸ μηκέτι προσέχειν τοῖς Ἰουδαίκοις ἔθεσι. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ Παῦλος καὶ τότε ἐπετίμησε, καὶ νῦν μέμνηται τῆς τότε γενομένης ἐπιπλήξεως· καὶ τούτου οὐκ ἔλαττον τὸν Πέτρον διὰ τοῦτο θαυμάσαι χρῆ, καταδεξάμενον ἅπαντα τὰ εἰρημένα. Ὁ γὰρ τὸ πᾶν κατωρθωκώς οὗτός ἐστιν, ὁ ἀνασχόμενος κατηγορηθῆναι, καὶ σιγήσας. Τοῦτο τῆς οἰκονομίας τὸ κέρδος.

Οὕτως ἡμῖν ἐκάτερος τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐγκλημάτων μὲν ἀπήλλακται, μυρίων δέ ἐστιν ἐγκωμίων ἄξιος, πρὸς τὴν τῶν λοιπῶν σωτηρίαν ἅπαντα καὶ ἀκούειν καὶ λέγειν σπουδάζων. Ἡμεῖς δὲ λοιπὸν τὸν Παύλου καὶ Πέτρου Θεὸν παρακαλέσωμεν, τὸν ἐκείνους ἀλλήλοις συνδήσαντα τοῖς τῆς ὁμονοίας δεσμοῖς, καὶ ἡμᾶς εἰς τὴν πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἀγάπην ἐπισφίγξαι σφοδρότερον· ἵνα τὴν κατὰ Θεὸν ὁμόνοιαν πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἔχοντες, δυναθώμεν καταξιωθῆναι τοὺς ἀγίους ἐκείνους ἰδεῖν, καὶ παρὰ τὰς αἰωνίους αὐτῶν εὐρεθῆναι σκηνάς, χάριτι καὶ φιλανθρωπίᾳ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι' οὗ καὶ μεθ' οὗ τῷ Πατρὶ καὶ τῷ ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι δόξα, κράτος, τιμὴ, καὶ προσκύνησις, νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ, καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Ἀμήν.

225. John is dramatizing the moment of composition of the Letter to the Galatians as happening before their eyes.

226. John now addresses (much more briefly) the second part of the twofold problem of Paul's rebuke, as named above in §3 (PG 51:374): first, that it was issued publicly in Antioch and, second, that it was enshrined by Paul for time immemorial when he recorded it in his letter to the Galatians.

227. Cf. 1 Tim 6:4; translating the idiom νοσεῖν περὶ τι with BDAG.

228. With ὠρθοπόδησε for ὀρθοποδοῦσιν (cf. p. 550 n. 222 above).

229. Cf. the same wording in §17 (PG 51:385): καὶ τὸ πᾶν ὁ Πέτρος κατάρθρωσε σιγήσας.

230. οἰκονομία, translated as with the title above (see p. 500 n. 6).

his disciples. In the same way, at this moment,²²⁵ Paul writes the things he wrote to the Galatians with the same true conviction with which he had rebuked Peter. For if Peter's being rebuked and remaining silent was to the benefit of the Jews at the earlier time, how much more would having these things being said about Peter at the later time be useful to those among the Galatians who had been corrupted?²²⁶ At the earlier time, those who lived in Antioch, by seeing Peter rebuked in an exaggerated fashion and remaining silent, were set straight by the accusation against their teacher and by his silence. In the same way now, the Galatians, who had a morbid craving for Jewish practices,²²⁷ upon hearing Paul saying these things about Peter, such as "*because he stood condemned*" (Gal 2:11), and he was "*not behaving rightly toward the truth of the gospel*" (Gal 2:14),²²⁸ and that, after he was rebuked, Peter remained silent about these matters, received from this accusation the most valuable instruction so they wouldn't adhere to the Jewish customs any longer. This is why Paul issued the rebuke in Antioch and why in his letter to the Galatians he makes mention of the reproof that had taken place on the earlier occasion. And one should admire Peter no less than Paul for this, because he accepted all these statements. For the man who achieved completely his goal of correcting them²²⁹ is the one who endured being accused and stayed silent. This is the gain that came about from this strategic accommodation.²³⁰

Thus, in our view,²³¹ each of the apostles has been freed from blame, and each is worthy of innumerable praises for his eagerness both to hear and to speak everything that leads to the salvation of the others. So at last, let's ask the God of Paul and Peter, who bound them tightly to one another with the bonds of concord, to make the love we have for one another even tighter, so that with godly concord²³² with one another we might be able to be deemed worthy to see those saints²³³ and to be found amid their eternal dwellings,²³⁴ by the grace and loving-kindness of our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom and with whom be glory, power, honor, and worship to the Father and to the Holy Spirit, now and always, forever and ever. Amen.

231. Or "by us" (dative of agent; Smyth §§1488–1490); hence: "thus by our discourse each of the apostles is established as free from blame."

232. C (the Constantinopolitan manuscript): τὴν κατὰ θεὸν ἀγάπην ("with godly love").

233. I.e., Peter and Paul, in heaven.

234. αἱ αἰώνιοι σκηναί, cf. Luke 16:9.

ΠΡΟΣ ΤΟΥΣ Οὐκ εἰς δέον χρωμένους τῷ ἀποστολικῷ ῥητῷ τῷ λέγοντι, «Εἴτε προφάσει, εἴτε ἀληθείᾳ Χριστὸς καταγγέλλεται» καὶ περὶ ταπεινοφροσύνης.

α'. [311] Τοῦ Φαρισαίου καὶ τοῦ τελώνου μνημονεύσαντες πρώην, καὶ ἄρματα δύο τῷ λόγῳ ζεύξαντες ἐξ ἀρετῆς καὶ κακίας, ἐκάτερον ἐδείξαμεν, ὅσον μὲν τῆς ταπεινοφροσύνης τὸ κέρδος, ὅσον δὲ τῆς ἀπονοίας τὸ βλάβος. Αὕτη μὲν γὰρ καὶ δικαιοσύνη συμβεβλημένη καὶ νηστεiais καὶ δεκάταις, ὑστέρησεν· ἐκείνη δὲ καὶ μετὰ ἁμαρτίας ζευχθεῖσα προέλαβε τὸ τοῦ Φαρισαίου ζεῦγος, καίτοι καὶ τὸν ἡνίοχον ἔχουσα φαῦλον. Τί γὰρ τελώνου χεῖρον; Ἄλλ' ὅμως ἐπειδὴ συνέτριψεν αὐτοῦ τὴν ψυχὴν, καὶ ἁμαρτωλὸν ἑαυτὸν ἐκάλεσεν, ὅπερ

1. Provenance: As Mayer documents, earlier scholars (Tillemont, Montfaucon and Stilting) all placed this homily in Antioch in December of 386 or 387 because the opening reference to a recent homily seems to fit *Anom.* hom. 5 (Provenance, 51, 87, and 112–13). The argument is persuasive; see *Anom.* Hom. 5.509–55 (SC 28^{bis}:314–16, ed. Malingrey), and especially the opening, which John even quotes here: ἄρματα δύο τῷ λόγῳ, ζεύξον δικαιοσύνην καὶ ἀπόνοιαν (lines 510–11). Mayer does not include this homily in her list of those she regards as of certain provenance (Provenance, 511–12) but has no extended discussion of why not.

Text: Mf PE (1837) as reprinted by JPM (PG, 1862), that contains also Mf's original text-critical notes (1721) on ME based on his collation of two manuscripts, *Colbertinus* 970 (= Paris. gr. 748 [XI]) and *Colbertinus* 3058 (= Paris. gr. 730 [XI]). PE made one emendation to the text in §5 and added two notes confirming readings of Paris. gr. 748. (These and Mf's original footnotes are all included in our notes below.) Pinakes lists ten manuscripts containing this homily, inclusive of HS's two manuscripts (Monac. gr. 352, Monac. gr. 6), to which can be added the two Paris codices for a total of twelve manuscripts known to contain this homily.

2. Mf notes that the title in Paris. gr. 748 and Paris. gr. 730 begins: Τοῦ αὐτοῦ. Πρὸ ταύτης ὁμιλήσας εἰς Φαρισαῖον, νῦν πρὸς τοὺς οὐκ εἰς δέον, κ.τ.λ. ("By the same author. After giving a homily before this one on the Pharisee, now he speaks against those who misuse, etc.").

Hom. Phil. 1:18
(De profectu evangelii)
CPG 4385 (PG 51:311–20)¹

Against those who misuse the statement of the apostle that says,
“*Whether by pretense or by true intention, Christ is proclaimed*”
(Phil 1:18), and concerning humility.²

1. [311] On a recent occasion we made mention of the Pharisee and the tax collector (cf. Luke 18:9–14), and in our homily we likened them to a pair of chariot-horses, one of virtue and the other of vice.³ By considering each, we demonstrated in one case how great is the gain of humility and in the other how great the harm from arrogance. This is because the latter, even if conjoined with righteousness, fasting, and tithes, comes up short; but the former, even if yoked with sin, still outstrips⁴ the Pharisee with whom he is paired, despite his having a defective charioteer. After all, what’s worse than a tax collector? Nevertheless, since he was so contrite about the state of his soul and called himself a sinner⁵—which he was—he has surpassed

3. John recasts the famous analogy of Plato, *Phaedr.* 246a–256b, which begins in 246a–b with εοικέτω [sc. ἡ ψυχὴ] δὴ ξυμφύτῳ δυνάμει ὑποπτέρου ζεύγους τε καὶ ἡνιόχου.... εἴτα τῶν ἵππων ὁ μὲν αὐτῷ καλὸς τε καὶ ἀγαθὸς καὶ ἐκ τοιούτων, ὁ δ’ ἐξ ἐναντίων τε καὶ ἐναντίος (“The soul can be likened to the conjoined capacity of a team of winged horses and a charioteer.... So then, one of the horses is good and virtuous, and descended from such, but the other is the opposite, and in turn is descended from such”). See also 253d: τῶν δὲ δὴ ἵππων ὁ μὲν, φαμέν, ἀγαθός, ὁ δ’ οὐ (“and we say that one of the horses is good, and the other not” [ed. Burnet, my translation]). Plato aligns the virtuous horse with σωφροσύνη καὶ αἰδώς and the nonvirtuous with ὕβρις καὶ ἀλαζονεία (253d–e); John’s correlates are ταπεινοφροσύνη and ἀπόνοια, respectively.

4. Mf notes that his two manuscripts read προέλαβε καὶ προέδραμε for προέλαβε before τὸ τοῦ Φαρισαίου ζεύγος (“outstrips and outruns the Pharisee with whom he is paired”). He adds that HS had included a marginal note conjecturing παρέδραμε (“overtakes”) for προέλαβε.

5. Luke 18:13: ὁ θεός, ἰλάσθητί μοι τῷ ἁμαρτωλῷ.

ἦν, ὑπερέβη τὸν Φαρισαῖον καὶ νηστείας ἔχοντα εἰπεῖν καὶ δεκάτας, καὶ κακίας πάσης ἀπηλλαγμένον. Τίνος ἕνεκεν, καὶ διὰ τί; Ὅτι εἰ καὶ πλεονεξίας καὶ ἀρπαγῆς ἀπήλλακτο, τὴν μητέρα τῶν κακῶν πάντων κενοδοξίαν τε καὶ ἀπόνοιαν εἶχεν ἐρριζωμένην ἐπὶ τῆς ψυχῆς. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ὁ Παῦλος παρακαλεῖ καὶ λέγει· Ἐκαστος τὸ ἑαυτοῦ ἔργον δοκιμαζέτω, καὶ τότε εἰς ἑαυτὸν τὸ καύχημα ἔξει, καὶ οὐκ εἰς τὸν ἕτερον. Ἐκεῖνος δὲ τῆς οἰκουμένης ἀπάσης παρῆλθεν εἰς μέσον κατήγορος, καὶ πάντων τῶν ὄντων ἀνθρώπων ἑαυτὸν ἔφησεν εἶναι βελτίω. Καίτοι καὶ εἰ δέκα μόνον, καὶ εἰ πέντε, καὶ εἰ δύο, καὶ εἰ ἑνὸς ἑαυτὸν προὔθηκεν, οὐδὲ τοῦτο ἀνεκτὸν ἦν· νυνὶ δὲ οὐχὶ προὔθηκεν ἑαυτὸν μόνον τῆς οἰκουμένης, ἀλλὰ καὶ κατηγόρησεν ἀπάντων. Διὰ τοῦτο ὑστέρησε κατὰ τὸν δρόμον. Καὶ καθάπερ ναῦς μυρία διαδραμοῦσα κύματα, καὶ πολλοὺς ἐκφυγοῦσα χειμῶνας, εἴτα ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ στόματι τοῦ λιμένος σκοπέλω τινὶ προσαράξασα πάντα τὸν ἐναποκείμενον ἀπόλλυσι θησαυρόν· οὕτω δὴ καὶ ὁ Φαρισαῖος οὗτος, τοὺς πόνους τῆς νηστείας ὑπομείνας καὶ τῆς ἄλλης ἀρετῆς ἀπάσης, ἐπειδὴ γλώττης οὐκ ἐκράτησεν, ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ λιμένι τὸ φορτικὸν ναυάγιον ὑπέμεινε. Τὸ γὰρ ἐξ εὐχῆς, ὅθεν κερδαίνειν ἔδει, τοσαῦτα βλαβέντα μᾶλλον ἀπελθεῖν, οὐδὲν ἕτερόν ἐστιν, ἢ ἐν λιμένι ναυάγιον ὑπομείναι.

β'. [312] Ταῦτ' οὖν εἰδότες, ἀγαπητοί, καὶ εἰς αὐτὴν τῆς ἀρετῆς τὴν κορυφὴν ἀνέλθωμεν, πάντων ἑαυτοὺς ἐσχάτους νομίζωμεν, μαθόντες ὅτι καὶ ἐξ αὐτῶν τῶν οὐρανῶν ἀπόνοια δύναται κατενεγκεῖν τὸν μὴ προσέχοντα, καὶ ἐξ αὐτῆς τῆς ἀβύσσου τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων ἀνενεγκεῖν εἰς ὕψος ταπεινοφροσύνη τὸν μετριάζειν εἰδότα. Αὕτη γὰρ πρὸ τοῦ Φαρισαίου τὸν τελώνην ἔστησεν· ἐκείνη δὲ, ἣ ἀπόνοια λέγω, καὶ ἡ ὑπερηφανία, καὶ ἀσωμάτου περιεγένετο δυνάμεως τοῦ διαβόλου· ἡ δὲ ταπεινοφροσύνη καὶ τῶν οἰκείων ἁμαρτημάτων ἡ ἐπίγνωσις εἰς παράδεισον τὸν ληστὴν εἰσήγαγε πρὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων. Εἰ δὲ οἱ τὰ οἰκεῖα ὁμολογοῦντες ἁμαρτήματα, τοσαύτην ἑαυτοῖς προξenoῦσι τὴν παρρησίαν, οἱ πολλὰ μὲν ἑαυτοῖς συνειδότες ἀγαθὰ, ταπεινοῦντες δὲ ἑαυτῶν τὴν ψυχὴν, πόσων οὐκ ἐπιτεύξονται στεφάνων; Ὅταν γὰρ ἁμαρτία συμβεβλημένη ᾗ τῇ ταπεινοφροσύνῃ, οὕτω τρέχει μετ' εὐκολίας, ὡς δικαιοσύνη μετ' ἀπονοίας οὗσαν ὑπερβῆναι καὶ προλαβεῖν. Ἄν τοίνυν

6. With transposition of τὸ δὲ ἔργον ἑαυτοῦ δοκιμαζέτω ἕκαστος to ἕκαστος τὸ ἑαυτοῦ ἔργον δοκιμαζέτω; minus δὲ before ἔργον; minus μόνον after ἑαυτόν.

7. I.e., the Pharisee.

8. Luke 18:11: ὁ θεός, εὐχαριστῶ σοι ὅτι οὐκ εἰμὶ ὥσπερ οἱ λοιποὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἄρπαγες, ἄδικοι, μοιχοί, ἢ καὶ ὡς οὗτος ὁ τελώνης.

9. A favored Chrysostomic trope—see, e.g., *Hom. Rom.* 5:3 (PG 51:156); *Res. mort.* §5 (PG 50:426); *Hom. Rom.* 21.5 (PG 60:608); and as applied again to the Pharisee in the Lukan parable in *Hom. 1 Cor.* 21.1 (PG 61:569).

the Pharisee, even though the Pharisee could speak of continual fasting and tithes and was free from all wickedness. Why was this, and for what reason? Because, although he had freed himself from greed and extortion, the mother of all vices—that is, vainglory and arrogance—had taken root in his soul. That’s why Paul, too, exhorts and says, “*Let each person test their own works, and then each will have a boast in what is their own and not the other’s*” (Gal 6:4).⁶ That man⁷ moved through the public sphere as an accuser of the whole world, and he declared himself better than everyone alive,⁸ although indeed it would’ve been intolerable even if he had placed himself before only ten, or five, or two, or even one person. But as it was, he not only placed himself ahead of the entire world, but he also brought accusations against all the others. That’s why he came up short in the race. By way of illustration, a ship that’s made its way through countless waves and escaped many storms, when it is at the very mouth of the harbor runs aground on some crag and then loses the entire treasure it holds.⁹ This was exactly the case also with this Pharisee. After enduring the travails of fasting and a life of virtue he suffered an awful shipwreck right there in the harbor since he couldn’t master his tongue. Indeed, for a person to come away from prayer—from which, after all, one should receive gain!—instead more greatly harmed, is nothing other than suffering shipwreck right in the harbor.

2. [312] So then, beloved, because we know these things, even if we ascend to the very height of virtue, let’s consider ourselves the least of all, since we’ve learned that arrogance is able to bring the person who’s heedless down from heaven itself, even as humility can bring one who knows how to be modest out of the very depths of sin and up to the highest height. For the latter¹⁰ placed the tax collector before the Pharisee, and the former—I mean senseless arrogance and self-conceit—was worse than the incorporeal power of the devil. And it was humility and the recognition of his own sins that led the thief into paradise before the apostles (cf. Luke 23:43). If those who confess their own sins secure for themselves such great eschatological confidence, then what magnificent crowns could evade the grasp of people who have many good deeds on their conscience and yet have an attitude of humility about their own souls? For when sin is joined with humility, it races forward with such ease as to surpass and overtake righteousness that is accompanied by arrogance. And yet if you combine

10. I.e., humility.

μετὰ δικαιοσύνης αὐτὴν συνάψης, ποῦ οὐκ ἀφίξεται; πόσους οὐ διαβήσεται οὐρανούς; Παρ' αὐτὸν πάντως στήσεται τοῦ Θεοῦ τὸν θρόνον ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν ἀγγέλων μετὰ παρρησίας πολλῆς. Πάλιν εἰ μετὰ δικαιοσύνης ἡ ἀπόνοια ζευχθεῖσα, τῇ τῆς οἰκείας κακίας ὑπερβολῇ καὶ βαρύτητι καθελκύσαι τὴν ἐκείνης παρρησίαν ἴσχυσεν, ἂν μετὰ ἁμαρτίας ἢ συμβεβλημένη, εἰς πόσῃ οὐ κατακρημνίσαι δυνήσεται τὸν ἔχοντα αὐτὴν γέενναν;

Ταῦτα λέγω, οὐχ ἵνα ἀμελῶμεν δικαιοσύνης, ἀλλ' ἵνα φύγωμεν ἀπόνοιαν· οὐχ ἵνα ἁμαρτάνωμεν, ἀλλ' ἵνα μετριάζωμεν. Θεμέλιος γάρ ἐστι τῆς καθ' ἡμᾶς φιλοσοφίας ἡ ταπεινοφροσύνη. Κἂν μυρία ἄνωθεν οἰκοδομήσης, κἂν ἐλεημοσύνην, κἂν εὐχὰς, κἂν νηστείαν, κἂν πᾶσαν ἀρετὴν, ταύτης μὴ προκαταβληθείσης, πάντα εἰκὴ καὶ μάτην ἐποικοδομηθήσεται, καὶ καταπεσεῖται ῥαδίως κατὰ τὴν οἰκοδομὴν ἐκείνην τὴν ἐπὶ τῆς ψάμμου τεθεῖσαν. Οὐδὲν γάρ ἐστιν, οὐδὲν τῶν ἡμετέρων κατορθωμάτων, δ' οὐ ταύτης δεῖται· οὐδὲν ἐστιν, δ' χωρὶς ταύτης στήναι δυνήσεται. Ἀλλὰ κἂν σωφροσύνην εἴπῃς, κἂν παρθενίαν, κἂν χρημάτων ὑπεροψίαν, κἂν ὀτιοῦν, πάντα [313] ἀκάθαρτα καὶ ἐναγῇ καὶ βδελυρὰ ταπεινοφροσύνης ἀπούσης. Πανταχοῦ τοίνυν αὐτὴν παραλαμβάνωμεν, ἐν ῥήμασιν, ἐν πράγμασιν, ἐν ἐνθυμήμασι, καὶ μετὰ ταύτης ταῦτα οἰκοδομῶμεν.

γ'. Ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν περὶ ταπεινοφροσύνης ἱκανῶς εἴρηται, οὐ πρὸς τὴν ἀξίαν τοῦ κατορθώματος· οὐδεὶς γὰρ αὐτὴν κατ' ἀξίαν ὑμῆσαι δυνήσεται· ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὴν σύνεσιν τῆς ὑμετέρας ἀγάπης. Εὖ γὰρ οἶδ' ὅτι καὶ ἀπὸ ὀλίγων τῶν εἰρημένων μετὰ πολλῆς αὐτὴν ἐπισπάσσεσθε τῆς σπουδῆς. Ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἀνάγκη καὶ τὴν ἀποστολικὴν ῥῆσιν τὴν σήμερον ἀναγνωσθεῖσαν, πολλοῖς δοκοῦσαν παρέχειν ῥαθυμίας πρόφασιν, ποιῆσαι φανεράν καὶ δήλην, ὥστε μὴ ψυχράν τινα ἀπολογίαν ἐντεῦθεν τινὰς ποριζομένους τῆς οἰκείας ἀμελεῖν σωτηρίας, φέρε, ἐπὶ ταύτην τὸν λόγον ἀγάγωμεν.

11. I.e., Christianity as John understands it, as both a set of teachings and a way of living. Chrysostom will end this homily by pointing to the Canaanite woman of Matt 15:21–27 as an exemplar of φιλοσοφία; see §12 (PG 51:319–20).

12. These are the practices of the Pharisee in Luke's parable and also those called for by Jesus in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt 6:1–17).

13. Cf. 1 Cor 3:10–17.

14. I.e., in the previous homily and in what has been said thus far in the present one.

15. A standard epideictic topos, that the subject of praise exceeds any capacity of human speech to capture.

16. John is playing on the term πρόφασις in the lemma of Phil 1:18, which means both “pretext” and “pretense” (LSJ A.1.2).

humility with righteousness, what place will be beyond its reach? To what high heavens will it not soar? That person will even stand alongside the very throne of God in the midst of the angels with great eschatological confidence. Arrogance, even when it is yoked with righteousness, due to the magnitude and weight of its own vice, has the power to pull down the eschatological confidence that righteousness entails. If this is the case, then into what depths of hell won't the arrogant be thrown if their arrogance is joined with sin?

I'm not saying these things so that we might neglect righteousness, but that we might flee from arrogance, not so that we might sin, but so that we might be modest. For humility is the foundation of the life of true philosophy.¹¹ Even if from the beginning of your life you build up countless acts—whether almsgiving, prayers, fasting,¹² or every virtue—if humility hasn't been laid down as its foundation, all these practices will be built up¹³ in vain and without purpose, and it will fall down easily, like the building that was set upon the sand (cf. Matt 7:26–27). For there's nothing, not a single one of our good deeds, that doesn't have need of humility. There's nothing that will be able to stand without it. Whether you mention chastity, or virginity, or contempt for possessions, or any other thing whatsoever, they're all [313] unclean, accursed, and abominable in the absence of humility. So then, let's embrace humility always in our words, our deeds, and our desires, and along with it, let's build up these other good practices, as well.

3. Nonetheless, although a fair amount has been said about humility,¹⁴ it doesn't approach the worthiness of this virtue, for no one will be able to sing its praises worthily.¹⁵ But I have in view your own understanding, beloved, since I know well that even from the few things that've been said you'll be drawn to humility with the utmost eagerness. But it's necessary to elucidate clearly the statement of the apostle that was read today, since it seems to many people to offer a “pretext”¹⁶ for laxity.¹⁷ So come, let's bring our homily to bear on this, so some people don't procure from this statement any vain self-justification for neglecting their own salvation (cf. Heb 2:3).

17. *ῥαθυμία* often means “laziness” or “moral torpor” in Chrysostom, but here (as the context will show) it seems to be a “laxity” (*PGL* 3), in particular about proper doctrine and teaching and protecting those against the incursions of “heresy.” The problem is introduced as only an “apparent” one (*δοκοῦσα* ... *πρόφασις*), i.e., that the text of Phil 1:18 appears (in the eyes of some) to offer justification for such laxity.

Τίς οὖν ἐστὶν ἡ ῥῆσις; Εἴτε προφάσει, φησὶν, εἴτε ἀληθείᾳ Χριστὸς καταγγέλλεται. Τοῦτο πολλοὶ περιφέρουσιν ἀπλῶς καὶ ὡς ἔτυχεν, οὐ τὰ πρότερα, οὐ τὰ μετὰ ταῦτα ἀναγινώσκοντες· ἀλλὰ τῆς ἀκολουθίας τῶν λοιπῶν ἀποκόψαντες μελῶν ἐπ' ὀλέθρῳ τῆς ἑαυτῶν ψυχῆς τοῖς ῥαθυμοτέροις προβάλλονται. Ἐπιχειροῦντες γὰρ αὐτοὺς τῆς ὑγιοῦς ἀπάγειν πίστεως, εἴτα ὀρώντες δεδοικότας καὶ τρέμοντας, ὡς οὐκ ἀκίνδυνον ὄν τοῦτο ποιεῖν, καὶ βουλόμενοι τὸν φόβον αὐτῶν ἐκλῦσαι, τὴν ἀποστολικὴν ταύτην παράγουσιν ῥῆσιν, λέγοντες· Ὁ Παῦλος συνεχώρησε τοῦτο, εἰπών· Εἴτε προφάσει, εἴτε ἀληθείᾳ Χριστὸς καταγγελλέσθω. Ἄλλ' οὐκ ἔστι ταῦτα, οὐκ ἔστι. Πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ οὐκ εἶρηκε, καταγγελλέσθω, ἀλλὰ, καταγγέλλεται· πολὺ δὲ τὸ μέσον τούτου κἀκείνου. Τὸ μὲν γὰρ εἰπεῖν, καταγγελλέσθω, νομοθετοῦντός ἐστι· τὸ δὲ εἰπεῖν, καταγγέλλεται, τὸ συμβαῖνον ἀπαγγέλλοντος. Ὅτι δὲ οὐ νομοθετεῖ Παῦλος αἰρέσεις εἶναι, ἀλλὰ ἀπάγει πάντας τοὺς αὐτῷ προσέχοντας, ἄκουσον τί φησιν· Εἴ τις ὑμᾶς εὐαγγελίζεται παρ' ὃ παρελάβετε, ἀνάθεμα ἔστω, κἂν ἐγὼ, κἂν ἄγγελος ἐξ οὐρανῶν. Οὐκ ἂν δὲ ἀνεθεμάτισε καὶ ἑαυτὸν καὶ ἄγγελον, εἰ τὸ πρᾶγμα ἀκίνδυνον ἦδει. Καὶ ἄλιν, Ζηλῶ γὰρ ὑμᾶς Θεοῦ ζήλω, φησὶν· ἡρμოსάμην γὰρ ὑμᾶς ἐνὶ ἀνδρὶ παρθένον ἀγνήν. Φοβοῦμαι δὲ

18. Chrysostom never identifies these πολλοί more specifically, but he seems to have in view any Christian teachers who would appeal to this text to justify variability in Christian doctrine, or even go further and claim Paul was the inaugurator and legitimator of “heresies.” Because Chrysostom can otherwise be very direct in his heresiological naming of Marcionites, Manichaeans, or others, this generality might suggest he is partially creating or at least drawing attention to this possible “problem” that he perceives in order preemptively to avert any use of this text to overturn the heresiological trope of a pristine and unified original gospel message that was only later perverted. For comparison, see Tertullian, *Marc.* 5.20.1–2 (SC 483:363–66, ed. Braun and Moreschini), who also appeals to Phil 1:18 to insist the apostle did not countenance diversity in teaching, though he does not say outright that Marcion or his followers cite the verse, as he does when turning next to Phil 2:6–7 (*Marc.* 5.20.3–5). Theodoret is similarly general in referring to “some foolish people who suppose this statement was said about the heresies” (τοῦτο τινες τῶν ἀνοήτων καὶ περὶ τῶν αἰρέσεων ὑπειλήφασιν εἰρῆσθαι), but he may be repeating what he found in Chrysostom; see *Interpretatio in xiv epistulas sancti Pauli*, Phil 1:18 (PG 82:564).

19. ἀπλῶς, translated with LSJ II.4; PGL L. The term also means “literally” (PGL E) and, in general, “simple” or “simplistically.” For John it signals a false reading that must be countered by a careful reading (μετ' ἀκριβείας, with PGL L) such as he promises to provide.

20. Translating προβάλλεσθαι with LSJ B.III.2.b.

21. A very clear statement of the “problem.”

22. Cf. Titus 1:13; 2:2. Part of the “problem” for Chrysostom is the possible incon-

And what is that statement? “*Whether by ‘pretense,’*” he says, “*or by true intention, Christ is proclaimed*” (Phil 1:18). Many people¹⁸ bandy this quote about superficially¹⁹ and in a self-serving way, reading neither the things that come before or after. Cutting off the thread of the argument in the other portions of the text, they offer it as an excuse²⁰ to those who are more lax—to the ruination of their own souls!²¹ When they’re attempting to lead these people away from a salutary faith,²² and they see them in fear and trembling at the prospect of doing something that isn’t without danger,²³ wishing to eliminate their fear, they adduce this apostolic statement, saying, “Paul made a concession for this when he said, ‘*whether by pretense or by true intention,*’ let Christ be proclaimed” (Phil 1:18).²⁴ But this is not the case, it just isn’t! First of all, Paul did not say, “let him be proclaimed,” but “*he is proclaimed.*” And there’s a great distance between the first and the second. Saying “let him be proclaimed” is what someone says when they’re promulgating a law, but saying “*he is proclaimed*” is what one says when reporting what is taking place.²⁵ To show that Paul doesn’t lay down a law that heresies should exist,²⁶ but instead is leading all those listening to him away from heresies, listen to what he says: “*If anyone preaches you a gospel besides what you received, let that one be anathema, even if it is I or even if an angel from heaven!*” (Gal 1:8–9).²⁷ He wouldn’t have anathematized both himself and an angel if he knew the matter posed no danger. And again, “*I am zealous for you with the zeal of God,*” he says. “*I have betrothed you as a holy virgin to one husband But I am afraid lest,*

sistency in Paul’s attitude toward other teachers and teachings in this passage vis-à-vis Galatians (for instance) and especially the Pastoral Epistles, with their harsh invective and characteristic language about “salutary teaching” (ὕγιαίνουσα διδασκαλία; 1 Tim 1:10; 2 Tim 4:3; Titus 1:9; 2:1, etc.) that John echoes and appropriates here.

23. I.e., receiving from those other teachers a gospel message that is not true (John credits those auditors for having an appropriate fear).

24. The first part is a direct quotation up until the verb, which Chrysostom charges the above (wrong) interpretation with misquoting, thus making the whole verse a problem. This interpreter misreads the text, John insists, by replacing Paul’s indicative *καταγγέλλεται* with the imperative *καταγγελλέσθω* (a point John will immediately make in objecting to this reading).

25. John makes the same argument in *Hom. Phil.* 2.2 (PG 62:193).

26. Compare the similar problem addressed in *Hom. 1 Cor.* 11:19.

27. The order of clauses is reversed, with Gal 1:9b (εἴ τις . . . ἔστω) coming first, followed by Gal 1:8a, with ἐγὼ for ἡμεῖς; καὶν (= καὶ ἐάν) for ἢ before ἀγγελος; ἐξ οὐρανῶν for ἐξ οὐρανοῦ.

μήποτε ὡς ὁ ὄφεις Εὐαν ἠπάτησεν ἐν τῇ πανουργίᾳ αὐτοῦ, οὕτω φθαρῇ τὰ νοήματα ὑμῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀπλότητος τῆς εἰς τὸν Χριστόν. Ἴδου καὶ ἀπλότητα τέθεικε, καὶ συγγνώμην οὐκ ἔδωκεν. Εἰ γὰρ ἦν συγγνώμη, κίνδυνος οὐκ ἦν· εἰ δὲ κίνδυνος οὐκ ἦν, οὐκ ἂν ἐφοβήθη Παῦλος· καὶ οὐχ ὁ Χριστὸς δὲ τὰ ζιζάνια καὶ ἐκέλευσε κατακαῆναι, εἰ πρᾶγμα ἀδιάφορον ἦν καὶ τούτῳ, ἀκείνω, καὶ ἐτέρῳ προσέχειν, καὶ πᾶσιν ἀπλῶς.

δ'. Τί ποτ' οὖν ἐστὶ τὸ λεγόμενον; Μικρὸν ἄνωθεν ὑμῖν τὴν ἱστορίαν ἅπασαν διηγῆσασθαι βούλομαι· δεῖ γὰρ εἰδέναι ἐν τίσιν ὁ Παῦλος ἦν, ἡνίκα ταῦτα ἐπέστελλεν. Ἐν τίσι τοίνυν ἦν τότε; Ἐν δεσμωτηρίῳ καὶ ἀλύσει καὶ κινδύνοις ἀφορήτοις. Πόθεν τοῦτο δῆλον; Ἐξ αὐτῆς τῆς ἐπιστολῆς. Ἀνωτέρω γὰρ τούτου φησί· Γινώσκεις δὲ ὑμᾶς βούλομαι, ἀδελφοί, ὅτι τὰ κατ' ἐμὲ μᾶλλον εἰς προκοπὴν τοῦ Εὐαγγελίου ἐλήλυθεν, ὥστε τοὺς δεσμούς μου φανεροὺς ἐν Χριστῷ γενέσθαι ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ πραιτωρίῳ, καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς ἅπασιν· καὶ τοὺς πλείονας δὲ τῶν ἀδελφῶν πεποιθότας τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου περισσοτέρως τολμᾷν ἀφόβως τὸν λόγον λαλεῖν. Νέρων δὲ ἦν αὐτὸν ἐμβεβληκὸς τότε τῷ δεσμωτηρίῳ. Καθάπερ γὰρ τις [314] ληστής τῆς οἰκίας ἐπιβάς, καθευδόντων ἀπάντων, τὰ πάντα ὑφαيروῦμενος, ἐπειδὴν ἴδῃ τινὰ λύχρον ἄψαντα, καὶ τὸ φῶς σβέννυσι, καὶ τὸν λυχνούχον ἀναιρεῖ, ἵνα μετὰ ἀδείας αὐτῷ τὰ τῶν ἄλλων ὑφαρεῖσθαι καὶ ἀρπάξαι ἐξῇ· οὕτω δὲ καὶ Νέρων ὁ Καῖσαρ τότε, ὥσπερ τις ληστής καὶ τοιχωρύχος, καθευδόντων ἀπάντων βαθύν τινα καὶ ἀναίσθητον ὕπνον, τὰ πάντων ἀρπάζων, γάμους διορύττων, οἰκίας ἀνατρέπων, ἅπαν κακίας εἶδος ἐπιδεικνύμενος, ἐπειδὴ τὸν Παῦλον εἶδε λύχρον ἄψαντα κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην, τὸν τῆς διδασκαλίας λόγον, καὶ ἐλέγχοντα αὐτοῦ τὴν πονηρίαν, ἐσπούδαζε καὶ τὸ κήρυγμα σβέσαι, καὶ τὸν διδάσκαλον ἀνελεῖν, ἵνα μετ' ἐξουσίας αὐτῷ πάντα ποιεῖν ἐξῇ, καὶ δήσας τὸν ἅγιον ἐκεῖνον ἐνέβαλεν εἰς δεσμωτήριον. Τότε τοίνυν ταῦτα ἔγραφεν ὁ μακάριος Παῦλος.

28. ἀπλότης means both “simplicity” and, in terms of speech acts, “sincerity.” The context shows that John has the latter in mind.

29. Minus παραστήσαι τῷ Χριστῷ after παρθένον ἀγνήν (marked as an ellipsis in the translation); with μήποτε for μήπως after φοβοῦμαι δέ; ἠπάτησεν (cf. Gen 3:13) for ἐξηπάτησεν after Εὐαν.

30. Mf notes that one of his manuscripts (PE confirms it is Paris. gr. 748) reads καὶ ὁ Χριστός for καὶ οὐχ ὁ Χριστός and οὐκ ἂν for καὶ before ἐκέλευσε. The translation is essentially the same despite the different placement of the negative.

31. John seeks to deny the “problem” that “heresies” or divergent teaching are an ἀδιάφορον or a matter that was tolerated by either Christ or Paul.

32. With ἅπασιν for πᾶσιν after τοῖς λοιποῖς; plus δέ after πλείονας; minus ἐν κυρίῳ after τῶν ἀδελφῶν, though all three readings are reversed in the quotation in §7 (PG 51:316) below.

33. Cf. Titus 1:11.

just as the serpent deceived Eve by its cunning, so have your minds been corrupted from the sincerity²⁸ that is for Christ” (2 Cor 11:2–3).²⁹ Look at how he has stipulated “sincerity” and didn’t offer a concession. For if it were a concession, then the matter didn’t pose a danger; but if it didn’t pose a danger, then Paul wouldn’t have been “afraid.” And Christ in turn wouldn’t have commanded³⁰ that the weeds be burned (cf. Matt 13:30) if it were a matter of no difference at all whether to heed this gospel or that one, or another, or, in a word, all of them.³¹

4. So then, what does the statement mean? I wish to tell you the full story, starting a bit earlier. For one must know what circumstances Paul was in when he wrote these things in his letter. So then, what circumstances was he in at that time? He was in prison, in chains, and in unbearable dangers. How do we know this clearly? From the letter itself. For previous to this passage he says, *“I wish you to know, brothers and sisters, that my circumstances have all the more led to the advancement of the gospel, with the result that the whole praetorium and all the rest are aware that my chains are for Christ. And also the majority of the brothers and sisters, with confidence born from my chains, have become all the more bold in fearlessly speaking the word”* (Phil 1:12–14).³² Now, Nero was the one who had thrown Paul in prison back then. This was just like [314] a robber who enters a house while everyone is slumbering to pilfer all their possessions. When he sees someone has lit a lamp, he both extinguishes the light and destroys the lampstand, so he might be able to pilfer and plunder all the rest. This is exactly what the Caesar Nero did at that time. While everyone was slumbering in a deep and unaware sleep, like a robber and burglar he plundered everyone’s goods, undermined marriages, and overthrew houses,³³ exhibiting every form of wickedness. But when he saw that Paul had lit a lamp, that is, the message of his teaching, throughout the world, and that Paul was exposing his wickedness, Nero was eager both to extinguish the gospel proclamation and destroy the teacher. Thus he bound that holy man and threw him into prison, so he might be able to do anything at all with complete impunity.³⁴ This was the context, then, in which the blessed Paul wrote these things.

34. On the *σύγκρισις* (rhetorical comparison) between Paul and Nero in John’s writings, see HT 206–12. This duel between the apostle and emperor is rooted in the martyrological traditions, such as the *Acta Pauli* and others. See the texts and translations in David L. Eastman, *The Ancient Martyrdom Accounts of Peter and Paul*, WGRW 39 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015).

Τίς οὐκ ἂν ἐκπλαγείη; τίς οὐκ ἂν θαυμάσειε; μᾶλλον δὲ τίς κατ' ἀξίαν ἐκπλαγείη καὶ θαυμάσειεν ἂν τὴν γενναίαν ἐκείνην καὶ οὐρανομήκη ψυχὴν, ὅτι δεδεμένος ἐν Ῥώμῃ καὶ καθειργμένος, ἀπὸ τοσούτου διαστήματος Φιλιππησίοις ἐπέστελλεν; Ἴστε γὰρ ὅσον τὸ μέσον Μακεδονίας καὶ Ῥώμης. Ἄλλ' οὔτε τῆς ὁδοῦ τὸ μῆκος, οὔτε τοῦ χρόνου τὸ πλῆθος, οὔτε ὁ τῶν πραγμάτων ὄχλος, οὔτε ὁ κίνδυνος καὶ τὰ ἐπάλληλα δεινὰ, οὔτε ἄλλο οὐδὲν τὴν ἀγάπην καὶ τὴν μνήμην ἐξέβαλε τῶν μαθητῶν, ἀλλ' εἶχεν αὐτοὺς ἅπαντας ἐν διανοίᾳ· καὶ οὐχ οὕτως αὐτῷ ταῖς ἀλύσειν αἱ χεῖρες ἐδέδεντο, ὡς τῷ πόθῳ τῶν μαθητῶν ἢ ψυχῇ συνεδέδετο καὶ προσήλωτο· ὅπερ οὖν καὶ αὐτὸ δηλῶν ἐν τῷ προοιμίῳ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς ἔλεγε· Διὰ τὸ ἔχειν με ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ μου ὑμᾶς, ἔν τε τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου, καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀπολογίᾳ καὶ βεβαιώσει τοῦ Εὐαγγελίου. Καὶ καθάπερ βασιλεὺς ἐπὶ τὸν θρόνον ἀναβὰς ὑπὸ τὴν ἔω καὶ καθίσας ἐν ταῖς βασιλικαῖς αὐλαῖς, μυρίας εὐθέως δέχεται πανταχόθεν ἐπιστολάς· οὕτω δὴ κακεῖνος, καθάπερ ἐν βασιλικαῖς αὐλαῖς τῷ δεσμωτηρίῳ καθήμενος, πολλῶ πλείω καὶ ἐδέχετο καὶ ἔπεμπε τὰ γράμματα, τῶν πανταχόθεν ἐθνῶν ἐπὶ τὴν ἐκείνου σοφίαν ὑπὲρ τῶν καθ' ἑαυτοὺς πραγμάτων ἀναφερόντων ἅπαντα· καὶ τοσούτῳ πλείονα πράγματα τοῦ βασιλεύοντος ὠκονόμει, ὅσῳ καὶ μείζονα ἀρχὴν ἐμπεπίστευτο. Οὐ γὰρ δὴ τοὺς τὴν Ῥωμαίων οἰκοῦντας χώραν μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς βαρβάρους ἅπαντας, καὶ γῆν καὶ θάλατταν φέρων εἰς τὰς ἐκείνου χεῖρας ἐνέθηκεν ὁ Θεός. Καὶ τοῦτο δηλῶν Ῥωμαίοις ἔλεγεν· Οὐ θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν, ἀδελφοί, ὅτι πολλάκις ἐλθεῖν προεθέμην πρὸς ὑμᾶς, καὶ ἐκωλύθη ἄχρι τοῦ δεῦρο, ἵνα τινὰ καρπὸν σχῶ καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν, καθὼς καὶ ἐν τοῖς λοιποῖς ἔθνεσιν· Ἐλλῆσί τε καὶ βαρβάροις, σοφοῖς τε καὶ ἀνοήτοις ὀφειλέτης εἰμί. Καθ' ἐκάστην τοίνυν ἐφρόντιζε τὴν ἡμέραν, τοῦτο δὴ Κορινθίοις, τοῦτο δὴ Μακεδόσι, πῶς Φιλιππησίοι, πῶς Καππαδόκαι, πῶς Γαλάται, πῶς Ἀθηναῖοι, πῶς οἱ τὸν Πόντον οἰκοῦντες, πῶς ἅπαντες ἄνθρωποι. Ἄλλ' ὅμως τὴν γῆν ἅπασαν ἐγκεχειρισμένος οὐχ ὑπὲρ ἐθνῶν ὀλοκλήρων ἐμερίμνα μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑπὲρ ἐνὸς ἀνθρώπου· καὶ νῦν μὲν δι' Ὀνήσιμον τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ἔπεμπε, νῦν

35. Plus μου after καρδίᾳ.

36. From Antioch over three hundred years later John imagines this scene of parallel lives of the emperor and the prisoner that took place at Rome in the 60s, each handling his morning correspondence.

37. Mf noted that one of his manuscripts (Paris. gr. 730) adds συνεχῶς before τὰ γράμματα ("continually send letters"), and the other (Paris. gr. 748, as confirmed by PE), συχνῶς ("frequently send letters").

38. With transposition of προεθέμην and ἐλθεῖν.

39. Cf. 2 Cor 11:28.

40. Cf. this same argument in relation to Priscilla and Aquila in *Hom. Rom. 16:3 A* §2 (PG 51:189).

Who wouldn't be astounded? Who wouldn't be amazed? Or rather, who could possibly be suitably astounded and amazed at that soul, so noble and heaven-reaching, because when he was bound and shut up in Rome he wrote to the Philippians across such a great distance? For you know how far apart Macedonia and Rome are. But neither the length of the journey nor the span of time, nor the multitude of concerns, nor the danger and continuous horrors, nor anything else cast out his love and remembrance of his disciples, but Paul had them all in his mind. His hands were not as tightly bound with chains as his soul was bound to and affixed by fervent devotion to his disciples. He made this very fact clear in the opening to the letter when he said, "*Because I have you in my heart, in my chains, and in the defense and confirmation of the gospel*" (Phil 1:7).³⁵ An emperor ascends his throne at dawn and takes his seat in the imperial court, and then immediately receives a huge number of letters from all over the world. In the very same way, Paul, sitting in prison as though in the imperial court,³⁶ all the more used to both receive and send letters,³⁷ as the nations from all around would refer all the matters that concerned them to the attention of his wisdom. And Paul was entrusted with an even greater authority, inasmuch as the things over which he had administrative responsibility were much more wide-ranging than those of the ruling emperor. After all, God placed into his hands not only those who lived in the territory of the Romans, but even all the barbarians, both on land and at sea. Paul made this clear when he said to the Romans, "*But I do not want you to be ignorant, sisters and brothers, that I repeatedly intended to come to you, and I was prevented up until now, so that I might have some fruit among you also, just as I have also among the rest of the gentiles. I am obligated both to Greeks and barbarians, both to the wise and the foolish*" (Rom 1:13–14).³⁸ Indeed, every single day,³⁹ his care was this matter for the Corinthians, that for the Macedonians, how things were going with the Philippians, how with the Cappadocians, how with the Galatians, how with the Athenians, how with the inhabitants of Pontus, how with all the human race. Despite having been entrusted with the whole world, his care was not only for whole nations but also for a single person.⁴⁰ At one point, he sent a letter on account of⁴¹ Onesimus,⁴²

41. Mf notes that his two manuscripts read Ὀνησίμῳ for δι' Ὀνήσιμον before τὴν ἐπιστολήν. One should probably understand that reading as a dative of interest or advantage (Smyth §§1474, 1481): "in the interests of Onesimus."

42. I.e., The Letter to Philemon.

δὲ διὰ τὸν παρὰ Κορινθίους πεπορνευκότα. Οὐδὲ γὰρ τοῦτο ἐσκόπει, ὅτι εἷς ἦν ὁ ἁμαρτῶν, καὶ δεόμενος προστασίας· ἀλλ' ὅτι ἄνθρωπος ἦν, ἄνθρωπος τὸ τῷ Θεῷ τιμιώτατον ζῶον, καὶ δι' ὃν οὐδὲ τοῦ Μονογενοῦς ὁ Πατὴρ ἐφείσατο.

ε'. Μὴ γάρ μοι τοῦτο εἶπης, ὅτι Δραπέτης ὁ δεῖνα, καὶ ληστής καὶ κλέπτης, καὶ μυρίων γέμων κακῶν, [315] ἢ ὅτι πτωχὸς καὶ ἀπερριμμένος, καὶ εὐτελής, καὶ οὐδενὸς ἄξιος λόγου· ἀλλ' ἐννόησον ὅτι καὶ ὑπὲρ τούτου Χριστὸς ἀπέθανε, καὶ ἀρκεῖ σοι τοῦτο εἰς πάσης προνοίας ὑπόθεσιν. Ἐννόησον ὁποῖόν τινα ἐκεῖνον εἶναι χρῆ, ὃν τοσούτου Χριστὸς ἐτιμήσατο, ὥς μηδὲ τοῦ αἵματος φείσασθαι τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ. Οὐδὲ γὰρ, εἰ βασιλεὺς ὑπὲρ τινος εἴλετο καταθῆσαι ἑαυτὸν, ἐζητήσαμεν ἂν ἑτέραν ἀπόδειξιν τοῦ μέγαν τινὰ εἶναι καὶ περισπούδαστον ἐκεῖνον τῷ βασιλεῖ, οὐκ ἔγωγε οἶμαι· ἥρκει γὰρ ἡ τελευτὴ δεῖξαι τοῦ τετελευτηκότος τὴν περὶ αὐτὸν ἀγάπην. Νυνὶ δὲ οὐκ ἄνθρωπος, οὐκ ἄγγελος, οὐκ ἀρχάγγελος, ἀλλ' αὐτὸς ὁ τῶν οὐρανῶν Δεσπότης, αὐτὸς ὁ μονογενὴς Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ σάρκα περιβαλόμενος ἐπέδωκεν ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν. Οὐ πάντα οὖν ποιήσομεν καὶ πραγματευσόμεθα, ὥστε τοὺς οὕτω τιμηθέντας ἀνθρώπους πάσης ἀπολαῦσαι παρ' ἡμῶν προνοίας; Καὶ ποῖαν ἔχομεν ἀπολογίαν; τίνα συγγνώμην; Τοῦτο γοῦν αὐτὸ καὶ ὁ Παῦλος ἐνδεικνύμενος ἔλεγε· Μὴ τῷ βρώματί σου ἐκεῖνον ἀπόλλυε, δι' ὃν Χριστὸς ἀπέθανε. Τοὺς γὰρ καταφρονούντας τῶν ἀδελφῶν, καὶ ὥς ἀσθενούντων ὑπερορῶντας βουλόμενος ἐντρέψαι καὶ εἰς σπουδὴν ἀγαγεῖν καὶ πείσαι κηδεσθαι τῶν πλησίον, ἀντὶ πάντων τὸν τοῦ Δεσπότης θάνατον τέθεικε.

Καθήμενος τοίνυν ἐν τῷ δεσμωτηρίῳ τοῖς Φιλιππησίοις ἐπέστελλεν ἐκ τοσούτου τοῦ διαστήματος. Τοιαύτη γὰρ ἡ κατὰ Θεὸν ἀγάπη· οὐδενὶ τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων διακόπτεται, ἄνωθεν ἔχουσα τὰς ρίζας ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ τὰς ἀμοιβάς. Καὶ τί φησι; Γινώσκειν δὲ ὑμᾶς βούλομαι, ἀδελφοί. Εἶδες πρόνοιαν ὑπὲρ μαθητῶν; εἶδες διδασκάλου κηδεμονίαν; Ἀκουσον καὶ φιλοστοργίαν μαθητῶν περὶ τὸν διδάσκαλον, ἵνα ἴδῃς ὅτι τοῦτο ἦν τὸ ποιοῦν ἰσχυροὺς ἐκείνους καὶ ἀκαταγωνίστους, τὸ συνδεδέσθαι ἀλλήλοις. Εἰ γὰρ Ἀδελφός ὑπὸ

43. John addresses a possible objection to his own invocation of Paul's letter on behalf of the single person, Onesimus, as a sign of Paul's virtue and solicitude.

44. On Chrysostom's view of Onesimus, see Mitchell, "John Chrysostom on Philemon: A Second Look," *HTR* 88 (1995): 135–48.

45. πρόνοια: "care," "forethought," "providential oversight."

46. I.e., if we don't exercise πρόνοια for them.

47. With δι' ὃν for ὑπὲρ οὗ, harmonizing the text of 1 Cor 8:11 with Rom 14:15.

48. Mf (1721) emended the reading of HS ME, τὰς ἀφορμάς ("origins"), to τὰς ἀμοιβάς ("recompense"), as is read by Paris. gr. 748 and 730.

49. PE (1837) emended Mf's reading (from HS ME), ἰδῆς, to εἰδῆς ("you might

and at another because of the man among the Corinthians who had committed the sexual sin (cf. 1 Cor 5:1–13). For Paul didn't focus his attention on the fact that this was a single man who'd sinned and needed his oversight, but that he was a human being—a human being, the creature that is most honorable in God's eyes, and for whom God did not spare his only begotten Son (cf. Rom 8:32).

5. Now, don't say to me,⁴³ “The guy in question⁴⁴ was a runaway slave, a robber, and a thief, and full of countless vices,” [315] or “He was poor, an outcast, a lowlife, and worthy of no account.” But consider that even on behalf of this man, “*Christ died*” (Rom 14:15; cf. 1 Cor 8:11); this is all you need as a basis for full regard and care.⁴⁵ Consider what kind of person Onesimus had to be, a man whom Christ himself honored to the point of not sparing even his own blood. If an emperor chose to sacrifice himself on behalf of someone, I don't suppose we would seek any further proof of the fact that they were a person of real importance and one much admired by the emperor. For the death is sufficient proof of the love that the man who died had for them. But in this case, it wasn't a human being, or an angel, or an archangel, but the very Lord of heaven, the only begotten Son of God himself who, having taken on flesh, gave himself on our behalf (cf. Gal 2:20). Therefore, won't we do everything and make it our business to ensure that the human beings who've been honored in this way enjoy unlimited care from us? And what sort of self-defense will we have?⁴⁶ What excuse? Paul was demonstrating this very point when he said, “*Don't by the food you eat destroy that person for whose sake Christ died*” (Rom 14:15).⁴⁷ Paul puts the death of the Lord before everything, wishing to turn around those who look down on their brothers and sisters and have contempt for them as being “weak” (cf. Rom 14:1; 1 Cor 8:10–12) and to lead them to genuine concern and persuade them to be solicitous of their neighbors.

So then, when sitting in prison, Paul sent a letter to the Philippians from such a great distance. This is what godly love is like. It's not severed by any human considerations, since it has its roots and its recompense⁴⁸ from heaven above. And why does he say, “*I wish you to know, brothers and sisters*” (Phil 1:12)? Have you seen his care for his disciples? Have you seen the solicitude the teacher had? Hear, too, of the devotion his disciples had for their teacher, so you might see⁴⁹ that what makes them strong and invincible is the fact that they were closely bound together with one another. For

know”), as is read by Paris. gr. 748. JPM reversed their decision, putting ἰδῆς back into the text, but including the reading of Paris. gr. 748 in a note.

ἀδελφοῦ βοηθούμενος, ὡς πόλις ὄχυρά, πολλῷ μᾶλλον τοσοῦτοι συνδεδεμένοι τοῖς τῆς ἀγάπης δεσμοῖς, πᾶσαν ἂν ἀπεκρούσαντο τὴν τοῦ πονηροῦ δαίμονος ἐπιβουλὴν.

“Οτι μὲν οὖν ὁ Παῦλος συνεδέδετο τοῖς μαθηταῖς, οὐδὲ ἀποδείξεως δεῖ λοιπὸν ἡμῖν, οὐδὲ λόγου, ὅπου γε καὶ δεδεμένος αὐτῶν ἐμερίμνα, καὶ καθ’ ἐκάστην ἡμέραν καὶ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἀπέθνησκε τῷ πόθῳ πυρούμενος. 5’. “Οτι δὲ καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ τῷ Παύλῳ συνδεδεμένοι μετὰ ἀκριβείας ἦσαν ἀπάσης, καὶ οὐκ ἄνδρες μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ γυναῖκες, ἄκουσον τί φησι περὶ τῆς Φοίβης· Συνίστημι δὲ ὑμῖν Φοίβην τὴν ἀδελφὴν, διάκονον οὖσαν τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἐν Κεγχρέαις, ἵνα προσδέξησθε αὐτὴν ἐν Κυρίῳ ἀξίως τῶν ἁγίων, καὶ παραστήτε αὐτῇ, ἐν ᾧ ἂν ὑμῶν πράγματι χρήζη, ἥτις προστάτις πολλῶν ἐγενήθη, καὶ αὐτοῦ ἐμοῦ. Ἀλλ’ ἐνταῦθα μὲν μέχρι προστασίας ἐμαρτύρησεν αὐτῇ τὴν σπουδὴν· Πρίσκιλλα δὲ καὶ Ἀκύλας καὶ μέχρι θανάτου διὰ τὸν Παῦλον ἐχώρησαν, καὶ περὶ αὐτῶν δὲ οὕτω γράφει λέγων· Ἀσπάζονται ὑμᾶς Ἀκύλας καὶ Πρίσκιλλα, οἵτινες ὑπὲρ τῆς ψυχῆς μου τὸν ἑαυτῶν τράχηλον ὑπέθηκαν, εἰς θάνατον δηλονότι. Καὶ περὶ ἐτέρου πάλιν αὐτοῖς τούτοις γράφων, φησὶν· “Οτι ἤγγισεν ἕως θανάτου, παραβουλευσάμενος τῇ ψυχῇ, ἵνα τὸ ὑμῶν ὑστέρημα ἀναπληρώσῃ τῆς πρὸς με λειτουργίας. Εἶδες πῶς ἐφίλουν τὸν διδάσκαλον; πῶς πρὸ τῆς ψυχῆς τῆς ἑαυτῶν τὴν ἄνεσιν ἐσκόπουν τὴν ἐκείνου; Διὰ τοῦτο οὐδεὶς αὐτῶν περιεγένετο τότε.

Ταῦτα δὲ λέγω, οὐχ ἵνα ἀκούωμεν μόνον, ἀλλὰ ἵνα καὶ μι-[316]μώμεθα· καὶ οὐ πρὸς τοὺς ἀρχομένους μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἀρχοντας ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος ἀποτείνεται, ἵνα καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ πολλὴν περὶ τοὺς διδασκάλους κηδεμονίαν ἐπιδεικνύωνται, καὶ οἱ διδάσκαλοι τὴν αὐτὴν τῷ Παύλῳ φιλοστοργίαν περὶ τοὺς ὑποταττομένους ἔχωσιν, οὐχὶ τοὺς παρόντας μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς πόρρωθεν ὄντας. Καὶ γὰρ ὁ Παῦλος καθάπερ μίαν οἰκῶν οἰκίαν τὴν οἰκουμένην ἅπασαν, οὕτω τῆς πάντων ἐφρόντιζε σωτηρίας, καὶ τὰ αὐτοῦ

50. John is of course playing on the term δεσμοί, as in the broader context of his lemma, Phil 1:13–14, translated also as “chains” above and below (but English does not speak of the “chains” of love but of the “bonds of love”). John is deliberately coordinating the two forms of “bondage” Paul experienced.

51. Cf. 1 Cor 15:31 (and 2 Cor 11:28), both of which share καθ’ ἡμέραν.

52. Minus ἡμῶν after ἀδελφῆν; transposition of οὖσαν and διάκονον; transposition of αὐτὴν and προσδέξησθε; transposition of χρήζη and πράγματι; ἥτις for καὶ γὰρ αὐτῇ; transposition of ἐμοῦ and αὐτοῦ.

53. John has combined the two verses here (Rom 16:4 begins at οἵτινες), which explains the problem noted by Mf and reprinted by JPM (“*Haec non quadrant ad textum Epist. Ad Romanos*”). 1 Cor 16:19: minus ἐν κυρίῳ πολλά after ὑμᾶς and before Ἀκύλας.

if “a brother helped by a brother is like a secure city” (Prov 18:19), then how much more would those who are so closely bound together by the bonds⁵⁰ of love beat off any plot from the wicked demon.

Now, there’s no need for further proof or argument from us that Paul was bound closely to his disciples, when, after all, he was anxiously bound to them and, burning with ardor, he was dying on their behalf every single day.⁵¹ 6. But as proof that the disciples in turn were bound closely to Paul with rapt attention—and not only men, but women, also—listen to what Paul says about Phoebe: “I recommend to you Phoebe, our sister, who is deacon of the assembly in Cenchreae, so that you might receive her in the Lord in a manner worthy of the saints, and provide her with whatever she might need from you, a woman who has been the patron of many, including myself” (Rom 16:1–2).⁵² In this case, he testified to her fervency that extended to serving as his patron. But in the case of Priscilla and Aquila, he testified to a fervency that went as far as dying on Paul’s behalf. About them he writes as follows, saying, “Aquila and Priscilla greet you, who laid down their own necks on behalf of my life” (1 Cor 16:19; Rom 16:4),⁵³ which clearly means “to the point of death.” And again, when writing to the Philippians about someone else,⁵⁴ he says, “Because he drew near to death, risking his life so that he might complete what is lacking in your service to me” (Phil 2:30).⁵⁵ Have you seen how they loved their teacher? How they set their sights on giving him relief, even before their own lives? That’s why no one ever prevailed over them back then.

I’m saying these things not only for us to hear them but also for [316] us to imitate them.⁵⁶ And what we’re saying isn’t directed only at those who stand under authority but also at those in authority. This is both so disciples might demonstrate tremendous care for their teachers and teachers might extend to those who are submitted to their care the same devotion that Paul had—and that means not only for those who are present but even those who are far away. Indeed, Paul’s concern was for the salvation of all, as he inhabited the entire civilized world as though a single homeland.⁵⁷

54. I.e., Epaphroditus.

55. Minus διὰ τὸ ἔργον τοῦ Χριστοῦ after ὅτι; with ἕως for μέχρι; transposition of ἡγγισεν and ἕως/μέχρι θανάτου; transposition of ἀναπληρώση and τὸ ὑμῶν ὑστέρημα.

56. Mf notes that Paris. gr. 748 and Paris. gr. 730 read ἵνα καὶ διεγειρώμεθα (“so that we might also be roused to action”) for ἵνα καὶ μιμώμεθα.

57. Paronomasia with οἰκεῖν, οἰκία, and οἰκουμένη.

πάντα ἀφείς δεσμὰ καὶ θλίψεις καὶ πληγὰς καὶ στενοχωρίας, ἐπεσκόπει καὶ ἐπυνθάνετο καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν, πῶς τὰ τῶν μαθητῶν ἔχοι· καὶ πολλάκις δι' αὐτὸ τοῦτο μόνον ἔπεμψε, νῦν μὲν Τιμόθεον, νῦν δὲ Τυχικόν· καὶ περὶ μὲν ἐκείνου φησίν· "Ἴνα γνῶ τὰ περὶ ὑμῶν, καὶ παρακαλέσῃ τὰς καρδίας ὑμῶν· περὶ δὲ Τιμοθέου·" Ἐπεμψα αὐτὸν πρὸς ὑμᾶς μηκέτι στέγων, μήπως ἐπείρασεν ὑμᾶς ὁ πειράζων· καὶ τίτον πάλιν ἀλλαχοῦ, καὶ ἄλλον ἐτέρωσε. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ αὐτὸς τῇ τῶν δεσμῶν ἀνάγκῃ πολλάκις ἐν ἐνὶ κατεχόμενος τόπῳ συγγενέσθαι τοῖς αὐτοῦ σπλάγχνοις οὐκ ἠδύνατο, διὰ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτοῖς συνεγένετο.

ζ'. Καὶ τότε τοίνυν ἐν δεσμοῖς ὧν γράφει τοῖς Φιλιππησίοις λέγων· Γινώσκεις δὲ ὑμᾶς βούλομαι, ἀδελφοί, τοὺς μαθητὰς ἀδελφούς καλῶν. Τοιοῦτον γὰρ ἡ ἀγάπη· πᾶσαν ἀνωμαλίαν ἐκβάλλει, καὶ ὑπεροχὴν καὶ ἀξίαν οὐκ οἶδεν, ἀλλὰ κἂν ἀπάντων ὑψηλότερος ἢ τις, πρὸς τὸν πάντων κάτεισι ταπεινότερον· ὅπερ καὶ Παῦλος ἐποίει. Ἀλλ' ἀκούσωμεν τί βούλεται γινώσκεις αὐτούς· "Ὅτι τὰ κατ' ἐμέ, φησί, μᾶλλον εἰς προκοπὴν τοῦ Εὐαγγελίου ἐλήλυθεν. Εἰπέ μοι, πῶς καὶ τίνι τρόπῳ; Ἄρα τῶν δεσμῶν ἀφέθης; Ἄρα ἀπέθου τὴν ἄλυσιν, καὶ μετὰ ἀδείας κηρύττεις ἐν τῇ πόλει; Ἄρα εἰς ἐκκλησίαν εἰσελθὼν, μακροὺς καὶ πολλοὺς κατέτεινας λόγους περὶ τῆς πίστεως, καὶ πολλοὺς λαβὼν μαθητὰς ἀπῆλθες; Ἄρα νεκροὺς ἡγείρας, καὶ ἐθαυμαστώθης; Ἄρα λεπροὺς ἐκάθηρας, καὶ ἐξεπλάγησαν ἅπαντες; Ἄρα δαίμονας ἀπήλασας, καὶ ἀνυψώθης; Οὐδὲν τούτων, φησί. Πῶς οὖν ἡ προκοπὴ γέγονε τοῦ Εὐαγγελίου; εἰπέ. Ὡστε τοὺς δεσμούς μου, φησί, φανεροὺς ἐν Χριστῷ γενέσθαι ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ πραιτωρίῳ, καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς πᾶσι. Τί λέγεις; τοῦτο ἄρα, τοῦτο ἡ προκοπή; τοῦτο ἡ ἐπίδοσις; τοῦτο ἡ αὔξησις τοῦ κηρύγματος, ὅτι πάντες ἔμαθον ὅτι δέδεσαι; Ναί, φησίν. Ἄκουσον γοῦν τῶν ἐξῆς, ἵνα μάθης ὅτι τὰ δεσμὰ οὐ μόνον οὐκ ἐγένετο κώλυμα, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑπόθεσις πλείονος παρρησίας· Ὡστε τοὺς πλείονας τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἐν

58. John has combined Paul's δεσμὰ from the lemma (Phil 1:7, 13, 14, 17) with three further terms (θλίψεις, πληγαί, στενοχωρίαί) from the *peristasis* catalogue of 2 Cor 6:4–5.

59. δι' αὐτὸ τοῦτο deliberately echoes εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦτο in the first half of Col 4:8, the second half of which will be cited next.

60. HS, followed by Mf and JPM, had identified the quotation as the differently worded parallel in Eph 6:22, but it is clearly the Colossians text.

61. Paraphrased in the first part, with transposition of μηκέτι στέγων and ἔπεμψα; plus αὐτὸν (cf. Τιμόθεον in 3:2) πρὸς ὑμᾶς after ἔπεμψα; minus/ellipsis of εἰς τὸ γνῶναι τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν.

62. I.e., his envoys (Paul does not use the term μαθητής).

63. Chrysostom addresses Paul directly here and asks his author to explain how the words on the page can quite fit with the realities claimed, which seem counterfactual.

Dismissing all his chains, afflictions, wounds, and constraints,⁵⁸ he set his sights on and made inquiries every single day about how things were going for his disciples. And often it was for this very reason⁵⁹ that at one time he sent Timothy, and at another Tychicus. About the latter he says, “*So that he might learn about your circumstances and might encourage your hearts*” (Col 4:8),⁶⁰ and about Timothy, “*I sent him to you because I could no longer endure it, lest the tempter had tempted you*” (1 Thess 3:5).⁶¹ And another time, once again, with Titus and yet another envoy sent elsewhere (cf. 2 Cor 8:18; 12:18). For when he was detained in one place, often by the constraint of chains, he wasn’t able to be with those who were his heart; but he was with them through his disciples.⁶²

7. And so, indeed, it was when he was in chains that he writes to the Philippians, saying, “*I wish you to know, brothers and sisters*” (Phil 1:12), calling his disciples “brothers and sisters.” This is what love is like. It casts out all disparity and doesn’t recognize superiority and stature. But even if someone is of higher rank than all, they stoop down to the humbler ranks of all the rest. And this is precisely what Paul customarily did. And yet we should listen to what it is that he “wishes them to know.” “*That my circumstances,*” he says, “*have all the more led to the advancement of the gospel*” (Phil 1:12). Tell me,⁶³ “How and in what way? Have you been released from your chains? Have you cast off your fetters and are you now preaching the gospel in the city without fear? Have you gone into the assembly and delivered long and extensive speeches about the faith and come away taking many disciples with you? Have you raised the dead and been an object of marvel? Have you cleansed lepers, and led all to be astounded? Have you driven out demons and been put on a pedestal for it?” “None of these things,” Paul says. “Well then, how has ‘the advancement of the gospel’ occurred? Tell me!” “*With the result that the whole praetorium and all the rest are aware that my chains are for Christ*” (Phil 1:13). “What are you saying, Paul? Is this it, then? Is this the ‘advancement’? Is this the progress? Is this the proliferation of the gospel proclamation—that they all learned that you had been bound in prison?” “Yes,” Paul says.⁶⁴ Now listen to what follows,⁶⁵ so you might learn that chains not only weren’t a hindrance, but they were even the basis for greater confidence: “*So that also the majority*

64. Chrysostom seeks to make Paul present both in the words he creates for him within the dialogue he enacts with his author and within his actual words in the letter to the Philippians.

65. John invites his own auditors into the conversation.

Κυρίῳ, πεποιθότας τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου, περισσοτέρως τολμᾶν ἀφόβως τὸν λόγον λαλεῖν. Τί λέγεις, ὦ Παῦλε; οὐκ ἀγωνίαν ἀνέβαλεν, ἀλλὰ θάρσος τὰ δεσμά; οὐ φόβον, ἀλλὰ πόθον; Οὐκ ἔχει τὰ λεγόμενα ἀκολουθίαν. Οἶδα καὶ γὰρ κατὰ ἀνθρωπίνων πραγμάτων ἀκολουθίαν ταῦτα συνέβαινε, φησίν· ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ φύσιν ἦν τὰ γινόμενα, καὶ θείας χάριτος τὰ κατορθώματα. Διὰ τοῦτο ὁ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἀγωνίαν ἐποίει, τοῦτο ἐπ' ἐκείνῳ θάρσος παρεῖχε. Καὶ γὰρ στρατηγὸν ἐὰν λαβὼν τις καὶ καθείρξας ποιήσῃ φανερόν τοῦτο, εἰς φυγὴν ἐμβάλλει τὸ στρατόπεδον ἅπαν· καὶ ποιμένα δὲ ἐὰν τις τῆς ποίμνης ἀπαγάγῃ, μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς ἀδείας ἀπελαύνει τὰ πρόβατα. Ἄλλ' οὐκ ἐπὶ Παύλου οὕτως, ἀλλὰ τούναντίον ἅπαν. Ὁ στρατηγὸς γὰρ ἐδέδετο, καὶ οἱ στρατιῶται προθυμότεροι ἐγίνοντο, καὶ μετὰ πλείονος τῆς παρηρησίας τοῖς ἐναντίοις ἐπεπῆδων· ὁ ποιμὴν καθεῖρκετο, καὶ τὰ πρόβατα οὐκ ἀνηλοῦτο, οὐδὲ ἐσκορπίζετο.

η'. [317] Τίς εἶδε, τίς ἤκουσεν ἐν τοῖς τῶν διδασκάλων δεινοῖς πλείονα παράκλησιν λαμβάνοντας τοὺς μαθητάς; Πῶς οὐκ ἔδεισαν; πῶς οὐκ ἐφοβήθησαν; πῶς οὐκ εἶπον πρὸς τὸν Παῦλον, Ἰατρὲ, θεράπευσον σεαυτόν; ἀπάλλαξον σεαυτὸν τῶν πολυπλόκων δεινῶν, καὶ τότε ἡμῖν τὰ μυρία προξενήσεις ἀγαθὰ. Πῶς ταῦτα οὐκ εἶπον; Πῶς; ὅτι πεπαιδευμένοι ἦσαν παρὰ τῆς τοῦ Πνεύματος χάριτος, ὅτι ταῦτα οὐκ ἐξ ἀσθενείας ἐγίνετο, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ συγχωρήσεως, ἵνα μειζόνως ἢ ἀλήθεια διαλάβῃ, διὰ δεσμῶν καὶ φυλακῶν καὶ θλίψεων καὶ στενοχωριῶν αὐξανομένη καὶ πρὸς μείζον αἰρομένη μέγεθος. Οὕτως ἡ δύναμις τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ τελειοῦται. Εἰ μὲν γὰρ ὑπεσκέλισε τὸν Παῦλον τὰ δεσμά, καὶ δειλότερον ἐποίησεν, ἢ αὐτόν, ἢ τοὺς ἐκείνῳ προσήκοντας ἔδει διαπορεῖν· εἰ δὲ μᾶλλον θαρρεῖν παρεσκεύασε καὶ εἰς πλείονα δόξαν ἤγαγεν, ἐκπλήττεσθαι δεῖ καὶ θαυμάζειν, πῶς διὰ πράγματος ἀτιμίαν ἔχοντος δόξα τῷ μαθητῇ προεξενεῖτο, διὰ πράγματος δειλίαν ἐμβάλλοντος θάρσος καὶ παράκλησις πᾶσιν ἐκείνοις ἐγένετο. Τίς γὰρ αὐτόν οὐκ ἐξεπλήττετο τότε, ὁρῶν ἄλυσιν περικείμενον; Τότε δαίμονες

66. John has repeated ὥστε from the start of this grammatical sentence in Phil 1:13.

67. Mf notes that his two manuscripts read ἐπ' ἐκείνων, "in the case of these" (i.e., the Christians at Philippi), for ἐπ' ἐκείνῳ.

68. An allusion to Zech 13:7, quoted in Matt 26:31 // Mark 14:27.

69. With John's own paraphrase of τοῦ Χριστοῦ for μου. (The sentence is first-person direct discourse by Christ within Paul's self-testimony in 2 Cor 12:9.)

70. As John tells it, only this would have made Paul's imprisonment a problem. He joins Paul's insistent claim here that the imprisonment was not a matter of ignominy but of triumph and progress for the gospel.

71. Taking τῷ μαθητῇ as a collective singular (Smyth §996).

of the brothers and sisters in the Lord, with confidence born from my chains, have become all the more bold in fearlessly speaking the word" (Phil 1:14).⁶⁶ "What are you saying, Paul? That your chains didn't produce trepidation, but courage? Not terror, but devotion? But what you've said makes no logical sense!" "Don't I know it!" Paul says. "It's because the things that have taken place are not in accord with the logic of human affairs." These occurrences were beyond what is natural, and these virtuous actions were born of divine grace. That's why the very thing that causes trepidation in other people is what provided courage in the case of Paul.⁶⁷ After all, if one takes an army general captive and locks him up and makes this fact publicly known, it incites the entire army to flee. And if someone leads the shepherd away from the sheepfold, they can then lead the sheep away without any fear at all. But in the case of Paul it wasn't like this, but it was the complete opposite. For the army general had been put in chains, and the general's soldiers became all the more fervent, and they attacked their enemies with even greater boldness. The shepherd was shut away, and the sheep weren't destroyed, nor were they scattered.⁶⁸

8. [317] Who has seen, or who has heard of disciples who've received greater encouragement because of the terrible things experienced by their teachers? How weren't they terrified? How weren't they frightened? How did they refrain from saying to Paul, "*Physician, heal yourself*" (Luke 4:23); free yourself from this tangle of terrors, and then you'll secure countless good things for us"? How was it they didn't say these things? How? Because they'd been taught by the grace of the Spirit that these circumstances didn't arise from weakness but from Christ's allowing them to happen so that the truth—amplified and raised up to a greater height via chains, imprisonments, afflictions, and constraints—might shine all the more. In this way "*the power of Christ is perfected in weakness*" (2 Cor 12:9).⁶⁹ Now, if the bonds of imprisonment had overcome Paul and made him more cowardly,⁷⁰ then either he or those associated with him should've been thrown for a loss. But if the bonds made them all the more confident and led them to greater glory, then we should marvel and be amazed at how the disciples⁷¹ procured greater glory from something filled with dishonor, how confidence and encouragement came to all of them from something that incites cowardice. Who didn't marvel at him back then, when they saw him wrapped in a chain? Back then demons used to run away⁷² all the

72. Cf. Acts 19:12.

ἐδραπέτευον μᾶλλον, ὅτε ἐώρων αὐτὸν ἐν δεσμωτηρίῳ διατρίβοντα. Οὐ γὰρ οὕτω βασιλικὴν κεφαλὴν λαμπρὰν τὸ διάδημα ποιεῖ, ὡς τὰς ἐκείνου χεῖρας ἢ ἄλυσιν, οὐ παρὰ τὴν οἰκείαν φύσιν, ἀλλὰ παρὰ τὴν ἀπανθοῦσαν αὐταῖς χάριν. Διὰ τοῦτο πολλὴ παράκλησις ἐγένετο τοῖς μαθηταῖς. Καὶ γὰρ ἐώρων τὸ μὲν σῶμα δεδεμένον, τὴν δὲ γλῶτταν οὐ δεδεμένην· τὰς μὲν χεῖρας ἐσφιγμένας, τὸν δὲ λόγον λελυμένον, καὶ τῆς ἀκτῖνος τῆς ἡλιακῆς ταχύτερον τὴν οἰκουμένην ἐπιτρέχοντα πᾶσαν. Καὶ τοῦτο αὐτοῖς παράκλησις ἐγένετο διὰ τῶν ἔργων μαρτυροῦσιν, ὅτι οὐδὲν τῶν παρόντων δεινόν. Καὶ γὰρ ὅταν ὑπὸ θεοῦ πόθου καὶ ἔρωτος ἢ ψυχῇ βαφεῖσα τύχη γνησίως, πρὸς οὐδὲν ἐπιστρέφεται τῶν παρόντων· ἀλλ' ὥσπερ οἱ μαινόμενοι καὶ πυρὸς καὶ σιδήρου καὶ θηρίων καὶ πελάγους καὶ πάντων κατατολμῶσιν, οὕτω καὶ οὗτοι μανίαν τινὰ καλλίστην καὶ πνευματικωτάτην μανέντες, μανίαν ἀπὸ σωφροσύνης γινομένην, πάντων κατεγέλωντῶν ὀρωμένων. Διὰ τοῦτο δεδεμένον ὀρῶντες τὸν διδάσκαλον, μᾶλλον ἐσκίρτων, μᾶλλον ἠγάλλοντο, διὰ τῶν ἔργων τοῖς ἐναντίοις δόντες ἀπόδειξιν, ὅτι πάντοθεν εἰσιν ἀνάλωτοι καὶ ἀχείρωτοι.

θ'. Τότε τοίνυν, ὅτε ἐν τούτοις τὰ πράγματα ἦν, τινὲς τῶν ἐχθρῶν τῶν Παύλου βουλόμενοι τὸν πόλεμον ἀναρριπίσαι χαλεπώτερον, καὶ μείζονα τοῦ τυράννου ποιῆσαι τὴν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀπέχθειαν, προσεποιοῦντο καὶ αὐτοὶ κηρύττειν, καὶ ἐκήρυττον τὴν ὀρθὴν καὶ ὑγιῆ πίστιν ὑπὲρ τοῦ τὸ δόγμα ἐπιδιοῦναι μειζόνως· τοῦτο δὲ ἐποίουν, οὐχὶ τὴν πίστιν σπεῖραι βουλόμενοι, ἀλλ' ἵνα μαθῶν ὁ Νέρων, ὅτι τὸ κήρυγμα αὖξεται καὶ τὸ δόγμα ἐπιδίδωσι, ταχύτερον τὸν Παῦλον ἐπὶ τὸ βάραθρον ἀπαγάγῃ. Δύο τοίνυν ἦν διδασκαλεῖα, τῶν Παύλου μαθητῶν, καὶ τῶν ἐχθρῶν τῶν τοῦ Παύλου· τῶν μὲν ἐξ ἀληθείας κηρυττόντων, τῶν δὲ ἀπὸ φιλονεικίας καὶ τῆς πρὸς τὸν Παῦλον ἀπεχθείας. Καὶ ταῦτα δηλῶν ἔλεγε· Τινὲς μὲν διὰ φθόνον καὶ ἔριν τὸν Χριστὸν κηρύττουσιν, ἐκείνους ἐμφαίνων τοὺς ἐχθροὺς· Τινὲς δὲ καὶ δι' εὐδοκίαν, περὶ τῶν ἑαυτοῦ μαθητῶν τοῦτο λέγων. Εἶπε πάλιν περὶ ἐκείνων, Οἱ μὲν ἐξ ἐριθείας, οἱ ἐχθροί· οὐχ ἄγνως, [318] οὐχ ὑγιῶς, ἀλλ' Οἰόμενοι θλίψιν ἐπιφέρειν τοῖς δεσμοῖς

73. On Paul's chain (as often contrasted with the emperor's crown), see *HT* 176–85.

74. A reference to the emperor Nero, as the context will make clear.

75. For the same argument, see *Laud. Paul.* 4.15 (AP 215–16).

76. Even if this involves some contortions, Chrysostom wishes this early Pauline example of rival teachers to accord with his view that there was just one apostolic teaching in terms of content. Hence, he seeks to focus on the intention behind that teaching as the only element of variance (with a focus on particular wording in Phil 1).

77. διδασκαλεῖον, also “school of thought” (*PGL* 2), but John has been emphasizing that the doctrines were the same but the motives different.

more when they would see him dwelling in prison. For the royal crown doesn't confer as much splendor on the head of the emperor as the chain confers on that man's hands⁷³—but not because of the nature of the chain itself, but because of the grace that blossomed forth in those hands. This is why the disciples received such tremendous encouragement, for they saw his body bound, but his tongue unbound (cf. 2 Tim 2:9); his hands held fast, but his word set free and running around the entire world faster than the rays of the sun. And this was an encouragement to them, since they learned through his actions that none of the present circumstances was so terrible. After all, when a soul is nobly bathed in devotion and love for God, it turns its attention to none of the present realities. But just as those who are mad venture recklessly into fire, the sword, beasts, the open seas, and all such things, so also these disciples, crazed by a kind of supreme spiritual madness—a madness that comes from right-mindedness!—used to laugh in the face of all such visible realities. That's why, when they saw their teacher bound in prison, they jumped for joy all the more, they were jubilant all the more, by their actions giving proof to their enemies that they were unassailable and invincible on all sides.

9. So, just when these things were taking place amid these circumstances, some of Paul's enemies, wishing to stir up an even more bitter battle and increase the tyrant's⁷⁴ enmity for Paul, themselves even made a pretense of preaching the gospel.⁷⁵ They were preaching the true and salutary faith⁷⁶ with the goal of causing the teaching to progress all the more. But they weren't doing it out of a wish to sow the faith, but so that once Nero had learned that the gospel proclamation was proliferating and the teaching progressing, he might more quickly arrest Paul and drag him off to the dungeon. Consequently, there were two forms of teaching,⁷⁷ one belonging to Paul's disciples, and the other to Paul's enemies. The former preached the gospel out of a true intention,⁷⁸ and the latter out of competition and enmity for Paul. He makes this clear when he says, "*Some because of envy and contention ... preach Christ*" (Phil 1:15),⁷⁹ indicating those enemies, and "*others because of goodwill*" (Phil 1:15), saying this about his own disciples. Then once again about the former: "*some out of enmity*" (Phil 1:16), that is, the enemies. "*Not out of a pure motive*" [318], that is, not in a salutary way, but "*intending to add further affliction to my chains*

78. ἐξ ἀληθείας, as John's interpretation of Paul's εἴτε προφάσει εἴτε ἀληθείᾳ in Phil 1:18.

79. Minus καί after τινὲς μέν; ellipsis as marked in the translation.

μου· οἱ δὲ ἐξ ἀγάπης· πάλιν τοῦτο περὶ τῶν ἀδελφῶν τῶν ἑαυτοῦ· Εἰδότες ὅτι εἰς ἀπολογίαὶν τοῦ Εὐαγγελίου κεῖμαι. Τί γάρ; Πλὴν παντὶ τρόπῳ, εἴτε προφάσει, εἴτε ἀληθείᾳ, Χριστὸς καταγγέλλεται. Ὡστε μάτην καὶ εἰκῇ ἐπὶ τῶν αἰρέσεων τοῦτο τὸ ῥῆμα παραλαμβάνεται. Οἱ γὰρ τότε κηρύττοντες οὐχὶ δόγμα διεφθαρμένον ἐκήρυττον, ἀλλὰ πίστιν ὑγιῆ καὶ ὀρθήν. Εἰ γὰρ δόγμα διεφθαρμένον ἐκήρυττον, καὶ ἕτερα παρὰ τὸν Παῦλον ἐδίδασκον, οὐκ ἔμελλεν αὐτοῖς προχωρεῖν, ὅπερ ἐβούλοντο. Τί δὲ ἐβούλοντο; Τῆς πίστεως αὐξηθείσης καὶ πολλῶν γενομένων τῶν Παύλου μαθητῶν, εἰς μείζονα πόλεμον τὸν Νέρωνα διεγείρει. Εἰ δὲ ἕτερα δόγματα ἐκήρυττον, οὐκ ἂν πολλοὺς ἐποίησαν τοὺς Παύλου μαθητάς· μὴ ποιοῦντες δὲ, οὐκ ἂν παρώξυναν τὸν τύραννον. Οὐ τοίνυν τοῦτό φησιν, ὅτι διεφθαρμένα δόγματα εἰσήγον, ἀλλ' ὅτι ἡ αἰτία, ἀφ' ἧς ἐκήρυττον, αὕτη ἦν διεφθαρμένη. Ἔτερον γὰρ ἐστὶ λαλεῖν τὴν πρόφασιν τοῦ κηρύγματος, καὶ ἕτερον αὐτὸ τὸ κήρυγμα μὴ εἶναι ὑγιές. Τὸ μὲν γὰρ κήρυγμα οὐ γίνεται ὑγιές, ὅταν τὰ δόγματα ᾗ πλάνης γέμοντα· ἡ πρόφασις δὲ οὐ γίνεται ὑγιής, ὅταν τὸ μὲν κήρυγμα ὑγιές ᾗ, οἱ δὲ κηρύττοντες μὴ διὰ τὸν Θεὸν κηρύττωσιν, ἀλλ' ἢ πρὸς ἔχθραν, ἢ πρὸς χάριν ἐτέρων.

ι'. Οὐ τοίνυν τοῦτό φησιν, ὅτι αἰρέσεις εἰσήγον, ἀλλ' ὅτι οὐκ ἀπὸ προφάσεως ὀρθῆς, οὐδὲ δι' εὐλάβειαν ἐκήρυττον, ὅπερ ἐκήρυττον. Οὐ γὰρ ἵνα τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον αὐξήσωσι, τοῦτο ἐποιοῦν, ἀλλ' ἵνα αὐτὸ πολεμήσωσι, καὶ εἰς μείζονα αὐτὸν ἐμβάλωσι κίνδυνον· διὰ τοῦτο αὐτοῖς ἐγκαλεῖ. Καὶ ὅρα πῶς μετὰ ἀκριβείας αὐτὸ τέθεικεν. Οἰόμενοι θλίψιν, φησὶν, ἐπιφέρειν τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου. Οὐκ εἶπεν, ἐπιφέροντες, ἀλλ', Οἰόμενοι ἐπιφέρειν, τουτέστι, νομίζοντες· δεικνὺς ὅτι εἰ καὶ ἐκεῖνοι νομίζουσιν, ἀλλ' οὐκ αὐτὸς οὕτω διάκειται, ἀλλὰ καὶ χαίρει διὰ τὴν τοῦ κηρύγματος ἐπίδοσιν. Ἐπήγαγεν οὖν λέγων. Ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τούτῳ χαίρω καὶ χαρήσομαι· εἰ δὲ πλάνην τὰ δόγματα εἶχε, καὶ αἰρέσεις εἰσήγον ἐκεῖνοι, οὐκ ἡδύνατο χαίρειν ὁ Παῦλος. Ἐπειδὴ δὲ ὑγιές καὶ ἀνόθευτον τὸ δόγμα, διὰ τοῦτό φησι, Χαίρω καὶ χαρήσομαι. Τί γάρ, εἰ

80. John denies this “problem,” i.e., that Paul was condoning the preaching of imperfect forms of the gospel.

81. Chrysostom sidesteps the possible problem that the disciples who were won over by the other teachers were not in fact disciples of Paul.

82. John emphasizes what the text does not say in order to resolve the “problem” of Phil 1:18 being used to justify heresy.

83. See p. 558 n. 16 above on the senses of πρόφασις, for both Paul and John.

84. Mf notes that Paris. gr. 748 and Paris. gr. 730 read αὐτῷ πολεμήσωσι (a reading he marks “sic”), and he retains that of HS ME, αὐτὸ πολεμήσωσι. LSJ I.1 and II.1 allow for both cases with the verb πολεμεῖν, noting that the accusative is found in later Greek.

85. Chrysostom uses the rewording topos to show what Paul did *not* mean.

86. With transposition of ἀλλὰ before καὶ ἐν τούτῳ instead of before καὶ χαρήσομαι.

(Phil 1:16). *Some out of love*" (Phil 1:17), again saying this is about his own disciples. "Knowing that I am destined for a defense of the gospel. For what purpose? Only that in every way, whether by pretense or by true intention, Christ is proclaimed" (Phil 1:17–18). Consequently, it is useless and baseless to interpret this statement as referring to heresies,⁸⁰ because those who were preaching the gospel at that time weren't preaching a corrupted doctrine, but a faith that was salutary and true. After all, if they'd been preaching a corrupted doctrine and were teaching things different from Paul, they wouldn't have succeeded in their wishes. What did they wish? To rouse Nero to a heightened battle by the proliferation of the faith and the large numbers of people who were becoming disciples of Paul. If they were preaching other doctrines, then Paul wouldn't have made so many disciples.⁸¹ And if they hadn't done so, then they wouldn't have provoked the tyrant. Paul didn't say that they introduced corrupt doctrines,⁸² but that the reason why they were preaching was corrupted. It's one thing to tell of the pretext⁸³ for the preaching and another to say that the preaching itself isn't salutary. The preaching isn't salutary when the doctrines are full of error; but the pretext isn't salutary when, though the preaching is salutary, those who preach don't preach for the sake of God but either out of enmity or to curry favor in the eyes of others.

10. Hence, Paul doesn't say that they introduced heresies, but that they preached what they preached neither from an honest motive nor for the sake of piety. Because they didn't do this so they might cause the gospel to proliferate, but so that they might throw it into battle⁸⁴ and plunge Paul into greater danger. That's why he issues an accusation against them. And see how precisely he has put it: "*intending to add further affliction to my chains*" (Phil 1:16), he says. He didn't say, "adding,"⁸⁵ but "*intending to add*," that is, "supposing," thus showing that although they were supposing this, in fact he himself was not in such a state, but he was even rejoicing because of the gospel's progress. Then he added, saying, "*But even in this I rejoice, and I shall rejoice*" (Phil 1:18).⁸⁶ If the doctrines contained error and those preachers were introducing heresies, Paul couldn't have rejoiced. But since their doctrine was salutary and unadulterated, he says, "*I rejoice, and I shall rejoice*" (Phil 1:18).⁸⁷ Why would that be if by doing this out of enmity

This may be a rephrasing for emphasis in this context. John follows the reading of \mathfrak{M} (καὶ ἐν τούτῳ χαίρω, ἀλλὰ καὶ χαρήσομαι) when citing the verse in *Hom. Phil.* 2.3; 3.1 (PG 62:193, 197) and *Hom. 1 Tim.* 2.3 (PG 62:514).

87. Minus ἀλλά before καὶ χαρήσομαι.

ἑαυτοὺς ἀπολλύουσιν ἐκεῖνοι, ἐξ ἀπεχθείας τοῦτο ποιοῦντες; Ἀλλὰ τὰ ἐμὰ καὶ ἄκοντες αὖξουσιν. Εἶδες πόση τοῦ Παύλου ἡ δύναμις; πῶς οὐδενὶ τῶν τοῦ διαβόλου μηχανημάτων ἀλίσκεται; Καὶ οὐ μόνον οὐχ ἀλίσκεται, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτοῖς τούτοις αὐτὸν χειροῦται. Πολλὴ μὲν γὰρ οὖν καὶ ἡ τοῦ διαβόλου κακουργία, καὶ τῶν ἐκείνῳ διακονούντων ἡ πονηρία· ἐν προσχήματι γὰρ τοῦ τὰ αὐτὰ φρονεῖν, σβέσαι τὸ κήρυγμα ἐβούλοντο. Ἄλλ' Ὁ δρασσόμενος τοὺς σοφοὺς ἐν τῇ πανουργίᾳ αὐτῶν, οὐ συνεχώρει τοῦτο γενέσθαι τότε. Τοῦτο γοῦν αὐτὸ ἐμφαίνων ὁ Παῦλος ἔλεγε· Τὸ δὲ ἐπιμεῖναι τῇ σαρκὶ ἀναγκαιότερον δι' ὑμᾶς, καὶ τοῦτο πεποithῶς οἶδα, ὅτι μενῶ καὶ συμπαραμενῶ πᾶσιν ὑμῖν. Ἐκεῖνοι μὲν γὰρ τῆς παρουσίας με ζωῆς ἐκβαλεῖν ἐπιθυμοῦσι, καὶ πάντα διὰ τοῦτο ὑπομένουσιν· ὁ δὲ Θεὸς οὐκ ἀφήσι δι' ὑμᾶς.

ια'. Ταῦτα τοίνυν μετὰ ἀκριβείας ἅπαντα μνημονεύετε, ἵνα τοὺς ἀπλῶς καὶ ὡς ἔτυχε ταῖς Γραφαῖς κεχρημένους καὶ ἐπ' ὀλέθρῳ τῶν πλησίον, μετὰ πάσης σοφίας δύνησθε διορθοῦν. Δυνησόμεθα δὲ καὶ μεμνήσθαι [319] τῶν εἰρημένων, καὶ ἐτέρους διορθοῦν, ἂν εἰς εὐχὰς αἰεὶ καταφεύγωμεν, καὶ παρακαλῶμεν τὸν Θεὸν τὸν διδόντα λόγον σοφίας, δοῦναι καὶ σύνεσιν ἀκροάσεως, καὶ φυλακὴν τῆς πνευματικῆς ταύτης παρακαταθήκης ἀκριβῆ καὶ ἀχείρωτον. Ἄ γὰρ οὐκ ἰσχύομεν πολλάκις ἐξ οἰκείας κατορθῶσαι σπουδῆς, ταῦτα δυνησόμεθα ἀνύσαι εὐμαρῶς δι' εὐχῶν, εὐχῶν δὲ λέγω τῶν διηνεκῶν. Αἰεὶ γὰρ καὶ ἀδιαλείπτως εὔχεσθαι χρή, καὶ τὸν ἐν θλίψει, καὶ τὸν ἐν ἀνέσει, καὶ τὸν ἐν δεινοῖς, καὶ τὸν ἐν ἀγαθοῖς ὄντα· τὸν μὲν ἐν ἀνέσει καὶ πολλοῖς ἀγαθοῖς, ἵνα ἀκίνητα καὶ ἀμετάβλητα ταῦτα μένη καὶ μηδέποτε μεταπέσῃ· τὸν δὲ ἐν θλίψει καὶ πολλοῖς τοῖς δεινοῖς, ἵνα τινὰ χρηστὴν αὐτῷ ἴδῃ γενομένην μεταβολὴν, καὶ εἰς γαλήνην παρηγορίας μεταβληθῇ. Ἐν γαλήνῃ εἶ; Οὐκοῦν παρακάλει τὸν Θεὸν βεβαίαν σοι μένειν τὴν γαλήνην ταύτην. Χειμῶνα εἶδες ἐπαναστάντα;

88. An answer in the voice of Paul.

89. Cf. 2 Cor 11:15: οἱ διάκονοι αὐτοῦ/οἱ ἐκείνῳ διακονοῦντες, and μετασχηματίζονται/ ἐν προσχήματι. Through this intertextual allusion, John is now saying that the other gospel proclaimers Paul mentions were actually in collusion with their master, the devil.

90. Cf. Rom 12:16; 15:5; 2 Cor 13:11; Phil 2:2; 4:3.

91. δι' ἡμᾶς sic JPM (PG) for δι' ὑμᾶς (rightly HS and Mf). With ἐπιμεῖναι for ἐπιμένειν; minus ἐν before τῇ σαρκί, but elsewhere in his homilies John reads ἐν as, e.g., in *Hom. Phil.* 3.3; 4.1 (PG 62:202, 205); but not, e.g., in *Exp. Ps.* Ψ 114 §4 (PG 55:326).

92. JPM (PG) indents here, but he omits Mf's paragraph number (PG 51:318); however, he resumes with §12 in the following column.

93. ἀπλῶς καὶ ὡς ἔτυχε, a deliberate repetition of the pair of terms Chrysostom had used early in the homily in §3 (PG 51:313) to characterize the method responsible for what he regards as a faulty reading of the verse; note also the same term for its result: ὀλεθρος.

they inflict destruction upon themselves? “And yet they’re furthering my cause without meaning to!”⁸⁸ Have you seen how great Paul’s power is? How he isn’t caught in any of the stratagems of the devil? And not only isn’t he caught, but he even bests the devil by means of those very stratagems. Indeed, the malevolence of the devil is colossal, as is the wickedness of those who serve him;⁸⁹ for in the guise of holding the same views,⁹⁰ they were actually wishing to extinguish the gospel proclamation. But “*the one who catches the wise by their cunning*” (1 Cor 3:19; cf. Job 5:13) didn’t allow that to happen then. This is the very point that Paul stresses when he says, “*But to remain in the flesh is more necessary for your sake, and having this confidence I know that I shall remain, and I shall abide together with all of you*” (Phil 1:24),⁹¹ meaning, “those preachers desire to cast me out of the present life, and they endure all things for this purpose. But ‘*for your sake*’ (Phil 1:24), God doesn’t allow it.”

11.⁹² So then, remember all these things in detail so that with complete wisdom you might be able to correct those who use the Scriptures superficially and in a self-serving way⁹³ and to the ruination of their neighbors. And we shall be able both to remember [319] the things that have been said and to correct others if we always take refuge in prayer and beg the God who gives us a word of wisdom (cf. 1 Cor 12:8) to give us also the intelligence⁹⁴ to hear it and the capacity to keep this spiritual deposit accurately and invincibly.⁹⁵ For the good deeds that we’re often unable to do from our own diligence we shall be able to accomplish easily through prayers⁹⁶—and by that I mean continual prayers. Both the person in affliction and the one at ease, the one in terrible circumstances and the person in favorable ones, should always pray “*ceaselessly*” (1 Thess 5:17). The one at ease and in considerably favorable circumstances⁹⁷ should pray that these might remain unaltered and unchanged; the person in affliction and terrible circumstances that they might see a favorable change take place for themselves and might be transferred into a consoling calm. Are you in a state of calm now? Well then, beg God that this calm remain securely

94. Cf. Col 1:9; 2 Tim 2:7.

95. Cf. 1 Tim 6:20; 2 Tim 1:12, 14.

96. Mf notes that other manuscripts read δι’ ἐντεύξεων (“through petitions”) for δι’ εὐχῶν, a reading perhaps lost because of a dittography, resulting in the adopted reading (δι’ εὐχῶν, εὐχῶν δέ).

97. Mf notes that his two manuscripts read ἀγαθοῖς φιλοτιμηθέντα, ἵνα (“[the one at ease and] endowed with favorable circumstances”) for πολλοῖς ἀγαθοῖς, ἵνα.

Παρακάλει έκτενῶς τὸν Θεὸν παρενέγκαι τὸ κλυδώνιον, καὶ γαλήνην ἀπὸ χειμῶνος ποιῆσαι. Ἦκούσθης; Ἐπὶ τούτῳ εὐχαρίστησον, ἐπειδὴ ἠκούσθης. Οὐκ ἠκούσθης; Παράμεινον, ἵνα ἀκουσθῇς. Κἂν γὰρ ἀναβάλληται ποτε τὴν δόσιν ὁ Θεός, οὐχὶ μισῶν οὐδὲ ἀποστρεφόμενος, ἀλλὰ τῇ μελλήσει τῆς δόσεως διηνεκῶς σε παρ' ἑαυτῷ κατέχειν βουλόμενος, καθάπερ καὶ πατέρες φιλόστοργοι ποιοῦσι· καὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖνοι τῶν ῥαθυμοτέρων παιδῶν τὴν διηνεκῇ προσεδρεῖαν τῇ τῆς δόσεως ἀναβολῇ σοφίζονται. Οὐ χρεῖα σοι μεσιτῶν ἐπὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ, οὐδὲ πολλῆς τῆς περιδρομῆς, καὶ τοῦ κολακεῦσαι ἐτέρους· ἀλλὰ κἂν ἔρημος ᾖς, κἂν ἀπροστάτευτος, αὐτὸς διὰ σαυτοῦ παρακαλέσας τὸν Θεὸν ἐπιτεύξῃ πάντως. Οὐχ οὕτω δι' ἐτέρων ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν παρακαλούμενος ἐπινεύειν εἴωθεν, ὡς δι' ἡμῶν αὐτῶν τῶν δεομένων, κἂν μυρίων ὦμεν γέμοντες κακῶν. Εἰ γὰρ ἐπ' ἀνθρώπων κἂν μυρία προσκεκρουκότες ὦμεν, ὅταν καὶ ὑπὸ τὴν ἔω, καὶ μέσης ἡμέρας, καὶ ἐν ἑσπέρᾳ φαινώμεθα τοῖς πρὸς ἡμᾶς λελυπημένοις, τῇ συνεχείᾳ καὶ τῇ διηνεκεῖ τῆς ὀψεως συντυχία καταλύομεν ῥαδίως αὐτῶν τὴν ἔχθραν, πολλῷ μᾶλλον ἐπὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦτο γένοιτ' ἂν.

ιβ'. Ἀλλ' ἀνάξιος εἶ; Γενοῦ τῇ προσεδρεῖᾳ ἄξιος. "Ὅτι γὰρ καὶ τὸν ἀνάξιον δυνατὸν ἄξιον ἐκ τῆς προσεδρεῖας γενέσθαι, καὶ δι' ἡμῶν αὐτῶν μᾶλλον, ἢ δι' ἐτέρων παρακαλούμενος ὁ Θεός ἐπινεύει, καὶ ὅτι τὴν δόσιν ἀναβάλλεται πολλάκις, οὐχ ἡμᾶς ἐξαπορῆσαι βουλόμενος, οὐδὲ κεναῖς ἐκπέμψαι χερσίν, ἀλλ' ἵνα μειζόνων ἡμῖν ἀγαθῶν αἴτιος γένηται· τὰ τρία ταῦτα διὰ τῆς παραβολῆς τῆς σήμερον ἀναγνωσθείσης ὑμῖν πειράσομαι ποιῆσαι φανερά. Προσηλθε τῷ Χριστῷ ἢ Χαναναία ὑπὲρ θυγατρὸς δεομένη δαιμονιζομένης, καὶ βοῶσα μετὰ πολλῆς έκτενεῖας, φησίν· Ἐλέησόν με, Κύριε, ἢ θυγάτηρ μου κακῶς δαιμονίζεται. Ἴδου ἀλλόφυλος ἢ γυνή, καὶ βάρβαρος, καὶ τῆς πολιτείας τῆς Ἰουδαϊκῆς ἐκτός. Καὶ τί γὰρ ἕτερον ἢ κύων, καὶ ἀνάξιος τοῦ λαβεῖν τὴν

98. In this movement of the homily Chrysostom addresses a series of questions or problems about prayer, including the claim that unanswered prayers are due to divine hatred or indifference. Chrysostom will offer a pedagogical "solution" to this "problem" of theology and theodicy.

99. Although there are no verbal correspondences, John may have Matt 7:7–12 in mind.

100. *προσεδρεῖα*, translated with *PGL* 5, "assiduity, perseverance diligence"; 5.b, "in prayer and devotion ... ref. to delayed answer to prayer" (citing this text), which makes sense given Chrysostom's exhortation to his congregation. But note also *PGL* 6: "importunity, pertinacity," as also perhaps relevant to the story of the Canaanite woman, which he will treat next.

101. I.e., those greater than what one asks for.

102. Although Matt 15:21–28 is a miracle story with a dialogue, John treats it as a parable or object-lesson. At first glance, given that the Canaanite woman makes inter-

in place for you. Do you see storms arising? With persistence beg God to dispel the waves and bring about calm after the storm. Has your prayer been heard? Then offer thanks for the fact that you've been heard. Has your prayer not been heard? Stay with it so you might be heard. If God defers the gift sometimes, it's not because he hates you or has turned his back on you,⁹⁸ but because he wishes by the delay of the gift to make you continually train your attention on him. This is just what loving fathers do, as well. For even the fathers of the laziest children cleverly cajole them into continual perseverance by the deferral of gifts. You don't need intercessors before God or much cajoling or other people to offer flattering words. Even if you're alone, even if you have no patron, by begging God yourself of your own accord, you'll attain your request in full.⁹⁹ He's not as accustomed to assent when others beg on our behalf as he is when we ourselves ask, even if we're full of countless misdeeds. Even if we commit countless offenses, when we appear at dawn, at noon, and in the evening before those whom we've grieved, through these constant and continual face-to-face encounters we'll readily dissolve their enmity. If this is the case with ordinary human beings, then how much more would this be the case with God.

12. But you're unworthy? Become worthy by perseverance.¹⁰⁰ Because even an unworthy person can become worthy by perseverance. God assents more when he's begged by prayers we offer on our own behalf than by those that come from others. And God often defers the gift, not because he wishes to disconcert us or send us away empty-handed, but so that he might be the cause of even greater good things¹⁰¹ for us. I shall attempt to make these three points absolutely clear by means of the parable¹⁰² that was read today. The Canaanite woman approached Christ, making a request on behalf of her daughter who was demon-possessed and, crying out with great persistence, says, "*Have mercy on me, Lord! My daughter is badly afflicted by a demon*" (Matt 15:22).¹⁰³ Look, the woman was a foreigner and a barbarian and an outsider to the Jewish people and way of life.¹⁰⁴ So why is she anything other than a dog and someone unworthy to have her

cession for her daughter, it seems a problematic choice for John's second point about the superiority of prayer on one's own behalf. He will have a rather inventive answer for that (see below).

103. Minus *ὡς* Δαυίδ after κύριε.

104. *πολιτεία* encompasses both these things. John accedes to and amplifies the ethnic disparagement at work in the text.

αἵτησιν; Οὐ γάρ ἐστι, φησί, καλὸν λαβεῖν τὸν ἄρτον τῶν τέκνων, καὶ δοῦναι τοῖς κυναρίοις. Ἄλλ' ὅμως ἀπὸ τῆς προσεδρείας γέγονεν ἄξια. Οὐ γὰρ μόνον εἰς τὴν τῶν παιδων αὐτὴν εὐγένειαν εἰσήγαγε, κύνα οὖσαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ μετὰ πολλῶν τῶν ἐγκωμίων ἐξέπεμψεν, εἰπών. Ὡ γύναι, μεγάλη σου ἡ πίστις· γεννηθήτω σοι ὡς θέλεις. Ὅταν δὲ ὁ Χριστὸς λέγῃ, Μεγάλη ἡ πίστις, μηδεμίαν ἐτέραν ἀπόδειξιν ζητεῖ τῆς μεγαλοψυχίας τῆς κατὰ τὴν γυναῖκα. Εἶδες πῶς ἐκ τῆς προσεδρείας γέγονεν [320] ἄξια, ἀναξία οὖσα ἡ γυνή; Βούλει μαθεῖν καὶ ὅτι δι' ἡμῶν αὐτῶν μᾶλλον, ἢ δι' ἐτέρων παρακαλοῦντες αὐτὸν ἀνύομεν; Ἐκραξεν αὕτη, καὶ προσελθόντες οἱ μαθηταὶ λέγουσιν. Ἀπόλυσον αὐτήν, ὅτι κράζει ὅπισθεν ἡμῶν· καὶ πρὸς μὲν ἐκείνους φησὶν, Οὐκ ἀπεστάλην, εἰ μὴ εἰς τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἀπολωλότα οἴκου Ἰσραὴλ· ὅτε δὲ αὕτη δι' ἑαυτῆς προσῆλθε καὶ ἐπέμενε βοῶσα, καὶ λέγουσα. Ναί, Κύριε, καὶ γὰρ τὰ κυνάρια ἐσθίει ἀπὸ τῆς τραπέζης τῶν κυρίων αὐτῶν· τότε τὴν χάριν ἔδωκε, καὶ φησι· Γεννηθήτω σοι ὡς θέλεις. Εἶδες πῶς, ὅτε μὲν ἐκεῖνοι παρεκάλουν, διεκρούσατο· ὅτε δὲ αὕτη ἡ δεομένη τῆς δωρεᾶς ἐβόησεν, ἐπένευσεν; Ἐκεῖνοις μὲν γὰρ φησιν, Οὐκ ἀπεστάλην, εἰ μὴ εἰς τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἀπολωλότα οἴκου Ἰσραὴλ· ταύτη δὲ εἶπε, Μεγάλη σου ἡ πίστις· γεννηθήτω σοι ὡς θέλεις. Πάλιν παρὰ μὲν τὴν ἀρχὴν καὶ ἐν προοιμίῳ τῆς αἰτήσεως οὐδὲν ἀπεκρίνατο· ἐπειδὴ δὲ καὶ ἅπαξ καὶ δευτερον καὶ τρίς προσῆλθε, τότε τὴν χάριν ἔδωκε, διὰ τοῦ τέλους ἡμᾶς πείθων, ὅτι τὴν δόσιν ἀνεβάλετο, οὐχ ἵνα αὐτὴν διακρούσῃται, ἀλλ' ἵνα πᾶσιν ἡμῖν δείξῃ τὴν ὑπομονὴν τῆς γυναικός. Εἰ γὰρ ἵνα αὐτὴν διακρούσῃται ἀνεβάλετο, οὐδ' ἂν πρὸς τῷ τέλει ἔδωκεν· ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἀνέμενε δείξαι πᾶσιν αὐτῆς τὴν φιλοσοφίαν, διὰ τοῦτο ἐσίγα. Εἰ γὰρ εὐθέως ἔδωκε καὶ παρὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν, οὐκ ἂν ἔγνωμεν τὴν ἀνδρείαν τῆς γυναικός. Ἀπόλυσον αὐτήν, φησὶν,

105. With δοῦναι for βαλεῖν, as in *Hom. Matt.* 22.5; 52.2 (PG 57:169, 329); *Hom. Jo.* 22.1; 31.2 (PG 59:134, 177); *Hom. Rom.* 19.2 (PG 60:586); *Non desp.* §7 (PG 51:370); *Exp. Ps.* Ψ 43 §2 (PG 55:169); Ψ 117 §1 (PG 55:329); but *Adv. Jud.* 1.2 (PG 48:845); *Hom. Gen.* 38.3; 44.3 (PG 53:354, 409); *Hom. Heb.* 26.4 (PG 63:189) read βαλεῖν.

106. But minus σου after μεγάλη (unlike in previous sentence), to turn it into a third-person testimonial.

107. John pronounces the first point proven.

108. I have marked this as an intended quotation, since Chrysostom reads ἔκραξεν here and when he cites the lemma in *Hom. Matt.* 52.1 (PG 58:571), against the reading of \mathfrak{M} , ἐκραύγασεν αὐτῇ.

109. The verb ἀπολύειν is usually translated here as “send her away,” but the logic of John’s argument as it unfolds next requires the disciples to be acting as the Canaanite woman’s intercessors on behalf of her request. So perhaps he is taking it in reference to “releasing” the woman from her distress about her daughter. Or maybe even the sense “free her” (i.e., the daughter) from the possession of the demon is in view.

110. Minus (or ellipsis) of ἀπὸ τῶν ψυχῶν τῶν πιπτόντων before ἀπὸ τῆς τραπέζης.

request granted? “*For it is not good,*” he says, “*to take the children’s bread and give it to the dogs*” (Matt 15:26).¹⁰⁵ But nevertheless, she became worthy by her perseverance. For not only did Christ bring up the point about her children’s family pedigree—that it was that of a “dog”—but he sent her away with such abundant praises, saying, “*Great is your faith, woman! Let it be done for you as you wish*” (Matt 15:28). When Christ says her “*faith is great*” (Matt 15:28),¹⁰⁶ don’t seek any further proof of the woman’s magnanimity. Have you seen how, despite being unworthy, the woman became worthy from perseverance [320]?¹⁰⁷ Do you want to learn also the point that we accomplish more when we beg God ourselves rather than through others? She “*cried out*”¹⁰⁸ and “*the disciples approached,*” saying, “*Release her,*¹⁰⁹ *because she is crying out after us*” (Matt 15:23). And he says to them, “*I was not sent except to the lost sheep of the house of Israel*” (Matt 15:24). But it was at the moment when she approached on her own behalf and continued calling out and saying, “*Yes, Lord, for even the little dogs eat from the table of their masters*” (Matt 15:27¹¹⁰), that he granted the favor and said, “*Let it be done for you as you wish*” (Matt 15:28). Have you seen how when the disciples begged Christ was evasive, but when she herself cried out asking for the benefaction he assented? For to them he says, “*I was not sent except to the lost sheep of the house of Israel*” (Matt 15:24), but to her he said, “*Great is your faith! Let it be done for you as you wish*” (Matt 15:28). Again, at the onset and opening words of her request, he didn’t answer at all; but it was at the moment when she had approached one, two, and three times over that he granted the favor. In the end, he convinces us that he deferred the gift, not so that he might evade her, but so that he might show to all of us the woman’s endurance. For if he’d deferred in order to evade her, he wouldn’t have granted it at the end. But he remained silent, since he was waiting in order to show everyone her disciplined virtue.¹¹¹ For if he’d granted it immediately and at the beginning, we wouldn’t have known of the woman’s bravery. “*Release her,*” it¹¹² says, “*because she is crying out after*

111. φιλοσοφία, as so often in John, combines several of its senses (PGL B.4 and 5). It is also not unthinkable that John has in view that the Canaanite woman is already an adherent of the Christian philosophy (B.3), given that Christ commends her πίστις (and John has emphasized that she was τῆς πολιτείας τῆς Ἰουδαϊκῆς ἐκτός and hence a prototypical gentile convert in his eyes). But the stronger emphasis is on her virtuous behavior (ὑπομονή, ἀνδρεία).

112. One expects φασίν, making a contrast between the disciples and Christ (see next sentence). But if the singular φησὶν (with Monac. gr. 352 and Monac. gr. 6), I take the subject as impersonal: “it [the text] says,” in reporting the speech of the disciples.

ὅτι κράζει ὀπισθεν ἡμῶν. Τί δὲ ὁ Χριστός; Ὑμεῖς φωνὴν ἀκούετε, ἐγὼ δὲ τὴν διάνοιαν ὀρῶ· οἶδα τί μέλλει λέγειν. Οὐ βούλομαι τὸν ἐγκεκρυμμένον αὐτῆς τῇ διανοίᾳ θησαυρὸν ἀφεῖναι λαθεῖν, ἀλλ' ἀναμένω καὶ σιγῶ, ἵνα αὐτὸν ἐκκαλύψας εἰς τὸ μέσον καταθῶμαι, καὶ πᾶσι ποιήσω φανερόν.

ιγ'. Ταῦτ' οὖν ἅπαντα μαθόντες, κἂν ἐν ἁμαρτήμασιν ὤμεν, καὶ τοῦ λαβεῖν ἀνάξιοι, μὴ ἀπογινώσκωμεν, εἰδότες ὅτι τῇ προσεδρεΐᾳ τῆς ψυχῆς δυνησόμεθα γενέσθαι τῆς αἰτήσεως ἄξιοι. Κἂν ἀπροστάτευτοι καὶ ἔρημοι ὤμεν, μὴ ἀπαγορεύωμεν, εἰδότες ὅτι μεγάλη προστασία, τὸ αὐτὸν δι' ἑαυτοῦ προσελθεῖν τῷ Θεῷ μετὰ προθυμίας πολλῆς. Κἂν μέλλῃ καὶ ἀναβάληται πρὸς τὴν δόσιν, μὴ ἀναπέσωμεν, μαθόντες ὅτι ἡ μέλλησις καὶ ἀναβολὴ κηδεμονίας καὶ φιλανθρωπίας ἐστὶ τεκμήριον. Ἄν οὕτως ὤμεν πεπεικότες ἑαυτούς, καὶ μετὰ ψυχῆς ὀδυνωμένης καὶ θερμῆς καὶ διεγνηγερμένης προαιρέσεως, καὶ τοιαύτης οἴας ἡ Χαναναία προσῆλθεν, αὐτῷ προσίωμεν καὶ ἡμεῖς, κἂν κύνες ὤμεν, κἂν ὅτιοῦν εἰργασμένοι δεινὸν, καὶ τὰ οἰκεῖα ἀποκρουσόμεθα κακὰ, καὶ τοσαύτην ληψόμεθα παρρησίαν, ὡς καὶ ἐτέρων προστῆναι· ὃν τρόπον καὶ αὕτη ἡ Χαναναία οὐ μόνον αὕτη παρρησίας ἀπέλαυσε καὶ μυρίων ἐγκωμίων, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ θυγάτριον τῶν ἀφορήτων ἴσχυσεν ἐξαρπάσαι δεινῶν. Οὐδὲν γάρ, οὐδὲν εὐχῆς δυνατώτερον πεπυρωμένης καὶ γνησίας. Αὕτη καὶ τὰ παρόντα διαλύει δεινὰ, καὶ τῶν κατ' ἐκεῖνον τὸν καιρὸν συμβαινόντων ἐξαρπάζει κολάσεων. Ἰν' οὖν καὶ τὸν παρόντα βίον μετ' εὐκολίας διανύσωμεν, κἀκεῖ μετὰ παρρησίας ἀπέλθωμεν, πολλῇ σπουδῇ καὶ προθυμίᾳ ταύτην ἐπιτελέσωμεν διηνεκῶς. Οὕτω γὰρ δυνησόμεθα καὶ τῶν ἀποκειμένων τυχεῖν ἀγαθῶν, καὶ τῶν χρηστῶν ἀπολαύειν ἐλπίδων· ὧν γένοιτο πάντας ἡμᾶς ἐπιτυχεῖν, χάριτι καὶ φιλανθρωπία καὶ οἰκτιρμοῖς τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, μεθ' οὗ τῷ Πατρὶ ἅμα τῷ ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι δόξα, τιμὴ, κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Ἀμήν.

113. διάνοια: “mind,” “intention,” “meaning.”

114. Here John is personifying the internal dialogue of Christ (ironically, about the internal intention of the Canaanite woman).

us” (Matt 15:23). And what about Christ? “You hear her voice, but I see her heart.”¹¹³ I know what she’s going to say. I don’t want the treasure that is hidden away in her heart to be allowed to escape notice, but I’m waiting and remaining silent so that once I have uncovered that treasure, I shall set it out in public and make it manifest to all.”¹¹⁴

13. Since we’ve learned all these things, let’s not despair, even if we’re mired in sin and unworthy of receiving anything, because we know that by exercising perseverance in our souls, we shall have the ability to become worthy recipients of what we ask. Even if we have no patron to protect us and we stand completely alone, let’s not grow weary, because we know that the most powerful protection comes when someone approaches God with much fervency on their own behalf. Even if God delays and defers about the gift, let’s not lose heart, because we’ve learned that the delay and deferral are a sure sign of his solicitude and magnanimity.¹¹⁵ And if we’ve convinced ourselves of this, and if we, too, approach God with the pained soul and fervent and enervated purpose with which the Canaanite woman approached, then even if we might be dogs, even if we’ve done any sort of terrible deed, we shall shake off our own wicked deeds and receive the eschatological confidence to stand even taller than others. In the same way, not only did this Canaanite woman herself enjoy confidence and abundant praises, but she was also able to snatch her daughter away from unbearably terrible circumstances. For nothing—nothing!—is more powerful than prayer that is inflamed¹¹⁶ and genuine. This prayer destroys the terrible things that happen in the present, and it snatches us from the chastisements that are going to happen in the time to come. Therefore, so we might complete the present life with ease and go off to the next with confidence, let’s practice this prayer continually with great zeal and eagerness. For in this way we shall be able both to attain the good things that are in store and to enjoy the benefit of auspicious hopes. May we all attain these things by the grace, loving-kindness, and mercies of our Lord Jesus Christ, with whom be glory, honor, and power to the Father, together with the Holy Spirit, forever and ever. Amen.

115. This is the repeated solution to the “problem” of unanswered prayers.

116. On prayer as a fire, see also, e.g., *Hom. 2 Cor. 4:13* Γ §12 (PG 51:301).

ΕΙΣ ΤΟ «Χήρα καταλεγέσθω μὴ ἐλάττων ἐτῶν ἐξήκοντα γεγονυῖα»
καὶ περὶ παίδων ἀνατροφῆς, καὶ περὶ ἐλεημοσύνης.

α'. [321] Εἰς καιρὸν ἢ τοῦ Πνεύματος ὠκονόμησε χάρις ταύτην τῆς ἀποστολικῆς ἐπιστολῆς ἀναγνωσθῆναι τὴν περικοπὴν, ἣν ἠκούσατε σήμερον· ἔχει γάρ τινα πρὸς τὰ πρώην εἰρημένα συγγένειαν καὶ ἀκολουθίαν πολλήν, εἰ καὶ μὴ ἐν τοῖς ῥήμασιν, ἀλλ' ἐν τοῖς νοήμασι. Τὸ μὲν γὰρ πρώην ἀναγνωσθὲν τοῦτο ἦν· Περὶ δὲ τῶν κεκοιμημένων οὐ θέλω ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν, ἀδελφοί· καὶ πολλὰ περὶ ἀναστάσεως ἐλέχθη τότε, τὸ γενναίως τὰ τοιαῦτα φέρειν πάθη, καὶ εὐχαριστεῖν τῷ λαμβάνοντι τοὺς προσήκοντας ἡμῖν Θεῷ. Σήμερον τὸ ἀναγνωσθὲν τοῦτό ἐστι· Χήρα καταλεγέσθω μὴ ἐλάττων ἐτῶν ἐξήκοντα γεγονυῖα. Ἐπεὶ οὖν ἀπὸ θανάτου χηρεῖα γίνεται, καὶ τοῦτο μάλιστα ἐστὶ τὸ τὴν ὁδύνην ἐπιτεῖνον, καὶ διεγείρον τὸ πένθος, μεμνημένοι τῶν πρώην

1. Provenance: HS Mf and others all locate this homily in Antioch (see Mayer, *Provenance*, with a full table of scholars on p. 265, with dates ranging from 387 to 388 and in one case possibly as late as 393). Mayer does not include it among her “homilies of certain provenance” (pp. 511–12), but on p. 434, she says, “Thus, for instance, when in *In illud: Vidua eligatur* (CPG 4386) the fathers in the audience are accused of running off to the ‘holy men’ and harassing those on the peaks of the mountains for help whenever their sons suffer mental illness [i.e., §11 (PG 51:331)], there are strong grounds for suspecting that the situation described is local to Antioch.” The other main piece of evidence is that the homily opens with a reference to the previous one, which treated 1 Thess 4:13 and the resurrection, which, as Mf identified it (3:311), is *Laz.* hom. 5, which bears the title Περὶ δὲ τῶν κεκοιμημένων οὐ θέλω ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν, ἀδελφοί, ἵνα μὴ λυπήσθε· καὶ εἰς τὸν Ἰώβ καὶ τὸν Ἀβραάμ. Job and Abraham are mentioned in the present homily, also, in §9 (PG 51:329).

Text: Mf PE (1837) as reprinted by JPM (PG, 1862), containing also Mf’s original text-critical notes (1721) on ME based on his collation of three manuscripts, *Regius* 1975 (= Paris. gr. 765 [XII]), *Colbertinus* 970 (= Paris. gr. 748 [XI]) and *Colbertinus* 1030 (= Paris. gr. 768 [XIII]). PE made three emendations to the text in §§11, 13 and 16 (PG 51:331, 333, 336) and added seven notes confirming readings of Paris. gr. 748. (References to these and Mf’s original footnotes are all included in our footnotes below.) Pinakes lists thirty-six manuscripts that contain this homily, including the two

Hom. 1 Tim. 5:9–10
(In illud: vidua eligatur)
CPG 4386 (PG 51:321–38)¹

On the statement, “*Let a widow be enrolled if she is not less than sixty years of age*” (1 Tim 5:9²) and concerning the raising of children, and concerning almsgiving.

1. [321] The grace of the Spirit arranged for this passage you heard from the apostle’s letter to be read today, for it contains some things that are close to and much in line with what was said on the previous occasion,³ if not in the words, at least in the ideas. For the passage read then was this: “*Now concerning those who have gone to death’s sleep, I do not wish you to be ignorant, brothers and sisters*” (1 Thess 4:13).⁴ Many things were said at that time about the resurrection: to bear such sufferings nobly and to give thanks to God who has taken those who are near and dear to us.⁵ The passage that was read today is this: “*Let a widow be enrolled if she is not less than sixty years of age*” (1 Tim 5:9). Since widowhood comes from death and this event is what especially intensifies grief and heightens mourning, hold in your memory the things we said on that earlier occasion to

used by HS (Oxon. Coll. Nov. 80 and Monac. gr. 6) and, though it includes two Paris codices (Paris. gr. 756 and 799), does not include the three drawn upon by Mf; with those a total of thirty-nine manuscripts are known to contain this homily.

2. With ἐλάττων for ἔλαττον, as also throughout this homily, in §§1 (PG 51:321); 2 (PG 51:323); 3 (PG 51:324); but the latter reading is found in *Hom. 1 Tim.* 14.1 (PG 62:572).

3. Mf rightly emended the text of HS ME with the plus πρώην before εἰρημένα, as found in all three of his manuscripts and now replicated in the PG text. One of HS’s manuscripts, Monac. gr. 6, fol. 93^v, also reads the plus, so there it was likely a transcription error that led to HS’s text.

4. With θέλω for θέλομεν; with transposition of οὐ θέλω/θέλομεν ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν and περὶ τῶν κεκοιμημένων.

5. I.e., taken from this life (and perhaps also “received” into the next life). This is the exact same language Chrysostom had used in the prior sermon, in *Laz.* 5.2 (PG 48:1019–20): ἀλλ’ ἵνα εὐχαριστῇς τῷ λαβόντι.

εἰρημένων, ἃ τοὺς πενθοῦντας παρακαλοῦντες εἰρήκαμεν, καὶ ταῦτα μετὰ πάσης ὑποδεξάμενοι τῆς σπουδῆς μετ' ἐκείνων εἰς τὰ ταμιεῖα τῆς διανοίας ἀπόθεσθε.

Τὸ γὰρ τῆς χηρείας ὄνομα δοκεῖ μὲν εἶναι συμφορᾶς ὄνομα, οὐκ ἔστι δέ, ἀλλ' ἀξίωμα, καὶ τιμὴ, καὶ δόξα μεγίστη· οὐκ ὄνειδος, ἀλλὰ στέφανος. Εἰ γὰρ καὶ ἄνδρα οὐκ ἔχει συνοικοῦντα ἢ χήρα, ἀλλὰ τὸν Χριστὸν ἔχει συνοικοῦντα, τὸν πάντα ἀποκρούμενον τὰ ἐπιόντα δεινά. Ἀρκεῖ γὰρ ἐν ταῖς ἐπιούσαις ἐπηρείαις τῆς χήρας, εἰσελθεῖν καὶ γόνυ κλῖναι, καὶ στεναῖσαι πικρὸν, καὶ δάκρυα προχεῖν, καὶ πᾶσαν ἀποκρούσασθαι τῶν ἐπηρεαζόντων τὴν ἐπιβουλήν· τὰ γὰρ ὅπλα τῆς χήρας τοιαῦτα, δάκρυα, καὶ στεναγμοί, καὶ εὐχαὶ διηνεκεῖς· διὰ τούτων οὐκ ἀνθρωπίνην ἐπήρειαν μόνον, ἀλλὰ [322] καὶ δαιμονικὰς ἐφόδους ἀποκρούσασθαι δύναται. Ἡ χήρα τῶν μὲν βιωτικῶν ἀπήλλακται πραγμάτων, πρὸς δὲ τὸν οὐρανὸν ὁδεύει λοιπόν· καὶ ἦν περὶ τὸν ἄνδρα ἐπεδείκνυτο σπουδὴν καὶ θεραπείαν, ταύτην εἰς τὰ πνευματικὰ πράγματα ἀναλῶσαι δυνήσεται. Εἰ δὲ λέγοις, ὅτι τὸ παλαιὸν συμφορὰ ἦν τὸ πρᾶγμα, ἐκεῖνο ἂν εἴποιμι, ὅτι καὶ ὁ θάνατος κατάρα ἦν· ἀλλὰ γέγονε τιμὴ καὶ ἀξίωμα τοῖς γενναίως αὐτὸν φέρουσιν ἐπιόντα. Οὕτω γοῦν οἱ μάρτυρες στεφανοῦνται· τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον καὶ ἡ χήρα πρὸς ἀξίωμα μέτεισι μέγα.

β'. Βούλει μαθεῖν ὅσον ἐστὶ χήρα; πῶς ἐστι τιμία τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ ἐπέραστος καὶ συνήγορος μεγίστη, καὶ τοὺς καταδικασθέντας, καὶ τοὺς ἀπεγνωσμένους, καὶ τοὺς παρρησίαν οὐκ ἔχοντας, καὶ τοὺς ἐκπεπολεμωμένους τῷ Θεῷ καὶ πάσης ἐστερημένους ἀπολογίας φανεῖσα ἐξαρπάξει καὶ καταλλάττει, καὶ οὐχὶ συγγνώμην αὐτοῖς κομίζει μόνον, οὐδὲ ἀπαλλαγὴν τιμωρίας, ἀλλὰ καὶ πολλὴν τὴν παρρησίαν καὶ τὴν λαμπρότητα, καὶ τῶν ἡλιακῶν ἀκτίνων καθαρωτέρους ἐργάζεται, κἂν ἀπάντων ὥσι κατερρυπωμένοι μᾶλλον ἀνθρώπων; Ἀκουσον αὐτοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ λέγοντος πρὸς Ἰουδαίους· Ὅταν τὰς χεῖρας ὑμῶν ἐκτείνητε, ἀποστρέψω τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς μου ἀφ' ὑμῶν· ἂν πληθύνητε τὴν δέησιν, οὐκ εἰσακούσομαι ὑμῶν· αἱ γὰρ χεῖρες ὑμῶν αἵματος πλήρεις. Ἀλλ' ὅμως

6. Note that ἀξίωμα can mean either “an honor” or “a rank, position.” John will play on both of these meanings in relation to what it means to be a “widow” (enrolled or not) below.

7. Part of the “problem” for Chrysostom (as it was for the author of 1 Timothy) is how to define the term χήρα. Here I use the traditional translation of “widow,” but the reader should keep in mind that in some early Christian texts and contexts, though mostly before John’s time, “the term χήρα (‘a woman who lives without a man’) can refer to any woman who has chosen to lead a sexually continent life” and not always “a woman whose husband has died” (Charlotte Methuen, “The ‘Virgin Widow’: A Problematic Social Role for the Early Church?,” *HTR* 90 [1997]: 285–98, here 287, with parenthetical quotation from Gustav Stählin, “χήρα,” *TDNT* 9:440–65, here 442). For

comfort those who mourn, and receive the words of this homily with all eagerness, depositing them in the treasuries of your minds along with the former ones.

Now, the word “*widowhood*” seems to signify misfortune, and yet it’s not that, but instead it’s an honor,⁶ a dignity, and the greatest glory—not a reproach but a crown! Although the widow⁷ doesn’t have a husband to live with her, she has Christ living with her—Christ, who drives away all the terrible things that may come. For in the face of the insults that a widow meets, all she has to do is go inside, get on her knees, groan bitterly and pour forth tears, and all the plots of those who sling insults are driven away. These are the weapons of the widow: tears, groaning, and constant prayer.⁸ By these means she’s able to drive away not just human insults, but [322] even the assaults of demons. The widow has been freed from the affairs of daily life and is on the path toward heaven at last. She’ll be able to expend the same zeal and service she had shown for her husband on spiritual affairs. Now, if you’d say the past occurrence⁹ was a misfortune, I’d say that the death was indeed a curse. But it has become an honor and a dignity for those who are able to bear with nobility what comes their way. This is what happens with martyrs receiving their crowns, and in the very same way the widow follows this path, too, as she pursues this greatly honorable rank.

2. Do you want to learn the tremendous value of the widow? How precious she is to God, so loving and such a great advocate who rescues and reconciles the condemned and the forsaken, those who have no confidence and are at enmity with God and lacking means of self-defense? How she provides them not only with pardon or release from punishment, but with great confidence and splendor, making them more pure than the rays of the sun, even if they were the most filthy people on earth? Hear God saying to the Jews, “*When you extend your hands, I shall turn my eyes away from you; if you increase your entreaties, I shall not listen to you. For your hands are full of blood*” (Isa 1:15). But despite all this, he promises to become

some of the exegetical and historical issues see John M. G. Barclay, “Household Networks and Early Christian Economics: A Fresh Study of 1 Timothy 5.3–16,” *NTS* 66 (2020): 268–87; and on the fraught history of interpretation of 1 Tim 5 among early Christian authors see Clark, *Reading Renunciation*, 366–70. In what follows, it is clear that Chrysostom does assume a *χήρα* is a bereaved wife, but he has various questions about what makes a truly holy and properly enrolled widow.

8. Cf. 1 Tim 5:5 on constant petitions and prayers being the sign of a “true widow” (ἡ ὀντως χήρα).

9. I.e., the death of the husband.

τούτοις τοῖς μιαιοῖς, τοῖς ἀνδροφόνοις, τοῖς ἀπαρρησιάστοις, τοῖς ἡτιμωμένοις ἐπαγγέλλεται καταλλάττεσθαι, εἰ βοηθήσειαν ἀδικουμέναις χήραις. Μετὰ γὰρ τὸ εἰπεῖν, Ἀποστρέψω τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς μου, καὶ οὐκ εἰσακούσομαι, φησί· Κρίνατε ὀρφανῶ, καὶ δικαιώσατε χήραν· καὶ δεῦτε, καὶ διαλεχθῶμεν· καὶ ἐὰν ὧσιν ὑμῶν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι ὡς φοινικοῦν, ὡς χιόνα λευκανῶ. Εἶδες πόσῃ ἔχει δύναμιν ἡ [323] χήρα; ποῦ τὴν προστασίαν ἐπιδείκνυται τὴν ἑαυτῆς, οὐ παρὰ ἄρχοντι καὶ βασιλεῖ τῶν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ἀλλὰ παρ' αὐτῷ τῷ τῶν οὐρανῶν βασιλεῖ; πόσῃ δύναται καταλῦσαι ὀργὴν, καταλλάξαι τὸν Δεσπότην τοῖς ἀνίατα νεοσχοῖσιν, ἐξαρπάσαι τιμωρίας ἀφορήτου, ψυχὴν βαφεῖσαν τῷ τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων ρύπῳ τῆς κηλίδος ἐκπλῦναι ἐκείνης, καὶ πρὸς τὴν ἄκραν ἀγαγεῖν καθαρότητα; Μὴ τοίνυν καταφρονῶμεν χήρας γυναικὸς, ἀλλὰ πᾶσαν περὶ αὐτὴν ἐπιμέλειαν ἐπιδείξωμεν. Προστάτις ἡμῶν ἐστὶν ἡ ὄντως χήρα.

Ἄξιον δὲ ἐπιστάντας ἰδεῖν, περὶ ποίας ἐνταῦθα χήρας φησί. Καὶ γὰρ καὶ ἐκεῖναι χῆραι λέγονται, αἱ εἰς εὐτέλειαν ἐσχάτην καταπεσοῦσαι, καὶ ἐγγεγραμμέναι, καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν τρεφόμεναι χρημάτων, καθάπερ οὖν ἐπὶ τῶν ἀποστολῶν. Ἐγένετο γὰρ, φησί, γογγυσμὸς μεταξὺ τῶν Ἑλληνιστῶν, ὅτι παρεθεωροῦντο ἐν τῇ διακονίᾳ τῇ καθημερινῇ αἱ χῆραι αὐτῶν. Οὐχ αὗται δὲ μόνον χῆραι λέγονται, ἀλλὰ κάκεῖναι, αἱ μηδενὸς μὲν δεόμεναι, ἀλλ' εὐπορίας ἀπολαύουσαι, καὶ οἰκίας προεστῶσαι, τὸν δὲ ἄνδρα ἀποβαλοῦσαι μόνον. Ἰδωμεν οὖν περὶ ποίας χήρας ἐνταῦθα φησι λέγων· Χήρα καταλεγέσθω μὴ ἐλάττων ἐτῶν ἐξήκοντα γεγονυῖα· ἄρα περὶ τῆς δεομένης βοηθείας καὶ χρεῖαν ἐχούσης ἐξ ἐκκλησιαστικῶν τρέφεσθαι χρημάτων, ἢ περὶ τῆς ἀνευδεοῦς καὶ ἐν εὐπορίᾳ ζώσης; Εὐδὴλον ὅτι περὶ ταύτης. Περὶ μὲν γὰρ ἐκείνης ὅταν λέγῃ, τῆς λιμῶ διαφθειρομένης, οὐ χρόνον τίθησιν, οὐκ ἀκρίβειαν ἀπαιτεῖ τρόπων· ἀλλ' ἀπλῶς, Εἴ τις πιστὸς ἢ πιστὴ, φησί, χήρας

10. These are regular features of Chrysostom's anti-Judaistic rhetoric, which builds on and reapplies internal prophetic critique in the Septuagint but greatly amplifies it (on which see Wilken, *John Chrysostom and the Jews*; Shepardson, "Between Polemic and Propaganda," and much further literature).

11. With διαλεχθῶμεν for διελεγχθῶμεν, "let's perform an examination" (with LSV IV; NETS: "let's argue it out"); ellipsis of λέγει κύριος after διαλεχθῶμεν (as marked in the translation); with ὑμῶν αἱ ἁμαρτίαι for αἱ ἁμαρτίαι ὑμῶν.

12. προστασία, her role as one who extends patronage to others by brokering divine favor. This is an intended irony, in that the legislation presumes the widow needs the patronage of others since she (like the orphan) stands outside patriarchal protection.

13. προστάτις, also "patron" (with previous note).

14. John appears to be using ἐγγράφεσθαι ("be recorded," "be put on the list") as synonymous with καταλέγεσθαι ("be enrolled") in the lemma of 1 Tim 5:9.

reconciled with these people who are defiled, homicidal, tongue-tied by sin and dishonorable¹⁰—on the condition that they give help to widows who are treated unjustly. For after saying, “*I shall turn my eyes away ... and I shall not listen*” (Isa 1:15), it says, “*Exact judgment for the orphan, and do justice for the widow. And come, and let’s confer ... and if your sins are as scarlet, I shall whiten them like snow*” (Isa 1:17–18).¹¹ Do you see what great power [323] the widow has? How she puts forward her own role as an advocate,¹² not standing in front of a ruler or king of an earthly realm, but before the very king of the heavens? How she has the ability to mollify tremendous anger in order to reconcile the Lord to those who are incurably sick? To rescue them from an unbearable punishment? To wash the stain out of a soul that has been dipped in the mire of sin and to lead it to the highest purity? Therefore, let’s not have contempt for a woman who is a widow, but show her our complete care and attention. For “*the true widow*” (1 Tim 5:5) is our advocate.¹³

It’s right for those who pay close attention to look into what sort of widow Paul is speaking of here. It is the case that those women who’ve fallen into abject poverty and are registered¹⁴ and fed from the funds of the church are called “widows,” just as took place in the time of the apostles. For, it says, “*There was grumbling between the Hellenists because their widows were being overlooked in the daily service*” (Acts 6:1).¹⁵ However, these aren’t the only women who are called “widows”; there are also women who have need of nothing, enjoy abundance, and preside over households, having lost only their husbands. So, let’s have a look at which kind of widow Paul is speaking of here when he says, “*Let a widow be enrolled if she is not less than sixty years of age*” (1 Tim 5:9). Does this refer to the widow who requires assistance and needs to be fed from the church funds, or the one who has no needs and lives in abundance? Clearly it is a reference to former. When he speaks about this widow—the one being decimated by hunger—he doesn’t add an age limit, he doesn’t require a detailed account¹⁶ of her way of life, but he simply says, “*If a believing man*

15. With μεταξὺ τῶν Ἑλληνιστῶν for τῶν Ἑλληνιστῶν πρὸς τοὺς Ἑβραίους after γογγυσμός. Chrysostom cites the lemma in the text-form of M in Hom. Act. 14.1 (PG 60:113).

16. Or, to use a less customary sense of ἀκρίβεια for John, “he does not require a parsimonious way of life” (with LSJ 2). However, the context better supports the translation chosen.

ἔχει, ἐπαρκείτω αὐταῖς, καὶ μὴ βαρεῖσθω ἡ Ἐκκλησία. Οὐκ εἶπεν, "Ὅταν ἐξήκοντα ἐτῶν γέννηται· οὐκ εἶπεν, Εἰ ἐξενοδόχησεν, εἰ ἀγίων πόδας ἐνιψέ· καὶ μάλα εἰκότως." Ἐνθα μὲν γὰρ ἂν πενίαν διορθῶσαι δέοι, οὐκ ἀναμένει χρόνον. Τί γὰρ εἰ πεντήκοντα ἐτῶν οὕσα λιμῶ διαφθείροιτο; τί δὲ ἐὰν ἐν νεότητι τὸ σῶμα ἀνάπηρος οὕσα τύχοι; καθευδεῖται ἀναμένουσα τὸ ἐξηκοστὸν ἔτος; Ἀλλ' ἀπανθρωπίας τοῦτο ἐσχάτης. Διὰ τοῦτο, ὅταν μὲν λιμὸν παραμυθήσασθαι δέοι, οὐδὲν περὶ χρόνων καὶ τῆς κατὰ ψυχὴν ἀρετῆς ἀκριβολογεῖται· ὅταν δὲ μὴ ᾗ διορθῶσασθαι πενίαν, ἀλλὰ τιμὴν κατ' ἀξίαν χαρίσασθαι, εἰκότως τοσαύτην ποιεῖται τρόπων ἐξέτασιν.

γ'. Καθάπερ γὰρ εἰσι παρθένων χοροὶ, οὕτω καὶ χηρῶν τὸ παλαιὸν ἦσαν χοροὶ, καὶ οὐκ ἐξῆν αὐταῖς ἀπλῶς εἰς τὰς χήρας ἐγγράφεσθαι. Οὐ περὶ ἐκεῖνης οὖν λέγει τῆς ἐν πενίᾳ ζώσης καὶ δεομένης βοήθειας, ἀλλὰ περὶ ταύτης τῆς ἐλομένης χηρείαν. Τίνος δὲ ἔνεκεν καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτης ἀπαιτεῖ χρόνον; Οἶδεν ὅτι πυρά τις ἐστὶν ἡ νεότης, καὶ πέλαγος κυμάτων γέμον καὶ πολλὰς ἔχον ἐπαναστάσεις. Ἐπειδὴν οὖν μέλλωσιν ἀπὸ τῆς ἡλικίας ἀτέλειαν ἔχειν, καὶ ὥσπερ ἐν λιμένι διατρίβωσι τῷ γήρᾳ, τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν αὐταῖς σβεσθεισῶν, μετὰ ἀδείας αὐτὰς εἰς τὸν χορὸν εἰσάγει τοῦτον. Τί οὖν, οὐχὶ πολλαί, φησί, καὶ μετὰ εἰκοστὸν ἔτος ἀρξάμεναι μέχρι τέλους διέλαμψαν, καὶ τὸν ζυγὸν ἤνεγκαν, καὶ ἀποστολικὸν ἐπεδείξαντο βίον; [324] κωλύσομεν οὖν ἐκείνας, εἰπέ μοι, καὶ βουλομένας ἐν χηρείᾳ ζῆν ἀναγκάσομεν δευτέροις ὁμιλῆσαι γάμοις; καὶ ποῦ τοῦτο ἄξιον ἀποστολικῆς γνώμης; τί οὖν ἐστὶ τὸ λεγόμενον; Προσέχετε μετὰ ἀκριβείας, ἀγαπητοί, αὐτῇ τῇ σημασίᾳ τῆς λέξεως. Οὐ γὰρ εἶπε, Χήρα

17. With transposition of ἔχει and χήρας.

18. With transposition of ἐτῶν and ἐξήκοντα and reworded in the syntax as a temporal clause (but nonetheless an unmistakable allusion to Paul's actual wording within Chrysostom's denied rewording).

19. I adopt the reading plus εἰ ἐτεκνοτρόφησεν before εἰ ἐξενοδόχησεν with Mf's three manuscripts as well as Monac. gr. 6 (fol. 91). The minus is likely due to a transcription error (parablepsis) by one of HS's assistants.

20. Clearly an exact quotation of 1 Tim 5:10; John is not denying that these are Paul's words, but is insisting they apply to a different "problem" from that addressed in 5:16.

21. Here I adopt the reading καθεύδεται (not noted in earlier editions), with Paris. gr. 765 and Monac. gr. 6, for Mf PE PG's reading, καθευδεῖται, "will she go to sleep and wait?" (as is also read by Paris. gr. 768). Mf had indicated that Paris. gr. 748 reads καθεδεῖται ("will she sit and wait?"), which the PE editors judged "recte" in their note but did not adopt into the text.

22. Chrysostom is himself reflecting the history as recounted, e.g., by Methuen, "The 'Virgin Widow.'"

or woman has widows, let him or her give sufficient care for their widows, and let the church not be encumbered” (1 Tim 5:16).¹⁷ He didn’t say, “when she has attained ‘sixty years of age’” (cf. 1 Tim 5:9);¹⁸ he didn’t say, “if she has reared children,¹⁹ if she has given hospitality, if she has washed the feet of the saints” (1 Tim 5:10).²⁰ And rightly so. For when it’s necessary to address an immediate state of poverty, one doesn’t delay because of a matter of age. What if she’s decimated by hunger when she’s fifty years old? Or what if she happens to have bodily disability when still in her youth? Should she go to sleep²¹ and wait for the sixtieth year? That would be utterly inhumane. Therefore, when one must relieve hunger, one doesn’t ask for a detailed account of how old she is or how virtuous her soul. However, when it’s not about addressing poverty, but granting honor according to worth, then of course one would make such an extensive examination of her way of life.

3. For just as now there are choirs of virgins, in the old days there were choirs of widows,²² and it wasn’t permitted for women to be registered among the widows indiscriminately. In any event, Paul isn’t speaking²³ about the woman who lives in poverty and requires assistance, but about the one who’s chosen the state of widowhood. So why does he give an age requirement for this woman? He knows that youth is a conflagration²⁴ and a sea filled with waves and brimming with rising swells. Hence, since they’re going to have immunity later due to age, and once their desires have been extinguished they’ll live in old age as though in a calm harbor, Paul provides them with a safe route into the chorus of widows. “What, then,” someone²⁵ says, “weren’t there many women who, having set out on this path twenty years prior, have been splendid to the end, borne the yoke, and displayed an apostolic life? [324] Then tell me, shall we prevent them and compel them to be joined in a second marriage even though they wish to live in widowhood? How exactly is this statement worthy of apostolic judgment?” So then, what was said?²⁶ Pay careful attention,

23. I.e., in 1 Tim 5:9–10.

24. *πυρά*, also a “funerary fire” (LSJ A.1.a), hence a pointed image in this context.

25. John is using the voice of a hypothetical interlocutor to set up the potential “problem” with what Paul wrote, as occasioned (and perhaps exacerbated) by his own previous argument that one shouldn’t worry about age requirements when a woman is experiencing serious poverty and in immediate need.

26. John begins his “solution” to the problem just posed by directing attention back into the text.

γινέσθω μὴ ἐλάττων ἐτῶν ἐξήκοντα γεγонуῖα, ἀλλὰ, *Χήρα καταλεγέσθω*· καὶ πάλιν οὐκ εἶπε, *Χῆραι νεώτεραι μὴ καταλεγέσθωσαν*, ἀλλὰ, *Τὰς νεωτέρας δὲ χήρας παραιτοῦ*· πρὸς γὰρ τὸν Τιμόθεον ταῦτα διαλέγεται. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ πολλοὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων εὐχεῖρωτοι περὶ κακῆγορίας εἰσὶ, καὶ τὰς γλώττας κατὰ τῶν τῆς Ἐκκλησίας προεστώτων ἡκονήκασι, βουλόμενος ἐξαρπάσαι τὸν ἄρχοντα τῶν ἐγκλημάτων, τούτους τίθησι τοὺς νόμους, καὶ φησι· Σὺ παραιτοῦ, καὶ σὺ μὴ κατάλεγε. Ἄν αὕτη βούληται οἴκοθεν καὶ παρ' ἐαυτῆς αἰρεῖσθαι ταῦτα, ποιεῖτω· σὺ μέντοι μὴ καταδέξῃ μηδέπω, ἵνα μὴ λέγωσιν ὅτι Νεωτέραν οὖσαν, γήμασθαι βουλομένην, οἰκίας προστῆναι, ὃ δεῖνα κατηνάγκασε· διὰ τοῦτο ἔπεσε, καὶ ὑπεσκελίσθη. Σὺ μὴ καταλέξης αὐτήν, ἵνα, κἂν πέση, τῶν ἐγκλημάτων ἧς ἀπηλλαγμένος· κἂν μὴ πέση, μετὰ πλείονος ἀσφαλείας τῷ προσήκοντι καιρῷ καταλέξης.

Εἰ δὲ λέγει, *Βούλομαι νεωτέρας χήρας γαμεῖν*, τεκνογονεῖν, ἄκουσον ποίας φησὶ νεωτέρας, τὰς μετὰ τὸ καταστρηνιάσαι τοῦ Χριστοῦ βουλομένας γαμεῖν, τὰς φλυάρους, τὰς περιέργους, τὰς περιερχομένας τὰς οἰκίας, τὰς λαλούσας τὰ μὴ δέοντα, τὰς ἐκτραπέισας ὀπίσω τοῦ Σατανᾶ. Οὐ γὰρ εἰπὼν ἀπλῶς, *Βούλομαι νεωτέρας γαμεῖν*, ἐσίγησεν, ἀλλὰ λέγει καὶ ποίας νεωτέρας, καὶ τὰ πτώματα αὐτῶν ἔπεισι. Ποῖα πτώματα; Ὅταν καταστρηνιάσωσι, φησὶ, τοῦ Χριστοῦ, γαμεῖσθαι θέλουσι, καὶ ἀργαὶ μανθάνουσι, καὶ περιέργοι,

27. Both *σημασία*—"significance, signification, meaning" (PGL 2)—and *λέξις*—"style," "phrasing," "text," "literal meaning," "wording" (PGL 2–10)—are hermeneutical terms; in combination, Chrysostom is insisting that the solution to the problem is manifested in Paul's own careful word choices that, John avers, overturn the challenge of the protagonist whom he has just personified.

28. Note the rewording, or denial of alternate wording, *topos*.

29. For *παραιτεῖσθαι*, possibly also "refuse" (BDAG 2.b), but the translation given fits better with John's argument that Paul wanted to give Timothy wiggle room to allow younger widows not to be married (as long as there was not a risk of their straying away from their vow of celibacy).

30. Plus *τάς* before *νεωτέρας*.

31. Mf noted that one of his manuscripts (PE adds that it is Paris. gr. 748) reads *ἡκόνησαν* for *ἡκονήκασι*.

32. As often, John may be blending his perception of the ecclesial politics of Paul's day with the circumstances of his own.

33. John has added the pronoun *σύ* in both cases to emphasize that the rules are directed to Timothy, the leader (*ἄρχων*), to enforce. The first is an actual quotation from 1 Tim 5:11 (*παραιτοῦ*); the second, *κατάλεγε*, is not, but is John's paraphrase and recasting of the passive voice in the third-person singular imperative in 5:9 (*χήρα καταλεγέσθω*). As this argument continues, I am translating the *σύ* as "Timothy," and at times adding "for your part," to make this emphasis clear.

beloved, to the meaning of the text as worded.²⁷ For he didn't say,²⁸ "Let a woman who is less than sixty years of age not be a widow," but "*Let a widow be enrolled*" (1 Tim 5:9). And again, he didn't say, "Let younger widows not be enrolled," but, "*avoid*²⁹ the *younger widows*" (1 Tim 5:11).³⁰ This is because he's saying these things to Timothy. Since many people are susceptible to slander and have sharpened³¹ their tongues against those who preside over the church,³² Paul stipulates these legal requirements out of a wish to insulate the leader from these accusations. He says, "For your part, *avoid*" (1 Tim 5:11) and, 'For your part, don't enroll' (cf. 1 Tim 5:9).³³ If she wishes of her own accord to choose this life, let her do it. But for your part, Timothy, don't permit it yet, lest they say, 'So-and-so³⁴ has forced this on a woman when she was young and wished to be married and preside over a household. That's why she's fallen into sin³⁵ and been tripped up.' For your part, Timothy, don't enroll her, so if she falls into sin, you might be free of these accusations; and if she doesn't fall, do it so you might enroll widows at the proper time with greater assurance."³⁶

If Paul does say, "*I wish younger widows to marry, to bear children*" (1 Tim 5:14),³⁷ listen to what sort of young women he is speaking about—those who, after waxing wanton against Christ, wish to marry; prattlers, busybodies, going around from house to house, who say things they shouldn't, who've been turned around to follow Satan (cf. 1 Tim 5:11, 13–14).³⁸ Paul didn't just say, "*I wish younger women to marry*" (1 Tim 5:14),³⁹ and then remain silent, but he also indicates what sort of young women, and he enumerates their failings. What kind of failings? "*When they wax wanton against Christ,*" he says, "*they wish to become married*"

34. Chrysostom assumes that Timothy is both the recipient of the letter and the model for bishops and other church leaders who follow.

35. *πίπτειν*, translated with PGL B.4. This sense should be understood for the following, when translated simply "fall," which also can have this resonance in English (with Merriam-Webster 4.b, 5).

36. John uses prosopopoeia to recast imaginatively Paul's full instructions for Timothy, including the charges made by would-be antagonists of Timothy that Paul is presented as having preemptively addressed by his careful wording.

37. Minus *οὖν* after *βούλομαι*; plus *χήρας* after *νεωτέρας*.

38. Every one of these phrases adopts the words of the text of 1 Tim 5 but with all as reset in John's own syntax as accusatives and with a reordering of the clauses in 5:13. While this is a close paraphrase, he will quote the verse exactly in what follows.

39. Minus *οὖν* after *βούλομαι*.

περιερχόμεναι τὰς οἰκίας, λαλοῦσαι τὰ μὴ δέοντα, καὶ ἐξετράπησαν. Τίνος ὁπίσω; Τοῦ Σατανᾶ. Ἐπεὶ οὖν μετὰ τὸ χηρεῖαν ἐλέσθαι, καὶ ταύτην πᾶσαν ὑπομεῖναι τὴν ἀσχημοσύνην, βούλονται γαμῆσαι πάλιν, βέλτιον πρὶν ἔχεσθαι, καὶ τὰς πρὸς τὸν Χριστὸν καταπατῆσαι συνθήκας, ἐπὶ τοῦτο ἐλθεῖν· ὡς εἰ μὴ τις εἴη τοιαύτη, οὐκ ἐπιτίθησιν ἀνάγκην γάμου δευτέρου.

δ'. Καὶ ὅτι τοῦτό ἐστιν ἀληθές, δῆλον ἐκεῖθεν. Εἰ γὰρ ὡς νόμον τοῦτο τέθεικε πάσαις ταῖς γυναῖξιν τὸ γαμεῖν καὶ οἰκοδεσποτεῖν, περιττῶς ἐκεῖνα ἀπῆτει, Εἰ ἐτεκνοτρόφησεν, εἰ ἀγίων πόδας ἐνίψεν, εἰ θλιβομένοις ἐπήρκεσεν, εἰ παντὶ ἔργῳ ἀγαθῷ ἐπηκολούθησε· περιττῶς ἀκακείνῳ φησι τὸ, Ἐνὸς ἀνδρὸς γεγονυῖα. Εἰ γὰρ πάσας τὰς νεωτέρας κελεύεις γαμεῖσθαι, πῶς δυνήσεται τις ἐνὸς ἀνδρὸς εἶναι γυνή; Ὡστε πρὸς ἐκείνας ὁ λόγος αὐτῶ. Οὕτω καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς συνουσίας τῆς κατὰ τὸν γάμον ποιεῖ. Εἰπὼν γὰρ, Μὴ ἀποστερεῖτε ἀλλήλους, εἰ μὴ τι ἂν ἐκ συμφώνου πρὸς καιρὸν, ἵνα σχολάζητε τῇ νηστείᾳ καὶ τῇ προσευχῇ, καὶ πάλιν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συνέρχησθε· ἵνα μὴ νομίξης τὸ πρᾶγμα νόμον εἶναι, προστίθῃσι τὴν αἰτίαν ὕστερον λέγων· Ἴνα μὴ πειράζῃ ὑμᾶς ὁ Σατανᾶς. Τοῦτο δὲ λέγω κατὰ συγγνώμην, οὐκ ἐπιταγὴν, διὰ τὴν ἀκρασίαν ὑμῶν. Ὡσπερ οὖν οὐ πᾶσιν ἐκεῖ ταῦτα διαλέγεται, ἀλλὰ [325] τοῖς ἀκρατεστέροις τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ εὐαλώτοις· οὕτω καὶ ἐνταῦθα ταῖς εὐχειρώτοις τῶν γυναικῶν, καὶ μὴ δυναμέναις ἐνεγκεῖν τὸν μετὰ ἀκριβείας βίον τῆς χηρείας, ταύταις παραινεῖ καὶ συμβουλεύει δευτέρον ἐπεισάγειν νυμφίον.

40. Minus γάρ after ὅταν; with γαμεῖσθαι for γαμεῖν.

41. In 1 Tim 5:13: with transposition of καὶ περίεργοι from before λαλοῦσαι τὰ μὴ δέοντα to before περιερχόμεναι; minus (ellipsis) of οὐ μόνον ... φλύαροι καί.

42. συνθῆκαι, used of human marriage vows (PGL 4.a) and also of monastic vows (4.b.iii), the play on terms being deliberate here.

43. John seeks to solve two apparent problems in 1 Tim 5:9 and 5:14: First, is the apostle commanding celibacy or marriage (or both)? Second, if the young woman remarries (1 Tim 5:14), then she cannot be a *univira* and hence never be enrolled as a widow later (1 Tim 5:9). Clark, *Reading Renunciation*, 369, articulates well the problem and solution of the present homily: "Two church fathers, Jerome and John Chrysostom, note that the Pastor's recommendation of remarriage for young widows (1 Tim 5:14) comes unraveled within the chapter itself. They provide a deconstructive reading that reveals the inconsistency of the chapter.... Hence, Chrysostom concludes, 'Paul' did not mean that he wished all young widows to remarry, but only those 'more fragile' ones who might lapse into dubious behavior."

44. Chrysostom quotes the exact words of the text but wishes to insist that they apply only to younger widows without self-control, not to all women.

(1 Tim 5:11⁴⁰). “*And they learn to be idle, they are busybodies, they go from house to house ... saying things they shouldn’t... And they have been turned around*” (1 Tim 5:13, 15).⁴¹ To follow whom? Satan. And so, because after choosing widowhood and enduring all this opprobrium they wish to marry again, it’s better that they be taken in marriage before they trample on their vows⁴² to Christ, before they come to this end. But in the case of a woman who’s not like this, Paul didn’t impose the necessity of a second marriage.⁴³

4. That this is true is clear from the context. For if Paul had laid it down as a law for all women “*to marry*” and “*to run households*” (1 Tim 5:14),⁴⁴ then it would’ve been superfluous for him to add the following, “*If she has reared children, if she has washed the feet of the saints, if she has helped the afflicted, if she has attended to every good work*” (1 Tim 5:10).⁴⁵ And equally superfluous would be his saying, “*who was a wife of one man*” (1 Tim 5:9).⁴⁶ “After all, if you command all the younger widows to be married, how will any woman be the wife of one man?”⁴⁷ Consequently, his statement is directed at those other women we just mentioned.⁴⁸ He does the same thing when it comes to conjugal relations in marriage. First, he said, “*Don’t deprive one another, except by common agreement for a short time, so that you might devote yourselves to fasting and prayer and again come back together*” (1 Cor 7:5). And later, so that you might not consider this practice a legal requirement, he adds the reason, “*Lest Satan might tempt you. I say this by way of concession, not command, because of your lack of self-control*” (1 Cor 7:5–6).⁴⁹ For, just as in this case (cf. 1 Cor 7), Paul says these things not to all but [325] to the people who most lack self-control and are easily led astray, so also here (cf. 1 Tim 5), he advises these women who are easily overcome and not able to bear the life of a widow with rigorous discipline, and he counsels them to enter into a second marriage.

45. Minus εἰ ἐξενδοχῆσεν after εἰ ἐτεκνοτρόφησεν; but it is present when John quotes the verse above in §2 (PG 51:323), and again below in §6 (PG 51:326) below.

46. With transposition of γεγονυῖα and ἐνὸς ἀνδρός.

47. Chrysostom addresses Paul himself with this reasonably perceived problem of possible self-contradiction in his instructions of 1 Tim 5:3–16.

48. Because in John’s eyes Paul could not have been self-contradictory, another solution must be found. In this case, he appeals to different referents or addressees, i.e., the younger widows who lack sufficient self-control, as described twice in §3 (PG 51:324) with the help of 1 Tim 5:11, 13, 15. Chrysostom’s reading presumes clearer signposting than many readers of the Pastoral Epistles find here.

49. With οὐκ ἐπιταγὴν for οὐ κατ’ ἐπιταγὴν (1 Cor 7:6); transposition of διὰ τὴν ἀκρασίαν ὑμῶν from after ὁ Σατανᾶς (1 Cor 7:5) to after ἐπιταγὴν.

Ἡ γὰρ χηρεία διπλοῦν τι πρᾶγμα ἐστὶ. Τί ποτέ ἐστι διπλοῦν; Ἔργων ἐπίδειξις αγαθῶν, καὶ τιμῆς ὑπεροχὴ μεγίστης. Καθάπερ οὖν καὶ ἡ ἀρχὴ διπλοῦν τι πρᾶγμα ἐστίν· ἔχει γὰρ καὶ ἔργα καὶ ἀξίωμα· ἀξίωμα μὲν ἀρχῆς ἢ ἐξουσία, καὶ ἡ παρὰ τῶν πολλῶν θεραπεία, καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ εἶναι ἄρχοντα· ἔργα δὲ ἀρχῆς, τὸ βοηθεῖν τοῖς ἀδικουμένοις, κωλύειν τοὺς ἀδικοῦντας, προεστάναι τῶν πόλεων, διανυκτερεύειν ἐν ταῖς κοιναῖς τῶν πραγμάτων φροντίσι, καὶ μυρία ἕτερα· οὕτω καὶ ἡ χηρεία καὶ ἀξίωμα ἐστὶ καὶ ἔργον· ἀξίωμα ἐστίν, αὐτὸ τὸ χήρα εἶναι, μέγιστον ὄν, ὡς ἀπεδείξαμεν ἔμπροσθεν· ἔργον ἐστὶ, τὸ μὴ δεύτερον ἐπεισάγειν ἄνδρα, ἀλλ' ἀρκεσθῆναι τῷ προτέρῳ, τὸ τεκνοτροφεῖν, τὸ ξενοδοχεῖν, τὸ ἀγίον πόδας νίψαι, τὸ θλιβομένοις ἐπαρκεῖσαι, τὸ παντὶ ἔργῳ ἀγαθῷ ἐπακολουθεῖν. Ὁ τοίνυν Παῦλος περὶ αὐτῶν διαλεγόμενος, τὰ μὲν ἔργα τῆς χήρας ἀφήσιν αὐτὴν πάντα ἐπιτελεῖν· εἰς δὲ τὸ ἀξίωμα τῆς χήρας, καὶ τὸν χορὸν, καὶ τὴν τάξιν οὐκ ἀφήσιν αὐτὴν εἰσελθεῖν, ἕως ἂν ἐξηκοστὸν ἔτος παρέλθῃ, μονονουχὶ λέγων· Ποιεῖτω μὲν τὰ τῆς χήρας ἔργα, τῆς δὲ τιμῆς ἀξιούσθω τότε, ὅταν πάντα ἐπιδειξαμένη καὶ τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ χρόνου λοιπὸν ἀσφάλειαν ἔχῃ, καὶ τὴν ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων ἀπόδειξιν, καὶ τὴν ἔξωθεν μαρτυρίαν. Μηδεὶς γυναιξὶ μόνον τὸν λόγον τοῦτον ἐπιτήδειον εἶναι νομίζετω. Καὶ γὰρ καὶ ἀνδράσιν ἐστὶ χρήσιμος, ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ στέργωσι τὰς ἑαυτῶν καὶ ἀπελθούσας, καὶ μὴ λεαίνας συγκατοικίῳσι τοῖς παιδίσι, μητρυιὰς ἐπεισάγοντες, καὶ τὴν ἀσφάλειαν τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἅπασαν ἀνατρέποντες.

ε'. Ταῦτα δὲ λέγομεν οὐχὶ νομοθετοῦντες δεύτερον ἀποστρέφεσθαι γάμον, ἀλλὰ παραινοῦντες καὶ συμβουλευόντες μετὰ σωφροσύνης ἀρκεῖσθαι τῷ προτέρῳ. Ἔτερον ἐστὶν παραινεῖν καὶ συμβουλεύειν, ἕτερον νομοθετεῖν. Ὁ μὲν γὰρ παραινῶν καὶ συμβουλεύων, κύριον ἀφήσιν τὸν ἀκούοντα τῆς τῶν συμβουλευομένων αἰρέσεως εἶναι· ὁ δὲ νομοθετῶν, ταύτην παραιτεῖται τὴν ἐξουσίαν αὐτῶν. Ἀλλ' ἡ Ἐκκλησία οὐ νομοθετεῖ ταῦτα, ἀλλὰ παραινεῖ μόνον·

50. Mf notes that some manuscripts read *χήραν* (sic) for *χήρα* before εἶναι.

51. In each case, reworded with the infinitive, but following exactly the wording and sequence of the biblical text, so a near quotation.

52. Part of the challenge for Chrysostom is going on too long in an address that seems to concern only part of his audience and not his majority male addressees. He will often handle this "problem" by pivoting, such as he does here and again below at §7 (PG 51:327), to insist that his message is in fact applicable to both men and women.

53. Because *ἀσφάλεια* means both these things, I have double-glossed it here so the full impact will be clear.

54. Having expressed his strong preference, Chrysostom seeks to avert a possible "problem," that he has gone too far and stipulated against second marriage entirely. He now tries to self-correct, both for himself and for Paul, using the distinction between the genres of law and advice.

Widowhood, it seems, is a double thing. What does that mean, double? It's a proof of good works and a distinction of the highest honor. Just as with leadership, it's a double-sided thing, for it comprises both works and a position of honor. The authority of leadership is, on the one hand, the position of honor and the gestures of respect they get from the many, which is the very essence of what it means to be a leader. On the other hand, the work of leadership is helping those who are treated unjustly, stopping those who are inflicting injustice, presiding over cities, spending sleepless nights out of concerns about public affairs, and other things too many to count. In the same way, widowhood is both a position of honor and it is work. It's an honorable position to be a widow,⁵⁰ the highest rank, as I have shown earlier. And it's work not to enter into marriage with a second husband, but to be content with the former, "to raise children, to extend hospitality, to wash the feet of the saints, to assist the afflicted, to attend to every good work" (cf. 1 Tim 5:10).⁵¹ Therefore, when speaking about these things Paul allows a woman to do all the works of the widow, but he doesn't allow her to enter into the position of honor, that is, the chorus and rank of widows, until she passes sixty years of age. He was as much as saying, "Let her do the works of the widow, but let her be deemed worthy of this honorable rank when she's shown all these things and has the secure demeanor that comes with age and the proof that comes from her works and good testimony from outsiders." Let no one think this discussion pertains solely to wives.⁵² For indeed this is also useful for husbands, so that they, too, might love their wives who have departed from this life, and not make their children dwell with she-lions by bringing in second wives as stepmothers and destroying the safety and security⁵³ of the household.

5. We say these things not to admonish you to avoid a second marriage,⁵⁴ but advising and counseling you to be chastely content with the first marriage. Yet advising and counseling are one thing, and legislating is another. For the one who gives advice and counsel allows the hearer to be the master of the choice they make about the counsel received. But the one who is legislating takes this freedom of choice away from the hearer.⁵⁵ Neverthe-

55. I adopt the reading Mf had included in a note for one of his manuscripts (and PE confirms as Paris. gr. 748), *παραιρείται* for Mf PE PG's reading *παραιτείται*. The idiom *παραιρείται ἐξουσίαν* is an established part of Chrysostom's vocabulary—see *Virginit.* §9 and §28 (SC 125:120, 184), in both cases making a similar contrast between law and advice. But neither Mf nor PE noted that Paris. gr. 748 reads *αὐτοῦ* instead of *αὐτῶν* after *τὴν ἐξουσίαν*. (The former reading is also adopted here and translated

καὶ γὰρ καὶ δεύτερον ἐπέτρεψε γάμον ὁ Παῦλος, οὕτως εἰπών· *Γυνὴ δέδεταί νόμῳ, ἐφ' ὅσον χρόνον ζῇ ὁ ἀνὴρ αὐτῆς· ἐὰν δὲ κοιμηθῇ ὁ ἀνὴρ, ἐλευθέρᾳ ἐστὶν ᾧ θέλει γαμηθῆναι, μόνον ἐν Κυρίῳ· μακαριωτέρα δὲ ἐστὶν, ἐὰν οὕτω μένῃ.* “Ὡςπερ οὖν καλὸν μὲν ὁ γάμος, κρείσσων δὲ ἡ παρθενία· οὕτω καλὸν μὲν καὶ ὁ δεύτερος γάμος, κρείσσων δὲ αὐτοῦ ὁ πρῶτος καὶ μόνος. Οὐ τοίνυν ἐκβάλλομεν δεύτερον γάμον, οὐδὲ νομοθετοῦμεν ταῦτα, ἀλλὰ παραινοῦμεν, εἴ τις δύναίτο σωφρονεῖν, ἐπὶ τῷ προτέρῳ μένειν.

Παραينوῦμεν δὲ καὶ συμβουλεύομεν καὶ δι' αὐτὴν τῆς οἰκίας τὴν ἀσφάλειαν· μάχης γὰρ πολλάκις καὶ πολέμων καθημερινῶν ὁ δεύτερος γάμος ἀρχὴ καὶ πρόφασις γέγονε. Πολλάκις γοῦν ἀνὴρ ἐπὶ τραπέζης καθήμενος, τῆς προτέρας γυναικὸς ἀναμνησθεὶς ἐπὶ τῆς δευτέρας, ἐδάκρυσεν ἡρέμα· ἡ δὲ εὐθέως ἡγήριανε, καὶ καθάπερ θηρίον ἐπεπήδησε, τῆς φιλοστοργίας [326] αὐτὸν τῆς πρὸς ἐκείνην ἀπαιτοῦσα δίκην· καὶ ἐπαινέσαι τὴν ἀπελθοῦσαν θελήσῃ, γίνεται πολέμου καὶ μάχης πρόφασις ἢ τῶν ἐγκωμίων ὑπόθεσις. Καὶ πρὸς μὲν τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ἀπελθόντας σπενδόμεθα, καὶ μετὰ τῆς ζωῆς αὐτῶν καὶ τὴν πρὸς αὐτοὺς καταλύομεν ἔχθραν· ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν γυναικῶν τοῦναντίον ἅπαν. “*Ἦν γὰρ οὐκ εἶδεν, ἥς οὐκ ἤκουσε, παρ' ἧς οὐδὲν ἔπαθε δεινόν, ταύτην μισεῖ καὶ ἀποστρέφεται, καὶ οὐδὲ ὁ θάνατος τὸ μῖσος σβέννυσι. Τίς εἶδε, τίς ἤκουσε ζηλοτυπουμένην κόνιν, καὶ πολεμουμένην τέφραν;*

ς'. Ἀλλ' οὐ μέχρι τούτου τὸ δεινόν· ἀλλὰ καὶ γένωνται παῖδες ἐκ τῆς δευτέρας, καὶ μὴ γένωνται, πόλεμος πάλιν καὶ μάχη. Μὴ γενομένων μὲν γὰρ ὁδυνᾶται μερίζωνς, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο, καθάπερ πολεμίους καὶ τὰ μέγιστα ἡδικοχότας τοὺς τῆς προτέρας ὀρεῖ, διὰ τῆς ἐκείνων ζωῆς τῆς οἰκείας ἀπαιδίας σαφεστέραν λαμβάνουσα αἰσθησιν. Ἄν δὲ γένωνται, πάλιν οὐκ ἔλαττον τὸ δεινόν. Ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἀνὴρ πολλάκις φιλοστόργως πρὸς τὴν ἀπελθοῦσαν

accordingly, in line with the contrast formed with the previous sentence.) The reading *παραιτεῖται* (Mf PE PG) is not impossible and could be translated, “bids for this authority over them” (and perhaps be a play on 1 Tim 5:11), yet it is not preferable. But while Monac. gr. 6 reads *ταύτην παραιτεῖται τὴν ἐξουσίαν αὐτῶν*, Paris. gr. 765 has *ταύτην παραιτεῖται τὴν ἐξουσίαν αὐτόν*, so there is much variety in the manuscripts on this sentence. However, the reading of the “other” manuscript that Mf mentions (I have confirmed it is Paris. gr. 768), *παραινεῖται* (“advises”), makes much less sense, and, indeed, it contradicts John’s point that advice and legislation are not the same thing, as the next line has it, *παραινεῖ μόνον*. (Perhaps this reading has been assimilated to that.)

56. Part of both the problem and opportunity for Chrysostom is to try to reconcile the Pauline instructions on marriage in 1 Cor 7 with those in 1 Tim 5 and other passages. See Clark, *Reading Renunciation*, 330–70, on how various patristic authors seek to confront this “problem” to their own ends and purposes. See also *Hom. 1 Cor. 7:2–4* in this volume.

less, the church does not legislate these things, but is only giving advice. And it is the case that Paul allowed second marriage⁵⁶ when he said this: “A wife is bound by the law for as long as her husband lives. But if he goes to death’s sleep, she is free to get married to whomever she wishes—only, in the Lord. Yet she is more blessed if she remains as she is” (1 Cor 7:39–40⁵⁷).⁵⁸ Just as marriage is good, but virginity is better, so also a second marriage is good, but the first and only marriage is better than it. Therefore, we’re not rejecting second marriage, nor are we laying down the law on this, but we’re giving advice that if someone is able to be chaste they should stay contented with the first marriage.

We give this advice and this counsel also for the sake of the safety and security of the household. For a second marriage has frequently been the origin and provocation of war and daily battles. Often a husband sits at the table and cries silent tears when he remembers his first wife in the presence of the second, and immediately she becomes enraged and attacks him like a wild animal,⁵⁹ [326] demanding requital for his love for the former wife. And if he wishes to praise his departed wife, the occasion of his praises becomes a provocation of war and battle. We make peace even with enemies who’ve departed in death, and with the end of their life we dissolve the enmity we have toward them. But with wives, it is just the opposite!⁶⁰ She hates and turns her back on a woman whom she never saw and never heard, and from whom she experienced no harm; and not even death can extinguish this hate. Who has seen, who has heard, of dust⁶¹ that is a cause of jealousy, or of ashes that incite wars?

6. But the danger doesn’t stop there. Whether the second wife gives birth to children or not, yet again there is war and battle. If there are no children, then there’s even more distress, and because of this she looks upon the children of the former wife as enemies who’ve done her the greatest injustice, since by virtue of their existence she is even more acutely aware of her own childlessness. And yet in turn if children are born to the second wife, again the horror is none the less. For often the husband out of his love for the departed wife clings to the children he had with her, both

57. Minus *καί* before *κοιμηθῇ*.

58. See also *Hom. 1 Cor. 7:39–40* in this volume.

59. More theriomorphic misogyny, as with the image of the she-lion above.

60. A conventional slur about the malevolent jealousy of second wives.

61. I.e., the corpse of the first wife.

διακείμενος ἀντέχεται τούτων, φιλῶν τε ὁμοῦ καὶ ἐλεῶν τῆς ὀρφανίας αὐτούς· ἐκείνη δὲ πανταχοῦ τοὺς αὐτῆς προτιμᾶσθαι βούλεται, καὶ οὐδὲ ἐν ἀδελφῶν τάξει, ἀλλ' ἐν οἰκετῶν ἀπερριμμένων εἶναι βούλεται τούτους· ἅπερ ἅπαντα οἰκίαν ἀνατρέψαι δύναται· ἂν, καὶ τῷ γεγαμηκότι ποιῆσαι τὸν βίον ἀβίωτον. Διὰ ταῦτα παραινοῦμεν, εἰ δυνατόν, σωφρονεῖν, στέργειν τῷ προτέρῳ γάμῳ, καὶ μήτε νυμφίους τὰς γυναῖκας, μήτε γυναῖκας τοὺς ἄνδρας ἐπεισάγειν, ὥστε μὴ τὴν οἰκίαν ἀνατρέπεσθαι πᾶσαν.

Τίνος δὲ ἔνεκεν περὶ χηρείας διαλεγόμενος, οὐκ ἠρκέσθη τῷ προτέρῳ μόνῳ, τῷ εἰπεῖν, Ἐνὸς ἀνδρὸς γυνή; Ἵνα μάθῃς, ὅτι χήραν ποιεῖ οὐ τὸ μὴ γαμῆσαι δεύτερον μόνον ἀπλῶς, ἀλλὰ τὸ κομᾶν ἐν ἔργοις ἀγαθοῖς, ἐν ἐλεημοσύνῃ καὶ φιλάνθρωπῃ, καὶ ταῖς τῶν ξένων θεραπαίαις. Εἰ γὰρ τὰς παρθένους οὐδὲν ὠφέλησεν ἡ παρθενία (καίτοι πολλῶ μείζων χηρείας ἢ παρθενία), ἀλλ' ἀπῆλθον, σβεσθέντος αὐταῖς τοῦ πυρὸς τῶν λαμπάδων, ἡτιμωμέναι, ἐπειδὴ τὸν ἀπὸ τῆς φιλάνθρωπίας καὶ ἐλεημοσύνης οὐκ ἔσχον ἐπιδείξαι καρπὸν, πολλῶ μᾶλλον αἱ χῆραι. Ἐκείνης γοῦν ἀκούσας τῆς παραβολῆς ὁ Παῦλος, καὶ φοβούμενος ὑπὲρ τούτων, πολλὴν ὑπὲρ τοῦ πράγματος ποιεῖται τὴν ἀκριβολογίαν, ἵνα μὴ τῇ μονογαμίᾳ θαρροῦσαι τῆς λοιπῆς ἀρετῆς καταμελήσωσι· διὰ τοῦτό φησιν, Ἐν ἔργοις καλοῖς μαρτυρουμένη· ὥσπερ γὰρ καλὸν ἢ παρθενία, χωρὶς δὲ τῶν λοιπῶν ἄκαρπος γέγονε, καὶ τοῦ νυμφῶνος ἀπέκλεισεν· οὕτω καλὸν ἢ χηρεία, χωρὶς δὲ τῆς λοιπῆς ἀρετῆς μάταιόν ἐστι καὶ περιττόν. Διὰ τοῦτο οὐ μέχρι τοῦ μὴ δεύτερον ἐπεισάγειν ἄνδρα τὴν παραίνεσιν ἔστησεν ὁ Παῦλος, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἕτερα πολλῶ πλείονα καὶ μείζονα ἀπαιτεῖ παρὰ τῆς χήρας. Καὶ καθάπερ οἱ τοὺς στρατιώτας καταλέγοντες σώματος ζητοῦσιν εὐεξίαν, οὕτω καὶ οὗτος εἰς τὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ στρατόπεδον αὐτὴν καταλέγων, ψυχῆς εὐεξίαν ἐζήτησε καὶ εὐτονίαν καὶ τὴν ἐν ἅπασιν τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς ἔργοις σπουδὴν, οὕτω λέγων· Εἰ ἐτεκνοτρόφησεν, εἰ ἐξενοδόχησεν, εἰ ἀγίων πόδας ἐνίψεν, εἰ θλιβομένοις

62. In other words, John reasons, if being a widow just meant having lost one's husband, Paul would have stopped at 1 Tim 5:9 and not continued into 1 Tim 5:10.

63. Chrysostom is contrasting lifelong celibacy with the state of the celibate widow. He will reiterate below in §15 (PG 51:335) that (perpetual) virginity, *παρθενία*, is the more rigorous requirement.

64. For a similar argument, which goes well beyond the wording of the parable in excoriating the specific moral failures of the "foolish virgins," see *Hom. 1 Cor. 10:1–11* §2 (PG 51:244). He will return to this point once more later in the present homily in §15 (PG 51:336).

65. John assumes Paul knew the teachings of Jesus, including the parables.

because he loves them and because he pities them for being orphans. But the second wife always wishes for her own children to have preeminence, and she wishes the children of the former marriage not to be on the footing of siblings but rather that of contemptible house slaves. All these things have the potential to destroy a household and make life unlivable for the man who has taken on this marriage. For these reasons we advise you, if you can stay chaste, to be content with your former marriage, and, wives, don't bring in second husbands or, husbands, second wives, so the entire household not be destroyed.

And why was it that, when speaking about widowhood, Paul wasn't satisfied with mentioning just the first statement:⁶² "*a wife of one husband*" (1 Tim 5:9)? It was so you might learn that what makes a widow isn't just not marrying for the second time, but adorning oneself with good works, with almsgiving, benevolence and service to strangers (cf. 1 Tim 5:10). For virginity conferred no benefit on the virgins (although virginity is so much greater than widowhood),⁶³ but they went away in dishonor after the flame in their lamps had been extinguished (Matt 25:8–12), since they weren't able to show the fruit that comes from acts of benevolence and almsgiving.⁶⁴ If this was the case with them, how much more is it with the widows. Now Paul had heard that parable⁶⁵ and, fearing for them, he enacts a rigorous standard concerning⁶⁶ the matter of widowhood, lest by undue confidence in the criterion of monogamy they might neglect the other elements of virtue. That's why he says, "*testified to by good works*" (1 Tim 5:10). Virginity is a good thing, but without the rest of the virtues it becomes fruitless and shuts one out of the bridal chamber; likewise, widowhood is a good thing, but without the rest of the elements of virtue it is useless and in vain. That's why Paul didn't stop with the advice not to bring in a second husband, but he asks other things from the widow that are even more numerous and of greater importance. Just as those who enlist soldiers seek bodily fitness, so also Paul, when enlisting a woman for the soldier-squad of Christ seeks fitness and vibrancy in the soul and eagerness for all the good works. He put it this way, "*If she has reared children, if she has given hospitality, if she has washed the feet of the saints, if she has*

66. Mf notes that some of his manuscripts read ἐπὶ τοῦ for ὑπὲρ τοῦ before πράγματος. The translation would be substantially the same (rendering ἐπὶ with genitive with LSJ A.III.4).

ἐπήρκεσεν, [327] εἰ παντὶ ἔργῳ ἀγαθῷ ἐπηκολούθησε. Τούτων γὰρ ἕκαστον δοκεῖ μὲν εἶναι ῥῆμα ψιλόν, πολλὴν δὲ ἐν ἑαυτῷ συνέχει τὴν ζωὴν.

ζ'. Καὶ εἰ δοκεῖ, πρῶτον, ἐξετάσωμεν ὃ πρῶτον αὐτὸς τέθεικεν· Εἰ ἐτεκνοτρόφησε. Τροφὴν γὰρ ἐνταῦθα λέγει οὐ ταύτην τὴν ψιλὴν καὶ παρὰ τοῖς πολλοῖς νομιζομένην, τὸ μὴ λιμῷ φθειρομένους περιδεῖν τοὺς παῖδας· τοῦτο γὰρ οὐδὲ αὐτὴ τῆς φύσεως ἡ ἀνάγκη ἀφήσι παραμεληθῆναί ποτε· ὅθεν οὐδὲ προσταγμάτων ὑπὲρ τούτου χρεῖα καὶ νόμων, ἵνα τὰ ἔκγονα τρέφωσιν αἱ χῆραι· ἀλλὰ τὴν τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἐπιμέλειαν, τὴν ἀνατροφὴν τὴν μετ' εὐλαβείας ἐνταῦθα φησιν· ὡς αἱ γε μὴ οὕτω τρέφουσαι, παιδοκτόνοι μᾶλλον εἰσιν ἢ μητέρες. Τοῦτο οὐ πρὸς γυναῖκας μόνον λέγω, ἀλλὰ καὶ πρὸς ἄνδρας. Καὶ γὰρ πολλοὶ πολλὰκις τῶν πατέρων, ὅπως μὲν ἵππος γένοιτο καλὸς τῷ παιδί, καὶ ὅπως οἰκία λαμπρά, καὶ ὅπως πολυτελὴς ἀγρὸς, πάντα ποιοῦσι καὶ πραγματεύονται· ὅπως δὲ αὐτῷ ψυχὴ γένοιτο καλὴ καὶ προαίρεσις εὐσεβῆς, οὐδένα ἔχουσι λόγον. Καὶ τοῦτό ἐστιν, ὃ τὴν οἰκουμένην ἀνατρέπει πᾶσαν, ὅτι τῶν οἰκείων ἀμελοῦμεν παίδων, καὶ τῶν μὲν κτημάτων αὐτῶν ἐπιμελούμεθα, τῆς δὲ ψυχῆς αὐτῶν καταφρονοῦμεν, ἐσχάτης ἀνοίας πρᾶγμα ὑπομένοντες. Τὰ μὲν γὰρ κτήματα κἂν πολλὰ ἦ καὶ πολυτελῆ, τοῦ δυναμένου μετ' ἀρετῆς αὐτὰ οἰκονομεῖν οὐκ ὄντος σπουδαίου, πάντα ἀπολεῖται καὶ οἰχῆσεται μετ' αὐτοῦ, καὶ βλάβην ἐσχάτην ἐνέγκοι τῷ κεκτημένῳ· ἂν δὲ ἡ ψυχὴ γενναία γένηται καὶ φιλόσοφος, κἂν μηδὲν ἔνδον ἀποκείμενον ἦ, τὰ πάντων δυνήσεται μετὰ ἀδείας συσχεῖν. Δεῖ τοίνυν σκοπεῖν, οὐχ ὅπως αὐτοὺς πλουσίους ἐν ἀργυρίῳ καὶ χρυσίῳ καὶ τοῖς τοιοῦτοις ποιήσωμεν, ἀλλ' ὅπως ἐν εὐλαβείᾳ καὶ φιλοσοφίᾳ καὶ κτήσει τῆς ἀρετῆς πάντων γένοιντ' ἂν εὐπορώτεροι· ὅπως μὴ πολλῶν δέοιντο, ὅπως μὴ περὶ τὰ βιωτικὰ καὶ τὰς νεωτερικὰς ἐπιθυμίας ὥσιν ἐπτοημένοι. Καὶ τὰς εἰσόδους αὐτῶν, καὶ τὰς ἐξόδους μετ' ἀκριβείας περιεργάζεσθαι χρὴ, τὰς διατριβάς, τὰς συνουσίας, εἰδότες ὅτι τούτων ἀμελουμένων, οὐδεμίαν ἔξομεν παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ συγγνώμην. Εἰ γὰρ τῆς τῶν ἄλλων προνοίας ἀπαιτούμεθα τὰς εὐθύνas (Ἐκαστος γὰρ

67. In the rest of the homily Chrysostom will devote attention to each of these five clauses (though not in equal proportion) to demonstrate this point.

68. The composite verb τεκνοτροφεῖν literally means to provide children with τροφή, which means both “food, nourishment” (LSJ I.1, 3) and “rearing” as in raising and educating (LSJ II.1–2). John will challenge an exegesis that relies on the simple etymology.

69. ἔκγονα, mirroring the wording of the text (1 Tim 5:4).

70. ἀνατρέπειν, as used repeatedly earlier of the destruction of the household in §§4–5 (PG 51:325–26). John is making a wordplay (paronomasia) with ἀνατρέφειν (i.e., “ruining” versus “rearing”).

helped the afflicted, [327] if she has attended to every good work” (1 Tim 5:10). Each of these seems to be a simple statement, but each comprehends a whole life within itself.⁶⁷

7. If it seems good to you, let’s focus our investigation first on the statement Paul placed first, “*If she has reared children*” (1 Tim 5:10). By “rearing”⁶⁸ here, he doesn’t mean the simple sense of the word as most people understand it—that is, not allowing one’s children to die of hunger. After all, the very force of nature doesn’t allow them to be the object of such neglect; that’s why there’s no need for commands and laws about this to get widows to feed their offspring.⁶⁹ But the “rearing” Paul is speaking of here is a concern for righteousness and a pious upbringing. After all, those who don’t rear them in this way are more child-killers than they are mothers. I’m saying this not only to wives but also to husbands. For many fathers often do everything and go to much trouble so the child might have a beautiful horse, a lovely house, and an expensive plot of land. But they give no attention to how the child might have a virtuous soul and a pious ethical disposition. This is what ruins⁷⁰ the whole world—that we neglect our own children. While we exert care for their possessions, we’re disdainful of their souls, under the sway of something that’s the height of folly. After all, even if someone’s possessions are plentiful and pricey, if the person empowered to manage them virtuously isn’t diligent, they’ll all be destroyed and obliterated, and along with that, bring the most serious harm on the one who owns them.⁷¹ But if a soul is noble and inclined to the philosophical virtues, even if it has nothing stored away within, it will be able to hold fast and secure the possessions of everyone. Hence we should put our close attention not on how we might make our children rich in silver and gold and things like that, but how they might be more wealthy than all people in piety, in philosophy, and the acquisition of virtue; how they might not have need of many things, so that they might not be all aflutter with excitement for pedestrian things and faddish desires. And we must busy ourselves with closely attending to their comings and goings, their habits and friends, knowing that if we neglect these things, we shall have no excuse before God, since, if we are asked to give an account of how we look out for others—for, Paul says, “let each *not seek their own advantage, but that of the*

71. I adopt the reading of Paris. gr. 748 (as noted by the PE editors), μετὰ τοῦ καὶ βλάβην ἐσχάτην ἐνεγκεῖν for μετ’ αὐτοῦ, καὶ βλάβην ἐσχάτην ἐνέγκοι before τῷ κεκτημένῳ (the latter reading translated, “will come to an end with them, and it might bring the most serious harm on the one who owns them”).

μὴ τὸ ἑαυτοῦ ζητείτω, φησὶν, ἀλλὰ τὸ τοῦ πλησίον), πόσω μᾶλλον τῆς τῶν παίδων; Οὐ κατώκισά σοι, φησὶν, αὐτὸν ἐξ ἀρχῆς; ἐπέστησα δέ σε αὐτῷ διδάσκαλον καὶ προστάτην καὶ κηδεμόνα καὶ ἄρχοντα; τὴν ἐξουσίαν αὐτοῦ πᾶσαν φέρων εἰς τὰς σὰς ἐνέθηκα χεῖρας; Ἀπαλὸν ὄντα διαπλάττειν ἐκέλευσα, καὶ ρυθμίζειν· ποῖαν ἂν ἔχοις συγγνώμην, εἰ περιίδοις αὐτὸν ἀποσκιρτήσαντα; Τί γὰρ ἂν εἴποις; ὅτι δυσήνιος ἐστι καὶ τραχὺς; Ἄλλ' ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἔδει ταῦτα προορῶντα, ὅτε εὐήνιος ᾗ, καὶ κομιδῇ νέος, χαλινοῦν μετ' ἀκριβείας, ἐθίζειν πρὸς τὰ δέοντα, ρυθμίζειν, κολάζειν αὐτοῦ τὰ νοσήματα τῆς ψυχῆς. "Οτε εὐκολωτέρα ἢ ἐργασία, τότε τὰς ἀκάνθας ἐκτέμνειν ἔδει, ὅτε ἀπαλωτέρας οὕσης τῆς ἡλικίας εὐκολώτερον ἀνεσπῶντο, καὶ οὐκ ἂν ἀμελούμενα τὰ πάθη, καὶ αὐξανόμενα, δυσκατέργαστα γέγονε. Διὰ τοῦτό φησι, Κάμψον ἐκ νεότητος τὸν τράχηλον αὐτοῦ, ὅτε εὐκολωτέρα γένοιτο' ἂν ἡ παιδαγωγία. Οὐκ ἐπιτάττει [328] δὲ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὸς συνεφέπτεται σοι τοῦ ἔργου. Καὶ πῶς, καὶ τίνι τρόπῳ; Ὁ κακολογῶν πατέρα ἢ μητέρα, φησὶ, θανάτῳ τελευτάτω. Ὁρᾷ πόσον αὐτοῖς ἐπέστησε φόβον; πόσῃ ἐπετείχισεν ἀγωνίαν; πῶς δυνατὴν σου τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐποίησε; Τίνα οὖν ἀπολογίαν ἔχοιμεν ἂν εἰπεῖν, ὅταν αὐτὸς μὲν, ἐπειδὴν ἡμεῖς ὑβριζώμεθα, μηδὲ τῆς ζωῆς αὐτῶν φεῖδῃται· ἡμεῖς δὲ, ὑβριζομένου τοῦ Θεοῦ παρ' αὐτῶν, μηδὲ ἀγανακτεῖν αὐτοῖς ὑπομένωμεν; Ἐγὼ, φησὶν, οὐδὲ ἀποκτεῖναι παραιτοῦμαι τὸν ὑβρίζοντά σε· σὺ δὲ οὐδὲ ῥήματι λυπεῖν ἀνέχη, φησὶ, τὸν τοὺς ἐμοὺς καταπατοῦντα νόμους. Καὶ ποῦ ταῦτα συγγνώμης ἄξια; Ὁρᾷ αὐτὸν ὑβρίζοντα εἰς τὸν πεποιηκότα, καὶ οὐ δυσχεραίνεις, εἰπέ μοι, οὐδὲ φοβεῖς καὶ ἐπιτιμᾷς, καὶ ταῦτα εἰδώς, ὅτι καὶ τοῦτο αὐτὸς ὁ Θεὸς ἐκώλυσε, οὐκ ἐπειδὴ βλάβη τις εἰς ὑβριζόμενον γίνεται (ἀνώλεθρον γὰρ τὸ Θεῖον), ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐκείνου σωτηρίας; Ὁ γὰρ περὶ τὸν Θεὸν ἀγνώμων γενόμενος καὶ ἀναίσθητος, πολλῶ μᾶλλον εἰς τὸν γεγεννηκότα, καὶ εἰς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχὴν ἐμπαροινῆσαι δυνήσεται.

72. With transposition of ἕκαστος from after τὸ τοῦ ἑτέρου to the front of the sentence (cf. Rom 15:2); with μὴ ... ζητείτω for μηδεὶς ... ζητείτω; with πλησίον (cf. Rom 15:2) for ἑτέρου after ἀλλὰ τό.

73. φησὶν picks up on παρὰ τῷ θεῷ a few lines earlier. John is imagining the scrutiny that awaits each parent at the heavenly trial.

74. While at first children in general are being discussed, the example now becomes more focused on fathers' raising their sons in the patriarchal household and polis, so I translate the Greek masculine pronouns as such in English.

75. ἀποσκιρτᾶν, the first of a series of terms likening the young male child to an untamed colt (δυσήνιος, εὐήνιος, χαλινοῦν).

76. With αὐτοῦ for αὐτῶν after τράχηλον.

neighbor” (1 Cor 10:24)⁷²—how much more must we give an account of how we look out for our own children? God says,⁷³ “Didn’t I place him⁷⁴ in your house from the beginning? Didn’t I appoint you as his teacher, advocate, caregiver, and superior? Didn’t I place all authority over him into your hands? Didn’t I command you to form and train him in his tender youth?” What kind of excuse could you have if you allow him to scamper off?⁷⁵ What could you possibly say? That he’s unbridled and prickly? But you should’ve had forethought of that from the beginning, when he was easily bridled and completely young, to put a tight muzzle on him, accustom him to what is right, train him, and punish the maladies of his soul. One should pull out the thorns when the task is easier, when at a more tender age they are drawn out more easily. The passions shouldn’t be ignored, given that as they grow in size, they become harder to tame. That’s why he says, “*Guide the child by the neck from their youth*” (Sir 7:23),⁷⁶ that is, at the time when educational training is easier. God doesn’t solely issue this as a command, [328] but he himself joins you in this work. How and in what way? “*Let the one who speaks badly of father or mother be put to death*” (Exod 21:16).⁷⁷ Do you see what great fear he puts over them? What pain he imposes as a barricade? How powerful he made your authority as parents? So, what excuse would we be able to offer, when God himself doesn’t even spare our children’s life when we are insulted by them? And on our part, when God is insulted by them, we don’t even dare to show our vexation with them? God says, “I do not hold back from killing the one who insults you, but you can’t endure offering a single word that may pain the child who trampled on my laws?” And how are these things even worthy of an excuse? You see your children insulting the God who made them,⁷⁸ and, tell me, are you not disgusted? And you don’t instill fear in them and deliver a rebuke, even though you know that this is exactly what God himself commanded—not because it brings any harm on God to be insulted (for the Divine is inviolable), but for the sake of the child’s own salvation? For someone who is stupid and senseless when it comes to God will be all the more able to hurl offenses at the parent who begot them, and at their own soul.

77. Minus αὐτοῦ after πατέρα and after μητέρα; reading θανάτῳ τελευτάτω (with A), for Rahlfs’s τελευτήσει θανάτῳ.

78. By Chrysostom’s logic, the child who verbally abuses a parent is offending both that parent and God who gave the legal ruling of Exod 21:16.

η'. Μὴ τοίνυν ἀμελῶμεν, εἰδότες ὅτι τῶν κατὰ Θεὸν αὐτοῖς εὖ διακειμένων, καὶ κατὰ τὸν παρόντα βίον ἔσονται εὐδόκιμοι καὶ λαμπροί. Τὸν γὰρ ἀρετῇ συζῶντα καὶ ἐπιεικείᾳ πάντες αἰδοῦνται καὶ τιμῶσι, κἂν ἀπάντων πενέστερος ᾗ, ὥσπερ οὖν τὸν πονηρὸν καὶ διεστραμμένον ἀποστρέφουσι καὶ μισοῦσιν ἅπαντες, κἂν εὐπορίαν ᾗ κεκτημένος πολλήν. Οὐ τοῖς ἄλλοις δὲ μόνον ἀνθρώποις ἔσται αἰδέσιμος, ἀλλὰ καὶ σοὶ τῷ γεγεννηκότι ποθεινότερος, πλὴν τῆς φύσεως οὐκ ἐλάττονα ἐτέραν ὑπόθεσιν ἔχων πρὸς τὸ φιλεῖσθαι τὴν ἀρετήν· οὐ ποθεινότερος δὲ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ χρησιμώτερος ἔσται σοὶ θεραπεύων, δουλεύων, γηροκομῶν. Ὡς περ γὰρ οἱ περὶ τὸν Θεὸν ἀγνώμονες καὶ τῶν γεγεννηκότων καταφρονοῦσιν· οὕτως οἱ τὸν πεποιηκότα θεραπεύοντες, ἐν πολλῇ καὶ τοὺς γεγεννηκότας ἔχουσι τῇ τιμῇ. Ἵνα οὖν καὶ παρὰ Θεῷ, καὶ παρὰ ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκιμῇ, καὶ σοὶ τὴν ζωὴν ἡδεῖαν ποιῇ, καὶ τῆς μελλούσης ἀπαλλάττῃ κολάσεως, πᾶσαν ἐπιδείκνυστο περὶ αὐτὸν τὴν σπουδὴν. Ὅτι γὰρ οἱ τῶν παίδων ἀμελοῦντες, κἂν τᾶλλα ὥσιν ἐπιεικεῖς καὶ μέτριοι, διὰ ταύτην τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τὴν ἐσχάτην ὑποστήσονται δίκην, ἱστορίαν σοὶ τίνα διηγῆσθαι παλαιάν.

Ἱερεὺς τις ἦν παρὰ τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ἐπιεικὴς τὰ ἄλλα καὶ μέτριος, Ἥλεϊ τῷ ὀνόματι.⁷⁹ Ἦν οὖν οὗτος Ἥλεϊ δύο παῖδας ἔχων εἰς ἔσχατον πονηρίας ἐληλακότας· οὐ κατεῖχε δὲ, οὐδὲ ἐκώλυε· μᾶλλον δὲ κατεῖχε μὲν καὶ ἐκώλυεν, οὐ μετὰ τῆς προσηκούσης δὲ ἀκριβείας καὶ σφοδρότητος. Δέον γὰρ μαστιγῶσαι, τῆς πατρῴας ἐκβαλεῖν οἰκίας, πάντα ἐπιδείξασθαι διορθώσεως τρόπον, παρῆναι καὶ συνεβούλευε μόνον, οὕτω λέγων· Μὴ, τέκνα, μὴ ποιεῖτε οὕτως· ὅτι οὐκ ἀγαθὴ ἡ ἀκοή, ἣν ἐγὼ ἀκούω περὶ ὑμῶν. Τί λέγεis; τὸν Δεσπότην ὕβρισαν, καὶ τέκνα καλεῖς; ἡγνόησαν τὸν πεποιηκότα, καὶ σὺ ἐπιγινώσκεις αὐτῶν τὴν συγγένειαν; Διὰ τοῦτο φησιν, ὅτι οὐκ ἐνουθετεῖ αὐτούς· νουθεσία γάρ ἐστιν, οὐκ ἐὰν ἀπλῶς συμβουλευσωμεν, ἀλλ' ἐὰν σφοδρότερον καὶ τομῶ-^[329]τερον καὶ ὄσσην ἢ τοῦ τραύματος ἀπαιτεῖ σηπεδῶν, τοσαύτην ἐπαγάγωμεν τὴν

79. κατέχειν translated with LSJ A.I.b, consistent with the colt metaphor above (see p. 606 n. 75).

80. With transposition of μὴ ποιεῖτε οὕτως from after ἐγὼ ἀκούω to before ὅτι οὐκ ἀγαθὴ; plus περὶ ὑμῶν after ἐγὼ ἀκούω.

81. Chrysostom addresses Eli directly with this interrogatory rebuke.

82. Cf. 1 Kgdm 2:12: καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ Ἡλὶ τοῦ ἱερέως υἱοὶ λοιμοὶ οὐκ εἰδότες τὸν κύριον (cf. also 2:17: καὶ ἦν ἁμαρτία τῶν παιδαρίων ἐνώπιον κυρίου μεγάλη σφόδρα, ὅτι ἠθέτουσιν τὴν θυσίαν κυρίου).

83. One can imagine the voice tones that accompanied this interrogation in the live homily.

84. νουθετεῖν, νουθεσία also mean, less harshly, “admonish, admonition,” but the stronger term “reprimand” is needed for the contrast Chrysostom is setting up.

8. So let's not neglect this, knowing that if our children are in a good position vis-à-vis what God requires, then they'll be highly esteemed and illustrious in the present life as well. For all people praise and honor the person who lives in virtue and fairness, even if they're the poorest of all, just as all hate and shun one who's wicked and perverse, even if they've acquired an abundance of possessions. The former child won't only be revered by other people but will be all the more cherished by you, their parents, because in addition to your natural bonds inciting you to mutual love, you'll have an additional reason that is no less powerful—their virtue. And this child will not only be more cherished but also more useful to you in helping, serving, and caring for you in your old age. Just as those who are ignorant about God have disdain also for their parents, so also those who worship the God who created them hold the parents who begot them in great honor, too. Hence, so that your children might be highly esteemed in the eyes of both God and humanity and make your life pleasant and escape the coming punishment, give them your closest attention! To show you that those who neglect their children—even if they themselves are equitable and fair in all other respects—will submit to the most severe penalty for this sin, I'm going to tell you an ancient story.

There was a priest among the Jews who was equitable and fair in all other respects, whose name was Eli. Now, this man Eli had two sons who were charging headlong into a life of abject wickedness. He didn't put a bridle on them⁷⁹ nor did he prevent them. Or, rather, he was attempting to bridle and prevent them, but not with the requisite rigor and force. For although it's necessary to apply the whip, throw them out of the ancestral home and point out every type of correction, Eli used to offer only advice and counsel, speaking like this: "*No, my children, don't act like this, because the report that I heard about you is not good*" (1 Kgdms 2:24).⁸⁰ "What are you saying?"⁸¹ They insulted the Lord, and you call them '*children*'? They disregarded the one who created them,⁸² and you acknowledge their kinship?"⁸³ That's why it says, "*he was not reprimanding*⁸⁴ *them*" (1 Kgdms 3:13).⁸⁵ If we simply offer counsel, that doesn't constitute a reprimand; what does is if, with more force and sharpness, [329] we inflict as large a gash as this festering wound requires. And it's not enough to speak or just

85. To follow John's argument here, it is important to note the immediately preceding words in 1 Kgdms 3:13, *κακολογούντες θεὸν υἱοὶ αὐτοῦ*—the same charge, *κακολογεῖν*, as in Exod 21:16, quoted above in §7 (PG 51:328).

πληγὴν. Οὐ τοίνυν ἀρκεῖ τὸ εἰπεῖν, οὐδὲ τὸ παραινεῖσαι μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ πολλὴν ἐπιτειχίσαι δεῖ τὸν φόβον, ὥστε τὴν τῆς νεότητος περικόψαι ῥαθυμίαν. Ἐπεὶ οὖν παρῆναι μὲν, οὐ παρῆναι δὲ ὡς ἔδει, τοῖς πολεμίοις αὐτοὺς ἐξέδωκε, καὶ μάχης γενομένης, ἔπεσον ἐπὶ τῆς παρατάξεως, καὶ τὴν ἀγγελίαν οὐκ ἐνεγκῶν, πεσὼν συνετρίβη καὶ αὐτὸς καὶ ἀπέθανεν. Ὅρᾳς ὅτι δικαίως εἶπον, ὅτι καὶ παιδοκτόνοι οἱ πατέρες εἰσὶν, οἱ μὴ σφοδρῶς τοῖς αὐτῶν κεχρημένοι παισὶ ῥαθυμοῦσι, μηδὲ τὴν κατὰ Θεὸν ἀπαιτοῦντες αὐτοὺς εὐλάβειαν; Οὕτω γοῦν ὁ Ἥλει παιδοκτόνος ἐγένετο. Εἰ γὰρ οἱ πολέμιοι κατέσφαζαν αὐτοῦ τοὺς υἱοὺς, ἀλλὰ τῆς σφαγῆς οὗτος αἴτιος ἐγένετο, διὰ τῆς περὶ αὐτοὺς ῥαθυμίας ἀποστήσας τοῦ Θεοῦ τὴν βοήθειαν, καὶ γυμνοὺς καὶ ἐρήμους δείξας τοῖς βουλομένοις αὐτοὺς ἀνελεῖν. Οὐκ ἐκείνους δὲ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἑαυτὸν προσάωλεσε.

θ'. Τοῦτο δὴ πολλοὶ καὶ τῶν νῦν πατέρων πάσχουσιν· οὐ βουλόμενοι μαστιγῆσαι, οὐδὲ ἐπιτιμῆσαι ῥήμασιν, οὐδὲ λυπῆσαι τοὺς ἑαυτῶν υἱοὺς ἀτάκτως ζῶντας καὶ παρανόμως, πολλάκις εἶδον ἐπὶ τοῖς ἐσχάτοις ἀλόντας, εἰς δικαστήριον ἀρπαγέντας, ὑπὸ δημίων ἀποτμηθέντας. Ὅταν γὰρ σὺ μὴ παιδεύσης, ὅταν σὺ μὴ σωφρονίσῃς, μιανοῖς ἀνθρώποις καὶ διεφθαρμένοις σαυτὸν ἀναμίξας, καὶ κοινωνήσας τῆς πονηρίας αὐτοῖς, ὑπὸ τοῖς κοινοῖς ἄγονται νόμοις καὶ κολάζονται πάντων ὁρώντων· καὶ μετὰ τῆς συμφορᾶς μείζων ἢ αἰσχύνῃ γίνεται, δακτυλοδεικτούντων ἀπάντων τὸν πατέρα μετὰ τὴν ἐκείνου τελευτὴν, καὶ ἄβατον αὐτῷ ποιούντων τὴν ἀγοράν. Ποίοις γὰρ ὀφθαλμοῖς ἀντιβλέψαι δυνήσεται τοῖς ἀπαντῶσιν αὐτῷ μετὰ τὴν τοιαύτην τοῦ παιδὸς ἀσχημοσύνην καὶ συμφοράν; Διὸ δέομαι καὶ ἀντιβολῶ πολλὴν τῶν οἰκείων παίδων ποιεῖσθαι τὴν πρόνοιαν, καὶ πανταχοῦ τὴν σωτηρίαν ζητεῖν αὐτῶν τῆς ψυχῆς. Διδάσκαλος εἶ τῆς οἰκίας ἀπάσης, καὶ τὴν γυναῖκα καὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς σοὶ παραπέμπει συνεχῶς ὁ Θεός. Καὶ νῦν μὲν φησιν ὁ Παῦλος περὶ τῶν γυναικῶν· Εἰ δέ τι μανθάνειν θέλουσιν, ἐν οἴκῳ τοὺς ἰδίους ἄνδρας ἐπερωτάτωσαν· νῦν δὲ περὶ τῶν παίδων, Ἐκτρέφετε αὐτὰ ἐν παιδείᾳ καὶ νοουθεσίᾳ Κυρίου. Νόμισον ἀγάλματα χρυσᾷ ἔχειν ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκίας, τὰ παιδία· καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν αὐτὰ ῥύθμιζε καὶ περισκόπει μετὰ ἀκριβείας, καὶ παντὶ

86. In the LXX text, upon hearing the news Eli fell from his chair and broke his back: *ἔπεσεν ἀπὸ τοῦ δίφρου ὀπισθίως ἐχόμενος τῆς πύλης, καὶ συνετρίβη ὁ νῶτος αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀπέθανεν.*

87. See above, §7 (PG 51:327).

88. Here trying to capture both senses of *παιδεύειν*, “instruct” and “chastise” (as John is referring to both).

89. With *μανθάνειν* for *μαθεῖν* before *θέλousι*.

90. *νόμισον ἀγάλματα χρυσᾷ ἔχειν ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκίας, τὰ παιδία.* Perhaps John is playing

offer advice, but one should set a barricade of considerable fear around them in order to cut off the moral dereliction of youth. Since Eli was giving advice—but he wasn’t advising as he should have—he surrendered his sons to the enemy, and when the battle came, they fell to their death in the line of battle. And he, not able to bear the news, “fell to the ground broken, and he himself died” (cf. 1 Kgdms 4:11–18).⁸⁶ You see that I was right when I said that parents who don’t use force with their children but are remiss and don’t require them to show piety toward God are indeed child-killers?⁸⁷ Yes indeed, Eli was the murderer of his children. It’s true that the enemies slaughtered his sons, but he was the cause of the slaughter, since by his dereliction of his duty for them he deprived them of God’s help and exposed them as naked and all alone before those who wished to kill them. Not only was he responsible for the deaths of his sons, but he destroyed himself along with them.

9. And this is the fate many fathers nowadays suffer, too. Because they don’t wish to apply the whip, nor verbally rebuke nor pain their own sons when they’re living disorderly and lawless lives, they’ve often seen them arrested for the worst crimes, carried off to trial, and beheaded by public executioners. For when you don’t instruct them with severity,⁸⁸ when you don’t counsel them to control their behavior—in effect getting yourself mixed up with filthy and perverse men and being a partner to their wickedness—your children are brought to trial under the public laws and are punished before the eyes of all. Along with this misfortune comes the greater shame, when after the child’s death everyone points a finger at the father, and makes the public square effectively off-limits for him. For how will he be able to look face-to-face with his own eyes at those who meet him after his child has met with such disgrace and misfortune? Therefore, I beg and implore you to give careful attention to your own children and always seek the salvation of their souls. You are the teacher of your entire household, and God has given both your wife and your sons into your ongoing care. So at one time Paul says about wives, “*If they wish to learn something, let them ask their own husbands at home*” (1 Cor 14:35),⁸⁹ and at another time about children, “*Rear them in strict instruction and admonition of the Lord*” (Eph 6:4). Consider that you have children like statues of gold⁹⁰ in your house, and every single day train and watch over them with

on the dual senses of ἄγαλμα as “statue” and “glory, delight, honor,” as in Aeschylus, Ag. 208 (ed. Page): εἰ τέκνον δαίξω, δόμων ἄγαλμα (“If I shall slay my child [Iphigenia], the very glory of my household”) See LSJ A.4, and A.1, respectively, citing this line.

τρόπῳ τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτῶν κατακόσμει καὶ διάπλαττε· μίμησαι τὸν μακάριον Ἰωβ, ὃς καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν κατὰ διάνοιαν αὐτοῖς πλημμελουμένων δεδοικώς, προσέφερεν ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν θυσίας, καὶ πολλὴν αὐτῶν ἐποιεῖτο τὴν πρόνοιαν. Μίμησαι τὸν Ἀβραάμ· καὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖνος οὐχ ὑπὲρ χρημάτων καὶ κτημάτων ἐσπούδαζεν, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ τῶν θείων νόμων, ὅπως αὐτῶν τὴν φυλακὴν τοῖς ἐκγόνοις μετὰ ἀκριβείας παρακαταθοῖτο. Καὶ μαρτυρεῖ ταύτην αὐτοῦ τὴν ἀρετὴν ὁ Θεὸς οὕτω λέγων· Ἦιδειν γὰρ, ὅτι συντάξει Ἀβραάμ τοῖς παισὶν αὐτοῦ τὰ κρίματα καὶ τὰ δικαιώματα. Καὶ ὁ Δαυὶδ δὲ, ἡνίκα ἐτελεύτα, ἀντὶ μεγάλης κληρονομίας καλέσας τὸν υἱὸν τὸν ἑαυτοῦ, ταῦτα παρηγγύα καὶ συνεχῶς ἔλεγεν· ὅτι Εἰ βουλευθείης, παιδίον, κατὰ τοὺς τοῦ Θεοῦ νόμους ζῆν, οὐδὲν ἐμπεσεῖται τῶν ἀδοκήτων, ἀλλὰ πάντα σοι κατὰ ῥοῦν ἥξει τὰ πράγματα, καὶ πολλῆς ἀπολαύσης τῆς ἀσφαλείας· ἂν δὲ ἐκείνης ἐκπέσης τῆς βοηθείας οὐδὲν ὄφελός σοι τῆς βασιλείας καὶ τῆς πολλῆς ταύτης δυνάμεως. Ταῦτα καὶ τοιαῦτα ἔλεγεν, εἰ καὶ μὴ τοῖς ῥήμασι τούτοις.

ι'. [330] Ταῦτα καὶ ἡμεῖς, καὶ ζῶντες, καὶ μέλλοντες τελευτᾶν, πρὸς τοὺς παῖδας τοὺς ἑαυτῶν διαλεγώμεθα, καὶ πείθωμεν αὐτοὺς, ὅτι μέγας πλοῦτος, καὶ κληρονομία ἀδιάπτωτος, καὶ θησαυρὸς ἀνεπηρέαστος ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ φόβος ἐστί· καὶ σπουδάζωμεν μὴ χρήματα αὐτοῖς καταλιμπάνειν τὰ ἀπολλύμενα, ἀλλὰ εὐσέβειαν τὴν μένουσαν καὶ μὴ δαπανωμένην. Εὐσεβείας μὲν γὰρ οὐκ οὔσης καὶ τὰ ὄντα ἀπόλλυται χρήματα μετὰ κινδύνων καὶ τῆς ἐσχάτης αἰσχύνης· ταύτης δὲ παρούσης καὶ τὰ οὐκ ὄντα προσγίνεται. Ἐὰν ἀναθρέψῃς σὺ καλῶς τὸ παιδίον, οὕτω κάκεῖνος τὸν υἱὸν τὸν ἑαυτοῦ, καὶ οὗτος τὸν υἱόν· καὶ καθάπερ σειρά τις καὶ ἀκολουθία πολιτείας ἀρίστης μέχρι παντὸς βαδιεῖται, παρὰ σοῦ λαβοῦσα τὴν ἀρχὴν καὶ τὴν ῥίζαν, καὶ τῆς τῶν ἐγγόνων ἐπιμελείας σοι φέρουσα τοὺς καρπούς. Εἰ μετὰ ἀκριβείας οἱ πατέρες τοὺς ἑαυτῶν ἐπαίδευον παῖδας, οὐ νόμων, οὐ δικαστηρίων ἔδει, οὐ τιμωριῶν καὶ κολάσεων καὶ τῶν δημοσίων φόνων. Δικαίῳ γὰρ, φησί, νόμος οὐ κεῖται.

91. κατὰ διάνοιαν; cf. Job 1:5^e: ἔλεγεν γὰρ Ἰωβ Μήποτε οἱ υἱοί μου ἐν τῇ διανοίᾳ αὐτῶν κακὰ ἐνενόησαν πρὸς θεόν.

92. With ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν for περὶ αὐτῶν, “for them” (so Rahlfs at Job 1:5^c; cf. the variance at Job 1:5^d in A between περὶ and ὑπέρ).

93. Plus Ἀβραάμ after συντάξει; with τοῖς παισὶν for τοῖς υἱοῖς.

94. The latter part of this sentence is a paraphrase, with τὰ κρίματα καὶ τὰ δικαιώματα for ποιεῖν δικαιοσύνην καὶ κρίσιν.

95. I.e., Solomon.

96. I.e., divine assistance. John is making a bit of a wordplay (not found in the LXX) with βουλευθείης and βοήθεια (linking human will and divine assistance). That βοήθεια comes from the Lord is a theme in LXX Psalms of David (e.g., Ps 53:6; 61:8; cf. Ps 120:1–2).

close attention, and in every way outfit and fashion their souls. Imitate the blessed Job who, out of fear for the offenses his children committed in their minds,⁹¹ “used to offer sacrifices on their behalf” (Job 1:5)⁹² and look out for your children carefully. Imitate Abraham, for he, too, didn’t exert himself on behalf of money and possessions, but on behalf of the divine laws, so he might ensure that his offspring observe them attentively. It is God who testifies to his virtue in this, when he says, “For he knew that Abraham had issued commands to his children” (Gen 18:19)⁹³ about the judgments and statutes (cf. Gen 18:19).⁹⁴ And David, too, as he lay dying, called his own son⁹⁵ and instead of a grand inheritance handed over these instructions and said repeatedly, “My child, if you would make it your intention to live according to God’s laws, nothing unexpected will befall you, but all your affairs will go swimmingly, and you’ll enjoy great security. But if you’re deprived of divine intervention,⁹⁶ all your royal rule and its great power will accord you no benefit.” David said these things and others along these lines, although not in these exact words.⁹⁷

10. [330] So let us, too, say these words to our own children, both while we’re alive and when we’re about to die. And let’s persuade them that the fear of God is a great fortune, an unfailing inheritance, and a treasure that cannot be touched. And let’s not be eager to leave behind possessions that are perishable but instead piety, which remains and doesn’t get expended. For in the absence of piety, even the possessions one has perish, accompanied by dangers and the depths of shame. But when piety is present, even the things one doesn’t have are accrued. If you raise your child well, that’s how he in turn will raise his own son, and that one his own,⁹⁸ and, as it were, a family line and succession of virtuous behavior will proceed into the future, after receiving its start and root from you, and bearing the fruits of your care for your offspring. If fathers would sternly instruct their own sons, there would be no need for laws, or courts, or penalties, or punishments, or death by public executioners.⁹⁹ For, he says, “*It isn’t for the innocent that the law is laid down*” (1 Tim 1:9). But if we neglect

97. Indeed, the passage in question, 3 Kgdms 2:1–9, bears no verbal similarity to John’s creative rendition.

98. Chrysostom is replicating a paternal line of father-son relationships, so the translation reflects the gendered argument (the women and daughters are off his radar at this point).

99. Translating the reading of PG, φόνων (with Monac. gr. 6, the source for HS). However, as Mf noted, his three manuscripts read φόβων (“fears”) rather than φόνων. HS had included a marginal note (not mentioned by Mf or PE) conjecturing φόβων.

Ἐπειδὴ δὲ καταμελοῦμεν αὐτῶν, διὰ τοῦτο μείζοσιν αὐτοὺς περιβάλλομεν κακοῖς, καὶ ταῖς τῶν δημίων ἐκδίδομεν χερσὶ, καὶ εἰς τὰ βάραθρα συνεχῶς ὠθοῦμεν. Ὁ γὰρ περιψύχων τὸν υἱὸν τὸν ἑαυτοῦ, καταδεσμεύσει τὰ τραύματα αὐτοῦ, φησί. Τί ἐστὶν Ὁ περιψύχων; Ὁ ἐλεῶν, ὁ κολακεύων, ὁ θεραπεύων ὑπὲρ τὸ μέτρον. Σφοδρότητος γὰρ οὗτος καὶ ἐπιμελείας δεῖται καὶ φόβων. Ταῦτα λέγω οὐχ ἵνα λίαν τραχεῖς ᾖμεν τοῖς παισὶν, ἀλλ' ἵνα μὴ εὐκαταφρόνητοι πρὸς αὐτοὺς φαινώμεθα. Εἰ γὰρ γυνὴ τὸν ἄνδρα φοβεῖσθαι ὀφείλει, πολλῶ μᾶλλον τὸ παιδίον τὸν πατέρα. Καὶ μὴ μοι λέγε, ὅτι ἀδύνατον περιγενέσθαι τῆς νεότητος. Εἰ γὰρ χήραν γυναῖκα ἀπαιτεῖ τὴν πρόνοιαν ταύτην ὁ Παῦλος, πολλῶ μᾶλλον τοὺς ἄνδρας· εἰ ἀδύνατον ἦν, οὐκ ἂν ἐπέταξεν. Ἀλλ' ἡ πᾶσα πονηρία παρὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν γίνεται ῥαθυμίαν, καὶ τὸ μὴ ἐξ ἀρχῆς, μηδὲ ἐκ πρώτης ἡλικίας εἰς εὐλάβειαν ἐνάγειν αὐτούς. Ἀλλ' ὅπως μὲν τῆς ἔξωθεν μετὰσχοιεν παιδεύσεως, καὶ εἰς στρατείαν τελέσαιεν, σπουδάζομεν, καὶ χρήματα καταβάλλομεν, καὶ φίλους ἀξιοῦμεν, καὶ πολλὰς κεχρήμεθα ταῖς περιδρομαῖς· ὅπως δὲ εὐδοκιμήσαιεν παρὰ τῷ βασιλεῖ τῶν ἀγγέλων, οὐδένα ποιοῦμεθα λόγον.

Καὶ εἰς θεάματα μὲν συνεχῶς συγχωροῦμεν ἀναβαίνειν, εἰς ἐκκλησίαν δὲ οὐκ ἀναγκάζομεν οὐδέποτε· ἀλλὰ καὶ ἅπαξ ἢ δεύτερον παραγένηται τὸ παιδίον, ἀπλῶς καὶ εἰκῇ καὶ μάτην καὶ ψυχαγωγίας ἕνεκεν ἐνταῦθα παραγίνεται. Οὐκ ἐχρῆν δὲ οὕτως· ἀλλ' ὥσπερ εἰς διδασκαλεῖον πέμποντες τῶν μαθημάτων ἀπαιτοῦμεν τὰς εὐθύνas, οὕτω καὶ εἰς ἐκκλησίαν πέμποντες, μᾶλλον δὲ ἄγοντες. Οὐ γὰρ ἐτέροις αὐτοὺς ἐπιτρέπειν, ἀλλ' αὐτοὺς κατέχοντας ἐνταῦθα εἰσιέναι ἐχρῆν, καὶ τῆς ἐνταῦθα ἀκροάσεως καὶ διδασκαλίας τὴν μνήμην ἀπαιτεῖν ἔδει. Οὕτω γὰρ, οὕτω ῥάων ἐγένετο καὶ εὐκολος ἡμῖν ἡ

100. Plus ὁ before περιψύχων (so Rahlfs); with τὸν υἱὸν τὸν ἑαυτοῦ for υἱόν; with τὰ before τραύματα. B and S (κ) read περὶ ψυχῶν υἱῶν, but Rahlfs adopted the reading of A. LSJ notes that περιψύχειν more normally means “chill,” or, metaphorically, “refresh, revive, cherish” (citing this Sirach passage *v.l.* among other texts).

101. Mf notes that two manuscripts (one of which is Paris. gr. 748) read λιμῶ (“in hunger”) for λίαν, which makes little sense in context.

102. ἡ δὲ γυνὴ ἵνα φοβῆται τὸν ἄνδρα; this is the same attitude commanded of slaves in Eph 6:5, ὑπακούετε τοῖς κατὰ σάρκα κυρίοις μετὰ φόβου καὶ τρόμου.

103. Chrysostom assumes the norms of the patriarchal household throughout this homily that is urging its shored-up maintenance against what he regards as laxity among his contemporaries. The household codes of the Paulinist letters enshrine the social scale of husband, wife, children, and slaves as a subjugation ἐν φόβῳ Χριστοῦ (Eph 5:21).

104. 1 Tim 5:10, εἰ ἐτεκνοτρόφησεν (cf. 5:4).

our children, we in effect surround them with greater evils and give them over into the hands of the executioners and continually shove them into the pits. For, he says, “The *one who cherishes his own son will bind up his wounds*” (Sir 30:7).¹⁰⁰ What does “the one who cherishes” mean? The one who shows him mercy, who flatters, who attends on him beyond proper measure? For the son has need of sternness, sharp attention, and things to scare him. I’m not saying these things so that we might be overly¹⁰¹ harsh toward our children, but to avoid our appearing contemptible in their eyes. For if a wife should fear her husband (cf. Eph 5:33),¹⁰² how much more should the child fear his father.¹⁰³ Don’t tell me that it’s impossible to get the upper hand over impetuous youth. For if Paul requires this close attention from a widow¹⁰⁴—a woman—then how much more from men?¹⁰⁵ If it were impossible, he wouldn’t have commanded it. Evil comes entirely from our dereliction and our not urging our children toward piety from the beginning and from their earliest age. However, when it comes to how they might participate in secular education and secure an appointment in the military, we exert great efforts, pay loads of money, make requests of friends, and use all kinds of maneuvers. Yet we take no account whatsoever when it comes to how they might attain the approval of the King of the angels.

We allow them to go to the spectacles all the time, but we don’t ever force them to go to church. Even if the child is here once or twice, he’s with us here in a way that’s perfunctory, purposeless, unproductive, and for mere amusement. This should not be the case. Just as when we send him to school we ask for a full account of his learnings, so also should we, when sending—or, even better, bringing—him to church.¹⁰⁶ For we shouldn’t entrust this to others, but we should take hold of our sons, grab them, and bring them here, and ask them to recount what they heard and were taught here. This indeed, this is why our correction of children has become so lenient and complacent. For if at home as well they continually heard you speaking about the philosophical life¹⁰⁷ and counseling them

105. Chrysostom often uses the virtuous behavior of women to shame men on the logic of a *minore ad maius* (“from the lesser to the greater”); the presumption is that women are by nature lower than men.

106. See the similar complaint about parents not bringing their children to the *synaxis* in *Hom. Rom. 12:20* §§3–4 (PG 51:176–80). There he also constructs the same competition between the *synaxis* and the spectacles for their attention and attendance.

107. By this John means Christian teachings and morals (as he understands them).

τῶν παίδων διόρθωσις· εἰ γὰρ καὶ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ διαπαντὸς ἤκουον ὑμῶν διαλεγομένων περὶ φιλοσοφίας, καὶ συμβουλευόντων αὐτοῖς τὰ δέοντα, καὶ τὰ ἐνταῦθα αὐτοῖς προσετίθετο μετ' ἐκείνων, καὶ ταχέως ἂν τῶν καλῶν τούτων σπερμάτων γενναῖον ἡμῖν ἐπεδείξαντο καρπὸν. Ἄλλ' οὐδὲν τούτων ποιοῦμεν, ἀλλὰ πάρεργα ἡμῖν τὰ ἀναγκαῖα· κἂν παραινέσῃ [331] τις περὶ τούτων, γέλως εὐθέως· καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τὰ ἄνω κάτω γεγένηται, καὶ οὐς οὐ παιδεύουσιν οἱ γονεῖς, οἱ ἔξωθεν παιδεύουσι νόμοι.

ια'. Οὐκ αἰσχύνῃ καὶ ἐρυθριᾷς, εἰπέ μοι, ὅταν τὸν υἱὸν τὸν σὸν ὁ δικαστὴς κολάσῃ καὶ σωφρονέστερον ποιήσῃ, καὶ τῆς ἔξωθεν ἐκεῖνος δέηται διορθώσεως, τοσοῦτον ἐξ ἀρχῆς σοι συνοικήσας χρόνον; οὐκ ἐγκαλύπτῃ καὶ καταδύῃ; Τολμᾷς δὲ ὅλως, εἰπέ μοι, πατὴρ ἔτι καλεῖσθαι, οὕτω προδοὺς τὸν υἱόν, καὶ τὴν ἀναγκαίαν οὐκ εἰσενεγκὼν αὐτῷ φορὰν, ἀλλὰ περιδὼν ὑπὸ πάσης διαφθαρέντα κακίας; Κἂν μὲν δραπέτην τινὰ ἴδῃς ραπίζοντα τὸ παιδίον, ἀγανακτεῖς καὶ ὀργίζῃ καὶ δυσχεραίνεις, θηρίου χαλεπώτερον ἐπιτηδήςας τῇ τοῦ τυπητήσαντος ὄψει· τὸν δὲ διάβολον καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν ὀρῶν αὐτὸν ραπίζοντα, δαίμονας εἰς ἀμαρτήματα ἐνάγοντας, καθεύδεις καὶ οὐκ ἀγανακτεῖς, οὐδὲ ἐξαρπάζεις τοῦ χαλεπωτάτου θηρίου τὸν υἱόν; Πάλιν ἂν μὲν ὑπὸ δαίμονος ἐνεργῇται, πρὸς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους τρέχεις, καὶ τοὺς ἐν ταῖς κορυφαῖς τῶν ὀρέων ἐνοχλεῖς, ὥστε αὐτὸν τῆς μανίας ἀπαλλάξαι ἐκείνης· ἀμαρτίας δὲ, ἥ παντὸς δαίμονός ἐστι χαλεπωτέρα, συνεχῶς ἐνοχλοῦσης, οὐδὲν πλέον ποιεῖς;

Καὶ τὸ μὲν παρὰ δαίμονος ἐνοχλεῖσθαι χαλεπὸν οὐδέν· οὐ γὰρ εἰς γέενναν ἐμβαλεῖν τὸ δαιμόνιον δύναται πάντως, ἀλλ' ἐὰν νήφωμεν, καὶ στεφάνους ἡμῖν ὁ πειρασμὸς οὗτος οἶσει λαμπροὺς καὶ περιφανεῖς, ὅταν εὐχαρίστως φέρωμεν τὰς τοιαύτας ἐπηρείας· τὸν δὲ ἀμαρτία συζῶντα ἀμύχανον σωθῆναι ποτε, ἀλλ' ἀνάγκη πάντως καὶ ἐνταῦθα ἐπονείδιστον εἶναι, καὶ ἀπελθόντα ἐκεῖ ἀθάνατα πάλιν κολάζεσθαι. Ἄλλ' ὅμως ταῦτα εἰδότες, ὑπὲρ μὲν τῶν ἐλαττόνων πολλὴν ποιοῦμεθα σπουδὴν, ὑπὲρ δὲ τῶν μειζόνων οὐδὲ διαναστῆναι βουλόμεθα· καὶ δαιμονῶντα μὲν ὀρῶντες θρηνοῦμεν, ἀμαρτάνοντα δὲ ὀρῶντες οὐδὲ αἰσθανόμεθα· δέον τότε κατακόπτεσθαι καὶ ὀδύρεσθαι, μᾶλλον δὲ οὐκ ὀδύρασθαι μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ κατέχειν καὶ χαλινοῦν, συμβουλευεῖν, παραινεῖν, φοβεῖν, ἐπιτιμᾶν, παντὶ τρόπῳ θεραπείας τὴν ἀρρωστίαν ἀπελαύνειν ἐκείνην, καὶ τὴν χῆραν μιμεῖσθαι ταύτην, περὶ ἧς ὁ Παῦλός φησιν· Εἰ ἐτεκνοτρόφησεν.

108. A financial metaphor signaled in the terms for paying property tax (τὴν ἀναγκαίαν ... εἰσφέρειν ... φορὰν).

109. Translating the reading of PG, which is a result of the PE editors having emended the text of Mf (from HS ME), with ἴδῃς for εἶδῃς. They cite Paris. gr. 748 as

about what's right to do, then the things said here would've been deposited with them, and quickly they would've shown forth the noble fruit of these good seeds. But we don't do any of these things, and instead we consider matters that are truly necessary to be of secondary importance. And if a parent might venture advice about [331] these things, laughter immediately ensues. That's why matters have been turned upside down, and so the laws of the public sphere chastise those whom parents do not.

11. Tell me, aren't you ashamed and embarrassed when the judge punishes your son and gets him to exhibit more self-control, when he has need of the correction from outsiders, despite having lived with you from the beginning and for such a long time since? Don't you hide your face and slink away in shame? Tell me, do you really dare still to be called "father" when you've abandoned your son in this way and not put in the required investment,¹⁰⁸ but allow him to be destroyed by vice? If you see¹⁰⁹ a runaway slave striking your child, you're outraged, angry, and troubled, and at the sight of the one who struck your child you attack more fiercely than a wild animal. But when you see the devil striking him every single day, with demons leading him into sins, you're slumbering away and aren't outraged, nor do you snatch your son from this fiercest of beasts? Again, if your son is beset by a demon, you run off to all the holy men, and you trouble those who live on the mountaintops to free him from that madness. But when a sin fiercer than any demon is troubling the child, you do nothing more?

Being troubled by a demon isn't a difficult thing. Granted, it's not possible to throw the demon completely into hell, but if we stay sober and alert, then this trial will offer us crowns that are splendid and shiny when we bear with good grace such awful abuse. But it's impossible for one who lives in sin ever to be saved. Indeed, they are of necessity an object of reproach here in this life, and then, after they go off to the next, they're punished again in perpetuity. And yet, despite knowing this, we nevertheless exert tremendous effort on things of less importance, and we don't even wish to rouse ourselves on behalf of those that are greater. When we see someone demon-possessed we wail in lament, but when we see someone sinning we're not even moved. But that's the time we should beat our breasts and lament, or, rather, not only lament, but grab hold and bridle them, give counsel, offer advice, strike fear in them, offer a rebuke, by every form of treatment driving out that illness, and imitate that widow of whom Paul

witness to this reading they pronounce "*recte*." One of HS's manuscripts, Monac. gr. 6, also reads ἰδῆς (but HS did not have a note to that effect).

Οὐ γὰρ πρὸς ἐκείνην μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ πρὸς ἅπαντας τοῦτον ἀποτείνει τὸν λόγον, καὶ πᾶσι παραινεῖ λέγων, Ἐκτρέφετε τὰ παιδιά ἐν νοουθεσίᾳ Κυρίου. Πρῶτον γὰρ τοῦτο καὶ μέγιστόν ἐστι τῶν αγαθῶν· ὅπερ οὖν καὶ παρὰ τῆς χήρας πρῶτον ἀπήτησεν.

Εἶτα μετὰ τοῦτο φησιν, Εἰ ἐξενοδόχησε. Τί λέγεις, εἰπέ μοι; χήραν γυναῖκα ξενοδοχίαν ἀπαιτεῖς; οὐ γὰρ ἀρκεῖ τὸ θρέφειν παιδιά; Οὐχί, φησίν· ἀλλὰ δεῖ καὶ τοῦτο προσεῖναι, καὶ μετὰ τὴν τῶν οἰκείων προστασίαν, καὶ τῶν ἄλλοτριῶν ἔχειν πρόνοιαν χρῆ, καὶ τὴν οἰκίαν ἀνοίξει τοῖς ξένοις. Ἀπῆλθεν ὁ ἀνὴρ· πᾶσαν τὴν περὶ ἐκείνον σπουδὴν περὶ τοὺς ξένους ἀνάλωσον. Τί οὖν, φησίν, εἰ πένης εἷη; Οὐκ ἔστιν ἐκείνης τῆς χήρας πενεστέρα τῆς ἐν ἀλεύρῳ μικρῷ καὶ ἐλαίου κυάθῳ τὸν μέγαν προφήτην ὑποδεξαμένης τὸν Ἥλιαν. Καὶ γὰρ καὶ ἐκεῖ παιδιά παρῆν· ἀλλ' οὔτε ἡ σπάνις τῶν ὄντων, οὔτε ἡ τοῦ λιμοῦ τυραννίς, οὔτε ὁ προσδοκώμενος θάνατος, οὐχ ἡ τῶν παιδίων φροντίς, [332] οὐχ ἡ χρηρεία, οὐκ ἄλλο οὐδὲν ἐγένετο κώλυμα τῇ φιλοξένῳ γυναικί.

ιβ'. Οὕτω πανταχοῦ οὐ μέτρα οὐσίας, ἀλλὰ μέτρα διανοίας ζητεῖται. Ὁ μεγαλόψυχος καὶ τῇ διανοίᾳ πλούσιος, κἂν ἀπάντων ἀνθρώπων πενέστερος ἐν χρήμασιν ᾖ, πάντας ὑπερβῆναι δυνήσεται καὶ φιλοξενία καὶ ἐλεημοσύνη, καὶ τῇ λοιπῇ πάσῃ φιλοφροσύνη· ὁ μικρολόγος καὶ πτωχὸς τὴν διάνοιαν, καὶ χαμαὶ ἔρπων, κἂν ἀπάντων εὐπορώτερος ᾖ, πάντων ἐστὶ πτωχότερος καὶ ἀπορώτερος· διὰ τοῦτο πρὸς τὰ τοιαῦτα ἅπαντα ὀκνεῖ καὶ ἀναδύεται. Καὶ ὥσπερ οὐδὲν ἐπὶ τοῦ πένητος ἡ πενία γένοιτ' ἂν κώλυμα πρὸς ἐλεημοσύνην διὰ τὸν τῆς διανοίας πλοῦτον· οὕτως οὐδὲν ἐπὶ τοῦ πλουτοῦντος ἡ εὐπορία συμπράξει δυνήσεται πρὸς τὴν φιλοφροσύνην διὰ τὴν τῆς διανοίας πενίαν.

Καὶ τὰ παραδείγματα ἐγγύθεν· ἡ μὲν γὰρ χήρα καὶ ἐν ἀλεύρῳ μικρῷ τὸν προφήτην ἐδέξατο· ὁ δὲ Ἀχαάβ τοσοῦτον κεκτημένος πλοῦτον, καὶ τῶν ἄλλοτριῶν ἐπεθύμησεν. Οὕτως οὐκ ἔστι χρημάτων πλοῦτος, ἀλλὰ πλοῦτος διανοίας ὁ παρέχων ἡμῖν εὐκολίαν περὶ τὴν ἐλεημοσύνην· ἐπεὶ καὶ ἡ χήρα ἐκείνη διὰ δύο μόνον ὀβολῶν μυρίους πλουσίους ὑπερηκόντισε, καὶ οὐκ ἐγένετο κώλυμα ἡ πενία. Αὕτη μὲν οὖν ἡ πενία μείζονα τὴν ἐλεημοσύνην εἰργάσατο·

110. This generalizing and contemporizing hermeneutic, extending the teaching beyond its initial referents, has been at work throughout this long treatment of the first condition of the widow in 1 Tim 5:10, εἰ ἐτεκνοτρόφησεν, in §§7–11 (PG 51:327–31).

111. With τὰ παιδιά ἐν for αὐτὰ ἐν παιδείᾳ καὶ before νοουθεσίᾳ κυρίου. Chrysostom cited the verse in the text-form of \mathfrak{M} above in §9 (PG 51:320).

112. διάνοια; also “intention.” The sense of “heart” is found in ethical discourse, in both the LXX and the NT (Matt 22:37 and parr.; Deut 6:5; Josh 22:5; Col 1:21) and in Hellenistic philosophy (e.g., Epictetus, *Diatr.* 2.2.13; see LSJ A.1).

said, “*if she has reared children*” (1 Tim 5:10). Indeed, he didn’t extend this statement to her alone, but to all¹¹⁰ and he gave this advice to everyone, saying, “*Rear children in the admonition of the Lord*” (Eph 6:4).¹¹¹ For this is the first and greatest of good deeds, which is why he lists it as the first requirement of the widow.

Next after this, he says, “*if she has given hospitality*” (1 Tim 5:10). “Tell me, what are you saying, Paul? You require hospitality from a woman who is a widow? Isn’t her rearing of children enough?” “No,” Paul says, “but one must add this, as well, after her responsibility for her own—to look out also for others and to open her house to strangers. Your husband has now departed; expend all the zealous attention you paid on him on strangers.” “Well,” someone will say, “what if she’s poor?” She’s no poorer than that widow who welcomed the great prophet Elijah with a little flour and a tiny dram of oil. And in that case, too, she had children in the house. But neither the scarcity of belongings, nor the oppressive famine, nor the anticipation of death, nor her anxiety for her children, [332] nor her status as a widow—nor anything else—was a hindrance to that woman who showed such hospitality.

12. Thus, at all times it’s not the measure of one’s possessions but the measure of one’s heart¹¹² that’s sought. The person who’s magnanimous and rich in their heart—even if the poorest of all when it comes to possessions—will be able to transcend all in hospitality and almsgiving, and in all the other virtues of kindness. The person who is impoverished and poor in their heart, groveling on the ground—even if more prosperous than all—is the poorest and neediest of all. That’s why in the face of all such dire needs those people hesitate and shrink back. In the case of a poor person, material poverty is no hindrance to almsgiving because of their richness of heart; likewise, in the case of the rich person, prosperity won’t be able to assist them in performing acts of kindness because of their impoverished heart.

Examples of this are near to hand. While the widow welcomed the prophet with a little bit of flour, Ahab, though he’d acquired tremendous wealth, desired what others had in addition (3 Kgdms 20:2).¹¹³ Thus, it’s not richness in possessions but richness of heart that provides us with an easy route to almsgiving. After all, that widow surpassed countless rich people with her two coins (Mark 12:41–44 // Luke 21:1–4), and poverty wasn’t a hindrance; indeed, this poverty generated even greater almsgiv-

113. The reference is to Ahab’s avarice for Naboth’s vineyard.

ὅπερ οὖν καὶ ὁ Παῦλός φησιν, Ἡ κατὰ βάθους πτωχεία ἐπερίσσευσεν εἰς τὸν πλοῦτον τῆς ἀπλότητος αὐτῶν. Οὐ γὰρ τοῦτο χρή σκοπεῖν, ὅτι δύο κατέβαλεν ὀβολούς, ἀλλ' ὅτι μόνους ἔχουσα τούτους, οὐκ ἐφείσατο, ἀλλ' ὁλόκληρον τὴν οὐσίαν εἰσήνεγκε, θαυμάζειν αὐτὴν χρή καὶ στεφανοῦν. Οὐ τοίνυν περιουσίας, ἀλλὰ προθυμίας ἡμῖν δεῖ, ὅταν ὑποδεχώμεθα ξένους. "Ὡσπερ γὰρ ταύτης παρουσίας οὐδὲν βλάβος γένοιτ' ἂν ἀπὸ πενίας, οὕτως ἀπουσίας οὐδὲν ὄφελος γένοιτ' ἂν ἐξ εὐπορίας. Τί λέγεις; Παιδίων ἐπιμελεῖται ἡ χήρα καὶ διὰ τοῦτο οὐκ ἂν δύναίτο θεραπεύειν ξένους; Δι' αὐτὸ μὲν οὖν τοῦτο εὐκολώτερον τοῦτο ἐργάζεται, κοινωνοὺς ἔχουσα τῆς θεραπείας τοὺς υἱοὺς, συναντιλαμβανομένους καὶ συνεφαπτομένους αὐτῇ τῆς καλῆς ταύτης πραγματείας. Ὡστε οὐ κώλυμα, ἀλλὰ βοήθεια τῆς φιλοξενίας ἔσται τῶν παιδίων τὸ πλῆθος, καὶ ἡ πολυχειρία πολλὴν τῇ διακονίᾳ παρέξει τὴν εὐκολίαν. Μὴ γάρ μοι πολυτελὴ τράπεζαν εἶπης· ἂν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν δέξηται τὸν ξένον, ἂν τὰ ὄντα παραθῇ, ἂν πολλὴν ἐπιδείξηται τὴν φιλοφροσύνην, ἀπήρτισται τῆς ξενοδοχίας ὁ καρπὸς ἅπας. Εἰ γὰρ ποτήριον ψυχροῦ μόνον βασιλείαν οὐρανῶν προξενεῖ, τὸ καὶ ὁμωρόφιον ποιῆσαι, καὶ τραπέζης κοινωνῶν, καὶ ἀναπαῦσαι, πόσον οἶσει τὸν καρπὸν, εἰπέ μοι; Σκόπει δὴ μοι Παύλου τὴν ἀκρίβειαν. Οὐ γὰρ ἀπλῶς ξενοδοχίαν ἐνταῦθα ἀπαιτεῖ, ἀλλὰ τὴν μετὰ προθυμίας καὶ ζεούσης ψυχῆς καὶ διανοίας θερμῆς. Εἰπὼν γὰρ, Εἰ ξενοδόχησεν, ἐπήγαγεν, Εἰ ἀγίων πόδας ἔνιψεν. Οὐ θεραπευαίνουσιν ἐπιτρέπειν χρή αὐτὴν μετὰ τύφου καθημένην τοῦ ξένου τὴν θεραπείαν, ἀλλ' αὐτουργὸν γενέσθαι, καὶ τὸν καρπὸν ἀρπάζειν, καὶ μηδενὶ παραχωρεῖν τοῦ καλοῦ τούτου θησαυροῦ. Καὶ πῶ, τοῦτο γένοιτ' ἂν, φησίν; εἰ γὰρ εὐγενὴς εἴη καὶ περιφανὴς καὶ λαμπρὰ καὶ ἐπίσημος ἐκ προγόνων. αὐτὴ τοῦ ξένου νίψει τοὺς πόδας; καὶ πῶς οὐκ [333] αἰσχρὸν; Αἰσχρὸν μὲν οὖν τὸ μὴ νίπτειν, ἄνθρωπε. Κἂν γὰρ μυριάκις αὐτῆς τὴν εὐγένειαν ἐπάρης καὶ τὴν περιφάνειαν, καὶ τὴν λαμπρότητα, τῆς αὐτῆς μετέχει τῷ νιπτομένῳ φύσεως, καὶ σύνδουλός ἐστι τοῦ θεραπευομένου καὶ ὁμότιμος.

ιγ'. Ἐννόησον τίς τῶν μαθητῶν τοὺς πόδας ἔνιψε, καὶ παῦσαί μοι περὶ εὐγενείας διαλεγόμενος. Ὁ κοινὸς τῆς οἰκουμένης Δεσπότης, ὁ τῶν ἀγγέλων βασιλεὺς καὶ ἔνιψε καὶ λέντιον περιεζώσατο, καὶ οὐχὶ τῶν μαθητῶν μόνον,

114. Minus αὐτῶν after πτωχεία.

115. Chrysostom addresses a hypothetical objector who raises once again the problem that of how one can demand that the poor provide hospitality to others when they by definition don't have the resources to do so.

116. A possible "problem" with the injunction is pointed out by a hypothetical

ing. This is what Paul is referring to when he says, “*Their abysmal poverty abounded to the wealth of their generosity*” (2 Cor 8:2).¹¹⁴ One shouldn’t focus attention on the fact that she threw in two coins, but should marvel and crown her because, having only these two coins, she didn’t spare them but offered her entire livelihood. So then, when we welcome strangers, what’s needed isn’t abundance, but eagerness. When the latter is present, no harm can come from poverty; but when it’s absent, no benefit can come from prosperity. “What are you saying? ‘Because the widow has to care for her children, she wouldn’t be able to serve strangers?’”¹¹⁵ Actually, it’s precisely this that makes it easier, because she has her sons as her partners in serving them, helping and joining her in this good practice. Hence a passel of children won’t be a hindrance, but rather a help to hospitality, and many hands will make light work when one serves. Don’t tell me, “Food for the table is expensive.” If she welcomes the stranger into her house, if she sets forth what she has, if she shows great kindness, then the full fruit of hospitality has been accomplished. For if only “*a cup of cold water*” (Matt 10:42) procures the kingdom of heaven, then tell me, what fruit will be born from hosting someone under your roof, having them share your table, and giving them a resting place? Look at Paul’s attention to detail! For he doesn’t just require hospitality here, but hospitality accompanied by eagerness, a fervent soul, and warmhearted intent. For after he said, “*if she has given hospitality*,” he added, “*if she has washed the feet of the saints*” (1 Tim 5:10). She should not sit in luxury while entrusting the task of serving the stranger to her maidservants, but she should do it herself and grab hold of its fruitful gain and cede to no one this excellent treasure. “How can this be?” someone says. “After all, if she is of noble birth, famous, illustrious, and of distinguished ancestry, will she really wash the feet of the stranger? How is that not [333] a shameful act?”¹¹⁶ Actually, sir, what’s shameful isn’t washing them! Even if you aggrandize her noble birth, fame, and luster over and over, she shares the same human nature with the one she washes, and she is a fellow slave and of the same honor as the one she assists.

13. Consider who it was who washed the disciples’ feet, and quit talking to me about “noble birth”! It was the common Master of the whole world, the King of the angels, who dressed himself in a towel and washed the feet—not only of his disciples, but even the very man who betrayed

interlocutor, only for the preacher to dismiss it quickly by inversion of what counts as shame and what honor.

ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ προδότου. Εἶδες πόσον τὸ μέσον τοῦ νίπτοντος καὶ τῶν νιπτομένων; Ἄλλ' ὅμως τὸ μέσον ἅπαν τοῦτο κατέβη, καὶ ὁ Δεσπότης τὸν δοῦλον ἔνιψεν, ἵνα ἡ δούλη τὸν σύνδουλον μὴ ἐπαισχύνηται. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ τοῦ προδότου, ἵνα μὴ μέλλης λέγειν, ὅτι εὐτελὴς καὶ εὐκαταφρόνητος ὁ μέλλων ἀπολαύειν τῆς θεραπείας. Εἰ γὰρ καὶ εὐτελὴς καὶ εὐκαταφρόνητος, ἀλλ' οὕτω κατὰ τὸν Ἰούδαν ἐστίν, οὐδὲ τοιαῦτά σοι διέθηκεν, οἷα τὸν Δεσπότην ἐκεῖνος, μετὰ τὰς μυρίας εὐεργεσίας ἐπὶ προδοσίαν ἑλθόν. Ἄλλ' ὅμως ἅπαντα ταῦτα προειδῶς ἔνιψεν, ἡμῖν νόμους τιθεὶς, ἵνα καὶ ἀπάντων ὦμεν ὑψηλότεροι, καὶ ἀπάντων λαμπρότεροι καὶ περιφανέστεροι, καὶ ἀπάντων χείρους οἱ μέλλοντες πρὸς ἡμᾶς κατάγεσθαι, μὴ διὰ τοῦτο αὐτῶν φεύγωμεν τὴν θεραπείαν, μηδὲ τὴν εὐτέλειαν ἐπαισχυνόμεθα.

Σὺ δὲ, ὦ γύναι, ἐὰν μὲν τινα ἴδῃς ἐν τοῖς βιωτικοῖς σοι βοηθοῦντα πράγμασιν, ἢ ἐν δικαστηρίῳ συμπράττοντα, ἢ ἐν ἄλλῳ τινὶ τοιούτῳ, καὶ ἀπαντᾷς, καὶ μετὰ πολλῆς δέχῃ τῆς εὐνοίας, καὶ χεῖρας καταφιλεῖς, καὶ ἀργύριον καταβάλλεις, καὶ τὰ τῶν θεραπαινίδων ποιεῖς· ἂν δὲ τὸν Χριστὸν εἰσελθόντα ἴδῃς, ὀκνεῖς καὶ καταδύῃ πρὸς τὴν αὐτοῦ θεραπείαν; Εἰ μὴ ὡς τὸν Χριστὸν δέχῃ τὸν ξένον, μὴ δέξῃ· εἰ δὲ ὡς τὸν Χριστὸν δέχῃ, μὴ ἐπαισχυθῇς τοῦ Χριστοῦ νίψαι τοὺς πόδας.

Οὐχ ὁρᾷς πόσοι τῶν ἐπηρεαζομένων εἰς ἀνδριάντων κατέφυγον πόδας; Καίτοι γε ἀναισθητός ἡ ὕλη, καὶ ἄψυχος ὁ χαλκός· ἀλλ' ὅμως ἐπειδὴ βασιλέων εἰσὶν εἰκόνες, προσεδόκησάν τινα καρπώσασθαι παρὰ τῶν ποδῶν ἐκείνων ὠφέλειαν. Σὺ δὲ οὐκ ἀναισθήτους πόδας, οὐδὲ ἄψυχον ὕλην, ἀλλ' εἰκόνα ἔνδον ἔχουσαν τὸν βασιλέα θεωροῦσα πρὸς σὲ εἰσιοῦσαν, οὐ προστρέχεις, εἰπέ μοι, καὶ τοὺς πόδας κατέχεις, καὶ παντὶ θεραπεύῃ τρόπῳ; Καὶ ποῦ ταῦτα συγγνώμης ἄξια; πόσης δὲ οὐκ ἂν εἴη τοῦτο αἰσχύνης; Ἐννόησον τίνι

117. The switch here to the female slave, ἡ δούλη, seems due to Chrysostom's assumption that this is a job done by female slaves (cf. *θεράπαινα* earlier in this passage, and also the female widow in the lemma, who washes feet).

118. Mf notes that two of his manuscripts read the imperfect, *ἐνιπτεν*, for *ἐνιψεν*.

119. The PE editors emended Mf's text here, reading *ἴδῃς* (with Paris. gr. 748) for *ἴδοις* after *εἰσελθόντα* (the latter being the reading of HS ME Mf) and, five lines earlier, *ἴδῃς* for *εἰδῃς* after *τινα* (also HS ME Mf). Further, they note that HS had a marginal note with the conjectural reading *εἰδῃς* after *εἰσελθόντα*, which matches the reading he had adopted five lines previously, *τινα εἰδῃς*, the latter of which was followed by Mf. JPM reworded the note to erase the PE's "*scripsimus*," and instead give the impression that he adopted the reading of Paris. gr. 748 on his own recognizance.

120. An ancient practice still sanctioned and regulated in Chrysostom's time (see Cod. theod. 9.44, from Valentinian I, Theodosius I, and Arcadius), even as the late fourth and first half of the fifth centuries (when the Code was formalized) saw inconsistency and contestation amid also the emergence of sanctuary claims for Christian

him (cf. John 13:1–11). Do you see how great the distance is between the one who washes and those who are washed? But nevertheless, the Master stooped down all this expansive distance and washed the slave so that the female slave¹¹⁷ might not be ashamed of her fellow slave. And the reason he washed the feet of the betrayer, too, was so you wouldn't say that the stranger who should enjoy your service is poor and despicable. For even if the stranger is both poor and despicable, they still aren't at the level of Judas, nor have they treated you as Judas did the Lord, proceeding to betray him after countless benefactions. Yet, though the Lord knew all these things, he still performed the washing,¹¹⁸ thereby laying down laws for us that, even if we might be of higher status than all, even if more illustrious and famous than all, even if those who turn to us for shelter are the worst of all, we might not for this reason flee from serving them, nor be ashamed of their poverty.

After all, woman, if you see a man who helps you with your daily business, or takes your side in court or any other matter like this, you make a point of meeting him, you receive him with great goodwill, you kiss his hands, pay him money, and do things that are suited to slave girls. But if you see¹¹⁹ Christ approaching, you hesitate and shrink back from the prospect of serving him? If you don't receive the stranger as Christ, then don't receive him; but if you do receive him as Christ, then don't be ashamed to wash his feet.

Don't you see how many people who've suffered some abuse have fled for refuge to the feet of statues?¹²⁰ This, despite the fact that the statue's material can't feel anything and the copper has no soul? But nonetheless, since these are images of the emperors, they expect to reap some benefit from their feet. But you aren't looking at feet that can't feel anything or a material that has no soul in it coming toward you, but an image that actually contains the Emperor inside it!¹²¹ Tell me, you don't run toward that person, or cling to their feet or serve them in any way? How is such behavior worthy of any excuse? Isn't it instead a matter of tremendous shame?

churches. For discussion, see Karl Shoemaker, *Sanctuary and Crime in the Middle Ages, 400–1500* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2011), 29–44.

121. On the human being bearing the image of the divine, see Gen 1:26–27 (καὶ ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον, κατ' εἰκόνα θεοῦ ἐποίησεν αὐτόν; cf. also Christ as the εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ in 2 Cor 4:4). John is here connecting that theologoumenon with his description of the person in need seeking help, who is Christ (cf. Matt 25:31–46). For further discussion of the εἰκὼν βασιλική ("imperial image") and God as the emperor of the universe in Chrysostom, see HT 55–64 (with further literature).

κοινωνεῖς φυσωμένη, καὶ πρὸς ἀλαζονείαν ἐπαιρομένη, καὶ τοῦ ξένου τὴν θεραπείαν αἰσχυνομένη. Τῷ διαβόλῳ δηλονότι· ἐκεῖνου γὰρ ἡ ὑπερφηφάνια νόσημα. Ἄν δὲ προσδράμῃς, ἐννόησον τίνα μιμῇ. Τὸν Δεσπότην τὸν σὸν, καὶ τὸ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ποιεῖς ἔργον. Ποία τοίνυν αἰσχύνῃ, ἢ ποῖον ὄνειδος τῷ Δεσπότη κοινωεῖν, εἰπέ μοι; Αἰσχύνῃ μὲν οὖν τὸ ταῦτα ἐπαισχύνεσθαι, καὶ νομίζειν ὄνειδος εἶναι, ὅπερ ἐποίησεν ὁ Χριστός.

Μεγάλα δύνανται πόδες ἀγίων εἰς οἰκίαν εἰσιόντες· αὐτὸ τὸ ἔδαφος ἀγιάζουσι, θησαυρὸν μυρίων εἰσάγουσιν ἀγαθῶν, φύσιν πεπηρωμένην διορθοῦνται, λιμὸν λύουσι, πολλὴν εἰσάγουσι τὴν εὐπορίαν. Οὕτω καὶ οἱ πόδες τοῦ Ἡλίου εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν τῆς χάριτος εἰς-[334]ελθόντες καινὸν τινα καὶ παράδοξον εὐετηρίας ἐπεδείξαντο τρόπον. Ἄρουραν τὴν οἰκίαν τῆς χάριτος ἐποίησε, καὶ τὴν ὑδρίαν ἄλωνα. Καινός τις τρόπος σπόρου καὶ ἀμητοῦ ἐγένετο τότε· ἔσπειρεν εἰς τὸ τοῦ δικαίου στόμα, καὶ τὰ καταβληθέντα μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς ἀφθονίας ἐκ τῆς ὑδρίας ἐθέριζεν· ἔσπειρεν ἄλευρον, καὶ ἐθέριζεν ἄλευρον· οὐκ ἐδεήθη βοῶν, καὶ ζεύγους, καὶ ἀρότρου, καὶ αὐλακος, οὐδὲ ὑετοῦ καὶ ἀέρος καὶ δρεπάνης, οὐδὲ ἄλωνος καὶ δραγμάτων, οὐδὲ ἀνέμων διακρινόντων ἀπὸ τοῦ καρποῦ τὰ ἄχυρα, οὐδὲ μύλης τριβούσης· ἀλλὰ ἐν μιᾷ καιροῦ ῥοπῇ τούτων ἀπάντων τὸ τέλος εὗρεν ἐπὶ τῆς ὑδρίας· καὶ δύο πηγὰς, τὴν μὲν ἀλεύρου, τὴν δὲ ἐλαίου διηνεκῶς ἀνῆκεν ἡ τοῦ προφήτου φωνή.

ιδ'. Τοιαῦτα τῶν ἀγίων τὰ δῶρα, καὶ δαψίλειαν καὶ εὐκολίαν ἔχει πολλήν. Τὰ μὲν γὰρ ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς δρεπόμενα δαπανᾶται, ἐκεῖνα δὲ αἱ πηγαὶ ἀντλούμεναι καθημέραν οὐκ ἐκενώθησαν, ἀλλ' ἦν ἰσοστάσιος πρὸς τὴν ἐκκένωσιν τῆς ἐπιρροῆς ἡ μάχη. Τοιαῦτα χαρίζονται πόδες ἀγίων, μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ πολλῷ πλείονα τούτων· καὶ εἰ μὴ μακρὸν ἐποιοῦν τὸν λόγον, πολλὰς ἂν ἀπηριθμησάμην τοιαύτας δωρεάς.

Ἄλλ' ὥσπερ τιμώμενοι τοιαῦτα φέρουσι δῶρα, οὕτως ἀτιμαζόμενοι μεγάλην ἐπάγουσι κόλασιν καὶ πῦρ ἀπαραίτητον. Πόθεν τοῦτο δῆλον; Ἀκουσον αὐτοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ λέγοντος τοῖς μαθηταῖς· Εἰς ἣν ἂν πόλιν ἢ οἰκίαν

122. On Satan's fall being due to arrogance, see Isa 14:12–20; cf. 2 Thess 2:4; 1 Tim 3:6. Chrysostom makes this same point in *Hom. 1 Cor.* 13.4 (PG 61:496): ὑπερφηφάνιαν, τὴν μητέρα τῶν κακῶν, ἣ καὶ τὸν διάβολον ἐποίησεν εἶναι διάβολον, οὐκ ὄντα τοιοῦτον ἔμπροσθεν (“arrogance, the mother of evils, which even made the devil become the devil, though he was not that previously”).

123. ὑδρία means not only a water jar but any vessel; it is used of the container in which the widow has the flour in 3 Kgdms 17:12.

124. In his embellishment of the biblical story, John contends that a whole new form of agriculture was achieved in that episode, one that circumvented the usual routines of nature and horticulture.

When you're puffed up, exalt yourself in boastfulness, and are ashamed of serving the stranger, consider whose partner you are—the devil, clearly, for arrogance was his malady.¹²² But consider whom you are imitating if you run toward the stranger: it is your Lord, and it is Christ's work that you are doing. Tell me, what kind of shame or what sort of disgrace is it to be a partner of the Lord? Instead, what is shameful is being ashamed of these things and considering actions that Christ performed to be a disgrace.

The feet of the saints are able to do great things when they enter a house. They sanctify its very foundation, they bring in a treasury of countless good things, they correct an incapacitated nature, they put an end to famine, they bring in great prosperity. Thus it was that the feet of Elijah, having entered the house of the widow, [334] showed forth a new and amazing form of agricultural bounty. He made the widow's house a fertile plot and her flour jar¹²³ a threshing floor. A new type of sowing and reaping came into being at that moment.¹²⁴ The widow sowed into the mouth of the righteous man, and from her jar she was reaping with great abundance the fruit of what she had sown. She sowed flour, and she reaped flour. She had no need of cows and a team of oxen, or a plow and furrows; nor of rain, air, and the sickle;¹²⁵ nor of a threshing floor and cut stalks of grain; nor winds to separate the wheat from the chaff; nor a millstone to grind it. But in one single moment of time, she found the culmination of all these steps in her flour jar. The voice of the prophet¹²⁶ released two fountains, one of flour and one of oil, without ceasing.

14. These are the gifts of the saints, and they hold great abundance and satisfaction. Things that are harvested from the earth are expended, whereas the fountains Elijah provided were drawn from daily and yet never emptied; the contestation between pouring out and emptying out was held in equilibrium. The feet of the saints give such gifts as these and even far greater ones than these. If it wouldn't make my homily too long, I would enumerate many benefactions such as these.

However, just as the saints give such gifts when they are honored, so when dishonored, they bring great punishment and an inexorable fire. From where is this clearly shown? Hear Christ himself saying to the disci-

125. Chrysostom often dilates on the sequential elements of the farmer's work from start to finish. See also in this volume, e.g., *Hom. Rom.* 5:3 §1 (PG 51:155–56); *Hom. Rom.* 16:3 A §5 (PG 51:194); *Hom. 1 Cor.* 10:1–11 §5 (PG 51:249).

126. Sc. the prophetic word in 3 Kgdms 17:14.

εἰσέλθῃτε, ἐρωτήσατε τίς ἄξιός ἐστιν ἐν αὐτῇ, κακεῖ μέναιτε, καὶ εἰσερχόμενοι λέγετε· Εἰρήνη τῇ οἰκίᾳ ταύτῃ. Ἵνα γὰρ μὴ λέγῃς, Δαπανῶ τὰ χρήματα, ἀναλίσκω τὴν οὐσίαν, τράπεζαν παρατιθεῖσα τοῖς ξένοις, αὐτὸν πρότερον τὸν εἰσιόντα παρασκευάζει σοι κομίσαι ξένια καὶ δῶρα πᾶσαν ὑπερβαίνοντα περιουσίαν. Ποῖα δὲ ταῦτα; Τῆς εἰρήνης τὴν χορηγίαν. Ταύτης γὰρ ἴσον οὐδέν. Ὅρᾳς μεθ' ὅσης εὐπορίας ὁ ἅγιος εἰσέρχεται εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν; Τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο ψιλὸν μὲν ἐστι, μυρίων δὲ ἀγαθῶν ὑπόθεσις. Τί γὰρ ἀσφαλέστερον οἰκίας γένοιτ' ἂν εἰρήνης ἀπολαύσεως; Εἰρήνην δὲ ἐπεύχονται οἱ ἅγιοι τοῖς ὑποδεχομένοις, οὐ τὴν πρὸς ἀλλήλους μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν πρὸς ἡμᾶς αὐτοὺς. Πολλάκις γοῦν πόλεμον ἐν τοῖς λογισμοῖς ἔχομεν, καὶ μηδενὸς ἐνοχλοῦντος ταραττόμεθα, καὶ ἐπιθυμίαι πονηραὶ συνεχῶς ἡμῖν ἐπανίστανται. Καὶ ταύτην οὖν καταστέλλει τὴν μάχην ἐκεῖνο τῶν ἀγίων τὸ ῥῆμα, καὶ πολλὴν ἔνδον ποιεῖ γαλήνην. Ὅμοῦ τε γὰρ ἐκεῖνος ἐφθέγγατο, καὶ πᾶσα ἐνθύμησις διαβολικὴ καὶ λογισμὸς ἄτοπος ἐδραπέτευσεν ἐκ τῆς ἡμετέρας ψυχῆς· ὥστε μείζονα λαμβάνεις ἢ δίδως.

Κὰν μὲν δέξωνται, φησὶν, ὑμᾶς, ἐλθέτω ἡ εἰρήνη ἐπ' αὐτοὺς· ἐὰν δὲ μὴ δέξωνται, ἐκτινάξατε τὸν κοινορτὸν τῶν ποδῶν ὑμῶν. Ἀμὴν, λέγω ὑμῖν, ἀνεκτότερον ἔσται γῇ Σοδόμων καὶ Γομόρρας ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ, ἢ τῇ πόλει ἐκείνῃ. Ὅρᾳς ὅτι ἀτιμαζόμενοι πόδες ἀγίων πόσον ἐπάγουσι πῦρ; Διὰ τοῦτο κελεύει νίπτειν αὐτοὺς, ἵνα θεραπευόμενοι πολλὴν ἡμῖν προξενήσωσι παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ τὴν παρρησίαν· ὁμοῦ δὲ καὶ ἐκεῖνο διὰ ταύτης ἡμᾶς παιδεύει τῆς παραινέσεως, τὰ τῆς φιλοξενίας ἔργα δι' ἐαυτῶν ἅπαντα ἐπιτελεῖν. Μίμησαι τὸν Ἀβραάμ, γενοῦ θυγάτηρ ἐκείνου, ὃς τριακοσίους δέκα καὶ ὀκτὼ ἔχων οἰκογενεῖς, αὐτὸς μετὰ τῆς γυναικὸς διενείματο τῆς φιλοξενίας τὸν [335] καρπὸν· καὶ ὁ μὲν δάμαλιν ἔφερον, ἡ δὲ ἐφύρασεν ἄλευρον. Τούτους καὶ σὺ ζήλωσον· οὐ γὰρ τὸ δοῦναι χρήματα μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ διακονῆσαι τοῖς δεομένοις πολὺν ἔχει τὸν μισθόν. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ οἱ ἀπόστολοι τοὺς ἐπτά ἐκείνους τοὺς περὶ Στέφανον ἐπέστησαν τῇ τοιαύτῃ διακονίᾳ. Καίτοι γε

127. A strategic harmonization and partial paraphrase of the two Synoptic accounts. After beginning with Matt 10:11a, Chrysostom switches to Luke to take οἰκίαν (to adjust the text to his beginning exemplum of Elijah entering the house of the woman at Zarephath) for Matthew's κώμην. Then he returns to Matthew for 10:11b, with ἐρωτήσατε for ἐξετάσατε τίς and transposition of ἐν αὐτῇ ἄξιός ἐστιν to ἄξιός ἐστιν ἐν αὐτῇ; Matt 10:11c (ἕως ἂν ἐξέλθῃτε) is ellipsed (as marked in the translation). Then he turns back to Luke 10:5 for λέγετε, εἰρήνη, but with τῇ οἰκίᾳ ταύτῃ (cf. Matt 10:12–13) for Luke's τῷ οἴκῳ τούτῳ. Much of this may have been spontaneous and from memory.

128. John refers both to the entity of peace and to the form of the blessing, εἰρήνη.

ples, “*Into whatever city or house you enter, ask who is worthy in it, and stay there.... And when you enter, say, ‘Peace be to this house’*” (Matt 10:11–12; Luke 10:5).¹²⁷ Lest you say, “I am spending money, I am using up all my income in laying out food for strangers,” Christ established that the person who enters the house first brings you hospitality gifts and presents that more than make up the surplus. What are these gifts? The provision of peace. There is no equal gift. Do you see with what abundance the saint enters into the house? It is a mere word,¹²⁸ and yet the basis for countless goods. After all, what could be more secure than a house enjoying peace? The saints pray for peace for those who welcome them, and not only peace with one another, but peace with our own selves. Oftentimes we are at war in our internal thoughts, and even without anyone troubling us, we’re perturbed, and wicked desires continually rise up within us. That word uttered by the saints represses this war and renders a great calm within. At the very moment the saint pronounced it, every devilish desire and improper thought escaped from our soul. As a result, you receive more than you give.

And “*If they receive you,*” he says, “*Let peace come upon them; but if they do not receive you, shake the dust from your feet. Amen, I say to you, it will be easier in the land of Sodom and Gomorrah on that day than in that city*” (Matt 10:13–15; cf. Luke 10:10–12).¹²⁹ Do you see what a powerful fire the feet of the saints bring on when they’re dishonored? The reason Paul commands us to wash their feet (cf. 1 Tim 5:10) is so that in serving them we might procure for ourselves¹³⁰ strong confidence before God. And at the same time, he teaches us by this piece of advice to carry out all the hospitable actions by our own hand. Imitate Abraham, become his daughter! Abraham, despite having three hundred and eighteen household slaves, distributed the fruits of hospitality between his wife and himself. [335] He brought the calf, and she kneaded¹³¹ the flour. You, then, imitate them! For it’s not only giving money, but also serving those in need that gains a sizable reward. That’s why the apostles set the seven men who were with Stephen over this ministry of service (cf. Acts 6:1–6). Although

129. Once again, a harmonization and paraphrase, combined with partial exact quotation. John starts (apparently) with Luke 10:8, reading *καὶ μὲν δέξονται ὑμᾶς* for *καὶ δέχονται ὑμᾶς*; he then turns to Matt 10:13b, but minus *ὑμῶν* after *ἡ εἰρήνη*; Matt 10:14a, with *ἐὰν δὲ μὴ δέξονται* for *ὅς ἐὰν μὴ δέξηται* (cf. Luke 10:10, *καὶ μὴ δέχονται*); Matt 10:15, plus *ἐν* before *ἡμέρα*.

130. *προξενεῖν*: a wordplay with the theme of *ξενία*, “hospitality.”

131. Mf notes that two of his manuscripts read *ἐφύρεν* for *ἐφύρασεν*.

οὐδὲν οἴκοθεν ἐκεῖνοι παρεῖχον τοῖς πένησιν, ἀλλὰ τὰ παρ' ἐτέρων διδόμενα ὠκονόμουν καλῶς· ἀλλ' ὅμως μέγαν ἀπηνέγκαντο τὸν μισθόν, ὅτι τὰ παρ' ἐτέρων διδόμενα καλῶς καὶ μετὰ ἀκριβείας ὠκονόμουν ἀπάσης.

ιε'. Γενοῦ τοίνυν καὶ σὺ τῶν σαυτοῦ καλὸς οἰκονόμος, ἵνα διπλοῦν λάβῃς τὸν καρπὸν, καὶ τοῦ δοῦναι, καὶ τοῦ καλῶς οἰκονομῆσαι. Μὴ ἐπαισχυνθῇς διὰ τῆς σαυτοῦ χειρὸς θεραπεῦσαι τὸν πένητα. Ὁ Χριστὸς οὐκ ἐπαισχύνεται χεῖρα ἐκτείνειν καὶ λαβεῖν διὰ τοῦ πένητος, καὶ σὺ χεῖρα ἐκτείνειν καὶ δοῦναι ἀργύριον ἐπαισχύνη; Καὶ πῶς τοῦτο οὐκ ἐσχάτης ἀνοίας; Ἐν μόνον ἐστὶν αἰσχύνη, πονηρία καὶ ὠμότης καὶ ἀπανθρωπία· φιλοφροσύνη δὲ καὶ ἐλεημοσύνη καὶ φιλανθρωπία καὶ τὸ διακονεῖσθαι τοῖς δεομένοις λαμπροτέρους ἡμᾶς ἐργάζεται. Ὅσον γὰρ ἂν ᾖ πλουσία καὶ εὐπορος, τοσοῦτον ἐπαινέσονται σε πάντες, ὅταν πρὸς τοὺς πτωχοὺς καὶ εὐτελεῖς καταβαίνης, οὐκ ἄνθρωποι δὲ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἄγγελοι, καὶ ὁ τῶν ἀγγέλων Δεσπότης· οὐκ ἐπαινέσεται δὲ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀμείψεται διπλαῖς δωρεαῖς. Οὐ γὰρ τῆς ἐλεημοσύνης μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς ταπεινοφροσύνης πολλοὺς σοὶ παρασκευάσει τοὺς μισθοὺς. Μὴ τοίνυν ἐπαισχυνώμεθα ταῖς τῶν πενήτων θεραπείαις, μηδὲ παραιτώμεθα νίπτειν τῶν ξένων τοὺς πόδας· ἀγιάζονται γὰρ ἡμῶν αἱ χεῖρες διὰ τῆς τοιαύτης διακονίας· καὶ εἰς εὐχὴν αὐτὰς ἀνατείνης ἀπὸ τῆς θεραπείας ἐκείνης, ὅρῳ αὐτὰς ὁ Θεὸς δυσωπεῖται μᾶλλον, καὶ τὴν αἴτησιν δίδωσι. Τὸ μὲν γὰρ χρήματα δοῦναι, πολλῶν ἂν εἴη· τὸ δὲ δι' ἑαυτῶν θεραπεῦσαι τοὺς δεομένους καὶ μετὰ προθυμίας τοῦτο ποιῆσαι καὶ ἀγάπης καὶ φιλαδελφίας, πολλῆς καὶ μεγάλης δεῖται ψυχῆς καὶ φιλοσόφου. Καὶ τοῦτο ἐστίν, ὃ μάλιστα πάντων ὁ Παῦλος ἐπιζητεῖ, τοῖς ἐν θλίψει καὶ πενίᾳ καὶ περιστάσεσιν οὕτω κελεύων συναλγεῖν, ὡς ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῖς ὄντας δεινοῖς. Τοῖς γὰρ δεσμίοις, φησὶν, ὡς συνδεδεμένοι.

Διόπερ οὐδὲ ἐνταῦθα τὸν λόγον ἔστησε μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἕτερον ἐπήγαγεν· Εἰ θλιβομένοις ἐπήρκεσεν, εἰ παντὶ ἔργῳ ἀγαθῷ ἐπηκολούθησε. Τί ἐστίν· Εἰ παντὶ ἔργῳ ἀγαθῷ ἐπηκολούθησεν; Ὡστε καὶ εἰς δεσμωτήριον εἰσιέναι, καὶ τοὺς δεδεμένους ἐπισκέπτεσθαι, καὶ ἀρρωστοῦντας ἐπισκοπεῖν, καὶ θλιβομένους παραμυθεῖσθαι, καὶ ὀδυνωμένους παρακαλεῖν, καὶ πάντα τρόπον τὰ κατὰ δύναμιν εἰσφέρειν ἅπαντα, καὶ μηδὲν ὅλως παραιτεῖσθαι τῶν εἰς

132. The adjective *πλουσία* makes it clear that John is now addressing a woman (returning to the lemma).

133. Cf. 1 Tim 2:8–9.

134. Paraphrasing with *τοῖς δεσμίοις* for *μιμνήσκεσθε τῶν δεσμίων*.

they didn't provide for the poor themselves, they did manage well what had been given by others. And all the same, they received a great reward, because they managed well and with detailed attention the things that had been given by others.

15. So then, you in turn be a good manager of what's yours, so you might receive a double portion of the fruits—those that come both from giving and from managing well. Don't be ashamed to serve the poor person with your own hands. Christ isn't ashamed to extend his hand and receive aid in the person of the poor (cf. Matt 25:40), and you're ashamed to extend your hand and give money? How is this not the height of folly? Shame consists in one thing only: wickedness, callousness, and disdain for our fellow human beings. And what makes us more illustrious is kindness, almsgiving, love for our fellow human beings, and serving those in need by our own hand. For inasmuch as you are rich and prosperous,¹³² all—not only humans but also angels and the Lord of the angels!—will praise you when you stoop down to assist the poor and destitute. The Lord will not only praise you but also give you a double recompense. He'll provide you with abundant rewards, not only for your almsgiving, but also for your humility. So then, let's not be ashamed of serving the poor, nor beg off from washing the feet of strangers. For our hands are sanctified by service such as this. And if you extend your hands to offer a prayer¹³³ after providing this service, on seeing your hands God will be all the more susceptible to your entreaty and grant your request. Many people have the ability to give money; but one must have a magnanimous and wise soul to serve those in need eagerly with one's own hands and to do it with love and devotion for the other. This is what Paul seeks above all; that's why he commands us to share in the suffering of those in affliction, poverty, and hardships as though we were in the very same terrible circumstances. For he says, "*as though sharing the bonds of those imprisoned*" (Heb 13:3).¹³⁴

That's why Paul doesn't stop here¹³⁵ with a single statement, but he adds another, "*if she helped the afflicted, if she attended to every good work*" (1 Tim 5:10). What does "*if she attended to every good work*" mean? That she entered into prison, visited those who were bound in chains, looked after the sick, consoled the afflicted, comforted the grieving, and offered in every way all that was in her power, and held back absolutely nothing she

135. By the transition in the previous sentence, Chrysostom now returns to the lemma, 1 Tim 5:9–10, and the next clause.

σωτηρίαν καὶ ἀνάπαυσιν τῶν ἀδελφῶν γινομένων τῶν ἡμετέρων. Εἰ δὲ χήραν γυναῖκα τοσαῦτα ἀπαιτεῖ κατορθώματα, τίνος ἂν εἶημεν ἀπολογίας ἄξιοι οἱ ἄνδρες ἡμεῖς ταῦτα μὴ ποιοῦντες, ἃ γυναῖκας χήρας ποιεῖν ἐνομοθέτησεν ὁ Παῦλος;

Ἄλλ' ἴσως ἂν εἴποι τις· Καὶ πῶς χήραν γυναῖκα τοσαύτην ἀπαιτεῖ ἀκρίβειαν, ὅτε δὲ περὶ παρθενίας ἐπέστελλεν, οὐδὲν διελέχθη τοιοῦτον; Πλείονα μὲν τούτων φιλοσοφίαν αὐτὰς ἀπήτησεν. Ὅταν γὰρ εἴπῃ· Μεμέρισται ἡ γυνὴ καὶ ἡ παρθένος, καί· Ἡ ἄγαμος μεριμνᾷ [336] τὰ τοῦ Κυρίου, πῶς ἀρέσει τῷ Κυρίῳ, καὶ πάλιν· Τοῦτο δὲ λέγω διὰ τὸ εὐσχημον καὶ εὐπρόσεδρον τῷ Κυρίῳ ἀπερισπάστως· οὐδὲν ἄλλο διὰ τούτων αἰνίττεται τῶν ῥημάτων ἀλλ' ἢ ὅτι τῶν βιωτικῶν ἀπάντων πραγμάτων καθάπαξ ἑαυτὴν ἀπορρήξασαν τὴν παρθένον ὁλόκληρον ἀναθεῖναι δεῖ τῷ Θεῷ τὴν ψυχὴν καὶ μηδὲν πρὸς τὴν γῆν ἔχειν κοινόν, μηδὲ ποτὲ μὲν τούτοις, ποτὲ δὲ ἐκείνοις σχολάζειν, ἀλλὰ καθόλου τούτοις ἀποταξαμένην, ὅλην εἰς τὰ πνευματικὰ πράγματα ἀναλίσκειν τὴν σχολήν. Καὶ ἡ παραβολὴ δὲ τῶν δέκα παρθένων αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἐδήλωσεν ἡμῖν. Διὰ τοῦτο γοῦν ἀπεκλείσθησαν τοῦ νυμφῶνος, ὅτι ἔλαιον οὐκ εἶχον· ἔλαιον δὲ οὐδὲν ἕτερόν ἐστιν, ἀλλ' ἡ φιλανθρωπία καὶ ἐλεημοσύνη καὶ φιλοφροσύνη καὶ προστασία τῶν ἀδικουμένων καὶ παράκλησις τῶν ὀδυνωμένων· ὅπερ οὐκ ἔχουσαι ἀπῆλθον ἐκεῖναι, καὶ τοῦ νυμφῶνος ἐξέπεσον.

ἰς'. Ταῦτ' οὖν εἰδότες ἅπαντα, καὶ γυναῖκες, καὶ ἄνδρες, καὶ παρθένοι, καὶ γεγαμημένοι, καὶ χῆραι, πολλὴν τῆς ἐλεημοσύνης ποιῶμεθα σπουδὴν· καὶ μὴ λέγωμεν, ὅτι ὁ δεῖνα πονηρὸς καὶ οὐκ ἄξιος εὖ παθεῖν, ὁ δεῖνα εὐτελής, ὁ δεῖνα ἀπερριμμένος. Μὴ πρὸς τὴν ἀξίαν ἴδῃς τοῦ δεομένου τῆς θεραπείας, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὴν χρεῖαν μόνον. Κἂν γὰρ εὐτελής ᾖ καὶ ἀπερριμμένος, κἂν εὐκαταφρόνητος, ὁ Χριστὸς οὕτω σοι λογιζέται τὸν μισθόν, ὥς αὐτὸς εὖ παθὼν δι' ἐκείνου. Ἵνα γὰρ μὴ πρὸς τὴν ἀξίαν βλέπωμεν τῶν εὐεργετουμένων, ἄκουσον τί

136. See p. 615 n. 105 above on this comparative trope, using women to shame the men.

137. περὶ παρθενίας; cf. περὶ δὲ τῶν παρθένων (1 Cor 7:25).

138. Once again, a possible "problem" of reconciling one Paul, or Pauline statement (1 Cor 7), with another (1 Tim 5), phrased by a hypothetical interlocutor.

139. φιλοσοφία here, comprising the life, practices, and commitments of the ascetic life (PGL B.4–5).

140. Minus καί after μεμέρισται (note that Chrysostom seems to construe the grammar of 1 Cor 7:33–34 according to the punctuation in \mathfrak{W} , per RP, and not NA²⁸).

141. Chrysostom has conflated 7:34 (about the unmarried woman, ἡ ἄγαμος) with 7:32, of the unmarried man (ὁ ἄγαμος).

142. Much compressed, even if some words are quoted. Ellipsis of πρὸς τὸ ... συμφέρον; ellipsis of οὐκ ἵνα ... ἐπιβάλω; with διὰ τό for πρὸς τό before εὐσχημον.

owned that contributes to the salvation and restoration of our brothers and sisters. If Paul requires such virtuous deeds from a widow—a woman¹³⁶—what self-defense would we men have if we don't do the things that Paul legislated for widowed women to do?

But perhaps someone would say, "How is it that he requires such exacting service of a widowed woman, but when he was writing about virginity (cf. 1 Cor 7:25–40)¹³⁷ he said no such thing?"¹³⁸ Actually, he demanded an even more rigorous ascetic lifestyle¹³⁹ from the virgins. For he said, "*The wife and the virgin have been divided*" (1 Cor 7:34),¹⁴⁰ and "*The unmarried woman*" "*worries about [336] the things of the Lord, how she will please the Lord*" (1 Cor 7:34, 32),¹⁴¹ and again, "*I say this ... for the sake of good conduct and undistracted devotion to the Lord*" (1 Cor 7:35).¹⁴² Paul is signaling¹⁴³ nothing else by these statements than that, having cut herself off once and for all from all matters of everyday life, the virgin should dedicate her life completely to God and have nothing to do with things of the earth. Nor should she devote herself sometimes to them and sometimes to other things,¹⁴⁴ but, having completely said goodbye to the former, she should spend her full devotion on spiritual matters. The parable of the ten virgins (Matt 25:1–13) shows this to us very clearly. The reason they were shut out from the bridal chamber was that they didn't have oil. "Oil" is nothing other than love for others, almsgiving, kindness, advocacy for the maltreated, and comfort for the grieving. It was because those virgins didn't have these things that they went away and fell short of entering the bridal chamber.

16. So now, knowing all these things—wives, husbands, virgins, married women, and widows—let's all exert great zeal for almsgiving. And let's not say, "So-and-so is wicked and not worthy of being treated well"; "so-and-so is base"; "so-and-so is an outcast." Don't look at the worthiness of the person in need of your service but at the need alone. For even if a person is base and an outcast, even if despicable, Christ reckons the reward to you as if he himself were the one well treated in place of the other. Listen to what Christ said so we wouldn't focus our eye on the worthiness of those who receive our benefactions: "You saw me hungry, and you fed me" (cf.

143. αινίττεσθαι, "hinting," one of the terms for allegorical or figurative interpretation. Here, John is denying that Paul was allegorizing or pointing to a meaning different from the plain sense. Next he will offer an allegorical interpretation of the oil in Jesus's parable of the ten virgins.

144. Sc. τὰ τοῦ Κυρίου ("the things of the Lord").

φησι· Πεινῶντά με εἶδετε, καὶ ἐθρέψατε. Εἴτα ἐκείνων λεγόντων· Πότε σε εἶδομεν πεινῶντα, καὶ ἐθρέψαμεν; ἐπήγαγε λέγων· Ἐφ' ὅσον ἐποιήσατε ἐνὶ τῶν μικρῶν τούτων, ἐμοὶ ἐποιήσατε· ὥστε οὐδεμία ἡμῖν καταλέλειπται πρόφασις. Ἵνα γὰρ μὴ λέγωμεν, ὅτι Ποῦ νῦν κατὰ τὸν Ἥλιον εὐρεῖν; ποῦ δὲ κατὰ τὸν Ἐλισσαῖον; καὶ, Δὸς μοι τοιούτους ἄνδρας, καὶ μετὰ πάσης αὐτοὺς ὑποδέξομαι τῆς προθυμίας, καὶ οὐ παραιτήσομαι νίψαι τοὺς πόδας καὶ παντὶ θεραπεῦσαι τρόπῳ· Ἵνα μὴ ταῦτα λέγωμεν, ὃ πολλῶ μείζον ἐστίν, αὐτὸς ὁ τοῦ Ἥλιου καὶ τοῦ Ἐλισσαίου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν Δεσπότης ἀπάντων διὰ τῶν πενήτων ὑπέσχετο πρὸς ἡμᾶς εἰσιέναι, λέγων· Ἐφ' ὅσον ἐποιήσατε ἐνὶ τούτων τῶν μικρῶν, ἐμοὶ ἐποιήσατε.

Ἀλλὰ μὴ παραδράμῃς τὸ εἰρημένον. Τὸ γὰρ, Πεινῶντά με εἶδετε καὶ ἐθρέψατε, τέσσαρας ἀνάγκας ἐφίστησιν ἐλεημοσύνης· τὸ ἀξιόπιστον τοῦ αἰτοῦντος, ὅτι Δεσπότης ἐστὶν ὁ αἰτῶν· τὸ ἀναγκαῖον τῆς χρείας, ὅτι πεινᾷ· τὸ εὐκολον τῆς δόσεως, ὅτι τραφῆναι ζητεῖ καὶ ἄρτον αἰτεῖ μόνον, οὐχὶ τρυφήν· τὸ μέγεθος τῆς δωρεᾶς, ὅτι βασιλείαν ἀντὶ τούτων τῶν μικρῶν ἐπαγγέλλεται. Ἀπάνθρωπος εἶ καὶ ὠμὸς καὶ ἀνηλεής; Αἰδέσθητι, φησὶ, τὸ ἀξίωμα τοῦ αἰτοῦντος. Ἄλλ' οὐ δυσωπεῖ σε τὸ ἀξίωμα; Πρὸς τὴν συμφορὰν ἐπικάμψθητι. Ἄλλ' οὔτε τὰ τῆς συμφορᾶς εἰς ἑλέον σε ἐπικάμπτει; Διὰ τὸ τῆς αἰτήσεως εὐκολον δός. Οὔτε τὸ ἀξίωμα, οὔτε τὸ ἀναγκαῖον τῆς χρείας, οὔτε τὸ εὐκολον τῆς δόσεως δύναται σε πείσαι; Οὐκοῦν διὰ τὸ μέγεθος τῶν ἐπηγγελμένων ἀγαθῶν παράσχες [337] τῷ δεομένῳ. Ὅρᾳς τέσσαρας αἰτίας δυναμένας καὶ τὸν λίθον αὐτὸν, καὶ τὸν μικρολόγον, καὶ τὸν τετυφωμένον, καὶ τὸν ἀνηλεῆ, καὶ τὸν νωθρότατον ἀπάντων ἀνθρώπων διαναστῆσαι; Τίς οὖν ἔσται συγγνώμη τοῖς μετὰ τοσαύτην παραίνεσιν καὶ συμβουλὴν τῶν δεομένων ὑπερορῶσιν;

Εἶπω δὴ καὶ ἕτερον πρὸς τούτοις· ἀκουέτωσαν οἱ μεμνημένοι. Αὐτὸς, ὅταν δέῃ σε θρέψαι, οὐδὲ τῆς σαρκὸς φείδεται τῆς ἑαυτοῦ· ὅταν δέῃ σε ποτίσαι, οὐδὲ τοῦ αἵματος φείδεται, οὐδὲ φθονεῖ· σὺ δὲ οὐδὲ ἄρτου μεταδίδως, οὐδὲ

145. John has rephrased ἐπέινασα γὰρ καὶ ἐδώκατέ μοι φαγεῖν in Matt 25:35 in light of the question in 25:37: πότε σε εἶδομεν πεινῶντα καὶ ἐθρέψαμεν;

146. With τῶν μικρῶν τούτων (cf. Matt 10:42; 18:6, 10, 14) for τούτων τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου τῶν ἐλαχίστων after ἐνί.

147. The text form is the same as in the previous quotation, except τούτων τῶν μικρῶν where earlier he read τῶν μικρῶν τούτων.

148. Not a quotation, but a paraphrase, recast as a first-person statement by Christ (cf. Matt 25:35).

149. δωρεά, here a double entendre, referring to the benefaction and the rewards it will ensure.

Matt 25:35).¹⁴⁵ Then, when they said, “*When did we see you hungry and feed you?*” (Matt 25:37), he added, saying, “*In as much as you did this for one of these little ones, you did it for me*” (Matt 25:40).¹⁴⁶ Hence, no excuse is left for us. This was so we wouldn’t say, “Where can one find a person like Elijah nowadays? Where one like Elisha? Give me men like them, and I’ll welcome them with great eagerness and won’t beg off from washing their feet and serving them in every way.” To keep us from saying these things, there’s something even more wonderful: the very Lord of Elijah and Elisha and all the prophets promised to come to our homes in the persons of the poor, when he said, “*In as much as you did this for one of these little ones, you did it for me*” (Matt 25:40).¹⁴⁷

Now don’t run too fast by this statement, because “you saw me hungry, and you fed me” (cf. Matt 25:37)¹⁴⁸ establishes four compulsory reasons for almsgiving: (1) the prestige and honor of the one who asks (because it is the Lord who asks); (2) the pressing need (because he’s hungry); (3) the ease of giving (because he seeks to be fed and asks only for bread and not luxuries); (4) the magnitude of the gift¹⁴⁹ (because it promises the Kingdom¹⁵⁰ in return for small actions). Are you hateful, cruel, and unmerciful? “Respect the honorable state of the one who asks,” he says. But his honorable state doesn’t shame you¹⁵¹ into it? Then be moved by his misfortune. But not even the circumstances of his misfortune move you to mercy? Give because his request is easy. Neither the honorable stature, nor the pressing need, nor the ease of giving is able to persuade you? Well, then, provide for the one who is in need because of the magnitude of goods it promises. [337] Do you see that there are four reasons that can stir even the person with a stone heart, the tightwad, the haughty, the merciless, the most slothful of all people? What pardon will be given to people who, after they’ve received such advice and counsel,¹⁵² disdain those who are in need?

And let me say something else to them. Let those who are initiated listen up! Christ himself, when he asks you to feed him, doesn’t even spare his own flesh. When he asks you to give him drink, he doesn’t even spare

150. The kingdom of heaven, per Matt 25:34.

151. The PE editors emended Mf’s text to *δυσωπεῖ* for *δυσωπεῖσαι* (presumably for *δυσωπήσαι*, “But might his stature not shame you to do it?”). They noted that HS had a marginal note with the conjectural reading *δυσωπεῖ*, which was later confirmed by Paris. gr. 748 (one of not infrequent instances where HS’s keen text-critical intuition was displayed). JPM (as usual) presents this as his own discovery and emendation.

152. I.e., the texts of Matthew and 1 Timothy, and the four principles that Chrysostom has expounded from them.

ποτηρίου; Καὶ ποίαν ἔξεις συγγνώμην τοιαῦτα λαμβάνων, καὶ οὕτω τίμια, καὶ τῶν εὐτελῶν φειδόμενος; "Ορα μὴ πολλάκις φειδόμενος τῷ Χριστῷ δοῦναι ἐπὶ κέρδει, ὥς ἐπὶ βλάβῃ τῷ διαβόλῳ. "Όταν γὰρ πένησι μὴ δῶμεν, συκοφάνταις διδόμεν· κλέπται πολλάκις, ἢ καὶ οἰκέται κακοῦργοι λαμβάνοντες ἀπῆλθον, ἢ καὶ ἕτεραι πραγμάτων περιστάσεις. Καὶ ταῦτα δὲ ὅταν διαφύγωμεν ἅπαντα, θάνατος ἐπελθὼν γυμνὸν ἀπήγαγεν. "Ιν' οὖν μὴ ταῦτα γίνηται, προλαβόντες δῶμεν αἰτοῦντι τῷ Χριστῷ, καὶ εἰς τὸν ἄσυλον ἀποθώμεθα θησαυρὸν, ἵνα καὶ ὑπὲρ τῆς φυλακῆς καὶ ὑπὲρ τῆς προσόδου θαρρῶμεν. Οὐ γὰρ διατηρεῖ μόνον, ἅπερ ἔλαβε, μετὰ ἀκριβείας· ἀλλὰ μετὰ πλείονος [338] αὐτὰ ἀποδίδωσί σοι τῆς προσθήκης πάλιν. Μὴ τοίνυν νομίζωμεν ἡμῖν ἐλαττοῦσθαι τὴν οὐσίαν, ὅταν ἐλεημοσύνην παρέχωμεν. Οὐ γὰρ ἐλαττοῦται, ἀλλ' αὖξεται· οὐ δαπανᾶται, ἀλλὰ πλεονάζει, καὶ πραγματεία τίς ἐστι καὶ σπόρος τὸ γινόμενον· μᾶλλον δὲ ἀμφοτέρων τούτων κερδαλεώτερον καὶ ἀσφαλέστερον. Ἡ μὲν γὰρ ἐμπορία καὶ πνεύμασι καὶ κύμασι θαλάσσης ὑπόκειται καὶ ναυαγίοις πολλοῖς, καὶ τὰ σπέρματα καὶ αὐχμοῖς καὶ ἐπομβρίαις καὶ ἐτέραις ἀέρων ἀνωμαλίαις· τὰ δὲ εἰς τὴν χεῖρα τοῦ Χριστοῦ καταβαλλόμενα χρήματα ἀνώτερα πάσης ἐστὶν ἐπιβουλῆς. Οὐδεὶς δύναται ἀρπάζειν ἐκ τῆς χειρὸς τοῦ λαβόντος τὰ δοθέντα ἅπαξ· ἀλλὰ μένει πολὺν ἡμῖν καὶ ἄφατον ἐργαζόμενα τὸν καρπὸν, καὶ τὸν ἄμνητον ἐν καιρῷ φέροντα πλούσιον. Ὁ σπείρων γὰρ φειδομένως, φησὶ, φειδομένως καὶ θερίσει· καὶ ὁ σπείρων ἐπ' εὐλογίαις, ἐπ' εὐλογίαις καὶ θερίσει. Σπείρωμεν τοίνυν μετὰ δαφιλείας, ἵνα καὶ οὕτω θερίσωμεν, καὶ τῆς αἰωνίου ζωῆς ἀπολαύσωμεν· ἥς γένοιτο πάντας ἡμᾶς ἐπιτυχεῖν, χάριτι καὶ φιλανθρωπία τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, μεθ' οὗ τῷ Πατρὶ σὺν τῷ ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι δόξα, κράτος, τιμὴ, νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ, καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Ἀμήν.

or refuse giving his own blood. But you don't share either bread or cup? What sort of pardon will you have when you receive gifts of such quality and value, and yet you're sparing when it comes to things that are cheap? Watch out lest, by continually being sparing in gifts to Christ (the kind that confer benefit), you give to the devil (the kind that confer harm). For when we don't give to the poor, instead we give to con men. Often thieves or even wicked household slaves take things and run off with them, or other calamities take place in our business affairs. And even when we escape all these troubles, death comes and leads us away naked. So, to avoid these things happening, let's take the initiative to give to Christ when he asks, and let's place our deposit in a treasury that's inviolate, so we might have confidence both in its safekeeping and its return on investment. For Christ not only watches closely over what he's received, but he'll return it again to you with a giant surplus. [338] Let's not think that our net worth is lessened when we give alms, for it's not lessened, but it increases; it's not depleted, but it multiplies. It amounts to a business investment and a planting of seeds, or, rather, it's more gainful and more secure than both of these enterprises. For commercial business is subject to winds, waves at sea, and frequent shipwrecks, as are seeds to droughts, deluges, and other vagaries in the weather. But the things sown into the hand of Christ are beyond any harm. No one is able to snatch these donations from Christ's hand once he's received them, but they remain, generating a great and indescribable fruitful gain for us, and bringing forth a rich harvest in their appointed season. *"For the one who sows sparingly,"* he says, *"will also reap sparingly. And the one sowing bountifully will also reap bountifully"* (2 Cor 9:6).¹⁵³ So then, let's sow with abundance so that we might thus reap and enjoy eternal life, which may we all attain by the grace and loving-kindness of our Lord Jesus Christ, with whom be glory, power, and honor to the Father, together with the Holy Spirit, now and always, forever and ever. Amen.

153. Plus γάρ after (first) σπείρων.

ΟΜΙΛΙΑ Εἰς τὸ ἀποστολικὸν ῥητὸν τὸ λέγον, «Τοῦτο δὲ γινώσκετε,
ὅτι ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις ἔσονται καιροὶ χαλεποί.»

α'. [271] Ἀσθενὴς μὲν εἰμι καὶ πτωχὸς, καὶ διδασκαλικῶν ἄπειρος λόγων·
ἀλλ' ὅταν ἴδω τὸν ὑμέτερον σύλλογον, ἐπιλανθάνομαι τῆς ἀσθενείας, ἀγνοῶ
τὴν πτωχείαν, οὐκ οἶδα τὴν ἀπειρίαν· τοιαύτη γὰρ τῆς ὑμετέρας ἀγάπης ἡ
τυραννίς. Διὸ καὶ τῶν ἐν εὐπορίᾳ καθεστῶτων προθυμότερον ὑμῖν τὴν τῆς
πτωχείας παρατίθημι τράπεζαν. Ταύτης δὲ ὑμεῖς αἴτιοι τῆς μεγαλοψυχίας,
τῇ προθυμίᾳ τῆς ἀκρόασεως τοὺς ἀναπεπτωκότας διεγείροντες, πρὸς τὴν
ἀκρόασιν κεχρηνότες, καὶ τῆς τοῦ λέγοντος ἐκκρεμάμενοι γλώττης. Οὕτω

1. Provenance: Mf, who first published this homily, argued that while the opening reference to a recent illness doesn't help to date or place the work (because of John's frequent illnesses), the reference to his inexperience in giving sermons might be seen to point to Antioch (6:278; see discussion in Mayer, *Provenance*, 95). Mayer also notes that Stilting (the only other major figure who has treated the provenance of this homily) found Mf's argument persuasive and built on it to argue for an early date of 386, due also to the preacher's expression of gratitude for the audience's close attention (*Provenance*, 116, citing Stilting, *Acta Sanctorum Septembris IV*, 465). While one may not find the latter argument convincing, the reference to John's inexperience does seem to point more to Antioch. However, Mayer does not include this homily among those she judges of certain provenance, given the paucity of firm indices for either Antioch or Constantinople (*Provenance*, 95).

Text: Mf (1721), based upon his transcription of Vat. gr. 559 (X), fols. 98–105 (CCG 6.73, p. 79), as reprinted in PE (vol. 6, 1835), and then PG (vol. 56, 1859). Mf had made a handful of textual notes, two of which mark manuscript readings as *sic* and a third offering a conjectural emendation (that was not adopted in the text). The PE editors added a single note. (All are accounted for in the footnotes below.) Pinakes lists five manuscripts containing this homily, inclusive of Mf's Vatican codex; the others are one in Jerusalem (X), and three in Greece (X–XI).

2. With γινώσκετε for γίνωσκε, as throughout this homily and in *Hom. princ. Ac.* 3.4 (PG 51:93); however, in *Hom. 2 Tim.* 7.1, 3; 8.1 (PG 62:635, 637, 641, 643), he cites

Hom. 2 Tim. 3:1
(*In illud: hoc scitote quod in novissimis diebus, etc.*)
CPG 4423 (PG 56:271–80)¹

A homily on the statement of the apostle that says, “*And know this: that in the last days perilous times will come to pass*” (2 Tim 3:1).²

1. [271] I am weak, poorly equipped, and inexperienced in teaching by homily. But when I see you assembled, I lose sight of my weakness, I disregard my poor state, and I’m not conscious of my inexperience. For such is the commanding power of your love!³ For that reason, I am setting my poor table⁴ before you today with more eagerness than those who are endowed with wealth. You are the reason for this magnanimity, because you rouse those who’ve reclined here⁵ to eagerness for hearing, you who stand with your mouths wide open for attentive hearing and are hanging on the very words⁶ of the speaker. Baby sparrows when they see their

the verse with γίνωσκε. With ἔσονται for ἐνστήσονται, but when Chrysostom himself cites the lemma multiple times below in §§3, 5, and 6 (PG 56:275–77), he has the latter reading, with ὤ. I follow the lead of the KJV in translating χαλεποί here as “perilous.”

3. τῆς ὑμετέρας ἀγάπης ἢ τυραννίς; cf. *Adv. Jud.* 6.1 (PG 48:904); *Paenit.* 1.1 (PG 49:277). For Chrysostom’s favored use of ἡ ὑμέτερα ἀγάπη see, in this volume, *Hom. Rom.* 8:28 §1, 2 (PG 51:165–67); *Hom. Rom.* 16:3 A §3 (PG 51:200); *Hom. 2 Cor.* 4:13 A §1 (PG 51:272–73); *Hom. 2 Cor.* 4:13 B §1 (PG 51:281); *Hom. 2 Cor.* 4:13 Γ §1 (PG 51:289, 291); *Hom. Gal.* 2:11–14 §1 (PG 51:373); *Hom. Phil.* 1:18 §3 (PG 51:313), and many more instances in Chrysostom’s homilies.

4. A favored metaphor of John’s for the nourishment the homily provides; see also, e.g., *Hom. 2 Cor.* 4:13 B §1 (PG 51:281); *Hom. Gal.* 2:11–14 §1 (PG 51:372–73).

5. I.e., to dine at the feast of the homily.

6. γλῶττα: literally, tongue, and here a metonymy for speech. Note the very similar image and wording in Chrysostom’s *Hom. Jo.* 5:17 (CPG 4441.10) 9.1 (PG 63:511): καθάπερ νεοττοὶ χελιδόνων τῆς καλιᾶς ἐκκρεμάμενοι, καὶ πρὸς ἡμετέραν κεχηγνότες γλῶτταν, a contributing argument for the authenticity of this homily, given that the latter is undisputed (see Mayer, *Provenance*, 506–9, who regards it as probable that this homily on John came from Chrysostom’s time in Constantinople).

καὶ νεοσσοὶ χελιδόνων, ἐπειδὴν ἴδωσι προσιπταμένην τὴν μητέρα, τῆς καλιᾶς προκύψαντες καὶ τοὺς αὐχένας ποιήσαντες ἐκκρεμεῖς, οὕτω δέχονται τὴν παρ' ἐκείνης τροφήν. Οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς προθυμίας πρὸς τὸν λέγοντα βλέποντες, δέχεσθε τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς γλώττης κομιζομένην ὑμῖν διάλεξιν, καὶ πρὶν ἢ τὰ ῥήματα ἐκπηδῆσαι τοῦ στόματος ἡμῶν, ἤρπασεν ἡ διάνοια τὰ λεγόμενα. Τίς οὖν οὐκ ἂν καὶ ὑμᾶς καὶ ἡμᾶς ἐπὶ τούτοις μακαρίσειεν, ὅτι λέγομεν *Εἰς ὧτα ἀκούοντων*; Κοινὸς ὁ πόνος, κοινὸς καὶ ὁ στέφανος· κοινὸν τὸ κέρδος, κοινὸς καὶ ὁ μισθός. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ἐμακάρισε τοὺς μαθητὰς λέγων· Ὑμῶν δὲ μακάριοι οἱ ὀφθαλμοί, ὅτι βλέπουσι, καὶ τὰ ὧτα ὑμῶν, ὅτι ἀκούουσι. Δότε μοι ταῦτα τὰ ῥήματα καὶ πρὸς ὑμᾶς εἰπεῖν, ἐπειδὴ καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν ἐπιδείκνυσθε προθυμίαν· Ὑμῶν δὲ μακάριοι οἱ ὀφθαλμοί, ὅτι βλέπουσι, καὶ τὰ ὧτα ὑμῶν, ὅτι ἀκούουσιν. Ἀλλ' ὅτι μὲν ὑμῶν τὰ ὧτα ἀκούει, δῆλον· ὅτι δὲ καὶ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ βλέπουσι, καθάπερ ἔβλεπον οἱ μαθηταὶ τότε, τοῦτο ἀποδείξαι πειράσομαι, ἵνα μὴ ἐξ ἡμισείας, ἀλλ' ὁλόκληρος ὑμῶν ὁ μακαρισμὸς ᾗ.

Τί οὖν ἔβλεπον τότε οἱ μαθηταί; Νεκροὺς ἀνισταμένους, τυφλοὺς ἀναβλέποντας, λεπροὺς καθαιρομένους, δαίμονας ἐλαυνομένους, χωλοὺς βαδίζοντας, ἅπαν φύσεως ἀμάρτημα διορθούμενον. Ταῦτα βλέπετε καὶ ὑμεῖς νῦν, εἰ καὶ μὴ τοῖς τοῦ σώματος, ἀλλὰ τοῖς τῆς πίστεως ὀφθαλμοῖς. Τοιαῦται γὰρ αἱ τῆς πίστεως ὄψεις· τὰ μὴ φαινόμενα βλέπουσι, καὶ τὰ μηδέπωπραχθέντα κατανοοῦσι. Πόθεν τοῦτο δῆλον, ὅτι πίστις ὄψις ἐστὶ τῶν μὴ βλεπομένων καὶ ἔλεγχος; Ἀκουσον τοῦ Παύλου λέγοντος· *"Ἔστι δὲ πίστις ἐλπιζομένων ὑπόστασις πραγμάτων, ἔλεγχος οὐ βλεπομένων"*. Καὶ τὸ δὴ θαυμαστὸν, οὗτοι μὲν οἱ τῆς σαρκὸς ὀφθαλμοὶ τὰ μὲν ὁρώμενα βλέπουσι, τὰ δὲ μὴ ὁρώμενα οὐ βλέπουσιν· οἱ δὲ τῆς πίστεως ὀφθαλμοὶ τοῦναντίον ἅπαν, τὰ μὲν ὁρώμενα οὐ βλέπουσι, τὰ δὲ μὴ ὁρώμενα βλέπουσι. Καὶ ὅτι τὰ βλεπόμενα οὐ βλέπουσι, καὶ τὰ μὴ βλεπόμενα βλέπουσιν, ὁ Παῦλος ἐδήλωσεν εἰπὼν οὕτως· *Τὸ γὰρ παραυτίκα ἐλαφρόν τῆς θλίψεως καθ' ὑπερβολὴν εἰς ὑπερβολὴν αἰώνιον βάρος δόξης ἡμῖν [272] κατεργάζεται, μὴ σκοπούντων ἡμῶν τὰ βλεπόμενα, ἀλλὰ τὰ μὴ βλεπόμενα*. Καὶ πῶς ἂν τις ἴδοι τὰ μὴ βλεπόμενα; Πῶς ἄλλως, ἀλλ' ἢ τοῖς τῆς πίστεως ὀφθαλμοῖς; Οὕτω καὶ ἀλαχοῦ φησι· *Πίστει νοοῦμεν*

7. In context, this quotation is connected with the theme of blessing in Sir 25:7 (ἐμακάρισα) and 25:8–9 (μακάριος ὁ... μακάριος ὅς).

8. With ἀκούουσιν for ἀκούει (both here and in the next sentence).

9. On οἱ τῆς πίστεως ὀφθαλμοί, “the eyes of faith,” in Chrysostom’s oeuvre, see p. 382 n. 34 above. In other Christian authors contemporary with him or later, as used for the “spiritual sense” and “spiritual insight” see, e.g., Ephraem Syrus, *De iis, qui filii dei naturam scrutantur* (ed. Phrantzoles, 6:204–5); *De panopolia ad monachos* (ed. Phrantzoles, 6:18); Ps.-Didymus the Blind, *Trin.* 3.38 (PG 39:976).

mother flying toward them peep out of the nest and stick out their necks so they might receive food from her. In the very same way, you also look toward the speaker with tremendous eagerness and receive the homily that is being delivered from our tongue, and before the words pop out of our mouth, your minds snatch up what's said. Who wouldn't bless both you and us for these things, since we say, "*Into the ears of those who hear*" (Sir 25:9).⁷ The exertion is shared, and shared, too, is the crown; the gain is shared, and shared, too, is the reward. That's why Christ blessed his disciples, saying, "*Blessed are your eyes because they see, and your ears because they hear*" (Matt 13:16).⁸ Allow me to say these words also to you, since you show the same eagerness: "*Blessed are your eyes because they see, and your ears because they hear*" (Matt 13:16). Now, the fact that your ears hear is clear. But I shall attempt to demonstrate to you that your eyes also see in the same way as the disciples saw back then, so you might have not just half the blessing but the whole of it.

So, what was it that the disciples saw back then? The dead raised, the blind seeing, lepers cleansed, demons driven out, the lame walking (cf. Matt 11:5 // Luke 7:22), every sin of nature set right. And you see these things now, too, although not with the eyes of the body, but with the eyes of faith.⁹ Such are the optics of faith: they see things that aren't apparent, and they perceive events that haven't yet occurred. Where is there clear proof that faith is the vision and conviction of things not seen? Listen to Paul saying, "*Faith is the basis of things hoped for, the conviction of those not seen*" (Heb 11:1). And what's truly marvelous is that these eyes of flesh see things that are visible, but they don't see those that aren't visible, whereas with the eyes of faith it's the complete opposite. They don't see things that are visible, but they do see things that aren't visible. Paul made this point very clear—that such eyes don't see things that are seen but they do see things that aren't seen—when he said the following: "*For the temporary lightness of affliction superabundantly brings about an eternal weight of glory for us, [272] since we focus our attention not on things that are seen but on those that are unseen*" (2 Cor 4:17–18).¹⁰ And how could anyone see things that aren't seen? How else other than with the eyes of faith? Thus also in another place he says, "*By faith we perceive that the world has been fashioned*" (Heb 11:3).

10. Minus ἡμῶν after θλίψεως; transposition of κατεργάζεται and ἡμῖν. In terms of the former variation unit, Chrysostom cites the verse in this form elsewhere, as, e.g., in *Hom. 2 Cor.* 9.2 (PG 61:461), but in other cases with ἡμῶν, as, e.g., in *Theod. laps.* 1.15 (SC 177, ed. Dumortier); *Stat.* 15.5 (PG 49:168); *Hom. Rom.* 5:3 §2 (PG 51:158).

κατηρτίσθαι τοὺς αἰῶνας. Πῶς; οὐ γὰρ εἶδομεν. Εἰς τὸ μὴ ἐκ φαινομένων τὰ βλεπόμενα γεγονέναι, φησί.

Βούλεσθε καὶ ἐτέραν παράγω μαρτυρίαν, ὅτι τὰ μὴ βλεπόμενα βλέπουσιν οἱ τῆς πίστεως ὀφθαλμοί; Γαλάταις ποτὲ γράφων ὁ Παῦλος ἔλεγεν· Οἷς κατ' ὀφθαλμοὺς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς προεγράφη ἐν ὑμῖν ἐσταυρωμένος. β'. Τί λέγεις, ὦ μακάριε Παῦλε; ἐν Γαλατία σταυρούμενον αὐτὸν εἶδον Γαλάται; οὐχὶ πάντες ὁμολογοῦμεν, ὅτι ἐν Παλαιστίνῃ ἐν μέσῃ Ἰουδαίᾳ τὸ πάθος ἐγένετο; Πῶς οὖν αὐτὸν εἶδον σταυρούμενον Γαλάται; Τοῖς τῆς πίστεως ὀφθαλμοῖς, οὐ τοῖς τῆς σαρκός. Εἶδες πῶς οἱ τῆς πίστεως ὀφθαλμοὶ τὰ μὴ φαινόμενα βλέπουσιν; Ἀπὸ τοσούτου γοῦν διαστήματος καὶ μετὰ τοσούτου χρόνον τὸν Χριστὸν εἶδον σταυρούμενον. Οὕτω καὶ ὑμεῖς βλέπετε τοὺς νεκροὺς ἀνισταμένους· οὕτω σήμερον εἶδετε τὸν λεπρὸν καθαίρομενον· οὕτως εἶδετε τὸν παραλελυμένον ἀναστάντα, καὶ μᾶλλον Ἰουδαίων τῶν παρόντων εἶδετε. Ἐκεῖνοι μὲν γὰρ παρόντες οὐ παρεδέξαντο τὸ θαῦμα, ὑμεῖς δὲ ἀπόντες παρεδέξασθε τὴν πίστιν. "Ὡστε δικαίως εἶπον πρὸς ὑμᾶς, ὅτι Μακάριοι ὑμῖν οἱ ὀφθαλμοί, ὅτι βλέπουσιν.

Εἰ δὲ καὶ ἐτέρωθεν βούλει μαθεῖν ὅτι τὰ μὴ βλεπόμενα βλέπουσιν οἱ τῆς πίστεως ὀφθαλμοί, τὰ δὲ βλεπόμενα παρατρέχουσιν· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἂν ἄλλως ἴδοιεν τὰ μὴ βλεπόμενα, εἰ μὴ καταφρονήσαιεν τῶν εἰρημένων· ἀκουσον τοῦ Παύλου περὶ τοῦ Ἀβραὰμ διαλεγομένου, ὅτι τοῖς τῆς πίστεως ὀφθαλμοῖς εἶδε τὸν υἱὸν τικτόμενον τὸν Ἰσαὰκ, καὶ οὕτω κατεδέξατο τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν. Τί γὰρ φησι; Καὶ μὴ ἀσθενήσας τῇ πίστει, οὐ κατενόησε τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σῶμα νενεκρωμένον. Μεγάλῃ τῆς πίστεως ἡ δύναμις. "Ὡςπερ γὰρ λογισμοὶ ἀνθρώπων δειλοὶ καὶ ἀσθενεῖς, οὕτω πίστις ἰσχυρὰ καὶ δυνατή. Οὐ κατενόησε τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σῶμα νενεκρωμένον. Ὅρᾳς πῶς ἀφῆκε τὰ ὀρώμενα; πῶς οὐκ εἶδεν εἰς τὸ γῆρας; Καίτοι γε αὐτὸ πρὸ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν ἔκειτο· ἀλλὰ τοῖς τῆς πίστεως ὀφθαλμοῖς

11. A favored and frequent phrase of Chrysostom's; see, e.g., *Hom. Gen.* 34.6 (PG 53:320); *Proph. obscurit.* 1.1 (PG 56:165); *Hom. 1 Cor.* 24.1 (PG 61:199); *Hom. 2 Cor.* 4.1 (PG 61:417)] *Hom. Eph.* 22.1 (PG 62:155), etc.

12. ὁμολογεῖν, also "confess." The Niceno-Constantinopolitan creed, strictly speaking, does not include the toponymn: σταυρωθέντα τε ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου, καὶ παθόντα, καὶ ταφέντα.

13. This is Paul's answer to Chrysostom's prior direct question. John makes the same argument—that it was with the eyes of faith that the Galatians saw Christ crucified from a distance of time and space—in *Hom. Gal.* on 3:1 (PG 61:648–49).

14. Cf. Matt 9:2–8; Mark 2:1–12, but John's reference to οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι seems to be linked to John 5:10–47.

15. Both a statement of belief in the occurrence of the miracle and a broader reference to the congregants' place within the Christian credal faith and its rituals of incorporation (especially baptism).

How is that? For we didn't see it. "*In order that that the things that are seen have not come from those that are visible*" (Heb 11:3), he says.

Do you want me to produce still another textual witness to the fact that the eyes of faith see things that aren't seen? When Paul wrote to the Galatians, he said, "*you before whose eyes Jesus Christ was publicly portrayed as crucified among you*" (Gal 3:1). 2. "What are you saying, blessed Paul?"¹¹ Did the Galatians see Christ being crucified in Galatia? Don't we all agree¹² that his passion took place in Palestine in the middle of Judea? Then how did the Galatians see him being crucified?" "With the eyes of faith, not those of the flesh."¹³ Have you seen how the eyes of faith see things that aren't visible? Indeed, from such a great distance and long interval of time they saw Christ being crucified. Thus also you see the dead being raised. Thus also today you saw the leper being cleansed (cf. Matt 8:2–4 and parr.). Thus you saw the paralytic standing up (cf. John 5:2–9),¹⁴ and you saw better than the Jews who were present then did. For they, though present, didn't accept the miracle, but you, though absent, have accepted the faith.¹⁵ Consequently, it was fully right that I said to you, "*Blessed are your eyes because they see*" (Matt 13:16).¹⁶

Do you want to learn from yet another source that the eyes of faith see things that aren't seen and run right past things that are seen? (For there is no other way that they could see things that aren't seen unless they disregard the things just mentioned.)¹⁷ If so, then listen to Paul saying about Abraham that it was with the eyes of faith that he saw his son, Isaac, being born, and thus he accepted the truth of the promise. For what does he say? "*And because he was not weak in faith, he did not perceive that his own body was at death's door*" (Rom 4:19).¹⁸ The power of faith is enormous! Faith is as strong and powerful as the reasonings of human beings are cowardly and weak (cf. Wis 9:14).¹⁹ "*He did not perceive that his own body was at death's door*" (Rom 4:19). Do you see how he let go of things that are visible? How he didn't look at his old age although it was right before his eyes?

16. With *μακάριοι ὑμῖν* for *ὑμῶν δὲ μακάριοι*—differently from the previous quotation in this homily in §1 (PG 56:271.28) and the succeeding one in §2 (PG 56:273.10–11).

17. I.e., τὰ βλεπόμενα.

18. Minus ἥδη before *νενεκρωμένον* (as also when quoted again later in this paragraph).

19. More a paraphrase than a quotation, though closest in the first clause; Wis 9:14: *λογισμοὶ γὰρ θνητῶν δειλοὶ, καὶ ἐπισφαλεῖς αἱ ἐπίνοιαι ἡμῶν*.

ἑώρα, οὐ τοῖς τοῦ σώματος. Διὸ οὐκ εἶδε τὸ γῆρας, οὐδὲ τὴν νέκρωσιν Σάρρας· οὐ κατενόησε τὴν νέκρωσιν τῆς μήτρας Σάρρας. Τὴν στέρωσιν ἡμῖν ἐνταῦθα αἰνίττεται. Διπλῇ γὰρ ἡ ἀσθένεια ἦν, ἡ μὲν ἀπὸ τῆς ἡλικίας, ἡ δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς ἀσθενείας φύσεως. Οὐ γὰρ τὸ σῶμα μόνον διὰ τὴν ἡλικίαν ἀχρηστον ἦν πρὸς παιδογονίαν, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὴ ἡ μήτρα νενέκρωτο, καὶ τὸ τῆς φύσεως ἐργαστήριον, καὶ πρὸ τοῦ γήρως ἀχρηστον ἦν διὰ τὴν στέρωσιν. Εἶδες ὅσα κωλύματα; Τὸ γῆρας τοῦ [273] ἀνδρός, τὸ γῆρας τῆς γυναικός· ἡ τοῦ γήρως ἀχρηστότερα στέρωσις· καὶ γὰρ καὶ τοῦτο μάλιστα κώλυμα παιδογονίας. Ἄλλ' ὅμως ταῦτα πάντα παρέδραμεν, καὶ τοῖς τῆς πίστεως ὀφθαλμοῖς εἰς τοὺς οὐρανούς ἀνέστη, μεγίστην τῶν ἐπηγγελμένων ἀπόδειξιν ἔχων τὴν δύναμιν τοῦ ὑποσχομένου. Διὰ τοῦτο Εἰς τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ οὐ διεκρίθη τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ, ἀλλ' ἐνεδυναμώθη τῇ πίστει. Βακτηρία γὰρ τίς ἐστιν ἰσχυρὰ ἡ πίστις, καὶ λιμὴν ἀσφαλῆς, τῆς τῶν λογισμῶν ἀπαλλάττουσα πλάνης, καὶ ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ πολλῇ τὴν ψυχὴν ἀναπαύουσα. Ὑμῶν δὲ μακάριοι οἱ ὀφθαλμοί, ὅτι βλέπουσι.

Καὶ γὰρ εἰς αὐτὸ πάλιν ἐπανελθεῖν ἀναγκαῖον τὸ ῥῆμα. Καίτοι ἐβλεπον καὶ οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι τὰ τότε γινόμενα. Ἄλλ' οὐ ταύτην μακαρίζει τὴν ὄψιν τὴν ἔξωθεν· αὕτη γὰρ καθ' ἑαυτὴν οὐχ ὁρᾷ τὰ θαύματα, ἀλλ' ἡ ἔνδον. Ἐκεῖνοι εἶδον τυφλὸν καὶ ἔλεγον· Οὗτός ἐστιν, οὐκ ἔστιν οὗτος· καλέσωμεν αὐτοῦ τοὺς γονεῖς. Ἀκούεις ἀμφιβαλλόντων; ὁρᾷς ὅτι οὐκ ἀρκεῖ ἡ τοῦ σώματος ὄψις πρὸς τὴν τοῦ θαύματος θεωρίαν; Οἱ παρόντες καὶ θεώμενοι ἔλεγον· Οὗτός ἐστιν,

20. Minus δέ after εἰς.

21. Chrysostom adopts and enhances the negative caricature of οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι, as in John 9:18, 22, and elsewhere in John's Gospel (especially John 12:37–41, once again with a blindness theme referencing Isaiah 6; cf. 9:39–41).

22. John contrasts ἡ ὄψις ἡ ἔξωθεν and ἡ ὄψις ἡ ἔνδον. Given that ὄψις can refer either to the thing seen (objective) or the capacity to see (see LSJ I and II), the contrast has also a further dimension: does one see what is there or what is inside and invisible (i.e., spiritual powers), and does one see from a place of “external” perspective, or what is for Chrysostom the higher one, the “internal” (i.e., the eyes of the soul)? On either reckoning he will cast “the Jews” as blind inside and out.

23. Chrysostom is paraphrasing the second half of the quotation in John 9:9 (Ἄλλοι ἔλεγον ὅτι οὗτος ἐστιν, ἄλλοι δὲ ὅτι ὅμοιος αὐτῷ ἐστιν) by influence of 9:8 (οὐχ οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ καθήμενος καὶ προσαιτῶν;), which fits his introduction of the statement (οἱ θεώμενοι/θεωροῦντες ... ἔλεγον). And yet the exact phrase οὐκ ἔστιν οὗτος is found in 9:16, which refers to “the Pharisees” view of Christ in these words: οὐκ ἔστιν οὗτος [παρὰ θεοῦ ὁ ἄνθρωπος]. The two statements, in direct contrast, are meant to show these spectators as hopelessly blind to what had actually happened.

24. Not a quotation (as it is marked in PG), but a paraphrased reenactment of the story in dialogue form. John 9:18 narrates the action: ἕως ὅτου ἐφώνησαν τοὺς γονεῖς

No, instead he was seeing with the eyes of faith and not with the eyes of the body. That's why he didn't see his old age, nor Sarah's "*deadly state*." "*He did not perceive ... the deadly state of Sarah's womb*" (Rom 4:19). Paul is here signaling her sterility. For it was a double weakness, partly from age and partly from the weakness of nature. After all, her body wasn't incapable of childbearing solely due to age, but her very womb was in a deathly state, and nature's production line was, due to her sterility, incapacitated even before she reached old age. Have you seen how numerous the impediments were? The husband's old age. [273] The wife's old age. Her sterility, which was an even greater incapacity than her age—after all, this in particular is the greatest impediment to childbearing. But nevertheless, Abraham ran right past all these things and with the eyes of faith he rose up into heaven, with the power of the one who tendered the promise serving as the greatest proof of the things he'd promised (cf. Gen 15:5–6). That's why "*he did not doubt God's promise because of lack of faith, but he was endowed with strength by faith*" (Rom 4:20).²⁰ For faith is a strong support and a secure harbor, freeing one from deceptive reasonings and granting the soul rest in profound quietude. "*Blessed are your eyes because they see*" (Matt 13:16).

And so, it's necessary to return once again to this statement. After all, the Jews²¹ also saw the things that took place back then. But what Christ blesses isn't this kind of externally oriented vision. For this type of vision in itself didn't perceive the miracles, but what does is internal vision.²² The Jews saw a blind man, and they said, "*This is he*," "this isn't he" (John 9:9, 8),²³ and "let's call his parents" (John 9:18).²⁴ Do you hear them doubting?²⁵ Do you see²⁶ that bodily vision was insufficient to perceive²⁷ the miracle? The people who were present at the time and "saw" it were saying, "*This is*

αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἀναβλέψαντος ("until they called the parents of the man who had regained his sight").

25. ἀμφιβάλλειν means both "doubting" and "disputing" (LSJ III, IV.2), both of which are in view here, but the governing contrast in this argument is between faith and doubt.

26. With these questions in the second-person singular, John is bringing each of his listeners into the scene as witnesses (hence, also testing their own "vision").

27. θεωρία here means the full or spiritual vision or insight, in ironic contrast (for Chrysostom), to οἱ θεωροῦντες in John 9:8, who miss entirely what is before their eyes. Yet it is the case that in the next clause he rewords the text to θεώμενοι for θεωροῦντες, the actual reading, which he cites when discussing this text in *Hom. Jo.* 57.1; 58.1 (PG 59:312, 316), which possibly takes an edge off this point, at least verbally. Nonetheless, the conceptual contrast is evident.

οὐκ ἔστιν οὗτος· ἡμεῖς δὲ οἱ μὴ παρόντες οὐ λέγομεν, Οὗτός ἐστιν, οὐκ ἔστιν οὗτος· ἀλλ' Αὐτός ἐστιν. "Εμαθες ὡς οὐδὲν βλάπτει ἡ ἀπουσία, ὅταν πίστεως ὀφθαλμοὶ ὦσι, καὶ ὡς οὐδὲν ὠφελεῖ ἡ παρουσία, ὅταν πίστεως ὀφθαλμοὶ μὴ ὦσι; Τί γὰρ ἐκείνους ὥνησε τὸ ἰδεῖν; Οὐδέν. Ἡμεῖς γὰρ ἐκείνων σαφέστερον εἶδομεν. Ἐπεὶ οὖν βλέπουσιν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ὑμῶν θεωρίαν, καὶ ἀκούει τὰ ὦτα ἀκρόασιν, ἣν ὁ Χριστὸς ἐμακάρισε, φέρε ὑμῖν τοὺς μαργαρίτας τῶν Γραφῶν παραθῶμεν. "Ωσπερ γὰρ τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις οὐκ ἐπέλυσε τὰ ζητήματα ὁ Χριστὸς, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπέτεινε τὴν ἀσάφειαν, ἐπειδὴ μὴ προσεῖχον· οὕτω δὴ καὶ ὑμῖν, ἐπειδὴ προσέχετε, τὰ κεκρυμμένα ἄγειν εἰς μέσον χρή. Καὶ γὰρ προσῆλθον οἱ μαθηταὶ καὶ ἐθαύμαζον λέγοντες· Διατί ἐν παραβολαῖς λαλεῖς αὐτοῖς; Ὁ δὲ ἔφη, Ἐπειδὴ βλέποντες οὐ βλέπουσιν. Οὐκοῦν ἐπειδὴ μὴ ἰδόντες ὑμεῖς εἶδετε, ἀναγκαῖον μὴ ἐν παραβολῇ εἰπεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς· καὶ ἐπειδὴ Ἀκούοντες οὐκ ἀκούουσιν. Οὐκοῦν ἐπειδὴ ὑμεῖς μὴ ἀκούσαντες τότε, ἀκούετε νῦν οὐκ ἔλαττον, ἢ τότε ἠκούσατε, ἀναγκαῖον ὑμᾶς μὴ ἀποστερῆσαι τῆς τραπέζης ταύτης. Καὶ γὰρ ὁ Χριστὸς τούτους οὐχ ἤττον ἐμακάρισεν ἢ ἐκείνους· Εἶδες

28. This appears to be a double entendre, both referring to fact that the man born blind is indeed the one who now can see because of the miracle, and to the Christological acclamation that it is Christ who has done it. The sentence αὐτός ἐστιν does not appear in John 9, but Chrysostom is probably referring to Christ's self-predication ἐκεῖνός ἐστιν in 9:37, now turned around to a Christian confession, which elicits belief and worship (as with the blind man in 9:38). The phrase αὐτός ἐστιν is found in acclamations of Christ in 1 John 1:7; Col 1:17, 18; cf. Matt 16:20, but not absolute (i.e., with predicates).

29. Sc. οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι of John 9.

30. ἐπέλυε τὰ ζητήματα, the precise language of "problems and solutions"; cf. Matt 13:33–35 (κεκρυμμένα) and the parallel in Mark 4:33–35 (ἐπιλύειν). Here Chrysostom presents Christ himself in his parable discourse as a practitioner of ζητήματα καὶ λύσεις, just as Origen did in his homily on Ps 77(78), φθέγγομαι προβλήματα ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, as quoted, differently worded, in Matt 13:35 (see Mitchell, "Problems and Solutions in Early Christian Biblical Interpretation"). As in other instances, one wonders about whether Chrysostom had had direct contact with this exegetical tradition from Origen. For general discussion about possible dependence of Chrysostom on Origen, see Astruc-Morize and Le Boulluec, "Le sens caché des Écritures").

31. Chrysostom makes the same argument in *Exp. Ps. Ψ* 49 §3 (PG 55:226).

32. κεκρυμμένα, as in Matt 13:35.

33. This is the opening of the passage that leads to John's repeated quotation of the macarism in Matt 13:16. In context, it is not "the Jews" who are the antecedent of αὐτοῖς, but ὅχλοι πολλοί, but this does not stop John from making the association via his intertext of John 9.

34. Plus ἐπειδὴ before βλέποντες to imbed the sentence in Chrysostom's constructed dialogue.

he,' 'this isn't he'" (John 9:9, 8). But we who weren't present don't say, "'This is he,' 'this isn't he,'" but "*It is he indeed!*"²⁸ Have you learned that absence brings no harm when the eyes of faith are there, even as presence confers no benefit when the eyes of faith aren't there? For what benefit did "seeing" give them?²⁹ None at all, for we've seen more clearly than they did. Therefore, since your eyes see the deeper spiritual vision and your ears hear the kind of hearing that Christ blessed, come on, let's hand over the pearls of Scripture to your safekeeping. Christ didn't give the Jews the solutions to the problems,³⁰ but he even heightened the obscurity, since they didn't pay attention.³¹ In the same way, then, since you're paying attention, we must bring the hidden things³² out into public view for you, too. For the disciples approached and marveled, saying, "*Why do you speak to them in parables?*" (Matt 13:10).³³ And he said, "because *although seeing, they do not see*" (Matt 13:13).³⁴ Consequently, since you have seen even without having seen (cf. John 20:29), there's no need to speak to you in parables. And then further, "*because although hearing, they do not hear*" (Matt 13:13).³⁵ Accordingly, since despite not having heard in the past you listen now no less than you listened³⁶ on earlier occasions,³⁷ there's no need for us to deprive you of this banquet table. Indeed, Christ blessed the ones who see no less than the ones who hear (cf. Matt 13:16).³⁸ For, he says, "You have seen and believed.

35. Plus ἐπειδὴ before ἀκούοντες, for the same reason as given in the previous note.

36. Mf marked ἡκούσατε as "*sic Ms.*" ("*Mss.*" in PG is a typo) followed by "*Sed mendum suspicior,*" but he adopted the reading of Vat. gr. 559 in the text (and translated it in his Latin, "*quam tunc audivissetis*") and made no conjectural emendation. It is possible that the text is corrupt here.

37. In the present wording of the text, the first τότε must refer to the time of Christ and the second to the time when the congregation listened to the preacher's earlier sermons, as introduced in §1 (PG 51:271). The reference to the τράπεζα (for the homily being offered as nourishment, as well perhaps as the Eucharist) also makes this link. But there seems to be a conflation of two (or even three) different sets of comparisons, and hence perhaps a lacuna in the text.

38. Another indication of a possible textual problem in this section is that the demonstratives τούτους and ἐκείνους do not have absolutely clear antecedents following upon the preceding. The translation above takes them as referring to the two halves of Matt 13:16 (those with eyes, those with ears), as quoted repeatedly above in §§1–2 (PG 51:271–73). This is consistent with the *akolouthia* of this extended first argument, in which John first treated hearing in §1 (PG 56:271.1–27) and then seeing in §§1–2 (PG 56:271.27–273.47), as marked in the transition at PG 56:271.26–28: Ἀλλ' ὅτι μὲν ὑμῶν τὰ ὦτα ἀκούει, δῆλον· ὅτι δὲ καὶ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ βλέπουσι, καθάπερ ἔβλεπον οἱ μαθηταὶ τότε, τοῦτο ἀποδείξαι πειράσομαι).

γάρ, φησὶ, καὶ ἐπίστευσας· μακάριοι οἱ μὴ ἰδόντες, καὶ πιστεύσαντες. Μὴ τοίνυν ὀκνηροὶ γίνεσθε πρὸς ἀρετὴν, ὅτι μὴ κατ' ἐκείνους τοὺς χρόνους, ἀλλὰ κατ' αὐτὸν ἐγένεσθε. Ἄν γὰρ ἐθέλοις, οὐκ ἐξημιώθης· ὥσπερ οὖν πολλοὶ καὶ τῶν τότε γενομένων, ἐπεὶ μὴ ἤθελον, οὐκ ὠφελήθησαν.

γ'. Τί οὖν ἐστὶ τὸ σήμερον ἀναγνωσθέν; Τοῦτο δὲ γινώσκετε, ὅτι ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις ἐνστήσονται καιροὶ χαλεποί. Τῷ Τιμοθέῳ πάλιν ὁ Παῦλος ἐπιστέλλει. Φοβερά ἡ ἀπειλή· ἀλλὰ διαναστῶμεν· τούτους γὰρ ἡμῖν τοὺς καιροὺς αἰνίττεται, καὶ τοὺς μετὰ τούτους, καὶ τοὺς περὶ τὴν συντέλειαν αὐτὴν. Τοῦτο δὲ γινώσκετε, ὅτι ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις ἐνστήσονται καιροὶ χαλεποί. Βραχὺ τὸ ῥῆμα, καὶ μεγάλη ἡ δύναμις. Καθάπερ γὰρ τὰ ἀρώματα οὐ τῷ πλήθει, ἀλλὰ τῇ φύσει τὴν εὐωδίαν ἐνδείκνυνται· οὕτω καὶ αἱ θεῖαι Γραφαὶ οὐ τῷ πλήθει τῶν ῥημάτων, ἀλλὰ τῇ δυνάμει τῶν ἐγκειμένων πᾶσαν ἡμῖν παρέχουσι τὴν ὠφέλειαν. Οὕτω καὶ θυμιάματος [274] φύσις καὶ καθ' ἑαυτὴν μὲν ἐστὶν εὐώδης· ἐπὰν δὲ εἰς πῦρ αὐτὴν ἐμβάλης, τότε πᾶσαν ἐπιδείκνυται τὴν ἐξ αὐτῆς ἡδονήν. Οὕτω καὶ ἡ θεία Γραφή καὶ καθ' ἑαυτὴν μὲν ἐστὶν ἡδίστη· ἐπειδὰν δὲ τῆς ἡμῶν ἐπιλάβῃται ψυχῆς, καθάπερ εἰς θυμιατήριον ἐμπεσοῦσα, ἅπαντα τὸν οἶκον τῆς εὐωδίας ἐμπύλησι. Τοῦτο δὲ γινώσκετε, ὅτι ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις ἐνστήσονται καιροὶ χαλεποί. Περὶ τῆς συντελείας λέγει. Τί οὖν πρὸς σέ, ὦ μακάριε Παῦλε; τί δὲ πρὸς Τιμόθεον; τί δὲ πρὸς τοὺς τότε ἀκούοντας; Μικρὸν γὰρ ὕστερον μέλλουσιν ἀποθνήσκειν, ἐξαρπάζεσθαι τῶν ἐπιόντων δεινῶν καὶ πονηρῶν ἀνθρώπων. Ἄλλ' οὐχὶ τὰ παρόντα βλέπω μόνον, φησὶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ μέλλοντα προορῶ. Οὐχὶ τῆς παρούσης φείδομαι ποίμνης, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑπὲρ τῆς μελλούσης ἀγωνιῶ καὶ δέδοικα. Ἡμεῖς μὲν γὰρ τῶν συνόντων ἡμῖν ἀνθρώπων μόλις ποιούμεθα πρόνοιαν, ἐκεῖνος δὲ ὑπὲρ τῶν μηδέπω τεχθέντων πολλὴν ποιεῖται τὴν σπουδὴν. Οὕτω καὶ ποιμὴν ἄριστος οὐχ ὅταν ἴδῃ τοὺς λύκους ἐπιόντας τῇ ποίμνῃ καὶ τῶν προβάτων

39. The first part of what John presents as a quotation is a paraphrase of Jesus's statement to Thomas in John 20:29: ὅτι ἑώρακάς με πεπίστευκας;

40. I.e., to have lived in the time of Christ and the apostles. Perhaps out of a concern that he'd gone too far in insisting on the irrelevance of having been there in the past, Chrysostom self-corrects to say that being an actual witness isn't a source of harm, but it does not confer the benefits of "the eyes of faith."

41. After a lengthy prooimion, the preacher at last turns to the Pauline lectionary reading of the day.

42. I.e., 2 Timothy, after 1 Timothy.

43. On the use of the verb αἰνίττεσθαι for "enigmas" and "dark" or "obscure" sayings, see p. 550 n. 219. Here it stands in ironic relationship to John's immediately previous avowal that his auditors do not need to be spoken to in parables or veiled language.

44. συντέλεια, a key eschatological term referring to the end or culmination of the age, as in Matt 13:40, 49; 24:3; 28:20.

Blessed are those who have not seen and have believed" (John 20:29).³⁹ So now, don't be hesitant when it comes to virtue, just because you didn't live in those times, but at the present one. For if you were to wish that,⁴⁰ you'd suffer no harm. But just as was the case with many of those who were alive back then, they received no benefit because they didn't wish it.

3. What is the passage that was read today?⁴¹ *"And know this: that in the last days perilous times will come"* (2 Tim 3:1). Paul writes this letter once again to Timothy.⁴² It is a terrifying threat. But let's keep alert. For he's giving us signals⁴³ about those times and the times after them and those of the very end of the age.⁴⁴ *"And know this: that in the last days perilous times will come."* The statement is short, but its power great. With perfume, for example, it's not the quantity, but the natural essence that manifests its sweet scent. As also with the divine Scriptures, it's not the quantity of words, but the power of what resides there that provides us with all the benefit. So, too, it's the nature of incense [274] that it has a sweet scent contained in itself. But at the moment when you throw it into fire, it manifests all the pleasant aroma that comes from it. In the very same way, the divine Scripture is in itself the height of sweetness. But when it takes hold of our soul, as though it has been plunged into an incense burner, it fills the entire abode with a sweet scent.⁴⁵ *"And know this: that in the last days perilous times will come"* (2 Tim 3:1). He's speaking of the end of the age. "Of what concern is that to you, blessed Paul? And of what concern to Timothy? And of what concern to those who heard of it at that time?" After all, a short while later they were going to die, to be snatched away from the terrors to come and from wicked men.⁴⁶ "But I don't look only to the events of the present," Paul says, "but I look ahead to those in the future as well. I have consideration not only for the present flock, but I'm anxious and fearful on behalf of the future flock, as well."⁴⁷ Now, when it comes to us, we hardly have forethought for the people in our own generation, but Paul exerted great zeal on behalf of those who hadn't yet been born. The most exemplary shepherd, at the moment when he sees the wolves approaching the flock and coming near the sheep, just gives an advance warning, even

45. Cf. John 12:3.

46. The hypothetical protagonist names one possible "problem" of this text: why did Paul write of things that would take place long after the deaths of all the epistolary partners (himself, Timothy, the first recipients)?

47. Paul's answer to the "problem" is that he is a pastor and a prophet with multiple time zones in view at the same time. On Chrysostom's view of Paul as a prophet with the ability to foretell the future, see *HT* 295–301.

ἐγγὺς γενομένους, τότε προλέγει μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ πόρρωθεν ὄντας μηνύει. Οὕτω καὶ ὁ Παῦλος, καθάπερ ποιμὴν ἄριστος, ἐφ' ὑψηλοῦ χωρίου τοῦ τῆς προφητείας ἀξιώματος καθήμενος, καὶ τοῖς προφητικοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ἄνωθεν προορῶν κατατρέχοντα τὰ θηρία, ἐπ' αὐτῆς τῆς συντελείας ὁρμώντας καὶ ἀποτεινομένους κατὰ τῆς ποίμνης προλέγει καὶ προδιαμαρτύρεται, ἵνα καὶ τοὺς μηδέπω γεννωμένους παρασκευάσῃ νήφειν, καὶ πᾶσαν τειχίσῃ τὴν ποίμνην τῇ προφητείᾳ.

Καὶ γὰρ καὶ πατὴρ φιλόστοργος οἰκίαν οἰκοδομούμενος πολλάκις τοῖς αὐτοῦ παισὶ λαμπρὰν καὶ μεγάλην οὕτως οἰκοδομεῖ, οὐχ ὥστε ἐκείνοις χρησίμην γενέσθαι μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐγγόνους καὶ τοῖς μετ' ἐκείνους. Οὕτω καὶ βασιλεὺς πόλει φιλουμένην περιβαλὼν τεῖχος ἔξωθεν, ἀσφαλὲς τοῦτο ποιεῖ καὶ ἰσχυρὸν καὶ διαρκές, οὐχ ἵνα ἐπὶ τῆς γενεᾶς αὐτοῦ μόνῃς ὑπηρετῇ, ἀλλ' ἵνα καὶ τοῖς μετὰ ταῦτα πᾶσι γένηται χρήσιμον, οὐ πρὸς τὰς τότε μηχανάς, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὰς ὕστερον γενομένας προσβολὰς ἐπιτήδειον. Οὕτω καὶ ὁ Παῦλος ἐποίησεν. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ τὰ γράμματα ἀποστολικά τείχη τῶν Ἐκκλησιῶν ἐστίν, οὐχὶ τοὺς τότε μόνον ὄντας, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς ὕστερον ἐσομένους ἀσφαλίζεται δι' αὐτῶν. Καὶ οὕτως ἰσχυρὸν καὶ ἀρραγὴ τὸν περίβολον τοῦτον κατεσκεύασε, καὶ πάσῃ περιήλασεν αὐτὸν τῇ οἰκουμένη μετὰ ἀσφαλείας ἀπάσης, ὥστε καὶ τοὺς τότε, καὶ τοὺς μετ' ἐκείνους, καὶ τοὺς νῦν, καὶ τοὺς αὖθις ἐπομένους μέχρι τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ παρουσίας ἀπάσης ἀπαλλάξαι τῆς τῶν πολεμίων πολιορκίας. Τοιαῦται τῶν ἁγίων αἱ ψυχαί· φιλόστοργοι, κηδεμονικαί, πατρικὴν εὐνοίαν ἀποκρύπτουσαι τῷ φίλτρῳ, καὶ τὴν τῆς φύσεως φιλοστοργίαν νικᾶσαι, καὶ τὰς ὁδῖνας ὑπερβαίνουσαι ἐκεῖνας· Πνεύματος γάρ εἰσι καὶ θείας χάριτος.

δ'. Βούλεσθε καὶ ἐτέρωθεν δείξω πάλιν, ὅτι οὐ τὰ καθ' ἑαυτοὺς μεριμνῶσιν οἱ ἅγιοι, οὐδὲ ὑπὲρ τῶν παρόντων δεδοίκασι μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν μετὰ ταῦτα ἐσομένων; Προσῆλθον αὐτῷ, φησὶν, οἱ μαθηταὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ ὄρους καθημένῳ, ἄνθρωποι λοιπὸν γεγηρακότες καὶ μετ' ὀλίγον χρόνον μέλλοντες ἀποδημεῖν ἀπὸ τῆς παρούσης ζωῆς. Τί οὖν ἐρωτῶσι; τί ἀγωνιῶσι; τί δεδοίκασι; ὑπὲρ τίνων τὴν πεῦσιν τῷ διδασκάλῳ προσάγουσιν; ἄρα ὑπὲρ τῶν κατὰ τὴν ζωὴν αὐτῶν, ἢ ὑπὲρ τῶν κατὰ τοὺς χρόνους ἐκείνους; Οὐδαμῶς. Ἀλλὰ πάντα ἐκεῖνα παραδραμόντες τί λέγουσι; Τί τὸ σημεῖον τῆς σῆς παρουσίας [275] καὶ τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος; Εἶδες κάκεῖνους ὑπὲρ τῆς συντελείας τοῦ

48. Cf. another metaphor John uses of the Pauline letters as the ark (greater than Noah's) that saves the whole world from the cataclysmic flooding of wickedness in *Laud. Paul.* 1.5 (AP 118–20).

49. On how Chrysostom navigates the particular and universal audiences in his various interpretations of Paul's letters, see *HT* 33–68; Mitchell, "The Continuing Problem of Particularity and Universality within the *corpus Paulinum*."

as he informs them that the wolves are some distance away. In the very same way, Paul, too—like an exemplary shepherd stationed upon the high ground of his prophetic position and with his prophetic eyes from above foreseeing the beasts coming in rampage—gives an advance warning and a preemptive testimony about those who at the very end of the age will rush in and contend against the flock. He does this so he might make even those not yet born vigilant and so he might set a protective wall around the entire flock by his prophecy.

Indeed, it's also the case that a loving father when he builds a house for his children often makes it so splendid and large that it's useful not only for them, but also for their children and for those who come after them. In the same way a king, when encircling his beloved city with an external wall, makes it secure and strong and permanent, so it might not only serve for his own generation, but be useful also for all those who come later, not only to withstand current military tactics, but also to be well-suited for the modes of attack that will be devised later. Paul does this, too. For the apostolic letters are walls for the churches;⁴⁸ through them Paul grants security not only to the people alive back then, but also to those who will come later.⁴⁹ And he made this bulwark so strong and unbreachable, and he built it to surround the entire world with complete security in order to rescue both those who were alive then and those who come after them, both those alive now and those to follow hereafter up until the coming of Christ, from being besieged by their enemies. This is what the souls of the saints are like: loving and caring, and in their powerful love exceeding paternal benevolence, outdoing natural affection, and surpassing even maternal birth pangs. For these things are born of the Spirit and divine grace.

4. Do you want me to demonstrate once more from another source that the saints don't exert their care only for their own affairs or for their own contemporaries but also for those who will live later? "*The disciples approached him*" (Matt 24:3), it says, when he was seated on the mountain (cf. Matt 24:3). They were men who had now grown old and a short while later were going to depart from the present life. So then, what do they ask? What are they anxious about? What do they fear? On whose behalf do they bring an inquiry to the teacher? For their own lives or for those who were alive at that time? Not at all. But instead, passing by all those things, what do they say? "*What is the sign of your coming [275] and of the end of the age?*" (Matt 24:3). Have you seen them asking about the end of the age and

αἰῶνος ἐρωτῶντας, καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐσομένων ἀνθρώπων φροντίζοντας; Οὐ γὰρ τὰ ἑαυτῶν ὁρῶσιν οἱ ἀπόστολοι, ἀλλὰ τὰ τῶν ἄλλων καὶ κοινῇ πάντες καὶ ἰδίᾳ ἕκαστος. Ὁ οὖν Πέτρος ὁ κορυφαῖος τοῦ χοροῦ, τὸ στόμα τῶν ἀποστόλων ἀπάντων, ἡ κεφαλὴ τῆς φατρίας ἐκείνης, ὁ τῆς οἰκουμένης ἀπάσης προστάτης, ὁ θεμέλιος τῆς Ἐκκλησίας, ὁ θερμὸς ἐραστὴς τοῦ Χριστοῦ· Πέτρε, γὰρ, φησί, φιλεῖς με πλεῖον τούτων; Διὰ τοῦτο λέγω τὰ ἐγκώμια, ἵνα μάθητε ὅτι ὄντως φιλεῖ τὸν Χριστόν· τοῦ γὰρ εἰς τὸν Δεσπότην φίλτρου ἡ κηδεμονία τῶν δούλων τεκμήριόν ἐστι μέγιστον. Καὶ οὐκ ἐγὼ ταῦτα λέγω, ἀλλ' αὐτὸς ὁ φιλούμενος Δεσπότης· Εἰ φιλεῖς με, φησί, ποίμαινε τὰ πρόβατά μου. Ἰδωμεν οὖν ὄντως εἰ ποιμένος ἔχει προστασίαν, εἰ ὄντως κηδεμονίαν, εἰ ὄντως φιλεῖ τὰ πρόβατα, εἰ ὄντως φιλόστοργός ἐστι περὶ τὴν ποίμνην, ἵνα καταμάθωμεν ὅτι καὶ τὸν ποιμένα φιλεῖ· τοῦτο γὰρ ἐκείνου σημεῖον ἔφησεν εἶναι. Οὗτος τοίνυν ὁ Πέτρος ἅπαντα ῥίψας ὅσα εἶχε, τὸ δίκτυον, τὰ ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ πάντα, καὶ ἀφείς τὴν θάλατταν, τὴν τέχνην, τὴν οἰκίαν. Μὴ γὰρ δὴ τοῦτο ἴδωμεν, ὅτι ὀλίγα ταῦτα, ἀλλ' ὅτι πάντα τὰ ὄντα· καὶ τὴν προθυμίαν ἐπαινέσωμεν. Καὶ γὰρ ἡ τὰ δύο καταβαλοῦσα δηνάρια οὐ πολὺν ὄγκον κατέθηκε χρημάτων, ἀλλὰ πολὺν πλοῦτον ἐπεδείξατο προαιρέσεως, καθάπερ καὶ οὗτος ἐν πολλῇ πενίᾳ μεγάλην εὐπορίαν προθυμίας παρέσχετο. Ὅπερ γὰρ ἐτέρῳ χωρία, καὶ ἀνδράποδα, καὶ οἰκήματα, καὶ χρυσίον, τοῦτο ἐκείνῳ τὸ δίκτυον, καὶ ἡ θάλαττα, καὶ ἡ τέχνη, καὶ τὸ πλοῖον. Μὴ τοίνυν τοῦτο ἴδωμεν, εἰ ὀλίγα ἀφῆκεν, ἀλλ' εἰ μὴ πάντα ἀφῆκε. Τοῦτο γὰρ ἐστι τὸ ζητούμενον, οὐκ ὀλίγα ἢ πολλὰ καταθεῖναι, ἀλλὰ μηδὲν ἐλάττω τῆς οἰκείας δυνάμεως εἰσενεγκεῖν. Πάντα τοίνυν ἀφείς, καὶ πατρίδα, καὶ οἰκίαν, καὶ φίλους, καὶ συγγενεῖς, καὶ αὐτὴν τὴν ἀσφάλειαν· καὶ γὰρ τὸν δῆμον τὸν Ἰουδαϊκὸν ἑαυτῷ τούτῳ τῷ τρόπῳ ἐξεπολέμησεν. Ἦδη γὰρ, φησί, συνέβητο Ἰουδαῖοι, ἐάν τις ὁμολογήσῃ αὐτὸν Χριστόν,

50. On these epithets, see *HT* 69–93, especially 87, with nn. 139 and 142 on the first and last in the list.

51. With Πέτρε for Σίμων Ἰωνᾶ; φιλεῖς (cf. 21:17) for ἀγαπᾷς.

52. In the first part of the sentence, in recreating the dialogue, Chrysostom has paraphrased the question, φιλεῖς με (actually, from the following verse, 21:17), into a conditional, Εἰ φιλεῖς με.

53. I.e., Christ as the shepherd, as emphasized in John 21:16: τὰ πρόβατά μου, to be read with John 10:11–16 (ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ ποιμὴν ὁ καλός).

54. In the PG text as translated above this is an *anakolouthon*, as the preacher interrupts himself to extol Peter's renunciation of possessions despite his poverty. Alternatively, perhaps there is a lacuna in the manuscript (Vat. gr. 559) here (see also pp. 50–51 for discussion).

55. A brief nod to a possible "problem" of praising Peter for giving up his possessions when they were paltry to begin with.

being concerned for the people who will be alive in the future? The apostles, both all in common and each one individually, didn't look to their own advantage but to that of others. Indeed, there was Peter, the chief of the band, the spokesperson of all the apostles, the head of that company, the patron of the whole world, the foundation of the church, the warm lover of Christ.⁵⁰ For, he says, "Peter, *do you love me more than these?*" (John 21:15).⁵¹ The reason I'm singing his praises is so you might learn that he truly loved Christ. After all, care for the slaves is the greatest proof that one loves their master. And it's not I who say this, but the beloved Master himself: "If you love me," he says, "*shepherd my sheep*" (John 21:16).⁵² So let's see if Peter truly exercised the leadership befitting a shepherd, if he truly cares for them, if he truly loves the sheep, if he truly had tender affection for the flock, so we might learn that he loves the shepherd, too.⁵³ For Christ said that the former is a sign of the latter. Indeed, this man Peter, having thrown away all he had, his net, all the things in the boat, and having left behind the sea, his occupation, and his house⁵⁴ (Matt 4:18–20; 19:27 and parr.).... Now, let's not focus on the fact that these possessions were few⁵⁵ but that they were all he had (Matt 19:27),⁵⁶ and let's praise his ethical zeal. For after all, the woman who threw in the two *denarii* (cf. Mark 12:41–44 // Luke 21:1–4) didn't deposit a weighty amount of money, but she displayed tremendous wealth in ethical volition. In the same way, Peter, too, exhibited a great abundance of ethical zeal⁵⁷ in the midst of his great poverty. Because what land, slaves, houses, and gold are to others, the net, the sea, his occupation, and his boat were to Peter. So then, let's not focus on whether he left behind a few possessions, but on whether he left "*everything*" (Matt 19:27) behind. For what's sought⁵⁸ isn't whether one deposits a few things or many, but if one contributes an amount that's not less than one's capacity. And so, after leaving everything—his homeland and house and friends and relatives and security itself⁵⁹.... Indeed, it was the case that by doing this, he was provoking the Jewish people to war against himself, for, it says, "*The Jews had already agreed if anyone might confess him as the*

56. ἰδοὺ ἡμεῖς ἀφήκαμεν πάντα.

57. On the translation and range of meanings of *προαίρεσις* and *προθυμία* in Chrysostom's writings, see HT 440.

58. Likely the participle τὸ ζητούμενον is a divine passive here: "what God seeks" (cf. 1 Cor 4:2, ζητεῖται). Alternatively (more in line with the form of problems and solutions) we could translate "what one should focus attention on."

59. A second *anakolouthon*, akin to the one previous in this paragraph.

ἀποσυνάγωγος γένηται. “Ὅθεν δῆλον, ὅτι οὐκ ἀμφέβαλλεν, οὐδὲ ἐδεδόικει περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν, ἀλλὰ σφόδρα ἐπέπειστο, καὶ ἀπ’ αὐτῆς τῆς τῶν πραγμάτων ἀποδείξεως, καὶ πρὸ τῆς τῶν πραγμάτων ἀποδείξεως ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ Σωτῆρος φωνῆς, ὅτι κληρονομήσει πάντως αὐτήν. Εἰπὼν γάρ, ὅτι Ἡμεῖς ἀφήκαμεν πάντα, καὶ ἠκολουθήσαμεν σοι, τί ἡμῖν ἔσται; ἀπεκρίθη αὐτοῖς ὁ Χριστὸς, ὅτι Καθήσεσθε ἐπὶ δώδεκα θρόνους, κρίνοντες τὰς δώδεκα φυλάς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ.

Ταῦτα δὲ κατεσκευάσα, ἵνα ὅταν δείξω αὐτὸν ἀγωνιῶντα ὑπὲρ τῶν συνδούλων, μὴ εἴπῃς ὅτι ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ ἐδεδόικει. Πῶς γὰρ ἂν ἔδεισεν, αὐτοῦ τοῦ μέλλοντος αὐτὸν στεφανοῦν ἀποφνημαμένου ὑπὲρ τοῦ στεφάνου καὶ τῶν βραβείων; Οὗτος τοίνυν ὁ Πέτρος, ὁ πάντα ἀφείς, ὁ θαρρῶν ὑπὲρ τῆς βασιλείας τῶν οὐρανῶν, προσελθόντος ποτὲ πλουσίου τινός, καὶ εἰπόντος τῷ Χριστῷ, Τί ποιήσω ἵνα κληρονομήσω ζωὴν αἰώνιον; καὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀποκριναμένου, Εἰ θέλεις τέλειος εἶναι, ὕπαγε, πώλησόν σου τὰ ὑπάρχοντα, καὶ δὸς πτωχοῖς, καὶ δεῦρο ἀκολουθεῖ μοι· εἴτα πρὸς τοῦτο λυπηθέντος ἐκείνου, καὶ λέγοντος τοῖς μαθηταῖς τοῦ Χριστοῦ, Ὅρατε πῶς δυσκόλως εἰσέρχονται οἱ πλούσιοι εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν· ἀμὴν, ἀμὴν λέγω ὑμῖν, ὅτι εὐκοπώτερόν ἐστι κάμηλον διὰ τρυπήματος ῥαφίδος [276] εἰσελθεῖν, ἢ πλούσιον εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ· ὁ Πέτρος, ὁ ἀκτήμων, ὁ θαρρῶν ὑπὲρ τῆς βασιλείας, ὁ ὑπὲρ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ μὴ δεδοικῶς σωτηρίας, ὁ πεπεισμένος σαφῶς περὶ τῆς ἐκεῖ αὐτῷ ἀποκειμένης τιμῆς, ἀκούσας ταῦτα ἔλεγε· Τίς δύναται σωθῆναι; Τί δέδοικας, ὦ μακάριε Πέτρε; τί ἀγωνιάς; τί τρέμεις; Πάντα ἔρριψας, πάντα ἀφῆκας· περὶ τῶν πλουτούντων ὁ λόγος,

60. With συνέθεντο for συνετέθειντο; minus οἱ before Ἰουδαῖοι; minus ἵνα before ἐάν; transposition of αὐτὸν ὁμολογήσῃ Χριστόν to ὁμολογήσῃ αὐτὸν Χριστόν.

61. Minus ἄρα after τί; transposition of ἔσται and ἡμῖν.

62. With καθήσεσθε for καθίσεσθε; minus καὶ ὑμεῖς after καθήσεσθε.

63. Chrysostom defends Peter against the charge of cowardice also, and at greater length, in *Hom. Gal. 2:11–14* §§4–7 (PG 51:375–78).

64. Although what follows shows that John is referring to the Matthean version of the pericope, his wording of the man’s question follows the Markan text rather than the parallel in Matt 19:16. The only variation is the transposition of ζωὴν αἰώνιον and κληρονομήσω.

65. With ellipsis of καὶ ἔξεις θησαυρὸν ἐν οὐανοῖς, as marked.

66. This quotation mixed with paraphrase reflects considerable harmonization among the parallel accounts: πῶς before δυσκόλως (with Mark 10:23 // Luke 18:24; plural of substantive with Mark 10:23 // Luke 18:24 (οἱ τὰ χρήματα ἔχοντες) but lexical choice πλούσιος with Matt 19:23; ἀμὴν (ἀμὴν) λέγω ὑμῖν from Matt 19:23. Textual changes from the Matthean account: plus Ὅρατε (cf. Matt 9:30; 16:6; 18:10; 24:6) before

Christ, that person should be put out of the synagogue" (John 9:22).⁶⁰ From this it's clear that Peter did not harbor doubts nor did he have fear about the kingdom of heaven. Instead, he was strongly convinced—both because of the proof offered by the unfolding events, and, even before the proof offered by events, by the statement made by the Savior—that he would fully inherit it. For after Peter said, "*We have left everything and have followed you. What will we have?*" (Matt 19:27),⁶¹ Christ answered them, "*You will sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel*" (Matt 19:28).⁶²

I've presented all these arguments so when I show Peter to be anxious on behalf of his fellow slaves, you won't say that he was afraid for himself.⁶³ For how could he have been afraid when the very Lord who was going to bestow the crown on him had made the declaration about the crown and the rewards? And so this man, Peter, the one who had left everything behind, the one who had bold confidence about the kingdom of heaven.... And when a rich man approached and said to Christ, "*What should I do so that I might inherit eternal life*" (Mark 10:17),⁶⁴ Christ answered him, "*If you wish to be perfect, go, sell your belongings and give to the poor... And come, follow me*" (Matt 19:19).⁶⁵ Then the man became grieved at this, and Christ said to the disciples, "*Look how difficult it is for the rich to enter into the kingdom of heaven. Amen, amen, I say to you that it is easier for a camel to enter through the eye of a needle [276] than for a rich person to enter into the kingdom of God*" (Matt 19:24 and par.).⁶⁶ It's at that moment⁶⁷ that Peter—the one without possessions, the one who had bold confidence about the kingdom of heaven, the one who had no fear for his own salvation, the one who'd been clearly convinced about the honor laid up in store for him there—when he had heard these things, said,⁶⁸ "*Who is able to be saved?*" (Mark 10:26 // Luke 18:26).⁶⁹ "What are you afraid of, blessed Peter? Why are you anxious? Why do you tremble? You threw everything

[πᾶς] δυσκόλως; with εἰσέρχονται for εἰσελεύσεται; plus ὅτι before εὐκοπώτερον; εἰσελθεῖν for διελθεῖν. This is likely due to Chrysostom quoting from memory, but also selectively as fits his argument.

67. Here translating the εἶτα from before πρὸς τοῦτο λυπηθέντος ἐκείνου that embeds the following quotation. As noted previously, this entire section includes multiple *anacoloutha* (or possible textual lacunae).

68. Actually, in none of the Synoptic accounts does Peter alone ask the following question; in Matt 19:25 and Mark 10:26 it is the disciples, and in Luke 18:26 a generic group of hearers.

69. Matt 19:25 has ἄρα after τίς. But both the Markan and Lukan versions have καὶ δύναται. More likely Chrysostom is quoting from memory and coalescing the versions.

ἐκείνων κατηγορία τὸ λεγόμενον· σὺ δὲ ἐν πενίᾳ καὶ ἀκτημοσύνῃ διατελεῖς ζῶν. Ἄλλ' οὐ τὸ ἑμαυτοῦ σκοπῶ, φησὶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ ἐτέρων συμφέρον ζητῶ. Διὰ τοῦτο ὑπὲρ τῶν καθ' ἑαυτὸν θαρρῶν, ὑπὲρ τῶν ἄλλων τὴν πεῦσιν προσήγαγε λέγων, Τίς δύναται σωθῆναι;

ε'. Εἶδες τῶν ἀποστόλων τὴν κηδεμονίαν; πῶς ἐν σώμα εἰσιν; εἶδες πῶς καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν παρόντων καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν μελλόντων ἐδεδοίκει ὁ Πέτρος; Οὕτω καὶ ὁ Παῦλος. Διὸ ἔλεγε· Γινώσκετε, ὅτι ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις ἐνστήσονται καιροὶ χαλεποί. Καὶ ἀλλαχοῦ δὲ τοῦτο ποιεῖ πάλιν. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἔμελλε λοιπὸν ἀφίστασθαι τῆς Ἀσίας, καὶ ἐπὶ τὴν Ῥώμην ἄγεσθαι, καὶ ἐκεῖθεν ἐπὶ τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀποδημεῖν· ὁ θάνατος γὰρ τῶν ἀγίων οὐκ ἔστι θάνατος, ἀλλὰ μετástασις ἀπὸ γῆς εἰς οὐρανόν, ἀπὸ τῶν ἐλαττόνων εἰς τὰ βελτίω, ἀπὸ τῶν συνδούλων ἐπὶ τὸν Δεσπότην, ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων πρὸς τοὺς ἀγγέλους· ἐπεὶ οὖν ἔμελλεν ἀπιέναι πρὸς τὸν τῶν ἀπάντων Δεσπότην Θεόν, καὶ τὰ καθ' ἑαυτὸν πάντα καλῶς ὥκονόμησε. Καὶ γὰρ τὸν χρόνον, ὃν συνῆν τοῖς μαθηταῖς, μετὰ πάσης ἀκριβείας τὴν διδασκαλίαν αὐτοῖς παρέθετο, καὶ λέγει· Καθαρὸς ἐγὼ ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος πάντων, καὶ οὐδὲν ἐνέλιπον, φησὶ, τῶν ὀφειλόντων εἰσενεχθῆναι πρὸς σωτηρίαν. Τί οὖν; ἐπειδὴ τὰ καθ' ἑαυτὸν ἡσφαλίσατο, ἐπειδὴ ἐγκαλεῖσθαι οὐκ ἔμελλεν ἀπὸ τοῦ Δεσπότου ὑπὲρ τῶν κατ' αὐτὸν χρόνων, ἄρα ἡμέλησε τῶν μετὰ ταῦτα ψυχῶν; Οὐδαμῶς· ἀλλ' ὥσπερ μέλλων καὶ ἐκείνων εὐθύνας ὑπέχειν, οὕτως κάκεῖνα μετὰ πάσης αὐτοῖς λέγει τῆς ἀκριβείας, καὶ αὐτὰ ἅ πάλιν ἀναγνώσωμεν τὰ ῥήματα· Προσέχετε, φησὶν, ἑαυτοῖς καὶ παντὶ τῷ ποιμνίῳ. Εἶδες πῶς ἦν συνδεδεμένος αὐτῶν τῇ φροντίδι; Ἡμῶν μὲν γὰρ ἕκαστος τὰ καθ' ἑαυτὸν μεριμνᾷ, ὁ δὲ προεστὼς τὰ πάντων. Διὸ φησι περὶ τῶν διδασκάλων· Οἵτινες ἀγρυπνοῦσιν ὑπὲρ τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν, ὡς λόγον ἀποδώσοντες. Φοβερόν ὄντως τὸ κρυπτήριον ὑπὲρ τοσούτου δήμου τὰς εὐθύνας ὑπέχειν· ἀλλ', ὅπερ ἔλεγον, καλέσας αὐτοὺς φησι· Προσέχετε

70. John addresses these lines to Peter.

71. In this personification John has placed unmistakably Pauline injunctions (even if not exact quotations) in Peter's mouth.

72. Quoted in the same form as previously in this paragraph.

73. Chrysostom is creating a prosopopoeia in his dialogue with Paul, likely with Acts 20:20 foremost in view: ὡς οὐδὲν ὑπεστειλάμην τῶν συμφερόντων τοῦ μὴ ἀναγγεῖλαι ὑμῖν.

74. Minus οὖν after προσέχετε.

75. With οἵτινες for αὐτοί; minus γάρ before ἀγρυπνοῦσιν.

76. Mf printed the manuscript reading κρυπτήριον, but added a note: "Sic ms. Sed haud dubie legendum κριτήριον. Ita enim sensus postulat," and translated the variant

away, you left everything behind. The statement concerns those who are rich; what's said is an accusation against them. But you've spent your life in poverty and without possessions."⁷⁰ "But I don't look to my own advantage," Peter says, "but I seek the advantage of others" (cf. Phil 2:4; 1 Cor 10:24, 33).⁷¹ This is why, despite having bold confidence in his own prospects, he introduced the question on behalf of others, saying, "*Who is able to be saved?*" (Mark 10:26 // Luke 18:26).⁷²

5. Have you seen the apostles' solicitude? How they're a single body? Have you seen how Peter was afraid both for the people present then and for those to come? This was also the case with Paul. That's why he said, "*Know that in the last days perilous times will come*" (2 Tim 3:1). And he does this again elsewhere, as well. There was that time when he was going to leave Asia at last and be conducted to Rome, and from there to go off into heaven. For the death of the saints isn't a death but a transference from earth to heaven, from lesser to greater things, from fellow slaves to the Master, from human beings to angels. So then, at that moment, when he was going to go off to the Lord God of all creation, he exercised excellent stewardship of all his responsibilities. Indeed, for the entire time that he was with his disciples (cf. Acts 20:18), he presented them with his teaching in the most careful and scrupulous way. He says, "*I am innocent of the blood of all*" (Acts 20:26), and, he says, "I've left nothing undone that would accrue to your salvation" (cf. Acts 20:20).⁷³ So what then? Since he'd securely dealt with his responsibilities during his lifetime, was he then neglectful of the souls that would come later since he was free of any accusation from the Lord concerning his own times? No way! In the same way as if he were going to have to give an account for those souls, too, he speaks to the Ephesian elders in a careful and detailed way about the things pertaining to his own conduct, and then about the concerns expressed in the words we shall read out now: "*Keep watch over yourselves and all the flock*" (Acts 20:28).⁷⁴ Have you seen how he'd been held bound by his care for them? Each of us is worried about our own affairs, but the leader cares for the affairs of everyone. That's why he says about the teachers: "*Who lose sleep on behalf of your souls, as those who will give an account*" (Heb 13:17).⁷⁵ Truly fearsome is the judgment⁷⁶ involved in having to account for such a large group of people. But, as I was saying, after summoning

reading, *judicium*, in his Latin rendition. JPM also retained the reading *κρυπτήριον* in the text and printed Mf's note (but without the last sentence). I adopt the emended reading, *κρίτηριον*, as translated above.

ἑαυτοῖς καὶ παντὶ τῷ ποιμνίῳ, ἐν ᾧ ὑμᾶς ἔθετο τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ποιμένας καὶ ἐπισκόπους. Τί γέγονεν; τίνος ἔνεκεν παραινεῖς; μή τι προορᾷς δεινόν; μή τι προβλέπεις χαλεπόν; μή τις κίνδυνος, μή τις συμφορὰ, μή τις πόλεμος; Εἰπέ· καὶ γὰρ ὑψηλότερος ἡμῶν ἔστηκας· καὶ οὐ τὰ παρόντα βλέπεις μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ μέλλοντα προορᾷς. Εἰπέ τοίνυν τίνος ἔνεκεν παραγγέλλεις ταῦτα καὶ παραινεῖς. Οἶδα, φησὶν, ὅτι μετὰ τὴν ἄφιξίν μου εἰσελεύσονται λύκοι βαρεῖς εἰς τὸ ποῖμνιον. Εἶδες ὅπερ ἔλεγον, πῶς οὐχ ὑπὲρ τῶν καθ' ἑαυτὸν χρόνων ἀγωνιᾷ καὶ δέδοικε μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν μετὰ τὴν ἄφιξιν αὐτοῦ; Εἰσελεύσονται γὰρ λύκοι, φησί· καὶ οὐχ ἀπλῶς, λύκοι, ἀλλὰ, Λύκοι βαρεῖς, μὴ φειδόμενοι τοῦ ποιμνίου.

Διπλοῦς ὁ πόλεμος· ἀπουσία Παύλου, καὶ ἔφοδος τῶν λύκων· οὐδὲ ὁ διδάσκαλος πάρεστιν, καὶ οἱ διαφθείροντες ἐπικείσονται. Καὶ σκοπεῖ κακουργίαν θηρίων, καὶ πονηρῶν [277] ἀνθρώπων ἐπίνοιαν· τὴν ἀπουσίαν παρετηρήσαντο τοῦ διδασκάλου, καὶ τότε ἐπέθεντο τῷ ποιμνίῳ. Τί οὖν; ἀπροστατεύτους ἡμᾶς ἔῃς, καὶ προλέγεις τὰ δεινὰ μόνον, οὐδεμίαν δὲ ἐπινοεῖς παραμυθίαν; Ἀλλὰ ἂν τοῦτο ποιῇς, μᾶλλον αὖξεις τὴν δειλίαν, καὶ καταβάλλεις τὰ φρονήματα, καὶ ἐκλύεις τὰ νεῦρα, παραλύεις τὰς χεῖρας τῶν ἀκουόντων. Διὰ τοι τοῦτο πρότερον αὐτοὺς τοῦ Πνεύματος ἀνέμνησεν· Ἐν ᾧ ὑμᾶς τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἔθετο ποιμένας καὶ ἐπισκόπους. Κἂν Παῦλος ἀπήν, φησὶν, ἀλλ' ὁ Παράκλητος πάρεστιν. Εἶδες πῶς ἐπτέρωσεν αὐτῶν τὴν ψυχὴν, ἀναμνήσας τοῦ διδασκάλου τοῦ θεοῦ, δι' ὃν καὶ αὐτὸς παρὼν ἴσχυε; Τίνος οὖν ἔνεκεν εἰς φόβον ἐνέβαλεν; Ἵνα ἐκβάλῃ πάλιν τὴν ῥαθυμίαν. Ἐκάτερα γὰρ δεῖ ποιεῖν τὸν συμβουλευόντα, μήτε ἀφιέναι θαρρεῖν τὸν ἀκούοντα, ἵνα μὴ ῥαθυμότερος γένηται· μήτε φοβεῖν πάλιν μόνον, ἵνα μὴ εἰς δειλίαν ἐμπέσῃ. Ἀναμνήσας μὲν οὖν τοῦ Πνεύματος, ἐξέβαλε τὴν δειλίαν· εἰπὼν δὲ τοὺς

77. Minus οὖν after προσέχετε; with transposition of τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον and ἔθετο; plus ποιμένας καί (cf. ποιμαίνειν in what follows) before ἐπισκόπους.

78. John addresses all these questions to Paul. Paul responds with the words of Acts 20:29.

79. Minus τοῦτο after οἶδα; with transposition of εἰσελεύσονται and μετὰ τὴν ἄφιξίν μου; with εἰς τὸ ποῖμνιον for εἰς ὑμᾶς (cf. μὴ φειδόμενοι τοῦ ποιμνίου).

80. With ellipsis of εἰς ὑμᾶς, as marked.

81. διπλοῦς ὁ πόλεμος; Mf crisply translates, “*duplex bellum*.”

82. John is broaching the potential “problem” by personifying the hypothetical response of the Ephesian elders at this precise moment, before Paul’s speech continues beyond Acts 20:29.

83. Plus ποιμένας καί before ἐπισκόπους.

84. ὁ παράκλητος; cf. John 14:26, where the “Comforter” is specifically identified with the Holy Spirit.

them, Paul says, “*Keep watch over yourselves and all the flock, over which the Holy Spirit has set you as shepherds and overseers*” (Acts 20:28).⁷⁷ “What has happened? Why do you offer this advice? Do you foresee something terrible? Do you forecast something horrible? Is it some danger, some misfortune, some battle? Speak! For you have stood higher up than we, and you don’t only see present events, but you also foresee the things that are going to happen. Now, tell us why you’re commanding and advising these things.”⁷⁸ He says, “*I know that after my departure savage wolves will come into the flock*” (Acts 20:29).⁷⁹ Have you seen what I was saying, how he’s anxious and fearful not only on behalf of his own days, but also on behalf of the times that will come after his departure? For “*wolves ... will come*” (Acts 20:29), he says, and not simply “wolves,” but “*savage wolves ... who do not spare the flock*” (Acts 20:29).⁸⁰

It was a double-pronged battle:⁸¹ the absence of Paul and the entrance of the wolves. The teacher isn’t present, and the deadly forces will attack. Just look at the malevolence of the beasts and the devious design of wicked people. [277] They watched intently for the absence of the teacher, and then they set upon the flock. “What then? You allow us to be leaderless, and you only give a forecast about the terrible things, but you devise no consolation? But if you do this, you increase the cowardice of the hearers all the more, dash their spirits, fray their nerves, and weaken their hands.”⁸² That’s why he first reminded them of the Spirit: “*over which the Holy Spirit has set you as shepherds and overseers*” (Acts 20:28).⁸³ “Even if Paul is away,” he means, “nonetheless the Comforter⁸⁴ is present.” Have you seen how Paul raised their souls aloft by reminding them of the divine Instructor that was the source of his own strength when he was present? So then, why did he cast them into fear? So he might in turn cast out their complacency.⁸⁵ For one who gives counsel must accomplish both these things—neither allowing the hearers to become overconfident, lest they become more complacent,⁸⁶ nor merely instilling perpetual fear, lest they collapse into cowardice. So, by reminding them of the Spirit, Paul cast out their

85. As Chrysostom tells it, this was all Paul’s deliberate plan, to fight two battles at once, against wolves from the outside and against complacency from within. This stratagem solves the “problem” Chrysostom has articulated, that Paul’s severe warning about the first could be perceived as frightening the believers rather than reassuring them at a time of crisis.

86. ῥᾰθυμος, an important term in this argument, means “complacent,” “indifferent,” “apathetic,” and “indolent” (see PGL s.v. ῥᾰθυμία). Chrysostom likely means all of these things at once.

λύκους, ἐξέβαλε τὴν ῥαθυμίαν. Λύκοι βαρεῖς, μὴ φειδόμενοι τοῦ ποιμινίου. Προσέχετε ἑαυτοῖς. Οὐδὲν ὑπεστειλάμην, φησί· μνημονεύετε μου.

Ἰκανὸν γὰρ ὄντως εἰς τὸ θαρρεῖν τὸ μεμνηῆσθαι Παύλου. Οὐχ ἀπλῶς δὲ λέγει τὴν μνήμην τὴν ἑαυτοῦ, ἀλλὰ τὴν μνήμην τῶν κατορθωμάτων. "Οτι γὰρ οὐχ ἀπλῶς λέγει τὴν μνήμην τὴν αὐτοῦ, ἀλλ' ἵνα μεμνημένοι ζηλώσωσιν, ἀκούσονται ἐπήγαγεν. Μνημονεύετε μου, ὅτι τριετίαν νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν οὐ διέλειπον μετὰ δακρύων καὶ τῶν ὀδυρμῶν ἐκείνων ἀπάντων, νουθετῶν ἕνα ἕκαστον ὑμῶν. Οὐχ ἀπλῶς ὑμᾶς βούλομαι μεμνηῆσθαι μου, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦ χρόνου καὶ τῆς νουθεσίας, καὶ τῆς σπουδῆς καὶ τῶν δακρύων, καὶ τῶν ὀδυρμῶν ἐκείνων ἀπάντων. Καθάπερ γὰρ ἐπὶ τῶν καμνόντων οἱ προσήκοντες, ἐπειδὴ πολλοὺς καὶ μακροὺς ἀποτεῖναντες λόγους μὴ πεισθῶσι τὰ τῶν ἀρρωστούντων προέσθαι σιτία καὶ φάρμακα, δακρύουσιν, ὥστε αὐτοὺς ἐπικάμψαι μᾶλλον· οὕτω καὶ Παῦλος ἐπὶ τῶν μαθητῶν ἐποίει· ἡνίκα ἂν εἶδεν ἀσθενοῦντα τὸν λόγον τῆς διδασκαλίας, τὴν θεραπείαν τὴν ἀπὸ τῶν δακρύων εἰσέφερε.

ς'. Τίς δὲ οὐκ ἂν ἡδέσθη Παῦλον δακρύνοντα καὶ ὀδυρόμενον ὁρῶν, εἰ καὶ τῶν λίθων ἀναισθητότερος ᾖ; Εἶδες πῶς κάκει προεῖπε τὰ μέλλοντα; Καὶ ἐνταῦθα τὸ αὐτὸ τοῦτο ποιεῖ λέγων· Τοῦτο δὲ γινώσκετε, ὅτι ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις ἐνστήσονται καιροὶ χαλεποί. Τίνος δὲ ἕνεκεν Τιμοθέῳ λέγει, καὶ οὐ λέγει· Ἰδέτωσαν δὲ οἱ μετὰ ταῦτα μέλλοντες γίνεσθαι, ὅτι ἐνστήσονται καιροὶ χαλεποί; Ἀλλὰ γίνωσκε σὺ, ἵνα μάθῃς ὅτι καὶ ὁ μαθητὴς ὁμοίως τῷ διδασκάλῳ τῶν ἐσομένων κήδεται. Οὐδὲ γὰρ εἰ μὴ ἐκήδετο, παραπλησίως ἐκείνῳ τὴν φροντίδα ἐνέθηκεν ἄν. Οὕτω καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ποιεῖ· ἐπειδὴ γὰρ προσῆλθον οἱ μαθηταί, τὰ περὶ τῆς συντελείας μαθεῖν θέλοντες, φησὶ πρὸς αὐτούς· Μελλήσετε δὲ ἀκούειν πολέμους. Καὶ μὴν οὐκ ἐκεῖνοι ἔμελλον ἀκούειν. Ἐν γὰρ ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα τῶν πιστῶν. Καὶ καθάπερ οἱ τότε ὄντες

87. Minus οὖν after προσέχετε.

88. This appears to be John's interpretation of Paul's intention as gleaned from the participle *μνημονεύοντες* in Acts 20:31, which he will quote next. In making this argument (and rephrasing the participle into the imperative, *μνημονεύετε μου*), Chrysostom is likely influenced also by the letters, such as Col 4:18: *μνημονεύετε μου τῶν δεσμῶν*; 1 Thess 2:9: *μνημονεύετε ... τὸν κόπον ἡμῶν καὶ τὸν μόχθον*.

89. With *μνημονεύετε μου* for *μνημονεύοντες* (see previous note); plus *καὶ τῶν ὀδυρμῶν ἐκείνων ἀπάντων* before *νουθετῶν*; plus *ὑμῶν* after *ἕνα ἕκαστον*.

90. Acts 20:19, 31; cf. 2 Cor 2:4. On Paul's tears as a favored theme of Chrysostom's, see *HT* 186–90.

91. I.e., in Acts 20:28–29, as just analyzed. John now returns to the focal passage of his homily, 2 Tim 3:1.

92. The addressee of this singular imperative is Timothy, though when citing

cowardice, and by mentioning the wolves, he cast out their complacency. “Savage wolves ... who do not spare the flock” (Acts 20:29). “Keep watch over yourselves” (Acts 20:28);⁸⁷ “I have held back nothing” (Acts 20:20), he says. “Remember me” (cf. Acts 20:31).⁸⁸

Indeed, holding Paul in remembrance is truly all that is required to instill confidence. Yet Paul doesn’t speak of remembering him in some general way, but of remembering his good deeds. For it is not for no reason that he says they should remember, but so that by remembering him they might emulate him. To establish this point he added this for his future listener: “Remember about me *that for three years, night and day, I did not leave off from admonishing each one of you with tears* and all those lamentations” (Acts 20:31).⁸⁹ I don’t wish you simply to have remembrance of me, but also of the amount of time, the admonishment, the zeal, the tears, and all those lamentations. Relatives of people who are sick, after they talk to them repeatedly and at great length but don’t manage to persuade them to give up unhealthy foods and drugs, start to cry in order to move them to change. This is the same thing Paul used to do in the case of the disciples. When he saw that his verbal teaching had limited power, he introduced the remedy that comes from tears.⁹⁰

6. What person, even if they were more unfeeling than a stone, wouldn’t stand in awe of Paul when seeing him crying and lamenting? Have you seen how there, too,⁹¹ he foretells future events? And in our passage he does this very same thing, saying, “*And know this: that in the last days perilous times will come*” (2 Tim 3:1). Why does he say this to Timothy and why doesn’t he say, “Let those who will live later observe that ‘*perilous times will come*’”? But instead, “know⁹² this, Timothy,”⁹³ so that you might learn that the disciple, too, just like his teacher, has concern for the events that will come to pass in the future. For if he wasn’t concerned, then he wouldn’t have invested the same care as his teacher. Christ did this same thing too. When the disciples approached him because they wished to learn about the end of the age, he says to them, “*And you will hear of wars*” (Matt 24:6). However, it wasn’t they themselves who were going to hear of them. For the body of the faithful is one. Just as those who were alive then hear about

the lemma just now (as throughout the homily), Chrysostom does so with the plural, γινώσκετε. Perhaps we see here an influence of the reading of \mathfrak{M} , γινώσκε, which John clearly knows (on which see p. 636 n. 2 above).

93. Chrysostom personifies Paul’s address to Timothy and the purpose for which the apostle gave these instructions to his disciple.

περὶ τῶν ὑστέρων ἀκούουσιν, οὕτω δὴ καὶ ἡμεῖς περὶ τῶν τότε γενομένων μανθάνομεν. Ὅπερ γὰρ εἶπον, σῶμα ἓν ἔσμεν ἡμεῖς κἀκεῖνοι, μετὰ ἀκριβείας ἀλλήλοις συνδεδεμένοι, εἰ καὶ τὴν ἐσχάτην τῶν μελῶν ἐπέχομεν τάξιν· καὶ τὸ σῶμα τοῦτο οὐ χρόνος δίστησιν, οὐ τόπος· συνδεδέμεθα γὰρ ἀλλήλοις, οὐ νεύρων περιβολαῖς, ἀλλ' ἀγάπης δεσμοῖς περιβεβλημένοι πάντοθεν. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ἐκείνοις περὶ ἡμῶν διαλέγεται, καὶ ἡμεῖς τὰ ἐκείνων ἀκούσωμεν.

Ἄξιον δὲ ζητῆσαι κἀκεῖνο, τί δῆποτε [278] πανταχοῦ τὰ σκυθρωπὰ πρὸς τὰ τέλη τῆς παρουσίας ζωῆς συνωθῆσθαι φησι. Καὶ γὰρ ἀλλαχοῦ λέγει· Ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις ἀποστήσονται τινες τῆς πίστεως· καὶ ἐνταῦθα πάλιν λέγει· Ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις ἐνστήσονται καιροὶ χαλεποί. Καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς σύμφωνα τούτοις προαναφωνῶν ἔλεγεν· Ἐπὶ γὰρ τῆς συντελείας μελλήσετε ἀκούειν πολέμους καὶ ἀκοὰς πολέμων, καὶ λιμοὺς καὶ λοιμοὺς. Τίνος οὖν ἕνεκεν ἐν τῇ συντελείᾳ τὸ μέγεθος καὶ ἡ σύνοδος τῶν συμφορῶν; Τινὲς μὲν φασιν, ὅτι κάμνουσα ἡ κτίσις καὶ ἀσθενοῦσα, καθάπερ σῶμα γεγρακὸς πολλὰ ἐπισπᾶται τὰ νοσήματα, οὕτω καὶ αὕτη γηρῶσα πολλὰς ἐπισπᾶται τὰς συμφοράς. Ἄλλὰ τὸ μὲν σῶμα κατὰ φύσεως ἀσθένειαν καὶ νόμον ἐπὶ τὸ γῆρας ἔρχεται· οἱ δὲ λοιμοὶ καὶ οἱ πόλεμοι καὶ οἱ σεισμοὶ οὐ διὰ τὸ γῆρας τῆς κτίσεώς εἰσιν. Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐπειδὴ τὰ κτίσματα ταῦτα γηρᾷ, διὰ τοῦτο τὰ νοσήματα ταῦτα· Λιμοὶ γὰρ, καὶ λοιμοὶ, καὶ σεισμοὶ κατὰ τόπους· ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἡ γνώμη διαφθείρεσθαι μέλλει· ἀμαρτιῶν γὰρ ἔστιν ἅπαντα ταῦτα κολαστήρια, καὶ νοσημάτων ἀνθρωπίνων φάρμακα. Καὶ γὰρ τὰ νοσήματα τὰ ἀνθρώπινα τότε ἐπιτείνεται. Καὶ τίνος ἕνεκεν τότε ἐπιτείνεται; φησὶν. Ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ, ὅτι ἐπειδὴ χρονίζει τὸ δικαστήριον, καὶ μέλλουσιν αἱ εὐθῦναι, καὶ οὕτω παραγέγονεν ὁ κριτῆς, ῥαθυμότεροι γίνονται οἱ μέλλοντες λόγον ὑπέχειν. Ὅπερ οὖν καὶ

94. Chrysostom takes the Pauline σῶμα Χριστοῦ imagery (Rom 12:4–5; 1 Cor 12:12–27; Eph 4:15–16) and extends it across space and time, past, present, and future.

95. The “solution” to the “problem” of Paul writing to Timothy about things not relevant in his own time, Chrysostom insists, is a reciprocal meeting of generations of πιστοί within the referents of the scriptural texts.

96. With ζητεῖν Chrysostom introduces a new question this text poses that needs attention.

97. With ἐν ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις for ἐν ὑστέροις καιροῖς, thus harmonizing 1 Tim 4:1 with 2 Tim 3:1.

98. A combination of quotation and paraphrase, spanning Matt 24:3, 6 and 7. Plus ἐπὶ γὰρ τῆς συντελείας (cf. 24:3: τί τὸ σημεῖον ... τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος;) before μελλήσετε; minus δὲ after μελλήσετε. To create an ellipsis down to 24:7b, John has recast the syntax to render λιμοὶ καὶ λοιμοὶ (which he reads, with \mathfrak{M} , in the nominative) in the accusative (λιμοὺς καὶ λοιμοὺς), as though they are also objects of ἀκούειν in Matt 24:6.

events later, so also we learn about the events that took place then. What I meant is that we and they are a single body closely bound to one another, even if we occupy the last position among the members.⁹⁴ Neither time nor location divides this body. For we've been bound to one another, not with bands of tendons, but encircled on all sides with the bonds of love. That's why Paul also speaks to them about us; so, in turn, let us hear about the circumstances of their day.⁹⁵

It's worthwhile investigating the question⁹⁶ of why it is [278] that Paul everywhere says the bleakest events are concentrated at the end of the present life. For in another place he also says, "In the last days *some will depart from the faith*" (1 Tim 4:1),⁹⁷ and here, once more again, he says, "*In the last days perilous times will come*" (2 Tim 3:1). Christ gave prophetic utterances that are in accordance with these statements, too: "for at the end of the age, *you will hear of wars and reports of wars*, and famines and bouts of pestilence" (Matt 24:6; cf. 24:7).⁹⁸ So then, why is it that at the end of the age there's a plethora and convergence of calamities? Now some people say⁹⁹ that creation is sick and weak: just as a body that's grown old attracts many illnesses, so also creation, as she grows old, attracts many calamities. However, the body advances to old age according to the weakness and law of nature, but pestilence and wars and earthquakes aren't due to creation's growing old. For illnesses like these—"famines and bouts of pestilence and earthquakes all over the place" (Matt 24:7)¹⁰⁰—don't come about because these parts of creation grow old, but instead because human intentionality causes them to become corrupted. For all these things are punishments for sin and remedies for human illnesses. As it was, human illnesses were becoming more extensive at that time. "And why were they becoming more extensive then?" someone asks. It seems to me that because the judgment was delayed and the rendering of accounts was still to come, but the judge hadn't yet appeared, those who were going to have to submit to that accounting became more morally complacent. This is precisely what Christ

99. The idea that the universe is experiencing senescence is one possible solution to the "problem" of end-times calamities envisioned by Christian apocalyptic eschatology (in Paul, by Christ in the gospels, and elsewhere in the Scriptures). Chrysostom introduces this view here only in order to dismiss it by means of an appeal to human versus natural causation. Perhaps the *τινές* he personifies are Epicureans like Lucretius (famously) in *Rer. nat.* 2.1105–1174 (ed. Bailey) or instead Christian thinkers whose views Chrysostom wishes to tinge with stock anti-Epicurean invective.

100. Textual reading following \mathfrak{M} , as indicated in n. 98, but now in the proper case.

περὶ τοῦ πονηροῦ οἰκέτου φησὶν ὁ Χριστὸς, ὅτι ἐκεῖθεν γέγονε ῥαθυμότερος. Χρονίζει γὰρ ὁ Κύριός μου, φησὶν ὁ οἰκέτης, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τοὺς συνδούλους ἔτυπτε, καὶ τὴν δεσποτικὴν διετάραττεν οὐσίαν. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς τοῖς μαθηταῖς συνελθοῦσι καὶ βουλομένοις μαθεῖν τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς συντελείας, οὐκ ἔλεγε, τῇ ἀδηλίᾳ τῶν μελλόντων ἐναγωνίους ἡμᾶς ποιῶν διηνεκῶς, ἵνα ἕκαστος αἰὲ προσδοκῶν τὸ μέλλον, καὶ ἐν ἐλπίσιν ὧν τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ παρουσίας, σπουδαιότερος ᾖ. Διὰ τοῦτο παραινεῖ τις λέγων· Μὴ ἀναβάλλου ἐπιστρέψαι ἐπὶ Κύριον, μὴδὲ ἀνάμενε ἡμέραν ἐξ ἡμέρας, μήποτε ὡς μέλλεις ἐκτριβῇς. Ἀδελός ἐστιν ἡ τελευταία, φησὶ, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἀδελός, ἵνα αἰὲ σπουδάξης. Διὰ τοῦτο ὡς κλέπτῃς ἐν νυκτὶ, οὕτως ἡ ἡμέρα Κυρίου ἔρχεται· οὐχ ἵνα κλέψῃ, ἀλλ' ἵνα ἡμᾶς ἀσφαλεστέρους ποιήσῃ. Ὁ γὰρ τὸν κλέπτῃν προορῶν, ἐν ἀγρυπνίᾳ διάγει, καὶ λύχνον ἄψας διὰ παντὸς ἐγρήγορεν. Οὕτως οὖν καὶ ὑμεῖς ἄψαντες τὸ φῶς τῆς πίστεως καὶ τῆς ὀρθῆς πολιτείας, παιδρὰς ἔχετε τὰς λαμπάδας ἐν ἀγρυπνίᾳ διηνεκεῖ. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ οὐκ οἶδαμεν πότε ὁ νυμφίος ἔρχεται, δεῖ παρεσκευασμένους εἶναι διὰ παντὸς, ἵν' ὅταν ἔλθῃ, νήφοντας εὔρῃ.

ζ'. Ἐβουλόμην ἐκτεῖναι τὸν λόγον· ἀλλὰ καὶ ταῦτα μόλις ἀφῆκεν εἰπεῖν ἡ τοῦ σώματος ἀσθένεια, δι' ἣν τὸν μακρὸν τοῦτον ὑμῶν διεσπάσθην χρόνον. Μακρὸς γὰρ ὁ χρόνος ἐμοί, οὐ τῷ ἀριθμῷ τῶν ἡμερῶν, ἀλλὰ τῷ μέτρῳ καὶ τῇ διαθέσει τῆς ψυχῆς. Τοῖς γὰρ φιλοῦσι καὶ ὁ βραχύς χρόνος τοῦ χωρισμοῦ πολὺς καὶ ἄφατος φαίνεται. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ὁ Παῦλος μικρὸν ἀποστάς Θεσσαλονικέων, ἔλεγεν· Ἡμεῖς, ἀδελφοί, ἀπορφανισθέντες ἀφ' ὑμῶν πρὸς καιρὸν ὥρας, προσώπω, οὐ καρδίᾳ, περισσοτέρως ἐσπουδάσαμεν

101. The reading of Mf, reprinted in PG, διετάραττεν ("he disturbed"), is ill-suited to the context. JPM did not reprint the following note from the PE editors: "δισπαράττεν *emendat* Segaar. *Animad. ad Daniel.*, p. 43." The reference is to a comment by Carolus Segaar on the text of Dan 8:7 about scribal variation between the verbs *σπαράττειν* and *ταράττειν*, for which Segaar offered, among other examples, this Chrysostomic text: "C. τὴν δεσποτικὴν διετάραττεν οὐσίαν immo δισπαράττεν." See Carolus Segaar, *Daniel secundum Septuaginta ex Tetraplis Origenis* (Utrecht: J. van Poolsum, 1775), 42–43. I have adopted the emendation of Segaar, as translated above, both because of its sense and the likelihood of the orthographic similarity having led to a scribal error.

102. With ἀναβάλλου for ἀνάμενε; ἀνάμενε for ὑπερβάλλου (which overlaps in sense with ἀναβάλλου; hence John has inverted the two verbs of the first two clauses); ἐπὶ (not πρὸς) before κύριον (in agreement with the reading of N/S); μὴδὲ for καὶ μὴ; minus ἐξάπινα γὰρ ἐξελεύσεται ὀργὴ κυρίου; plus μήποτε; ὡς μέλλεις with codex V (Venice [VIII]); with ἐκτριβῇς for the reading of V and S^s (suppletor), ἐκτριβήσῃ.

103. John could be referring to Sirach or perhaps to Christ.

says about the wicked householder: that he became all the more complacent. For the householder says, “*My master is delayed*” (Matt 24:48), and that’s why he beat his fellow slaves and divided up¹⁰¹ his master’s property. Therefore, when the disciples approached and wished to learn the precise date of the end of the age (cf. Matt 24:3), Christ didn’t tell it. He used the unknowability of future events to render us continually battle-ready, so that each might be all the more seriously engaged, always on high alert about the future and living in the hope of the coming of Christ. This is the reason someone says by way of advice: “*Don’t put off turning back to the Lord, nor tarry day by day, lest, as you delay, you be crushed*” (Sir 5:7).¹⁰² He¹⁰³ means, “The end is unknown, and it is unknown for just this purpose: that you remain carefully attentive.” The reason the day of the Lord comes like a thief in the night (cf. 1 Thess 5:2)¹⁰⁴ isn’t so that he might steal, but so he might cause us to be more attuned to our security. For the person who presages a thief stays vigilant and, having lit a lamp, stays continually wide awake (cf. Matt 24:43). Therefore, in the same way you too, having lit the lamp of faith and upright conduct, hold your shining lamps in perpetual vigilance. For since we don’t know when the bridegroom comes,¹⁰⁵ it’s necessary to be continually ready so that when he comes, he might find us awake.

7. I would wish to extend my homily, but the bodily illness that caused me to be parted from you for such a long time¹⁰⁶ has hardly allowed me to say even these things. I have a great span of time, not in number of days, but in the measure and condition of my heart and soul.¹⁰⁷ For to people in love, even a short time apart seems enormous and unspeakably long. This was why Paul, when he was apart from the Thessalonians for a short time, said, “*Sisters and brothers, when we were orphaned from you for a short time, in presence not in heart, we were very eager to see your face*” (1 Thess

104. The exact same nine words as the Pauline text, but Chrysostom has entirely transformed the word order. \mathfrak{M} : ἡ ἡμέρα κυρίου ὡς κλέπτῃς ἐν νυκτὶ οὕτως ἔρχεται; Chrysostom 6 7 8 1 2 3 4 5 9. PG rightly does not mark this as a quotation, also because it is not introduced as such. But, as always, John’s homily is saturated in the scriptural idiom.

105. The parable of Matt 25:1–13, recast in the language of Matt 24:42–44, as alluded to above.

106. A return to the theme with which the homily began.

107. The Greek has just ψυχῇ, but English more requires the heart as the seat of love, so I have double-glossed it to capture the sense.

τὸ πρόσωπον ὑμῶν ἰδεῖν. Εἰ δὲ Παῦλος ὁ πάντων μάλιστα φιλοσοφεῖν εἰδώς, οὐκ ἤνεγκεν πρὸς καιρὸν ὥρας, πῶς ἡμεῖς τοσαύτας οἴσομεν ἡμέρας; Ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνος μὲν μηκέτι στέγων, τὰ λείψανα τῆς ἀρρωστίας ἔχων, ἔδραμον πρὸς ὑμᾶς, μέγιστον φάρμακον ἡγούμενος ἐπιθήσειν τῆς ὑμετέρας ἀγάπης τὴν [279] συντυχίαν. Ἐμοὶ γὰρ καὶ ἱατρῶν χειρῶν χρησιμώτερον, καὶ πάσης τῆς ἐκεῖθεν παραμυθίας λυσιτελέστερον, τὸ τῆς ὑμετέρας ἀπολαύειν ἀγάπης· ἥς γένοιτο διηνεκῶς ἐντρυφᾶν, εὐχαῖς καὶ πρεσβείαις πάντων τῶν ἀγίων, εἰς [280] δόξαν τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι' οὗ καὶ μεθ' οὗ τῷ Πατρὶ δόξα, τιμὴ, κράτος, ᾧμα τῷ ἀγίῳ Πνεύματι, νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ, καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Ἀμήν.

108. Minus δέ after ἡμεῖς.

109. Mf with reason posited a lacuna in the text here (“*Hic quaedam desiderantur*”), because there is no signaling of the shift from Paul back to Chrysostom, as the grammar requires (for the first-person verb ἔδραμον), and no δέ to answer the μὲν. Mf supplied his conjecture in brackets in the Latin translation, but not in the Greek: “*Sed ille quidem [ne ad horam quidem tulit; ego vero tot dierum absentiam] non ultra ferens*” (“But he did not endure it for even an hour; yet I, not enduring the absence of so many days...”). (Note that JPM condenses this into a single note on the Latin page, with the result that the reader of the Greek is not alerted to the issue.) One can understand this as occasioned by a parablepsis error given the conjectured repetition of οὐ ἤνεγκεν πρὸς καιρὸν ὥρας. The translation above reflects the Mf text as reprinted in PG, even though problematic, until the occasion arises to check the other manuscripts.

2:17).¹⁰⁸ If Paul, who best of all knew how to live with philosophical equanimity, couldn't endure "*a short time*," then how shall we endure so many days? But though Paul¹⁰⁹ was "*no longer enduring it*" (1 Thess 3:5), despite having residues of my illness,¹¹⁰ I ran to you, my beloved, considering the prospect of meeting with you the greatest medicine. [279] Indeed, I have something even more useful than the healing hands of doctors and more advantageous than the relief they offer—the enjoyment of your love. May it be possible perpetually to feast on that by means of the prayers and entreaties of all the saints, to [280] the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ,¹¹¹ through whom and with whom be glory, honor, and power to the Father, together with the Holy Spirit, now and always, forever and ever. Amen.

110. In 1 Thessalonians Paul does not report that his bodily illness prevented him from going to Thessalonica; nor does he run to the Thessalonians, but, according to 3:5, he sends Timothy to them instead.

111. This closing formula differs from many others in this volume that have *χάριτι καὶ φιланθρωπία τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, but parts of the formula given here are also frequent among Chrysostom's homilies, such as the trifold *δόξα, τιμὴ, κράτος*—see, e.g., *Laz.* 2.6; 7.5 (PG 48:992, 1054); *Stat.* 1.12; 15.5 (PG 49:34, 162); *Paenit.* 1.4 (PG 49:284); etc., though they begin *χάριτι καὶ φιλανθρωπία*). See p. 51 n. 167 in the introduction on whether this is a possible indication of pseudepigraphy or false attribution.

τοῦ ἐν ἁγίοις πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἰωάννου ἀρχιεπισκόπου Κωνσταντινου-
πόλεως τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου λόγος εἰς τὸ «Ἐπεφάνη ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ
σωτήριος παιδεύουσα ἡμᾶς.»

2 τοῦ ἐν ἁγίοις πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἰωάννου ἀρχιεπισκόπου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως τοῦ
Χρυσοστόμου P] τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἁγίου Ἰωάννου τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου S | τοῦ ἁγίου Ἰωάννου
τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου AW 3 λόγος εἰς τό P] ὁμιλία εἰς τό S || ἐπεφάνη ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ
ἡ σωτήριος παιδεύουσα ἡμᾶς P] ἐπέφανη ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ εἰς τὰ Θεοφάνια S, AW

1. Provenance: AW 117 identifies this as only the second extant genuine homily by Chrysostom on the Feast of the Epiphany, January 6. The other festal homily for Epiphany, *De baptismo Christi et de epiphania* (CPG 4335; PG 49:363–72), is generally placed early in Chrysostom's ministry at Antioch because it seems to follow *In diem natalem Christi* (CPG 4334; PG 49:351–62), thought to have been preached at Antioch. But note that Mayer, *Provenance*, 436, 480, judging *De baptismo Christi* itself in terms of its detailed reference to Olympic games, judges it no more than possibly assignable to Antioch. In any case, the date and place of this other Epiphany sermon provide no clues either way about this homily's possible provenance, even as it is not clear that this homily was originally preached on the feast, as argued in the introduction. Nor does there seem to be any evidence in the text that allows us to locate it geographically. See also the introduction (pp. 51–58) for debate and arguments about the authenticity of this homily. The notes in the present translation point out some conspicuous points of correspondence between this homily and other Chrysostomic works as an aid to that ongoing discussion.

Text: Wenger text (AW) as emended by Mitchell. AW transcribed this homily from Sinai. gr. 491 (uncial, VIII–IX), fols. 116^r–129^r, as collated with Paris. gr. 700 (minuscule, IX–X), fols. 136^r–166^v (*sic*, AW 123; it should be 163^r–166^v). On the relation between the two manuscripts, Wenger stated: “Le manuscrit de Paris présente un texte identique à celui de *Sinaiticus* à l'exception de quelques variantes minimales et d'une finale plus développée, que le *Sinaiticus* semble avoir écourtée” (AW 120). Comparison of Wenger's edition with photographs of the Sinai manuscript made available

Hom. Tit. 2:11–12
(*In illud: apparuit gratia dei omnibus hominibus*)
CPG 4456 (AW as emended by Mitchell)¹

A homily by our father among the saints, John Chrysostom, archbishop of Constantinople, on the statement, “*The saving grace of God has been brought to light, giving us paideia*” (Titus 2:11).²

by Fr. Justin and digital images of Paris. gr. 700, available online (<https://gallica.bnf.fr>), has revealed significantly more variance between the readings of the two manuscripts than this assessment allows. Furthermore, AW’s published text and apparatus of variant readings contain numerous inaccuracies and some notations that are misleading. The text printed here includes my corrections of some thirty or more errors in AW’s text (as indicated) as well as places where I have adopted different readings from AW; all my emendations are explained in the notes accompanying the text. The two manuscripts are listed as S and P, respectively, and Wenger’s text as AW. Pinakes lists one more manuscript that contains this homily, Mone Iberon 255 (= Lambros 4375 [XIV]), fols. 237–240 (I), for a total of three known witnesses. I have not had access to a full set of images of the Iberon codex, but I incorporate one reading from that manuscript in the final benediction from Aubineau, “Soixante-six textes, attribués à Jean Chrysostome,” as indicated on §27. Variant readings listed exclude itacisms, alternate spellings, presence or absence of ν-moveable, etc.

2. Minus γάρ after ἐπεφάνη, as throughout this homily. Note that this title reads ἡ before σωτήριος (with \mathfrak{M}), as consistently when the lemma is cited in the homily in P (but not so in S). I adopt the reading of P (plus ἡ) throughout, which is how Chrysostom always cites Titus 2:11—e.g., *Hom. Tit.* 5.1 (PG 62:688); *Hom. Matt.* 57.1 (PG 58:557); *Bapt.* §2 (PG 49:365); *Adv. Jud.* 5.12 (PG 48:903); *Exp. Ps.* Ψ 117 §6 (PG 55:337). For an explanation of this translation of παιδεύουσα, see p. 676 n. 38 below. I adopt the reading of P for the title. Wenger (AW 123) had adopted that of S, but without discussion chose to remove from his text the somewhat redundant reading αὐτοῦ, “a homily by the same John Chrysostom [τοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰωάννου χρυσοστόμου],” though this reading was indicated in his apparatus. Note that the title in P does not identify this as a homily on the feast of the Epiphany; the ellipsis supplied by AW 123 in his *app. crit.*, “λόγος εἰς τὸ ... P,” has obscured this significant difference in reading (as well as in the citation of the lemma, including ἡ σωτήριος ... παιδεύουσα ἡμᾶς).

- 1 **1. [116^F]** Πρώην ὑμῖν περὶ σωφροσύνης διελέχθημεν καθάπερ μέμνησθε καὶ
οἷον δὲ νόμον ἀνέγνωμεν οὕτως ἔχοντα· Πᾶς ὁ ἐμβλέψας γυναικὶ πρὸς τὸ
ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτὴν ἤδη ἐμοίχευσεν αὐτὴν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ. Φοβερὸν τὸ
ῥῆμα, καὶ γὰρ ἀναίσχυντον τὸ πάθος· δεινὴ ἢ ἀπόφασις, καὶ γὰρ χαλεπὴ ἢ
5 ἐπιθυμία.

2. Καθάπερ οὖν κύνα τις ἔχων ἄγριον καὶ τοῖς παριοῦσιν ἐπιπηδῶντα
πᾶσιν, οὐκ ἀνέχεται λελυμένον εἶναι καὶ ἄφετον, ἀλλὰ σιδηρᾷ ἀλύσει δῆσας
αὐτὸν παραδίδωσιν ταῖς χερσὶν [116^V] τῶν οἰκετῶν μετὰ ἀσφαλείας κατέχειν,
οὕτως καὶ ὁ Θεὸς τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τοὺς ἡμετέρους, κυνῶν ἀναιδέστερον
10 ἐπιπηδῶντας τοῖς λαμπροῖς τῶν σωμάτων, οὐκ ἀφήσιν εἶναι λελυμένους,
ἀλλ' ὥσπερ σιδηρᾷ ἀλύσει τῷ φόβῳ τῆς νομοθεσίας ἀποδήσας αὐτούς,
παρέδωκεν μετὰ ἀσφαλείας κατέχειν τῷ λογισμῷ, προειπὼν καὶ ἀπειλήσας,

1 Folio references are to S (as in AW) **2** δέ S, P*] δὴ P^{corr} || γυναικί S] γυναῖκα P **3** ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτὴν S] ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτῆς P **6** καθάπερ οὖν S] καθάπερ P || ἄγριον S] ἄτιμον P **7** ἀνέχεται S] ἂν ἔχοιτο P || λελυμένον S] λελοιμένον (sc. λειμμένον?) P **9** κυνῶν S] κυνάς P **11** ἀλλ' S] om. P

3. *πρώην*, as often in Chrysostom's homilies to refer to the previous occasion as, e.g., *Hom. 1 Cor. 7:39–40* §1 (PG 51:217); *Hom. 2 Cor. 4:13 Γ* §1 (PG 51:291); *Hom. Gen. 25.1* (PG 53:218); *Anna 3.1* (PG 54:652); *Hom. Col. 9.1* (PG 62:359); *Adv. Jud. 1.1* (PG 48:843); *Laz. 2.1* (PG 48:981); and *Hom. Jo. 14.1* (PG 59:91), where it is also the first word of the homily.

4. *σωφροσύνη* is used for modesty or moderation in general (where it is one of the cardinal virtues of Platonic thought and Hellenistic ethics broadly) or, in early Christian texts, specifically for sexual self-control (PGL B).

5. AW 119 said that despite much effort he was not able to locate within Chrysostom's extant works the homily that is referred to here. I propose that it is likely *De paenitentia* hom. 6, which, though it bears the title, 'Ομιλία λεχθεῖσα περὶ νηστείας, from §2 forward (especially in §§2–5) is not about fasting but contains a sustained discussion of Matt 5:28, in which the verse is quoted fully eight times in John's exposition on it and the nature of improper desire four times in §2 (PG 49:316–17), three times in §4 (PG 49:319), and once in §5 (PG 49:321). Moreover, Matt 5:28 is explicitly cited in §2 (PG 49:316) as a divine law—ἀλλὰ θεῖον ὑμῖν ἀναγνώσσομαι νόμον, as stated here retrospectively (οἷον δὲ νόμον ἀνέγνωμεν οὕτως ἔχοντα). However, it is the case that, despite the homiletical treatment about the need for purity of vision and concern about *ἐπιθυμία* as ἢ τῆς μοιχείας μήτηρ in §2 (PG 49:316), the term *σωφροσύνη* itself is not used in *Paenit.* hom. 6 (cf. περὶ σωφροσύνης διελέχθημεν in the present homily), though we can note that, aside from the retrospective mentions, that term is found only once in the present argument, in §4, ὁ θησαυρὸς τῆς σωφροσύνης. Paragraphs 2–4, which follow in the present sermon, do pick up on and develop in a new direction and with a new analogy

1. Last time,³ as you remember, we spoke to you about self-control,⁴ and the passage of the law we read⁵ is as follows: “Everyone who looks at a woman with lustful desire for her has already committed adultery with her in his heart” (Matt 5:28).⁶ The statement is frightening, as indeed the passion is shameful; the declaration is dire, as indeed the lust is vicious.

2. A man who has a ferocious⁷ dog that leaps out at all who pass by certainly doesn’t allow it to be untethered and run free. Instead, binding it with an iron chain, he hands it over to the care of his household slaves, to hold it securely in check. In the very same way, God doesn’t allow our eyes, which leap out at beautiful bodies more shamelessly than dogs, to be untethered. Instead, having bound them by fear of his law⁸ as though with an iron chain,⁹ God has handed them over to the faculty of reason to hold them securely in check.¹⁰ In this way, God forewarned and threatened

the theme discussed on the earlier occasion, as the preacher himself states clearly in the transition at §5, ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν περὶ σωφροσύνης ικανῶς εἴρηται καὶ τότε καὶ νῦν τοῖς προσέχουσιν, which seems to fit this identification of the previous sermon.

6. With ἐμβλέψας γυναικί (with S) as against βλέπων γυναῖκα (P). This is in line with how Chrysostom reads the participle ἐμβλέψας throughout his oeuvre—see e.g. *Hom. Matt.* 17.1 (PG 57:255), where he cites the lemma as such. He is, however, inconsistent in whether he reads γυναικί—as here, and *Hom. Matt.* 17.1—or γυναῖκα—as in *Hom. Matt.* 7.7 (PG 57:81); *Anom.* 10.3 (PG 48:789); *Paenit.* 6.2–4 (PG 49:316–17, 319, 321).

7. P reads ἄτιμον, “dishonorable,” or perhaps a dog “bought on the cheap.” Its relative difficulty is perhaps an argument in its favor, but the reading of S, ἄγριον, is preferable in context (“wild,” “ferocious,” or “savage”).

8. A quite similar argument is found in *Paenit.* 6.2 (PG 49:316), which is possibly the precursor sermon to this one (see p. 668 n. 5 above in this homily): ὀφθαλμία χαλεπὴ μοιχεία· τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν ἐστὶ τὸ νόσημα, οὐ τῶν τοῦ σώματος. ἀλλὰ πρότερον τῶν τῆς ψυχῆς· διὰ τοῦτο ἐκεῖθεν ἀνέστειλε τὸ ρεύμα τῆς ἀκολασίας τῷ φόβῳ τοῦ νόμου· διὰ τοῦτο οὐχὶ μοιχείαν μόνον ἐκόλασεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπιθυμίαν ἐτιμωρήσατο (“Adultery is a vicious eye-disease. It is an illness of the eyes—yet not the eyes of the body, but even more, those of the soul. That’s why with this statement [sc. Matt 5:28] Christ stops up the discharge of debauchery by means of fear of the law. That’s why he not only chastises adultery, but he even punishes desire”).

9. A comparable plea about the fear of God acting as a chain is made by John in *Hom. Eph.* 8.7 (PG 62:66): Ταύτῃ τῇ ἀλύσει δῆσωμεν ἑαυτούς· ἀντὶ σιδηρίου γενέσθω ἡμῖν ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ φόβος (“Let’s bind ourselves with this chain; let the fear of God be for us like an iron chain”).

10. Although this exact image of the eyes as wild dogs is not to my knowledge found elsewhere in John’s oeuvre, it is fully consistent with other appeals, such as *Ep. Olymp.* 8.6d (SC 13^{bis}:182, ed. Malingrey) where Chrysostom describes virgins as

- 1 εἰ διαφύγοιεν καὶ τινος τῶν παριόντων ἐπιλάβοιντο, τὴν τῶν μοιχῶν αὐτὸν ἀπαιτήσῃ τιμωρίαν. Πᾶς γὰρ ὁ ἐμβλέψας γυναικὶ πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτὴν ἤδη ἐμοίχευσεν αὐτὴν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ.
3. Τοῦτο δὲ ἠπέλιπεν [117^I] τῶν ὁρώντων κηδόμενος. Ἐπὶ μὲν γὰρ
 5 τῶν κυνῶν καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, οὐχ οἱ δάκνοντες κύνες, ἀλλ' οἱ δακνόμενοι ἄνθρωποι τὰ ἔλκη λαμβάνουσιν· ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν ἀσελγῶς ὁρώντων ὀφθαλμῶν καὶ τῶν ὁρωμένων γυναικῶν, οὐχ αἱ ὀρώμεναι γυναῖκες, ἀλλ' οἱ ὀρώντες ἄνθρωποι τὰ τραύματα δέχονται. Ἐκεῖ ὁ δηχθεὶς ἐπλήγη, ἐνταῦθα ὁ δάκνων τὸν ἰὸν ἔλαβεν.
- 10 4. Διὰ τοῦτο αὐτοὺς ἀσφαλίζεται, διὰ τοῦτο βλέφαρα καὶ βλεφαρίδας τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς περιέθηκεν, ἵνα μὴ διὰ παντὸς ἀνεωγμένας ἔχῃς τὰς θυρίδας. "Ὅταν γὰρ θύραι διὰ παντὸς ὥσιν ἀνεωγμέναι, μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς εὐκολίας ὁ ληστής ἐπιεσέρχεται, μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς ἐξουσίας τὸν θησαυρὸν [117^V] τῆς σωφροσύνης συλᾷ. Διὰ τοῦτο κόραι καλοῦνται τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αἱ βολαί, ἵνα
 15 μάθῃς ὅτι αἰσχύνεσθαι χρή καὶ ἐρυθριᾶν· καθάπερ γὰρ αἱ κόραι αἱ ἀπειρογάμοι καὶ θαλαμευόμεναι οὐκ ἀνέχοντο οὐδὲ πρὸς τοὺς οἰκείους μετὰ ἀναιδείας

1 ἐπιλάβοιντο τὴν S] ἐπιλάβοιτο αὐτὴν P 2 ἀπαιτήσῃ S] ἀπαιτήσιν P (sic) | ἀπαιτήσιν AW || γυναικὶ S] γυναῖκα P 10 αὐτοὺς S] τούτους P 11 ἀνεωγμένας ἔχῃς τὰς θυρίδας. "Ὅταν γὰρ θύραι διὰ παντὸς ὥσιν S] om. P 13 ὁ ληστής ... τῆς ἐξουσίας S] om. P (h.t. εὐκολίας/ἐξουσίας) 14 συλᾷ S] ἀποσυλᾷ P 15 χρή S] δεῖ χρή P || αἱ κόραι αἱ ἀπειρογάμοι S, P] αἱ ἀπειρόγαμοι AW 16 οὐκ ἀνέχοντο S] οὐκ ἀναισχυνοί P || τοὺς P] τοῦ S

καθάπερ λυττῶντα κύνα καὶ συνεχῶς ἐπιπηδῶντα τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν διακρουόμενοι ("driving off desire as though it were a dog that was raging and continually leaping out to assault"). See also *Dav.* 3.1 (PG 54:695): Καὶ ποῖαν ἐτέραν ταύτης ζητεῖς μείζονα ἁμαρτίαν, ὅταν μοιχοὺς ἑαυτοὺς ἀπηρτισμένους ποιήσαντες, ἀναιδῶς, καθάπερ κύνες λυττῶντες, ἐπιπηδῶσι τῇ ἱερᾷ ταύτῃ τραπέζῃ; ("And what kind of sin are you looking for that is worse than this, when making themselves consummate adulterers, without shame they leap forward like raging dogs upon this holy table of the Eucharist?"). Right after this Chrysostom describes ὁ τρόπος τῆς μοιχείας by citing Matt 5:28; in the fuller argument he makes some of the same associations as in our passage above.

11. On theories of intromission and extramission in vision in relation to this Matthean text, see Paul Brooks Duff, "Vision and Violence: Theories of Vision and Matthew 5:27–28," in *Antiquity and Humanity: Essays on Ancient Religion and Philosophy Presented to Hans Dieter Betz on His 70th Birthday*, ed. Adela Yarbro Collins and Margaret M. Mitchell (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 63–75.

12. John shows himself blind to the possibility that women could be harmed by being the object of such leering looks.

13. Here taking the aorists as gnomic. For the latter, LSJ notes that ἰός can refer

that if the eyes should escape and pounce on any of the passersby, he will demand that their owner suffer the punishment that belongs to adulterers. For, “Everyone who looks at a woman with lustful desire for her has already committed adultery with her in his heart” (Matt 5:28).¹¹

3. He issued this threat out of concern for those doing the looking. Now, in the case of dogs and people, it’s not the dogs who bite who receive the wounds, but the people who are bitten. However, in the case of eyes that look lecherously and of women who are the objects of those looks, it’s not the women looked upon who receive the injury, but the men who are doing the looking.¹² In the former case, it’s the one who’s bitten who’s stricken, but in the latter, it’s the one who does the biting who’s poisoned.¹³

4. That’s why God rendered the eyes secure. That’s why he placed eyelids and eyelashes around them, lest you have doorways that are always open.¹⁴ For when doors are always open, a robber easily enters in and with full impunity absconds with your treasure—that is, your sexual self-control.¹⁵ This is why the flashing parts of the eyes are called *korai* (“pupils”),¹⁶ so you might learn that there is need for a proper sense of shame and embarrassment. Indeed, the *korai* (“virgins”), who have no experience of marriage and are sequestered in the women’s quarters, wouldn’t even dare to take a

to the “venom of a mad dog” (citing Rufus, frag. 118), so the sense may be more “who contracts rabies.”

14. Although Chrysostom elsewhere in his oeuvre uses the eyelashes as an example of God’s minute care and forethought in creation, for instance, likening them to the protection the outer stalks give to tender ears of corn in *Stat.* 11.4 (PG 49:123), this exact analogy is not found.

15. σωφροσύνη. As the previous sentences show, John’s concern here (as in the Matthean text that is his inspiration) is with *men’s* sexual self-control, which, he insists, by means of λογισμός (through the agency of fear of divine punishment) puts the ὀφθαλμοί on a short leash.

16. This argument is based upon a wordplay on κόρη, which means “virgin,” “doll,” and “pupil” of the eye (LSJ I, II, III), presumably because of the reflection in the pupil that looks like a miniature person (hence, a doll). The derivation of English “pupil” for this part of the eye is dependent upon the same etymological move in Latin (from *pūpilla*). This is a conventional pun in Greek thought and literature, as, e.g., in the Hermetic work, *Korē Kosmou*, in reference to Isis as a “virgin” or to the “pupil” of the universe. See Corp. herm. frag. 23 (ed. and trans. Nock and Festugière, 4:1–22); see also M. David Litwa, *Hermetica II: The Excerpts of Stobaeus, Papyrus Fragments, and Ancient Testimonies in an English Translation with Notes and Introduction* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018), 100–129, esp 101–2 on the meanings and referents of κόρη.

1 ἰδεῖν, οὕτω καὶ τὰς κόρας τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν χρή, καθάπερ κόρας ἀπειρογάμους ἐν θαλάμῳ, τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ καθημέναις, μὴ ἀναισχύντως ἀπάσαις ἐπαφίεναι ταῖς ὄψεσιν ἑαυτάς, ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἂν εἶεν κόραι λοιπόν, ἀλλὰ κύνες ἀναισχυντοί.

5 5. Ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν περὶ σωφροσύνης ἱκανῶς εἴρηται [118^F] καὶ τότε καὶ νῦν τοῖς προσέχουσιν· τὸ δὲ ζητούμενον, οὐχ ἵνα συνεχῆς ἡ παρ' ἡμῶν διδασκαλία γένηται καὶ συνεχῆς ἡ παρ' ὑμῶν ἀκρόασις, ἀλλ' ἵνα τι καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμετέρας διδασκαλίας καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς ὑμετέρας ἀκροάσεως γένηται πλέον εἰς λόγον ζωῆς τῆς ὑμετέρας, εἰς καύχημα ἡμέτερον, εἰς δόξαν καὶ ἔπαινον Θεοῦ, ἵνα δυνηθῶ καὶ ἐγὼ κατὰ τὴν ἡμέραν ἐκείνην καυχᾶσθαι ἐκ τῶν κατορθωμάτων ὑμῶν καὶ
10 εἰπεῖν· Ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ καὶ τὰ παιδία ἃ μοι ἔδωκεν ὁ Θεός.

6. Γενέσθω τὰ ῥήματα τὰ ἡμέτερα πράγματα δι' ὑμῶν. Καὶ γὰρ ἐπὶ τῶν γεγηπόνων οὐ τοῦτο ἐστὶν τὸ ζητούμενον ζεῦξαι βοῦς ἀροτῆρας καὶ βαθεῖαν αὐλακα [118^V] τεμεῖν καὶ καταβαλεῖν τὰ σπέρματα, ἀλλὰ δεῖξαι κομῶντα τὰ λήϊα καὶ τὴν ἄλωνα τῶν δραγμάτων πεπληρωμένην, ἵνα, ὅταν ἔλθῃ ὁ
15 διακαθαίρων αὐτήν, οὗ τὸ πτύον ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ, μηδαμοῦ τῆς ἄλωνος ἄχυρον εὔρῃ, ἀλλὰ πανταχοῦ σῖτον, πανταχοῦ καρπὸν ὠριμον εἰς βασιλικὰς ἀποθήκας ἀπενεχθῆναι δυνάμενον. Ἦξει γάρ, ἥξει πάντως ἐκεῖνος ὁ βαπτίζων ὑμᾶς ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρί· καὶ τὸν μὲν σῖτον συνάξει εἰς τὰς ἀποθήκας, τὸ δὲ ἄχυρον κατακαύσει πυρὶ ἀσβέστῳ. Μεγάλη ἡ τιμωρία, ἀλλ' ἐὰν
20 θέλωμεν, οὐ λημφόμεθα τὴν τιμωρίαν οὐδὲ ἐσόμεθα ἄχυρα.

2 ἐν θαλάμῳ τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ καθημένης S] ἐν θαλάμῳ καθημένης P || ἀπάσαις S] αὐτάς ἀπάσαις P || ἀναισχύντως ἀπάσαις ἐπαφίεναι ταῖς ὄψεσιν ἑαυτάς S] ἀναισχύντως αὐτάς ἀπάσαις ἐπαφίεναι ἀντὶ ταῖς ὄψεσιν P 3 εἶεν S, P] om. AW 5 τοῖς προσέχουσιν· τὸ δὲ ζητούμενον S] τοῖς προσέχουσιν τὸ ζητούμενον P || συνεχῆς S] συνεχῶς P 6 ἡ παρ' ὑμῶν ἀκρόασις P] παρ' ὑμῶν ἡ ἀκρόασις S | ἡ παρ' ὑμῶν ἡ ἀκρόασις AW 8 ἔπαινον S] αἶνον P || Italics added to AW (quotation of Phil 1:11) 9 ὑμῶν S] om. P 10 ἃ μοι S, P] ἃ ἐμοί AW 11 γάρ S] γὰρ ἂν P 13 AW placed folio break after τεμεῖν || τὰ σπέρματα S] σπέρματα P 17 ἀπενεχθῆναι S] ἀπελθεῖν P 18 Italics added to AW (quotation of Matt 3:11//Luke 3:16) || μὲν S] om. P || τὰς ἀποθήκας S] ἀποθήκας P 20 τὴν τιμωρίαν S] πείραν τῆς τιμωρίας P

17. To capture the paronomasia of ἐν θαλάμῳ, τῷ ὀφ-θαλμῷ καθημέναις.

18. τὸ ζητούμενον here more literally as “what is sought,” rather than as a “problem to be solved,” or “disputed question” (but see §19 below).

19. Cf. Phil 2:16: λόγον ζωῆς ἐπέχοντες.

20. Cf. Phil 2:16: εἰς καύχημα ἐμοί.

21. Cf. Eph 1:6, 12.

shameless glance at the men of their own household. So also, those *korai* (“pupils”) of the eyes, although they’re embedded in the eye,¹⁷ like the *korai* (“virgins”) who have no experience of the bridal bed, mustn’t shamelessly let themselves loose to glance at anything and everything. Because then they wouldn’t be *korai* (“virgins”), but shameless dogs.

5. But what’s been said about sexual self-control both on the earlier occasion and today is enough for those who are paying attention. Yet the goal we aspire to¹⁸ isn’t for us to teach continually or for you to listen continually. It’s that from both our teaching and your listening you might gain some advantage for the account of your life,¹⁹ “for our boast”²⁰ and “for the glory and praise of God” (Phil 1:11),²¹ so that on that day I, too, might be able to boast of your virtuous deeds²² and say, “Here am I and the children whom God has given to me” (Heb 2:13; Isa 8:18).²³

6. Let our words become deeds by what you do. After all, for those who till the soil, the goal isn’t the yoking of the oxen for plowing and the cutting of deep furrows in the earth and the sowing of seeds,²⁴ but showing forth the crops in full bloom and the threshing floor full of sheaves. And thus when the one who cleans out the threshing floor comes, “whose winnowing wand is in his hand” (Matt 3:12 // Luke 3:17),²⁵ he won’t find chaff anywhere on the threshing floor, but everywhere grain, everywhere a ripe harvest that can be carted off into the royal silos. For the one who baptizes you “in the Holy Spirit and fire” (Luke 3:16) will come; he will surely come! And the grain he will gather into the silos,²⁶ “but the chaff he will burn with an unquenchable fire” (Matt 3:12 // Luke 3:17). The punishment is heavy, but if it is our wish, we shall not receive the punishment, nor shall we be chaff.

22. Phil 2:16; cf. 2 Cor 1:14.

23. Compare the similar argument in *Hom. Rom.* 12:20 §1 (PG 51:173), with reference to 2 Cor 5:10 as the supporting Pauline text for the idea that Christian leaders must give an account at the final judgment for those who are under their charge.

24. See p. 625 n. 125 above on Chrysostom’s fondness for rehearsing the steps involved in agriculture.

25. AW 124 identifies the quote as Luke 3:16–17, but it is not clear which of the two Gospel parallels is being cited (and the quotation refers only to Luke 3:17).

26. Chrysostom has rephrased the first half of the verse to balance out the clauses in a μέν ... δέ construction (as is done by D Θ f¹³ in Luke 3:17, which have plus μέν); with transposition of τὸν σίτον to before συνάξει, as also in *Exp. Ps.* Ψ 7 §11 (PG 55:98); with εἰς τὰς ἀποθήκας for εἰς τὴν ἀποθήκην; minus αὐτοῦ after σῖτον in Matt 3:12, or after ἀποθήκην/ἀποθήκας in Luke 3:17.

- 1 7. [119^F] Τοιοῦτον γὰρ ἡ ἁμαρτία· καθάπερ τὰ ἄχυρα τῶν ἀλόγων
ζῶων ἐστὶν τροφή καὶ πυρὸς δαπάνη, οὕτως καὶ ἡ ἁμαρτία τοῦ μέλλοντος
πυρὸς ἐστὶν δαπάνη. Βούλει μαθεῖν πῶς ἐστὶν πυρὸς δαπάνη ἡ ἁμαρτία; Εἴ
5 τις ἐποικοδομεῖ—φησὶν—ἐπὶ τὸν θεμέλιον τοῦτον, χρυσὸν, ἄργυρον, λίθους
τιμίους, ξύλα, χόρτον, καλάμην, ἐκάστου τὸ ἔργον φανερόν γενήσεται· ἡ γὰρ
ἡμέρα δηλώσει, ὅτι ἐν πυρὶ ἀποκαλύπτεται. Εἴ τις τὸ ἔργον κατακαήσεται,
ζημιωθήσεται. Ἴδου πυρὸς δαπάνη ἡ ἁμαρτία. 8. Ἄκουσον πῶς καὶ ἀφροσύνη
ἐστὶν καὶ ἀλόγων τροφή παθῶν· ἄκουσον τοῦ Δαυῖδ λέγοντος· [119^V] Αἰ
ἀνομίαι μου ὑπεῆραν τὴν κεφαλὴν μου· ὥσεί φορτίον βαρὺ ἐβαρύνθησαν
10 ἐπ’ ἐμέ· προσώξεσαν καὶ ἐσάπησαν οἱ μῶλωπές μου ἀπὸ προσώπου τῆς
ἀφροσύνης μου. Τὸ ἄχυρον πάλιν κοῦφόν ἐστιν καὶ εὐρίπιστον καὶ μικρὰ
ἀνέμου προσβολῇ ταχέως μετεωρίζεται καὶ πανταχοῦ περιφέρεται. [120^F]
Τοιοῦτοί εἰσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων οἱ ῥαδίως ὑπὸ ὀργῆς ἐξαπτόμενοι, οἱ ταχέως ὑπὸ
ἀνοίας φυσώμενοι. Διὰ τοῦτο παραινεῖ τις λέγων· Μὴ λίχμα παντὶ ἀνέμῳ—
15 ἵνα μὴ μείνης ἄχυρον—ἀλλ’ ἴσθι ἐστηριγμένος ἐπὶ τῇ πέτρᾳ.

9. Διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ ἦλθεν ὁ Χριστός, οὐχ ἵνα τὰ παλαιὰ ἁμαρτήματα
καταλύσῃ μόνον, ἀλλ’ ἵνα καὶ πρὸς τὰ μέλλοντα ἡμᾶς διορθώσῃται. Τοῦτο
καὶ Παῦλος, δεικνὺς ὅτι οὐ διὰ τὰ παλαιὰ μόνον ἦλθεν ἁμαρτήματα, ἀλλὰ
καὶ διὰ τὰ μέλλοντα κατορθώματα, ἐβόα τήμερον· Ἐπεφάνη ἡ χάρις τοῦ
20 Θεοῦ ἡ σωτήριος, παιδεύουσα ἡμᾶς. Ἀλλὰ διανάστητε· πάλιν γὰρ τοὺς

1 τοιοῦτον γὰρ ἡ ἁμαρτία S] om. P || ἄχυρα τῶν ἀλόγων ζῶων ἐστὶν τροφή S] ἄχυρα
τροφὴ τῶν ἀλόγων ζῶων ἐστὶν P 2 πυρὸς δαπάνη, οὕτως καὶ ἡ ἁμαρτία τοῦ μέλλοντος
πυρὸς ἐστὶν δαπάνη S] πυρὸς δαπάνη τοῦ μέλλοντος P 4 χρυσόν, ἄργυρον P] χρυσίον,
ἀργύριον S, AW 6 κατακαήσεται S] κατακαῇ P 7 πῶς S] καὶ πῶς P || ἀφροσύνη S]
ἀφροσύνης τέκνον P 8 δαδ n.s. S, P] Δαβίδ AW; plene form Δαυῖδ (1,231x in Chry-
sostom v. 25x Δαβίδ, per TLG texts) 12 ἀνέμου S] ἀνέμων P 15 ἄχυρον S] ἄχυρον
ων P 16 διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ S] διὰ γὰρ τοῦτο P || τὰ παλαιὰ ἁμαρτήματα S] τὰ παλαιὰ
ἁμαρτήματα P 17 καὶ S] καὶ τὰ P 18 διὰ τὰ παλαιὰ μόνον ἦλθεν ἁμαρτήματα S] διὰ τὰ
παλαιὰ ἁμαρτήματα ἦλθεν μόνον P 19 κατορθώματα S] ἁμαρτήματα P 20 ἡ σωτήριος
P] om. S, AW

27. The interrogative phrase βούλει μαθεῖν (here and in §21) is found over a hundred and twenty times in Chrysostom’s oeuvre, as a part of his interactive preaching style. By contrast, Gregory of Nyssa uses it five times, Libanius (either John’s teacher, or at least his contemporary at Antioch), five.

28. I.e., the eschatological day of the Lord, the time of judgment.

29. Minus δέ before τις. I adopt the reading of P, χρυσόν, ἄργυρον, not χρυσίον, ἀργύριον (the reading of S, accepted by AW). The former is read by M at 1 Cor 3:12 and found elsewhere in Chrysostom’s oeuvre in *Hom. 1 Cor.* 9.2 (PG 61:78); *Hom. Heb.* 9.1 (PG 63:77); *Exp. Ps.* Ψ 44 §12 (PG 55:201); ellipsis of καὶ ἐκάστου τὸ ἔργον ὁποῖόν ἐστιν ... λήμψεται, as marked in the translation.

7. This is what sin is like. In the same way as chaff is fodder for irrational beasts and fuel for fire, so also is sin fuel for the fire to come. Do you want to learn²⁷ how sin is fuel for fire? “If anyone builds,” he says, “upon this foundation—gold, silver, precious stones, wood, grass, hay—the work of each will become manifest. For the day²⁸ will disclose it, because it is revealed by fire.... If someone’s work will be burned up, they will suffer loss (1 Cor 3:12–13, 15).²⁹ See how sin is fuel for fire. 8. Hear how it is also foolishness³⁰ and fodder for irrational passions. Hear David saying, “My lawless deeds have risen higher than my head. Like a heavy load they have weighed down upon me. My welts stink and rot in the face of my foolishness” (Ps 37:5–6). Again, chaff is light and easily fanned into flames, quickly cast in the air by a little volley of wind and everywhere whirled about. Such are those people who are readily enflamed by anger, who are swiftly puffed up³¹ by folly. The reason a speaker gives this advice, “Don’t winnow in every wind” (Sir 5:9),³² is so you might not remain chaff.³³ Instead, be firmly fixed upon rock!³⁴

9. The reason Christ came wasn’t only so he might abolish the old sins,³⁵ but also so he might offer us correction for the future. So also Paul, in demonstrating that Christ didn’t come only for the sake of the old sins but also for virtuous deeds in the future, has this very day cried out,³⁶ “the saving grace of God has been brought to light³⁷ ... giving us *paideia*” (Titus

30. P reads ἀφροσύνης τέκνον, “a child of foolishness.”

31. Possibly Chrysostom has in mind Paul’s use of the term φυσιοῦσθαι in this broader section of 1 Corinthians (4:6, 18, 19).

32. Minus ἐν before παντί.

33. For the same sentiment, see, e.g., Hom. Matt. 11.6 (PG 57:199): Μηδεὶς τοίνυν γινέσθω ἄχυρον, μηδεὶς εὐρίπιστος ἔστω, μηδὲ ταῖς πονηραῖς ἐπιθυμίαις προκεισθω, πανταχοῦ ῥαδίως ὑπ’ αὐτῶν ἀναρριπιζόμενος. Ἄν μὲν γὰρ μείνης σῖτος, καὶ πειρασμὸς ἐπενεχθῇ, οὐδὲν πείσῃ δεινόν (“So then, let no one be chaff, let no one be easily fanned into flames, nor be disposed to evil desires, everywhere easily swept away by them. For if you remain grain, even if temptation threatens, you’ll suffer no terrible harm”).

34. Cf. Matt 7:25.

35. There are verbal resonances with Matt 5:17 (Μὴ νομίσητε ὅτι ἦλθον καταλῦσαι) but perhaps also to the distinction between the παλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος and the καινὸς ἄνθρωπος of Eph 4:20–24.

36. I.e., in the lectionary passage read by the ἀναγνώστης. See pp. 52–53 in the introduction for discussion of this as a mark of authenticity.

37. The verb ἐπιφαίνειν can have transitive or intransitive meanings in active, middle, and passive voices. Hence ἐπεφάνη can be translated “appeared” (as it is in most all major translations) or “has been made to appear” or “was manifested.” John will play on the passive voice and also on the literal sense of the compound ἐπι-φαίνειν,

- 1 θησαυρούς διανοίγομεν, πάλιν τοὺς [120^V] μαργαρίτας δείκνυμεν· μηδεὶς τοίνυν διαδράμῃ τῶν εἰρημένων τὸ κάλλος· Ἐπεφάνη ἡ χάρις.

- 10 Διὰ τί οὐκ εἶπεν· ἐδόθη ἡ χάρις, ἀλλ' Ἐπεφάνη ἡ χάρις; Ἵνα μάθῃς ὅτι, πρὸ τοῦ φανῆναι τὴν χάριν, ἐν σκότει τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἡ φύσις ἐκάθητο·
5 τοῖς γὰρ ἐν σκότει καθήμενοις ὁ Χριστὸς φαίνει, ὅπερ οὖν καὶ ὁ προφήτης προαναφωνῶν ἔλεγεν· Ὁ λαὸς ὁ καθήμενος ἐν σκότει εἶδεν φῶς μέγα. Ἐπεφάνη ἡ χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡ σωτήριος. Εἶδες ἀποστόλων καὶ προφητῶν συμφωνίαν; Ὁ λαὸς ὁ καθήμενος ἐν σκότει· τοιαύτη γὰρ ἡ φύσις τοῦ σκότους· ὅπουπερ ἂν καταλάβῃ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, [121^Γ] εὐθέως καθίζει αὐτοὺς καὶ οὐκ
10 ἀφίησιν προβῆναι περαιτέρω, ἢ βάδισις σφαλέρα καὶ ἐπικίνδυνος γίνεται. Ὁδηγῶν τοίνυν καὶ τὸ ἄπρακτον τῆς φύσεως ἡμῶν πρὸς ἀρετὴν, ἔλεγεν· Ὁ λαὸς ὁ καθήμενος ἐν σκότει εἶδεν φῶς μέγα.

- 11 Οὐ τοῦτο δὲ μόνον ἐνδείκνυται ἡμῖν τὸ ἀποστολικὸν ῥῆμα τὸ Ἐπεφάνη, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἕτερον πρὸς τοῦτοις. Ποῖον δὲ τοῦτο; Ὅτι οὐχ ἡμεῖς ζητήσαντες
15 εὗραμεν τὸ φῶς, ἀλλὰ αὐτὸ ἡμῖν ἐπεφάνη· οὐχ ἡμεῖς ἀπῆλθαμεν πρὸς αὐτόν, ἀλλ' αὐτὸς παρεγένετο πρὸς ἡμᾶς. Καὶ τοῦτο δηλῶν ὁ Χριστὸς ἔλεγεν· Οὐχ

1 θησαυρούς διανοίγομεν, πάλιν S] θησαυρούς ἀπλανῇ P 2 διαδράμῃ τῶν εἰρημένων S] παραδράμῃ τῶν ὀρωμένων P 3 ἐδόθη S] κατεπέμφθη P || ἀλλ' ἐπεφάνη ἡ χάρις S, P] om. AW 4 τῶν ἀνθρώπων ... ἐν σκότει S] om. P (h.t. ἐν σκότει) 7 ἐπεφάνη S] καὶ ἐπεφάνη P || ἡ σωτήριος P] σωτήριος S, AW 8 συμφωνίαν S] ὁμοφωνίαν P 9 καθίζει αὐτοὺς S] αὐτοὺς καθίζει P 10 καὶ P] ἐπὶ καὶ S 15 εὗραμεν S, P] εὗρομεν AW || αὐτό S] αὐτόματον P, τοῦτο AW 16 παρεγένετο S, P] προσεγένετο AW || δηλῶν ὁ Χριστὸς ἔλεγεν S] αὐτὸ ἔλεγεν ὁ Χριστὸς P

“shine upon” (cf. BDAG, 2) in his larger argument yet to come. To capture both senses, I translate *ἐπεφάνη* consistently as “has been brought to light” (cf. LSJ s.v. *ἐπιφανής* A: “coming to light, coming suddenly into view, appearing”). Due to the lexical and substantive connection, the Titus text was an appropriate lection for the Feast of the “Epiphany” (τὰ θεοφάνια or ἡ ἐπιφάνεια). For discussion of whether this homily was in fact originally delivered on Epiphany, see introduction, pp. 51–58.

38. Ellipsis of *ἡ σωτήριος πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις*, as marked. Below in this homily, especially in §§19–24, John will take up the definitional question of which of the different senses of *παιδεία/παιδεύειν* Paul has in view in this passage. The words can mean both “teaching” and “punishment” or something in between, like “chastisement” or “discipline” (see *PGL*). So the reader can see that argument unfold, I am rendering the participle as a verbal clause with the transliterated noun as its object. Each time *paideia* appears in the translation, one should keep all of these senses in view and see how John is emphasizing, distinguishing, or accenting one or the other.

39. See the very similar statement in *Sanct. Anast.* §2 (PG 63:496): Μαργαρίτης γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγος.... Ἀλλὰ διανάστητε, καὶ ὤψεσθε πόσον ἡμῖν θησαυρὸν αὕτη

2:11–12).³⁸ Now, stay awake! Because once again we're opening treasures, once again we're displaying pearls.³⁹ So let no one run past the beauty that's contained in these words:⁴⁰ "*Grace has been brought to light*" (Titus 2:11).

10. Why didn't he say, "grace has been given"⁴¹ (cf. Eph 4:7),⁴² but instead, "*Grace has been brought to light*" (Titus 2:11)? So you might learn that before grace shone forth⁴³ human nature was sitting in darkness. For Christ shines upon those sitting in darkness, exactly as the prophet foretold when he said, "*The people sitting in darkness have seen a great light*" (Isa 9:1).⁴⁴ "*The saving grace of God has been brought to light*" (Titus 2:11). Have you seen the harmony⁴⁵ between the apostles and the prophets? "*The people sitting in darkness.*" For such is the nature of darkness: wherever it might apprehend⁴⁶ people, immediately it makes them sit down and doesn't allow them to advance any further; walking becomes precarious and dangerous. So then, in order to lead even our intractable nature toward virtue, he said, "*The people sitting in darkness have seen a great light*" (Isa 9:1).

11. The apostle's statement, "*has been brought to light*" (Titus 2:11), shows us not only this, but also something else in addition to these things. What might that be? That we didn't find the light by seeking it, but it "*has been brought to light*"⁴⁷ (Titus 2:11) for us. It wasn't we who went off after him, but he who came to us.⁴⁸ And Christ showed this when he said, "*You*

τῆς λέξεως ἡ δύναμις ἀνακαλύπτει ("For the word of God is a pearl.... But stay awake and you'll see what a sizable treasure this powerful statement reveals").

40. For διαδράμη τῶν εἰρημένων τὸ κάλλος (so S), P reads παραδράμη τῶν ὁρωμένων τὸ κάλλος: "let no one run past the beauty of the things that are seen" (on this reading, pointing to the previous sentence rather than to the quotation that follows).

41. P reads κατεπέμφθη, "has been sent down."

42. ἐνὶ δὲ ἐκάστῳ ἡμῶν ἐδόθη ἡ χάρις.

43. φαίνειν (see p. 675 n. 37 on the lexical linkages to the lemma and theme of the homily).

44. Reading καθήμενος with LXX A (against B, πορευόμενος; cf. Luke 1:79); with εἶδεν with B^c L C (against B A, ἴδετε). (Correcting the citation of Isa 9:2 on AW 126.)

45. I adopt συμφωνίαν with S; P reads the synonym ὁμοφωνίαν. John's point is that Isaiah and Paul reinforce one another by their agreement on this point—cf. *Exp. Ps.* Ψ 109 §3 (PG 55:268); see also the similar argument about the συμφωνία of the two Testaments in *Hom. 2 Cor. 4:13 B* §§2, 6 (PG 51:282, 286); cf. *Hom. 2 Cor. 4:13 Γ* §2 (PG 51:291) in this volume.

46. Cf. John 1:5: καὶ τὸ φῶς ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ φαίνει, καὶ ἡ σκοτία αὐτὸ οὐ κατέλαβεν.

47. John seems to be emphasizing the passive voice of the verb. The reading of P, with αὐτόματον instead of αὐτό, might push less on the passive sense: "on its own initiative 'it has come to light' for us."

48. Reading παρεγένετο with S and P, against AW: προσεγένετο.

- 1 ὑμεῖς με ἐξελέξασθε, ἀλλ' ἐγὼ ὑμᾶς ἐξελεξάμην. [121^V] Καὶ ὁ ἀπόστολος δὲ πάλιν, συνωδὰ τούτοις βοῶν, ἔλεγεν· Τότε δὲ ἐπιγνώσομαι καθὼς καὶ ἐπεγνώσθην· νῦν δὲ οὐκ ἐπέγνων, ἀλλ' ἐπεγνώσθην. Καὶ πρὸς Φιλιππησίους δὲ γράφων ἔλεγεν· Διώκω δὲ εἰ καὶ καταλάβω ἐφ' ᾧ καὶ κατελήμφθην,
 5 διὰ πάντων δηλῶν ὅτι οὐχ ἡμέτερον κατόρθωμα γέγονεν ἡμῶν ἢ σωτηρία, ἀλλὰ θεία χάριτι πάντες ἐσώθημεν· ὅπερ οὖν καὶ ἐνταῦθα αἰνίττεται λέγων· Ἐπεφάνη ἡ χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ.

12. Ποῖα χάρις; Καὶ γὰρ [122^F] καὶ τῆς παλαιᾶς χάρις ἔστιν καὶ ὁ Ἰωάννης ἐβόα λέγων· Χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος ἐλάβομεν. Καὶ γὰρ ὄντως χάρις καὶ ἡ τῆς
 10 παλαιᾶς, ἀπαλλάξασα αὐτοὺς τῆς δουλείας τῆς ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ μυρίων κακῶν ἐτέρων· ἀλλὰ μείζων αὕτη ἡ χάρις. Τότε μὲν γὰρ τῶν Αἰγυπτίων ἀπήλλαξεν, νῦν δὲ τῆς τῶν δαιμόνων ἡλευθέρωσεν τυραννίδος· τότε ἀπήλλαξεν τῆς μανίας Φαραῶ, νυνὶ δὲ τῆς κατοχῆς τοῦ διαβόλου· τότε διὰ Μωϋσέως, νυνὶ δὲ διὰ τοῦ Μονογενοῦς· τότε διὰ ῥάβδου, νυνὶ δὲ διὰ σταυροῦ· τότε διὰ θαλάσσης
 15 ἐρυθρᾶς, νυνὶ δὲ διὰ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας· τότε ἀπὸ πηλοῦ καὶ πλινθείας ἐξήγαγεν, [122^V] νῦν ἀπὸ θανάτου καὶ ἁμαρτίας· τότε εἰς γῆν ῥέουσιν γάλα καὶ μέλι, νῦν εἰς βασιλείαν οὐρανῶν εἰσήγαγεν.

2 τούτοις βοῶν S] βοῶν τούτοις P 3 Italics removed from AW (not a quotation) || νῦν δὲ ... ἐπεγνώσθην S] om. P (h.t. ἐπεγνώσθην) 4 ἔλεγεν S] om. P || καταλάβω S] καταλάβω φησὶν P 5 ἡμῶν S] ἡμῖν P 8 καὶ γὰρ καὶ S] καὶ γὰρ ἡ P 12 νῦν δὲ τῆς τῶν δαιμόνων ... τυραννίδος· τότε S] om. P (h.t. ἀπήλλαξεν) 13 Φαραῶ S] τοῦ Φαραῶ P || νυνὶ 4x S] νῦν P, AW 14 τοῦ Μονογενοῦς S] Μονογενοῦς P 15 Italics added to AW (quotation of Titus 3:5) 16 νῦν S, P] νῦν δέ AW || Italics added to AW (quotation of Exod 3:7, 17; 33:3) 17 οὐρανῶν εἰσήγαγεν S] εἰσήγαγεν οὐρανῶν P

49. With transposition of ἐξελεξάμην and ὑμᾶς.

50. Possibly John has Gal 4:9 in mind with this contrast marked νῦν δέ and having to do with knowledge of and by God.

51. Although the text of the Johannine Prologue is ambiguous about where the speech of John the Baptist that begins in John 1:15 ends, Chrysostom in *Hom. Jo.* 14.1 (PG 59:92) stipulates that the voice of 1:16–17 is John the evangelist (whom he calls μαθητής), so we assume that identity of the speaker in the translation above, even though the text of this homily just says Ἰωάννης.

52. Despite being more of a paraphrase, this is introduced as a quotation, and hence it is marked as such in the translation. The reading has a transposition of ἐλάβομεν and χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος; minus καὶ before χάριν. The ἀντὶ is multivalent and could mean “(one grace) in place of” another; “grace after grace,” or “grace upon grace” (BDAG 1 and 2). I translate the quotation (“grace for grace”) in a way that tries not to force a single interpretation. The exposition that follows will play out one version of

didn't choose me, but I chose you" (John 15:16).⁴⁹ And once again, the apostle also sings in harmony with these sentiments, saying: "*Then I shall know, just as also I have been known*" (1 Cor 13:12). But now⁵⁰ I have not known, but "*I have been known*" (1 Cor 13:12). And also, when writing to the Philippians, he said, "*I press forward to see if I might apprehend, inasmuch as I also have been apprehended*" (Phil 3:12). In all these statements Paul was showing clearly that the cause of salvation wasn't our virtuous action, but it was by divine grace that we were all saved (cf. Eph 2:5, 8). This is exactly what he's pointing to here, too, when he says, "*The grace of God has been brought to light*" (Titus 2:11).

12. What sort of grace? Well to be sure, there's the grace of the old covenant. And the disciple John⁵¹ cried out, saying, "*We received*" "*grace for grace*" (John 1:16).⁵² For the grace that belonged to the old covenant truly was grace, too, given that it delivered them from slavery in Egypt and from countless other terrible things. But this grace⁵³ is greater. Back then it gave deliverance from the Egyptians, but now it has granted freedom from the tyranny of demons. Then it gave deliverance from the madness of Pharaoh, but now⁵⁴ from the possessive grip of the devil. Then it came through Moses, but now through the Monogenes⁵⁵ (cf. John 1:17–18). Then it came through a staff (cf. Exod 14:16), but now through a cross (cf. Eph 2:16).⁵⁶ Then through a sea of red (cf. Exod 15:22), now "*through the water of regeneration*" (Titus 3:5). Then it brought people out from mud and brickmaking (cf. Exod 1:14), but now from death and sin (cf. Rom 8:2). Then it brought people "*into a land flowing with milk and honey*" (Exod 3:7, 17; 33:3), now into the kingdom of heaven (cf. Matt 3:2, etc.).

this, showing both continuity of the two and what the preacher regards as the superiority of the *χάρις* in the new. Note that one thing the preacher does not do here in relating the "old" and the "new" forms of *χάρις* is say that the first contains *τύποι* of the second, which contains the *ἀλήθεια*—but see *Hom. Jo.* 14.1–2 (PG 59:92–93).

53. I.e., that of which the apostle speaks in Titus 2:11. For Chrysostom, this is the grace that belongs to the *καινή διαθήκη*. Although *χάρις* is not found in 2 Cor 3:4–18, the contrast of the two covenants (*παλαιά, καινή*) from there is influencing John's argument here.

54. In the four comparisons that follow, each time S reads *νυνί*, but P the synonym (perhaps slightly less vivid), *νῦν*.

55. "The only begotten" of John 1:18 (retained here as a title to capture the antithetical play with Moses).

56. A similar but not identical comparison between Moses's staff and Christ's cross is made in *Exp. Ps.* Ψ 109 §3 (PG 55:269).

- 1 **13.** Ὅντως ἐπεφάνη ἡ χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡ σωτήριος. Ἀλλὰ τίνος ἕνεκεν, ὃ
μακάριε Παῦλε, τοσαῦτα κατορθώματα παρέδραμες ἐνὶ ῥήματι; Ἀνακάλυψόν
μοι τὴν χάριν, εἰπέ μοι τὸ πέλαγος τῶν δωρεῶν. Ἀρκεῖ πάντα παραστῆσαι,
5 μέτρον ἡ χάρις. Ἐπεφάνη ἡ χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὁ Θεὸς ἄνθρωπος ἐγένετο, διὰ σὲ
μορφὴν δούλου ἔλαβεν, ἵνα ἐλεύθερον ποιήσῃ τὸν δοῦλον. [123^r] Καὶ καθάπερ
δεσπότης, σφόδρα φιλῶν οἰκέτην, τὸ ἱμάτιον αὐτοῦ περιβάλλεται, οὕτω καὶ
ὁ Χριστός, φιλῶν τὴν φύσιν τὴν ἡμετέραν, τὸ ἱμάτιον αὐτῆς περιεβάλετο.
Ἀνθρώπου μὲν ἔλεος ἐπὶ τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ, τοῦ δὲ Θεοῦ τὸ ἔλεος ἐπὶ πᾶσαν
10 σάρκα. Εἶδες πῶς καὶ τὸ μέγεθος ἔδειξεν τῆς χάριτος καὶ τὸ καθολικὸν τῆς
δωρεᾶς, τὸν δεδωκότα εἰπῶν;
- 14.** Ἀλλὰ τί ἐστὶν σωτήριος ἴδωμεν. Αἱ χάριτες ἀπὸ τῶν διδόντων τὰ
ὀνόματα λαμβάνουσιν, οἷον ὅταν ἄρχων δῷ χάριν, ἀρχοντικὴ καλεῖται ἡ χάρις,
ὅταν βασιλεὺς δῷ χάριν, βασιλικὴ καλεῖται ἡ χάρις· ἐπεὶ οὖν καὶ ἐναυῦθα ὁ
15 Σωτὴρ ἔδωκεν τὴν χάριν, σωτήριος ἡ χάρις λέγεται. [123^v] Διὰ τοῦτο γάρ

1 ἡ σωτήριος P] σωτήριος S, AW 2 παρέδραμες S] παρέδραμεν P 3 μοι S] om.
P 4 οὐκ ἔχει μέτρον ἡ χάρις S] οὐκ ἔχει μέτρον P 5 ἐπεφάνη S] ἐφάνη P 6 μορφὴν
δούλου S] δούλου μορφὴν P 9 ἀνθρώπου μὲν S] ἀνθρώπου μὲν οὖν P 12 τί S, P] τίς
AW 13 ἡ χάρις P] χάρις S, AW 14 ἡ χάρις S, P] χάρις AW 15 διὰ τοῦτο γάρ φησιν S]
διὰ τοῦτο καλέσεις γάρ P

57. I.e., *χάρις* (“gift,” “grace”) which Chrysostom regards as a kind of Pauline shorthand for the totality of divine benisons.

58. Chrysostom often refers to the treasures in the Scriptures as an ocean, elsewhere as an ocean not of gifts (τὸ πέλαγος τῶν δωρεῶν) but of meanings or senses (τῶν νοημάτων), as in *Hom. Rom. 16:3 A* §1 (PG 51:187); *Hom. Rom. 28.3* (PG 60:654); *Hom. Gen. 10.3, 7* (PG 53:84, 89); etc.

59. The homilist addresses Paul directly here (as is so often done by Chrysostom). For AW 121, this homily provides a “solution” to the “problem” of Chrysostom’s reputation for coming too close to Pelagianism (“Ce passage [Titus 2:11] est très intéressant car il permet de corriger ce que l’on a souvent appelé le pélagianisme de Chrysostome”). While this may be the case in terms of the reception of Chrysostom, the homily itself does not call out particular theological opponents. The theme of the relationship between human virtue and divine grace, well exhibited here, is a constant one in Chrysostom’s writings, and often those on Paul (see *HT* 135–99, with discussion and references).

60. *χάρις*, of course, means both grace and gift; John does not see these as separate or distinct, though he can put more emphasis on one aspect at any given time as it suits his argument and context.

13. Truly, “*The saving grace of God has been brought to light*” (Titus 2:11). “But why, blessed Paul, did you run past so many marvelous deeds by using this single word?⁵⁷ Reveal this grace to me; tell me the ocean⁵⁸ of its gifts!”⁵⁹ “The generous love of the one who gives is sufficient to represent it all,” he says. For when the gift of grace⁶⁰ comes from God, it is a gift beyond measure. “*The grace of God has been brought to light*” (Titus 2:11), that is, God became human,⁶¹ for your sake he took “*the form of a slave*” (Phil 2:7), so he might make the slave free. As a master who very much loves a household slave wraps himself in his garment,⁶² so also Christ out of love for our nature wrapped himself in it as a garment.⁶³ “*Human mercy is upon one’s neighbor, but God’s mercy is upon all flesh*” (Sir 18:13).⁶⁴ Have you seen how Paul, by declaring who the giver is,⁶⁵ demonstrated both the magnitude of grace and the universality of the gift?

14. But let’s see what “*saving*” (Titus 2:11) means. Gifts take their names from those who give them. For example, when a leader gives a gift, it’s called a “leadership gift”; when an emperor gives a gift, it’s called an “imperial gift.” Consequently, since here it’s the Savior who gave the gift, it’s

61. Cf. Phil 2:7.

62. This does not appear to be a reference to a known cultural convention (e.g., of a manumission ceremony, which does not contain such clothes swapping by the master), but is instead meant by John to be a surprising, even shocking, act of paternalistic love of a master for his slave. Chrysostom is not the first to use the image of a superior donning the clothes of his slave for the incarnation; see, e.g., Origen, *Comm. Rom.* 5.10.11–12 (PG 14:1051–52). (I thank Chris L. de Wet for this reference and for valuable discussion on this point via email, September 18, 2016.) See also de Wet, *Preaching Bondage: John Chrysostom and the Discourse of Slavery in Early Christianity*, 141, 204 on “paternalism.”

63. For this customary metaphor for the incarnation using the verb περιβάλλω, see PGL B.2, with references spanning from Clement to Theodoret. Although PGL includes no examples from Chrysostom, one can add, e.g., *Hom. Jo.* 6.1; 11.2 (PG 59:61, 80), τὴν σάρκα τὴν ἡμετέραν περιέβαλετο; 63.2 (PG 59:350), τὴν φύσιν τὴν ἡμετέραν περιέβαλετο.

64. John has helped along the contrast by adding μέν to the first clause, and in both clauses pulling the genitive forward for emphasis (ἀνθρώπου, Θεοῦ); he also reads Θεοῦ for κυρίου. (The citation corrects AW’s Eccl 18:12.)

65. A reference back to Titus 2:11 and the dependent genitive τοῦ Θεοῦ that Paul (indisputably the author of Titus for Chrysostom, of course) added to χάρις to tell who gave that gift.

- 1 φησιν· Καὶ καλέσεις ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν, ὅτι αὐτὸς σώσει τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν.

15. Καὶ πῶς, φησίν, εἰ καθολικὴ χάρις ἐστὶν καὶ εἰς τὴν οἰκουμένην ἐξέχεεν τὴν δωρεάν, τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ μόνον σώζειν ἐπηγγέλατο; Ὁ γὰρ
5 ἰουδαϊκὸς μόνος οὗτος ἐχρημάτιζεν δῆμος ἔμπροσθεν, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔμεινεν μόνος οὗτος χρηματίζων· ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ μετὰ ταῦτα ἀνάξιοι τῆς τιμῆς εὐρέθησαν, μετέβη ἡ προσηγορία εἰς τὴν οἰκουμένην πᾶσαν.

16. “Ὅτι γὰρ λαὸς αὐτοῦ ἡμεῖς, ἄκουσον σαφῶς τοῦ Ὡσηὲ λέγοντος καὶ τοῦ Παύλου ἐρμηνεύοντος· [124^F] Καλέσω τὸν οὐ λαόν μου λαόν μου. Καὶ
10 ὅτι περὶ ἡμῶν εἴρηται δῆλον ἐκεῖθεν· ἡμεῖς ἐσμεν οἱ οὐ λαός, ἡμεῖς ἐγενόμεθα λαός. Καὶ ἕτερον δὲ τούτου σαφέστερον ἄκουσον· Καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῷ τόπῳ οὗ ἐρρέθη αὐτοῖς οὐ λαός μου, ὑμεῖς ἐκεῖ κληθήσεσθε υἱοὶ Θεοῦ ζῶντος. Ποίω τόπῳ; Ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ φησίν· ἐκεῖ γὰρ οἱ προφῆται ἔλεγον οὐ λαός μου, καὶ ἐκεῖ τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἔλεγεν ὁ Χριστός· Εἰς ὁδὸν ἐθνῶν μὴ εἰσέλθῃτε, ἀλλ' ἐν
15 αὐτῇ τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ πάλιν εἶπεν· Πορευθέντες μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη.

1 καλέσεις S, P] λέγεις AW || Ἰησοῦν, ὅτι S] τὸν Ἰησοῦν, φησίν, ὅτι P 2 ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν S] om. P 4 Italics added to AW (quotation of Matt 1:21) 5 ἰουδαϊκὸς μόνος οὗτος S] ἰουδαϊκὸς νόμος οὕτως P || δῆμος S] om. P 7 μετέβη S, P] μετέβην AW || ἡ προσηγορία S, P] προσηγορία AW || πᾶσαν S] ἅπασαν P 11 οὗ ἐρέθη S (sic)] οὗ ἂν ῥήθη P, οὗ ἐρρέθη AW || κληθήσεσθε S] κληθήσονται P

66. Or, “the Savior’s gift.”

67. With ὅτι αὐτὸς σώσει for αὐτὸς γὰρ σώσει.

68. As often, a hypothetical interlocutor introduces a potential “problem.” In *Hom. Rom.* 17.9 (PG 60:561) Chrysostom also regards the Hosea-Paul duet in Rom 9:25–26 as confirming the solution to these problems of peoplehood and theodicy: Ἀποδοὺς τοῖνυν τὴν λύσιν τῷ ζητήματι τὴν διὰ τῶν πραγμάτων, ὥστε καὶ ἐτέρωθεν ἀξιόπιστον ποιῆσαι τὸν λόγον, καὶ τοὺς προφῆτας ἐπείσάγει τὰ αὐτὰ προαναφωνοῦντας (“So, having given the solution to the problem, one that is grounded in the events, in order to make the argument credible in another way, he then adds the prophets who foretold the very same things”).

69. Cf. Acts 10:45: καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ ἔθνη ἡ δωρεὰ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐκκέχυται.

70. If the text of S is reliable, the preacher is using λαός and δῆμος interchangeably here. Chrysostom can refer to ὁ τῶν Ἰουδαίων δῆμος as, e.g., in *Adv. Jud.* 1.2; 4.6 (PG 48:846, 880); *Laed.* §13 (SC 103:118, ed. Malingrey); *Scand.* 14.12 (SC 79, ed. Malingrey). The reading of P is significantly different, and likely corrupt (by metathesis, μόνος/νόμος): ἰουδαϊκὸς νόμος οὕτως ἐχρημάτιζεν ἔμπροσθεν, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔμεινεν μόνος οὕτω χρηματίζων (“the Jewish law conferred this designation previously, but they didn’t remain the only people thus designated”).

called a “saving gift.”⁶⁶ That is why it says, “*And you will call his name Jesus, because he will save his people from their sins*” (Matt 1:21).⁶⁷

15. “And how is it,” one might say,⁶⁸ “that if grace is universal and God has poured out this gift into the whole world,⁶⁹ he promised to save only ‘his people’”? (Matt 1:21). For before this the Jewish people were the only ones to bear this designation of his “people”;⁷⁰ however, they didn’t remain the only ones designated as this. But because later they were found unworthy of the honor,⁷¹ the title⁷² passed to the whole world.

16. Now, to show that we are his people, listen to Hosea clearly stating it and Paul giving the interpretation:⁷³ “*I shall call the not-my-people, my people*” (Rom 9:25; cf. Hos 2:25).⁷⁴ From this passage it’s clear this was said about us. We’re the “not-people”; we’ve become “the people.”⁷⁵ Listen to still another passage even clearer than this one: “*And it shall come to pass that in the very place it was said to them, ‘not-my-people’, there you shall be called sons of the living God*” (Rom 9:26; Hos 2:1).⁷⁶ In what place? “In the land of Judea,” he says. For it was there that the prophets said, “*not-my-people*” (Hos 2:1), and it was there that Christ said to his disciples, “*Don’t go into the way of the gentiles*” (Matt 10:5).⁷⁷ And yet it was in the very land of Judea⁷⁸ that he said once more, “*Go forth and make disciples of all the*

71. Cf. Acts 13:46–48.

72. I.e., of being ὁ λαὸς αὐτοῦ.

73. For John this is another instance of the harmony of apostles and prophets (as stated in §10).

74. ἐρῶ τῷ Οὐ-λαῶ-μου Λαὸς μου εἶ σύ.

75. Cf. 1 Pet 2:10: οἱ ποτε οὐ λαὸς, νῦν δὲ λαὸς θεοῦ. In *Hom. Rom.* 17.9 (PG 60:561) Chrysostom identifies the “not-my-people” as τὰ ἔθνη, but not as ἡμεῖς specifically.

76. Here Paul had quoted Hos 2:1 LXX exactly. AW has put the comma after μου and before ὑμεῖς, regarding Chrysostom as having construed the pronoun to fit his change of the verb to the second person plural (κληθήσεσθε for κληθήσονται). This receives some confirmation from the second citation of the verse in this paragraph (see n. 81 below). That means Chrysostom has altered the syntax from both Paul and Hosea, in both of which ὑμεῖς belongs in the prior clause. The shift in the person of the verb is found only here; John cites the lemma as κληθήσονται in *Hom. Rom.* 16.9 (PG 60:562) and also in the third person, ἐκλήθησαν, in the citation that will follow in this paragraph (though there with a shift of tense).

77. With εἰσέλθῃτε for ἀπέλθῃτε.

78. Actually, this was in the Galilee, according to Matt 28:16. John is generalizing about the region as being the territory of the Jewish people.

- 1 Εἶδες πῶς ἐν τῷ τόπῳ οὗ ἐρρέθη αὐτοῖς οὗ λαός μου, ἐκεῖ ἐκλήθησαν υἱοὶ Θεοῦ ζῶντος; Διὰ τοῦτό φησιν· Αὐτὸς σώσει τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ [125^F] ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν.

17. Μεγάλη σωτηρία ὄντως· οὐδὲ γὰρ οὕτω μέγα ἀπαλλαγῆναι θανάτου
 5 ὡς μέγα ἀπαλλαγῆναι ἁμαρτίας· διὰ γὰρ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ὁ θάνατος, οὐ διὰ τὸν θάνατον ἡ ἁμαρτία. Καὶ ἵνα μάθῃς ὅτι αὕτη μείζων ἢ ἀπαλλαγή καί, ταύτης ἀνηρημένης, οὐκ ἔστιν φοβερός ὁ θάνατος, ἀπ' αὐτοῦ σκοπεῖ τοῦτο τοῦ σώματος τοῦ δεσποτικοῦ. 18. Τὸ γὰρ σῶμα ἐκεῖνο ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν, καὶ ἐμπεισὼν εἰς τὸν θάνατον ὠδῖνας αὐτῷ πικρὰς ἤγειρεν καὶ διέρρηξεν
 10 αὐτοῦ τὴν γαστέρα· καὶ οὐ μόνον οὐ κατεπόθη, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἠφάνισεν αὐτὸν εἰς τέλος. Καὶ καθάπερ ὁ Δανιήλ, μάζαν εἰς τὸ στόμα τοῦ δράκοντος ἐμβαλὼν, διέφθειρεν [125^V] τὸ θηρίον, οὕτω καὶ ὁ Χριστός, τὴν σάρκα τὴν ἑαυτοῦ εἰς τὸ στόμα τοῦ θανάτου ῥίψας, διέσχισεν αὐτοῦ τὴν γαστέρα· καὶ γὰρ κέντρον

1 ἐρρέθη S, P] ἐρρήθη AW || Italics added to AW (quotation of Rom 9:26) 2 λαὸν αὐτοῦ P] λαόν S, AW || Correcting AW's "124v." Fol. 124v has no text inscribed (presumably because of considerable run through of ink from the recto). The text continues on 125r, where indicated above. 3 αὐτῶν S] αὐτοῦ P 4 ὄντως S] ὅμως P || οὐδέ S] οὐδέν P || ἀπαλλαγῆναι S] ἀπαλλαγῆς P 5 Italics removed from AW (not a quotation) || τὸν θάνατον S, P] τοῦ θανάτου AW 6 καὶ ἵνα P] ἵνα S 7 τοῦ σώματος S, P] om. AW 10 Italics added to AW (quotation of 1 Cor 15:54; cf. that of 15:56 following) 11 μάζαν S] om. P 12 εἰς τὸ στόμα τοῦ θανάτου ῥίψας S] εἰς τὸ στόμα τοῦ δράκοντος ἐμβαλὼν ῥίψας P 13 αὐτοῦ τὴν γαστέρα S] τὴν τοῦ θανάτου γαστέρα P

79. Or "all the nations," but Chrysostom is clearly construing it as a reference to the movement of the status of peoplehood from Jews to the gentiles.

80. Correcting the citation from AW's Matt 29:28.

81. An exact quotation, except with ἐκλήθησαν for κληθήσονται to mark the fulfillment of the prophecy (and minus ὑμεῖς accordingly).

82. As in §14, S has minus γάρ but also (surprisingly, given the point Chrysostom is making) minus αὐτοῦ after λαόν. It is, however, on a page break in S, which is followed by a blank, damaged page (fol. 124^v; the text continues on fol. 125r). αὐτοῦ is read in P (fol. 165r) and adopted here.

83. Surely an allusion to Rom 5:12–21 but not a quotation, and so it should not be in italics, as in AW.

84. I.e., the one from sin.

85. Cf. Heb 2:14–15.

86. Cf. Acts 2:24.

87. Death for Chrysostom, as in places for Paul (such as one of the passages in view here, 1 Cor 15:54–56), is a hypostatized entity. I begin capitalizing from here because of the combat scene envisioned (see next, and subsequent notes). But one could have done so earlier in this paragraph and the previous (§17), according to the full train of thought and set of presuppositions at work about Death as personified entity.

gentiles⁷⁹” (Matt 28:19).⁸⁰ Have you seen how “in the very place it was said to them, ‘not-my-people’, there you shall be called sons of the living God” (Rom 9:26; Hos 2:1)?⁸¹ That’s why it says, “He will save his people from their sins” (Matt 1:21).⁸²

17. Salvation is truly magnificent; because not even deliverance from death is as significant as deliverance from sin. For death came on account of sin,⁸³ not sin on account of death. And, so you might learn that this deliverance⁸⁴ is the greater one, and that once sin has been annihilated, death isn’t to be feared;⁸⁵ observe what took place in the case of the Lord’s own body. 18. For that body “*did not commit sin*” (1 Pet 2:22), and once he’d fallen into death, he inflicted bitter pains⁸⁶ on Death⁸⁷ and split his belly in two.⁸⁸ Not only was the Lord not “*swallowed up*”⁸⁹ (1 Cor 15:54; cf. Isa 25:8), but in the end he even obliterated Death.⁹⁰ Just as Daniel, by tossing cake into the mouth of the dragon, destroyed the beast,⁹¹ so also Christ, by hurling his own flesh into the mouth of Death, split his belly apart.⁹² For

88. This vivid imagery of Death/Hades, with a belly swollen full of the righteous dead, vivisected by Christ, who vanquishes him and frees them, is found, with some of the same language, in Chrysostom’s older contemporary, Ephrem Syrus, in his *Sermo in pretiosam et vivificam crucem*: ἐν τούτῳ τῷ ἁγίῳ ὄπλῳ (sc. ὁ σταυρός) διέρρηξε Χριστὸς τὴν παμφάγον τοῦ ἄδου γαστέρα καὶ τὸ πολυμήχανον τοῦ Διαβόλου ἐνέφραξε στόμα. Τοῦτον ἰδὼν ὁ θάνατος, τρομάξας καὶ φρίξας, πάντας οὓς εἶχεν ἀπὸ τοῦ πρωτοπλάστου ἀπέλυσε (ed. Phrantzoles, 4:135; my translation: “By means of this holy weapon [i.e., the cross] Christ split the omnivorous belly of Hades in two and he shut the conniving mouth of the Devil. On seeing this cross, Death, shivering and shaking with fear, released all those whom he had held fast, starting with the first-formed man [Adam]”). See the excellent treatment of this scene in texts and Byzantine art by Margaret English Frazer, “Hades Stabbed by the Cross of Christ,” *Metropolitan Museum Journal* 9 (1974): 153–61, who cites this Ephrem text (pp. 157–58) and others up through Romanos Melodos, including one Ps-Chrysostomic text. One difference is that the preacher in *Hom. Tit. 2:11–12* focuses not on the cross but on the very σῶμα of Christ as having torn Death/Satan/Hades apart, though this is likely due to the comparison he is trying to make with Bel (Add Dan). (See also n. 92 below for another instance in Chrysostom’s writings that makes this same analogy.)

89. I.e., Christ did not suffer the fate Paul said Death did.

90. The language is different, but cf. 2 Tim 1:10.

91. Cf. Bel. (Add Dan) 23–27. The language is very close: καὶ ἐποίησε μάζαν καὶ ἐνέβαλεν εἰς τὸ στόμα τοῦ δράκοντος, καὶ φαγὼν διερράγη (Bel 27).

92. The same argument comparing Christ’s body attacking Death with Daniel’s assault on the dragon, with much identical language, is made by Chrysostom in *Hom. 1 Cor. 24.4* (PG 61:204): Οὐδεμία γὰρ γυνὴ παιδίον κύουσα οὕτως ὠδίνει, ὥς ἐκεῖνος, τὸ σῶμα ἔχων τὸ Δεσποτικόν, διεκόπτετο διασπώμενος. Καὶ ὅπερ ἐπὶ τοῦ δράκοντος γέγονε

- 1 τοῦ θανάτου ἢ ἁμαρτία. Ἀνελών τοίνυν τὸ κέντρον, εἶασεν λοιπὸν τὸ θηρίον ἀνενέργητον.

19. Ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ ζητούμενον ἐκεῖνό ἐστιν· τί δηποτοῦν εἰπὼν ἐπεφάνη ἡ χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ ἢ σωτήριος, ἐπήγαγεν παιδεύουσα ἡμᾶς. Ἡ γὰρ χάρις οὐ
 5 παιδεύει, ἀλλὰ δημηγορεῖ· ἡ χάρις οὐ παιδεύει, ἀλλὰ ἀφήσιν ἁμαρτήματα. συγγνώμην δίδωσιν, οὐ παιδεῖαν ἐπάγει. Ἀλλὰ μὴ φοβηθῆς τὸ ὄνομα τῆς παιδείας· [126^F] ἔστιν γὰρ παιδεία κόλασις καὶ ἔστιν παιδεία διδασκαλία· Ὅν γὰρ ἀγαπᾷ Κύριος παιδεύει—φησὶν—μαστιγοῖ δὲ πάντα υἱὸν ὃν παραδέχεται. Ἐνταῦθα παιδεία ἢ κόλασις ἐστιν. Ἄκουσον ἀλλαχοῦ πῶς ἢ
 10 παιδεία διδασκαλός ἐστιν· Μακάριος ἄνθρωπος ὃν ἂν παιδεύσης, Κύριε, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ νόμου σου διδάξης αὐτόν. Κατὰ τοῦτο τοίνυν ἐπεφάνη ἡ χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ ἢ σωτήριος, παιδεύουσα ἡμᾶς, τοῦτ' ἐστὶν διδάσκουσα ἡμᾶς.

1 τοῦ S, P] om. AW || εἶασεν λοιπὸν τὸ θηρίον ἀνενέργητον S] νεκρὸν εἶασεν τὸ θηρίον λοιπὸν P 3 καὶ S] om. P || ἐκεῖνο S] τοῦτο P 4 ἢ σωτήριος P] σωτήριος S, AW 5 ἀλλὰ δημηγορεῖ· ἡ χάρις οὐ παιδεύει P] om. S (h.t. οὐ παιδεύει), AW 7 ἔστιν γὰρ P] ἔστιν S, AW 8 φησὶν S] om. P || υἱὸν S] ἄνθρωπον P 9 παιδεία ἢ κόλασις S] ἢ παιδεία κόλασις P 9 ἄκουσον ἀλλαχοῦ πῶς ἢ παιδεία διδασκαλός ἐστιν P] om. S (h.t. ἐστὶν) 10 παιδεύσης κύριε καὶ ἐκ S] παιδεύση κύριος κύριε καὶ ἐκ P 11 διδάξης P] διδάξεις S (itac.?), AW || τοίνυν S] οὖν P 12 ἢ σωτήριος P] σωτήριος S, AW || τοῦτ' ἐστὶν διδάσκουσα ἡμᾶς P] om. S (h.t. ἡμᾶς), AW

τοῦ Βαβυλωνίου, ὅτε λαβὼν τὴν τροφὴν διερράγη μέσος, τοῦτο καὶ ἐπὶ τούτου. Οὐ γὰρ διὰ τοῦ στόματος πάλιν ἐξῆλθεν ὁ Χριστὸς τοῦ θανάτου, ἀλλ' αὐτὴν μέσῃ διαρρήξας τὴν γαστέρα τοῦ δράκοντος καὶ ἀνατεμών, οὕτως ἀπὸ τῶν ἀδύτων προῆι μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς λαμπρότητος (“For no woman giving birth to a child suffers as much pain as Death did when, having the Lord’s own body inside, he was vivisected and torn in two. And precisely what happened in the case of the Babylonian dragon, when it took the food and was split down the middle, happened also in the case of the Lord. Yet Christ didn’t come out again through the mouth of Death, but after he had split the belly of the dragon right down the middle and cut him open, he walked right out of the hidden chamber in full splendor”). In that context also Chrysostom refers to 1 Cor 15:54–56 for the triumph over death, as here. In both cases, it is a reference to a tradition such as that contained in the *Decensus Christi ad inferos* (inspired by 1 Pet 3:18–19, etc.), as appended to the *Acta Pilati*, in which Christ journeys to hell and releases the righteous dead. See further Frazer, “Hades Stabbed by the Cross of Christ.”

93. P reads νεκρὸν εἶασεν τὸ θηρίον λοιπὸν (“he left the beast finally dead”).

94. τὸ ζητούμενον.

95. Chrysostom does not mention the intervening words, πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις, which is a bit surprising given the argument about universality above (§§15–16); he appears to have presumed, but not quoted, that part.

indeed, “*the sting of death is sin*” (1 Cor 15:56). And then, after snatching away its sting, he left the beast in the end completely powerless.⁹³

19. But there’s still that vexing question⁹⁴ to be investigated: “Why then was it that after saying, ‘*The saving grace of God has been brought to light*,’ Paul added, ‘*giving us paideia*’ (Titus 2:11–12)?”⁹⁵ For grace doesn’t teach privately, but it speaks publicly; grace doesn’t chastise,⁹⁶ but it forgives sins. It grants pardon, it doesn’t bring punishment.”⁹⁷ Now don’t be afraid of the word *paideia*.⁹⁸ Because *paideia* means “chastisement” and *paideia* means “instruction.”⁹⁹ “*For the Lord chastises*¹⁰⁰ *the one he loves*,” it says, “*and he applies the whip to every son whom he accepts*” (Heb 12:6; Prov 3:12).¹⁰¹ In that statement *paideia* means “chastisement.” But hear how elsewhere *paideia* means “the role of instruction”: “*Blessed is the person whom you instruct, O Lord, and whom you teach from your law*” (Ps 93:12).¹⁰² Accordingly, then, “*the saving grace of God has been brought to light, giving us paideia*” (Titus 2:11–12) means “teaching us.”¹⁰³

96. ἀλλὰ δημηγορεῖ· ἡ χάρις οὐ παιδεύει is restored from P (lacking in S, likely a parablepsis error). In setting up these three antitheses, John is playing off different senses of παιδεύειν/παιδεία, as “instruction,” “chastisement,” and “punishment” (hence the varieties in translating οὐ παιδεύει above, to fit the three contrasts).

97. I take the interlocutor’s question to extend to here. Then what follows is John’s solution, or λύσις, initially addressing the interlocutor in the second person (and, by extension, his audience at the *synaxis* as well).

98. In responding to the ζητούμενον, Chrysostom first treats it as a lexical problem.

99. John’s gloss is upheld in a modern lexicon like PGL (see above, n. 38).

100. Although most English translations choose “discipline” here (including NETS), in the next sentence, John identifies this as κόλασις, “chastisement, correction” (LSJ 2), or “punishment” (PGL 1).

101. It is not possible to tell whether John is quoting from one or the other, since Hebrews has quoted the Proverbs LXX text exactly (and φησὶν is ambiguous). The quotation in this exact form is found in *Laz.* 1.12 (PG 48:980); *Exp. Ps.* Ψ 7 §8 (PG 55:92); *Hom. Jo.* 35.3 (PG 59:202); *Hom. Heb.* 29.1 (PG 63:204); and, without γάρ, in *Adv. Jud.* 8.7 (PG 48:939); *Stat.* 1.9 (PG 49:28); *Exp. Ps.* Ψ 110 §3 (PG 55:284).

102. Minus σύ before παιδεύσης with LXX A; I adopt the reading διδάξης (from P), rather than διδάξεις (S). The macarism is quoted by Chrysostom in this form also in *Stat.* 18.3 (PG 49:185); *Hom. Jo.* 47.5 (PG 59:322); *Hom. Phil.* 15.5 (PG 62:294).

103. Having set up the alternative solutions to the lexical quandary, the preacher argues for the single meaning of παιδεύουσα here as giving “instruction.” But that leads to the next questions, how and what does grace teach?

- 1 20. Καὶ πῶς διδάσκει ἡ χάρις; Ἡ γὰρ χάρις ἁμαρτήματα ἀφήσιν, ἀλλ' αὕτη ἡ ἄφεσις τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν διδασκαλία κατορθωμάτων ἐστίν· καὶ γὰρ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων τῶν νοῦν ἐχόντων οὐχ οὕτω μαστιγες καὶ πληγαὶ παιδεύουσιν πολλοὺς ὡς ἁμαρτημάτων συγχώρησις. "Ὅταν γοῦν ἴδῃ τὴν φιλάνθρωπίαν
5 τοῦ συγχωρήσαντος, [126^V] ὁ ἡμαρτηκῶς ἑαυτὸν ἀκριβέστερον ποιεῖ πρὸς τὰ μέλλοντα κατορθώματα. Καὶ οὕτως αὐτὸν παιδεύει ἡ χάρις, μαστίγων μᾶλλον κατανύττουσα· ἐρυθριᾷ γὰρ καὶ αἰσχύνεται πάλιν τοῖς αὐτοῖς περιπεσεῖν, δυσωπεῖται τὸ μέγεθος τῆς δωρεᾶς τοῦ εὐεργετήσαντος καὶ γίνεται παίδευσις ἡ χάρις.
- 10 21. Βούλει μαθεῖν καὶ ἐτέρωθεν πῶς καὶ χάρις ἐστίν καὶ παίδευσις, πῶς καὶ ἐχαρίσατο καὶ ἐπαίδευσεν ὁ Χριστός; Εἶδεν τὸν παραλελυμένον, συνέπηξεν αὐτοῦ τὰ νεῦρα, διωρθώσατο τῆς φύσεως αὐτοῦ τὴν ἀσθένειαν, ἐπανήγαγεν πρὸς τὴν προτέραν ὑγίαν τὸ σῶμα, εἴτα ὕστερον ἰδὼν αὐτὸν ἔλεγεν· Ἴδου ὑγιῆς γέγονας [127^T]—τοῦτο χάριτος· *μηκέτι ἀμάρτανε*—
15 τοῦτο παιδείας καὶ διδασκαλίας. Καὶ τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἀμφότερα ἐνεχείρισεν· εἰπὼν μὲν γὰρ πορευθέντες βαπτίζετε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, τὴν χάριν ἐδήλωσεν, τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν παραπτωμάτων· ἐπαγαγὼν δὲ διδάσκοντες αὐτοὺς τηρεῖν πάντα ὅσα ἐνετείλαμην ὑμῖν, τὴν παιδείαν ἐνέφηγεν. Ἄ δὲ καὶ ὁ Παῦλος δηλῶν ἔλεγεν·
20 Ἐπεφάνη ἡ χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ, παιδεύουσα ἡμᾶς.

1 γάρ S] om. P 3 τῶν νοῦν S, P] τὸν νοῦν AW || πληγαί S] πληγαῖς P 4 πολλοὺς S] om. P || τὴν P] τὴν τὴν S (sic) 5 ἑαυτὸν ἀκριβέστερον S] ἀκριβέστερον ἑαυτὸν P 7 κατανύττουσα P] κατανοίγουσα S | κατανυγεῖσα AW conj. || γὰρ καὶ S] καὶ P 10 πῶς καὶ S] πῶς P 11 πῶς S] πάλιν P 12 διωρθώσατο S] διόρθωσεν P || φύσεως αὐτοῦ S] φύσεως P 13 ἐπανήγαγεν S] ἐπήγαγεν P 14 χάριτος P] χάρις S, AW || ἀμάρτανε S, P] ἁμαρτάνει (sic) AW 15 Altering AW's punctuation to establish consistency in the two parallel clauses 17 τὴν ἄφεσιν S] καὶ τὴν ἄφεσιν P 18 παραπτωμάτων S] ἁμαρτήματα P || δέ S] om. P 19 ἂ δὲ καὶ S] ἂ καὶ P 20 τοῦ θεοῦ P] τοῦ θεοῦ σωτήριος S, AW

104. This part of the argument (especially §§20–21) bears resemblance to the much briefer treatment of the verse in Chrysostom, *Hom. Tit.* 5.1 (PG 62:689), with the same emphasis on how χάρις brings about συγχώρησις and how it acts both to deal with past and future sins and to provide ἀσφάλεια for the future: Ἀλλὰ μὴ νομίσῃς, ὅτι ἡ χάρις μέχρι τῆς τῶν προτέρων συγχωρήσεως ἴσταται, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰς τὸ μέλλον ἡμᾶς ἀσφαλίζεται· καὶ γὰρ καὶ τοῦτο χάριτος ("But don't suppose that grace stops with forgiving our former sins, but it even secures us for the future. Indeed, this is precisely the role of grace").

105. P omits πολλοὺς and also reads πληγαῖς for πληγαί ("Indeed, the whips that offer *paideia* even by means of beatings").

20. So how does grace teach? Well, grace forgives sins, but this act of forgiving sins constitutes a teaching about virtuous actions.¹⁰⁴ Indeed, the whips and beatings that offer *paideia* to the masses¹⁰⁵ aren't as effective for intelligent people as is the pardoning of their sins. Because when those who've sinned¹⁰⁶ see the merciful love of the one who has pardoned them, they make themselves all the more attentive to do acts of virtue in the future. This is how grace gives them *paideia*, spurring them on¹⁰⁷ even better than whips do, since out of embarrassment they're ashamed to fall into the same actions again. They're abashed at the magnitude of their benefactor's gift, and so grace becomes a process of *paideia*.

21. Do you want to learn from yet another source how it is both grace and a process of *paideia*, how Christ both gave a gift of grace and offered *paideia*? He saw the man who was paralyzed, he strengthened his tendons, he corrected the weakness of his nature, he brought his body back to its former health (cf. John 5:2–9). Then later, when Christ saw him, he said, “*Look, you’ve become healthy!*” (John 5:14)¹⁰⁸—this is an act of grace.¹⁰⁹ And, he said, “*No longer sin*” (John 5:14)—this is an act of *paideia* and instruction. Both these tasks were what Christ entrusted to his disciples. For by saying, “*Go forth and ... baptize all the nations in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit*” (Matt 28:19),¹¹⁰ he was clearly showing grace, that is, the forgiveness of transgressions. But by adding, “*teaching them to observe all the things I commanded you*” (Matt 28:20), he was pointing to *paideia*. And indeed, this is precisely what Paul showed so clearly when he said, “*The saving grace of God has been brought to light ... giving us paideia*” (Titus 2:11–12).

106. The translation chooses the plural here to avoid gender-exclusive language, but the Greek is singular.

107. AW rightly adopts *κατανύπτουσα*, the reading of P, here (as translated above). S has *κατανόγουσα* (a rare intensive of *ἀνόλω* nowhere else used by Chrysostom), about which AP offers the following hesitant conjecture: “*num κατανυγείσα?*” (presumably the hesitation is due to the ill-suited passive voice). Chrysostom likes the verb *κατανύπτειν*; see, e.g., *Hom. Rom. 16:3 B* §6 (PG 51:206); *Exp. Ps. Ψ 110* §5 (PG 55:287); *Hom. Matt. 87.4* (PG 58:774); *Hom. Jo. 48.3* (PG 59:272); *Hom. Rom. 30.4* (PG 60:666); *Hom. Act. 9:1 3.3* (PG 51:140) in addition to the citations listed in PGL 1.b.

108. ἰδοὺ for ἴδε (correcting AW's citation of John 15:14).

109. I adopt *χάριτος*, the reading of P, instead of *χάρις* (that of S, adopted by AW).

110. A paraphrase at the start: *πορευθέντες βαπτίζετε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη* for *πορευθέντες μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη* βαπτίζοντες.

1 22. Ὑπὲρ δὲ τούτων ἀπάντων εὐχαριστήσωμεν τῷ Θεῷ καὶ διὰ παντὸς
 ἔχωμεν διὰ μνήμης τὴν χάριν ταύτην. [127^V] καὶ τετυφωμένος ἦς καὶ
 ἀπονενοημένος, καὶ εὐθυμῆς, παιδεύσει σε ἡ χάρις μετριάξειν. Ὅταν γὰρ
 5 ἐννοήσης ὅτι ὁ τῶν ἀγγέλων δεσπότης, Θεὸς ὁ σύνθρονος τοῦ πατρός, δούλου
 μορφὴν ἔλαβεν, οὐ δυνήσῃ ποτὲ ὀργῆς ἢ ἀπονοίας πάθος κατασχεῖν ἐν τῇ
 ψυχῇ.

23. Οὕτω γοῦν καὶ Παῦλος παιδεύει ἐν ταπεινοφροσύνῃ ἡμᾶς, δεικνὺς
 ὅτι τοῦτο αὐτὸ χάρις ἐστὶν καὶ διδασκαλία· διὸ καὶ τῆς χάριτος ἀναμιμνήσκει
 πρότερον. Καὶ ποῦ τοῦτο ποιεῖ; Φιλιππησίοις γράφων καὶ βουλόμενος αὐτοὺς
 10 πείσαι παραχωρεῖν ἀλλήλοις τῶν πρωτείων, οὕτως συνεβούλευσεν. Τῇ
 ταπεινοφροσύνῃ ἀλλήλους προηγούμενοι ὑπερέχοντας ἑαυτῶν. [128^Γ] Εἴτα
 τὴν διδασκαλίαν ἀπὸ τῆς χάριτος ἐπήγαγεν εἰπών. Τοῦτο γάρ—φησὶν—
 φρονεῖσθω ἐν ὑμῖν ὁ καὶ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ὃς ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχων οὐχ
 15 ἀρπαγμόν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ, ἀλλ' ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν, μορφὴν δούλου
 λαβών· καὶ σχήματι εὔρεθεις ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἐταπείνωσεν ἑαυτόν.

24. Εἶδες πῶς τὴν χάριν εἰς μέσον ἀγαγὼν διδασκαλίαν τὸ πρᾶγμα
 ἐποίησεν; Οὕτω, καὶ ὅταν εἰς ἀγάπην προτρέπηται, ποιεῖ, τῆς χάριτος
 ἀναμιμνήσκων καὶ λέγων· Καθὼς ὁ Χριστὸς ἠγάπησεν ἡμᾶς καὶ παρέδωκεν
 ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους. Παιδευθῶμεν τοίνυν

1 δέ S] δὴ P || ἀπάντων S, P] ἀπάτων (sic) AW 2 καὶ ἀπονενοημένος S, P] om.
 AW 3 Ὅταν γὰρ ... ἔλαβεν S] om. P 5 ὀργῆς ἢ S] ἀγαθῶν οὐδέ P 7 ἐν ταπεινοφροσύνῃ
 S] εἰς ταπεινοφροσύνῃ P 8 τοῦτο αὐτὸ χάρις S] τὸ αὐτὸ καὶ χάρις P 9 ποιεῖ S] φησὶν
 P 10 τῇ ταπεινοφροσύνῃ P] ἐν τῇ ταπεινοφροσύνῃ S 11 προηγούμενοι S] ἡγούμενοι
 P (with M) || ὑπερέχοντας S, P] ὑπέρετας AW 12 εἰπών S] om. P 15 εὔρεθεις S, P]
 εὔρηθεις (sic) AW 17 ἐποίησεν P] ἐκάλεσεν S, AW || προτρέπηται S] om. P 18 καθὼς
 S] οὕτως P 19 ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν S] om. P

111. Cf. 1 Thess 1:2.

112. καὶ ἀπονενοημένος is read by both manuscripts (AW *app. crit.* incorrectly says only P adds it).

113. I.e., “give you the *paideia*.”

114. With transposition of μορφὴν and δούλου.

115. Ὅταν γὰρ ἐννοήσης ... ἔλαβεν is the reading of S. P has dropped the line, resuming (after μετριάξειν in the previous line) with οὐ δυνήσῃ, and reads ἀγαθῶν οὐδέ for ὀργῆς ἢ. That textual reading appears corrupt but would be something like, “You’ll never be able to harbor the emotions for good or arrogance in your soul.”

116. I.e., *paideia*.

117. John is seeking to show that in Titus 2:11 and other places, like John 5:14 and Matt 28:19–20, χάρις precedes παιδεία.

22. So, on behalf of all these things, let's give thanks to God, and let's remember this grace at all times.¹¹¹ And if you're conceited and haughty,¹¹² if you're high-spirited, grace will instruct you¹¹³ in moderating your behavior. For when you consider that the Lord of the angels—the God who shares the throne with the Father—took “*the form of a slave*” (Phil 2:7),¹¹⁴ you'll never be able to harbor the emotion of wrath or of arrogance in your soul.¹¹⁵

23. This is how Paul offers us instruction¹¹⁶ in humility, by showing that it's the very thing that constitutes grace and teaching. That's why he mentions grace first.¹¹⁷ And where does he do¹¹⁸ this? When writing to the Philippians and wishing to persuade them to cede to one another the positions of preeminence, he puts his counsel this way: “*In humility consider one another better than yourselves*” (Phil 2:3).¹¹⁹ Then he added the teaching that comes from grace, saying, “*For,*” he says, “*let your mindset be that which was in Christ Jesus, who, although he was in the form of God, did not consider being equal to God something to be grasped at, but he emptied himself, taking the form of a slave ... and being found in human form, he humbled himself*” (Phil 2:5–8).¹²⁰

24. Have you seen how by bringing grace to the forefront Paul made the matter a form of instruction?¹²¹ He does this also when he is giving a protreptic appeal¹²² to love, by bringing grace to mind and saying, “*Just as Christ loved us and handed himself over on our behalf*” (Eph 5:2),¹²³ thus

118. ποιεῖ (S); P reads φησὶν (“And where does he say this?”).

119. S reads προηγούμενοι (with p^{46} D^{*}.c I K 075. 0278. 1175. 1505; cf. Rom 12:10 on the sense of the verb) for ἡγούμενοι (so \mathfrak{M} and other witnesses). In one other place in his oeuvre, John cites Phil 2:3 with προηγούμενοι, in *Scand.* 17.5 (SC 79, ed. Malin-grey), but when citing the lemma in *Hom. Phil.* 6.3 (PG 62:222), he has ἡγούμενοι. John conflates Phil 2:3 and Rom 12:10 (τῇ τιμῇ ἀλλήλους προηγούμενοι ὑπερέχοντας ἑαυτῶν) also in *Hom. Gen.* 4.7; 33.5 (PG 53:47, 312). AW's ὑπηρέτας for ὑπερέχοντας (the reading of both manuscripts) is an outright mistake.

120. With φρονεῖσθω for φρονεῖτε, and ellipsis in Phil. 2:7 (ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος), as marked in the translation.

121. S reads ἐκάλεσεν (“how after bringing grace to the forefront Paul called the matter ‘instruction’”).

122. As AW notes, P omits προτρέπεται, though it is required for the ὅταν clause. John may or may not have a formal προτρεπτικός λόγος in mind, but he uses the term consistent with its rhetorical definition as a discourse of persuasion toward a particular course or way of life.

123. Minus καί before ὁ Χριστός; John may also have in mind Gal 2:20, where in the following verse (2:21), this act of Christ's handing himself over in love is called χάρις.

- 1 ἀπὸ τῆς χάριτος καὶ εὐχαριστήσωμεν τῷ φιλανθρώπῳ Θεῷ καὶ διὰ τὴν
γενομένην [128^V] εἰς ἡμᾶς δωρεὰν καὶ διὰ τὴν ἐκ τῆς χάριτος διδασκαλίαν,
ὅτι καὶ τῶν προτέρων ἁμαρτημάτων ἀπηλλάγημεν καὶ πρὸς τὰ μέλλοντα
κατορθώματα μεγίστην ἔχομεν ἀσφάλειαν τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων τὴν ἄφεσιν.
- 5 25. Καὶ καθάπερ ἐν κατόπτρῳ, τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ τοῦ λόγου, τὸν βίον τὸν
ἡμέτερον κατανοῶμεν μετὰ ἀκριβείας καὶ ῥυθμιζόμεν τὰ ἡμελημένα τῶν
πράξεων. Καὶ ὅπερ ἐν τοῖς κουρείοις καθεζόμενοι ποιοῦσιν ἄνθρωποι μετὰ τὸ
τὴν τρίχα ἀποκείρασθαι τῆς κεφαλῆς, τὸ κάτοπτρον τῇ δεξιᾷ κατέχοντες,
περισκοπούμενοι [129^Γ] μήπου τι κατὰ τὴν κουρὰν ἁμάρτημα γέγονεν τῇ
10 κεφαλῇ, κατ' αὐτὸ καὶ σὺ ποιήσον· καθάπερ κάτοπτρον τὴν διδασκαλίαν τοῦ
λόγου λαβών, ἀπ' αὐτῆς σου τὸν βίον θεώρει πάντα, κἂν ἴδῃς ἁμάρτημά τι
γεγεννημένον, εὐθέως διορθῶσαι καὶ σύ.
- 15 26. Οὕτω καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες ποιοῦσιν· ἀπὸ γὰρ τῆς εὐνῆς εὐθέως
διανιστάμεναι, τὴν τε ὄψιν ἀποσμήχουσιν καὶ τὴν τῶν τριχῶν κόμην
διατιθέασιν, καὶ πρὸς τὸ κάτοπτρον βλέπουσιν, τοῦ κάλλους τῆς ὄψεως οὕτω
τὴν δοκιμασίαν ποιοῦνται, ὥστε μηδὲν ἡμελημένον παραδραμεῖν. Καὶ σὺ

3 ἀπηλλάγημεν καὶ πρὸς τὰ μέλλοντα κατορθώματα μεγίστην ἔχομεν ἀσφάλειαν S] ἀπηλλάγημεν ἀπολογίαν τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων τὴν ἄφεσιν P 7 κουρείοις, regularizing the orthography] κουρίοις S, P, AW (itac.) || ποιοῦσιν ἄνθρωποι S] ἄνθρωποι P 8 τῇ δεξιᾷ S] ἐν τῇ δεξιᾷ P 9 περισκοπούμενοι μήπου τι S] περισκοποῦσιν μήπου P 10 κατ' αὐτό P] κατὰ τούτων S, AW 11 τὸν βίον θεώρει πάντα S] θεώρει πάντα τὸν βίον P || κἂν S] καὶ εἰ P 12 διορθῶσαι καὶ σύ S] διορθῶσαι P | διόρθῶσαι (sic) AW 13 Οὕτω καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες ... παραδραμεῖν P, AW in angle brackets] om. S 16 δοκιμασίαν AW] δοκίμασιν P || Καὶ σὺ τοῖνον λαβών P, AW] τοῖνον λαβών S

124. Cf. Eph 5:1–2a, 25. Although the phrasing of the final clause in its four words (καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους) follows John 13:34, Chrysostom in context is offering this as an instance of *Pauline* love protreptic, which must mean he is thinking of the broader argument of Eph 5.

125. The text of P appears to have suffered some corruption here; for καὶ πρὸς τὰ μέλλοντα κατορθώματα ... ἀσφάλειαν, it reads ἀπολογίαν (and then resumes τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων τὴν ἄφεσιν). It lacks a verb of which ἀπολογίαν is the object.

126. The λόγος here naturally refers to the teaching of Scripture, specifically the lemma, Titus 2:11, but it may equally or jointly refer to the teaching of Scripture in the present λόγος, the homily. The phrase ἡ διδασκαλία τοῦ λόγου is used in this way repeatedly by Chrysostom—e.g., *Adv. Jud.* 8.4 (PG 48:932); *Terr. mot.* §1 (PG 50:713); *Hom. Gen.* 40.1 (PG 53:369); *Hom. Jo.* 5:19 §1 (PG 56:248). And it is grounded for him also in the missionary proclamation by Paul and the other apostles of the word of the gospel—e.g., *Hom. Rom.* 2.2 (PG 60:402); *Hom. Matt.* 6.5 (PG 57:68); *Exp. Ps.* Ψ 49 §6 (PG 55:250).

also you love one another.¹²⁴ Therefore, let's receive our *paideia* from grace, and let's give thanks to God who mercifully loves us—both because of the free gift that has come to us and because of the teaching that comes from the gift of grace, since we've been delivered from our former sins and, in addition, we have the forgiveness of sins as the most secure basis for our virtuous actions in the future.¹²⁵

25. Let's look closely at our own life in this teaching of Scripture¹²⁶ as though looking in a mirror,¹²⁷ and let's correct our careless misdeeds. Men who sit in the barbershop, after their full head of hair has been cut, hold the mirror in their right hand and check carefully all around, lest there's been an errant snip in the hair on their head.¹²⁸ You, too, should do the exact same thing.¹²⁹ Grasping this teaching of Scripture as though it were a mirror, take a close look at your entire life in it, and, if you see something amiss,¹³⁰ you, too, correct it immediately!

26. This is what women do, as well. For as soon as they get up from bed, they wash off their face and arrange their hairdo, and by looking at the mirror, they test¹³¹ the beauty of their appearance so they not overlook something that's carelessly askew.¹³² So now, you¹³³ too, grasping this teach-

127. Despite biblical passages that refer to mirrors (e.g., 1 Cor 13:12; 2 Cor 3:18; Jas 1:23–24), John does not appear to be making a direct allusion to them here so much as he is to everyday custom.

128. There is a very close parallel, using much the same language, in Chrysostom's *Hom. Matt.* 4.8 (PG 57:49): Ἀλλ' ἐν κουρείῳ μὲν καθήμενος, καὶ τὴν κόμην ἀποκείρων, τὸ κάτοπτρον λαβὼν περισκοπεῖς μετὰ ἀκριβείας τὴν τῶν τριχῶν σύνθεσιν ("But when you sit in the barbershop and get your hair cut, you take the mirror and check carefully and attentively the condition of your hair"). As in the present homily, this is in contrast to the lack of concentrated attention people give to the beauty or disfigurement (ἀμορφία) of their souls.

129. I adopt the reading of P, κατ' αὐτό, over that of S, κατὰ τούτων (as read by AW).

130. Of course, ἁμαρτήματα means both sin and error.

131. P reads δοκίμασιν, which AW sensibly corrected to δοκιμασίαν.

132. This sentence, marked as an insertion via brackets in the text in AW, is found only in P. AW was confident that the monastic male community at Saint Catherine's in the Sinai may have felt the exemplum of the woman's toilette to be irrelevant to their context ("le *Sinaiticus* a certainement fait des coupures à l'intention sans doute d'un auditoire monastique" [p. 121]), and thus they had deleted it. This is an unlikely and unnecessary conjecture, because it does not reckon with the fact that the woman in this comparison as it continues (see n. 133 below) is not just any female but is an analogy for the church or perhaps the soul, as in *Catech. illum.* 1.4 (SC 50^{bis}:111, ed. Wenger), whose bridegroom—for whom she primps—is Christ. The rendition in AW

- 1 τοῖνυν λαβὼν τὸ κάτοπτρον τῆς διδασκαλίας, μόρφωσον καὶ τύπωσον τὸ κάλλος τῆς ψυχῆς· ἔχεις γὰρ ἄνδρα καὶ σὺ ὧ μέλλεις ἀρέσκειν· ὥσπερ ἐκεῖναι οὐδὲν πρὸ τοῦ ἔργου τούτου ποιοῦνται, οὕτω καὶ σὺ μηδὲν ταύτης προτίμα τῆς σπουδῆς, ἀλλὰ καὶν ἅπασαν τὴν οἰκίαν ἡμελημένην ἴδοις, πρότερον
- 5 ἄρεσον τῷ ἀνδρί, καὶ τότε τὰ ἄλλα διάθες καλῶς. "Οτι γὰρ ἔχεις ἄνδρα καὶ σὺ, ἄκουσον τοῦ Παύλου λέγοντος· Ἑρμοσάμην ὑμᾶς ἐνὶ ἀνδρὶ παρθένον παραστήσαι τῷ Χριστῷ. "Οσα δὲ μείζων τοῦ ἀνδρὸς τούτου ἡ ἀξία, τοσούτω μείζονα παρ' ἡμῶν γενέσθαι χρή τὴν σπουδὴν· ὁ γὰρ εἰς κάλλος βλέπει ψυχῆς καὶ ταύτην βούλεται καλλωπίζεσθαι τὴν ὄψιν. Πᾶσα γὰρ ἡ δόξα τῆς θυγατρὸς
- 10 τοῦ βασιλέως ἔσωθεν.

27. Ταύτην τοῖνυν τὴν δόξαν καλλωπίζωμεν, ἵνα μετὰ ταύτης ἀπαντήσαντες τῷ βασιλεῖ τῆς δόξης τῆς αἰωνίου καὶ ἀθανάτου τύχωμεν τιμῆς·

2 ἔχεις γὰρ ἄνδρα καὶ σὺ ... ἔσωθεν P, AW in angle brackets] om. S 11 τοῖνυν P] δέ S || μετὰ ταύτης ἀπαντήσαντες I (per Aubineau)] μετὰ ταύτης S | μετὰ ταύτης ἅπαντες τῷ βασιλεῖ τῆς δόξης P | μετὰ ταύτης ἅπαντες τῷ βασιλεῖ τῆς δόξης <παραστήσαντες> AW

121 ("la mimique de l'homme chez le coiffeur suffisait à la leçon, sans y ajouter celle de la femme devant son miroir") has missed this key point in the development of the image. In any case, there is also a clear contrast between men's coiffures in the public barbershop and women's confinement at home. Beyond that, we can likely account for the minus in S by parembolism (note that καὶ σὺ is repeated at least three times in the last four lines, differently placed by our two manuscripts). The scribe of S clearly understands καὶ σὺ in line 12 to follow διορθῶσαι, because τοῖνυν λαβὼν begins on a new line; hence we have adopted that reading above and posit that καὶ σὺ was once more repeated by the preacher before τοῖνυν λαβὼν (though it is lacking in P). For all these reasons, I adopt the reading of P and remove the brackets.

133. The gender of the participle λαβὼν indicates that the preacher moves from the example of the women to addressing everyone in the assembly generally.

134. I.e., Christ, as the argument will make clear. The language deliberately echoes 1 Cor 7:32–34.

135. Although John will cite 2 Cor 11:2, following the logic of his argument earlier (see above, n. 132), Eph 5:25–33 may have also been in his mind as he makes this transition into the marital imagery.

136. ἄκουσον τοῦ Παύλου λέγοντος, a phrasing Chrysostom favors and uses much more than any other ancient Christian author. See, in this volume, *Hom. 1 Cor. 7:2–4* §3 (PG 51:213); *Hom. 2 Cor 4:13* Γ §10 (PG 51:299); *Hom. 2 Tim. 3:1* §§1, 2 (PG 56:271–72); and throughout his oeuvre as, e.g., in *Hom. Matt. 9:2*; 10:5 (PG 57:178, 190); *Hom. Gen. 2.2*; 4.2 (PG 54:589, 596); *Adv. Jud. 3.4* (PG 48:867); *Stat. 1.8*; 3.6 (PG 49:27, 57), among many examples.

137. Minus γάρ after ἡρμοσάμην; minus ἀγνήν after παρθένον.

ing as a mirror, shape and mold the beauty of your soul. For you, too, have a husband whom you're going to please.¹³⁴ Just as those women do nothing before this cosmetic work, you, too, should value nothing ahead of zealous care for your soul. But even if you see your entire house falling down from neglect, please your husband first, and then make sure the other things are in good order. After all, for the fact that you also have a husband,¹³⁵ listen to Paul saying,¹³⁶ *"I have betrothed you to one husband, to present you as a virgin to Christ"* (2 Cor 11:2).¹³⁷ Our measure of zeal must be all the greater to suit this husband's extraordinary worthiness. For he looks at the beauty of our soul,¹³⁸ and he wishes it to be adorned in splendor. For *"all the glory of the daughter of the king comes from the inside"* (Ps 44:14).¹³⁹

27. So then, let's put on this glory as our adornment, so that when with this glory we've approached the King of glory¹⁴⁰ we might attain an honor

138. The beauty of the soul (ψυχῆς κάλλος), though of course not unique to him, is a favored Chrysostomic theme—see, in this volume, *Hom. Rom. 12:20* §4 (PG 51:179); *Hom. Rom. 16:3 A* §4 (PG 51:193); also, e.g., *Hom. Gen. 47.2*; *48.2* (PG 54:431, 437); *Dav. 3.2* (PG 54:698); *Hom. Act. 27.2* (PG 60:207).

139. ἔχεις γὰρ ἄνδρα ... ἔσωθεν, adopting the reading of P (S omits; AW places in brackets). This passage clearly makes reference to the exemplum of the women's morning routine in the previous passage adopted also from P but lacking in S. For the scriptural quote, plus γάρ after πᾶσα (supplied by John to connect with the argument); reading τῆς θυγατρὸς τοῦ with LXX A, for αὐτῆς θυγατρὸς (B). This psalm verse is drawn upon rather frequently by Chrysostom as, e.g., in *Virginity. 6.2* (SC 125:110, ed. Musurillo); *Hom. princ. Act. 3.5* (PG 51:95); *Hom. Rom. 16:3 A* §4 (PG 51:193); *Hom. Heb. 28.5* (PG 63:199), with a similar appeal and language as here: οὐχ ὥστε τὸ σῶμα λευκὸν ποιῆσαι καὶ ἀποστίλβον, ἀλλ' ὥστε τὴν ψυχὴν καλλωπίσαι· αὕτη γάρ ἐστιν ἡ ἀγωνιζομένη ἐκεῖ καὶ ἀθλοῦσα. Πᾶσα ἡ δόξα τῆς θυγατρὸς τοῦ βασιλέως ἔσωθεν, φησί. Ταῦτα περιθουμυρίων γὰρ καὶ ἄλλων ἀπαλλάττεις σαυτὴν κακῶν, καὶ τὸν ἄνδρα μερίμνης, καὶ σαυτὴν φροντίδος. Οὕτω γὰρ αἰδέσιμος ἔσῃ τῷ ἀνδρὶ, ὅταν μὴ πολλῶν δέῃ ("not in order to make your body bright and shiny, but to make your soul beautiful. This [your soul] is what contends and contests [in the theater of heaven]. 'All the glory of the daughter of the king comes from the inside,' he says. Clothe yourself in these things. For you are ridding yourself of countless other evils and ridding your husband of worry and yourself from anxious care. And so you will be respected by your husband when you don't have need of many possessions").

140. In §27 with AW I adopt the reading of P for the first part (to χάριτι), but I reject AW's conjectural emendation to the text of P, παραστήσαντες (cf. 2 Cor 11:2, παραστήσαι τῷ Χριστῷ), which causes more problems than it resolves. For instance, the participle is active voice, and AW has translated it as though its object were ἅπαντας, "afin de nous presenter tous en cette tenue au roi de gloire," rather than the manuscript reading, ἅπαντες. Beyond these internal considerations, we can confirm that P's

- 1 χάριτι καὶ φιλανθρωπία τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, μεθ' οὗ τῷ Πατρὶ ἡ δόξα σὺν ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι, νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Ἀμήν.

1 καὶ φιλανθρωπία S] om. P || μεθ' οὗ τῷ Πατρὶ ἡ δόξα σὺν ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι, νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων S] ὅ ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας P

ungrammatical ἅπαντες (ἅπαντες τῷ βασιλεῖ τῆς δόξης τῆς αἰωνίου; “all ... to the King of eternal glory”) is a result of corruption of ἀπαντήσαντες, because it is the reading of this homily in the third witness, codex Mone Ibero 255, fol. 240 (per Aubineau, “Soixante-six textes, attribués à Jean Chrysostome,” 58). This reading is also consistent with Chrysostom’s usage elsewhere, as in *Diab.* 2.5 (PG 49:264): ἵνα ... καὶ μετὰ πολλῆς δόξης ἀπαντήσωμεν τῷ βασιλεῖ τῆς δόξης Χριστῷ (“so that ... with great glory we might approach Christ, the King of glory”). For a similar closing benedictory formula, see *Catech. ult.* 3.10, ἵνα μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς δόξης ἀπαντήσωμεν τῷ βασιλεῖ τῶν οὐρανῶν (SC 366:242, ed. Piédagnel and Doutreleau).

that is eternal and unending, by the grace and loving-kindness of our Lord Jesus Christ, with whom be glory to the Father, together with the Holy Spirit, now and always, forever and ever.¹⁴¹ Amen.¹⁴²

141. AW returns in the benediction to accepting the reading of S, which he regards as a key sign of an authentic Chrysostomic homily: “Nous oserions presque dire qu’une homélie qui comporte cette conclusion a toute chance d’être authentique” (AW 121). Earlier he had noted that P has a different doxology: χάριτι τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰ. Χ., ᾧ ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας· ἀμήν. (“by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, to whom be glory and power forever and ever. Amen.”). Even though AW regards P as reliable for two other significant readings in the final paragraphs of this homily, in this case he resorts to a claim about the fatigue of the scribe: “Cependant, tout à fait à la fin l’attention du copiste qui ne reproduit pas exactement la doxologie coutumière de l’orateur paraît s’être relâchée: cette variante ne nous semble pas compromettre l’authenticité de l’ensemble” (AW 121). At any rate, it bears attention that AW thought the scribes of both S and P had introduced changes into the text in the concluding sections.

142. S has the *subscriptio* τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου εἰς τὰ Θεοφάνια (“a sermon of Chrysostom’s on the Feast of the Epiphany”). For discussion, see introduction, pp. 53–57.

Τοῦ ἐν ἀγίοις πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἰωάννου ἀρχιεπισκόπου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου ἐγκώμιον εἰς τὸν ἅγιον ἀπόστολον Παῦλον, λόγος α'.

1.1. [112] Οὐκ ἂν τις ἀμάρτοι λειμῶνα ἀρετῶν καὶ παράδεισον πνευματικὸν καλέσας τὴν Παύλου ψυχὴν, οὕτω πολὺ μὲν ἦνθι τῇ χάριτι, ἀξίαν δὲ τῆς χάριτος ἐπεδείκνυτο τῆς ψυχῆς τὴν φιλοσοφίαν. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ σκεῦος ἐκλογῆς γέγονε, καὶ καλῶς ἑαυτὸν ἐξεκάθηρε, δαψιλῆς ἢ τοῦ Πνεύματος ἐξεχύθη εἰς αὐτὸν δωρεά. Ὅθεν ἡμῖν καὶ τοὺς θαυμαστοὺς ἔτεκε ποταμούς, οὐ κατὰ τὴν τοῦ παραδείσου [114] πηγὴν τέσσαρας μόνους, ἀλλὰ πολλῶ πλείους καθ' ἐκάστην ῥέοντας τὴν ἡμέραν, οὐ τὴν γῆν ἄρδοντας, ἀλλὰ τὰς τῶν ἀνθρώπων ψυχὰς εἰς καρπογονίαν ἀρετῆς διεγείροντας. Τίς οὖν ἀρκέσει λόγος τοῖς τούτου κατορθώμασιν; ἢ ποία δυνήσεται γλῶσσα ἐφικέσθαι τῶν ἐγκωμίων τῶν ἐκείνου; Ὅταν γὰρ ἅπαντα τὰ ἐν ἀνθρώποις καλὰ συλλαβοῦσα ἔχη ψυχὴ μία, καὶ πάντα μεθ' ὑπερβολῆς, οὐ μόνον δὲ τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ τῶν ἀγγέλων, πῶς περιεσόμεθα τοῦ μεγέθους τῶν ἐγκωμίων; Οὐ μὴν διὰ τοῦτο σιγήσομεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ δι' αὐτὸ μὲν οὖν τοῦτο μάλιστα ἐροῦμεν. Καὶ γὰρ καὶ τοῦτο ἐγκωμίου μέγιστον εἶδος, τὸ νικᾶν τῶν κατορθωμάτων τὸ

1. Text: as indicated in the introduction (pp. 62–64), we reprint the Greek text of Auguste Piédagnel (AP) SC 300 (1982) for each of the seven homilies *De laudibus sancti Pauli*. The footnotes within the translations on *Laud. Paul.* 1.14; 3.6; 4.15; 4.16; 5.3; 5.7; 6.5; 6.11; and 7.2 document the nine places where Piédagnel's text (AP) diverges from HS. See abbreviations, p. xvi above, for the sigla for AP's manuscripts. The translation and notes do not attempt a comprehensive assessment of the variants in the textual tradition of *Laud. Paul.*; readers should consult the Piédagnel edition for a full *apparatus criticus*. Translation: This translation is replicated from HT, 442–47, with some minor adjustments; see HT, 140–51 for an analysis of the argument of this homily.

2. AP rightly adopts the reading τῶν ἐγκωμίων τῶν ἐκείνου with the majority of manuscripts (the exception being G, which lacks τῶν). That reading was noted by HS

Hom. 1 De laudibus sancti Pauli apostoli
CPG 4344 (SC 300:112–40)¹

In praise of saint Paul the apostle by our father among the saints,
John Chrysostom, archbishop of Constantinople, homily 1.

1.1. [112] One wouldn't be mistaken in calling Paul's soul a meadow of virtues and a spiritual paradise, for he flowered forth in grace so abundantly that he gave proof that the philosophy of his soul was worthy of that grace. For when he became "*a vessel of election*" (Acts 9:15) and cleansed himself so thoroughly, the gift of the spirit was plentifully poured into him. And from this source he in turn gave birth to marvelous rivers for us, not like the [114] fountain of paradise, which generated just four rivers, but many more, flowing out every single day, not irrigating the land but elevating the souls of people to bear the fruit of virtue. What speech is sufficient to tell of his virtuous deeds? Or what sort of tongue will be able to achieve the praises that belong to him?² For when one soul brings together all the virtues in humanity, and all of them to the highest degree—not only the human virtues but even those of the angels!—how shall we successfully render the magnitude of the praises?³ Yet for this reason we shall not keep silent, but indeed because of it⁴ especially we shall speak. And indeed, this is the greatest form of encomium, when the magnitude of the virtuous

in the margin because he had G; in this case, further manuscripts would show HS made the wrong choice of his two manuscripts.

3. The *πρόβλημα* of this homily is cast in the form of an epideictic topos—who could possibly find words that would adequately praise such an illustrious subject as Paul, who combines in himself all the virtues? The *λύσις* will be found in employing the rhetorical form of *σύγκρισις*, "comparison," by which Paul will be shown to be superior to every possible example of each type of virtue, including figures from the Old Testament all the way up to the angels in heaven.

4. The translation adopts the shorter reading, *ἀλλὰ καὶ δι' αὐτό* with AP, for *ἀλλὰ δι' αὐτὸ καὶ δι' αὐτό* before *μέν*, the reading of Mf PE PG. HS's text read *ἀλλὰ [αὐτὸ] καὶ δι' αὐτὸ μέν*.

μέγεθος μετὰ πάσης περιουσίας τοῦ λόγου τὴν εὐκολίαν, καὶ ἡ ἥττα μυρίων τροπαίων ἐστὶν ἡμῖν λαμπροτέρα.

1.2. Πόθεν οὖν εὐκαιρον εἶη ἂν ἄψασθαι τῶν ἐγκωμίων; Πόθεν ἄλλοθεν ἢ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τούτου πρώτου, <τοῦ> δεῖξαι τὰ ἀπάντων ἔχοντα ἀγαθὰ; Εἴτε γὰρ προφῆται ἐπεδείξαντό τι γενναῖον, εἴτε πατριάρχαι, εἴτε δίκαιοι, εἴτε ἀπόστολοι, εἴτε μάρτυρες, πάντα ταῦτα ὁμοῦ συλλαβὼν ἔχει μετὰ τοσαύτης ὑπερβολῆς μεθ' ὅσης οὐδεὶς ἐκείνων, ὅπερ ἕκαστος εἶχε καλόν, ἐκέκτητο.

1.3. [116] Σκόπει δέ· προσήνεγκεν Ἀβελ θυσίαν, καὶ ἐντεῦθεν ἀνακηρύττεται. Ἀλλ' ἐὰν τὴν Παύλου θυσίαν εἰς μέσον ἀγάγῃς, τοσοῦτον δεικνύται βελτίων ἐκείνης, ὅσον τῆς γῆς ὁ οὐρανός. Ποίαν οὖν βούλεσθε εἶπω; Οὐδὲ γὰρ μία μόνον ἐστί. Καὶ γὰρ ἑαυτὸν καθ' ἐκάστην κατέθηκεν ἡμέραν, καὶ ταύτῃ πάλιν διπλὴν ἐποίει τὴν προσφοράν· τοῦτο μὲν καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν ἀποδινήσκων, τοῦτο δὲ τὴν νέκρωσιν ἐν τῷ σώματι αὐτοῦ περιφέρειν. Καὶ γὰρ πρὸς κινδύνους διηνεκῶς παρητάττετο, καὶ ἐσφάττετο τῇ προαιρέσει, καὶ τῆς σαρκὸς τὴν φύσιν οὕτως ἐνέκρωσεν, ὥς τῶν σφαγιαζομένων ἱερείων μηδὲν ἔλαττον διακεῖσθαι, ἀλλὰ καὶ πολλῶ πλεόν. Οὐδὲ γὰρ βοῦς καὶ πρόβατα προσέφερον, ἀλλ' ἑαυτὸν διπλῇ καθ' ἐκάστην ἐσφαγιάζε τὴν ἡμέραν. Διὸ καὶ ἐθάρρῃσεν εἰπεῖν· Ἐγὼ γὰρ ἤδη σπένδομαι, σπονδὴν ἑαυτοῦ τὸ αἷμα καλέσας.

1.4. Οὐ μὴν ἠρέσθη ταῖς θυσίαις ταύταις, ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ καλῶς ἑαυτὸν καθιέρωσε, καὶ τὴν οἰκουμένην πᾶσαν προσήνεγκε, καὶ γῆν καὶ θάλατταν, καὶ Ἑλλάδα καὶ βάρβαρον, καὶ πᾶσαν ἀπαξάπλῳ ὅσῃν ἡλῖος ἐφορᾷ γῆν, ταύτην, καθάπερ ὑπόπτερός τις γενόμενος, ἐπῆλθε πᾶσαν, οὐχ ἀπλῶς ὁδοιπορῶν, ἀλλὰ τὰς ἀκάνθας τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων ἀνασπῶν, καὶ τὸν λόγον τῆς εὐσεβείας κατασπείρων, τὴν πλάνην ἀπελαύνων, τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐπα-[118] νάγων, ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἀγγέλους ποιῶν, μᾶλλον δὲ ἀπὸ δαιμόνων ἀγγέλους τοὺς ἀνθρώπους. Διὸ καὶ μέλλων ἀπιέναι μετὰ τοὺς πολλοὺς ἰδρῶτας καὶ τὰ πυκνὰ ταῦτα τρόπαια, παραμυθούμενος τοὺς μαθητάς, ἔλεγεν· Εἰ καὶ σπένδομαι ἐπὶ τῇ θυσίᾳ καὶ λειτουργίᾳ τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν, χαίρω καὶ συγχαίρω πᾶσιν ὑμῖν· διὸ καὶ ὑμεῖς χαίρετε καὶ συγχαίρετέ μοι. Τί τοίνυν γένοιτ' ἂν τῆς θυσίας ταύτης ἴσον, ἣν τὴν μάχαιραν τοῦ Πνεύματος σπασάμενος ἔθυσεν,

5. Another (ironic) solution to the πρόβλημα, John says, is to fail, for in failing he will have proven his case that Paul's virtue exceeds human words.

6. The *app. crit.* of AP 114 notes that HS's conjectural reading, plus τοῦ before δεῖξαι, is not found in any of the manuscripts. AP adopts HS's reading but places it in brackets. In PG the reading stands without brackets.

7. Adopting the reading ταύτην with HS and all his successors against AP's ταύτῃ (for which there is no support in the *app. crit.* nor in a note).

8. A near quotation, but rephrased in the third-person singular, [ἐποίει] τὴν

deeds overwhelmingly wins out over the skill of the speech; and our defeat is more magnificent to us than countless trophies.⁵

1.2. Now, then, what would make a good starting point for our praises? Where else than from this very initial point—demonstrating⁶ that he possessed the virtues of all people at once? For if prophets or patriarchs or righteous ones or apostles or martyrs displayed some noble quality, he possessed all these things together to a superlative degree that none of them attained, whatever the particular virtue of each.

1.3. [116] Consider this: Abel offered a sacrifice (cf. Gen 4:4), and for that he was extolled. But if you bring forward for comparison Paul's sacrifice, it's shown to be as superior to Abel's as heaven is to the earth. Now what kind of sacrifice do you want me to speak of? For there wasn't just one, because he sacrificed himself every single day, and, indeed, he rendered that offering⁷ double in that, on the one hand, he died every single day (cf. 1 Cor 15:31), and on the other, he carried around the dying in his body (cf. 2 Cor 4:10).⁸ For he continually met with dangers, and was slaughtering himself by his free choice, and put to death his fleshly nature in such a way that he was affected no less than the slaughtered sacrificial victims but, indeed, much more. For he didn't offer a cow or sheep, but it was himself he slaughtered, twice over, every single day. That's why he so boldly said: *"For I am already poured out as a drink offering"* (2 Tim 4:6), calling his own blood a libation.

1.4. Yet he wasn't satisfied with these sacrifices, but when he'd consecrated himself thoroughly, he offered up the whole world, both land and sea, Greek and barbarian, and in general all the land upon which the sun casts its gaze. Becoming just like a winged creature, he traversed all this land, not simply journeying through, but pulling up the thorns of sins and sowing the word of piety, driving out deception and bringing in **[118]** the truth, making angels from human beings—or, rather, transforming human beings from demons into angels. Therefore, when after his many toils and these numerous trophies he was about to depart, in order to console his disciples, he said: *"Even if I am poured out as the sacrifice and offering of your faith, I rejoice and join in rejoicing with all of you. So also you rejoice and join me in rejoicing"* (Phil 2:17–18).⁹ What could be the equal of this sacrifice, which he slew after drawing the sword of the Spirit, which he

νέκρωσιν ἐν τῷ σώματι αὐτοῦ περιφέρων, for Paul's first-person plural, [ἐχόμεν] τὴν νέκρωσιν τὴν Ἰησοῦ ἐν τῷ σώματι περιφέροντες.

9. With διό for τὸ δὲ αὐτό.

ἦν ἐν τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ προσήγαγε τῷ ὑπεράνω τῶν οὐρανῶν; Ἄλλ' ἀνηρέθη δολοφονηθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ Κάϊν ὁ Ἄβελ, καὶ ταύτη λαμπρότερος γέγονεν. Ἄλλ' ἐγὼ σοι μυρίους ἡρίθμησα θανάτους, καὶ τοσοῦτους ὅσας ἡμέρας κηρύττων ἔζησεν ὁ μακάριος οὗτος. Εἰ δὲ καὶ τὴν μέχρι τῆς πείρας αὐτῆς προελθοῦσαν βούλει μαθεῖν σφαγὴν, ἐκεῖνος μὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ μήτε ἀδικηθέντος μήτε εὐεργετηθέντος κατέπεσεν, οὗτος δὲ ὑπὸ τούτων ἀνηρεῖτο, οὓς ἐξαρπάσαι τῶν μυρίων ἡπείγετο κακῶν, καὶ δι' οὓς πάντα ἔπασχεν ἅπερ ἔπαθεν.

1.5. Ἀλλὰ Νῶε δίκαιος, τέλειος ἐν τῇ γενεᾷ αὐτοῦ, καὶ μόνος ἐν ἅπασι τοιοῦτος ἦν; Ἀλλὰ καὶ Παῦλος μόνος ἐν ἅπασι τοιοῦτος. Καὶ ἐκεῖνος μὲν ἑαυτὸν μετὰ τῶν παιδῶν διέσωσε μόνον· οὗτος δέ, πολὺ χαλεπωτέρου τὴν οἰκουμένην κατακλυσμοῦ καταλαβόντος, οὐ σανίδας πηξάμενος καὶ κιβωτὸν ποιήσας, ἀλλ' ἀντὶ σανίδων τὰς [120] ἐπιστολὰς συνθεῖς, οὐ δύο καὶ τρεῖς καὶ πέντε συγγενεῖς, ἀλλὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην ἅπασαν καταποντίζεσθαι μέλλουσαν ἐκ μέσων ἤρπασε τῶν κυμάτων. Οὐδὲ γὰρ τοιαύτη ἦν ἡ κιβωτός, ὥς ἐν ἐνὶ περιφέρεσθαι τόπῳ, ἀλλὰ τὰ τέρματα τῆς οἰκουμένης κατέλαβε, καὶ ἐξ ἐκείνου πάντας εἰσάγει μέχρι τοῦ νῦν εἰς τὴν λάρνακα ταύτην. Σύμμετρον γὰρ τῷ πλήθει τῶν σωζομένων αὐτὴν κατασκευάσας, δεχόμενος ἀλόγων ἀνοητοτέρους, ταῖς ἄνω δυνάμεσιν ἐφαμίλλους ἐργάζεται, καὶ ταύτῃ νικῶν τὴν κιβωτὸν ἐκείνην. Ἐκείνη μὲν γὰρ κόρακα λαβοῦσα, κόρακα πάλιν ἐξέπεμψε, καὶ λύκον ὑποδεξαμένη, τὴν θηριωδίαν οὐ μετέβαλεν· οὗτος δὲ οὐχ οὕτως, ἀλλὰ λαβὼν λύκους, πρόβατα εἰργάσατο, καὶ λαβὼν ἱέρακας καὶ κολοιούς, περιστερὰς τούτους ἀπέτελεσε, καὶ πᾶσαν ἀλογίαν καὶ θηριωδίαν τῆς τῶν ἀνθρώπων φύσεως ἐκβαλὼν, τὴν τοῦ Πνεύματος ἐπεισήγαγεν ἡμερότητα, καὶ μέχρι νῦν μένει πλέουσα ἡ κιβωτός αὕτη, καὶ οὐ διαλύεται. Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἴσχυσεν αὐτῆς τὰς σανίδας χαυνῶσαι τῆς κακίας ὁ χειμῶν, ἀλλ' ὑπερπλέουσα μᾶλλον τοῦ χειμῶνος τὴν ζάλην κατέλυσε· καὶ μάλα εἰκότως· οὐ γὰρ ἀσφάλτῳ καὶ πίσσῃ, ἀλλὰ Πνεύματι ἁγίῳ κεχρισμέναι αἱ σανίδες αὐταὶ εἰσιν.

1.6. Ἀλλὰ τὸν Ἀβραάμ θαυμάζουσιν ἅπαντες, ὅτι ἀκούσας· Ἐξέλθε ἐκ τῆς γῆς σου καὶ ἐκ τῆς συγγενείας σου, ἀφῆκε πατρίδα, καὶ οἰκίαν, καὶ φίλους καὶ συγγενεῖς, [122] καὶ πάντα ἦν αὐτῷ τὸ ἐπίταγμα τοῦ Θεοῦ. Καὶ γὰρ καὶ ἡμεῖς τοῦτο θαυμάζομεν. Ἀλλὰ τί Παύλου γένοιτ' ἐν ἴσον; Ὃς οὐ πατρίδα καὶ οἰκίαν καὶ συγγενεῖς ἀφῆκεν, ἀλλ' αὐτὸν τὸν κόσμον διὰ τὸν Ἰησοῦν,

10. Although not marked as a question in AP, I take it as an interrogative and translate it as such to capture the dialogue throughout this homily between the preacher and a presumed interlocutor who keeps calling up competitors to Paul only to have each be bested. Note the same sequence of ἀλλὰ ... ἀλλὰ clauses in §§5, 6, 9, 11, 12, and the use of other interrogatives to introduce the new examples. This is the rhetoric of σύγκρισις.

11. Minus ἀνθρωπος before δίκαιος; minus ὢν before ἐν τῇ γενεᾷ.

offered on the altar above the heavens? And yet Abel was murdered when treacherously attacked by Cain, and for this has been the more renowned?¹⁰ But I have enumerated for you the thousands of deaths of Paul, as many as the days this blessed man lived preaching the gospel. However, if you want to learn about how the slaughter of each proceeded, to the point of the plot involved, Abel fell at the hands of his brother, who had previously been neither harmed nor benefitted by him; but Paul was killed by the very people whom he was hastening to rescue from countless evils and for whose sake he was suffering all that he suffered.

1.5. But “*Noah was just, perfect in his generation*” (Gen 6:9),¹¹ and the only one of all who was like that? But Paul, too, was the only one of his caliber among all people. Noah saved only himself with his children; but Paul, when a much more terrible flood seized the world, [120] snatched not just two or three or five relatives, but the whole world from the midst of the waves when it was about to be drowned in the sea. He did this not by fastening planks together and making an ark, but by composing letters to serve as planks. The ark of Paul’s letters wasn’t of such a type as to be carried about in a single place, but it reached the very ends of the world, and, from that time until now, he brings all people into this ark. For, having prepared his ark in proportion to the multitude of those to be saved, welcoming people who were less intelligent than animals, he made them contenders with the powers above and, with his ark, proved victorious over Noah’s. For Noah’s ark took on board a raven and sent it out again as a raven (cf. Gen 8:6–7); it received a wolf yet did not alter its beastly nature. However, Paul wasn’t like this, but taking onboard wolves, he made them sheep, and taking on hawks and jackdaws, he completely transformed them into doves, and casting out all the irrationality and beastliness that belongs to human nature, in its stead he introduced the gentleness of the Spirit. And this ark remains sailing until now and hasn’t broken apart. For not even the storm of wickedness was strong enough to loosen its planks, but instead, sailing above the storm, it put an end to the tempest. And with good reason! For these planks have been glued not with asphalt and pitch, but with the Holy Spirit.

1.6. But everyone marvels at Abraham because when he heard, “*Come out from your land and from your kin*” (Gen 12:1), he left homeland and house and friends and relatives, [122] and all he had was the command of God? And we, too, admire him for this. But what could be Paul’s equal? He didn’t leave homeland and house and relatives, but the world itself for

μᾶλλον δὲ αὐτὸν τὸν οὐρανόν, καὶ τὸν οὐρανὸν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὑπερεῖδε, καὶ ἔν μόνον ἐξήτει, τοῦ Ἰησοῦ τὴν ἀγάπην. Καὶ ἄκουε αὐτοῦ τοῦτο δηλοῦντος καὶ λέγοντος· Οὔτε ἐνεστῶτα, οὔτε μέλλοντα, οὔτε ὕψωμα, οὔτε βάθος δυνήσεται ἡμᾶς χωρίσαι ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ Θεοῦ. Ἄλλ' ἐκεῖνος εἰς κινδύνους ῥίψας ἑαυτὸν τὸν ἀδελφιδοῦν ἐξήρπασε τῶν βαρβάρων; Ἄλλ' οὗτος οὐ τὸν ἀδελφιδοῦν, οὐδὲ τρεῖς καὶ πέντε πόλεις, ἀλλὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην πᾶσαν, οὐκ ἀπὸ βαρβάρων, ἀλλ' ἀπ' αὐτῆς τῆς τῶν δαιμόνων ἐξήρπασε χειρός, μυρίου καθ' ἐκάστην ὑπομένων κινδύνους, καὶ τοῖς οἰκείοις θανάτοις ἐτέροις πολλὴν ἀσφάλειαν κτῶμενος. Ἄλλ' ἐκεῖ τὸ κεφάλαιον τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἐστι καὶ ἡ κορωνὶς τῆς φιλοσοφίας, τὸ τὸν υἱὸν καταθῆναι; Ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐνταῦθα τὰ πρωτεῖα παρὰ τῷ Παύλῳ ὄντα εὐρήσομεν· οὐ γὰρ υἱόν, ἀλλ' ἑαυτὸν μυριάκις κατέθευσεν, ὅπερ ἔφθην εἰπών.

1.7. Τί ἂν τις θαυμάσειε τοῦ Ἰσαάκ; Πολλὰ μὲν καὶ ἄλλα, μάλιστα δὲ τὴν ἀνεξικακίαν, ὅτι φρέατα ὀρύττων καὶ τῶν οἰκείων ἐλαυνόμενος ὀρῶν, οὐκ ἐπεξήει, ἀλλὰ καὶ καταχωννύμενα ὀρῶν ἠνείχετο, καὶ πρὸς ἕτερον αἰεὶ μεθίστατο τόπον, οὐχ ὁμόσε αἰεὶ τοῖς λυποῦσι χωρῶν, ἀλλ' ἐξιστάμενος καὶ παραχωρῶν πανταχοῦ τῶν οἰκείων κτημάτων, ἕως αὐτῶν τὴν ἄδικον ἐκόρεσεν ἐπιθυμίαν. [124] Ἄλλ' ὁ Παῦλος οὐ φρέατα λίθοις καταχωννύμενα ὀρῶν, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἑαυτοῦ σῶμα, οὐ παρεχώρει καθάπερ ἐκεῖνος μόνον, ἀλλ' εἰσιὼν τοὺς λίθοις βάλλοντας αὐτὸν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνάγειν ἐφιλονείκει· ὅσω γὰρ κατεχώννυτο ἡ πηγὴ, τοσούτῳ μᾶλλον ἐξερρήγγυτο, καὶ πλείους ἐξέχεε ποταμούς εἰς ὑπομονήν.

1.8. Ἀλλὰ τὸν παῖδα τὸν τούτου θαυμάζει τῆς καρτερίας ἡ Γραφή; Καὶ ποία ἀδαμαντίνη ψυχὴ τὴν Παύλου δύναται ἂν ἐπιδείξασθαι ὑπομονήν; Οὐδὲ γὰρ δις ἑπτὰ ἔτη ἐδούλευσεν, ἀλλὰ τὸν πάντα βίον ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ νύμφης, οὐ συγκαίόμενος μόνον τῷ καύματι τῆς ἡμέρας καὶ τῷ παγετῷ τῆς νυκτός, ἀλλὰ μυρίας νιφάδας πειρασμῶν ὑπομένων, νῦν μὲν μᾶστιγας λαμβάνων, νῦν δὲ λίθοις τὸ σῶμα βαλλόμενος, καὶ νῦν μὲν θηρίοις μαχόμενος, νῦν δὲ πελάγει πυκτεύων, καὶ λιμῷ διηνεκεῖ ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτός, καὶ κρυμῷ, καὶ πανταχοῦ ὑπὲρ τὰ [126] σκάμματα πηδῶν, καὶ τὰ πρόβατα ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ διαβόλου φάρυγγος ἀφαρπάζων.

1.9. Ἀλλὰ σώφρων ὁ Ἰωσήφ; Ἀλλὰ δέδοικα μὴ γέλως ἢ τὸν Παῦλον ἐντεῦθεν ἐγκωμιάζειν, ὃς ἐσταύρωσεν ἑαυτὸν τῷ κόσμῳ, καὶ οὐ τὰ λαμπρὰ ἐν τοῖς σώμασι μόνον, ἀλλὰ πάντα τὰ πράγματα οὕτως ἑώρα, ὥς ἡμεῖς τὴν

12. With two ellipses as marked.

Jesus's sake, or rather, heaven itself, and even the heaven above heaven he disdained and sought only one thing, the love of Jesus. Listen to him showing this and saying, "*Neither things present, nor things to come ... nor height, nor depth ... shall be able to separate us from the love of God*" (Rom 8:38–39).¹² Did Abraham throw himself into dangers to snatch his nephew away from the barbarians (cf. Gen 14:12–16)? Well, Paul snatched away not his nephew, or three or five cities, but the whole world, not from barbarians, but from the very hand of the demons, enduring countless dangers every single day and acquiring a great measure of security for others by his own deaths. But then there is the chief of good deeds and the height of philosophy—the sacrificing of his son (cf. Gen 22). Still, even here we shall find that the primacy belongs to Paul, for he sacrificed not a son but himself, time and time again, as I have said before.

1.7. Now, for what might one marvel at Isaac? Well, many other things, but especially his forbearance, because, when digging wells and being driven from his own territory, he didn't proceed against his enemies (cf. Gen 26:15–33). Instead, he endured even seeing his wells reburied, and always moved on to another place, not going out to meet his aggressors, but standing out of the way and everywhere withdrawing from his own possessions until he might satisfy their unjust desire. [124] Yet Paul, seeing not wells but his own body buried with stones, didn't merely withdraw, as Isaac did, but he contended by going in and leading the people who were hurling stones at him into heaven. For as much as this well was reburied, so much more did it burst out and spew forth many rivers for endurance.

1.8. [124] But Scripture marvels at Jacob, Isaac's son, for his constancy? And yet what sort of steely soul could demonstrate the endurance Paul had? For he didn't serve two periods of seven years (cf. Gen 29:15–30), but his whole life for the bride of Christ (cf. 2 Cor 11:2–3). He wasn't only burned up by the heat of the day and the frost of the night, but he endured countless blizzards of trials, at one time being whipped (cf. 2 Cor 11:24–25; Acts 22:24–25), at another having his body pelted with stones (cf. 2 Cor 11:25; Acts 14:19), by turns fighting with beasts (cf. 1 Cor 15:32), and sparring with the sea (cf. 2 Cor 11; Acts 27), in perpetual hunger day and night (cf. 2 Cor 11:27), and bitter cold (cf. 2 Cor 11:27). Everywhere he was leaping over the [126] trenches and snatching the sheep out of the throat of the devil.

1.9. But Joseph was chaste, was he not (cf. Gen 39:7–20)? And yet I fear it might be laughable to praise Paul for this virtue, the man who crucified himself to the world (cf. Gal 6:14) and regarded not only the attractive

κόνιν καὶ τὴν τέφραν, καὶ ὡς ἂν νεκρὸς πρὸς νεκρὸν ἀκίνητος γένοιτο. Οὕτω μετὰ ἀκριβείας τῆς φύσεως τὰ σκιρτήματα κατευνάζων, οὐδὲν οὐδέποτε πρὸς οὐδὲν ἀνθρώπινον πάθος ἔπαθεν.

1.10. Ἐκπλήττονται τὸν Ἰῶβ ἅπαντες ἄνθρωποι; Καὶ μάλα εἰκότως· καὶ γὰρ μέγας ἀθλητῆς, καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν [128] τὸν Παῦλον παριστοῦσθαι δυνάμενος, διὰ τὴν ὑπομονήν, διὰ τὴν τοῦ βίου καθαρότητα, διὰ τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ μαρτυρίαν, διὰ τὴν καρτερὰν μάχην ἐκείνην, διὰ τὴν θαυμαστὴν νίκην τὴν μετὰ τὴν μάχην. Ἀλλὰ Παῦλος οὐχὶ μῆνας πολλοὺς ἀγωνιζόμενος οὕτω διῆγεν, ἀλλ' ἔτη πολλά, οὐχὶ τήκων βώλακας γῆς ἀπὸ ἰχώρος καὶ ἐπὶ κοπρίας καθήμενος, ἀλλ' εἰς αὐτὸ τοῦ λέοντος τὸ νοητὸν στόμα συνεχῶς ἐμπίπτων, καὶ μυρίοις παλαίων πειρασμοῖς, πάσης πέτρας στερρότερος ἦν· οὐχὶ παρὰ τριῶν φίλων ἢ τεσσάρων, ἀλλὰ παρὰ πάντων ὀνειδιζόμενος τῶν ἀπιστούντων ψευδαδέλφων, ἐμπυόμενος, λοιδορούμενος.

1.11. Ἄλλ' ἡ φιλοξενία τοῦ Ἰῶβ μεγάλη, καὶ ἡ πρὸς τοὺς δεομένους κηδεμονία; Οὐδὲ ἡμεῖς ἀντεροῦμεν· ἀλλὰ τῆς Παύλου τοσοῦτον καταδεεστέραν εὐρήσομεν ὅσον ψυχῆς σῶμα ἀφέστηκεν. Ἄ γὰρ ἐκεῖνος περὶ τοὺς τὴν σάρκα πεπηρωμένους ἐπεδείκνυτο, ταῦτα οὗτος περὶ τοὺς τὴν ψυχὴν λελωβημένους ἔπραττε, πάντας τοὺς χωλοὺς καὶ ἀναπήρους τὸν λογισμὸν διορθούμενος, καὶ τοὺς γυμνοὺς καὶ ἀσχημονοῦντας περιβάλλων τῇ τῆς φιλοσοφίας στολῇ· καὶ ἐν τοῖς σωματικῶις δὲ τοσοῦτον αὐτοῦ περιῆν, ὅσω πολλῷ μείζον τὸ πενία συζῶντα καὶ [130] λιμῷ βοηθεῖν τοῖς δεομένοις τοῦ ἐκ περιουσίας τοῦτο ποιεῖν· καὶ τοῦ μὲν ἡ οἰκία παντὶ ἐλθόντι ἀνέφικτο, τοῦ δὲ ἡ ψυχὴ πάσῃ τῇ οἰκουμένῃ ἤπλωτο, καὶ ὀλοκλήρους δῆμους ὑπεδέχετο. Διὸ καὶ ἔλεγεν· Οὐ στενοχωρεῖσθε ἐν ἡμῖν, στενοχωρεῖσθε δὲ ἐν τοῖς σπλάγχχνοις ὑμῶν. Καὶ ὁ μὲν, προβάτων αὐτῷ καὶ βοῶν ὄντων ἀπείρων, φιλότιμος περὶ τοὺς δεομένους ἦν· οὗτος δέ, οὐδὲν πλέον κεκτημένος τοῦ σώματος, ἀπ' αὐτοῦ τούτου τοῖς δεομένοις ἐπήρκει, καὶ βοᾷ λέγων· Ταῖς χρεῖαις μου καὶ τοῖς οὗσι μετ' ἐμοῦ ὑπηρετήσαν αἱ χεῖρες αὐται, τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος ἐργασίαν πρόσδοτον τοῖς πεινῶσι καὶ λιμώττουσι κεκτημένος.

1.12. Ἀλλὰ οἱ σκώληκες καὶ τὰ τραύματα χαλεπὰς καὶ ἀκαρτερήτους παρεῖχον τῷ Ἰῶβ τὰς ὁδύνας; Ὁμολογῶ καγὼ· ἀλλ' ἐὰν τὰς ἐν τοσοῦτοις ἔτεσι τοῦ Παύλου μαστίγας, καὶ τὸν λιμὸν τὸν διηνεκῇ, καὶ τὴν γυμνότητα, καὶ τὰς ἀλύσεις, καὶ τὸ δεσμοκτήριον, καὶ τοὺς κινδύνους, καὶ τὰς ἐπιβουλάς, τὰς παρὰ τῶν οἰκείων, τὰς παρὰ τῶν ἀλλοτρίων, τὰς παρὰ τῶν τυράννων, τὰς παρὰ τῆς οἰκουμένης ἀπάσης ἀντιθῆς, καὶ μετὰ τούτων τὰ τούτων πικρότερα, λέγω δὴ

features of human bodies, but all things, as we do dust and ashes. He was as unmoved by them as a corpse encountering another corpse. So precisely did he lull to sleep the surges of nature, that he never, ever, experienced a single human passion.

1.10. Are all people amazed at Job? And with good reason. For he was a great athlete, and [128] fit for comparison with Paul himself due to his endurance, his purity of life, his testimony about God, the severity of his battle, and the marvelous victory that ensued from it. But Paul fought like this continually, not for many months but many years; not dissolving clods of dirt with his pus (cf. Job 7:5) and sitting on a dunghill (cf. Job 2:8), but continually falling into the spiritual “*mouth of the lion*” (2 Tim 4:17). Wrestling with countless trials and temptations, he was more solid than any rock. It wasn’t by three or four friends that he was reproached, spit upon, and reviled, either, but by all the disbelieving false brethren.

1.11. But was Job’s hospitality and care for those in need great? We’ll not dispute that either. However, we shall find that his care falls as far short of Paul’s as a body differs from a soul. For the actions Job displayed for those maimed in body Paul performed for those mutilated in soul, setting straight all those who were lame and crippled in reasoning, and clothing the naked and shameless with the cloak of philosophy. Yet even with respect to bodily concerns, Paul surpassed Job, to the degree that it is so much better to help those in need when living with them [130] in poverty and famine than it is to do so from one’s surplus of goods. While the one man’s house was opened to everyone who approached it, the other’s very soul was extended for the whole world and received entire peoples. Hence, he also said, “*You are not confined in us, but you are confined in your compassion*” (2 Cor 6:12). The one, since he had countless herds of sheep and cows, was generous toward those in need; but the other, though he owned nothing more than his own body, from that very source supplied those in need and cried out saying: “*These hands served for my needs and those who were with me*” (Acts 20:34). By the labor of his body he acquired revenue for the hungry and famished.

1.12. But did the worms and the wounds produce terrible and unendurable pains for Job (cf. Job 2:9; 7:5)? Even I agree that they did. But if you compare with them the whippings Paul received during so many years, and the perpetual famine, and the nakedness, and the chains, and the prison, and the dangers, and the plots (those arising from his own people, those from outsiders, those from tyrants, those from all over the world), and to these things you add the even more bitter torments—I mean, the

τὰς ὑπὲρ τῶν πιπτόντων ὁδύνας, τὴν φροντίδα τῶν Ἐκκλησιῶν πασῶν, τὴν πύρρῳσιν ἣν ὑπὲρ ἐκάστου τῶν σκανδαλιζομένων ὑπέμενεν, ὅψει πῶς [132] πέτρας στερροτέρα ἢν ἡ ταῦτα φέρουσα ψυχὴ, καὶ σίδηρον καὶ ἀδάμαντα ἐνίκα. Ἄπερ οὖν ἐκεῖνος ἔπασχεν ἐν τῷ σώματι, ταῦτα οὗτος ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ, καὶ σκώληκος παντὸς χαλεπώτερον ἢ καθ' ἕκαστον τῶν σκανδαλιζομένων ἀθυμία διέτρωγεν αὐτοῦ τὴν ψυχὴν. Ὅθεν καὶ πηγὰς δακρῶν ἠφίει διηνεκεῖς, οὐ τὰς ἡμέρας μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς νύκτας, καὶ πάσης γυναικὸς ὠδινούσης δριμύτερον διεσπᾶτο καθ' ἕκαστον αὐτῶν. Διὸ καὶ ἔλεγε· Τεκνία μου, οὐς πάλιν ὠδίνω.

1.13. Τίνα ἂν τις μετὰ τὸν Ἰὼβ ἐκπλαγείη; Τὸν Μωϋσέα πάντως. Ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦτον ἐκ πολλοῦ τοῦ περιόντος ὑπερηκόντισε· μεγάλα μὲν γὰρ αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰ ἄλλα, τὸ δὲ κεφάλαιον καὶ ἡ κορωνὶς τῆς ἀγίας ψυχῆς ἐκείνης, ὅτι ἐξαλειφθῆναι εἴλετο τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ βίβλου ὑπὲρ τῆς σωτηρίας τῶν Ἰουδαίων. Ἄλλ' οὗτος μὲν συναπολέσθαι ἐτέροις ἡρεῖτο· ὁ δὲ Παῦλος οὐ συναπολέσθαι, ἀλλ' ἐτέρων σωζομένων, αὐτὸς ἐκπεσεῖν τῆς δόξης τῆς ἀπεράντου. Καὶ ὁ μὲν τῷ Φαραῷ, ὁ δὲ τῷ διαβόλῳ καθ' ἡμέραν ἐπύκτευε· καὶ ὁ μὲν ὑπὲρ ἐνὸς ἔθνους, ὁ δὲ ὑπὲρ τῆς οἰκουμένης ἀπάσης ἔκαμνεν, οὐχ ἰδρῶτι, ἀλλὰ καὶ αἵματι ἀντὶ ἰδρῶτος πάντοθεν περιρρεόμενος, οὐχὶ τὴν οἰκουμένην μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν αἰοίκητον διορθούμενος, οὐχὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὴν βάρβαρον.

1.14. [134] Ἐνῆν καὶ τὸν Ἰησοῦν εἰς μέσον παραγαγεῖν, καὶ τὸν Σαμουὴλ καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους προφήτας· ἀλλ' ἵνα μὴ μακρότερον ποιῶμεν τὸν λόγον, ἐπὶ τοὺς κορυφαίους αὐτῶν βαδίσωμεν· ὅταν γὰρ τούτων φανῇ κρείττων, οὐδεμία περὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀμφισβήτησις λείπεται. Τίνες οὖν οἱ κορυφαῖοι; Τίνες δὲ ἄλλοι μετὰ τούτους, ἢ ὁ Δαυῖδ, καὶ ὁ Ἡλίας, καὶ ὁ Ἰωάννης; ὧν ὁ μὲν τῆς προτέρας, ὁ δὲ τῆς δευτέρας πρόδρομος τοῦ Κυρίου παρουσίας· διὸ καὶ τῆς προσηγορίας ἀλλήλοις ἐκοινώνησαν. Τί οὖν τὸ ἐξαιρετον τοῦ Δαυῖδ; Ἡ ταπεινοφροσύνη καὶ ὁ πρὸς Θεὸν ἔρως. Καὶ τίς μὲν μᾶλλον, τίς δὲ οὐχ ἥττον τῆς Παύλου ψυχῆς ἀμφότερα ταῦτα κατάρθωσε; Τί δὲ τὸ θαυμαστὸν Ἠλίου; Ἄρα ὅτι τὸν οὐρανὸν ἔκλεισε, καὶ λιμὸν ἐπήγαγε, καὶ πῦρ κατήγαγεν; Οὐκ ἔγωγε οἶμαι· ἀλλ' ὅτι ἐζήλωσεν ὑπὲρ τοῦ Δεσπότου, καὶ πυρὸς σφοδρότερος

13. I.e., πρόδρομος, "forerunner."

pains he experienced over those who were stumbling, the care for all his churches, the fire he endured on behalf of those who were scandalized (cf. 2 Cor 11:23–29)—you will see how [132] the soul that bore these things was more solid than a rock and won out over iron and steel. And, in fact, the very things Job suffered in his body Paul suffered in his soul, and the despondency he felt over each person who was scandalized ate away at his soul more cruelly than any worm. This caused him to shed continual fountains of tears, not only during the days but also the nights (cf. Acts 20:32). He was more keenly torn apart by this pain for each of them than any woman in the throes of labor pains. Hence, he also said, “*My children, for whom I am in labor pains again*” (Gal 4:19).

1.13. At whom might one be amazed after Job? Surely Moses. But Paul surpassed him, too, by a wide margin. For while he possessed other great virtues also, the chief deed and highest achievement of that holy soul was that he chose to be left out of the book of God for the sake of the salvation of the Jews (cf. Exod 32:32). But whereas Moses chose to die along with the others, Paul chose not to join with them in death, but for the others to be saved while he was deprived of the boundless glory (cf. Rom 9:3). The one sparred with Pharaoh, the other with the devil, day after day. The one fought on behalf of one nation, the other on behalf of the whole world. And he was dripping not with sweat but, in place of sweat, had blood flowing from every pore, and set straight not just the civilized world but also the uninhabited territory, not just Greece but the barbarian land as well (cf. Rom 1:14).

1.14. [134] Now one could bring in Joshua and Samuel and the other prophets, but so we don’t make this speech too long, let’s move on to the most illustrious of them; for when Paul is seen to be better than these, no dispute will remain about the others. Who then are the most illustrious? Who else after those we have mentioned, except David, and Elijah, and John (the Baptist)? Of these last two, one was the forerunner of the first coming of the Lord, and the other of his second appearance—that’s why they share the same title¹³ with one another. Then what quality should we choose about David? His humility (cf. 2 Kgdms 12:13; Ps 50) and love for God. Who more than David possessed these things? But, still, who isn’t inferior to Paul’s soul when it comes to performing both of these virtuous deeds? What was so marvelous about Elijah? Is it that he shut up the heavens and brought about a famine (cf. 3 Kgdms 17:7–16; 18:1–6) and called down fire (cf. 3 Kgdms 18:36–39; 4 Kgdms 1:9–14)? No, I don’t think it’s for any of these things, but because he was zealous for the Lord and more

ἦν. Ἄλλ' εἰ τὸν Παύλου ζῆλον ἴδοις, τοσοῦτον ὅψει κρατοῦντα ὅσον ἐκεῖνος τῶν ἄλλων προφητῶν περιῖν. Τί γὰρ ἂν γένοιτο τῶν ῥημάτων ἐκείνων ἴσον, ἅπερ ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ Δεσποτοῦ δόξης ζηλῶν ἔλεγεν, ὅτι ηὐχόμεν ἀνάθεμα εἶναι ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν [136] μου, τῶν συγγενῶν μου κατὰ σάρκα; Διὰ τοῦτο τῶν οὐρανῶν αὐτῷ προκειμένων, καὶ τῶν στεφάνων καὶ τῶν ἐπάθλων, ἔμελλε καὶ ἐβράδυνε λέγων. Τὸ ἐπιμεῖναι τῇ σαρκὶ ἀναγκαιότερον δι' ὑμᾶς. Διὰ τοῦτο οὐδὲ τὴν κτίσιν αὐτὴν τὴν ὀρωμένην, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ τὴν νοητὴν ἐνόμισεν ἀρκεῖν εἰς παράστασιν τῆς ἀγάπης καὶ τοῦ ζήλου, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐτέραν οὐκ οὔσαν ἐζήτει, ὥστε ἐνδείξασθαι ὅπερ ἤθελε καὶ ἐπεθύμει. Ἄλλ' ὁ Ἰωάννης ἀκρίδας ἤσθιε καὶ μέλι ἄγριον; Ἄλλ' οὗτος ἐν μέσῃ τῇ οἰκουμένη καθάπερ ἐκεῖνος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ διέτριβεν, ἀκρίδας μὲν καὶ μέλι ἄγριον οὐ σιτούμενος, πολὺ δὲ εὐτελεστέραν ταύτης παρατιθέμενος τράπεζαν, καὶ οὐδὲ τῆς ἀναγκαίας εὐπορῶν τροφῆς διὰ τὴν ὑπὲρ τοῦ κηρύγματος σπουδὴν. Ἀλλὰ πολλὴν πρὸς τὸν Ἡρώδην οὗτος παρρησίαν ἐπεδείξατο; Ἄλλ' οὗτος οὐχ ἓνα καὶ δύο καὶ τρεῖς, ἀλλὰ μυρίους κατ' ἐκεῖνον ἐπεστόμισε, μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ πολλῶ χαλεπωτέρους ἐκείνου τοῦ τυράννου.

1.15. Λείπεται πρὸς τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτὸν ἐξετάσαι λοιπόν. Διόπερ ἀφέντες τὴν γῆν, πρὸς τὰς τῶν οὐρανῶν ἀναβησώμεθα ἀψίδας· ἀλλὰ μηδεὶς τόλμαν καταγινωσκέτω [138] τοῦ λόγου. Εἰ γὰρ καὶ τὸν Ἰωάννην ἄγγελον ἐκάλεσεν ἡ Γραφή καὶ τοὺς ἱερέας, τί θαυμαστόν, εἰ τὸν ἀπάντων ἀμείνω ταῖς δυνάμεσι παραβάλλομεν ἐκείναις; Τί οὖν ἐστὶν ἐκείνων τὸ μέγα; Ὅτι μετὰ πάσης ἀκριβείας ὑπακούουσι τῷ Θεῷ· ὅπερ καὶ ὁ Δαυὶδ ἐκπληττόμενος ἔλεγε· Δυνατοὶ ἰσχύϊ, ποιοῦντες τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ. Τοῦτο γὰρ ἴσον οὐδέν, καὶ μυριάκις ὥσιν ἀσώματοι· τὸ γὰρ μάλιστα ποιοῦν τούτους μακαρίους, τοῦτό ἐστιν, ὅτι πείθονται τοῖς προστάγμασιν, ὅτι οὐδαμοῦ παρακούουσι. Τοῦτο τοίνυν καὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ Παύλου μετὰ ἀκριβείας ἔστιν ἰδεῖν φυλαττόμενον· οὐ γὰρ δὴ τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ ἐποίησε μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ προστάγματα καὶ ὑπὲρ τὰ προστάγματα, καὶ τοῦτο δηλῶν ἔλεγε· Τίς οὖν μοί ἐστιν ὁ μισθός,

14. Minus γάρ; ellipsis as marked.

15. HS (followed by FD Mf PE PG) reads ταύτην before τὴν ὀρωμένην. AP noted that none of his manuscripts reads this and instead adopted the singular reading of Paris. gr. 728, αὐτήν (AP 136 n. 2; by far the majority of manuscripts read αὐτῶν). The translation follows AP's text, though with caution due to its poor attestation.

vehement than fire. But if you'd look at Paul's zeal, you'll see that it exceeds Elijah's as much as Elijah outshone the other prophets. What could possibly be equal to those words that he spoke in zeal on behalf of the glory of the Lord: "*I would wish to be anathema ... for the sake of my brethren, [136] my kin according to the flesh*" (Rom 9:3)?¹⁴ Therefore, when heaven and crowns and prizes were set before him, he put it off and delayed, saying, "*To remain in the flesh is more necessary for your sakes*" (Phil 1:24). For this reason, too, he didn't consider the visible creation itself,¹⁵ or the spiritual one, to be a sufficient object by which to manifest his love and zeal, but he sought another creation, one not even in existence (cf. Rom 8:39), so as to demonstrate what he wished and desired. Now, as for John, did he eat locusts and wild honey (cf. Mark 1:6 and parr.)? But Paul spent his time in the midst of the world, just as John did in the desert, though Paul didn't feed on locusts and wild honey, but set an even more frugal table than this, not even having enough food for his daily needs on account of his zeal for the gospel proclamation. But did John exhibit great boldness toward Herod (Mark 6:17–20 and parr.)? Sure, but Paul stopped up the mouths of thousands of men like Herod, not one or two or three, and, indeed, ones much crueler than that tyrant.

1.15. Finally, it remains only to compare him with the angels. So, leaving the earth behind, let's go up to the vaults of the heavens! But let no one accuse our discourse of audacity for this. [138] Since, if Scripture called both John and the priests "angel" (Mark 1:2 and parr.; Mal 2:7), then why is it a cause for wonder if we compare with those celestial powers the man who is more excellent than all? What, then, is their greatness? That they obey God with complete precision, which is what David said in admiring them: "*Mighty in strength, doing his word*" (Ps 102:20). Because nothing about the angels is a match for their obedience, even if they are infinitely incorporeal. For this especially is what makes the angels blessed—that they obey God's commands, that they never transgress. But, indeed, one can see this standard kept with precision also by Paul. For Paul not only carried out God's word, but both the commands and things beyond the commands,¹⁶ as he shows when he says: "*What then is my reward? That by preaching*

16. As AP notes (and HS had included in the margin but not adopted) some manuscripts read ἐζήσῃ after ὑπὲρ τὰ προστάγματα; hence, "he used to live according to the commands and things beyond the commands." See AP 139 n. 1 (with AP 70, 81) for the manuscript evidence; he reasonably retains the shorter reading, as in HS, regarding the plus as a gloss.

ἵνα εὐαγγελιζόμενος ἀδάπανον θήσω τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ; Τί ἕτερον θαυμάζων αὐτοὺς ὁ προφήτης ἔλεγεν; Ὁ ποιῶν τοὺς ἀγγέλους αὐτοῦ πνεύματα, φησί, καὶ τοὺς λειτουργοὺς αὐτοῦ πῦρ φλέγον. Ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦτο ἐπὶ Παύλου ἔστιν ἰδεῖν· καθάπερ γὰρ πνεῦμα καὶ πῦρ, οὕτω τὴν οἰκουμένην διέδραμεν ἅπασαν, καὶ τὴν γῆν ἐξεκάθηρεν. Ἀλλ' οὕπω τὸν οὐρανὸν ἔλαχε; Τὸ γὰρ θαυμαστὸν τοῦτο, ὅτι ἐν τῇ γῇ τοιοῦτος ἦν, καὶ σῶμα θνητὸν περικείμενος, πρὸς τὰς ἀσωμάτων ἡμιλλᾶτο δυνάμεις.

1.16. [140] Πρόσης οὖν οὐκ ἂν εἶημεν καταγνώσεως ἄξιοι, ὅταν ἐνὸς ἀνθρώπου πάντα συνειληχότος ἑαυτῷ τὰ καλά, ἡμεῖς οὐδὲ τὸ πολλοστὸν μέρος μιμήσασθαι αὐτὸν σπουδάζωμεν; Ταῦτ' οὖν ἐννοήσαντες, καὶ τῆς κατηγορίας ἑαυτοὺς ἀπαλλάξωμεν, καὶ σπουδάσωμεν πρὸς τὸν ἐκείνου ζῆλον ἐλθεῖν, ἵνα δυνηθῶμεν καὶ τῶν αὐτῶν ἀγαθῶν ἐπιτυχεῖν, χάριτι καὶ φιλανθρωπίᾳ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ᾧ ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Ἀμήν.

without pay I might set forth the gospel of Christ" (1 Cor 9:18). For what else does the prophet [David] marvel at the angels? "*The one who makes his angels winds,*" he says, "*and his ministers a fiery flame*" (Ps 103:4). But one can see this, too, in the case of Paul. For he ran through the whole world as though he were wind and fire, and he purified the earth. But hasn't he yet reached heaven? Well, what's truly marvelous is that he was such as this while on the earth and he vied with the incorporeal powers when clad in a mortal body.

1.16. [140] Of what magnitude of blame wouldn't we be worthy if, when one man has brought together all the virtues in himself, we're not zealous to imitate him in even a tiny way? Therefore, having set these things in our mind, let's free ourselves from this accusation, and let's strive to reach his zeal, so that we might be able to attain the same goods, by the grace and loving-kindness of our Lord Jesus Christ, to whom be the glory and the power, now and always, forever and ever. Amen.

Τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐγκώμιον εἰς τὸν ἅγιον ἀπόστολον Παῦλον, λόγος β'.

2.1. [142] Τί ποτέ ἐστὶν ἄνθρωπος, καὶ ὅση τῆς φύσεως τῆς ἡμετέρας ἢ εὐγένεια, καὶ ὅσης ἐστὶ δεκτικὸν ἀρετῆς τουτὶ τὸ ζῶον, ἔδειξε μάλιστα πάντων ἀνθρώπων Παῦλος· καὶ νῦν ἔστηκεν, ἐξ οὗ γέγονε, λαμπρᾷ τῇ φωνῇ πρὸς ἅπαντας τοὺς ἐγκαλοῦντας ἡμῶν τῇ κατασκευῇ ἀπολογούμενος ὑπὲρ τοῦ Δεσπότου, καὶ προτρέπων ἐπ' ἀρετῇ, καὶ τὰ ἀναίσχυντα τῶν βλασφημῶν ἐμφράττων στόματα, καὶ δεικνὺς ὅτι ἀγγέλων καὶ ἀνθρώπων οὐ πολὺ τὸ μέσον, ἐὰν [144] ἐθέλωμεν προσέχειν ἑαυτοῖς. Οὐ γὰρ ἄλλην φύσιν λαχὼν, οὐδὲ ἑτέρας κοινωνήσας ψυχῆς, οὐδὲ ἄλλον οἰκήσας κόσμον, ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ γῇ καὶ χώρᾳ καὶ νόμοις καὶ ἔθεσι τραφεῖς, πάντας ἀνθρώπους ὑπερηκόντισε τοὺς ἐξ οὗ γεγόνασιν ἄνθρωποι γενομένους. Ποῦ τοίνυν οἱ λέγοντες ὅτι δύσκολον ἢ ἀρετῇ, καὶ εὐκολον ἢ κακίᾳ; Οὗτος γὰρ ἀντιφθέγγεται τούτοις, λέγων· Τὸ παραυτίκα ἐλαφρὸν τῆς θλίψεως καθ' ὑπερβολὴν εἰς ὑπερβολὴν αἰώνιον βάρος δόξης κατεργάζεται. Εἰ δὲ αἱ τοιαῦται θλίψεις ἐλαφραί, πολλῷ μᾶλλον αἱ οἰκοθεν ἡδοναί.

2.2. Καὶ οὐ τοῦτο μόνον ἐστὶν αὐτοῦ τὸ θαυμαστόν, ὅτι περιουσία τῆς προθυμίας οὐδὲ ἡσθάνετο τῶν πόνων τῶν ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀρετῆς, ἀλλ' ὅτι οὐδὲ ἐπὶ μισθῷ ταύτην μετῇ. Ἡμεῖς μὲν γὰρ οὐδὲ μισθῶν προκειμένων ἀνεχόμεθα

1. Text: as indicated in the introduction (pp. 62–64), we reprint the Greek text of Auguste Piédagnel (AP) SC 300 (1982) for each of the seven homilies *De laudibus sancti Pauli*. The footnotes within the translations on *Laud. Paul.* 1.14; 3.6; 4.15; 4.16; 5.3; 5.7; 6.5; 6.11; and 7.2 document the nine places where Piédagnel's text (AP) diverges from HS. See abbreviations, p. xvi above, for the sigla for AP's manuscripts. The translation and notes do not attempt a comprehensive assessment of the variants in the textual tradition of *Laud. Paul.*; readers should consult the Piédagnel edition for a full *apparatus criticus*. Translation: This translation is replicated from HT 448–52, with some minor adjustments; see HT 152–59 for an analysis of the argument of this homily.

Hom. 2 De laudibus sancti Pauli apostoli
CPG 4344 (SC 300:142–60)¹

In praise of saint Paul the apostle by the same author, homily 2.

2.1. [142] What a human being is, and how great is the noble birthright of our nature, and what degree of virtue this creature is capable of showing—these things were demonstrated more by Paul than all others. And he now stands, as he has from when he first came, with a splendid voice defending the Lord our creator against all those who condemn the way we were fashioned.² He exhorts people to virtue, stops up the shameful mouths of the blasphemers, and demonstrates that the gap between angels and humans is not so great, if [144] we would wish to be attentive to ourselves. For Paul didn't obtain another nature, or share a different soul, or inhabit another world, but, having been reared on the same earth and land, and laws and customs, he exceeded all human beings who've existed from the time there have been human beings. So now, where are those who say, "Virtue is difficult, and vice is easy"?³ For Paul contradicts them when he says, "*The present ease of affliction superabundantly effects an eternal weight of glory*" (2 Cor 4:17).⁴ And if such afflictions as he speaks of are easy, how much more so are the pleasures that come from our own nature.

2.2. Now, what's marvelous about Paul isn't only that, in his abundant ethical zeal, he didn't experience the sufferings that the pursuit of virtue brings, but that he didn't even pursue it for the sake of a reward. For we don't endure the sweaty exertions required for virtue even when rewards

2. Here John sets up Marcionites, Manichaeans, and others as the *πρόβλημα*, for denying the goodness of creation and human nature, and Paul as the *λύσις*, proof of the innate goodness of the human being.

3. Another, even more direct, *πρόβλημα* John addresses here is Christian faithful who give this as an excuse for bad conduct; he implies that in saying this, they are allying themselves with the dualistic heretics of the previous note. In 2.9, John addresses them again directly and names the problem as one rooted not in an anthropological deficit from creation but rather in *ῥαθυμία*, "ethical torpor," "slackness," or "indolence."

4. Minus *γάρ*; minus *ἡμῶν* after *θλίψεως*; minus *ἡμῖν* after *κατεργάζεται*.

τῶν ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς ἰδρώτων· ἐκεῖνος δὲ καὶ χωρὶς τῶν ἐπάθλων αὐτὴν ἡσπάζετο καὶ ἐφίλει, καὶ τὰ δοκοῦντα αὐτῆς εἶναι κωλύματα μετὰ πάσης ὑπερήλατο τῆς εὐκολίας· καὶ οὔτε σώματος ἀσθένειαν, οὐ πραγμάτων περίστασιν, οὐ φύσεως τυραννίδα, οὐκ ἄλλο οὐδὲν ἡτιάσατο. Καίτοι καὶ στρατηγῶν καὶ βασιλέων ἀπάντων τῶν ὄντων ἐπὶ γῆς μείζονα φροντίδα ἐγχειρισθεῖς, ἀλλ' ὁμως καθ' ἐκάστην ἡκμαζε τὴν ἡμέραν. Καὶ τῶν κινδύνων ἐπιτεινομένων αὐτῷ, νεαρὰν ἐκέκτετο τὴν προθυμίαν, καὶ τοῦτο δηλῶν ἔλεγε· Τῶν μὲν ὀπίσω ἐπιλανθανόμενος, τοῖς δὲ ἔμπροσθεν ἐπεκτεινόμενος· καὶ θανάτου προσδοκώμενος, εἰς κοινωνίαν τῆς ἡδονῆς ταύτης ἐκάλει λέγων· Χαίρετε καὶ συχαίρετέ [146] μοι· καὶ κινδύνων ἐπικειμένων καὶ ὕβρεων, καὶ ἀτιμίας ἀπάσης, ἐσκίρτα πάλιν, καὶ Κορινθίοις ἐπιστέλλων ἔλεγε· Διὸ καὶ εὐδοκῶ ἐν ἀσθενείαις, ἐν ὕβρεσιν, ἐν διωγμοῖς·

2.3. Καὶ ὅπλα δὲ αὐτὰ δικαιοσύνης ἐκάλεσε, δεικνὺς ὅτι καὶ ἐντεῦθεν τὰ μέγιστα ἐκαρποῦτο, καὶ τοῖς ἐχθροῖς πάντοθεν ἀχείρωτος ἦν· καὶ πανταχοῦ μαστιζόμενος, ὕβριζόμενος, λοιδορούμενος, ὥσπερ ἐν θριάμβοις ἐμπομπεύων, καὶ τὰ τρόπαια συνεχῇ πανταχοῦ γῆς ἰστάς, οὕτως ἐκαλλωπίζετο, καὶ χάριν ὠμολόγει τῷ Θεῷ λέγων· Χάρις δὲ τῷ Θεῷ τῷ πάντοτε θριαμβεύοντι ἡμᾶς. Καὶ τὴν ἀσχημοσύνην καὶ τὴν ὕβριν τὴν διὰ τὸ κήρυγμα μᾶλλον, ἢ ἡμεῖς τὴν τιμὴν ἐδίωκε, καὶ τὸν θάνατον, ἢ ἡμεῖς τὴν ζωὴν, καὶ τὴν πενίαν, ἢ τὸν πλοῦτον ἡμεῖς, καὶ τοὺς πόνους μᾶλλον, ἢ τὰς ἀνέσεις ἕτεροι, καὶ οὐχ ἀπλῶς μᾶλλον, ἀλλὰ πολλῷ μᾶλλον, καὶ τὸ λυπεῖσθαι πλέον, ἢ τὸ χαίρειν ἕτεροι, τὸ ὑπερέχουσαι τῶν ἐχθρῶν μᾶλλον, ἢ τὸ κατεύχεσθαι ἕτεροι. Καὶ ἀντέστρεψε τῶν πραγμάτων τὴν τάξιν, μᾶλλον δὲ ἡμεῖς ἀντεστρέψαμεν, ἐκεῖνος δέ, ὥσπερ ὁ Θεὸς ἐνομοθέτησεν, οὕτως αὐτὴν ἐφύλαττε. Ταῦτα μὲν γὰρ κατὰ φύσιν ἅπαντα, ἐκεῖνα δὲ τοῦναντίον. [148] Τίς τούτων ἀπόδειξις; Παῦλος, ἄνθρωπος ὢν, καὶ τούτοις ἐπιτρέχων μᾶλλον ἢ ἐκεῖνοις.

2.4. Ἐν τούτῳ φοβερὸν ἦν μόνον καὶ φευκτόν, τὸ προσκροῦσαι Θεῷ, ἕτερον δὲ οὐδέν· ὥσπερ οὖν οὐδὲ ποθεινὸν ἄλλο τι, ὡς τὸ ἀρέσαι Θεῷ· καὶ οὐ λέγω τῶν παρόντων οὐδέν, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ τῶν μελλόντων. Μὴ γὰρ μοι πόλεις εἴπης καὶ ἔθνη καὶ βασιλεῖς καὶ στρατόπεδα καὶ ὅπλα καὶ χρήματα καὶ σατραπείας καὶ δυναστείας· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀράχνην ταῦτα εἶναι ἐνόμισεν· ἀλλ' αὐτὰ τὰ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς τίθει, καὶ τότε αὐτοῦ ὄψει τὸν σφοδρὸν ἔρωτα τὸν πρὸς τὸν Χριστόν. Οὗτος γὰρ πρὸς ἐκεῖνο τὸ φίλτρον, οὐκ ἀγγέλων ἀξίαν ἐθαύμασεν, οὐκ ἀρχαγγέλων, οὐκ ἄλλο τοιοῦτον οὐδέν. Τὸ γὰρ ἀπάντων μείζον εἶχεν ἐν

5. With τῶν μὲν for τὰ μὲν.

6. Plus καὶ before εὐδοκῶ; ellipsis as marked.

are set before us; but he, even without prizes, embraced virtue and loved it. He leaped with complete ease over the things supposed to be an obstacle to it and didn't offer as an excuse either weakness of body, or the crisis of circumstances, or the tyranny of nature, or anything else. Although he'd been entrusted with a greater object of care than all the generals and kings on the earth, nonetheless he flourished in virtue every single day. And when the dangers to him grew more intense, he acquired a fresh zeal for action, as what he said shows: "*forgetting the things behind and reaching out for the things ahead*" (Phil 3:13).⁵ When death was expected, he invited others to share in this pleasure, saying: "*Rejoice, and join me in rejoicing*" (Phil 2:18). [146] When dangers and abuses and all dishonor were at hand, again he leaped for joy and wrote in his letter to the Corinthians: "*Therefore, I am contented in weaknesses, in acts of abuse ... in persecutions*" (2 Cor 12:10).⁶

2.3. He called these greatest trials "weapons of righteousness" (cf. 2 Cor 6:7) to show that out of them the greatest things come to fruition, and that from all directions he was unconquered by his enemies. Everywhere when whipped, insulted, reviled, as though marching in triumphal processions and raising up continual trophies everywhere on earth, he took such pride in it and acknowledged his gratitude to God, saying, "*Thanks be to God who always leads us in triumph*" (2 Cor 2:14). He used to pursue the discredit and insult suffered for the gospel more than we do honor; death more than we do life; poverty more than we do wealth; sufferings more than others do relief—and not simply more, but so much more!—and being grieved more than others seek rejoicing, and praying for his enemies more than others pray against them. Paul overturned the order of things, or, rather, it's we who've overturned it, whereas he was the one who kept to the order just as God had legislated it. For all Paul's actions were in accord with nature, whereas ours are the opposite. [148] What's the proof of this? Paul, as a human being, ran after these afflictions more than he did those pleasures.

2.4. For Paul, there was only one thing that was fearful and to be avoided—offending God, and nothing else—just as there was no other thing to be desired than to please God. I'm not speaking of "nothing" in reference to things here present, either, but even of things to come (cf. Rom 8:38). Don't speak to me of cities and nations and kings and legions and weapons and possessions and provinces and power, for he didn't consider these things equal to a cobweb. But lay out instead the things in the heavens, and then you'll see his ardent love for Christ. When compared with that love, Paul didn't marvel at all at the status of angels or archangels or any other such creature. For he had the greatest possession of all in

ἑαυτῷ, τὸν τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἔρωτα· μετὰ τούτου πάντων ἑαυτὸν μακαριώτερον εἶναι ἐνόμισε. Καὶ τούτου χωρὶς, οὐδὲ τῶν κυριοτήτων καὶ τῶν ἀρχῶν καὶ τῶν ἐξουσιῶν γενέσθαι ἠύχετο, ἀλλὰ μετὰ τῆς ἀγάπης ταύτης ἐν ἐσχάτοις εἶναι ἐβούλετο μᾶλλον καὶ τῶν κολαζομένων, ἢ ταύτης χωρὶς, τῶν ἄκρων καὶ τῶν τιμωμένων.

2.5. Κόλασις γὰρ ἐκείνῳ μία, τὸ τῆς ἀγάπης ταύτης ἀποτυχεῖν. Τοῦτο αὐτῷ γέεννα, τοῦτο τιμωρία, τοῦτο μυρία [150] κακά, ὥσπερ καὶ ἀπόλαυσις, τὸ ταύτης ἐπιτυχεῖν· τοῦτο ζωὴ, τοῦτο κόσμος, τοῦτο ἄγγελος, τοῦτο παρόντα, τοῦτο μέλλοντα, τοῦτο βασιλεία, τοῦτο ἐπαγγελία, τοῦτο τὰ μυρία ἀγαθὰ. Ἅλλοι δὲ οὐδὲν τῶν μὴ φερόντων ἐνταῦθα, οὔτε λυπηρόν, οὔτε ἡδὺ εἶναι ἐνόμιζεν· ἀλλ' οὕτω κατεφρόνει τῶν ὀρωμένων πάντων, ὡς τῆς κατασηπομένης βοτάνης. Τύραννοι δὲ αὐτῷ, καὶ δῆμοι θυμοῦ πνέοντες, κώνωπες εἶναι ἐδόκουν· θάνατος δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ τιμωρία καὶ μυρία κολάσεις, παίδων ἀθύρματα· πλὴν εἴ ποτε διὰ τὸν Χριστὸν ὑπέμενε. Τότε γὰρ καὶ ταῦτα ἡσπάζετο, καὶ εἰς τὴν ἄλυσιν οὕτως ἐκαλλωπίζετο, ὡς οὐδὲ τὸ διάδημα Νέρων ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς ἔχων· καὶ τὸ δεσμωτήριον δὲ ὤκει, ὡς αὐτὸν τὸν οὐρανόν, καὶ τραύματα καὶ μαστιγὰς ἐδέχετο ἥδιον τούτων τῶν τὰ βραβεῖα ἀρπαζόντων· καὶ τοὺς πόνους ἐφίλει τῶν ἐπάθλων οὐχ ἥττον, ἔπαθλον τοὺς πόνους εἶναι νομίζων· διὰ τοῦτο καὶ χάριν αὐτοὺς ἐκάλει.

2.6. Σκόπει δέ. Ἐπαθλον ἦν, τὸ ἀναλῦσαι καὶ σὺν Χριστῷ εἶναι, τὸ δὲ ἐπιμεῖναι τῇ σαρκί, ὃ ἀγὼν οὗτος· ἀλλ' ὅμως τοῦτο μᾶλλον αἰρεῖται ἐκείνου, καὶ ἀναγκαιότερον αὐτῷ εἶναι φησι· τὸ ἀνάθεμα ἀπὸ Χριστοῦ γενέσθαι, ἀγὼν ἦν καὶ πόνος, μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ ὑπὲρ ἀγῶνα καὶ [152] πόνον· τὸ εἶναι μετ' αὐτοῦ, ἔπαθλον. Ἀλλὰ τοῦτο μᾶλλον αἰρεῖται ἐκείνου διὰ τὸν Χριστόν. Ἀλλ' ἴσως εἴποι τις ἂν ὅτι πάντα ταῦτα διὰ τὸν Χριστόν ἡδέα αὐτῷ ἦν. Τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ ἐγὼ φημι, ὅτι ἅπερ ἀθυμίας ἡμῖν αἷτια, ταῦτα ἐκείνῳ μεγάλην ἔτικτεν ἡδονήν. Καὶ τί λέγω κινδύνους καὶ τὰς ἄλλας τλαιπωρίας; Καὶ γὰρ ἐν ἀθυμίᾳ διηνεκεῖ ἦν· διὸ καὶ ἔλεγε· Τίς ἀσθενεῖ, καὶ οὐκ ἀσθενῶ; τίς σκανδαλίζεται, καὶ οὐκ ἐγὼ πυροῦμαι; Πλὴν εἰ καὶ τὴν ἀθυμίαν ἡδονὴν ἔχειν εἴποι τις ἂν. Πολλοὶ γὰρ καὶ τῶν τέκνα ἀποβαλόντων, συγχωρούμενοι μὲν θρηνεῖν, παραμυθίαν λαμβάνουσι· κωλυόμενοι δέ, ἀλγοῦσι· καθάπερ οὖν καὶ ὁ Παῦλος, νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας δακρύων, παραμυθίαν ἐλάμβανεν· οὐδεὶς γὰρ οὕτω τὰ οἰκεῖα ἐπένησε κακά, ὡς τὰ ἀλλότρια ἐκεῖνος. Πῶς γὰρ οἶε διακεῖσθαι αὐτὸν Ἰουδαίων οὐ σωζομένων, ἵνα σωθῶσιν, εὐχόμενον ἐκπεσεῖν τῆς ἀνωθεν δόξης;

7. Minus ἐν before τῇ σαρκί.

himself—the love of Christ (cf. 2 Cor 5:14). With this love, he considered himself more blessed than all people; apart from it, he prayed not even to belong to the dominions and the powers and the principalities (cf. Rom 8:38–39; Col 1:16). With this love, he wished more to be among the most lowly of the punished than, apart from it, among the elite and honored.

2.5. For Paul there was only one form of punishment, to fail to gain this love. This would be Gehenna for him, this would be chastisement, this would be [150] evils without measure, just as also what was enjoyment was to obtain this love. This is life, this is creation, this an angel, this present things, this things to come, this a kingdom, this a promise, this the goods beyond measure. He considered no other perishable earthly reality either grievous or pleasant. But he was as disdainful of all visible things as of a rotting plant. To him tyrannies and peoples breathing wrath seemed to be gnats. And death, chastisement, and punishment were children's playthings to him—except, that is, anytime he endured them for Christ's sake. Then he would embrace them and so pride himself in his chain as not even Nero did when crowned with the diadem. He inhabited the prison as though heaven itself, and accepted wounds and whippings with more pleasure than those who snatch up trophies. He loved the sufferings no less than prizes, considering the sufferings to be a prize. That's why he even called them "a grace" (cf. Phil 1:29).

2.6. Consider this. There was a prize—"to die and be with Christ.... But to remain in the flesh" (Phil 1:23–24)⁷—this was the competitive struggle. Nevertheless, Paul chose the latter over the former and said it was more necessary for him. To be anathema from Christ (cf. Rom 9:3) was a struggle and painful toil—indeed well above struggle and [152] toil. Because to be with Christ was a prize. But he chose the one over the other for the sake of Christ. But likewise one might say that all these tribulations endured for Christ's sake were pleasure for Paul. And I, too, say that all the things that cause despondency in us produced great pleasure in him. And why am I speaking of dangers and the other hardships? For Paul was in constant despondency, as he said, "*Who is weak, and I am not weak; who is made to stumble, and I do not burn?*" (2 Cor 11:29). Besides, one could say that even despondency is pleasurable. For many of those who've lost children, if they give way to lament, receive consolation from it, but, if prevented, they grieve painfully. In the same way, then, Paul, by crying night and day (cf. Acts 20:31), received continual consolation. No one so mourned over their own wicked deeds as he did over those of others. For what kind of state do you suppose he should be in when Jews remain unsaved, given that he

“Οθεν δῆλον ὅτι τὸ μὴ σώζεσθαι αὐτοὺς πολλῷ χαλεπώτερον ἦν. Εἰ γὰρ μὴ χαλεπώτερον, οὐκ ἂν ἠῤῥατο ἐκεῖνο· ὡς γὰρ κουφότερον εἴλετο, καὶ μᾶλλον ἔχον παραμυθίαν· καὶ οὐχ ἁπλῶς ἐβούλετο, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐβόα λέγων· “Οτι λύπη μοί ἐστι, καὶ ὁδὴν τῇ καρδίᾳ μου.

2.7. [154] Τὸν οὖν καθ’ ἐκάστην, ὡς εἶπεῖν, <ὑπὲρ> τῶν τὴν οἰκουμένην οἰκούντων ἀλγοῦντα, καὶ ὑπὲρ ἀπάντων κοινῇ, καὶ ἐθνῶν, καὶ πόλεων, καὶ ὑπὲρ ἐνὸς ἐκάστου, τίνι ἂν τις δυνηθεῖη παραβαλεῖν; ποίῳ σιδήρῳ; ποίῳ ἀδάμαντι; Τί ἂν τις ἐκείνην καλέσειε τὴν ψυχὴν; χρυσὴν, ἢ ἀδαμαντίνην; καὶ γὰρ ἀδάμαντος ἦν παντὸς στερροτέρα, καὶ χρυσοῦ καὶ λίθων τιμίῳν τιμιωτέρα· κακείνης μὲν οὖν τῆς ὕλης τὴν εὐτονίαν παρελάσει, ταύτης δὲ τὴν πολυτέλειαν. Τίνι ἂν οὖν τις αὐτὴν παραβάλοι; Τῶν μὲν οὐσῶν οὐδεμιᾶ. Εἰ δὲ χρυσὸς ἀδάμας γένοιτο, καὶ ἀδάμας χρυσός, τότε ὅπως οὖν αὐτῶν τεύξεται τῆς εἰκόνης. Ἀλλὰ τί μοι δεῖ παραβάλλειν ἀδάμαντι καὶ χρυσῷ; Τὸν κόσμον ἀντίθετος ἅπαντα, καὶ τότε ὅψει καθέλκουσαν τοῦ Παύλου τὴν ψυχὴν. Εἰ γὰρ περὶ τῶν ἐν μηλωταῖς καὶ σπηλαίοις καὶ ἐν μικρῷ μέρει τῆς οἰκουμένης διαπρεψάντων τοῦτο φησιν ἐκεῖνος, πολλῷ μᾶλλον περὶ αὐτοῦ ἂν εἴποιμεν ἡμεῖς, ὡς ὅτι πάντων ἀντάξιος ἦν. Εἰ τοίνυν ὁ κόσμος αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἄξιος, τίς ἄξιος; τάχα ὁ οὐρανός; Ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦτο σμικρόν. Εἰ γὰρ αὐτὸς <οὐρανοῦ> μετὰ τῶν ἐν τοῖς [156] οὐρανοῖς προετίμησε τοῦ Δεσπότης τὴν ἀγάπην, πολλῷ μᾶλλον ὁ Δεσπότης ὁ τοσοῦτον αὐτοῦ ἀγαθώτερος, ὅσον πονηρίας ἀγαθότης, μυρίων αὐτὸν οὐρανῶν προτιμήσει. Οὐ γὰρ ὁμοίως ἡμᾶς φιλεῖ, καθάπερ ἡμεῖς αὐτόν, ἀλλὰ τοσοῦτῳ πλεον, ὅσον οὐδὲ λόγῳ παραστήσαι ἐνι.

2.8. Σκόπει γοῦν ἡλικίων αὐτόν καὶ πρὸ τῆς μελλούσης ἡξίωσεν ἀναστάσεως. Εἰς παράδεισον ἤρπασεν, εἰς τρίτον ἀνήγαγεν οὐρανόν, ἀπορρήτων ἐποίησε κοινωνὸν τοιούτων, ἃ μηδενὶ τῶν τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην λαχόντων φύσιν θέμις εἶπεῖν. Καὶ μάλα εἰκότως· καὶ γὰρ ἐν γῇ βαδίζων, ὡς μετὰ ἀγγέλων περιπολῶν, οὕτως ἔπραττεν ἅπαντα· καὶ σώματι θνητῷ συνδεδεμένος, τὴν ἐκείνων καθαρότητα ἐπεδείκνυτο, καὶ ἀνάγκαις τοσαύταις ὑποκείμενος, ἐφιλονεῖκε τῶν ἄνω δυνάμεων μηδὲν ἔλαττον φανῆναι. Καὶ γὰρ ὡς πτηνὸς τὴν οἰκουμένην διέδραμε, καὶ ὡς ἀσώματος πόνων ὑπερεώρα καὶ κινδύνων,

8. Minus μεγάλη before καί and ἀδιάλειπτος after it (likely an ellipsis).

9. Adopting the conjectural reading of HS (and all following him, including AP), ὑπὲρ before τῶν τὴν οἰκουμένην οἰκούντων (see AP 154, with the term in brackets in the text, as explained in n. 1).

10. AP discovered here an unacknowledged conjectural reading of HS, which was retained by all the successors, plus οὐρανοῦ after Εἰ γὰρ αὐτός, which is not found in any of his fourteen manuscripts. AP retained HS’s reading on grammatical and contextual grounds, but added brackets around it in the text (AP 154, 155 n. 4).

prayed to be deprived of the heavenly glory so that they might be saved (cf. Rom 9:3)? From this it's clear that their not being saved was much more terrible, for if it weren't more terrible, then Paul wouldn't have uttered that prayer. For he chose the easier option, as it were, the one having more consolation. But this wasn't simply a matter of what he wished, as he even cried out, "*because I have grief and pain in my heart*" (Rom 9:2).⁸

2.7. [154] So then, this man who grieved every single day (so to speak) for⁹ the inhabitants of the world, for all in common (both nations and cities), and for each person individually, to what could one possibly compare him? To what sort of iron? To what sort of steel? What might one call that soul? Golden, or steely? For it was more solid than any steel, and more precious than gold and precious stones. It will outdo the former material in malleability and the latter in costliness. To what then might one compare it? To none of the things that exist; but if gold could become steel, and steel gold, then perhaps in some way his soul would attain its likeness from their combination. But why must I compare it with steel and gold? Place the whole world opposite his soul, and then you'll see Paul's soul outweighing it in the balance. If Paul said of those who distinguished themselves in sheepskins and caves in a small part of the world that the world is not worthy of them (cf. Heb 11:37–38), how much more should we say of him that he was worthy of all? Indeed, if the world is not worthy of him, what is worthy? Perhaps heaven? But even this is too small. For if Paul himself [156] preferred the love of the Lord to heaven,¹⁰ along with the things in heaven (cf. Rom 8:38–39), how much more will the Lord, who exceeds Paul in goodness as much as goodness surpasses evil, prefer him to countless heavens. For the Lord doesn't love us in the same way that we love him, but so very much more that it cannot be expressed in words.

2.8. Now consider what lofty experiences the Lord deemed Paul worthy of, even before the coming resurrection. He snatched him up into paradise, led him into the third heaven, made him a partner in the kind of secrets that no one bearing human nature is lawfully allowed to speak (cf. 2 Cor 12:2–4). And with good reason. For while walking on the earth, he continually did everything as though he were going about with angels. Although bound up with a mortal body, he exhibited the purity of the angels, and even when subject to such great constraints, he made it his fervent ambition to appear in no way inferior to the powers above. For he ran around the world like a bird and, like an incorporeal being, disdained sufferings and dangers. He had contempt for earthly things as though he'd

καὶ ὡς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἤδη λαχὼν, κατεφρόνει τῶν ἐπὶ γῆς, καὶ ὡς μετ' αὐτῶν ἀναστρεφόμενος τῶν ἀσωμάτων δυνάμεων, οὕτω διηνεκῶς ἐγρηγορῶς ἦν. Καίτοι γε ἄγγελοι πολλάκις ἐνεχειρίσθησαν ἔθνη διάφορα· ἀλλ' οὐδὲ εἰς αὐτῶν τὸ ἔθνος, ὃ ἐνεπιστεύθη, οὕτως ὠκονόμησεν, ὡς Παῦλος τὴν οἰκουμένην ἅπασαν. Καὶ μὴ μοι λέγε ὅτι Παῦλος οὐκ ἦν ὁ ταῦτα οἰκονομῶν· καὶ γὰρ καὶ αὐτὸς ὁμολογῶ. Εἰ γὰρ καὶ μὴ [158] αὐτὸς ἦν ὁ ταῦτα ἀνύων, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ οὕτως ἐκτὸς ἦν τῶν ἐπὶ τούτοις ἐπαίνων, ἐπειδὴ ἑαυτὸν οὕτω κατεσκεύασεν ἄξιον τῆς τοσαύτης χάριτος. Ὁ Μιχαὴλ τὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἔθνος ἐνεχειρίσθη. Παῦλος δὲ γῆν καὶ θάλατταν, καὶ τὴν οἰκουμένην, καὶ τὴν αἰοίκητον.

2.9. Καὶ ταῦτα οὐκ ἀγγέλους ὑβρίζων λέγω, μὴ γένοιτο, ἀλλὰ δεικνύς ὅτι δυνατὸν ἄνθρωπον ὄντα μετ' ἐκείνων εἶναι, καὶ ἐγγὺς αὐτῶν ἐστάναι. Καὶ τίνος ἕνεκεν οὐκ ἄγγελοι ταῦτα ἐνεχειρίσθησαν; Ἵνα μηδεμίαν ἀπολογίαν ἔχῃς ῥαθυμῶν, μηδὲ εἰς τὴν διαφορὰν τῆς φύσεως καταφεύγῃς καθεύδων· ἄλλως δὲ καὶ τὸ θαῦμα μείζον ἐγίνετο. Πῶς γὰρ οὐ θαυμαστὸν καὶ παράδοξον, ἀπὸ γλώττης πηλίνης ἐκπηδῶντα λόγον, θάνατον φυγαδεύειν, ἁμαρτήματα λύειν, πεπηρωμένην διορθοῦν φύσιν, καὶ τὴν γῆν ἐργάζεσθαι οὐρανόν; Διὰ τοῦτο ἐκπλήττομαι τοῦ Θεοῦ τὴν δύναμιν, διὰ ταῦτα θαυμάζω τοῦ Παύλου τὴν προθυμίαν, ὅτι τοσαύτην ὑπεδέξατο χάριν, ὅτι τοιοῦτον παρεσκεύασεν ἑαυτόν.

2.10. Καὶ ὑμᾶς παρακαλῶ μὴ θαυμάζειν μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ μιμεῖσθαι τὸ ἀρχέτυπον τοῦτο τῆς ἀρετῆς· οὕτω γὰρ [160] δυνησόμεθα τῶν αὐτῶν στεφάνων κοινωνῆσαι ἐκείνῳ. Εἰ δὲ θαυμάζεις ἀκούων ὅτι, τὰ αὐτὰ κατορθώσας, τῶν αὐτῶν ἐπιτεύξῃ, ἄκουσον αὐτοῦ ταῦτα λέγοντος· Τὸν ἀγῶνα τὸν καλὸν ἡγωνίσαι, τὸν δρόμον τετέλεκα, τὴν πίστιν τετήρηκα· λοιπὸν ἀπόκειται μοι ὁ τῆς δικαιοσύνης στέφανος, ὃν ἀποδώσει μοι Κύριος ὁ δίκαιος κριτὴς ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ· οὐ μόνον δὲ ἐμοί, ἀλλὰ καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς ἡγαπηκόσι τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν αὐτοῦ. Ὅρᾳς πῶς πάντας εἰς τὴν αὐτὴν κοινωνίαν καλεῖ; Ἐπεὶ οὖν ἅπασιν πρόκειται τὰ αὐτά, πάντες σπουδάσωμεν ἄξιοι γενέσθαι τῶν ἐπηγγελμένων ἀγαθῶν· καὶ μὴ μόνον τὸ μέγεθος καὶ τὸν ὄγκον τῶν κατορθωμάτων ἴδωμεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν τόνον τῆς προθυμίας, δι' ἧς τοσαύτην ἐπεσπάσατο χάριν, καὶ τὸ τῆς φύσεως συγγενές· τῶν γὰρ αὐτῶν ἡμῖν ἐκοινωνήσεν ἀπάντων. Καὶ

11. A hypothetical interlocutor offers a possible "problem" with John's argument that Paul exceeds the angels.

12. I.e., the archangel Michael.

13. John seeks to deflect a potential πρόβλημα his encomiastic hyperbole might have created.

already attained heaven; he was as continually vigilant as if he were dwelling with the incorporeal powers themselves. Indeed, quite often angels are given charge of different nations, but not a single one of them so managed the nation with which he was entrusted as Paul did the whole world. Now, don't say to me, "Paul wasn't the one managing these things,"¹¹ for I myself acknowledge this as well. But just because [158] he wasn't himself the one who was accomplishing all these things, that doesn't mean Paul should be excluded from the praises these acts deserve, because he had prepared himself in such a way as to be worthy of this abundant grace. Michael¹² was given charge of the nation of the Jews (cf. Dan 10:21; 12:1), but Paul of earth and sea, both civilized and uninhabited territories.

2.9. Now, I am not saying these things to insult the angels (perish the thought!)¹³ but to prove that it's possible for one who's a human being to be with the angels and to stand near them. And why were the angels not given charge of the things Paul was? So you might have no defense for slacking off, nor be able to take refuge in the difference between human and angelic nature for your state of ethical torpor. And besides, the marvel becomes even greater. For how isn't it marvelous and incredible that a word that leaped forth from a tongue of clay sent death fleeing, destroyed sin, set straight an incapacitated nature, and made the earth into heaven? Therefore, I admire the power of God, and for these things I marvel at Paul's ethical zeal, since he received so great a share of grace due to the fact that he'd prepared himself so well.

2.10. And I urge you not only to marvel at but also to imitate this archetype of virtue. For in this way, [160] we shall be able to share in the same crowns as he. But if you're amazed when you hear that if you perform the same virtuous deeds you'll attain the same goods, listen to him saying it: *"I have fought the good fight, I have completed the race, I have kept the faith. Finally, the crown of righteousness is reserved for me, which the Lord, the just judge, will give to me on that day. And not only to me but also to all those who have loved his appearing"* (2 Tim 4:7–8).¹⁴ Do you see how he calls all to the same common destiny? Therefore, since the same things lie in store for all, let's all be zealous to become worthy of these promised goods. And let's look not only at the height and volume of Paul's virtuous deeds, but also at the intensity of the ethical zeal by which he gained such great grace. Let's look also at the kinship of nature that we have with him, for he shared

14. With transposition of the epithet, ὁ δίκαιος κριτής, from the end of the clause to follow κύριος (and minus ὁ before it) and precede ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ.

οὕτω καὶ τὰ σφόδρα δυσκατόρθωτα, ῥάδια ἡμῖν φανεῖται καὶ κοῦφα, καὶ τὸν βραχὺν τοῦτον καμώντες χρόνον, τὸν ἀγήρω καὶ ἀθάνατον ἐκεῖνον στέφανον φοροῦντες διατελέσομεν, χάριτι καὶ φιλανθρωπία τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ᾧ ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος νῦν καὶ αἰεὶ καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Ἀμήν.

in all the same things with us. And in this way the most difficult actions will seem to us easy and light. Then after toiling for such a short period of time, we shall continually wear that undecaying and immortal crown by the grace and loving-kindness of our Lord Jesus Christ, to whom be the glory and the power, now and always, and forever and ever. Amen.

Τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐγκώμιον εἰς τὸν ἅγιον ἀπόστολον Παῦλον, λόγος γ'.

3.1. [162] Ὁ μακάριος Παῦλος τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης προθυμίας ἐνδεικνύμενος τὴν ἰσχύν, καὶ ὅτι πρὸς αὐτὸν δυνάμεθα πτῆναι τὸν οὐρανόν, ἀφείς ἀγγέλους καὶ ἀρχαγγέλους καὶ τὰς ἄλλας δυνάμεις, ποτὲ μὲν δι' ἑαυτοῦ μόνου μιμητὰς γενέσθαι κελεύει τοῦ Χριστοῦ λέγων· Μιμηταί μου γίνεσθε, καθὼς καὶ ἐγὼ Χριστοῦ· ποτὲ δὲ καὶ χωρὶς ἑαυτοῦ πρὸς αὐτὸν αὐτοὺς ἀναβιβάζει τὸν Θεὸν λέγων· Γίνεσθε οὖν μιμηταί τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὡς τέκνα ἀγαπητά. Εἴτα δεικνὺς ὡς οὐδὲν οὕτω ποιεῖ τὴν μίμησιν ταύτην, ὡς τὸ κοινωφελῶς ζῆν καὶ πρὸς τὸ τῷ παντὶ χρήσιμον ὁρᾶν, ἐπήγαγε· Περιπατεῖτε ἐν ἀγάπῃ. Διὰ τοῦτο εἰπὼν· Μιμηταί μου γίνεσθε, περὶ ἀγάπης εὐθέως διαλέγεται, δεικνὺς ὅτι αὕτη μάλιστα ἡ ἀρετὴ ἐγγὺς εἶναι ποιεῖ Θεοῦ· ὡς αἱ [164] γε ἄλλαι ταύτης καταδεέστεραι, καὶ περὶ ἀνθρώπους πᾶσαι στρέφονται· οἷον ἡ πρὸς ἐπιθυμίαν μάχῃ, ὁ περὶ τὴν γαστέρα πόλεμος, ἡ πρὸς τὴν φιλαργυρίαν παράταξις, ἡ πρὸς τὸν θυμὸν πάλη· τὸ δὲ φιλεῖν, τοῦτο κοινὸν ἡμῶν καὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ἔλεγεν· Εὐχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐπηρεαζόντων ὑμᾶς, ὅπως γένησθε ὅμοιοι τοῦ Πατρὸς ὑμῶν τοῦ ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.

3.2. Τοῦτο τοίνυν καὶ ὁ Παῦλος εἰδὼς κεφάλαιον ὃν τῶν ἀγαθῶν, μετὰ πολλῆς ἐπεδείξατο τῆς ἀκριβείας. Οὐδεὶς γοῦν οὕτως ἐχθροὺς ἐφίλησεν, οὐδεὶς οὕτω τοὺς ἐπιβουλεύσαντας εὐηργέτησεν, οὐδεὶς τοσαῦτα ὑπὲρ τῶν λελυπηκότων ἔπαθεν· οὐδὲ γὰρ εἰς ἅπερ ἔπασχεν ἔβλεπεν, ἀλλὰ τὸ κοινὸν

1. Text: as indicated in the introduction (pp. 62–64), we reprint the Greek text of Auguste Piédagnel (AP) SC 300 (1982) for each of the seven homilies *De laudibus sancti Pauli*. The footnotes within the translations on *Laud. Paul.* 1.14; 3.6; 4.15; 4.16; 5.3; 5.7; 6.5; 6.11; and 7.2 document the nine places where Piédagnel's text (AP) diverges from HS. See abbreviations, p. xvi above, for the sigla for AP's manuscripts. The translation and notes do not attempt a comprehensive assessment of the variants in the textual tradition of *Laud. Paul.*; readers should consult the Piédagnel edition for a full *apparatus criticus*. Translation: This translation is replicated from HT 453–57, with some minor adjustments; see HT 159–64 for an analysis of the argument of this homily.

Hom. 3 De laudibus sancti Pauli apostoli
CPG 4344 (SC 300:162–80)¹

In praise of saint Paul the apostle by the same author, homily 3.

3.1. [162] The blessed Paul, when demonstrating the power of human ethical zeal² and the fact that we're able to fly to heaven itself, bypassed the angels and archangels and the other powers as examples. Instead, one time he used an appeal to himself alone when commanding them to become imitators of Christ, saying, "*Be imitators of me, just as also I am of Christ*" (1 Cor 11:1). And at another time, without mentioning himself, he makes them ascend to the example of God himself, saying, "*Therefore, be imitators of God, as beloved children*" (Eph 5:1). Next, in order to show that nothing brings about this imitation so well as living for the common good and looking to the advantage of each, he adds: "*Walk in love*" (Eph 5:2). For the same reason, after saying, "*Be imitators of me*" (1 Cor 11:1), immediately he discusses love (cf. 1 Cor 13), thus demonstrating that this is the virtue that makes one especially near to God. The **[164]** other virtues are inferior to it, and all revolve around human beings—for example, the conflict with desire, the war regarding the belly, the battle against avarice, the fight against anger. But loving is something common to us and to God. This is why Christ said, "*Pray for those who abuse you, so that you might be like your Father in heaven*" (Matt 5:44–45).³

3.2. Therefore, knowing that this is the chief of the virtues, Paul demonstrated it with tremendous care. For example, no one so loved enemies, no one gave such benefactions to those plotting against him, no one suffered so many things on behalf of those who had grieved him. For he

2. *προθυμία* (for various senses see p. 443 n. 23). The implied *ζήτημα* of this entire homily is whether humans can indeed train their free will to choose eagerly to act virtuously, even in the divine likeness, and how. John will address the problem and its solution directly in the conclusion to this homily in §10, but it is at work throughout.

3. With *ὅμοιοι* for *υἱοί*. On this consistent textual reading of Matt 5:45 by Chrysostom, see p. 166 n. 116 above (on *Hom. Rom. 12:20*).

τῆς φύσεως ἐνενόει, καὶ ὅσῳ μᾶλλον ἐξεθηριοῦντο, τοσούτῳ μᾶλλον αὐτῶν ἡλέει τὴν μανίαν. Καὶ ὡς ἂν τις διατεθεῖη πατὴρ περὶ παῖδα φρενίτιδι κατεχόμενον—ὅσῳ γὰρ ἂν ὑβρίζηται καὶ λακτίζει χαλεπῶς ὁ κάμνων, τοσούτῳ μᾶλλον αὐτὸν ἐλεεῖ καὶ δακρύει—, οὕτω κάκεῖνος τῇ τῶν δαιμόνων ὑπερβολῇ τῶν ταῦτα ἐπαγόντων αὐτῷ τὴν νόσον στοχαζόμενος, πρὸς πλείονα κηδεμονίαν διανίστατο.

3.3. [166] Ἄκουσον γοῦν αὐτοῦ πῶς ἡμέρας, πῶς συμπαθητικῶς ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἡμῖν διαλέγεται, τῶν πεντάκις αὐτὸν μαστιγώσαντων, τῶν καταλευσάντων, τῶν δησάντων, τῶν τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ διψώντων, καὶ διασπάσασθαι καθ' ἐκάστην ἐπιθυμούντων αὐτὸν τὴν ἡμέραν. Μαρτυρῶ γὰρ αὐτοῖς, φησὶν, ὅτι ζῆλον Θεοῦ ἔχουσιν, ἀλλ' οὐ κατ' ἐπίγνωσιν. Καὶ πάλιν τοὺς ἐπεμβαίνοντας αὐτοῖς ἀναχαιτίζων ἔλεγε· Μὴ ὑψηλοφρόνει, ἀλλὰ φοβοῦ· εἰ γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς τῶν κατὰ φύσιν κλάδων οὐκ ἐφείσατο, μήπως οὐδὲ σοῦ φείσεται. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἀπόφασιν εἶδε δεσποτικὴν ἐξελθοῦσαν κατ' αὐτῶν, οὗ κύριος ἦν, τοῦτο ἐποίει· συνεχῶς ἐδάκρυεν ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν, ἤλγει, τοὺς ἐνάλλεσθαι βουλομένους αὐτοῖς ἐκώλυε, καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἐγχωρούντων ἐφιλονεῖκει σκιὰν γοῦν συγγνώμης αὐτοῖς εὐρεῖν. Καὶ ἐπειδὴ λόγῳ πείθειν οὐκ εἶχε διὰ τὸ ἀνένδοτον αὐτῶν καὶ σκληρόν, ἐπὶ συνεχεῖς εὐχὰς ἐτρέπετο λέγων· Ἀδελφοί, ἡ μὲν εὐδοκία μου καὶ ἡ δέησίς μου ἡ πρὸς τὸν Θεόν, ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἐστὶν εἰς σωτηρίαν. Ὑποτείνει δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ χρηστὰς ἐλπίδας λέγων· Ἀμεταμέλητα τὰ χαρίσματα καὶ ἡ κλήσις τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὥστε μὴ ἀπογνῶναι τέλεον καὶ ἀπολέσθαι· ἅπερ ἅπαντα κηδομένου καὶ σφόδρα ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν διακαιομένου ἦν, ὡς ὅταν λέγῃ ὅτι· Ἦξει ἐκ Σιών ὁ ῥυόμενος, καὶ ἀποστρέψει ἀσεβείας ἀπὸ Ἰακώβ. Καὶ γὰρ σφόδρα διεκόπτετο καὶ ἐδάκνετο ἀπολλυμένους ὁρῶν. Διὸ πολλὰς ἐπενόει παραμυθίας τῆς [168] ἀληθοῦς ταύτης ἑαυτῷ, ποτὲ μὲν λέγων· Ἦξει ὁ ῥυόμενος, καὶ ἀποστρέψει ἀσεβείας ἀπὸ Ἰακώβ, ποτὲ δέ· Οὕτω καὶ οὔτοι ἠπειθήσαν τῷ ὑμετέρῳ ἐλέει ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐλεηθῶσι.

3.4. Ποιεῖ δὲ τοῦτο καὶ Ἱερεμίας, βιαζόμενος καὶ φιλονεικῶν ἀπολογίαν τινὰ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἡμαρτηκότων εὐρεῖν, νῦν μὲν λέγων· Εἰ αἱ ἁμαρτίαι ἡμῶν

4. AP documents the split in the manuscripts here between ὑπερβολῇ and ὑποβολῇ (“ambush”) but retains HS’s choice of the former over the latter on text-critical grounds (AP 164–65, with n. 2).

5. An inexact allusion to 2 Cor 11:23–26.

6. With μου for τῆς ἐμῆς καρδίας; plus ἡ before πρὸς τὸν θεόν (but lacking in MS A = Paris. gr. 755).

7. Minus ἐκ Σιών before ὁ ῥυόμενος, marked as an ellipsis in the text.

8. Minus νῦν before ἠπειθήσαν.

didn't look upon the things he was suffering at their hands, but he considered the nature they had in common. The more savage they became, the more he pitied their insane behavior. Just as a father is disposed toward a child gripped by brain fever (for the more the sick child torments himself and violently struggles, the more the father has pity on them and sheds tears on their behalf), so also Paul, discerning the illness of those who were bringing these afflictions on him because of the abundance⁴ of demons they had, was roused to greater solicitation.

3.3. [166] For instance, hear how gently, how compassionately, he speaks to us about them, the very people who whipped him five times, who pelted him with stones,⁵ who bound him, who thirsted for his blood, and desired him to be torn apart every single day. "*For I testify about them,*" he says, "*that they have zeal for God, but not according to knowledge*" (Rom 10:2). And again, when holding in check those who were attacking them [i.e., "Jews"], he said: "*Don't be haughty, but fearful. For if God did not spare the natural branches, neither will he spare you*" (Rom 11:20–21). Since Paul saw the Lord's judgment coming to fulfillment against them, he did what was in his power to do. He cried continually over them, he was in pain (cf. Rom 9:2), he prevented those who wished to rush out against them, and he made it his fervent ambition to find, from the possible options, at least a shadow of an excuse for them. And since he wasn't able to persuade them by argument, on account of their unyielding and hard nature, he continually took recourse to prayers, saying: "*Brothers, my wish and my prayer to God is for salvation on their behalf*" (Rom 10:1).⁶ He even extended favorable hopes for them, saying, "*The gracious gifts and call of God are irrevocable*" (Rom 11:29), so that they might not give up completely and perish. All these actions were those of a man full of concern and ardently inflamed on their behalf, as when he says: "*The deliverer will come from Zion, and he will banish impieties from Jacob*" (Rom 11:26; Isa 59:20). And he was very much cut to the heart and bitterly vexed at seeing them perishing. Therefore, he used to conceive of many consolations [168] for himself for this pain, at one time saying, "*The deliverer will come ... and he will banish impieties from Jacob*" (Rom 11:26⁷; Isa 59:20) and at another, "*Thus also they disbelieved, so that by the mercy you've received they, too, might be shown mercy*" (Rom 11:31).⁸

3.4. Jeremiah does this, too, arguing with force and contending to find some excuse for those who have sinned, once saying, "*If our sins have*

ἀντέστησαν ἡμῖν, ποιήσον ἕνεκεν σοῦ, νῦν δὲ πάλιν· Οὐχὶ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἡ ὁδὸς αὐτοῦ, οὐδὲ ἄνθρωπος πορεύεται καὶ κατορθώσει τὴν πορείαν αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἀλλαχοῦ πάλιν· Μνήσθητι ὅτι χοῦς ἐσμέν. Καὶ γὰρ ἔθος τοῖς ὑπὲρ τῶν ἡμαρτηκότων δεομένοις, καὶ μὴδὲν ἔχωσιν εὐλογον εἰπεῖν, σκιὰν γοῦν τινα ἀπολογίας ἐπινοεῖν, οὐ διηκριβωμένας μὲν, οὐδὲ εἰς δόγματα ἐλκυσθῆναι δυναμένας, παραμυθουμένας δὲ ὅμως τοὺς ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀπολλυμένων ὀδυνωμένους. Μὴ τοίνυν μὴδὲ ἡμεῖς τὰς τοιαύτας ἀκριβῶς ἐξετάσωμεν ἀπολογίας, ἀλλ' ἐννοοῦντες ὅτι ψυχῆς εἰσιν ὀδυνωμένης, ζητούσης εἰπεῖν τι ὑπὲρ τῶν ἡμαρτηκότων, οὕτως ἐκδεχόμεθα τὰ εἰρημένα.

3.5. [170] Ἄρ' οὖν πρὸς Ἰουδαίους μόνον τοιοῦτος, πρὸς δὲ τοὺς ἔξωθεν οὐχί; Πάντων ἡμερώτερος ἦν καὶ πρὸς τοὺς οἰκείους, καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἄλλοτριους. Οὐκοῦν ἄκουσον τί Τιμοθέῳ φησί· Δοῦλον δὲ Κυρίου οὐ δεῖ μάχεσθαι, ἀλλ' ἥπιον εἶναι πρὸς πάντας, διδακτικόν, ἀνεξίκακον, ἐν πραότητι παιδεύοντα τοὺς ἀντιδιατιθεμένους, μὴ ποτε δῶ αὐτοῖς ὁ Θεὸς μετάνοιαν εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας, καὶ ἀνανήψωσιν ἐκ τῆς τοῦ διαβόλου παγίδος, ἐζωγρημένοι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ ἐκείνου θέλημα. Θέλεις ἰδεῖν αὐτὸν καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἡμαρτηκotas πῶς διαλέγεται; Ἄκουσον τί Κορινθίοις ἐπιστέλλων φησί· Φοβοῦμαι δὲ μήπως ἐλθὼν, οὐχ οἶους θέλω, εὖρω ὑμᾶς· καὶ μετ' ὀλίγα· Μὴ πάλιν ἐλθόντα με ταπεινώσῃ ὁ Θεὸς μου πρὸς ὑμᾶς, καὶ πενθήσω πολλοὺς τῶν προημαρτηκότων, καὶ μὴ μετανοησάντων ἐπὶ τῇ ἀσελγείᾳ καὶ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ ἣ ἔπραξαν. Καὶ Γαλάταις δὲ γράφων ἔλεγε· Τεκνία μου, οὐς πάλιν ὠδίνω, ἄχρις οὗ μορφωθῇ Χριστὸς ἐν ὑμῖν. Καὶ ὑπὲρ τοῦ πεπορνευκότος ἄκουσον αὐτοῦ, πῶς οὐχ ἤττον ἐκείνου καὶ ὀδυνᾶται καὶ παρακαλεῖ λέγων· Κυρώσατε εἰς αὐτὸν ἀγάπην. Καὶ ἡνίκα δὲ αὐτὸν ἐξέκοπτε, μετὰ πολλῶν δακρύων τοῦτο ἐποίει. Ἐκ γὰρ πολλῆς θλίψεως, φησί, καὶ συνοχῆς καρδίας ἔγραψα ὑμῖν, οὐχ ἵνα λυπηθῆτε, ἀλλὰ ἵνα γνῶτε τὴν ἀγάπην, ἣν ἔχω [172] περισσοτέρως εἰς ὑμᾶς· καὶ πάλιν· Ἐγενόμην τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ὡς Ἰουδαῖος, τοῖς ὑπὸ νόμον ὡς ὑπὸ νόμον, τοῖς ἀσθενέσιν ὡς ἀσθενής, τοῖς πᾶσι γέγονα τὰ πάντα, ἵνα πάντως τινὰς σώσω· καὶ ἀλλαχοῦ πάλιν· Ἵνα παραστήσω πάντα ἄνθρωπον τέλειον ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.

9. Minus κύριε before ποιήσον; minus ἡμῖν after ποιήσον.

10. With ἄνθρωπος for ἀνὴρ.

11. As AP notes, John has introduced the Psalm text as though it were from Jeremiah, with no mention of a change of subject (AP 169 n. 3).

12. With δέ for γάρ after φοβοῦμαι.

13. With ἐπὶ τῇ ἀσελγείᾳ καὶ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ for ἐπὶ τῇ ἀκαθαρσίᾳ καὶ πορνείᾳ καὶ ἀσελγείᾳ.

14. With κυρώσατε for κυρώσαι.

15. With transposition of τὴν ἀγάπην and ἵνα γνῶτε.

16. With ellipses as marked; with τὰ πάντα for πάντα.

weighed against us, act for your own sake" (Jer 14:7),⁹ and then again, "*The way of a man does not belong to him, nor will someone go out walking and straighten out his path as he goes*" (Jer 10:23),¹⁰ and again somewhere else, "*Remember that we are dust*" (Ps 102:14).¹¹ For it's customary for those who make an appeal on behalf of sinners, even if they don't have any reasonable argument, to conceive of at least some shadow of an excuse. Even though it's not held to be accurate, nor is it able to be taken as credible, nevertheless the excuse gives consolation to those grieving over those who are perishing. Hence, let's not examine such excuses too carefully, either, but let's take up these statements in the recognition that they belong to a soul in pain who seeks to say something on behalf of those who've sinned.

3.5. [170] And was Paul like this only to Jews, but not to outsiders? No! He was gentler than all, toward both his own people and strangers. Accordingly, listen to what he says to Timothy: "*A servant of the Lord should not fight, but be gentle to all, skilled in teaching, forbearing, instructing with meekness those set against him, that perhaps God might grant them repentance for knowledge of the truth, and they might sober up from the snare of the devil, as they've been held captive by him to do his will*" (2 Tim 2:24–26). Do you want to see Paul and observe how he spoke to those who had sinned? Listen to what he said when writing to the Corinthians: "*I fear lest when I come, I might not find you to be as I wish*" (2 Cor 12:20),¹² and a little bit later, "*lest again my God might humble me when I come to you, and I shall mourn over many who have previously sinned and not repented for the licentiousness and impurity that they have practiced*" (2 Cor 12:21).¹³ Even writing to the Galatians, he said, "*my children, for whom I am in labor pains again, until Christ might be formed in you*" (Gal 4:19). And listen to him speaking about the man who had committed the sexual sin, how Paul was pained no less than he was and appealed, saying, "*Reaffirm love for him*" (2 Cor 2:8).¹⁴ And at the time when he cut the man off from the community (cf. 1 Cor 5), he did it with "*many tears*." "For," he says, "*from much affliction and distress of the heart, I wrote to you ... not so that you might be grieved but that you might know the love that I have [172] abundantly for you*" (2 Cor 2:4).¹⁵ And again, "*I became to the Jews as a Jew ... to those under the law as though under the law.... To the weak as though weak ... I have been all things to the whole lot of them, so that I might save some wholly*" (1 Cor 9:20–22).¹⁶ And elsewhere again, "*so that I might present every person as perfect in Christ Jesus*" (Col 1:28).¹⁷

17. With παραστήσω for παραστήσωμεν.

3.6. Εἶδες ψυχὴν ὑπερβαίνουσαν πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν; Πάντα ἄνθρωπον προσεδόκησε παραστῆσαι, καὶ τό γε αὐτοῦ μέρος, πάντας παρέστησε. Καὶ γὰρ ὥσπερ τὴν οἰκουμένην ἅπασαν γεννήσας αὐτός, οὕτως ἐθορυβεῖτο, οὕτως ἔτρεχεν, οὕτω πάντας ἐσπούδαζεν εἰσαγαγεῖν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν, θεραπεύων, παρακαλῶν, ὑπισχνούμενος, εὐχόμενος, ἰκετεύων, τοὺς δαίμονας φοβῶν, τοὺς διαφθείροντας ἐλαύνων, διὰ παρουσίας, διὰ γραμμάτων, διὰ ῥημάτων, διὰ πραγμάτων, διὰ μαθητῶν, δι' ἑαυτοῦ, τοὺς πίπτοντας ἀνορθῶν, τοὺς ἐστώτας στηρίζων, διεγείρων τοὺς χαμαὶ κειμένους, θεραπεύων τοὺς συντετριμμένους, ἀλείφων τοὺς ῥαθυμοῦντας, φοβερὸν ἐμβοῶν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἐχθροῖς, δριμύ βλέπων ἐπὶ τοῖς πολεμίοις· καθάπερ τις στρατηγὸς ἄριστος, αὐτὸς σκευοφόρος, αὐτὸς ὑπασπιστής, αὐτὸς προασπιστής, αὐτὸς παραστάτης, αὐτὸς πάντα γινόμενος τῷ στρατοπέδῳ.

3.7. [174] Καὶ οὐκ ἐν τοῖς πνευματικοῖς μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τοῖς σαρκικοῖς πολλὴν τὴν πρόνοιαν ἐπέδεικνυτο, πολλὴν τὴν σπουδὴν. Ἀκουσον γοῦν αὐτοῦ, πῶς ὑπὲρ μιᾶς γυναικὸς πρὸς ὀλόκληρον ἐπιστέλλει δῆμον λέγων· Συνίστημι δὲ ὑμῖν Φοίβην, τὴν ἀδελφὴν ἡμῶν, διάκονον οὖσαν τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἐν Κεγχρεαῖς, ἵνα προσδέξησθε αὐτὴν ἐν Κυρίῳ ἁξίως τῶν ἁγίων, καὶ παραστήτε αὐτῇ, ἐν ᾧ ἂν ὑμῶν πράγματι χρήζη· καὶ ἄλιν· Οἶδατε τὴν οἰκίαν Στεφανᾶ· ἵνα καὶ ὑμεῖς ὑποτάσσησθε τοῖς τοιούτοις· καὶ ἄλιν· Ἐπιγινώσκετε τοὺς τοιούτους. Καὶ γὰρ καὶ τοῦτο ἴδιον τῆς φιλοστοργίας τῶν ἁγίων, τὸ καὶ ἐν τούτοις βοηθεῖν. Οὕτω καὶ ὁ Ἐλισσαῖος τὴν ὑποδεξαμένην αὐτὸν γυναῖκα, οὐκ ἐν τοῖς πνευματικοῖς μόνον ὠφέλει, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τοῖς σαρκικοῖς ἐσπούδαζεν ἀμείβεσθαι· διὸ καὶ ἔλεγεν· Εἴ σοί τίς ἐστι λόγος πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα, ἢ πρὸς τὸν ἄρχοντα;

3.8. Καὶ τί θαυμάζεις, εἰ τὴν ἀπὸ τῶν γραμμάτων παρεῖχε σύστασιν ὁ Παῦλος, ὅπου γε καὶ καλῶν τινος πρὸς ἑαυτόν, οὐδὲ τοῦτο ἀνάξιον εἶναι ἐνόμισε, τὸ καὶ περὶ ἐφοδίων αὐτῶν φροντίσαι, καὶ καταθέσθαι αὐτὸ ἐν [176] ἐπιστολῇ; Καὶ γὰρ ἐπιστέλλων Τίτῳ φησί· Ζηνᾶν τὸν νομικὸν καὶ Ἀπολλῶ σπουδαίως πρόπεμψον, ἵνα μηδὲν αὐτοῖς λείπη. Εἰ δὲ παρατιθέμενος οὕτω σπουδαίως ἐξέπεμπε, πολλῷ μᾶλλον, εἴ που κινδυνεύοντας εἶδε, πάντα ἂν

18. HS reads τις στρατηγὸς [ῆ] ἄριστος [ιατρός], as is also in PG, but without brackets (which were removed already in ME and hence also in Mf and PE). Despite the presence of the longer reading in multiple manuscripts, AP 172–73 adopted the shorter reading, τις στρατηγὸς ἄριστος, as more contextually sensible (regarding the longer reading as a conflation of standard images such as Chrysostom uses elsewhere). The translation follows AP's text.

19. In the Greek text, substituting χρήζη for AP's χρήζη (with TLG).

20. With transpositions of οὖσαν and διάκονον; αὐτὴν and προσδέξησθε; χρήζη and πράγματι.

3.6. Have you seen the soul that traversed the whole earth? For he expected he could present every human being, and, for his part, he did present them all. For as though he himself had begotten the entire world, thus was he troubled, thus did he run about, thus was he zealous to lead all into the kingdom. He did so by healing, encouraging, promising, praying, supplicating, frightening the demons, driving off the corrupted, through his personal visits, through his letters, through his words, through his deeds, through his disciples, through his own self, picking up the fallen, strengthening those who were standing, raising those lying in the dirt, healing the downtrodden, goading on the slackers, casting threats at his enemies, keeping a sharp eye on his adversaries. Like some noble general,¹⁸ he himself carried baggage, he himself was the armor carrier, himself the shield bearer, himself the man on the flank, himself being all things for the army.

3.7. [174] And it wasn't only in spiritual matters but also in material ones that he demonstrated great forethought, great zeal. For instance, listen to how he wrote to a whole people about a single woman, saying, "*I recommend to you Phoebe, our sister, who is deacon of the assembly in Cenchreae, so that you might receive her in the Lord in a manner worthy of the saints, and provide her with whatever she might need¹⁹ from you*" (Rom 16:1–2).²⁰ And again, "*You know the house of Stephanas ... so that you be subjected to the authority of such as these*" (1 Cor 16:15–16). And again, "*Recognize such men*" (1 Cor 16:18). Giving assistance in these matters is the proper mark of the tender love the saints exhibited. Thus also, Elisha rendered service to the woman who gave him hospitality, not only in spiritual things, but he was zealous to compensate her in material goods also. That's why he said, "*Do you have any message for the king or for the ruler?*" (4 Kgdms 4:13).²¹

3.8. Why are you surprised if Paul was furnishing letters of recommendation, whereas even when summoning people to come to him he didn't consider it beneath his dignity to exert care for their travelling provisions and to set it down in **[176]** a letter? For when he wrote to Titus, he said: "*Be zealous to send Zenas the lawyer and Apollos on their way fitly equipped, so that they might lack nothing*" (Titus 3:13). And if he exerted such zeal in recommending those whom he sent out on a journey, how much more so would he do everything possible if he saw people anywhere in danger. For

21. With Εἴ σοί τις ἐστὶ λόγος for εἰ ἔστιν λόγος σοι (though with variation in the manuscripts, as AP indicates).

ἔπραξεν. Ὅρα γοῦν καὶ πρὸς τὸν Φιλήμονα ἐπιστέλλων, διὰ Ὀνήσιμον πόσῃ ποιεῖται σπουδὴν, καὶ πῶς συνετῶς, πῶς κηδεμονικῶς ἐπιστέλλει. Ὁ δὲ ὑπὲρ ἑνὸς οἰκέτου, καὶ ταῦτα φυγάδος γεγεννημένου, καὶ ὑφελομένου πολλὰ τῶν δεσποτικῶν, ὁλόκληρον μὴ παραιτησάμενος συνθεῖναι ἐπιστολὴν, ἐννόησον ἡλίκος περὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ἦν. Καὶ γὰρ ἐν μόνον αἰσχύνης ἄξιον ἐνόμιζεν εἶναι, τό, δέον γενέσθαι τι πρὸς σωτηρίαν, παριδεῖν. Διὰ τοῦτο πάντα ἐκίνει, καὶ οὐδὲν ὠκνεῖ δαπανᾶν ὑπὲρ τῶν σωζομένων, οὐ ῥήματα, οὐ χρήματα, οὐ σῶμα· ὁ γὰρ μυριάκις ἑαυτὸν θανάτοις ἐκδούς, πολλῶ μᾶλλον οὐδὲ χρημάτων ἐφείσατο, εἴ γε παρῆν. Καὶ τί λέγω, εἴ γε παρῆν; Καὶ γὰρ μὴ παρόντων δυνατὸν δείξαι, ὅτι οὐκ ἐφείσατο. Καὶ μὴ νομίσης αἰνιγμα εἶναι τὸ ῥῆμα, ἀλλ' αὐτοῦ πάλιν ἄκουσον γράφοντος Κορινθίους· Ἥδιστα δαπανήσω, καὶ ἐκδαπανηθήσομαι ὑπὲρ τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν. Καὶ Ἐφεσίους δὲ δημηγορῶν ἔλεγεν· Αὐτοὶ οἴδατε ὅτι [178] ταῖς χρεαῖαις μου καὶ τοῖς οὖσι μετ' ἐμοῦ ὑπηρετήσαν αἱ χεῖρες αὐτά.

3.9. Καὶ ὦν μέγας, ἐν τῷ κεφαλαίῳ τῶν ἀγαθῶν, τῇ ἀγάπῃ, φλογὸς πάσης σφοδρότερος ἦν· καὶ καθάπερ σίδηρος εἰς πῦρ ἐμπεσών, ὅλος γίνεται πῦρ, οὕτω καὶ αὐτὸς τῷ πυρὶ τῆς ἀγάπης ἀναφθείς, ὅλος γέγονεν ἀγάπῃ· καὶ ὥσπερ κοινὸς πατὴρ τῆς οἰκουμένης ἀπάσης ὦν, οὕτω τοὺς γεγεννηκότας αὐτοὺς ἐμιμεῖτο· μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ πάντας ὑπερηκόντισε πατέρας, καὶ σωματικῶν καὶ πνευματικῶν ἔνεκεν φροντίδων, καὶ χρήματα, καὶ ῥήματα, καὶ σῶμα, καὶ ψυχὴν, καὶ πάντα ἐπιδίδους ὑπὲρ τῶν ἡγαπημένων. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ πλήρωμα αὐτὴν ἐκάλει νόμου, καὶ σύνδεσμον τελειότητος, καὶ μητέρα τῶν ἀγαθῶν πάντων, καὶ ἀρχὴν καὶ τέλος ἀρετῆς· διὸ καὶ ἔλεγε· Τὸ δὲ τέλος τῆς ἐπαγγελίας ἀγάπῃ ἐκ καθαρᾶς καρδίας, καὶ συνειδήσεως ἀγαθῆς· καὶ πάλιν· Τὸ γάρ, οὐ μοιχεύσεις, οὐ φονεύσεις, καὶ εἴ τις ἐτέρα ἐντολή, ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ ἀνακεφαλαιοῦται, ἐν τῷ· Ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου ὡς σεαυτὸν.

3.10. Ἐπεὶ οὖν ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλος καὶ πάντα τὰ ἀγαθὰ ἡ ἀγάπῃ, καὶ ταύτῃ τὸν Παῦλον ζηλώσωμεν· καὶ γὰρ οὗτος ἐντεῦθεν τοιοῦτος ἐγένετο. Μὴ γάρ μοι τοὺς νεκροὺς εἴπῃς οὓς ἀνέστησε, μηδὲ τοὺς λεπροὺς οὓς ἐκάθηρεν· [180] οὐδὲν τούτων ὁ Θεὸς ἐπιζητήσει παρὰ σοῦ. Κτῆσαι τὴν ἀγάπην τὴν

22. On Chrysostom's view of Onesimus, see p. 566 n. 44 above.

23. With οἴδατε for γινώσκετε.

24. In wording these last two allusions are very close to quotations.

25. With ἐπαγγελίας for παραγγελίας; translation of ἐπαγγελία here as roughly synonymous, with LSJ A.

26. John is addressing the implied πρόβλημα introduced by a hypothetical interlocutor, who complains that they cannot possibly imitate Paul since he had the power

example, see how he wrote a letter to Philemon, exercising such great zeal on behalf of Onesimus. See how intelligently, how carefully, he writes! Now the man who did not beg off from composing an entire epistle for a single household slave—and at that, one who had run away and absconded with many of his master's belongings²²—just imagine how magnanimous he was when it came to others. For he considered only one thing to be worthy of shame: overlooking anything necessary for salvation. This is why he was always on the move and didn't hesitate to expend anything on behalf of those being saved, neither words, nor money, nor body. Surely the man who repeatedly gave himself over to death all the more wouldn't spare his possessions if such were present. And why do I say, "if such were present"? For indeed, it's possible to prove that he didn't spare even things that were not present. Now don't think this is a riddle, but listen again to him writing to the Corinthians: "*With greatest pleasure I shall spend, and I shall be expended on behalf of your souls*" (2 Cor 12:15). And as he said in his speech to the Ephesians, "*You yourselves know that [178] these hands served for my needs and those of the people with me*" (Acts 20:34).²³

3.9. Paul was so great in love, the chief of the virtues, that he was more fervently ardent than any flame. And just as iron when it lands in fire becomes completely fire, so also Paul, ignited with the fire of love, has become completely love. As though a common father of the whole world, thus he served as a representative of the very human beings he had begotten. And yet, however, he outdid all fathers in caring for both bodily and spiritual needs, giving everything—money and words and body and soul—on behalf of those he loved. For this reason, he called it the fullness of the law (cf. Rom 13:10), the bond of perfection (cf. Col 3:14),²⁴ the mother of all good things, and the beginning and end of virtue. Hence he also says, "*The goal of the command is love from a pure heart and a good conscience*" (1 Tim 1:5);²⁵ and again, "*For 'You shall not commit adultery,' 'You shall not murder' ... and any other commandment is summed up in 'You shall love your neighbor as yourself'*" (Rom 13:9).

3.10. Therefore, since love is the beginning and end and sum total of the virtues, let's zealously imitate Paul in this, because it was from love that he became such as he was. Now don't speak to me of the dead he raised (cf. Acts 20:7–12), or the lepers he cleansed (cf. Acts 19:11–12).²⁶ **[180]** God won't demand any of these things from you. Acquire the love of Paul, and

to do miracles that others lack. John's λύσις is that it was not supernatural powers that made Paul such as he was but love—something all people can attain.

Παύλου, καὶ τὸν στέφανον ἔξεις ἀπηρτισμένον. Τίς ταῦτά φησιν; Αὐτὸς ὁ τῆς ἀγάπης τροφεύς, οὗτος ὁ καὶ σημείων καὶ θαυμάτων καὶ μυρίων αὐτὴν ἐτέρων προθείς. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ σφόδρα αὐτὴν κατωρθώκει, διὰ τοῦτο καὶ μετὰ ἀκριβείας αὐτῆς οἶδε τὴν ἰσχύν. Ἐντεῦθεν καὶ αὐτὸς τοιοῦτος ἐγένετο, καὶ οὐδὲν οὕτως αὐτὸν ἐποίησεν ἄξιον, ὥς ἡ τῆς ἀγάπης δύναμις· διὸ καὶ ἔλεγε· Ζηλοῦτε τὰ χαρίσματα τὰ κρείττονα· καὶ ἔτι καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ὁδὸν ὑμῖν δείκνυμι, τὴν ἀγάπην λέγων, τὴν καλλίστην ὁδὸν καὶ ῥαδίαν. Ταύτην τοίνυν καὶ ἡμεῖς βαδίζωμεν διηνεκῶς, ἵνα καὶ Παῦλον ἴδωμεν, μᾶλλον δὲ τὸν Παύλου Δεσπότην, καὶ τῶν ἀκηράτων ἐπιτύχωμεν στεφάνων, χάριτι καὶ φιλανθρωπίᾳ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ᾧ ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος νῦν καὶ αἰεὶ καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Ἀμήν.

you'll have a crown of perfection. Who says these things? The very foster father of love²⁷ himself, this man who placed love above signs and marvels and countless other things. Since Paul succeeded so surpassingly in love, for this reason he knows precisely its power. He became such as he was from this; nothing made him so worthy as the power of love. Hence, he said, "*Be zealous for the greater spiritual gifts; and I am showing you a still more superlative way*" (1 Cor 12:31),²⁸ meaning that love is the most excellent and easiest way. So now, let's also continually walk the walk of love, so that we might see Paul—or, rather, Paul's Lord—and attain the undefiled crowns, by the grace and loving-kindness of our Lord Jesus Christ, to whom be the glory and the power, now and always, and forever and ever. Amen.

27. ὁ τῆς ἀγάπης τροφεύς; see HT 87 n. 140 on this epithet for Paul in Chrysostom.

28. Minus δέ after ζηλοῦτε.

Τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐγκώμιον εἰς τὸν ἅγιον ἀπόστολον Παῦλον, λόγος δ'.

4.1. [182] Ὁ μακάριος Παῦλος, ὁ τήμερον ἡμᾶς συναγαγὼν καὶ τὴν οἰκουμένην φωτίσας, οὗτος ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τῆς κλήσεως ἐτυφλώθη ποτέ· ἀλλ' ἢ πῆρως ἐκείνου φωτισμὸς γέγονε τῆς οἰκουμένης. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἔβλεπε κακῶς, ἐπῆρwsεν αὐτὸν καλῶς ὁ Θεός, ὥστε ἀναβλέψαι χρησίμως, ὁμοῦ μὲν τῆς ἐαυτοῦ δυνάμεως ἀπόδειξιν αὐτῷ παρεχόμενος, ὁμοῦ δὲ ἐν τῷ πάθει τὰ μέλλοντα προδιατυπῶν, καὶ τοῦ κηρύγματος τὸν τρόπον διδάσκων, καὶ ὅτι ταῦτα πάντα οἶκοθεν ἀποβαλόντα, καὶ μύσαντα καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς, αὐτῷ πανταχοῦ ἔπεσθαι χρή. Διὸ καὶ αὐτὸς ἐβόα τοῦτο αὐτὸ δηλῶν· Εἴ τις δοκεῖ σοφὸς εἶναι ἐν ὑμῖν, γενέσθω μωρός, ἵνα γένηται σοφός· ὥς οὐκ ἐνὸν ἀναβλέψαι καλῶς, μὴ πρότερον πηρωθέντα καλῶς, καὶ τοὺς οἰκείους καὶ ταρατ-[184] τοντας αὐτὸν ἐκβαλόντα λογισμούς, καὶ τῇ πίστει τὸ πᾶν ἐπιτρέψαντα.

4.2. Ἀλλὰ μηδεὶς ταῦτα ἀκούων ἡναγκασμένην νομιζέτω εἶναι ταύτην τὴν κλῆσιν· καὶ γὰρ ἐδύνατο πάλιν ἐπανελθεῖν, ὅθεν ἐξέβη. Πολλοὶ γοῦν ἕτερα μείζονα θαύματα ἰδόντες, ὑπέστρεψαν πάλιν, καὶ ἐν τῇ Καινῇ, καὶ ἐν τῇ Παλαιᾷ· οἷον ὁ Ἰούδας, ὁ Ναβουχοδονόσορ, ὁ Ἑλύμας ὁ μάγος, ὁ Σίμων, ὁ Ἀνανίας καὶ ἡ Σάπφειρα, ὅλος τῶν Ἰουδαίων ὁ δῆμος· ἀλλ' οὐχ ὁ Παῦλος. Ἀλλὰ διαβλέψας πρὸς τὸ ἀκήρατον φῶς τὸν δρόμον ἐπέτεινε, καὶ πρὸς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἵπτατο. Εἰ δὲ ἐξετάξεις τίς ἐνεκεν ἐπηρώθη, ἄκουε αὐτοῦ

1. Text: as indicated in the introduction (pp. 62–64), we reprint the Greek text of Auguste Piédagnel (AP) SC 300 (1982) for each of the seven homilies *De laudibus sancti Pauli*. The footnotes within the translations on *Laud. Paul.* 1.14; 3.6; 4.15; 4.16; 5.3; 5.7; 6.5; 6.11; and 7.2 document the nine places where Piédagnel's text (AP) diverges from HS. The translation and notes do not attempt a comprehensive assessment of the variants in the textual tradition of *Laud. Paul.*; readers should consult the Piédagnel edition for a full *apparatus criticus*. Translation: This translation is replicated from HT 458–67, with some minor adjustments; see HT 212–26 for an analysis of the argument of this homily. Provenance: this is the only one of the seven homilies *De laudibus sancti Pauli* that seems clearly situated at Antioch, because of the reference to the

Hom. 4 De laudibus sancti Pauli apostoli
CPG 4344 (SC 300:182–228)¹

In praise of saint Paul the apostle by the same author, homily 4.

4.1. [182] The blessed Paul, the one who brought us together today and illuminated the world, this man was blinded at the time of his call (cf. Acts 9:8–19). But his blinding has become the enlightenment of the world! For since he saw malevolently, God rightly blinded him so that he might see again usefully. In that one stroke, God both provided Paul a proof of his own power and prefigured his future in suffering. In this way, God taught him the manner in which the gospel was to be preached: that it was necessary for Paul to cast off all that was his own, shut his eyes, and follow him everywhere. Hence, Paul himself, conveying this very message, declared: “*If anyone among you thinks they are wise, let them become foolish, so that they might become wise*” (1 Cor 3:18).² In fact, it’s not possible to see again rightly if one hasn’t formerly been beneficently blinded, [184] cast off the reasonings that were troubling them, and turned completely to the faith.

4.2. But let no one on hearing these things think that this call was a matter of compulsion,³ for he was able to return again to the way from which he’d come. Indeed, many, after seeing other, greater marvels, turned back again, both in the New and in the Old Testament—for example, Judas, Nebuchadnezzar, Elymas the magician, Simon, Ananias and Sapphira, the entire Jewish people. But not Paul. He, after gazing upon the undefiled light, intensified his course and flew toward heaven. And if you want to know the reason he was blinded, listen to him saying, “*For you have heard*

temple of Apollo there in 4.6 (AP 192) and other local events (so Mayer, *Provenance*, 312, 511, who includes it among the homilies that in her judgment can be located with certainty.

2. Minus ἐν τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ; transposition of μωρός and γενέσθω.

3. The implied πρόβλημα is that the heavenly call could entail that Paul was acting under divine compulsion and thus was unlike human beings with free will.

λέγοντος· Ἦκούσατε γὰρ τὴν ἐμὴν ἀναστροφήν ποτε ἐν τῷ Ἰουδαϊσμῷ, ὅτι καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ἐδίωκον τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν καὶ ἐπόρθουν αὐτήν, καὶ προέκοπτον ἐν τῷ Ἰουδαϊσμῷ ὑπὲρ πολλοὺς συνηλικιώτας ἐν τῷ γένει μου, περισσοτέρως ζηλωτῆς ὑπάρχων τῶν πατρικῶν μου παραδόσεων. Ἐπεὶ οὖν οὕτω σφοδρὸς ἦν καὶ ἀπρόσιτος, σφοδροτέρου ἐδεῖτο χαλινοῦ, ἵνα μὴ τῇ ῥύμῃ τῆς προθυμίας ἀγόμενος, καὶ παρακούσῃ τῶν λεγομένων. Διὰ δὲ τοῦτο καταστέλλων αὐτοῦ τὴν μανίαν ἐκείνην, πρῶτον κατευνάζει τὰ κύματα τῆς ῥαγδαίας ὀργῆς ἐκείνης διὰ τῆς πηρώσεως, καὶ τότε αὐτῷ διαλέγεται, δεικνὺς τῆς σοφίας [186] αὐτοῦ τὸ ἀπρόσιτον, καὶ τὸ τῆς γνώσεως ὑπερέχον, καὶ ἵνα μάθῃ τίνα πολεμεῖ, ὃν οὐ μόνον κολάζοντα, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ εὐεργετοῦντα δύναται ἐνεγκεῖν. Οὐ γὰρ σκότος αὐτὸν ἐπήρωσεν, ἀλλ' ὑπερβολὴ φωτὸς αὐτὸν ἐσκότησε.

4.3. Καὶ τί δήποτε μὴ ἐξ ἀρχῆς τοῦτο ἐγένετο, φησί; Μὴ ζῆτει τοῦτο, μηδὲ περιεργάζου, ἀλλὰ παραχώρει τῷ ἀκαταλήπτῳ τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ προνοίας τοῦ καιροῦ τὴν ἐπιτηδεΐότητα. Καὶ γὰρ καὶ αὐτὸς τοῦτο ποιεῖ λέγων· “Ὅτε δὲ εὐδόκησεν ὁ ἀφορίσας με ἐκ κοιλίας μητρός μου, καὶ καλέσας διὰ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ ἀποκαλύψαι τὸν Υἱὸν αὐτοῦ ἐν ἐμοί. Οὐκοῦν καὶ σὺ μηδὲν περιεργάζου πλέον, ὅταν Παῦλος τοῦτο λέγῃ. Τότε γάρ, τότε συνέφερε τῶν σκανδάλων ἀρθέντων ἐκ μέσου. Λοιπὸν ἀπὸ τούτου μάθωμεν, ὅτι οὐδεὶς οὐδαμῶς οὐδὲ τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ, οὐδὲ αὐτὸς οἴκοθεν αὐτὸν εὗρεν, ἀλλ' ὁ Χριστὸς ἑαυτὸν ἐφάνέρωσε. Διὸ καὶ ἔλεγεν· Οὐχ ὑμεῖς με ἐξελέξασθε, ἀλλ' [188] ἐγὼ ἐξελεξάμην ὑμᾶς. Ἐπεὶ τίνας ἔνεκεν ὁρῶν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ ἀνισταμένους νεκρούς, οὐκ ἐπίστευσεν; Ὅρῶν γὰρ χωλὸν βαδίζοντα, καὶ δαίμονας δραπετεύοντας, καὶ παραλυτικούς σφιγγομένους, οὐδὲν ἐκαρποῦτο· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἡγνῶει ταῦτα ὁ οὕτω περιεργαζόμενος τοὺς ἀποστόλους. Καὶ Στεφάνου δὲ λιθαζομένου, παρὼν καὶ ἰδὼν τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ ὡς πρόσωπον ἀγγέλου, οὐδὲν ἐντεῦθεν ἐκέρδανε. Πῶς οὖν οὐδὲν ἐντεῦθεν ἐκέρδανεν; Ὅτι οὐδέπω ἦν κεκλημένος.

4. Translating Ἰουδαϊσμός here as John understands it. For the historical-epistolary Paul (who was writing before there was any split between “Judaism” and “Christianity”), I would translate the sense less anachronistically as “in the Jewish way of life.”

5. Minus τοῦ θεοῦ after τὴν ἐκκλησίαν.

6. Another possible problem—the timing of the divine plan. John first dismisses the question, but then seeks to answer it in what follows as involving both divine intent and human cooperation.

7. On this usage of περιεργάζομαι for bad forms of curiosity in Chrysostom, see AP 186 n. 3; Astruc-Morize and Le Boulluc, “Le sens caché des Écritures,” 7.

8. The καιρός, as the “time,” “moment,” or “occasion” on which that larger theodicy question will be answered. The preacher deflects the answer to the question of divine timing to another occasion, imputing both the action in the past and the revelation of its answer to the same divine providence, ἡ τοῦ Θεοῦ πρόνοια.

about my behavior then in Judaism,⁴ that I was persecuting the church to the highest degree and trying to lay it waste, and I was advancing in Judaism beyond many of the peers in my race, being as I was exceedingly zealous for my ancestral traditions” (Gal 1:13–14).⁵ Therefore, since Paul was so severe and unapproachable, he stood in need of a bridle that was even more severe, lest, led by the strength of his will, he might misunderstand what was said. That’s why, forestalling Paul’s mania, God first calms the waves of his ferocious wrath by blinding him, and then he speaks to him. In this way, he demonstrates [186] the unapproachability of his wisdom and the superiority of his knowledge. God did this so that Paul might learn who it was he was fighting against—a God whom he could not withstand, not only in punishments but even in kindnesses. For darkness didn’t blind Paul, but the superabundance of light cast him into darkness.

4.3. But one might say, “Well, why in the world didn’t this happen at the beginning?”⁶ Don’t seek an answer to this, nor be so meddlesomely curious⁷ about it, but leave the suitable time⁸ to the incomprehensibility of God’s providence. For even Paul himself does this, saying, “*but when God, who set me apart from my mother’s womb and called me through his grace, thought it well to reveal his son in me*” (Gal 1:15–16). Now, indeed, when Paul says this, don’t you be any more curious about it. Because that moment, that very moment, was the advantageous one, when stumbling blocks had been thrown from his path. Then from this let’s learn that no one ever, not even those who preceded him, nor Paul himself, found Christ on his own, but Christ revealed himself. Hence, he said, “*You did not choose me, but [188] I chose you*” (John 15:16). Yet why was it that when Paul saw the dead raised by Jesus’s name, he didn’t believe? For although he saw a lame man walking (cf. Acts 3:1–10), demons running away (cf. Acts 5:16; 8:7), and paralytics strengthened (cf. Acts 8:7)—for no one who was so curious about the apostles could’ve been ignorant of these things—Paul bore no fruit from it? Even when Stephen was pelted with stones, and he was present and saw his face, “*like the face of an angel*” (Acts 6:15),¹⁰ Paul gained no benefit from that either. But how could he have gained any benefit from it—because he had not yet been called.

9. Or, “to me” (ἐν ἐμοί).

10. With ὡς for ὡσεύ.

4.4. Σὺ δὲ ἀκούων ταῦτα, μὴ ἀναγκαστὴν τὴν κλῆσιν εἶναι νόμιζε· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀναγκάζει ὁ Θεός, ἀλλ' ἀφίησι κυρίους εἶναι προαιρέσεων καὶ μετὰ τὴν κλῆσιν. Καὶ γὰρ Ἰουδαίοις ἀπεκάλυψεν ἑαυτὸν καὶ ὅτε ἐχρῆν, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἠθέλησαν δέξασθαι διὰ τὴν δόξαν τὴν παρὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων. Εἰ δὲ λέγοι τις τῶν ἀπίστων, πόθεν δῆλον ὅτι Παῦλον ἐκάλεσεν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ ἐπείσθη; διὰ τί γὰρ μὴ καὶ ἐμὲ ἐκάλεσεν; ἐκεῖνο πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐροῦμεν· πιστεύεις τοῦτο, εἰπέ μοι ὅλως, ὦ ἄνθρωπε; Οὐκοῦν εἰ πιστεύεις, ἀρκεῖ σοι εἰς σημεῖον. Εἰ μὲν γὰρ ἀπιστεῖς ὅτι ἐκάλεσεν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, πῶς λέγεις, διὰ τί μὴ καὶ ἐμὲ ἐκάλεσεν; εἰ δὲ [190] πιστεύεις ὅτι ἐκάλεσεν, ἀρκεῖ σοι τοῦτο εἰς σημεῖον. Πίστευε τοίνυν· καὶ γὰρ καὶ σὲ καλεῖ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ, ἐὰν ψυχὴν εὐγνώμονα ἔχῃς· ὡς ἐὰν ἀγνώμων ᾖ καὶ διεστραμμένος, οὐδὲ τὸ ἐνεχθῆναι σοι φωνὴν ἄνωθεν ἀρκέσει εἰς σωτηρίαν.

4.5. Ποσάκις γοῦν ἤκουσαν οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι φωνῆς ἐξ οὐρανοῦ φερομένης, καὶ οὐκ ἐπίστευσαν; πόσα εἶδον σημεῖα, καὶ ἐν τῇ Καινῇ, καὶ ἐν τῇ Παλαιᾷ, καὶ οὐκ ἐγένοντο βελτίους; Ἄλλ' ἐν μὲν τῇ Παλαιᾷ, οὗτοι μετὰ μυρία θαύματα ἐμοσχοποίησαν· ἡ δὲ Ἰερικουντία πόρνη μηδὲν τούτων θεασαμένη πίστιν ἐπεδείξατο θαυμαστὴν περὶ τοὺς κατασκόπους. Καὶ ἐν τῇ γῇ δὲ τῆς ἐπαγγελίας οὗτοι μὲν, τῶν σημεῖων γινομένων, ἔμενον λίθων ἀναισθητότεροι· οἱ δὲ Νινευῖται τὸν Ἰωάνν θεασάμενοι μόνον, ἐπίστευσαν καὶ μετενόησαν, καὶ τὴν θεήλατον ὁργὴν ἀπεκρούσαντο. Ἐν δὲ τῇ Καινῇ, ἐπ' αὐτῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ τῆς παρουσίας, ὁ μὲν ληστής σταυρούμενον ἰδὼν, προσεκύνησεν· οὗτοι δὲ νεκροὺς ἐγείροντα θεασάμενοι, καὶ ἔδῃσαν καὶ ἐσταύρωσαν.

4.6. Τί δὲ ἐφ' ἡμῶν; Οὐχὶ πῦρ ἐκ τοῦ ναοῦ, ἐκ τῶν θεμελίων τῶν ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ἐκπηδῆσαν ἐφῆλατο τοῖς οἰκο-[192]δομοῦσι, καὶ οὕτως αὐτοὺς

11. Repeating the potential “problem” from 4.2.

12. John poses the “problem” as coming from unbelievers (ἄπιστοι) who deny Paul’s divine calling. This may well be rooted in social reality of back-and-forth banter between residents in Antioch—such as we see in *Hom. Rom.* 16:3 B §1 (PG 51:197) on p. 214 n. 27 above—for which Chrysostom seeks to arm his congregants with answers. But also (and simultaneously) this is a way for Chrysostom to position any insider skepticism as aligning itself with outsiders.

13. Chrysostom advises that this speech include a countercharge of inconsistency against the “unbelieving” interlocutor.

14. By this selective catalogue (perhaps inspired first by Acts 7), Chrysostom compiles a brief history of “Jews” as always disbelieving, a stock piece of his (and other ancient Christian authors’) anti-Judaistic rhetoric.

15. To set up this charged rhetorical comparison, Chrysostom relies on something not specified in the text of Luke about the good thief: that he was a gentile, not a Jew.

16. ἐφ' ἡμῶν means “nearer to us” in both chronological and geographical terms. In what follows, Chrysostom refers to eight events during the time emperor Julian

4.4. Now, when you hear these things, don't think that the call was compulsory.¹¹ God doesn't compel, but allows people to be masters of their own choices even after the call. For he revealed himself to Jews when it was useful, but they didn't wish to receive it, on account of their love for the glory that comes from human beings (cf. 1 Thess 2:6; John 12:43). Now, what if one of the unbelievers should say,¹² "How do we know that God called Paul from heaven and he was persuaded? Why didn't he call me, too?" You'll say to him: "Do you believe this? Tell me completely, man! Very well, if you do believe, then this is a sufficient sign for you. But if you don't believe that God called him from heaven, then how is it you say, 'Why didn't he call me, too?'"¹³ On the other hand, if [190] you believe that he called, then this is a sufficient sign for you. So then, believe, for God calls you from heaven, if you have a right-minded soul. But if you're senseless and twisted, then not even a voice borne to you from above will suffice for salvation."

4.5. How often did the Jews hear a voice borne from heaven, and they didn't believe? How many signs did they see, in both the New and in the Old Testament, and they weren't improved?¹⁴ But in the Old Testament, the Jews, after seeing countless wonders, made the golden calf (cf. Exod 32:4), whereas the prostitute of Jericho, who had seen none of these things, showed a marvelous faith in the matter of the spies (cf. Josh 2:1–24). And in the land of the promise, although miracles were taking place, they remained more unperceiving than stones, whereas the Ninevites, by just looking at Jonah, believed and repented and drove off the divine wrath (cf. Jonah 3:1–10). And in the New Testament, during the very appearance of Christ, the thief, when seeing him crucified, was reverent toward him (cf. Luke 23:39–43),¹⁵ whereas the Jews, after seeing him raise the dead, bound and crucified him.

4.6. But what about incidents nearer to us?¹⁶ Didn't fire from the temple, leaping out from the foundations in Jerusalem, attack the [192]

was resident in Antioch (from 18 July 362 to 5 March 363), each of which is attested in some form by Ammianus Marcellinus, Libanius, or Julian himself in his writings (but, of course, with different interpretations). This contested local history, carried out in forms of public oratory such as Julian's bitter satire, *Misopogon*, was of especially intense interest for Chrysostom's Antiochene audience; see Brändle, *John Chrysostom*, 13–15; Kelly, *Golden Mouth*, 8–10. In the present homily, Chrysostom argues that all these occurrences—(1) fire halting Julian's plan to rebuild the temple in Jerusalem; (2) the fire at the temple of Apollo in Daphne after the body of St. Babylas was removed from the precinct on Julian's orders; (3) the death of Julian's uncle; (4) the death of

ἀπέστησε τῆς παρανόμου τότε ἐπιχειρήσεως; ἀλλ' ὅμως οὐ μετεβάλοντο, οὐδὲ ἀπέθεντο τὴν πώρωσιν. Πόσα δὲ ἕτερα γέγονε μετ' ἐκεῖνο θαύματα τότε, καὶ οὐδὲν ἐντεῦθεν ἐκέρδαναν; οἷον ὁ κεραυνὸς ὁ κατὰ τῆς ὀροφῆς τοῦ ναοῦ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος κατενεχθεῖς· ὁ τοῦ δαίμονος αὐτοῦ τούτου χρησμός, ὃς τὸν τότε βασιλεύοντα ἠνάγκαζε μετακινεῖν τὸν πλησίον κείμενον μάρτυρα, λέγων· μὴ δύνασθαι φθέγγεσθαι, ἕως ἂν τὴν λάρνακα τὴν ἐκείνου βλέπῃ πλησίον· καὶ γὰρ ἐκ γειτόνων ἦν κειμένη. Μετὰ τοῦτον πάλιν, ὁ θεὸς ὁ τούτου εἰς τὰ ἱερά σκεύη ἐνυβρίσας, σκωληγόβρωτος γεγονὼς ἐξέψυξε· καὶ ὁ ταμίας δὲ τῶν βασιλικῶν χρημάτων δι' ἑτέραν παρανομίαν εἰς τὴν Ἐκκλησίαν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ γενομένην, μέσον λακίσας ἀπώλετο. Πάλιν αἱ πηγαὶ αἱ παρ' ἡμῖν, αἱ νικῶσαι [194] τῷ

Felix, the treasurer; (5) the polluted streams; (6) the famine; (7) the death of Julian; and (8) the succession of Jovian, a Christian emperor—were unmistakable signs of divine providence repudiating and ultimately removing the “pagan” emperor Julian (and all he represented). For discussion and documentation, see the valuable study of David B. Levenson, “The Ancient and Medieval Sources for the Emperor Julian’s Attempt to Rebuild the Jerusalem Temple,” *JSJ* 35 (2004): 409–60, esp. 418 n. 33, with references in Ammianus, Libanius, and Julian, and to six other places in Chrysostom’s oeuvre where this full schema, or an abbreviated version, is found. Ammianus Marcellinus also regards several of these events as *omina* or *signa*, portending that Julian’s military campaign against the Persians was fated to end in failure and his own death (*Res. ges.* 23.1.1–7).

17. Compare Ammianus Marcellinus, *Res. ges.* 23.1.1–3, who tells of Julian’s attempt to rebuild the Jerusalem temple with Alypius of Antioch as the director of the project; however, because “terrifying balls of flame kept bursting forth near the foundations of the temple” (“*metuendi globi flammarum prope fundamenta crebris assultibus erumpentes*”), the workmen couldn’t even approach to start the construction, and the plan was suspended (Rolfe, LCL). For full discussion see Levenson, “The Ancient and Medieval Sources for the Emperor Julian’s Attempt to Rebuild the Jerusalem Temple,” 416–18, who argues that Ammianus and Chrysostom both rely on the same Antiochene oral tradition.

18. For Chrysostom, fire—as a customary vehicle of divine punishment, both biblical and beyond—links the two events of the temple in Jerusalem and the temple of Apollo. See Robert J. Penella, “Fire Parallelisms in Some Christian Accounts of the Termination of Julian’s Attempt to Rebuild the Temple of Jerusalem,” in *Tria Lustra: Essays and Notes Presented to John Pinsent*, ed. H. D. Jocelyn and Helena Hunt, Liverpool Classical Papers 3 (Liverpool: Liverpool Classical Monthly, 1993), 71–74.

19. This is an abbreviated version of the long-form triumphal narratives Chrysostom composed in his *Bab.* (CPG 4347) and *Bab. Jul.* (CPG 4348). The central incidents include the relocation of the body of the third-century martyr St. Babylas into the sacred grove of Daphne and near the temple of Apollo by Julian’s brother Gallus, then emperor Julian’s order that it be removed from there as a part of his repristination of the cult, and then, right after the martyr’s body was removed, the fire that beset the

builders and thus turn them away from that lawless undertaking?¹⁷ Yet nevertheless, they weren't changed, nor did they lay aside their obtuseness. How many other marvels have happened after that one, and from them they've not benefitted at all? For example, there's the thunderbolt¹⁸ that fell down upon the roof of the temple of Apollo.¹⁹ It was the oracle of this very demon who had compelled the then-reigning emperor²⁰ to move the body of the martyr²¹ that was lying nearby, saying it couldn't speak as long as it saw the martyr's casket lying nearby (for it was situated in the neighborhood).²² Again, after this happened, the same emperor's uncle "became worm-eaten and expired" (cf. Acts 12:23) after he desecrated the holy vessels. And the treasurer of the imperial assets, on account of another lawless act committed by him against the church, "split open in the middle" and died (cf. Acts 1:18).²³ And again, the streams in our territory, which are more abundant [194] than rivers in their flow, all at once retreated and were diverted when the emperor was polluting the district with sacrifices

temple, 22 October, 362. (On the correspondence of *Laud. Paul.* 4 with those historical events see Mayer, *Provenance*, 462.) Chrysostom attributed the fire in the temple of Apollo to divine retribution, Julian to Christian arson (in response to which the Great Church in Antioch was closed), and others, as Ammianus Marcellinus reports, to sparks from unattended candles left at the temple by a pilgrim, the philosopher Asclepiades (*Res. ges.* 22.13.1–3).

20. I.e., Julian; in a customary form of invective, John intentionally does not use his name in this oration, though he does in a few other places, such as *Bab.* §1 (PG 50:529); *Adv. Jud.* 5.11; 6.2 (PG 48:900–901, 905).

21. I.e., Saint Babylas (see n. 19 above).

22. Daphne was a verdant suburb of Antioch (some five miles from the city) that featured a temple of Apollo built by Seleucus Nicator in the late fourth or early third century BCE, updated by Antiochus IV in the second century BCE, and renovated by Julian in 362 CE as part of his efforts to restore traditional cults. See Glanville Downey, *A History of Antioch in Syria from Seleucus to the Arab Conquest* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961), 82–86. For a spatial analysis of the Daphne incidents as remembered and consciously manipulated by Chrysostom and others to enshrine the control of Nicene party Christians in Antioch, see Shepardson, *Controlling Contested Places*, 58–91.

23. Ammianus Marcellinus also reports these deaths of prince Julian (emperor Julian's uncle) and Felix (treasurer) as bad omens in *Res. ges.* 23.1.4–5. (See also AP 193 n. 5; Levenson, "The Ancient and Medieval Sources for the Emperor Julian's Attempt to Rebuild the Jerusalem Temple," especially 418 n. 33 with further references.) In both cases John has cast the events in a scriptural idiom by employing near quotations for gruesome deaths from Acts to signal divine punishment and comeuppance. In the first instance (the emperor's uncle), it is from the death of Herod Agrippa I in 12:23

ρεύματι τοὺς ποταμούς, ἄθρόον ἔφυγον καὶ ἀπεπήδησαν, μηδέποτε τοῦτο παθοῦσαι πρότερον, ἀλλ' ὅτε θυσίαις καὶ σπονδαῖς τὸ χωρίον ἐμόλυνεν ὁ βασιλεὺς. Τί ἂν τις εἴποι τὸν λιμὸν τὸν πανταχοῦ τῆς οἰκουμένης μετὰ τοῦ βασιλέως ταῖς πόλεσι συνεμπεσόντα, αὐτοῦ τοῦ βασιλέως τὸν θάνατον, τὸν ἐν τῇ Περσῶν χώρα, τὴν πρὸ τοῦ θανάτου ἀπάτην, τὸ στρατόπεδον τὸ ἐν μέσοις ἀποληφθὲν τοῖς βαρβάροις, καθάπερ ἐν σαγῇ τινὶ καὶ δικτύοις, τὴν ἄνοδον ἐκεῖθεν τὴν θαυμαστὴν καὶ παράδοξον; Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ὁ μὲν ἀσεβὴς βασιλεὺς ἔπεσεν ἐλεεινῶς, ἕτερος δὲ εὐσεβὴς διεδέξατο, πάντα εὐθέως ἐλύετο τὰ δεινά· καὶ οἱ ἐν μέσοις εἰλημμένοι δικτύοις καὶ οὐδεμίαν οὐδαμῶθεν διέξοδον ἔχοντες στρατιῶται, τοῦ Θεοῦ λοιπὸν νεύσαντος, τῶν βαρβάρων ἀπαλλαγέντες μετὰ ἀσφαλείας ἐπανήσαν [196] ἀπάσης. Ταῦτα τίνα οὐχ ἱκανὰ ἐφελκύσασθαι πρὸς τὴν εὐσέβειαν;

4.7. Τὰ δὲ παρόντα οὐ πολλῶ τούτων θαυμαστότερα; οὐ σταυρὸς κηρύττεται, καὶ ἡ οἰκουμένη προστρέχει; οὐ θάνατος καταγγέλλεται ἐπονείδιστος, καὶ πάντες ἐπιπηδῶσι; μὴ γὰρ οὐκ ἐσταυρώθησαν μυριοί; μὴ γὰρ μετ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ οὐχὶ δύο λησται ἀνεσκολοπίσθησαν; μὴ γὰρ οὐκ ἐγένοντο πολλοὶ σοφοί; μὴ γὰρ οὐκ ἐγένοντο πολλοὶ δυνατοί; τίνος ὄνομά ποτε οὕτως ἐκράτησε; καὶ τί λέγω σοφοὺς καὶ δυνατοὺς; μὴ γὰρ οὐκ ἐγένοντο βασιλεῖς ἐπίδοξοι; τίς οὕτω περιεγένετο τῆς οἰκουμένης ἐν βραχεῖ χρόνῳ; Μὴ γὰρ μοι λέγε τὰς αἰρέσεις τὰς ποικίλας καὶ παντοδαπάς· πάντες γὰρ τὸν αὐτὸν Χριστὸν κηρύττουσιν, εἰ καὶ μὴ ὕγιῶς πάντες, ἐκεῖνον τὸν ἐν Παλαιστίνῃ

(σκληρόβρωτος γεγονὼς ἐξέψυξε for γενόμενος σκληρόβρωτος ἐξέψυξεν), and in the second (the treasurer), from the death of Judas in 1:18 (μέσον λακίσας ἀπώλετο, for ἐλάκησεν μέσος [καὶ ἐξεχύθη πάντα τὰ σπλάγχνα αὐτοῦ]).

24. Ammianus Marcellinus mentions a drought just after the burning of the temple of Apollo (*Res. ges.* 22.13.4). Downey, *A History of Antioch in Syria*, 383, says the onset of the drought predated Julian's arrival in Antioch, but Chrysostom wishes to link the natural event with sacrificial activity of the emperor. Although he mentions the drought also in *Bab.* §2 (PG 50:531), he does not there connect it explicitly with Julian's cultic sacrifices at Antioch (on which see AP 195 n. 2 with references) as he does here.

25. For one account of the battle, the wounding, and the noble death of Julian as a philosopher, see Ammianus Marcellinus, *Res. ges.* 25.3. For different identifications of the hand by which Julian was killed ("a Persian, a barbarian camp-follower, a Saracen, one of Julian's own soldiers," the latter later remembered as a Christian), see Glen W. Bowersock, *Julian the Apostate* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1978), 116–18. The meanings of Julian's death continued to be publicly debated in Antioch decades later; on the competing arguments of Libanius and Chrysostom, see Christine Shepardson, "Rewriting Julian's Legacy: John Chrysostom's *On Babylas* and Libanius's *Oration* 24," *Journal of Late Antiquity* 2 (2009): 129–68.

and libations, although this hadn't ever happened to them before.²⁴ And what might one say about the famine over the whole world that landed on the cities at the same time as the emperor, or the death of the emperor himself in the land of Persia,²⁵ the trick that occurred before his death,²⁶ the battalion intercepted in the midst of the barbarians as though with some dragnet or fishing seines, or the marvelous and incredible journey back from there? For when the impious emperor piteously fell, and another, a pious man, succeeded him,²⁷ all these horrible things immediately came undone. The soliders who had been taken in the midst of the nets and had no way out at all from any direction, when God finally assented, were set free from the barbarians and returned with complete safety. [196] Who wouldn't find these incidents a sufficient inducement to piety?

4.7. But what about present events—aren't they even more marvelous than these? Isn't the cross being preached and the world running toward it? Isn't death proclaimed to be a matter of reproach, and all are leaping to it? Yet weren't countless men crucified? Weren't two thieves impaled on crosses with Christ himself? Wasn't it the case that not many were wise? Not many were powerful (cf. 1 Cor 1:26)? And whose name so triumphed at that time? But why should I speak of the wise and powerful, for weren't there glorious emperors? Who has so prevailed over the whole world in a short time? Now don't mention to me the various and assorted heresies, for they all preach the same Christ, even if they all don't do it soundly. They all worship that man who was crucified in Palestine under Pontius Pilate.

26. ἡ πρὸ τοῦ θανάτου ἀπάτη. AP 195 n. 4 thinks this refers to unreliable omens Julian received; but it is much more likely a reference to tales of Julian being deceived by a Persian deserter to burn his fleet at Ctesiphon, a story repeated with relish as a source of ridicule by Christian authors like Ephraem the Syrian (*Hymns against Julian* 3.15) or Gregory Nazianzus (*Or.* 5.11–12). For a critical assessment of the full range of sources on the campaign, including this incident and the retreat that is mentioned next, and the historiographic puzzles they pose, see Neil McLynn, "The Persian Expedition," in *A Companion to Julian the Apostate*, ed. Hans-Ulrich Wiemer and Stefan Rebenich, Brill's Companions to the Byzantine World 5 (Leiden: Brill, 2020), 293–325, esp. 309–17 on "Smoke and Mirrors: Confusion at Ctesiphon"; and, more briefly, Bowersock, *Julian the Apostate*, 114–15.

27. Jovian, who reigned from June 363 to February 364, and revoked some of Julian's anti-Christian edicts. See Jan Willem Drijvers, "Jovian between History and Myth," in *Imagining Emperors in the Later Roman Empire*, ed. P. W. Burgersdijk and Alan J. Ross, Cultural Interactions in the Mediterranean 1 (Leiden: Brill, 2018), 234–56.

πάντες προσκυνοῦσι σταυρωθέντα, τὸν ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου. Ταῦτα οὖν οὐ δοκεῖ τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ σαφεστέραν ἔχειν ἀπόδειξιν τῆς φωνῆς ἐκείνης τῆς ἐξ οὐρανοῦ κατενεχθείσης; Διὰ τί γὰρ μηδεὶς οὕτω περιεγένετο βασιλεὺς ὡς οὗτος ἐκράτησε, καὶ ταῦτα μυρίων ὄντων τῶν [198] κωλυμάτων; καὶ γὰρ βασιλεῖς ἐπολέμησαν, καὶ τύραννοι παρετάξαντο, καὶ δῆμοι πάντες κατεξανέστησαν, καὶ τὰ ἡμέτερα ὅμως οὐκ ἡλαττοῦτο, ἀλλὰ καὶ μᾶλλον λαμπρότερα ἐγίνετο. Πόθεν οὖν, εἴπατέ μοι, ἡ τοσαύτη ἰσχὺς;

4.8. Μάγος ἦν, φησί. Μόνος οὖν οὗτος μάγος τοιοῦτος ἐγένετο. Πάντως ἡκούσατε, ὅτι καὶ παρὰ Πέρσαις καὶ Ἰνδοῖς πολλοὶ γεγόνασι μάγοι, καὶ εἰσιν ἔτι καὶ νῦν· ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ὄνομα αὐτῶν ἐστὶν οὐδαμοῦ. Ἀλλ' ὁ ἐκ Τυάνων, φησὶν, ἀπατεῶν ἐκεῖνος καὶ γόης, καὶ αὐτὸς ἔλαμψε. Ποῦ καὶ πότε; Ἐν μικρῷ μέρει τῆς οἰκουμένης, καὶ πρὸς βραχὺν χρόνον, καὶ ἐσβέσθη ταχέως καὶ ἀπώλετο, οὐκ Ἐκκλησίαν καταλιπὼν, οὐ λαόν, οὐκ ἄλλο τι τοιοῦτον οὐδέν. Καὶ τί λέγω μάγους καὶ γόητας τοὺς σβεσθέντας; πόθεν τὰ τῶν θεῶν ἐπαύθη πάντα, καὶ ὁ Δωδωναῖος, καὶ ὁ [200] Κλάριος, καὶ πάντα τὰ πονηρὰ ταῦτα ἐργαστήρια σιγαῖ καὶ ἐπεστομίσται;

4.9. Πόθεν οὖν οὐ τοῦτον μόνον τὸν σταυρωθέντα, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ ὅσα τῶν ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ σφαγέντων πεφρίκασιν δαίμονες; τίνας δὲ ἔνεκεν καὶ σταυρὸν ἀκούοντες ἀποπηδῶσι; Καὶ μὴν καταγελαῖν ἔδει· μὴ γὰρ λαμπρὸν καὶ ἐπίσημον ὁ σταυρός; Τοῦναντίον μὲν οὖν, αἰσχροὺς καὶ ἐπονείδιστον. Θάνατος γὰρ ἐστὶ καταδίκου· θάνατός ἐστιν ὁ κακῶν ἔσχατος, καὶ παρὰ Ἰουδαίους ἐπάρατος, καὶ παρὰ Ἑλλήσι βδελυκτός. Πόθεν οὖν αὐτὸν ἐδεδοίκεσαν δαίμονες; ἄρ' οὐκ ἀπὸ τῆς τοῦ σταυρωθέντος δυνάμεως; Εἰ γὰρ αὐτὸ καθ' ἑαυτὸ τὸ πρᾶγμα ἐδεδοίκεσαν, μάλιστα μὲν οὖν καὶ τοῦτο ἀνάξιον θεῶν· πλὴν πολλοὶ καὶ πρὸ αὐτοῦ καὶ μετ' αὐτὸν ἐσταυρώθησαν, καὶ μετ' αὐτοῦ δὲ δύο. Τί οὖν, εἰ εἴποι τις, ἐν ὀνόματι τοῦ ληστοῦ τοῦ σταυρωθέντος, ἢ τοῦ δεῖνος, ἢ τοῦ δεῖνος, φεύξεται ὁ δαίμων; Οὐδαμῶς, ἀλλὰ καὶ γελάσεται. Ἐὰν δὲ τὸν Ἰησοῦν προσθῇς τὸν Ναζωραῖον, καθάπερ ἀπὸ πυρός τινος φεύγουσι. Τί οὖν ἂν εἴποις; πόθεν ἐκράτησεν; ὅτι [202] πλάνος ἦν; Ἀλλ' οὐ τοιαῦτα αὐτοῦ τὰ παραγγέλματα· ἄλλως δέ, καὶ πλάνοι πολλοὶ γεγόνασιν. Ἀλλ' ὅτι μάγος; Ἀλλ' οὐ τοῦτο μαρτυρεῖ τὰ δόγματα· καὶ μάγων πολλὴ πολλακίς

28. As so often, one question leads to another. In this case, even if the activity of a kind of power is granted, what is its source?

29. Apollonius of Tyana (d. ca. 100), who was memorialized in the third-century work by Philostratus, *Vit. Apoll.*, which was in turn critiqued by Eusebius, *Hier.*, in the fourth. Eusebius implicitly acknowledges reasons for comparing Apollonius with Christ while seeking to refute the comparability of the two. Chrysostom's reference to this objection shows that contestation between Christ and Apollonius was still a live debate in his time.

Don't these events seem to be a clearer proof of his power than that voice borne from heaven? Why has no emperor prevailed in the way Christ has triumphed, even when there were countless [198] obstacles? For indeed, kings battled against it, tyrants drew themselves up for war, and whole peoples rose up against it; but nevertheless our cause wasn't diminished by these hindrances, but indeed it was becoming even more magnificent. From where then, tell me, does such a great power come?²⁸

4.8. "He was a magician," someone says. Well, then, he was the only magician who turned out like this! Surely, you've heard that among the Persians and the Indians there have been many magicians, and there are still some even now. But not even their name is recognized anywhere. "But what about the man from Tyana?"²⁹ someone says. "That man was a cheat and a charlatan, and he was renowned." Where, and when? In a tiny part of the world, and for a short time, then he was quickly snuffed out and perished, leaving behind neither a church nor a people, nor any other such thing. And why do I mention the magicians and charlatans whose lives have been snuffed out? From what power have all the cults of the gods ceased, both the one at Dodona and the one [200] at Claros,³⁰ and all these wicked workshops gone silent and been muzzled?

4.9. From what power, then, is it that demons shiver with fear, not only at the man who was crucified, but even at the bones of those slain on his behalf? Why is it that even at hearing the word "cross," they leap away? Surely this deserves derision. For is the cross magnificent and distinguished? No, on the contrary, it's shameful and reproachable, for it belongs to one condemned. This form of death is the worst of evils, accursed to Jews and abominable to Greeks (cf. 1 Cor 1:23). From where then comes the demons' great fear of it? Isn't it from the power of the one who was crucified? For if they feared the cross in itself, this especially would be unworthy of divine beings. After all, many people were crucified, both before and after Christ, and two along with him. What would happen, then, if someone should say, "in the name of the thief who was crucified," or some other such guy, or another? Will the demon flee? Certainly not, but it will even laugh! But if you add, "Jesus, the Nazarene," they flee as though from a fire. What then could you say? From where did Christ triumph? Was it because [202] he was a swindler? But his commands are not of that type, and besides, there have been many swindlers. Because he was a magician? But his doctrines don't bear witness to this. And there's always been a great

30. As Piédagnel notes (AP 200 n. 1), sanctuaries of Zeus and Apollo, respectively.

ἐγένετο φορά. Ἄλλ' ὅτι σοφός; Ἀλλὰ σοφοὶ πολλοὶ πολλάκις ἐγένοντο. Τίς οὖν οὕτως ἐκράτησεν; Οὐδείς οὐδέποτε, οὐδὲ κατὰ μικρὸν ἐγγύς.

4.10. Ὅθεν δῆλον ὅτι οὐκ ἐπειδὴ μάγος ἦν, οὐδὲ ὅτι πλάνος ἦν, ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ τούτων διορθωτής, καὶ θεία δύναμις τις καὶ ἄμαχος, διὰ τοῦτο καὶ αὐτὸς πάντων περιεγένετο, καὶ τῷ σκηνοποιῷ τούτῳ τοσαύτην ἐνέπνευσε δύναμιν, ὅσῃ αὐτὰ τὰ πράγματα μαρτυρεῖ. Ἄνθρωπος γὰρ ἐπ' ἀγορᾶς ἐστηκώς, περὶ δέρματα τὴν τέχνην ἔχων, τοσοῦτον ἴσχυσεν, ὥς καὶ Ῥωμαίους, καὶ Πέρσας, καὶ Ἰνδοὺς, καὶ Σκύθας, καὶ Αἰθίοπας, καὶ Σαυρομάτας, καὶ Πάρθους, καὶ Μήδους, καὶ Σαρακηνοὺς, καὶ ἅπαν ἀπλῶς τὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων γένος πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν ἐπαναγαγεῖν ἐν ἔτεσιν οὐδὲ ὅλοις τριάκοντα. Πόθεν οὖν, εἰπέ μοι, ὁ ἀγοραῖος, καὶ ἐπὶ ἐργαστηρίου ἐστηκώς, καὶ σμίλῃν μεταχειρίζων, καὶ αὐτὸς τοιαῦτα ἐφιλοσόφει, καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ἔπεισε, καὶ ἔθνη, καὶ πόλεις, καὶ χῶρας, οὐ λόγων ἰσχὺν [204] ἐπιδεικνύμενος, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸυναντίον ἅπαν, τὴν ἐσχάτην ἀμαθίαν ἀμαθὴς ὢν; Ἀκουσον γοῦν αὐτοῦ λέγοντος, καὶ οὐκ αἰσχυνομένου. Εἰ καὶ ιδιώτης τῷ λόγῳ, ἀλλ' οὐ τῇ γνώσει. Οὐ χρήματα κεκτημένος. Καὶ γὰρ καὶ τοῦτο αὐτὸς φησι. Μέχρι τῆς ἄρτι ὥρας καὶ πεινῶμεν, καὶ διψῶμεν, καὶ κολαφίζόμεθα. Καὶ τί λέγω χρήματα, ὅπου γε οὐδὲ τῆς ἀναγκαίας πολλάκις εὐπόρει τροφῆς, οὐδὲ ἱμάτιον περιβαλέσθαι εἶχεν; Ὅτι δὲ οὐδὲ ἐξ ἐπιτηδεύματος λαμπρὸς ἦν, καὶ τοῦτο ὁ μαθητὴς αὐτοῦ δείκνυσσι λέγων ὅτι. Ἐμείνει πρὸς Ἀκύλαν καὶ Πρίσκιλλαν διὰ τὸ ὁμότεχνον. ἦσαν γὰρ σκηνοποιοὶ τὴν τέχνην. Οὐκ ἀπὸ προγόνων ἐπίσημος. πῶς γάρ, τοιοῦτον ἐπιτηδεύμα ἔχων; Οὐκ ἀπὸ πατρίδος, οὐκ ἀπὸ ἔθνους. Ἀλλ' ὅμως ἐλθὼν εἰς [206] μέσον, καὶ φανεῖς μόνον, πάντα ἐτάραξε τὰ τῶν ἐναντίων, πάντα συνέχεε, καὶ καθάπερ πῦρ εἰς καλάμην ἐμπεσὼν καὶ χόρτον, οὕτω κατέκαυσε τὰ τῶν δαιμόνων, καὶ εἰς ἅπερ ἐβούλετο, πάντα μετέστησε.

4.11. Καὶ οὐ τοῦτο μόνον ἐστὶ τὸ θαυμαστόν, ὅτι αὐτὸς τοιοῦτος ὢν τοσαῦτα ἴσχυσεν, ἀλλ' ὅτι καὶ οἱ πλείους τῶν μαθητευομένων, πένητες, ιδιώται, ἀπαίδευτοι, λιμῷ συζῶντες, ἄσημοι καὶ ἐξ ἀσήμων. Καὶ ταῦτα καὶ αὐτὸς κηρύττει, καὶ οὐκ αἰσχύνεται λέγων αὐτῶν τὴν πενίαν, μᾶλλον δὲ οὐδὲ

31. After denying other possible solutions (magic, trickery), John repeats his solution to the question—the source of the power must be divine.

32. Also known as the Sarmatians.

33. John means here Christianity, which he regards as both the truthful teachings and the form of life.

34. Minus δὲ before καί.

35. With μέχρι for ἄχρι; minus καὶ γυμνιτεύομεν (by ellipsis).

36. I.e., Luke, the author of Acts.

load of magicians. Because he was a wise man? But there have often been many wise men. Who, then, ever triumphed like this? No one, ever, nor was anyone even the tiniest bit close.

4.10. From all this it's clear that it wasn't because he was a magician, or because he was a swindler, but because he was a reformer of these things and a divine and unconquerable power³¹—that's why he prevailed over all—and into this tentmaker Christ breathed such a large measure of power, as the facts themselves testify. Because a man standing in the marketplace, having a trade in skins, became so powerful that he led the entire human race—Romans, Persians, Indians, Scythians, Ethiopians, Sauromatians,³² Parthians, Medes, and Saracenes—singly to the truth, and in less than thirty years at that! From where was it, then, tell me, that the man who hung about the market, and stood in a workshop, and took in hand a knife, himself came to teach and practice such a great philosophy³³ and persuaded the others, even nations, both cities and countryside, [204] despite the fact that he did not display powerful eloquence but, to the utter contrary, was unlearned, to the lowest degree of poor learning? As evidence, hear him saying with no shame, “*even if I am unskilled in word, I am not in knowledge*” (2 Cor 11:6).³⁴ Nor had he acquired much money, for he himself even says: “*Until this very hour we hunger and thirst and are buffeted*” (1 Cor 4:11).³⁵ But why should I speak of money when he often didn't even have enough food to meet his basic needs, or have a garment in which to dress himself? He wasn't illustrious on account of his vocation, either, as his disciple³⁶ shows when he says he remained with Aquila and Priscilla “*because of the same trade ... for they were tentmakers by trade*” (Acts 18:3).³⁷ Neither was he distinguished by great ancestors. For how could he be, having such a trade? Nor was he distinguished by his native country or his people. But nevertheless, when he came into [206] the public eye and simply appeared, he threw everything pertaining to his adversaries into confusion, he encompassed all things, and, like fire falling into stubble and grass, he thus incinerated the demonic powers and changed everything into whatever he wished.

4.11. And it's not only marvelous that he, being as he was, had such great powers, but also that the majority of those he was instructing were poor, unskilled, uneducated, living in famine, undistinguished folk born of undistinguished stock. Paul himself proclaimed these facts and wasn't

37. With ellipsis of εἶναι ... εἰργάζετο after τὸ δμότεχνον, as marked in the translation.

προσαιτῶν ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν. Πορεύομαι γάρ, φησίν, εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ διακονῶν τοῖς ἁγίοις, καὶ πάλιν· Κατὰ μίαν σαββάτων ἕκαστος ὑμῶν τιθέτω παρ' ἑαυτῷ θησαυρίζων, ἵνα μὴ, ὅταν ἔλθω, τότε λογίαι γίνωνται. "Ὅτι δὲ καὶ τὸ πλεῖον αὐτῶν ἐξ ἰδιωτῶν συνειστέλει, Κορινθίοις ἐπιστέλλων, φησί· Βλέπετε τὴν κλῆσιν ὑμῶν, ὅτι οὐ πολλοὶ σοφοὶ κατὰ σάρκα· καὶ ὅτι ἐξ ἀσήμενων· Οὐ πολλοί, φησίν, εὐγενεῖς· καὶ οὐ μόνον οὐκ εὐγενεῖς, ἀλλὰ καὶ σφόδρα εὐτελεῖς. Καὶ γὰρ τὰ ἀσθενῆ, φησί, τοῦ κόσμου ἐξελέξατο ὁ Θεός, καὶ τὰ μὴ ὄντα, ἵνα τὰ ὄντα καταργήσῃ. Ἀλλ' ἰδιώτης μὲν καὶ ἀπαιδευτος, πιθανὸς δὲ [208] ὅπως οὖν εἰπεῖν; Οὐδὲ τοῦτο. Καὶ τοῦτο αὐτὸς πάλιν δείκνυσι λέγων· Κἀγὼ ἦλθον πρὸς ὑμᾶς, οὐ καθ' ὑπεροχὴν λόγου ἢ σοφίας, καταγγέλλων ὑμῖν τὸ μαρτύριον. Οὐ γὰρ ἔκρινά τι εἰδέναι ἐν ὑμῖν, εἰ μὴ Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν, καὶ τοῦτον ἐσταυρωμένον· καὶ ὁ λόγος μου καὶ τὸ κήρυγμά μου οὐκ ἐν πειθοῖς σοφίας λόγοις.

4.12. Ἀλλὰ τὸ κηρυττόμενον ἱκανὸν ἐπισπάσασθαι; Ἀλλ' ἄκουσον καὶ περὶ αὐτοῦ τί φησιν· Ἐπεὶ καὶ Ἰουδαῖοι σημεῖα αἰτοῦσι, καὶ Ἕλληνες σοφίαν ζητοῦσιν, ἡμεῖς δὲ κηρύττομεν Χριστὸν ἐσταυρωμένον, Ἰουδαίοις μὲν σκάνδαλον, Ἕλλησι δὲ μωρίαν. Ἀλλ' ἀδείας ἀπέλαυσεν; Ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἀνέπνει ποτὲ τῶν κινδύνων. Καὶ γὰρ ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ, φησί, καὶ ἐν φόβῳ καὶ ἐν τρόμῳ πολλῷ ἐγενόμην πρὸς ὑμᾶς· οὐκ αὐτὸς δὲ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ τὰ αὐτὰ ἔπασχον. Μέμνησθε γάρ, φησί, τὰς πρότερον ἡμέρας, ἐν αἷς φωτισθέντες, πολλὴν ἄθλησιν ὑπεμείνατε παθη-[210]μάτων· τοῦτο μὲν, ὀνειδισμοῖς καὶ θλίψεσι θεατριζόμενοι, τοῦτο δὲ κοινωνοὶ τῶν οὕτω πασχόντων γενηθέντες. Καὶ γὰρ τὴν ἀρπαγὴν τῶν ὑπαρχόντων ὑμῶν μετὰ χαρᾶς προσεδέξασθε. Καὶ πάλιν Θεσσαλονικεῦσι γράφων λέγει· Ὑμεῖς γὰρ τὰ αὐτὰ ἐπάθετε ὑπὸ τῶν ἰδίων συμφυλετῶν, καθὼς καὶ αὐτοὶ ὑπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων, τῶν καὶ τὸν Κύριον ἀποκτεινάντων, καὶ τοὺς ἰδίους προφήτας, καὶ ἡμᾶς ἐκδιωξάντων, καὶ Θεῷ μὴ ἀρεσκόντων, καὶ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις ἐναντίων. Καὶ Κορινθίοις δὲ πάλιν ἐπιστέλλων ἔλεγεν ὅτι· Περισεύει τὰ παθήματα τοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς ὑμᾶς,

38. Or, "bringing a collection for the saints" (cf. 2 Cor 8:4, 19–20; 9:1, 12–13, where Paul uses the verb διακονεῖν and noun διακονία to refer to that specific act of service).

39. With transposition of παρ' ἑαυτῷ and τιθέτω; ellipsis of ὅ τι ἂν εὐοδῶται before ἵνα μὴ.

40. Minus γάρ before τὴν κλῆσιν; minus ἀδελφοί before ὅτι (ellipsis).

41. Ellipsis as marked.

42. Minus ἐλθὼν before πρὸς ὑμᾶς; minus ἀδελφοί before ἦλθον; minus τοῦ θεοῦ after μαρτύριον. Reading οὐκ ἐν πειθοῖς σοφίας λόγοις for ἐν πειθοῖς ἀνθρωπίνης σοφίας λόγοις (98).

43. With ἐπεὶ for ἐπειδὴ; κηρύττομεν for κηρύσσομεν.

44. With μέμνησθε for ἀναμνησθήσεσθε; καὶ for τε καὶ before θλίψεσιν; πασχόντων for ἀναστρεφόμενων; plus γάρ before τὴν ἀρπαγὴν; ellipsis as marked.

ashamed to mention their poverty or, rather, even to beg on their behalf. For, he says, *"I am going to Jerusalem doing a service³⁸ for the saints"* (Rom 15:25). And again, *"On every first day of the week, let each of you set aside a measure of your own goods so that there aren't collections only when I come"* (1 Cor 16:2).³⁹ And he even commended the fact that the majority of them were from among the unskilled when he wrote to the Corinthians: *"Look at your calling, that not many are wise according to the flesh"* (1 Cor 1:26).⁴⁰ And that they were from undistinguished stock is clear when he says, *"Not many are of noble birth"* (1 Cor 1:26). And they weren't only not of noble birth, but they were of very low status. For, he says, *"God chose the weak things of the world ... even things that are nothing, so that he might abolish the things that are something"* (1 Cor 1:27–28).⁴¹ But perhaps, though he was unskilled and uneducated, he was in some way a persuasive [208] speaker? Not even this, as he himself again proves when he says, *"And I came to you, not proclaiming to you the testimony with preeminence of eloquence or wisdom. For I had decided not to know anything among you except Jesus Christ and him crucified. And my word and my gospel proclamation were not in persuasive words of wisdom"* (1 Cor 2:1–2, 4).⁴²

4.12. But perhaps the message he preached was sufficient to draw disciples? Yet listen to what he says about it: *"Since Jews ask for signs and Greeks seek wisdom, but we preach Christ crucified, a stumbling block to Jews and foolishness to Greeks"* (1 Cor 1:22).⁴³ But did he have the benefit of a secure arena to preach in? He couldn't even stop to take a breath because of the dangers then present! For, he says, *"I was in weakness and in fear and in great trembling before you"* (1 Cor 1:23). And this was the case not only for Paul himself, but his disciples also continually suffered the same things, as he says: *"Remember the former days in which, after you were enlightened, you endured a great contest of sufferings, [210] sometimes held up to shame with reproaches and afflictions, at other times being partners with those who were suffering in this way... For you even welcomed the seizing of your belongings with joy"* (Heb 10:32–34).⁴⁴ Again, when writing to the Thessalonians, he says, *"For you yourselves ... suffered the same things at the hands of your own compatriots as also they did from the Jews, who killed the Lord and their own prophets, and persecuted us, and do not please God, but oppose all human beings"* (1 Thess 2:14–15).⁴⁵ Once again, in writing to the Corinthians, he says, *"The sufferings of Christ abound in you"* and *"Just*

45. Minus καὶ ὑμεῖς before ὑπὸ τῶν ἰδίων συμφυλετῶν; minus Ἰησοῦν after ἀποκτεινάντων.

καὶ ὥσπερ κοινωνοὶ ἐστε τῶν παθημάτων, οὕτω καὶ τῆς παρακλήσεως, καὶ Γαλαταῖς· Τοσαῦτα ἐπάθετε εἰκῆ, φησὶν, εἴ γε καὶ εἰκῆ.

4.13. Ὅταν οὖν καὶ ὁ κηρύττων ιδιώτης ᾗ καὶ πένης καὶ ἄσημος, καὶ τὸ κηρυττόμενον οὐκ ἐπαγωγόν, ἀλλὰ καὶ σκάνδαλον ἔχον, καὶ οἱ ἀκούοντες αὐτὸ πένητες καὶ ἀσθενεῖς καὶ οὐδένες, καὶ κίνδυνοι ἐπάλληλοι καὶ συνεχεῖς καὶ τοῖς διδασκάλοις καὶ τοῖς μαθηταῖς, καὶ ὁ καταγγελλόμενος ἐσταυρωμένος, τί τὸ ποιῆσαν κρατήσιν; Οὐκ εὐδὴλον ὅτι θεία τις καὶ ἀπόρρητος δύναμις; Παντί που δῆλον. Καὶ τοῦτο καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐναντίων ἔστι κατιδεῖν. Ὅταν γὰρ ἴδῃς τὰ ἐναντία τούτων συνδραμόντα, καὶ πλοῦτον, καὶ εὐγένειαν, καὶ πατρίδος μέγεθος, καὶ ῥητο-[212]ρείας δεινότητα, καὶ ἄδειαν καὶ θεραπείαν πολλήν, καὶ εὐθέως σβεσθέντα τὰ καινοτομηθέντα, τούτους δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν ἐναντίων περιγενομένους, τί τὸ αἴτιον, εἰπέ μοι; Ταῦτόν γὰρ συνέβη, οἷον ἂν εἰ μετὰ στρατοπέδων καὶ ὅπλων καὶ παρατάξεως τοῦ βασιλεύοντος μὴ δυνηθέντος κρατῆσαι τῶν βαρβάρων, πτωχὸς τις γυμνὸς καὶ μόνος, καὶ μηδὲ ἀκόντιον μεταχειρίζων, μηδὲ ἱμάτιον ἔχων, εἰσελθὼν διαπράξοιτο ἅ μετὰ ὅπλων καὶ παρασκευῆς οὐκ ἴσχυσαν ἕτεροι.

4.14. Μὴ τοίνυν ἀγνωμόνει, ἀλλὰ καθ' ἐκάστην φέρε τὴν ψῆφον, καὶ προσκύνει τοῦ σταυρωθέντος τὴν δύναμιν. Οὐδὲ γάρ, ἂν ἴδῃς τινὰ πόλεις κατασκευάζοντα, καὶ τάφρους περιελαύνοντα, καὶ μηχανήματα προσάγοντα τείχεσι, καὶ ὅπλα χαλκεύοντα, καὶ στρατιώτας καταλέγοντα, καὶ χρήματα ἔχοντα ἄπειρα, καὶ μὴ δυνάμενον πόλιν μίαν ἐλεῖν, ἄλλον δὲ γυμνῷ σώματι προσβαλόντα, καὶ χερσὶ μόναίς χρώμενον, οὐχὶ μίαν καὶ δευτέραν καὶ εἴκοσι πόλεις, ἀλλὰ μυρίας κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην ἐπιτρέχοντα, καὶ αὐτάνδρους λαμβάνοντα, ἀνθρωπίνης ἂν εἴποις εἶναι τοῦτο δυνάμεως. Οὕτω δῆλον ὅτι καὶ νῦν. Διὰ γὰρ τοῦτο συνεχώρησεν ὁ Θεὸς καὶ ληστὰς σταυρωθῆναι, καὶ πρὸ αὐτοῦ τινὰς ἀπατεῶνας φανῆναι, ἵνα καὶ ἀπὸ συγκρίσεως τοῖς σφόδρα ἀναισθητοῦσι δειχθῇ τῆς ἀληθείας ἢ ὑπεροχῆ, καὶ σὺ μάθῃς ὅτι οὐκ ἐκείνων εἶς οὗτος, ἀλλὰ πολὺ καὶ ἄπειρον τούτου καὶ ἐκείνων τὸ μέσον. Οὐδὲν γὰρ αὐτοῦ [214] τὴν δόξαν συσκιᾶσαι ἴσχυσεν, οὐ τὸ τῶν αὐτῶν κοινωνῆσαι παθῶν, οὐ τὸ τοῖς αὐτοῖς χρόνοις συνδραμεῖν. Εἰ μὲν γὰρ τὸν σταυρὸν οἱ δαίμονες δεδοίκασι, καὶ οὐ τοῦ σταυρωθέντος τὴν ἰσχύν, ἐμφράττει τῶν ταῦτα λεγόντων τὸ στόμα τῶν ληστῶν ἢ ξυνωρίς. Εἰ δὲ καὶ ἡ δυσκολία

as you are partners in the sufferings, so also in the comfort" (2 Cor 1:5, 7). And to the Galatians: "*You suffered so many things in vain, if indeed it was in vain*" (Gal 3:4).

4.13. Therefore, when the one preaching is unskilled and poor and undistinguished, and the message preached not alluring but even scandalous, and the ones hearing it poor and weak and nobodies, and the dangers continuous and unremitting for both teachers and disciples, and the one being proclaimed a victim of crucifixion, what caused it to conquer? Isn't it clear that it was some divine and ineffable power? I suppose it's clear to everyone. And one can perceive this from a consideration of the opponents, as well. For when you see the qualities opposite to these coming together—wealth, noble birth, greatness of fatherland, [212] forcefulness of rhetoric, security, widespread cultic service to the gods, and religious novelties routinely snuffed out in an instant—but nonetheless you see these Christians with the opposite background prevailing, what's the cause of this? Tell me! For the same thing happened as if, although the emperor wasn't able to conquer the barbarians with battalions and weapons and a marshalled army, some poor, naked, and solitary man who didn't even have a javelin in his hand or a garment to wear should come in and accomplish what the others weren't powerful enough to do with weaponry and armaments.

4.14. So, don't be lacking in sense, but every single day cast your vote and worship the power of the one who was crucified. For if you saw someone making military preparations against cities, building trenches, moving siege machines up to the walls, forging weapons, enlisting soldiers, in possession of an endless supply of money, but not able to seize one city, whereas another man attacks with a naked body and, using his hands alone, overruns not one and two and twenty cities but countless numbers throughout the whole world and takes the men and all others captive, you wouldn't say that this was done by a human power! This is clearly the case even now. For this is why God allowed the thieves to be crucified along with Christ and for some deceivers to appear before he did, so that from this comparison the superiority of the truth might be proven to even the most imperceptive of people, and that you might learn that Christ was not one of those, but the difference between him and them is huge and boundless. For nothing [214] was powerful enough to obscure his glory, not sharing the same sufferings or coinciding in time. For if it were the cross that the demons feared and not the power of the man who was crucified, then this pair of thieves (cf. Matt 27:38 // Mark 15:27) would zip up the mouths of those who say such things. But if it were the difficulty of the times that

τῶν καιρῶν τὸ πᾶν ἤνυσεν, ἀπολογοῦνται οἱ περὶ Θεοῦδαν καὶ Ἰούδαν, περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν ἡμῖν ἐπιχειρήσαντες μετὰ καὶ ἐτέρων πολλῶν τῶν σημείων, καὶ διαφθαρέντες. Ὅπερ γὰρ ἔφην, διὰ τοῦτο ταῦτα εἶασεν ὁ Θεός, ἵνα ἐκ περιουσίας τὰ αὐτοῦ δείξῃ. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ψευδοπροφήτας ἐπὶ τῶν προφητῶν φανῆναι συνεχώρησε, καὶ ψευδαποστόλους ἐπὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων, ἵνα μάθῃς ὅτι οὐδὲν τῶν αὐτοῦ συσκιᾶσαι δύναται.

4.15. Εἶπω σοι καὶ ἐτέρωθεν δύναμιν κηρύγματος θαυμαστὴν καὶ παράδοξον, καὶ δείξω σοι καὶ διὰ τῶν πολεμούντων αἰρόμενον αὐτὸν καὶ αὐξανόμενον; Τῷ Παύλῳ τούτῳ ποτέ τινες πολεμοῦντες, ἐκήρυττον τουτὶ τὸ δόγμα ἐν Ῥώμῃ. Βουλόμενοι γὰρ τὸν Νέρωνα παροξύνει πολεμοῦντα τῷ Παύλῳ, ἀναδέχονται καὶ αὐτοὶ κηρύττειν, [216] ἵνα μᾶλλον ἐξαφθέντος τοῦ λόγου, καὶ πλειόνων γενομένων μαθητῶν, θερμότερος ὁ θυμὸς τοῦ τυράννου γένηται, καὶ ἀγριωθῇ τὸ θηρίον. Καὶ τοῦτο αὐτὸς ὁ Παῦλος Φιλιππησίους ἐπιστέλλων ἔλεγε· Γινώσκεις ὑμᾶς βούλομαι, ἀδελφοί, ὅτι τὰ κατ' ἐμὲ μᾶλλον εἰς προκοπὴν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἐλήλυθεν, ὥστε τοὺς πλείονας τῶν ἀδελφῶν πεποιθότας τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου περισσοτέρως τολμᾶν ἀφόβως τὸν λόγον λαλεῖν. Τινὲς μὲν καὶ διὰ φθόνον καὶ ἔριν, τινὲς δὲ καὶ δι' εὐδοκίαν τὸν Χριστὸν κηρύσσουν· οἱ μὲν ἐξ ἐριθείας, οὐχ ἄγνως, οἰόμενοι θλιῖψιν ἐπιφέρειν τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου· οἱ δὲ ἐξ ἀγάπης, εἰδότες ὅτι εἰς ἀπολογίαν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου κείμεναι. Τί γάρ; πλὴν παντὶ τρόπῳ, εἴτε προφάσει, εἴτε ἀληθείᾳ, Χριστὸς καταγγέλλεται. Εἶδες πῶς πολλοὶ ἐξ ἐριθείας ἐκήρυττον; Ἄλλ' ὅμως καὶ διὰ τῶν ἐναντίων ἐκράτει.

4.16. Μετὰ δὲ τούτων, καὶ ἕτερα ἦν τὰ ἀντικρούοντα. Καὶ γὰρ καὶ νόμοι παλαιοὶ οὐ μόνον οὐκ ἐβοήθουν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἠναντιοῦντο καὶ ἐπολέμουν, καὶ ἡ πονηρία καὶ ἡ ἄγνοια τῶν διαβαλλόντων· βασιλέα γάρ, φασίν, ἔχουσι τὸν Χριστόν. Οὐ γὰρ δὴ ᾗδισαν τὴν ἄνω βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ, τὴν φρικτὴν ἐκείνην καὶ ἀπέραντον, ἀλλ' ὡς τυραν- [218] νίδα αὐτῶν ἐπείσαγόντων τῇ οἰκουμένῃ, οὕτω διέβαλον. Καὶ κοινῇ πάντες, καὶ ἰδίᾳ ἕκαστος αὐτοῖς ἐπύκτενε· κοινῇ μὲν, ὡς τῆς πολιτείας ἀναιρουμένης, καὶ τῶν νόμων ἀνατρεπομένων· ἰδίᾳ δέ, ὡς ἐκάστης οἰκίας διασπωμένης καὶ καταλυομένης. Καὶ γὰρ πατὴρ

46. Adopting the reading of AP, ἐξαφθέντος, over HS and successors' πλατυνθέντος. AP documents that the manuscripts are split here (a variance noted already by HS, though not so indicated by AP) but argues for the former on both the weight of attestation and the contextual sense.

47. For this same argument, see *Hom. Phil. 1:18* §§9–10 (PG 51:317–18).

48. Minus δὲ before ὑμᾶς; minus ἐν κυρίῳ before πεποιθότας; minus τὸν Χριστὸν καταγγέλλουσιν before οὐχ ἄγνως (by ellipsis).

accomplished everything, then the followers of Theudas and Judas (cf. Acts 5:36–37) furnish a rebuttal, given that they tried the same things as we, with even many other signs, and they were killed. As I have said, this is why God allowed these things—to demonstrate the deeds that were his by their superiority. Consequently, he allowed false prophets to appear at the time of the prophets (cf. Jer 6:13; 33:8, 11, etc.), and false apostles at the time of the apostles (cf. 2 Cor 11:13), so that you might learn that he cannot leave any of his deeds in obscurity.

4.15. Shall I tell you from another direction about the marvelous and incredible power of the gospel message, and prove to you that Paul was raised up and amplified even by those who battled against him? Once some people, fighting against this man, Paul, were preaching this dogma in Rome. Because they wished to provoke Nero, who was fighting with Paul, they took upon themselves the task of preaching the gospel, [216] so that when the word was kindled⁴⁶ and more disciples were made, the wrath of the tyrant would rage hotter, and the beast would become fiercer.⁴⁷ Paul himself said this when writing to the Philippians, *“I wish you to know, brothers and sisters, that my circumstances have all the more led to the advancement of the gospel, so that ... the majority of the brothers and sisters, with confidence born from my chains, have become all the more bold in fearlessly speaking the word. For some preach Christ because of envy and contention, but others because of goodwill. Some out of enmity, not out of a pure motive, but intending to add further affliction onto my chains. But others preach out of love, knowing that I am destined for a defense of the gospel. For what purpose? Only that in every way, whether by pretense or by true intention, Christ is proclaimed”* (Phil 1:12, 14–18).⁴⁸ Do you see how many were preaching “out of enmity” (Phil 1:16)? But nevertheless, he was triumphing through the deeds of his opponents.

4.16. Now along with these, there were other hindrances. For the old laws weren’t only no help, but they even opposed and fought him. There was also the wickedness and ignorance of the slanderers who said, “They have Christ as their king.” They didn’t know about that awe-inspiring and boundless kingdom above, but [218] brought the slanderous accusation against the Christians that they were establishing a tyrannical state in the world. All in public and each one privately fought against them: in public, by saying that the commonwealth is being done away with and the laws are being overthrown; in private, that each house is being torn apart and destroyed. For, indeed, at that time a father did battle against his child, and

ἐπολέμει παιδὶ τότε, καὶ υἱὸς ἡρνεῖτο πατέρα, καὶ γυναῖκες ἄνδρας, καὶ ἄνδρες γυναῖκας, καὶ θυγατέρες μητέρας, καὶ συγγενεῖς συγγενεῖς, καὶ φίλοι φίλους, καὶ ποικίλος τις ἦν ὁ πόλεμος οὗτος καὶ παντοδαπός, εἰς τὰς οἰκίας ἔρπων, συγγενεῖς διασπών, βουλευτήρια ταράττων, δικαστήρια θορυβῶν, ὡς τῶν πατρῶν ἐθῶν καταλυομένων, καὶ ἐορτῶν καὶ θεραπειᾶς δαιμόνων ἀνατρεπομένης, ἃ τοῖς πάλαι νομοθέταις πρὸ τῶν ἄλλων ἀπάντων περισπούδαστα ἦν. Καὶ μετὰ τούτων καὶ ἡ τῆς τυραννίδος ὑποψία πάντοθεν αὐτοὺς ἐλαύνεσθαι ἐποίει. Καὶ οὐκ ἂν ἔχοι τις εἰπεῖν, ὅτι παρὰ μὲν Ἑλληνιστὰ, παρὰ δὲ τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ἡσύχαζεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐκεῖνοι πολλῶ χαλεπώτερον ἐπετίθεντο· καὶ γὰρ καὶ αὐτοὶ πολιτείας ἀναίρεσιν ἡτιῶντο. Οὐ παύεται γάρ, φησί, λαλῶν [220] ῥήματα βλάβσημα κατὰ τοῦ τόπου τοῦ ἁγίου τούτου καὶ τοῦ νόμου.

4.17. Ἄλλ' ὅμως πάντοθεν τῆς πυρᾶς ἀναπτομένης, ἀπὸ τῶν οἰκιῶν, ἀπὸ τῶν πόλεων, ἀπὸ τῶν ἀγρῶν, ἀπὸ τῆς ἐρημίας, ἀπὸ τῶν Ἑλλήνων, ἀπὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων, ἀπὸ τῶν ἀρχόντων, ἀπὸ τῶν ἀρχομένων, ἀπὸ τῶν συγγενῶν, ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς, ἀπὸ τῆς θαλάττης, ἀπὸ τῶν βασιλευόντων, καὶ πάντων ἀλλήλους ἐξαγριούντων, καὶ θηρίου παντὸς χαλεπώτερον ἐπιτιθεμένων, ὁ μακάριος οὗτος εἰς τοσαύτας καμίνους ἐμπηδῶν, καὶ ἐν μέσῳ λύκων ἰστάμενος, καὶ πάντοθεν βαλλόμενος, οὐ μόνον οὐ κατεχώσθη, ἀλλὰ καὶ πάντα αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν ἀλήθειαν μετήγαγεν. Εἶπω καὶ ἄλλους πρὸς τούτοις πολέμους χαλεπωτάτους· ὁ τῶν ψευδαποστόλων, τὸ μάλιστα πάντων αὐτὸν λυποῦν, ὁ τῶν οἰκείων τῶν ἀσθενούντων· πολλοὶ γὰρ πιστεύοντες διεφθείροντο· ἀλλὰ καὶ πρὸς ταῦτα ἤρκεσε. Πόθεν καὶ ἐκ ποίας ἰσχύος; Τὰ ὄπλα ἡμῶν, φησὶν, οὐ σαρκικά, ἀλλὰ δυνατὰ τῷ Θεῷ πρὸς καθαίρεσιν ὀχυρωμάτων, λογισμοὺς καθαιροῦντες καὶ πᾶν ὕψωμα ἐπαιρόμενον κατὰ τῆς γνώσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ. Διὰ τοῦτο πάντα μετεβάλλετο, καὶ μετερρυθμίζετο ἄθρόον.

4.18. Καὶ ὥσπερ πυρᾶς ἀναφθείσης, αἱ ἄκανθαι, κατὰ μικρὸν δαπανώμεναι, εἰκουσι καὶ παραχωροῦσι τῇ φλογί, [222] καὶ καθαρὰς ποιοῦσι τὰς ἀρούρας· οὕτω δὴ καὶ τῆς Παύλου γλώττης φθεγγομένης, καὶ πάντα πυρὸς σφοδρότερον ἐπιούσης, εἶκεν ἅπαντα καὶ παρεχώρει, καὶ δαιμόνων θεραπεῖαι, καὶ ἐορταί, καὶ πανηγύρεις, καὶ πάτρια ἔθνη, καὶ νόμων διαφθοραί,

49. The following depiction of the trials and tribulations of the apostolic age has much in common with *Hom. Rom.* 5:3 §1 (PG 51:157–58).

50. The translation follows the reading adopted by AP, ἀνατρεπομένης, for HS and successors' καταλυομένης (though HS did note the prior reading in the margin). While here the manuscript evidence is less determinative, AP thought the former reading superior because it avoids the repetition καταλυομένων ... καταλυμένης.

51. Acts 6:13: plus τούτου after κατὰ τοῦ τόπου τοῦ ἁγίου. John has misapplied to

a son denied his father, and wives their husbands, husbands their wives, daughters their mothers (cf. Matt 10:35–36; Luke 12:53), relatives their relatives, friends their friends. This was a variable and many-sorted war,⁴⁹ creeping into the houses, tearing relatives apart, shaking up senates, upsetting law courts, as the ancestral customs and feasts were destroyed, and the cultic service of demons, which was more coveted by the ancient lawgivers than all other concerns, was overthrown.⁵⁰ In addition, the suspicion of tyranny caused them to be persecuted from all directions. And one couldn't say that these things happened just among the Greeks, whereas it was quiet among the Jews, but they, too, went even more harshly on the attack. For they used to charge Paul with the destruction of their commonwealth. As it says, "*He doesn't stop speaking [220] words of blasphemy against this holy place and the law*" (Acts 6:13 [sic]; cf. 21:28).⁵¹

4.17. But, nevertheless, when the fire was being kindled from all directions, from the houses, from the cities, from the fields, from the desert, from the Greeks, from the Jews, from the rulers, from the subjects, from the relatives, from the land, from the sea, from the emperors, and they were all provoking one another to savagery and attacking more harshly than any beast, this blessed man, leaping into furnaces of such magnitude, standing in the midst of wolves, and being pelted from all directions, not only wasn't overwhelmed, but he even led them all to the truth. And let me tell of other, worse battles than these: the war over the false apostles (cf. 2 Cor 11:13) and, what grieved him most of all, the struggle over the weak among his own people (cf. 2 Cor 11:29), given that many believers were being corrupted. However, he was sufficient to overcome even this. From whence and from what sort of power? "*Our weapons,*" he says, "*are not fleshly but powerful for God's sake, for the destruction of fortresses, as we destroy reasonings and every lofty thing raised up against the knowledge of God*" (2 Cor 10:4–5).⁵² On account of this, he was changing and refashioning everything all at once.

4.18. And just as when a fire has been kindled, as the briars become partly consumed by it, they yield and give way to the flame [222] and clear the fields, thus also when Paul's tongue spoke and attacked everything more violently than fire, everything yielded and gave way to it—demonic cults, feasts, festivals, ancestral customs, corrupt laws, popular anger, tyrannical

Paul the words cast against Stephen in Acts 6, likely by influence of the similar charge against Paul in Acts 21:28 (κατὰ ... τοῦ τόπου τούτου ... διδάσκων).

52. Minus γάρ before ὅπλα; minus τῆς στρατείας before ἡμῶν.

καὶ δῆμων θυμοί, καὶ τυράννων ἀπειλαί, καὶ οἰκείων ἐπιβουλαί, καὶ ψευδαποστόλων κακουργίαι· μᾶλλον δέ, καθάπερ τῆς ἀκτίνος ἀνισχύουσης, καὶ σκότος ἐλαύνεται, καὶ θηρία καταδύεται καὶ φωλεύει λοιπόν, καὶ λησται δραπετεύουσι, καὶ ἀνδροφόνοι περὶ τὰ σπήλαια καταφεύγουσι, καὶ πειραταὶ ἀφίστανται, καὶ τυμβωρύχοι ἀναχωροῦσι, καὶ μοιχοὶ καὶ κλέπται καὶ τοιχωρύχοι, ἅτε ἀπὸ τῆς ἀκτίνος ἐλέγχεσθαι μέλλοντες, ἀπελθόντες που μακρὰν ἑαυτοὺς ἀφανίζουσι, καὶ πάντα διαφανῆ καὶ λαμπρὰ γίνεται, καὶ γῆ, καὶ θάλαττα, τῆς ἀκτίνος ἄνωθεν πάντα καταυγαζούσης, τὰ πελάγη, τὰ ὄρη, τὰς χώρας, τὰς πόλεις· οὕτω δὴ καὶ τότε τοῦ κηρύγματος φανέντος, καὶ τοῦ Παύλου πανταχοῦ τοῦτο διασπείροντος, ἡλαύνετο μὲν ἡ πλάνη, ἐπανήει δὲ ἡ ἀλήθεια, κνῖσαι δὲ καὶ καπνός, καὶ κύμβαλα καὶ τύμπανα, καὶ μέθαι καὶ κῶμοι, καὶ πορνεῖαι, καὶ μοιχεῖαι, καὶ τὰ ἄλλα, ἃ μὴδὲ εἰπεῖν καλόν, τὰ ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς τῶν εἰδώλων τελούμενα ἔληγε καὶ ἐδαπανᾶτο, καθάπερ κηρὸς ὑπὸ πυρὸς τηκόμενα, καθάπερ ἄχυρα ὑπὸ φλογὸς δαπανώμενα· ἡ δὲ λαμπρὰ τῆς ἀληθείας φλόξ ἀνῆει φαιδρὰ καὶ ὑψηλὴ πρὸς αὐτὸν τὸν οὐρανόν, ὑπ' αὐτῶν τῶν κωλυόντων αἰρομένη, καὶ διὰ τῶν ἐμποδιζόντων αὐξανομένη· καὶ οὐδὲ κίνδυνος ἐπέιχεν αὐτῇ τὴν [224] φορὰν καὶ τὴν ῥύμην τὴν ἀκάθεκτον, οὐ συνηθείας τυραννὶς παλαιοτάτης, οὐ πατρίων ἐθῶν καὶ νόμων ἰσχύς, οὐ τὸ τῆς διδασκαλίας τῶν νόμων δυσπαράδεκτον, οὐκ ἄλλο τῶν εἰρημένων οὐδέν.

4.19. Καὶ ἵνα μάθῃς ἡλικὸν τοῦτό ἐστιν, ἀπειλήσων τοῖς Ἕλλησιν, οὐ λέγω κινδύνους καὶ θανάτους καὶ λιμόν, ἀλλ' ὀλίγην ζημίαν χρημάτων, καὶ ὄψει μεταβαλλομένους εὐθέως. Ἀλλ' οὐ τὰ ἡμέτερα τοιαῦτα, ἀλλὰ πάντων κατακοπτομένων καὶ σφαζομένων, καὶ πανταχοῦ πολεμουμένων, καὶ ποικίλοις τρόποις πολέμων, ἀνθηρότερα ταῦτα ἐγίνετο. Καὶ τί λέγω τοὺς παρόντας Ἕλληνας νῦν, τοὺς εὐτελεῖς καὶ εὐκαταφρονήτους; Τοὺς τότε θαυμαστοὺς παραγάγωμεν εἰς μέσον, τοὺς ἐπὶ φιλοσοφίᾳ βεβημένους, τὸν Πλάτωνα, τὸν Διαγόραν, τὸν Κλαζομένιον, καὶ ἐτέρους πολλοὺς τοιούτους, καὶ ὄψει τότε τοῦ κηρύγματος τὴν ἰσχύν. Μετὰ γὰρ τὸ κώνειον τοῦ Σωκράτους, οἱ

53. The idea that the more Christians were persecuted, the more they increased, is an apologetic topos long before Chrysostom (see, e.g. the famous line of Tertullian, *Apol.* 50.13: *Plures effimur, quotiens metimur a vobis; semen est sanguis christianorum*; “the more we are mowed down by you, the more numerous we become; the blood of Christians is seed”).

54. As AP indicates, in a marginal note HS had included the reading τὸν Πυθαγόραν after Πλάτωνα. AP confirms that none of his manuscripts support this reading, and accordingly rejects it (AP 224–25).

55. Diagoras of Melos, fifth-century BCE philosopher and lyric poet, outlawed from Athens ca. 415/4 for reputed “atheism” and ridiculing the Eleusinian mysteries; for a critical analysis of the sources and the development of the tradition of Diagoras’s

threats, plots from his own people, and the malefactions of false apostles. Here's still another comparison: you know how when the sun rises darkness is driven off, beasts keep hidden and lurk in their dens, thieves run away, murderers take refuge in caves, pirates keep away, grave robbers retire, and adulterers, thieves, and burglars, seeing that they're about to be put to shame by the sun's illuminating rays, go off somewhere far away and hide themselves. Everything—both land and sea—becomes translucent and radiant when the sun's rays shine from above upon it all: the oceans, the mountains, the fields, the cities. Well, in the same way, once the gospel had appeared and Paul was scattering its seed everywhere, deception was driven off, and the truth returned. But the smell of burnt offerings, the smoke, cymbals and drums, drunken bouts and orgies, sexual offences, adulteries, and all the other things that aren't good to mention (namely, the rites performed in the temples of the idols) were coming to a halt and being spent, melted away as wax is by fire, consumed as chaff by a flame. But the radiant flame of the truth was ascending, beaming and lofty, to heaven itself, raised up by those hindering it, and amplified by those obstructing it. No danger was able to hold back its [224] momentum and ungovernable force, not the tyranny of ancient habit, or the power of ancestral customs and laws, or the fact that the laws of Christian teaching strain belief, or any other of the things mentioned.

4.19. In order to learn what a great thing this is, threaten the Greeks—I'm not saying with dangers and deaths and famines, either, but with a small monetary loss—and you'll see them change heart instantly. However, this isn't the case with us; but when all our people are being massacred and slaughtered and everywhere embattled with various types of combat, our cause has been blossoming all the more.⁵³ And why should I speak of present-day Greeks, those cheap and despicable people? Let's bring forward the marvelous Greeks of the past, the ones who were renowned for philosophy—Plato,⁵⁴ Diagoras,⁵⁵ the Clazomenaeans,⁵⁶ and many other such types—and then you'll see the power of the gospel proclamation. For after Socrates's hemlock, some of his disciples went off to Megara,⁵⁷ afraid

atheism, see Leonard Woodbury, "The Date and Atheism of Diagoras of Melos," *Phoenix* 19 (1965): 178–211.

56. Anaxagoras, fifth-century BCE philosopher who was charged with impiety and exiled from Athens.

57. On Plato and other disciples of Socrates going to Megara after the death of Socrates, see Diogenes Laertius, *Vit. phil.* 3.6. Chrysostom refers to this tradition also

μὲν εἰς Μέγαρα ἀπῆλθον, δεδοικότες μὴ τὰ αὐτὰ πάθωσιν. [226] οἱ δὲ καὶ τῆς πατρίδος καὶ τῆς ἐλευθερίας ἐξέπεσον, καὶ πλέον μιᾶς γυναικός, οὐδενὸς ἑτέρου περιεγένοντο· ὁ δὲ Κιτιεὺς ἐν τοῖς γράμμασιν ἀφείς τὴν πολιτείαν, οὕτω κατέλυσε. Καίτοι οὐδὲν ἦν τότε τὸ ἐμποδίζον, οὐ κίνδυνος, οὐκ ἰδιωτεία, ἀλλὰ καὶ δεινοὶ λέγειν ἦσαν, καὶ χρημάτων εὐπόρου, καὶ τῆς παρὰ πᾶσι βωμένης πατρίδος ἐτύγχανον ὄντες· ἀλλ' οὐδὲν ἴσχυσαν. Τοιοῦτον γὰρ ἡ πλάνη, καὶ μηδενὸς ἐνοχλοῦντος, καταρρεῖ· τοιοῦτον ἡ ἀλήθεια, καὶ πολλῶν πολεμούντων, διεγείρεται.

4.20. Καὶ ταῦτα αὐτὴ ἡ τῶν πραγμάτων ἀλήθεια βοᾷ καὶ οὐδὲν δεῖ λόγων, οὐδὲ ῥημάτων, τῆς οἰκουμένης πάντοθεν φωνὴν ἀφείσης, τῶν πόλεων, τῶν ἀγρῶν, τῆς γῆς, τῆς θαλάττης, τῆς οἰκουμένης, τῆς ἀοικήτου, τῶν ἐν ταῖς ἀκρωρείαις. Οὐδὲ γὰρ τὴν ἔρημον ἀφῆκεν ἄμοιρον τῆς εὐεργεσίας αὐτοῦ, ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὴν μάλιστα ἐνέπλησεν, ὧν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ φέρων ἦλθεν ἡμῖν ἀγαθῶν, διὰ τῆς Παύλου γλώττης, διὰ τῆς χάριτος τῆς ἐντεθείσης αὐτῷ. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἀξίαν τῆς δωρεᾶς προθυμίαν παρέσχετο, καὶ δαψιλῆς ἡ χάρις ἐξέλαμψε, καὶ τὰ πλείονα τῶν εἰρημένων διὰ τῆς τούτου κατωρθώθη γλώττης.

4.21. [228] Ἐπεὶ οὖν οὕτω τὸ γένος ἡμῶν ἐτίμησεν ὁ Θεός, ὡς ἕνα ἄνθρωπον καταξιῶσαι τοσούτων γενέσθαι κατορθωμάτων αἴτιον, ζηλώσωμεν, μιμησώμεθα, σπουδάσωμεν γενέσθαι κατ' ἐκεῖνον καὶ ἡμεῖς, καὶ μὴ ἀδύνατον τοῦτο εἶναι νομίζωμεν. Ὁ γὰρ πολλάκις εἶπον, τοῦτο λέγων οὐ παύσομαι, ὅτι καὶ σῶμα ἐν αὐτῷ τὸ αὐτὸ ἦν ἡμῖν, καὶ τροφαὶ αἱ αὐταί, καὶ ψυχὴ ἡ αὐτὴ· ἀλλ' ἡ προαίρεσις μεγάλη, καὶ ἡ προθυμία λαμπρά· καὶ τοῦτο ἐκεῖνον τοιοῦτον ἐποίησε. Μηδεὶς τοίνυν ἀπογινωσκέτω, μηδεὶς ἀπαγορευέτω. Ἐὰν γὰρ παραστήσης σου τὴν διάνοιαν, οὐδὲν τὸ κωλύον τὴν αὐτὴν δεῖξασθαι χάριν. Οὐ γάρ ἐστι προσωπολήπτης ὁ Θεός· καὶ ἐκεῖνον αὐτὸς ἔπλασε, καὶ σὲ αὐτὸς παρήγαγε· καὶ ὥσπερ ἐκεῖνου Δεσπότης, οὕτω καὶ σός· ὥσπερ ἐκεῖνον ἀνεκήρυξεν, οὕτω καὶ σὲ βούλεται στέψαι. Ὑπόσχωμεν τοίνυν ἑαυτοὺς καὶ καθάρωμεν, ἵνα καὶ ἡμεῖς δαψιλῆ δεξάμενοι τὴν χάριν, τῶν αὐτῶν ἐπιτύχωμεν ἀγαθῶν, χάριτι καὶ φιλανθρωπία τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ᾧ ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Ἀμήν.

in *Hom. Col.* 10.4 (PG 62:370), on which see Pauline Allen, *John Chrysostom, "Homilies on Colossians,"* WGRW 46 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2021), 234–35.

58. Perhaps John has in mind Diotima from Plato's *Symposium* (so AP 226 n. 1), but other options include Latheneia of Mantinea and Axiothea of Phlius. For women in the Platonic Academy, see Crystal Addey, "Plato's Women Readers," in *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Plato in Antiquity*, ed. Harold Tarrant et al., Brill's Companions to Classical Reception 13 (Leiden: Brill, 2018), 411–32, especially 416–18.

lest they might suffer the same, [226] while others were deprived of their native land and freedom and won over no convert, except one woman.⁵⁸ The man from Citium,⁵⁹ having left his republic behind in writing, thus came to his end. Although at that time, there was nothing to impede them, no danger, no lack of training, but indeed they were proficient speakers, and they were rich in possessions and had the fortune to belong to a universally celebrated native land, nonetheless, they had no power at all. Such is the case with deception, that even when no one troubles it, it falls in ruins; such with the truth, that even when many battle against it, it is promoted.

4.20. The truth of these matters itself proclaims the twin principle I just enunciated, and there's no need of speeches or words, because the world has given voice to it from all directions—cities, fields, land, sea, inhabited and uninhabited territory, mountain ridges. He didn't even leave the desert bereft of his benefactions, but filled it especially with the good things he came to bring us from heaven through Paul's tongue, through the grace put into him. For since he provided a zeal for ethical action that was worthy of the gift, grace shone forth profusely, and the mass of achievements we've mentioned here was successfully accomplished through his tongue.

4.21. [228] Since, therefore, God so honored our race as to consider one man worthy to be the cause of such a proliferation of virtuous deeds, let's emulate him, let's imitate him, let's be zealous to be like him ourselves and not consider this impossible. For what I have repeatedly said I shall not stop saying: that the same body was in him as is in us, the same rearing, and the same soul. But his exercise of free will was tremendous, and his ethical zeal magnificent—and this is what made him such as he was. Therefore, let no one despair, let no one grow weary. For if you put it in your minds to do so, there's nothing to hinder you from receiving the same grace. For God doesn't show partiality (cf. Acts 10:32; Rom 2:11). And it was he who formed Paul and he who created you. Just as he's Paul's Lord, so also he's yours; just as he proclaimed Paul's praises, thus also he wishes to crown you. Therefore, let's submit ourselves and purify ourselves, so that, having received the grace that is so abundant, we might attain the same goods, by the grace and loving-kindness of our Lord Jesus Christ, to whom be the glory and the power, forever and ever. Amen.

59. Zeno, ca. 334–262 BCE, founder of the philosophical school of the Stoics, and the author of a *πολιτεία* that John regards as a weak competitor to that of Christ (see Mitchell, “John Chrysostom on the Sermon on the Mount”).

Τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐγκώμιον εἰς τὸν ἅγιον ἀπόστολον Παῦλον, λόγος ε'.

5.1. [230] Ποῦ νῦν εἰσιν οἱ τὸν θάνατον αἰτιώμενοι, καὶ τὸ παθητὸν τοῦτο σῶμα καὶ φθαρτὸν ἐμπόδιον εἶναι λέγοντες αὐτοῖς πρὸς ἀρετὴν; Ἀκουσάτωσαν τῶν Παύλου κατορθωμάτων, καὶ παυέσθωσαν τῆς πονηρᾶς ταύτης διαβολῆς. Τί γὰρ τὸ γένος ἡμῶν ἐβλαψεν ὁ θάνατος; τί δὲ ἡ φθορὰ πρὸς ἀρετὴν ἐνεπόδισεν; Ἐννόησον Παῦλον, καὶ ὅψει ὅτι καὶ ὦνησεν ἡμᾶς τὰ μέγιστα τὸ γενέσθαι θνητούς. Εἰ γὰρ μὴ θνητὸς ἦν οὗτος, οὐκ ἂν ἐδυνήθη εἰπεῖν, μᾶλλον δὲ οὐκ ἂν ἐπιδείξασθαι ἐδυνήθη ὁ διὰ τῶν ἔργων εἶπεν, ὅτι· Καθ' ἡμέραν ἀποθνήσκω, νῆ τὴν ὑμετέραν καύχησιν, ἣν ἔχω ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. Πανταχοῦ γὰρ ἡμῖν ψυχῆς καὶ προθυμίας δεῖ, καὶ τὸ κωλύον οὐδὲν ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις τετάχθαι. Οὐχὶ θνητὸς ἦν οὗτος; οὐχὶ ιδιώτης; οὐχὶ πένης καὶ ἐκ τῆς καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν ἐργασίας ποιούμενος τὴν [232] τροφήν; οὐχὶ σῶμα εἶχε πάσαις ἀνάγκαις ὑποκείμενον φυσικαῖς; Τί οὖν αὐτὸν ἐκώλυσε γενέσθαι τοιοῦτον οἷος γέγονεν; Οὐδέν. Μηδεὶς τοίνυν ἀθυμεῖτω πένης, μηδεὶς δυσχεραίνετω ιδιώτης, μηδεὶς ἀλγείτω τῶν εὐτελεῶν, ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνοι μόνοι ὅσοι ψυχὴν μεμαλακισμένην καὶ διάνοιαν ἔχουσιν ἐκνευρισμένην. Τοῦτο γὰρ γίνεται κάλυμα μόνον πρὸς ἀρετὴν, κακία ψυχῆς καὶ μαλακία γνώμης· ταύτης δὲ ἄνευ τῶν ἄλλων οὐδέν. Καὶ τοῦτο δῆλον ἀπὸ τοῦ μακαρίου τούτου τοῦ νῦν συναγαγόντος ἡμᾶς. Ὡσπερ γὰρ τοῦτον οὐδὲν ταῦτα παρέβλαψεν, οὕτω τοὺς ἔξωθεν οὐδὲν τὰ

1. Text: as indicated in the introduction (pp. 62–64), we reprint the Greek text of Auguste Piédagnel (AP) SC 300 (1982) for each of the seven homilies *De laudibus sancti Pauli*. The footnotes within the translations on *Laud. Paul.* 1.14; 3.6; 4.15; 4.16; 5.3; 5.7; 6.5; 6.11; and 7.2 document the nine places where Piédagnel's text (AP) diverges from HS. See abbreviations, p. xvi above, for the sigla for AP's manuscripts. The translation and notes do not attempt a comprehensive assessment of the variants in the textual tradition of *Laud. Paul.*; readers should consult the Piédagnel edition for a full *apparatus criticus*. Translation: This translation is replicated from *HT* 468–74, with some minor adjustments; see *HT* 330–53 for an analysis of the argument

Hom. 5 De laudibus sancti Pauli apostoli
CPG 4344 (SC 300:230–58)¹

In praise of saint Paul the apostle by the same author, homily 5.

5.1. [230] Where now are those who accuse death and say that this passible and corruptible body is an impediment to virtue for them?² Let them listen to Paul's virtuous acts and cease from this wicked slander. For what harm has death caused the human race? What impediment has corruptibility caused to virtue? Consider Paul, and you'll see that our being mortal brings us the greatest benefits. For if he weren't mortal, then he wouldn't have been able to say or, rather, wouldn't have been able to demonstrate through his deeds what he said: "*Every single day I die, by the boast about you that I have in Christ Jesus*" (1 Cor 15:31). For in all cases we just need a soul and the desire to act, and there will be nothing to hinder our being placed in the front ranks. Wasn't this man, Paul, mortal? Wasn't he unskilled? Wasn't he poor and a person who earned his [232] bread from daily labor? Didn't he have a body endowed with all the constraints of nature? Then what prevented him from becoming such a man as he was? Nothing. Therefore, let no one be disheartened to be poor, let no one be displeased to be unskilled, or suffer pain for being among the lowest ranks, but only those who have a weakened soul and an enfeebled mind. For this alone is a hindrance to virtue—wickness of soul and weakness of purpose—and apart from this, there is no other obstacle. And this is made clear by the example of this blessed man who has now brought us together. For just as these circumstances did him no harm, so also their opposites—rhetorical skill, abun-

of this homily, together with Mitchell, "A Variable and Many-Sorted Man," 93–111, especially 104–9, and Mitchell, "A Patristic Perspective on Pauline περιαντολογία."

2. Once again, the "problem" is those who regard the body and created matter as evil, such as Manicheans or Marcionites, though John does not name them as such overtly. And yet these opponents retreat from view in the rest of the homily, so this may be mostly a rhetorical platform to justify his own extreme praises for Paul.

ἐναντία ὠφέλησεν, οὐ λόγων δεινότης, οὐ χρημάτων πλῆθος, οὐ περιφάνεια γένους, οὐ δόξης μέγεθος, οὐ τὸ ἐν δυναστείᾳ εἶναι.

5.2. Τί λέγω τοὺς ἀνθρώπους; μᾶλλον δὲ μέχρι τότε ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς κατέχω τὸν λόγον, ἐξὸν εἰπεῖν τὰς ἀνωτέρω δυνάμεις, τὰς ἀρχάς, καὶ τὰς ἐξουσίας, καὶ τοὺς κοσμοκράτορας τοῦ σκοτούς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου; τί γὰρ ὤνησε τούτους τὸ φύσιν τοιαύτην λαχεῖν; οὐχὶ ἔρχονται πᾶσαι αἱ δυνάμεις κρινόμεναι διὰ Παύλου, καὶ τῶν κατ' ἐκεῖνον; Οὐκ οἶδατε γάρ, φησὶν, ὅτι ἀγγέλους κρινοῦμεν, μήτι γε βιωτικά; Μὴ τοίνυν δι' ἕτερον μηδὲν ἀλγῶμεν, ἀλλὰ διὰ κακίαν μόνον, μηδὲ δι' ἄλλο χαίρωμεν καὶ εὐφραινώμεθα, ἀλλὰ δι' ἀρετὴν μόνον. Ἐὰν ταύτην ζηλώσωμεν, οὐδὲν τὸ κωλύον γενέσθαι κατὰ Παῦλον.

5.3. [234] Ἐκεῖνος γὰρ οὐχὶ ἀπὸ τῆς χάριτος μόνον τοιοῦτος ἐγένετο, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς οἰκείας προθυμίας· καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἀπὸ τῆς χάριτος, ἐπειδὴ καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς προθυμίας. Μεθ' ὑπερβολῆς γὰρ ἑκάτερα, καὶ τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἔπνευσεν αὐτῷ, καὶ τὰ τῆς οἰκείας προαιρέσεως ὑπῆρξε. Βούλει μαθεῖν τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ; Τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ ἐδεδοίκεισαν δαίμονες. Ἄλλ' οὐ θαυμάζω τοῦτο, ὥσπερ οὐδ' ὅτι τὴν σκιὰν Πέτρου τὰ νοσήματα ἔφυγεν· ἀλλὰ θαυμάζω ὅτι τὸ θαυμαστὸν τοῦτο πρὸ τῆς χάριτος, καὶ ἀπὸ βαλβίδος αὐτῆς καὶ προσιμίων αὐτῶν ἐφάνη ποιῶν· οὐδὲ τὴν δύναμιν ταύτην ἔχων, οὐδὲ χειροτονίαν δεξάμενος, οὕτω τῷ πρὸς Χριστὸν ἐξήφθη ζήλω, ὥς πάντα τῶν Ἰουδαίων τὸν δῆμον διεγείρει κατ' ἑαυτοῦ; ὅς καὶ ἰδὼν αὐτὸν ἐν τοσοῦτοις ὄντα κινδύνους, ὥς καὶ τὴν πόλιν πολιορκεῖσθαι, διὰ θυρίδος ἐχαλάσθη διὰ τοῦ τείχους, καὶ χαλασθεῖς, οὐδὲ οὕτως εἰς ὄκνον ἐνέπεσεν, οὐδὲ εἰς δειλίαν καὶ φόβον, ἀλλὰ πλείονα προθυμίαν ἐντεῦθεν ἐδέ-[236]χετο, παραχωρῶν μὲν τοῖς κινδύνους δι' οἰκονομίαν, οὐ παραχωρῶν δὲ τῆς διδασκαλίας οὐδενί, ἀλλὰ τὸν σταυρὸν πάλιν ἀρπάσας ἠκολούθει· καίτοι γε παρὰ πόδας ἔχων ἔτι τὸ παράδειγμα τὸ κατὰ τὸν Στέφανον, καὶ ὁρῶν κατ' αὐτοῦ μάλιστα πάντων φόβου πνέοντας Ἰουδαίους, καὶ αὐτῶν ἐπιθυμοῦντας αὐτοῦ τῶν σαρκῶν ἀπογεύσασθαι. Οὔτε οὖν ἀφειδῶς ἐνέπιπτε τοῖς κινδύνους, οὐδὲ διαφεύγων μαλακώτερος ἐγίνετο πάλιν. Σφόδρα τῆς παρουσίας ἡρα ζωῆς διὰ τὸ κέρδος τὸ ἐξ αὐτῆς, καὶ σφόδρα

3. A near quotation, but lacking the repeated preposition *πρός* within the syntax of John's own sentence, with these as accusatives of respect after the infinitive *εἰπεῖν*.

4. As in the prior homily, John repeats his "solution" that avoids either extreme—Paul's virtue was due neither solely to divine power nor solely to his own agency, but it was from the cooperation of the two, as, John insists, is true for all Christians.

5. The translation follows the reading of AP, *χαλασθεῖς*, for HS and successors' *διαφυγών* (but note that HS had included the former reading in the margin). AP has confirmed that every one of his collated manuscripts has the former.

6. With perhaps an allusion to the description of the "preconversion" Paul in Acts, Chrysostom develops a further invective portrait of "the Jews" as enemies of the Pauline mission.

dant riches, renowned ancestry, fine reputation, being in a position of power—none of these benefited the outsiders in the least.

5.2. Why should I speak of human beings? Indeed, should I confine my speech to the earth, when it's possible to speak about the powers above, the dominions, the authorities, and the rulers of this dark age (cf. Eph 6:12)?³ For how did their possessing so lofty a nature benefit them? Aren't all the powers going to be judged by Paul and those in his likeness? "*Don't you know*," he says, "*that we shall judge angels, much less matters of daily life*" (1 Cor 6:3)? Therefore, let's not suffer pain for any other reason than wickedness alone, or rejoice and be made glad for any other reason than virtue alone. If we are zealous for virtue, there is nothing to hinder us from becoming like Paul.

5.3. [234] For he didn't become such as he was from grace alone, but also from his own fervent will. And this is why it was from grace, since it was also from his will. He had both sets of qualities abundantly, the things of God breathed into him, and those he possessed from his own free will.⁴ Do you want to learn about "the things of God"? Demons were frightened by his garments (cf. Acts 19:12). But I don't marvel at this (or because illnesses fled from Peter's shadow [cf. Acts 5:15]), but I marvel because, before he received divine grace, from the very starting gate and at the beginning, he appeared doing such amazing things as the following: without possessing this power, or having received the laying on of hands, he was so inflamed with zeal for Christ that he roused the entire Jewish populace against himself (cf. Acts 9:19–23). And, seeing that he was in such grave dangers and that the city was blockaded, he was lowered down the wall through a window (cf. Acts 9:25; 2 Cor 11:31–33). Yet after he was lowered down,⁵ he didn't descend into timidity or into cowardice and fright, but from the experience he received a greater zeal for ethical action. [236] Paul gave way to the dangers for the sake of the divine plan, but he gave way to no one when it came to the teaching. Snatching up the cross again, he followed its path (cf. Mark 8:34 and parr.), although he still had close at hand the example of what had happened to Stephen, and he saw Jews breathing murder (cf. Acts 9:1)⁶ against him more than the others and how they desired to taste of his very flesh. Therefore, he neither fell into dangers precipitantly, nor when he fled them did he in turn become weaker. He loved the present life exceedingly because of the gain to be had from it, and just as exceedingly he disdained it, because of the philosophi-

αὐτῆς ὑπερεώρα διὰ τὴν φιλοσοφίαν τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς ὑπεροφίας γινομένην αὐτῶ, ἢ διὰ τὸ ἐπείγεσθαι πρὸς τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀπελθεῖν.

5.4. Ὅπερ γὰρ αἱ λέγω περὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ οὐδέποτε παύσομαι λέγων, οὐδεὶς οὕτως εἰς ἐναντία πράγματα ἐμπεσὼν, ἐκάτερα πρὸς ἀκρίβειαν ἤσκησεν· οὐδεὶς γοῦν οὕτω τῆς παρούσης ἐπεθύμησε ζωῆς, οὐδὲ τῶν σφόδρα φιλοψυχούντων· οὐδεὶς οὕτως αὐτῆς ὑπερεῖδεν, οὐδὲ τῶν μεθ' ὑπερβολῆς θανατῶντων. Οὕτω πάσης ἐπιθυμίας καθαρὸς ἦν ἐκεῖνος, καὶ οὐδενὶ προσέπασχε τῶν παρόντων, ἀλλὰ πανταχοῦ τῇ βουλῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ τὴν ἐπιθυ- [238]μίαν ἐκίρνα τὴν ἑαυτοῦ· καὶ νῦν μὲν αὐτὴν καὶ τῆς μετὰ Χριστοῦ συνουσίας καὶ ὁμιλίας ἀναγκαιοτέραν εἶναι φησι, νῦν δὲ οὕτω βαρεῖαν καὶ ἐπαχθῆ, ὥς καὶ στενάζειν καὶ ἐπείγεσθαι πρὸς τὴν ἀνάλυσιν· Ἐκείνων γὰρ ἐπιθυμεῖ μόνον, τῶν κατὰ Θεὸν κέρδος αὐτῶ φερόντων, εἰ καὶ ἐναντία ταῦτα εἶναι συνέβαινε τοῖς προτέροις. Καὶ γὰρ ποικίλος τις ἦν καὶ παντοδαπός, οὐχ ὑποκρινόμενος, μὴ γένοιτο, ἀλλὰ πάντα γινόμενος ἅπερ ἡ τοῦ κηρύγματος καὶ τῆς σωτηρίας τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀπῆτει χρεία, κὰν τούτῳ τὸν Δεσπότην τὸν ἑαυτοῦ μιμούμενος.

5.5. Καὶ γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς καὶ ἄνθρωπος ἐφαίνετο, ὅτε ἔδει φανῆναι τοῦτο· καὶ ἐν πυρὶ πάλαι ὅτε ὁ καιρὸς τοῦτο ἀπῆτει· καὶ νῦν μὲν ἐν ὀπλίτου σχήματι καὶ στρατιώτου, νῦν δὲ ἐν εἰκόνι πρεσβύτου, νῦν δὲ ἐν αὔρα, νῦν δὲ ὡς ὁδοιπόρος, νῦν δὲ αὐτοάνθρωπος, καὶ οὐδὲ ἀποθανεῖν οὕτω παρητήσατο. Τὸ δέ, ἔδει τοῦτο, ὅταν εἴπω, μηδεὶς ἀνάγκην εἶναι νομιζέτω τοῦ λόγου, ἀλλὰ τῆς αὐτοῦ φιланθρωπίας μόνον. Καὶ ποτὲ μὲν ἐν θρόνῳ, ποτὲ δὲ ἐπὶ τῶν [240] Χερουβὶμ κάθηται. Πάντα δὲ ταῦτα πρὸς τὰς ὑποκειμένας οἰκονομίας ἔπραττε. Διὸ καὶ διὰ τοῦ προφήτου ἔλεγεν· Ἐγὼ ὀράσεις ἐπλήθυνα, καὶ ἐν χερσὶ προφητῶν ὡμοιώθην.

5.6. Οὕτω καὶ Παῦλος τὸν ἑαυτοῦ μιμούμενος Δεσπότην οὐκ ἂν κατεγνώσθη, νῦν μὲν ὡς Ἰουδαῖος γινόμενος, νῦν δὲ ὡς ἄνομος· καὶ νῦν μὲν νόμον ἐφύλαττε, νῦν δὲ ὑπερέωρα νόμου· καὶ ποτὲ μὲν ἀντείχετο τῆς παρούσης ζωῆς, ποτὲ δὲ κατεφρόνει αὐτῆς· καὶ νῦν μὲν ἤτει χρήματα, νῦν

7. John bracingly introduces the focal "problem" of this homily by admitting it: Paul's inconsistency, to the possible point of self-contradiction. John will seek to turn this into a paradoxical encomium, an argument of praise for what might be considered blameworthy.

cal perspective he gained from this disdain, or because he was in a hurry to go off to Jesus (cf. Phil 1:23).

5.4. As I always say about him and never shall stop saying, no one embarking upon contradictory actions has practiced both so accurately.⁷ For example, no one so desired the present life as he, not even those with a passionate love for their lives; no one so disdained it, not even those dying the worst death. This is how pure of desire Paul was: he wasn't devoted to a single thing in the present life, but always melded his own desire with the will of God. [238] At one time he said living was more necessary than communion and conversation with Christ (cf. Phil 1:24), but at another that it was so grievous and burdensome that he groaned and hastened to leave it (2 Cor 5:4; Phil 1:23). He desired only those things that would bring him godly gain, even if they happened to be contradictory to what he'd done before. For he was a variable and many-sorted man, not acting hypocritically,⁸ of course (God forbid!), but becoming all things that were required for the needs of the gospel and the salvation of humanity (cf. 1 Cor 9:22–23). And in doing this, he was imitating his Lord (cf. 1 Cor 10:33–11:1).

5.5. For God also appeared, even as a human being, when it was necessary for him to appear that way, and in fire once long ago when the time required it (cf. Exod 19:18). One time he appeared in the form of a foot soldier and army man, at another in the image of an old man, now in a cool breeze, then as a traveler, now in the form of a human being, nor did he even beg off from dying. But when I say, "This was necessary," let no one think it was a logical necessity, for it was so only because of his love for humanity. And sometimes God sits on the throne and other times on the [240] cherubim. He has done all these things with a view to his underlying providential designs. Hence, he said through the prophet: "*I have multiplied visions and have been given likenesses by the hands of the prophets*" (Hos 12:11).

5.6. Therefore, Paul shouldn't be condemned if, in imitation of his own Lord, at one time he was "*as a Jew*" and at another "*as one not under the law*" (1 Cor 9:20–21); at one time he was keeping the law, at another despising it; at one time cleaving to the present life, at another condemning it; at

8. The "problem" of variability in a nutshell, made all the more a "problem" because in Gal 2:13 Paul appeared to accuse Peter of hypocrisy (see *Hom. Gal. 2:11–14*, devoted entirely to this apparent problem).

δὲ καὶ διδόμενα διεκρούετο· καὶ ἔθνε καὶ ἐξυρᾶτο, καὶ πάλιν ἀνθεμάτιζε τοὺς ποιοῦντας· καὶ νῦν μὲν περιέτεμε, νῦν δὲ περιτομὴν ἐξέβαλε. Καὶ τὰ μὲν γινόμενα ἐναντία ἦν, ἡ δὲ γνώμη καὶ ἡ διάνοια ἀφ' ἧς ταῦτα ἐγίνετο σφόδρα ἀκόλουθος καὶ ἑαυτῇ συνημμένη. "Ὑν γὰρ [242] ἐζήτει, τῶν ταῦτα ἀκουόντων καὶ ὁρώντων τὴν σωτηρίαν. Διὰ δὲ τοῦτο νῦν μὲν ἐπαίρει νόμον, νῦν δὲ αὐτὸν καθαιρεῖ. Οὐ γὰρ δὴ μόνον ἐν οἷς ἔπραττεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν οἷς ἔλεγε, ποικίλος ἦν καὶ παντοδαπός, οὐχὶ μεταβαλλόμενος τὴν γνώμην, οὐδὲ ἕτερος ἐξ ἐτέρου γινόμενος, ἀλλὰ μένων ὅπερ ἦν, καὶ τῶν εἰρημένων ἕκαστον πρὸς τὴν παροῦσαν μεταχειρίζων χρεῖαν. Μὴ τοίνυν διὰ ταῦτα αὐτὸν κακίσσης, ἀλλὰ δι' αὐτὰ μὲν οὖν ταῦτα μάλιστα ἀνακήρυξον καὶ στεφάνωσον.

5.7. Ἐπεὶ καὶ τὸν ἱατρὸν, ὅταν ἴδῃς νῦν μὲν καίοντα, νῦν δὲ τρέφοντα, καὶ νῦν μὲν σιδήρῳ χρώμενον, νῦν δὲ φαρμάκῳ, καὶ ποτὲ μὲν ἀπάγοντα σιτίων καὶ ποτῶν, ποτὲ δὲ ἐπιτρέποντα τούτων ἄδην ἐμφορεῖσθαι τὸν κάμνοντα, καὶ ποτὲ μὲν περιβάλλοντα πάντοθεν, ποτὲ δὲ αὐτὸν ἐκείνον τὸν διαθερμανθέντα κελεύοντα φιάλῃ ὀλόκληρον ἐκπιεῖν ὑδάτων ψυχρῶν, οὐ καταγνώσῃ τῆς μεταβολῆς, οὐδὲ τῆς συνεχοῦς μεταστάσεως· ἀλλὰ τότε μάλιστα ἐπαινέσεις τὴν τέχνην, τὰ δοκοῦντα ἡμῖν ἐναντία εἶναι καὶ βλαβερά μετὰ τοῦ θαρρεῖν προσάγουσαν ὁρῶν, καὶ τὸ ἀσφαλὲς ἐγγυωμένην. Τοῦτο γὰρ ἀνὴρ τεχνικός. Εἰ δὲ ἱατρὸν ἀποδεχόμεθα τὰ ἐναντία ταῦτα ποιοῦντα, πολλῶ [244] μᾶλλον τὴν Παύλου ψυχὴν, οὕτω τοῖς κάμνουσι προσφερομένην, ἀνακηρύττειν δεῖ. Καὶ γὰρ τῶν τὰ σώματα ἀρρωστούντων οὐκ ἔλαττον οἱ τὰς ψυχὰς νοσοῦντες δέονται μηχανῆς καὶ μεταχειρίσεως· καὶ ἐξ εὐθείας αὐτοῖς προσίης, πάντα οἰχίσηται τὰ τῆς σωτηρίας αὐτῶν.

5.8. Καὶ τί θαυμαστόν, εἰ ἄνθρωποι ταῦτα ποιοῦσιν, ὅπου ὁ Θεός, ὁ πάντα δυνάμενος, τούτῳ κέχρηται τῆς ἰατρείας τῷ νόμῳ, καὶ οὐ πάντοτε ἡμῖν ἐξ εὐθείας ὁμιλεῖ; Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἐκόντας εἶναι βούλεται καλοὺς, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀνάγκη καὶ βία, ἐδέησεν αὐτῷ καὶ μεθόδου, οὐ διὰ τὸ αὐτοῦ ἀδύνατον, ἄπαγε, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ ἀσθενὲς τὸ ἡμέτερον. Αὐτῷ μὲν γὰρ ἔξεστι νεῦσαι μόνον, μᾶλλον δὲ ἐβελῆσαι μόνον, καὶ ποιῆσαι πάντα ἅπερ ἂν βούληται· ἡμεῖς δὲ

9. Among popular philosophers, the example of the doctor's variable cures is a commonplace. It is one that John uses often; see in this volume, e.g., *Hom. 2 Cor. 4:13 B* §2 (PG 51:283), with p. 410 n. 28.

10. The translation adopts the reading of AP, ἄδην (with four of his manuscripts, from two different families), for that of HS and his successors, ἄρδην (hence "all at once," which is less contextually fitting).

one time demanding money, at another rejecting what was offered; sometimes he was sacrificing and shaving his head (cf. Acts 21:24–26) and other times anathematizing those who did such things (cf. Gal 1:8–9); at one time circumcizing (cf. Acts 16:3), at another time casting out circumcision (cf. Phil 3:2–3). For the deeds were contradictory, but the mind and intention from which they arose were very much in agreement and united with one another. [242] He continually sought one thing—the salvation of those hearing his word and seeing his actions. That’s why at one time he exalts the law and at another he destroys it. For not only in what he did, but also in what he said, he was variable and many-sorted. However, he didn’t change his mind or become someone else, but he remained the very man who he was and, for the present need, made use of each of the courses of action I mentioned. Therefore, don’t reproach him for these things, but proclaim his praises and crown him all the more because of them!

5.7. Take the case of a physician.⁹ When you see him at one time cauterizing, at another feeding, at one time using an iron implement, at another giving a medicinal remedy, at one time withholding food and drink, and at another providing the sick their fill¹⁰ of these things, sometimes completely covering up a person who has a fever, and at other times ordering them to drink a full cup of cold water, you don’t condemn his variability or his constant changing. But instead, you praise his craft especially when you see that it introduces with confidence treatments that seem contradictory and harmful to us and guarantees that they are safe. For this is a man who is an expert craftsman. If we accept a physician who does these contradictory things, how much more [244] should we proclaim the praises of Paul’s soul, which in the same way attends to the sick? For those who are sick in their souls have no less need of adaptably strategic treatment than those who are ill in the body. Indeed, if you should approach them with straightforwardly consistent measures, all the efforts for their salvation will be undone.

5.8. If human beings do these things, why is it a surprise that God, who is able to do everything, has adopted this principle of healing and doesn’t always deal with us in a straightforward fashion? Since God wished us to be virtuous willingly, and not by compulsion and force, he had need of this approach—not because it was impossible for him (banish the thought!), but because of our weakness. For he is able merely by nodding, or, rather, only willing it, to make everything just as he wishes. But we, having at one

ἅπαξ ἑαυτῶν γενόμενοι κύριοι, οὐκ ἀνεχόμεθα πάντα ὑπακούειν αὐτῷ. Ἐὰν οὖν ἄκοντας ἐλκύσῃ, ὅπερ ἔδωκεν ἀφαιρήσεται, τὴν τῆς ἐξουσίας λέγω ἐλευθερίαν. Ἰν' οὖν μὴ τοῦτο γένηται, ἐδέησεν αὐτῷ μεθόδων πολλῶν. Ταῦτα δὲ ἡμῖν οὐχ ἀπλῶς εἴρηται, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ ποικίλον τοῦ μακαρίου Παύλου καὶ σοφόν. ὥστε ὅταν ἴδῃς αὐτὸν φεύγοντα κινδύνους, [246] θαύμασον ὁμοίως, ὥσπερ ὅταν ἴδῃς ὁμόσε χωροῦντα αὐτοῖς· καθάπερ γὰρ τοῦτο ἀνδρείας, οὕτω κακείνο σοφίας. Ὅταν ἴδῃς μεγάλα φθεγγόμενον, θαύμασον ὁμοίως, ὥσπερ ὅταν ἴδῃς μετριάζοντα· καθάπερ γὰρ τοῦτο ταπεινοφροσύνης, οὕτως ἐκείνο μεγαλοψυχίας. Ὅταν ἴδῃς καυχώμενον, θαύμασον ὁμοίως, ὥσπερ ὅταν ἴδῃς διακρουόμενον ἐγκώμιον· καὶ γὰρ καὶ τοῦτο ἥθους ἀτύφου, κακείνο φιλοστόργου καὶ φιλανθρώπου· τὴν γὰρ τῶν πολλῶν οἰκονομῶν σωτηρίαν, ταῦτα ἔπραττε.

5.9. Διὸ καὶ ἔλεγεν· Εἴτε ἐξέστημεν, Θεῷ· εἴτε σωφρονοῦμεν, ὑμῖν. Οὔτε γάρ τις ἄλλος εἶχε τοσαύτας ἀνάγκας πρὸς ἀπόνοιαν, οὔτε ἄλλος τις οὕτω καθαρὸς ἀλαζονείας ἦν. Σκόπει δέ· Ἡ γνώσις φυσιοῖ· καὶ πάντες τοῦτο ἂν εἴποιμεν μετ' ἐκείνου· καὶ τοσαύτη δὲ ἦν ἐν αὐτῷ γνώσις, ὅση ἐν οὐδενὶ τῶν πώποτε ἀνθρώπων γεγεννημένων· ἀλλ' ὅμως αὐτὸν οὐκ ἐπῆρεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ τούτῳ μετριάζει. Διὸ καὶ λέγει· Ἐκ μέρους γινώσκουμεν, καὶ ἐκ μέρους προφητεύουμεν· καὶ πάλιν· Ἐγώ, ἀδελφοί, οὕτω λογιζομαι ἑμαυτὸν κατειληφέναι, καί· Εἴ τις δοκεῖ εἰδέναι τι, οὕτω οὐδὲν ἔγνωκε. Πάλιν νηστεία φυσᾷ· καὶ τοῦτο ὁ [248] Φαρισαῖος δηλοῖ λέγων· Νηστεύω δις τῆς ἐβδομάδος. Ἀλλ' οὗτος οὐχὶ νηστεύων, ἀλλὰ καὶ λιμώττων ἑαυτὸν ἔκτρωμα ἐκάλει.

5.10. Τί λέγω νηστείαν καὶ γνῶσιν, ὅπου γε ὁμιλίας τοσαῦται καὶ οὕτω συνεχεῖς πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν ἦσαν αὐτῷ γεγεννημέναι, ὅσαι μῆτε προφητῶν, μῆτε ἀποστόλων ἐγένοντο μηδενί, καὶ μᾶλλον ἐταπεινοῦτο διὰ ταῦτα; Μὴ γάρ μοι ταύτας εἶπης τὰς ἀναγεγραμμένας· τὰς γὰρ πλείους ἀπέκρυψε, καὶ οὔτε

11. οἰκονομῶν; cf. 1 Cor 4:1; 9:17.

12. Minus γάρ before ἐξέστημεν.

13. Minus δέ before γινώσκουμεν.

14. With transposition of ἀδελφοί and ἐγώ; with οὕτω λογιζομαι ἑμαυτὸν κατειληφέναι for ἑμαυτὸν οὐ λογιζομαι κατειληφέναι.

15. Minus δέ before τις.

16. With τῆς ἐβδομάδος for τοῦ σαββάτου.

time become our own masters, refuse to obey him in everything. But if he were to draw us along unwillingly, then he would destroy precisely what he gave us—free will, I mean. Hence, so that this might not happen, God had need of many forms of approach. I haven't said these things to you frivolously, but to show the variability and cleverness of the blessed Paul. Therefore, when you see him fleeing dangers (cf. 2 Cor 11:30–33), [246] marvel the same as when you see him rushing forward to meet them. For just as the latter is proof of bravery, so the former is of wisdom. When you see him telling his magnificent exploits (cf. 2 Cor 11:22–29), marvel the same as when you see him speaking modestly. For just as the latter shows humility, the former indicates magnanimity of soul. When you see him boasting (cf. 2 Cor 10:8; 11:16–12:9, etc.), marvel the same as when you see him refusing praise. For the latter shows an uninflated character, and the former compassion and love for others. This is because he was doing all these things to administer¹¹ the salvation of the many.

5.9. Hence, he said, “*if we are out of our minds, it is for God; if we are in our right mind, it is for you*” (2 Cor 5:13).¹² No one else had such compelling reasons for madness, nor was anyone else so pure of boastfulness. Consider this: “*Knowledge puffs up*” (1 Cor 8:1). We would all say this with him. Yet he had knowledge of a caliber not found in any human being ever born, but despite that he didn't exalt himself, but spoke modestly even about this. Thus he says, “*We know in part, and we prophesy in part*” (1 Cor 13:9),¹³ and again, “*Brothers, I do not yet consider myself to have apprehended it*” (Phil 3:13),¹⁴ and, “*If any think they know something, they don't yet know anything*” (1 Cor 8:2).¹⁵ Or another example: fasting puffs up. This [248] is made clear by the Pharisee who says, “*I fast twice a week*” (Luke 18:12).¹⁶ But Paul, not merely fasting but even starving, called himself “a miscarriage” (cf. 1 Cor 15:8).

5.10. Why should I speak of fasting and knowledge, when he had so many and such continual moments of converse with God as were shared by none of the prophets or apostles, and nevertheless he used to humble himself for them? Now don't tell me that these experiences were written down.¹⁷

17. I.e., in Paul's letters. John now moves to the “problem” of Pauline boasting (*καυχᾶσθαι*), a much-discussed issue among moralists, such as in Plutarch's famous treatise, *De laude ipsius* (Περὶ τοῦ ἑαυτὸν ἐπαινεῖν ἀνεπιφθόνως, ed. Pohlenz). See the fuller treatment in Mitchell, “A Patristic Perspective on Pauline *περιαντολογία*” and the recent assessment of whether the parallels can point to direct influence by Geert Roskam, “Plutarch's Influence on John Chrysostom,” *Byzantion* 85 (2015): 351–54.

πάσας εἶπεν, ἵνα μὴ δόξαν ἑαυτῷ περιθῇ μεγάλην, οὔτε πάσας ἐσίγησεν, ἵνα μὴ τὰ τῶν ψευδαποστόλων ἀνοίξῃ στόματα. Οὐδὲν γὰρ ἀπλῶς ἐκεῖνος ἐποίει, ἀλλὰ πάντα μετὰ αἰτίας δικαίας καὶ εὐλόγου· καὶ μετὰ τοσαύτης σοφίας μετῇ τὰ ἐναντία πράγματα, ὡς τῶν αὐτῶν πανταχοῦ τυγχάνειν ἐπαίνων. Ὁ δὲ λέγω τοιοῦτόν ἐστι. Μέγα ἀγαθὸν τὸ μὴδὲν μέγα περὶ ἑαυτοῦ λέγειν· ὁ δὲ οὕτως αὐτὸ εὐκαίρως ἐποίει, ὡς εἰπὼν μᾶλλον ἢ σιγῆσας ἐπαινεθῆναι. Καὶ εἰ μὴ τοῦτο πεποίηκε, τῶν ἀκαίρως ἐγκωμιαζόντων κατηγορήθη ἂν μᾶλλον· εἰ γὰρ μὴ ἐκαυχῆσατο, πάντα ἂν ἀπώλεσε καὶ προέδωκε, καὶ τὰ τῶν ἐχθρῶν ἂν ἐπῆρε πράγματα. Οὕτως οἶδε τῷ καιρῷ πανταχοῦ κεχρῆσθαι, καὶ μετὰ γνώμης ὀρθῆς καὶ τὰ ἀπηγορευμένα ποιεῖν, καὶ οὕτω χρησίμως, ὡς τῶν προστεταγμένων μὴδὲν ἔλαττον ἐκ τούτων εὐδοκιμεῖν. Μᾶλλον γὰρ Παῦλος καυχώμενος τότε εὐδοκί- [250] μησεν, ἢ ἕτερός τις κρύπτων τὰ ἑαυτοῦ κατορθώματα· οὐδεὶς γὰρ τοσαῦτα εἰργάσατο ἀγαθὰ ἀποκρύπτων τὰ ἑαυτοῦ, ὅσα ἐκεῖνος ἐξεῖπὼν τὰ ἑαυτοῦ.

5.11. Καὶ τὸ δὴ πάλιν θαυμαστότερον, ὅτι οὐ μόνον ἐξεῖπεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ μέχρι τῆς χρείας ἔσθη. Οὐ γὰρ ὡς τοῦ καιροῦ παρέχοντος αὐτῷ πολλὴν τὴν ἄδειαν, ἀμέτρως πάλιν τῷ πράγματι ἐχρήσατο, ἀλλ' ἔγνω μέχρι ποῦ προελθεῖν ἔδει. Καὶ οὐδὲ τοῦτο αὐτῷ ἤρκεσεν, ἀλλ' ὥστε μὴ τοὺς ἄλλους διαφθεῖραι, μὴδὲ παρασκευάσαι ἀπλῶς ἑαυτοὺς ἐγκωμιάζειν, καὶ ἄφρονα ἑαυτὸν καλεῖ· αὐτὸς μὲν γάρ, τῆς χρείας καλούσης, τοῦτο ἐποίησεν. Ἐπειδὴ δὲ εἰκὸς ἦν τοὺς ἄλλους εἰς αὐτὸν ὀρώντας, ἀπλῶς καὶ εἰκῇ κεχρῆσθαι τῷ παραδείγματι· ὁ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἱατρῶν γίνεται· πολλάκις γάρ, ὁ μετὰ καιροῦ φάρμακον ἐπέθηκεν οὗτος, ἀκαίρως ἕτερος ἐπιθεὶς ἐλυμήνατο καὶ ἐπεσκοτήσε τῇ τοῦ φαρμάκου δυνάμει.

5.12. Ἰν' οὖν μὴ καὶ ἐνταῦθα τοῦτο γένηται, ὅρα πόση κέχρηται τῇ προδιορθώσει μέλλων καυχᾶσθαι, οὐχ ἅπαξ, οὐδὲ δὶς, ἀλλὰ πολλάκις ἀναδύομενος. Ὡφελον γὰρ ἀνείχεσθέ μου, φησί, μικρὸν τῇ ἀφροσύνῃ· καὶ πάλιν· Ὁ λαλῶ, οὐ λαλῶ κατὰ Κύριον, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐν ἀφροσύνῃ. Ἐν ᾧ δ' ἂν τις ἐν ἀφροσύνῃ τολμᾷ λέγων, τολμῶ καγώ. Καὶ τοσαῦτα εἰπὼν, οὐδὲ τούτοις ἠρκέσθη, ἀλλὰ πάλιν μέλλων εἰς τὰ ἐγκώμια ἐμβαίνειν κρύπτει ἑαυτὸν λέγων· Οἶδα [252] ἀνθρωπον· καὶ πάλιν· Ὑπὲρ τοῦ τοιούτου καυχῆσομαι,

18. AP reads ὥφελον for ὅφελον (noting that MSS BDM E read the latter, with M).

19. With transposition of τολμᾷ and ἐν ἀφροσύνῃ; with λέγων for λέγω.

For he hid the majority of them and didn't tell all, so that he not confer great glory on himself; nor did he keep silent about them all, so as not to open the mouths of the false apostles (cf. 2 Cor 11:13). For that man did nothing frivolously, but he did all in conjunction with a just and reasonable cause. And he pursued contradictory actions with such great wisdom that he has attained the same praises from all directions. What I'm saying is this: it's a great virtue not to boast about oneself. But the person who does it when the moment requires is to be praised more for speaking than for having remained silent. And if Paul hadn't done this, then he would be more worthy of blame than those who offer praise for others, but at the wrong time. For if he hadn't boasted, then he would've lost and abandoned everything and advanced the cause of his enemies. Thus, he knew how to employ it always in the right circumstance and how to do this forbidden thing with a right purpose—to confer such benefits that he earns no less esteem for it than he would receive for following what's prescribed. Indeed, Paul was more esteemed in the moment of boasting [250] than anyone else would be when hiding their good deeds; for no one has done such good deeds in concealing their actions as Paul has done in proclaiming his.

5.11. And what is still more marvelous is the fact that not only did he speak out, but he stopped precisely at the point of the present need. For he didn't employ the practice of boasting immoderately, under the pretext that the circumstance gave him license to do so, but he knew how far one should go. And even this didn't satisfy him, but, lest he corrupt the others and make them praise themselves frivolously, he calls himself a fool (cf. 2 Cor 12:11). After all, he did this when the need called for it, but the others, seeing him do it, would likely take up the practice by his example, yet do it frivolously and in vain. This is what happens in the case of doctors as well; for often the physician applies a medicine in a timely fashion, while someone else, by applying it at the wrong time, causes injury and blocks the potency of the medicine.

5.12. Therefore, lest this happen here, too, observe how he corrects himself in advance when he is about to boast—not once or twice, but he repeatedly shrinks away from doing it. For, he says, “*Would that you would put up with me in a little bit of a foolishness*” (2 Cor 11:11),¹⁸ and again, “*What I say I do not say in a fashion suiting the Lord, but as in foolishness.... In whatever one might dare to speak in foolishness, I, too, dare*” (2 Cor 11:17, 21).¹⁹ And even though he'd expressed such strong hesitation, he wasn't satisfied even at that, but, when about to embark on encomia again, he hides himself, saying, “*I know [252] a man,*” and again, “*On behalf of such*

ὕπερ δὲ ἑαυτοῦ οὐ καυχῆσομαι· καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα πάντα· Γέγονα ἄφρων, φησὶν, ὑμεῖς με ἠναγκάσατε. Τίς οὖν οὕτως ἀνόητος καὶ σφόδρα ἀναίσθητος, ὡς τὸν ἅγιον ἐκείνον ὁρῶν, τοσαύτης ἐπικειμένης ἀνάγκης, ὀκνοῦντα καὶ ἀναδύομενον περὶ ἑαυτοῦ τι μέγα εἰπεῖν, καὶ καθάπερ ἵππον κατὰ κρημνῶν ἐρχόμενον καὶ ἀναχαιτίζοντα συνεχῶς, καίτοι μέλλων τοσαῦτα οἰκονομεῖν, μὴ φεύγειν ἐκ πολλῆς τὸ πρᾶγμα περιουσίας, καὶ μόνου καιροῦ καταναγκάζοντος κεχρηῆσθαι τῷ πράγματι;

5.13. Βούλει καὶ ἕτερον αὐτοῦ δεῖξω τοιοῦτον; Τὸ γὰρ δὴ θαυμαστόν· τοῦτό ἐστιν, ὅτι οὐκ ἤρκεῖτο τῷ συνειδότι, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡμᾶς ἐδίδασκε πῶς ἕκαστον τούτων μετιέναι δεῖ, οὐχ ἑαυτῷ μόνον ἀπολογίαν κατασκευάζων ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν καιρῶν ἀνάγκης, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους παιδεύων, ὥστε ἐμπεσόντος καιροῦ μὴ φεύγειν τὸ τοιοῦτον, μήτε ἀκαίρως αὐτὸ μετιέναι πάλιν. Διὰ γὰρ τούτων ὧν εἶπε, μονονουχὶ ταῦτα ἔλεγε· κακὸν μέγα τὸ περὶ ἑαυτοῦ λέγειν μέγα τι καὶ θαυμαστόν· καὶ ἐσχάτης ἀνοίας τοῦτο, [254] ἀγαπητέ, τὸ μηδεμιᾶς ἀνάγκης ἐπικειμένης, καὶ ἀνάγκης βιαίας, καλλωπίζεσθαι τοῖς ἐγκωμίοις· οὐκ ἔστι τοῦτο κατὰ Κύριον λαλεῖν, ἀλλὰ παραπληξίας μᾶλλον δεῖγμα τὸ τοιοῦτόν ἐστι, καὶ πάντα ἡμῖν κενοῖ τὸν μισθὸν μετὰ τοὺς πολλοὺς ἰδρῶτας καὶ πόνους. Ταῦτα γὰρ ἅπαντα καὶ πλείονα τούτων, δι' ὧν παρητήσατο καὶ ἀνάγκης ἐμπεσούσης, εἶπε πρὸς ἅπαντας. Τὸ δὲ τούτου μεῖζον, ὅτι οὐδὲ ἀνάγκης ἐμπεσούσης, πάντα ἐξέχεεν εἰς μέσον, ἀλλὰ τὰ πλείονα ἀπεκρύψατο καὶ τὰ μεῖζονα. Ἐλεύσομαι γάρ, φησὶν, εἰς ὀπτασίας καὶ ἀποκαλύψεις Κυρίου· φεῖδομαι δέ, μὴ τις εἰς ἐμὲ λογίσσεται, ὑπὲρ ὃ βλέπει ἢ ἀκούει τι ἐξ ἐμοῦ. Ταῦτα δὲ ἔλεγε παιδεύων ἅπαντας, μὴδὲ ἀνάγκης οὔσης, πάντα ὅσα σύνισμεν ἑαυτοῖς, φέροντας αὐτὰ εἰς μέσον κατατιθέναι, ἀλλ' ὅσα τοῖς ἀκούουσι χρήσιμα.

5.14. Ἐπεὶ καὶ ὁ Σαμουὴλ· οὐδὲν γὰρ ἀπεικὸς καὶ ἐκείνου μνησθῆναι τοῦ ἁγίου, εἰς γὰρ ὠφέλειαν ἡμῶν καὶ τὰ ἐγκώμια γίνεται· ἐκαυχῆσά ποτε καὶ ἐκεῖνος, καὶ ἐξεῖπεν οἰκεῖα κατορθώματα· ἀλλὰ ποῖα; Ἄ τοῖς ἀκούουσι

20. Minus καυχόμενος after ἄφρων.

21. As AP observed, JPM silently changed the reading of all the manuscripts and all precursors (HS FD Mf PE) from μέλλων to μέλλοντα. The latter, while grammatically expected, is unattested by any of the manuscripts. The translation adopts the reading of the manuscripts (with HS AP) and seeks to capture the elongated sentence structure and highlight the καὶ μέλλων clause (which breaks with the series of accusative participles before) by placing it at the end.

22. John addresses the implied “problem” that Christians may learn from Paul’s example to engage in self-praise or boasting; he seeks to turn the tables by arguing that

a man I shall boast, but on behalf of myself I shall not boast" (2 Cor 12:2, 5). And after all these statements, he says, "*I have been a fool. But you compelled me*" (2 Cor 12:11).²⁰ Who, therefore, is so foolish and extremely stupid as not to flee from the practice of superfluous boasting and engage in it only when a timely circumstance has rendered it necessary? How could one not flee it when one sees that saint, even in the moment when there's a great necessity, hesitate and shrink away from boasting like a horse coming to a precipice and rearing back continually, even though he was destined²¹ to administer such important matters?

5.13. Do you want me to offer another such proof of his behavior? This is what's marvelous: that he wasn't satisfied with his own conscience, but he also taught us how we should pursue each of these strategies. Not only was he defending himself by taking recourse to the necessity of the times, but he was also teaching the others, so that when the time befell them, they would neither flee from the practice entirely nor again pursue it at the wrong moment.²² Indeed, through the comments he made, it's almost as if he were saying: "It's a great evil to tell something grand and marvelous about oneself." And this is the height of folly, [254] beloved, to adorn oneself with encomia when there's no need, as though there were some compelling need. This isn't speaking "*in a fashion suiting the Lord*" (2 Cor 11:17), but instead it's a proof of madness, and it nullifies the entire reward of our deeds, after much exertion and labors. For when there was a necessity, Paul told everyone all these things, and more besides that he begged off from telling. But, even more than this, not even when necessity befell him did he continually pour out all his virtuous deeds in public, but he hid the most and the best of them. For, he said, "*I shall go on to visions and revelations of the Lord.... I fear lest someone might consider me to be above what they see or hear from me*" (2 Cor 12:1, 6).²³ He spoke these things to teach us all that not even when there's a necessity should we bring out into the public eye all the good deeds we're conscious of in ourselves, but only what will be useful for the listeners.

5.14. This was the case also with Samuel. There's nothing unreasonable about bringing to mind that saint, since his encomia serve our benefit too. That man boasted once, too, and told of his own virtuous deeds. But

Paul is actually the premier example of moderation and salutary variability in speech. For this same argument, see *Hom. 2 Cor. 11:1* §10 (PG 51:310).

23. Minus *με* after *βλέπει*.

συνέφερεν. Οὐ γὰρ περὶ σωφροσύνης ἀπέτεινε λόγον μακρόν, οὐδὲ περὶ ταπεινοφροσύνης, οὐδὲ περὶ τοῦ μὴ μνησικακεῖν, ἀλλὰ ὑπὲρ τίνος; Ὑπὲρ τούτου, ὃ μάλιστα ἔδει μαθεῖν τὸν τότε βασιλεύοντα, ὑπὲρ δικαιοσύνης, καὶ τοῦ καθαρὰς ἔχειν τὰς χεῖρας δώρων. [256] Καὶ ὁ Δαυὶδ πάλιν καυχώμενος, ἀπ' ἐκείνων καυχᾶται τῶν δυναμένων τὸν ἀκροατὴν διορθῶσαι. Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐκεῖνος ἄλλην εἶπεν ἀρετὴν, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἄρκτον καὶ τὸν λέοντα παρήγαγεν εἰς μέσον, καὶ οὐδὲν ἕτερον. Τὸ μὲν γὰρ περαιτέρω τὸν λόγον ἐξαγαγεῖν, φιλοτίμου καὶ ἀλαζόνος· τὸ δὲ εἰπεῖν ταῦτα ἃ πρὸς τὴν παροῦσαν ἔμελλε χρεῖαν ἀναγκαῖα εἶναι, φιλανθρώπου καὶ τὸ τῶν πολλῶν συμφέρον ὁρώντος· ὃ δὴ καὶ Παῦλος ἐποίησε. Καὶ γὰρ διεβάλλετο, ὡς οὐκ ὦν ἀπόστολος δόκιμος, οὐδὲ ἔχων τινὰ ἰσχύν. Ἀνάγκη τοίνυν ἦν δι' ἐκεῖνα εἰς ταῦτα ἐμπεσεῖν, ἃ μάλιστα ἐδείκνυ αὐτοῦ τὸ ἀξίωμα.

5.15. Ὅρᾳς δι' ὅσων ἐπαίδευσε τὸν ἀκροατὴν μὴ ἀπλῶς καυχᾶσθαι; Πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ διὰ τοῦ δεῖξαι, ὅτι ἀνάγκη τοῦτο ἐποίησε· δεύτερον, διὰ τοῦ καὶ ὡς ἄφρονα ἑαυτὸν καλέσαι, καὶ πολλὰς χρήσασθαι παραιτήσεσι· τρίτον, διὰ τοῦ μὴ πάντα εἰπεῖν, ἀλλὰ τὰ μείζονα ἀποκρύψασθαι, καὶ ταῦτα ἀνάγκης οὔσης· τέταρτον, διὰ τοῦ προσωπεῖον ἕτερον ὑπελθεῖν, καὶ εἰπεῖν ὅτι· Οἶδα ἄνθρωπον· πέμπτον, διὰ τοῦ μὴ καὶ τὴν ἄλλην ἀρετὴν ἅπασαν εἰς μέσον ἀγαγεῖν, ἀλλ' ἐκεῖνο τὸ μέρος οὗ μάλιστα ὁ παρὼν ἐδεῖτο καιρὸς.

5.16. Οὐκ ἐν τῷ καυχᾶσθαι δὲ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τῷ ὑβρίζειν τοιοῦτος ἦν. Καίτοι καὶ τοῦτο κεκωλυμένον ἦν, τὸ ὑβρίζειν ἀδελφόν, ἀλλ' οὕτω καὶ τούτῳ δεόντως ἐχρήσατο πάλιν ὡς τῶν ἐγκωμιαζόντων μᾶλλον εὐδοκιμῆσαι. [258] Διὰ τοι τοῦτο καὶ Γαλάτας καλῶν ἀνοήτους καὶ ἄπαξ καὶ δῖς, καὶ Κρήτας γαστέρας ἀργάς, καὶ θηρία κακά, καὶ ἐντεῦθεν ἀνακηρύττεται. Καὶ γὰρ ὅρον ἡμῖν ἔδωκε καὶ κανόνα, ὥστε τῶν κατὰ Θεὸν ἀμελουμένων μὴ κεκρηῆσθαι θεραπείᾳ, ἀλλὰ πληκτικώτερον μεταχειρίζειν τὸν λόγον. Καὶ πάντων μέτρα ἐστὶ παρ' αὐτῷ κείμενα· διὰ δὴ τοῦτο πάντα ποιῶν καὶ λέγων εὐδοκίμει, καὶ ὑβρίζων καὶ ἐπαινῶν, καὶ ἀποστρεφόμενος καὶ θεραπεύων, καὶ ἐπαίρων

24. Chrysostom uses the same examples of Samuel and David to illustrate appropriate boasting in *Hom. 2 Cor. 11:1* §§7–9 (PG 51:307–8), developing the argument at considerably more length.

25. I.e., when begging Saul to let him contend with Goliath.

26. ἀξίωμα means both these things (see p. 192 n. 46).

which ones? Those that were of advantage to his hearers. For he did not prolong his speech with talk of his moderation, or humility, or refusal to bear grudges, but what did he speak about? About what the king at the time [Saul] especially had need to learn—justice and keeping one's hands clean of bribes (1 Kgdms 12:1–5). [256] Also David,²⁴ when he engaged in boasting, boasted of the things that could set his hearer on the right path. For he didn't mention any other virtuous deed,²⁵ but brought forward publicly his defeat of the bear and the lion, and nothing else (1 Kgdms 17:34–37). For to draw out his speech further would've been the act of a vainglorious man and foolish braggadocio, whereas to say the very things that would be necessary for the present need is the part of one who's magnanimous and looks to the advantage of the many—which is precisely what Paul did. For the slanders being brought against him were that he wasn't a proven apostle (cf. 2 Cor 12:11–13), nor did he have any power. Consequently, because of those charges, it was necessary that he go into the deeds that especially would prove his dignity and rank.²⁶

5.15. Do you see how many means he employed to instruct his hearer not to boast frivolously? First, by showing that he did this from necessity. Second, by calling himself a fool and repeatedly begging off from engaging in it. Third, by not telling everything but hiding his greater deeds—and this was when there was in fact a necessity. Fourth, by assuming another persona and saying, “*I know a man*” (2 Cor 12:2). Fifth, by not publicizing every other virtue, but only that portion for which the present time had special need.

5.16. But it wasn't only in boasting that he was like this, but also in insulting.²⁷ Although it had been forbidden to insult a brother (Matt 5:22), Paul used this practice, too, in such a fitting manner that he's more esteemed for it than are those who speak in praise. [258] Notice how for this reason he calls the Galatians stupid, not once but twice (Gal 3:1, 3), and Cretans “lazy gluttons” and “*wicked beasts*” (Titus 1:12), and is awarded praise for it. For he gave us a limit and a standard, so that we might not employ too much solicitation with those who are neglectful of God, but practice a more combative form of speech. The proper measure of all things resides in him. Indeed, for this reason, Paul is highly esteemed in everything he does and says, in both insulting and praising, abandoning and soliciting, exalt-

27. On the same lines as the previous rhetorical move on self-praise, here John seeks to turn the “problem” of insulting speech in the Pauline letters into a sign of virtue.

ἐαυτὸν καὶ μετριάζων, καὶ καυχώμενος καὶ ταλανίζων. Καὶ τί θαυμάζεις, εἰ ὕβρις καὶ λοιδορία εὐδοκιμεῖ, ὅπου γε καὶ φόνος εὐδοκίμησε καὶ ἀπάτη καὶ δόλος, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς Παλαιᾶς, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς Καινῆς;

5.17. Ταῦτ' οὖν ἅπαντα μετὰ ἀκριβείας ἐξετάσαντες, καὶ Παῦλον θαυμάσωμεν, καὶ τὸν Θεὸν δοξάσωμεν, καὶ ἡμεῖς οὕτως αὐτὸν μεταχειρισώμεθα, ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ τῶν αἰωνίων ἐπιτύχωμεν ἀγαθῶν, χάριτι καὶ φιλανθρωπία τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ᾧ ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος νῦν καὶ αἰεὶ καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Ἀμήν.

ing himself and speaking modestly, boasting and lowering himself. And why should you be surprised if insult and reviling receive esteem, when murder and deceit and guile were esteemed in both the Old and the New Testaments?²⁸

5.17. Therefore, now that we have studied all these things in careful detail, let's marvel at Paul, let's glorify God, and let's treat him in such a way that we ourselves also might attain the eternal goods, by the grace and loving-kindness of our Lord Jesus Christ, to whom be the glory and the power, now and always, and forever and ever. Amen.

28. For the OT, AP lists Gen 27, Jdt 10:11–13, etc. (for guile and deception), 1 Sam 17:38–54 [=1 Kgdms 17:38–54], and other passages (for murder; to which one should add at least Judg 4:24–26); and for the NT, Luke 16:1–9 (for guile). One may add 2 Thess 2:11 (deception) and, for murder, such parables as Mark 12:9 and parr., Matt 22:7, etc. John is deliberately drawing attention here to part of the problematic legacy of the Scriptures, but he does not pause to provide a solution other than the presumption, as with the doxology that follows, that these are all part of the divine plan.

Τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐγκώμιον εἰς τὸν ἅγιον ἀπόστολον Παῦλον, λόγος ζ'.

6.1. [260] Βούλεσθε τήμερον, ἀγαπητοί, παρέντες τὰ μεγάλα Παύλου καὶ θαυμαστά, ἃ δοκεῖ παρά τισι λαβὴν τινα ἔχειν, ταῦτα εἰς μέσον ἀγάγωμεν; καὶ γὰρ καὶ αὐτὰ ἐκείνων ὁψόμεθα οὐκ ἔλαττον αὐτὸν ποιοῦντα λαμπρὸν καὶ μέγαν. Τί οὖν ἐστὶν ὁ λαβὴν ἔχει; Ὡφθη ποτέ, φησί, πληγὰς δεδοικώς· καὶ γὰρ ὥφθη, ὅτε αὐτὸν προέτειναν τοῖς ἱμαῖσι· καὶ οὐ τότε μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἄλλοτε πάλιν ἐπὶ τῆς πορφυροπώλιδος, ὅτε καὶ πράγματα παρέσχε τοῖς βουλομένοις αὐτὸν ἐξαγαγεῖν. Οὐδὲν γὰρ ἄλλο κατασκευάζων [262] τοῦτο ἐποίει ἢ ἀσφάλειαν ἑαυτῷ καὶ τὸ μὴ ταχέως τοῖς αὐτοῖς περιπεσεῖν. Τί οὖν ἂν εἴποιμεν; Ὅτι οὐδὲν αὐτὸν οὕτω μέγαν δείκνυσι καὶ θαυμαστόν, ὡς ταῦτα τὰ εἰρημένα· οἷον ὅτι ψυχὴν ἔχων τοιαύτην, οὐχὶ τολμηράν, οὐδὲ ἀπονενοημένην, καὶ σῶμα οὕτως εἶκον πληγαῖς καὶ τρέμον μάλιστα, τῶν ἀσωμάτων δυνάμεων οὐκ ἔλαττον πάντων ὑπερεῖδε τῶν δοκούντων εἶναι φοβερῶν, ἥνίκα ὁ καιρὸς τοῦτο ἀπῆτει. Ὅταν οὖν ἴδῃς αὐτὸν ἀποτεινόμενον καὶ δεδοικότα, ἀναμνήσθητι τῶν ῥημάτων ἐκείνων, δι' ὧν ὑπερέβη τοὺς οὐρανοὺς, καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἀγγέλους ἡμιλλᾶτο, λέγων· Τίς ἡμᾶς χωρίσει ἀπὸ τῆς ἀγάπης τοῦ Θεοῦ; θλίψις, ἢ στενοχωρία, ἢ διωγμός, ἢ λιμός, ἢ κίνδυνος,

1. Text: as indicated in the introduction (pp. 62–64), we reprint the Greek text of Auguste Piédagnel (AP) SC 300 (1982) for each of the seven homilies *De laudibus sancti Pauli*. The footnotes within the translations on *Laud. Paul.* 1.14; 3.6; 4.15; 4.16; 5.3; 5.7; 6.5; 6.11; and 7.2 document the nine places where Piédagnel's text (AP) diverges from HS. See abbreviations, p. xvi above, for the sigla for AP's manuscripts. The translation and notes do not attempt a comprehensive assessment of the variants in the textual tradition of *Laud. Paul.*; readers should consult the Piédagnel edition for a full *apparatus criticus*. Translation: This translation is replicated from HT 475–81, with some minor adjustments; see HT 166–72 for an analysis of the argument of this homily.

2. λαβή, another way to describe Pauline “problems” (see *Hom. Rom.* 12:20 §5 for an extensive use of this wrestling metaphor by John to refer to the agonistics of Pauline problems and solutions, and p. 230 n. 89).

Hom. 6 De laudibus sancti Pauli apostoli
CPG 4344 (SC 300:260–90)¹

In praise of saint Paul the apostle by the same author, homily 6.

6.1. [260] Would you like it, beloved, if today we left behind Paul’s great and admirable deeds and instead brought before you the things that some people think provide “a wrestling hold”² against him? For we shall see that even these things make him no less illustrious and great than the deeds we usually praise. What, then, is it that provides a wrestling hold? “Well,” someone says,³ “he once appeared to be afraid of blows, for he sure looked that way when *‘they held out the straps’* (Acts 22:25).⁴ And not only then, but also once again another time, in the incident of the purple seller, when he gave objections to those who wished to lead him out from the prison (cf. Acts 16:35–40). By these acts, he was doing nothing other than securing [262] his own safety and insuring he not quickly fall into the same difficulties again.” Well, now, what should we say against this? That nothing shows him so great and marvelous as these things just mentioned. For instance, although he had a soul of a type that was neither daring nor full of reckless pride, and a body that yielded to blows and trembled before whips, when the occasion required it he had disdain for nothing less than all the incorporeal powers that are thought to be so frightening. Therefore, when you see him drawn out⁵ and frightened, remember those words with which he transcended the heavens and vied with the angels, saying: “*What will separate us from the love of God? Affliction, or misery, or persecution, or famine,*

3. John introduces a hypothetical protagonist as the spokesperson for the charge against Paul.

4. Minus *αὐτόν* before *τοῖς ἱμᾶσι*.

5. AP translates *ἀποτεινόμενον καὶ δεδοικότα* as “protester fortément tout en ayant peur” (AP 263), but that puts the lexical sense of *ἀποτείνειν* in the middle (without object) and posits a grammatical contrast within the sentence that is not syntactically marked. Rather, both participles refer to Paul’s experience of hardship, while the contrast stands within the larger argument of his bravery in the midst of real exhaustion and fear.

ἢ μάχαιρα; Ἀναμνήσθητι τῶν ῥημάτων ἐκείνων, δι' ὧν οὐδὲν ταῦτα εἶναι φησι, λέγων· Τὸ γὰρ παραυτίκα ἐλαφρὸν τῆς θλίψεως ἡμῶν καθ' ὑπερβολὴν εἰς ὑπερβολὴν αἰώνιον βάρους δόξης κατεργάζεται ἡμῖν, μὴ σκοπούντων ἡμῶν τὰ βλεπόμενα, ἀλλὰ τὰ μὴ βλεπόμενα. Πρόσθες τούτοις τὰς καθημερινὰς θλίψεις, τοὺς θανάτους τοὺς καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν· καὶ ταῦτα ἐννοήσας, καὶ Παῦλον θαύμαζε, καὶ σαυτοῦ μηκέτι ἀπογνῶς.

6.2. [264] Αὐτὴ γὰρ ἡ δοκοῦσα τῆς φύσεως εἶναι ἀσθένεια, αὐτὴ μέγιστον δεῖγμα τῆς ἀρετῆς ἐστὶ τῆς ἐκείνου, ὅτι οὐκ ἀπηλλαγμένος τῆς τῶν πολλῶν ἀνάγκης τοιοῦτος ἦν. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἡ τῶν κινδύνων ὑπερβολὴ πολλοῖς ἂν ταύτην παρέσχε τὴν ὑπόληψιν, καὶ ὑποπτεύειν ἴσως ἐποίησεν ὅτι, ἀνώτερος τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων γενόμενος, τοιοῦτος ἦν· διὰ ταῦτα συνεχωρεῖτο πάσχειν, ἵνα μάθῃς ὅτι εἰς τῶν πολλῶν ὧν κατὰ τὴν φύσιν, κατὰ τὴν προθυμίαν οὐ μόνον ὑπὲρ τοὺς πολλοὺς ἦν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ἀγγέλων εἰς ἦν. Μετὰ γὰρ τοιαύτης ψυχῆς καὶ τοιοῦτου σώματος τοὺς μυρίους ὑπέμενε θανάτους, καὶ κατεφρόνει τῶν παρόντων, τῶν μελλόντων. Διὸ καὶ τὰ μεγάλα ἐκεῖνα καὶ πολλοῖς ἄπιστα ἐφθέγγατο ῥήματα· Ὅτι ἡσχόμεν ἀνάθεμα εἶναι ἀπὸ Χριστοῦ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀδελφῶν μου, τῶν συγγενῶν μου κατὰ σάρκα.

6.3. Δυνατὸν γάρ, εἰ βουληθῆμεν μόνον, πᾶσαν φύσεως ἀγωνίαν τῇ τῆς προθυμίας νικῆσαι δυνάμει· καὶ οὐδὲν ἐστὶν ὅπερ ἀδύνατον ἀνθρώποις τῶν ὑπὸ Χριστοῦ κελευσθέντων· ἂν γὰρ ὅσην ἔχωμεν προθυμίαν ταύτην **[266]** ἐπιδῶμεν, καὶ ὁ Θεὸς πολλὴν ἡμῖν συνεισάγει ῥοπήν, καὶ οὕτω πᾶσι τοῖς ἐπιούσι δεινοῖς ἀνάλωτοι γενησόμεθα. Οὐδὲ γὰρ τὸ φοβεῖσθαι πληγὰς καταγνώσεως ἄξιον, ἀλλὰ τὸ διὰ τὸν φόβον τῶν πληγῶν ἀνάξιόν τι τῆς εὐσεβείας ὑπομεῖναι, ὥστε τὸ δεδοικέναι πληγὰς τὸν ἐν τοῖς ἀγῶσιν ἄληπτον θαυμαστότερον δείκνυσι τοῦ μὴ φοβουμένου. Μᾶλλον γὰρ ἡ προαίρεσις οὕτω διαλάμπει· τὸ μὲν γὰρ φοβηθῆναι πληγὰς, τῆς φύσεως· τὸ δὲ μηδὲν διὰ τὸν φόβον τῶν πληγῶν ἀπρεπὲς ὑπομεῖναι, τῆς προαιρέσεως διορθουμένης τὸ τῆς φύσεως ἐλάττωμα, καὶ κρατούσης τῆς ἀσθενείας ἐκείνης· ἐπεὶ οὐδὲ τὸ λυπεῖσθαι ἔγκλημα, ἀλλὰ τὸ διὰ τὴν λύπην εἰπεῖν τι ἢ πράξει τῶν τῷ Θεῷ μὴ δοκούντων. Εἰ μὲν γὰρ ἔλεγον ὅτι οὐκ ἦν ἄνθρωπος Παῦλος, καλῶς μοι τὰ τῆς φύσεως ἐλαττώματα εἰς μέσον ἦγες, ὡς μέλλων ταύτη τὸν λόγον ἐλέγχειν· εἰ δὲ λέγω καὶ διαβεβαιοῦμαι ὅτι ἄνθρωπος μὲν ἦν, καὶ ἡμῶν οὐδὲν ἀμείνων κατὰ τὴν φύσιν, βελτίων δὲ γέγονε κατὰ τὴν προαίρεσιν, εἰκῇ μοι

6. With Θεοῦ for Χριστοῦ; minus ἢ γυμνότης before ἢ κίνδυνος.

7. Minus γὰρ αὐτὸς ἐγὼ after ἡσχόμεν; minus τοῦ before Χριστοῦ.

or danger, or sword?" (Rom 8:35).⁶ Remember those words in which he said all such things are nothing: "*For the present ease of our affliction superabundantly effects an eternal weight of glory for us, as we do not look upon the visible things, but upon the invisible*" (2 Cor 4:17–18). Add to these the daily afflictions, the deaths every single day (cf. 1 Cor 15:31). Considering all these trials, marvel at Paul, and no longer despair in yourself.

6.2. [264] The apparent weakness of Paul's nature is itself the greatest proof of his virtue because, despite the fact that he wasn't set free from the natural constraints of the many, he was such a man as he was. The extreme number of dangers he overcame might provide many people with the false impression and perhaps make them suspect that Paul was such such a person as he was because he was above all human creatures. This is why God allowed him to suffer, so that you might learn that, although one of the many where nature is concerned, when it came to ethical zeal Paul was not only above the many but even one of the angels. This is because, endowed with such a soul and such a body, he continually endured countless deaths and despised the things of the present and those to come. Hence, he uttered those magnificent and to most people incredible words: "*I would wish to be anathema from Christ on behalf of my brethren, my kin according to the flesh*" (Rom 9:3).⁷

6.3. For it is possible, if we would only wish it, to win in every contest against nature—if we use the power of our will. None of the things Christ commanded is impossible for human beings. For if we would contribute as large a share of willingness as we are able, [266] then God will weigh in the balance heavily for us; thus we shall all become unassailable to all the terrors attacking us. What is truly blameworthy isn't fearing blows, but enduring something unworthy of piety because of that fear; hence, for the man who remains uncaptured in battle to have been afraid of blows proves him more admirable than the man who didn't fear. Indeed, in that case, what particularly shines through is his free will, since, while fearing blows is a matter of nature, enduring nothing unseemly on account of that fear is due to one's free will correcting the weakness of nature and proving victorious over that weakness. Neither is being grieved a cause for blame, but saying or doing something not pleasing to God because of grief. Now, if I were saying that Paul was not a human being, then you'd rightly bring up to me his deficiencies of nature in an attempt to refute my argument by reference to that nature. But if I'm saying—indeed, strongly maintaining—that, on the one hand, he was human and in no way superior to us in regard to nature but, on the other, that he became better in regard to the exercise of

ταῦτα προφέρεις, μᾶλλον δὲ οὐκ εἰκῆ, ἀλλὰ ὑπὲρ Παύλου. Καὶ γὰρ δεικνύεις ἐντεῦθεν ἡλικὸς ἐκεῖνος ἦν, ὡς ἐν τοιαύτῃ φύσει τὰ ὑπὲρ τὴν φύσιν ἰσχυῖσαι. Οὐκ ἐκεῖνον δὲ μόνον ἐπαίρεις, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀπορράπτεις τῶν ἀναπεπτωκότων τὰ στόματα, οὐκ ἀφίεις αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν τῆς φύσεως ὑπεροχὴν καταφυγεῖν, ἀλλ' ὥθων αὐτοὺς εἰς τὴν ἀπὸ προαιρέσεως σπουδὴν.

6.4. [268] Ἀλλὰ καὶ θάνατον, φησίν, ἔδεισέ ποτε; Καὶ γὰρ καὶ τοῦτο τῆς φύσεως. Ἀλλ' ὅμως οὗτος αὐτὸς πάλιν ὁ θάνατον δεδοικῶς ἔλεγε. Καὶ γὰρ ἡμεῖς, οἱ ὄντες ἐν τῷ σκῆνι, στεναζόμεν βαρούμενοι. Καὶ πάλιν· Ἡμεῖς αὐτοὶ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς στεναζόμεν. Εἶδες πῶς ἀντίρροπον τῆς φυσικῆς ἀσθενείας τὴν ἀπὸ προαιρέσεως εἰσῆγαγε δύναμιν; Ἐπεὶ καὶ μάρτυρες πολλοὶ πολλάκις ἀπάγεσθαι μέλλοντες ἐπὶ θανάτῳ ὠχρίασαν καὶ φόβου καὶ ἀγωνίας ἐνεπλήσθησαν· ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ τοῦτο μάλιστα θαυμαστοί, ὅτι καὶ οὗτοι δεδοικότες θάνατον, οὐκ ἔφυγον θάνατον διὰ τὸν Ἰησοῦν. Οὕτω καὶ Παῦλος φοβούμενος θάνατον, οὐδὲ γέενναν παραιτεῖται διὰ τὸν ποθούμενον Ἰησοῦν, καὶ τρέμων τελευτῇ, τὸ ἀναλῦσαι ἐπιζητεῖ. Οὐχ οὗτος δὲ μόνον τοιοῦτος ἦν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ κορυφαῖος αὐτῶν πολλάκις εἰπὼν **[270]** ὅτι ἔτοιμός ἐστι τὴν ψυχὴν ἐπιδοῦναι, σφόδρα ἐδεδοίκει θάνατον. Ἀκουσον γοῦν τί διαλεγόμενος αὐτῷ περὶ τούτου φησὶν ὁ Χριστός· Ὅταν δὲ γηράσῃς, ἐκτενεῖς τὰς χεῖράς σου, καὶ ἄλλος σε ζώσει καὶ οἴσει ὅπου οὐ θέλεις, τὸ τῆς φύσεως ἐλάττωμα διηγούμενος, οὐ τὸ τῆς προαιρέσεως.

6.5. Ἡ γὰρ φύσις τὰ αὐτῆς καὶ ἀκόντων ἡμῶν ἐπιδείκνυται, καὶ κρατῆσαι τῶν ἐλαττωμάτων ἐκείνων οὐκ ἔνι, οὐδὲ τὸν σφόδρα βουλούμενον καὶ σπουδάζοντα· οὐκοῦν οὐδὲν ἐντεῦθεν παραβλαπτόμεθα, ἀλλὰ καὶ θαυμαζόμεθα μᾶλλον. Ποῖον γὰρ ἔγκλημα φοβεῖσθαι θάνατον; ποῖον δὲ οὐκ ἐγκώμιον, φοβούμενον θάνατον μηδὲν διὰ τὸν φόβον ἀνελεύθερον ὑπομεῖναι; Οὐ γὰρ τὸ φύσιν ἔχειν ἐλάττωμα ἔχουσιν, ἔγκλημα, ἀλλὰ τὸ τοῖς ἐλαττώμασι δουλεύειν· ὡς ὁ γε τὴν παρ' αὐτῆς ἐπήρειαν τῇ τῆς προαιρέσεως ἀνδρείᾳ

8. John insists (against his imaginary interlocutor) that what *appear to be* problematic deficiencies or weaknesses in Paul are actually proofs of his superior ethical conduct.

9. Interestingly, manuscripts CFG and P have a quotation from 2 Cor 1:8b in place of Rom 8:23 as found in the other manuscripts (see AP 268 *app. crit.* and n. 2, a reading already noted in HS^{marg}). The translation adopts the chosen reading of HS and all editions down to and including AP.

10. I.e., Peter.

11. The translation adopts the reading of HS and successors [ὅταν δὲ γηράσῃς] ζώσουσί σε καὶ ἄξουσιν [ὅπου οὐ θέλεις] which is represented by manuscripts BDM and AL. I reject the choice by AP to adopt the reading of CFGP and E (a distinct family from the prior), which has clearly sought to regularize the wording of the citation, which, as

his will, then you're offering me these arguments in vain. Or, rather, they aren't in vain but on Paul's very behalf, for by your objections you prove how great he was, given that with such a nature he possessed things that exceed that nature.⁸ Not only do you exalt him, but once again you stop up the mouths of those who've lost heart, by not allowing them to take recourse in the superiority of nature as an excuse, but pushing them to the zeal that comes from the proper exercise of free will.

6.4. [268] "But," one says, "didn't Paul sometimes fear death too?" Well, this, too, comes from nature. Nevertheless, Paul himself, the man who [you say] feared death, also said, "*For we who are in the tent groan, weighted down*" (2 Cor 5:4); and again, "*We ourselves groan inwardly*" (Rom 8:23).⁹ Do you see how he introduces the power that comes from free will as a counterbalance to natural weakness? Even many martyrs when they were about to be led to their deaths often became pallid and filled with fear and anguish. But this is the very reason that they're especially admirable, because although they feared death, they didn't flee death for Jesus's sake. Thus, also Paul, though fearing death, doesn't beg off even from Gehenna on account of Jesus his beloved; and though trembling at his demise, he desires "*to pass away*" (Phil 1:23). And Paul wasn't the only one who was like this, but the chief of the disciples,¹⁰ too, although he repeatedly said **[270]** he was ready to give his life (cf. Matt 26:33 and parr.; John 13:37), had an intense fear of death. Hear what Christ said when speaking to him about this: "*when you become old, they will tie you with a belt and lead you where you do not wish*" (John 21:18),¹¹ thereby describing the deficiency of nature, not of the will.

6.5. Nature shows her effects even against our will, and it isn't possible to prevail over those deficiencies, not even when one is vehemently disposed and zealous to do so. However, we don't in the least suffer damage for this, but we're all the more to be marveled at, since what sort of blame is there in fearing death? Rather, what sort of praise isn't due to the person who, even as they fear death, endures nothing servile because of the fear? For there's no blame in having a nature with a deficiency, but rather in being enslaved to those deficiencies. How great and wonderful is the one who corrects the insult arising from nature by the bravery of their own

so often for Chrysostom, is a combination of exact quotation and paraphrase: [ὅταν δὲ γηράσῃς] ἐκτενεῖς τὰς χεῖράς σου, καὶ ἄλλος σε ζώσει καὶ οἴσει [ὅπου οὐ θέλεις] ("[when you become old] you will extend your hands and another will tie you with a belt and lead you [where you do not wish]").

διορθούμενος, μέγας καὶ θαυμαστός. Καὶ γὰρ [272] ταύτῃ δείκνυσιν ὅσον ἐστὶ προαιρέσεως ἰσχύς, καὶ ἐπιστομίζει τοὺς λέγοντας, διὰ τί μὴ φύσει γεγόναμεν καλοί; τί γὰρ διαφέρει τοῦτο <φύσει>, ἢ προαιρέσει εἶναι; πόσω δὲ τοῦτο βέλτιον ἐκείνου; ὅσω καὶ στεφάνους ἔχει, καὶ λαμπρὰν τὴν ἀνακήρυξιν.

6.6. Ἀλλὰ βέβαιον τὸ τῆς φύσεως; Ἀλλ' εἰ βούλει προαίρεσιν γενναίαν ἔχειν, τοῦτο στερρότερον ἐκείνου γίνεται. Ἡ οὐχ ὁρᾷς τῶν μαρτύρων ξίφεσι τὰ σώματα τεμνόμενα, καὶ τὴν μὲν φύσιν εἴκουσαν τῷ σιδήρῳ, τὴν δὲ προαίρεσιν οὐ παραχωροῦσαν αὐτῷ, οὐδὲ ἐλεγχομένην; οὐκ εἶδες ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἀβραάμ, εἰπέ μοι, προαίρεσιν φύσεως κρατήσασαν, ἥνικα τὸν παῖδα σφαγιάσαι ἐκελεύσθη, καὶ ταύτην ἐκείνης δυνατωτέραν φανείσαν; οὐκ εἶδες ἐπὶ τῶν τριῶν παίδων τὸ αὐτὸ τοῦτο συμβάν; οὐκ ἀκούεις καὶ τῆς ἔξωθεν παροιμίας λεγούσης, ὅτι δευτέρα φύσις ἢ προαίρεσις γίνεται ἐκ συνηθείας; Ἐγὼ δὲ φαίην ἂν ὅτι καὶ προτέρα, καθὼς τὰ προειρημένα ἀπέδειξεν. Ὅρᾳς ὅτι δυνατόν καὶ τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς φύσεως ἔχειν στερρότητα, ἐὰν προαίρεσις ἢ γενναία καὶ διεγχευμένη, καὶ πλείονα καρποῦσθαι τὸν ἔπαινον τὸν γε ἐλόμενον καὶ βουληθέντα, ἢ ἀναγκασθέντα καλὸν εἶναι;

6.7. [274] Τοῦτό ἐστι μάλιστα καλόν, ὡς ὅταν λέγῃ· Ὑπωπιάζω μου τὸ σῶμα καὶ δουλαγωγῶ. Τότε μάλιστα ἐγὼ αὐτὸν ἐπαινῶ, ὁρῶν οὐκ ἀπονητὶ τὴν ἀρετὴν κατορθοῦντα, ὥστε μὴ εἶναι τοῖς μετὰ ταῦτα ῥαθυμίας ὑπόθεσιν τὴν εὐκολίαν τὴν ἐκείνου. Καὶ ὅταν λέγῃ πάλιν· Τῷ κόσμῳ ἐσταύρωμαι, τὴν προαίρεσιν αὐτοῦ στεφανῶ. Ἐνὶ γάρ, ἐνὶ φύσεως ἰσχύϊ προαιρέσεως

12. Taking this as another objection from the hypothetical interlocutor, to whom John responds in what follows.

13. For Chrysostom's frequent reference to this biblical story, see AP 273 n. 1.

14. Chrysostom attributes this idea to "outsiders" also in *Hom. 1 Cor. 7.7* (PG 61:64): δευτέραν φύσιν τὴν συνήθειαν ἐκάλεσαν ("they called custom a 'second nature'"). While the exact quotation is not found, the general ideas about "second nature" are traditional. Aristotle, *Eth. Nic.* 7.10.4, 1152a30–33, for instance, cites a tag from the fifth-century BCE poet and philosopher Euenus: φημί [τὸ ἔθος] πολυχρόνιον μελέτην ἔμεναι, φίλε, καὶ δὴ / ταύτην ἀνθρώποισι τελευτῶσαν φύσιν εἶναι. ("Mark me, my friend, [habit] is long-term training, and / training in the end becomes human beings' nature" [ed. Bywater; trans. Rackham, LCL, adapted]). On the negative side, this appeal can be used, for instance, against eating meat as due to custom, as in Plutarch, *Tu. san.* 18 (*Mor.* 132a): ἐπεὶ δὲ τὸ ἔθος τρόπον τινὰ φύσις τοῦ παρὰ φύσιν γέγονεν ("since habit has become a kind of nature beyond nature"; my translation). On προαίρεσις, see n. 16 below. For a learned discussion of the long history of the maxim from antiquity to the present, see Steven Shapin, "Why Was 'Custom a Second Nature' in Early Modern Medicine?" *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 93 (2019): 1–26.

will! And [272] by this they also show how great the power of will is and they muzzle those who say, “Why haven’t we been created good by nature?” What’s the difference if this is by nature or by will? To what degree does the latter surpass the former? To the degree that the latter is what brings crowns and an illustrious acclaim.

6.6. “But is what belongs to nature steadfast?”¹² Oh, but if you wish to possess a noble will, that’s a thing much more strong than what comes of nature. Or do you not see that when the bodies of the martyrs are sliced up by swords (cf. Heb 11:37), while nature gives way to the sword, the will neither submits to it nor is refuted by it? Now, tell me, didn’t you see in Abraham’s case (cf. Gen 22:1–18) a will that prevailed over nature when he was commanded to sacrifice his son, and a will manifestly more powerful than nature? Or didn’t you see the same thing happen in the case of the three Hebrew youths (Dan 3:8–30)?¹³ Or haven’t you heard the maxim the pagans tell: “from force of habit free will becomes second nature.”¹⁴ Yet for my part, I would say it’s even “first” nature, just as the arguments I’ve previously made have demonstrated. Do you see that, if the will is noble and roused to action, it’s possible to possess the strength that comes from nature, too? And, if one chooses and wishes to be good, rather than doing so under compulsion, that one can reap for oneself the fruit of more abundant praise?

6.7. [274] This especially is virtue, as when he says, “*I beat my body black and blue and enslave it*” (1 Cor 9:27). I praise him most of all when I see that he performed his virtuous acts not without considerable exhausting effort, so that his easy effort wouldn’t be a support for the indolence of those who come along later. And when again he says, “*I have been crucified to the world*” (Gal 6:14),¹⁵ I award him a crown for his exercise of free will.¹⁶ For it’s possible, yes, it’s possible, to imitate the force of nature with the

15. John has supplied the first-person verb that is implied in Paul’s ellipsis: δι’ οὗ ἐμοὶ κόσμος ἐσταύρωται, καὶ γὰρ τῷ κόσμῳ.

16. προαίρεσις, the quality of “choice” and “ethical exercise of one’s free will,” so important for John’s view of the moral life, as it was for classical ethical theory as well as the rhetoric of the encomium, for people deserve praise only for that which they choose, not what they inherit. See HT 200–201, 249–50, with quotations and references from Aristotle and Epictetus; further discussion and references among Stoics and others in Samantha L. Miller, *Chrysostom’s Devil: Demons, the Will, and Virtue in Patristic Soteriology*, New Explorations in Theology (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2020), 80–96.

ἀκριβεία μιμήσασθαι· καὶ εἰς μέσον ἀγάγωμεν τοῦτον αὐτὸν τὸν ἀνδριάντα τῆς ἀρετῆς, εὐρήσομεν ὅτι τὰ ἐκ προαιρέσεως αὐτῷ προσόντα καλὰ, εἰς φύσεως στερρότητα ἐφιλονέικησεν ἐξενεγκεῖν.

6.8. Ἦλγει μὲν γὰρ τυπτόμενος, τῶν δὲ ἀσωμάτων δυνάμεων τῶν οὐκ ἀλγουσῶν οὐχ ἦττον αὐτῶν κατεφρόνει, ὥς ἔστιν ἀκοῦσαι τῶν ῥημάτων αὐτοῦ, ἃ μὴδὲ τῆς φύσεως αὐτὸν ποιεῖ νομίζεσθαι τῆς ἡμετέρας. Ὅταν γὰρ λέγῃ· Ἐμοὶ κόσμος ἐσταύρωται, καὶ γὰρ τῷ κόσμῳ, καὶ πάλιν· Ζῶ δὲ οὐκέτι ἐγώ, ζῇ δὲ ἐν ἐμοὶ Χριστός, τί ἄλλο ἐστὶν εἰπεῖν, ἢ ὅτι καὶ ἐξ αὐτοῦ μετέστη τοῦ σώματος; τί δέ, [276] ὅταν λέγῃ· Ἐδόθη μοι σκόλοψ τῇ σαρκί, ἄγγελος σατᾶν; τοῦτο δὲ οὐδὲν ἕτερόν ἐστιν, ἢ δεῖξαι μέχρι τοῦ σώματος ἰστάμενον τὸν πόνον· οὐκ ἐπειδὴ ἔνδον οὐ διέβαινε, ἀλλ' ἐπειδὴ τῇ περιουσίᾳ τῆς προαιρέσεως αὐτὸν διεκρούετο καὶ ἐξώθει. Τί δέ, ὅταν ἕτερα πολλὰ τούτων θαυμαστότερα λέγῃ, καὶ χαίρῃ μαστιζόμενος, καὶ καυχᾶται ἐπὶ ταῖς ἀλύσεσι; Τί ἂν ἄλλο τις εἴποι, ἢ τοῦτο ὅπερ ἔφην, ὅτι τὸ λέγειν· Ὑπωπιάζω μου τὸ σῶμα καὶ δουλαγωγῶ, καὶ φοβοῦμαι μήπως ἄλλοις κηρύξας αὐτὸς ἀδόκιμος γένωμαι, τὸ ἀσθενὲς τῆς φύσεως δείκνυσι, διὰ δὲ τούτων, ὧν εἶπον, τὴν εὐγένειαν τῆς προαιρέσεως;

6.9. [278] Διὰ γὰρ τοῦτο ἀμφοτέρα κεῖται, ἵνα μήτε διὰ τὰ μεγάλα ἐκεῖνα ἐτέρας αὐτὸν εἶναι νομίσης φύσεως καὶ ἀπογνῶς, μήτε διὰ τὰ μικρὰ ταῦτα καταγνῶς τῆς ἀγίας ψυχῆς, ἀλλὰ κάντεῦθεν πάλιν τὴν ἀπόγνωσιν ἐκβαλὼν, εἰς χρηστὰς σαυτὸν ἀγάγῃς ἐλπίδας. Διὰ τοῦτο τίθησι πάλιν καὶ τὸ τῆς χάριτος τοῦ Θεοῦ μεθ' ὑπερβολῆς, μᾶλλον δὲ οὐ μεθ' ὑπερβολῆς, ἀλλὰ μετὰ εὐγνωμοσύνης, ἵνα μὴδὲν αὐτοῦ νομίσης εἶναι. Λέγει δὲ καὶ τὰ τῆς αὐτοῦ προθυμίας, ἵνα μὴ τὸ πᾶν ἐπὶ τὸν Θεὸν ῥίψας, διάγῃς καθεύδων καὶ ῥέγων. Καὶ πάντων μέτρα καὶ κανόνας εὐρήσεις παρ' αὐτῷ μετὰ ἀκριβείας κειμένους.

10. Ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπηράσατο τῷ χαλκεῖ, φησὶν, Ἀλεξάνδρω ποτέ. Καὶ τί τοῦτο; Οὐ γὰρ θυμοῦ τὸ ῥῆμα ἦν, ἀλλ' ὁδύνης τῆς ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀληθείας· οὐ γὰρ

17. Perhaps a contextual reading of Phil 1:12–14 with 3:1; 4:4.

18. On Chrysostom's obsession with Paul's chains, see *HT* 176–85.

19. Plus καὶ φοβοῦμαι before μήπως.

20. ἡ εὐγένεια τῆς προαιρέσεως, a phrase that encapsulates and paradoxically unites both sides of the ancient nature/nurture debate.

21. I.e., divine grace and human free will.

22. Once again, a hypothetical interlocutor poses the problem.

23. On the problem of Paul's anger for late-antique interpreters, see Mitchell, "Reading Rhetoric with Patristic Exegetes: John Chrysostom on Galatians," in *Antiquity and Humanity*, 333–55. On how Paul's anger also becomes an opportunity for

precise exercise of free will. If we bring this man, the very portrait statue of virtue, forward for inspection, we shall find that he strove to bring the virtues that were his by free will to the same level of solidarity as those that come from nature.

6.8. For when beaten he suffered pain, but he disdained no less the incorporeal powers that don't suffer pain themselves, as one can hear in his words, which cause him to be thought by some as not even sharing our nature. For when he says, "*The world has been crucified to me, and I to the world*" (Gal 6:14), and again, "*No longer do I live, but Christ lives in me*" (Gal 2:20), what else can one say except that he'd departed from his very body? And what [276] does it mean when he says, "*A thorn in the flesh was given to me, a messenger of Satan*" (2 Cor 12:7)? This statement is nothing other than a demonstration that his pain reached even to his body. With the abundance of his free will he drove the pain off from himself and pushed it away (even though it tried to pass inside him). What does it mean when he says many other things more marvelous than these, and rejoices when whipped,¹⁷ and boasts in his chains¹⁸ (cf. 2 Cor 11:23–25)? What else could one say than what I have already, that in stating, "*I beat my body black and blue and enslave it, and fear lest, having preached to others, I might myself fail to pass the test*" (1 Cor 9:27),¹⁹ Paul demonstrates the weakness of his nature, and through these other statements I quoted, he shows the nobility of his will?²⁰

6.9. [278] And this is why both sets of things²¹ are in place, so that because of those great virtues, you might not consider him to be of another nature and lose heart, or because of these tiny matters condemn that holy soul, but even from the latter to lead yourself to good hopes by casting out despair. For this reason he sets forth again what belongs to the grace of God with great abundance, or, rather, not with abundance but with gratitude, that you might not consider anything to be his own accomplishment. And he also mentions the things that are due to his will, lest, by tossing all the credit God's way, you should pass your life in slumber and snoring. You'll find the measure and standard for all things residing with precision in Paul.

6.10. "But," someone²² says, "he once cursed the coppersmith, Alexander" (1 Tim 1:20). Why was this? Well, it wasn't due to anger²³ but to dis-

late-antique interpreters' own heresiological projects, see Todd S. Berzon, "O, Foolish Galatians: Imagining Pauline Community in Late Antiquity," *CH* 85 (2016): 435–67.

δι' ἑαυτὸν ἤλγει, ἀλλ' ὅτι ἀνθίστατο τῷ κηρύγματι· Λίαν γὰρ ἀνθίσταται, φησὶν, οὐχὶ ἐμοί, ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἡμετέροις λόγοις· ὥστε ἡ ἀρὰ οὐ μόνον τὸν τούτου πόθον ἐδείκνυε τὸν ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀληθείας, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς μαθητὰς παρεμυθεῖτο. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ πάντας εἰκὸς ἦν σκανδαλίζεσθαι, τῶν ἐπηρεαζόντων τῷ λόγῳ οὐδὲν πασχόντων, διὰ τοῦτο ταῦτα φησιν. Ἀλλὰ καὶ [280] κατηύξατό ποτε ἐτέρων τινῶν, λέγων· Εἴπερ δίκαιον παρὰ Θεῷ ἀνταποδοῦναι τοῖς θλίβουσιν ἡμᾶς θλίψιν· οὐκ ἐκείνους ἐπιθυμῶν δίκην δοῦναι, μὴ γένοιτο, ἀλλὰ τοὺς ἐπηρεαζομένους σπεύδων παραμυθῆσασθαι· διὸ καὶ ἐπάγει· Αὐτοῖς τοῖς θλιβομένοις ἄνεσιν. Ἐπεὶ ὅταν αὐτός τι πάσχη ἀηδές, ἄκουσον πῶς φιλοσοφεῖ, καὶ τοῖς ἐναντίοις ἀμείβεται, λέγων· Λοιδορούμενοι εὐλογοῦμεν, διωκόμενοι ἀνεχόμεθα, βλασφημούμενοι παρακαλοῦμεν. Εἰ δὲ τὰ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἄλλων λεγόμενα ἢ γινόμενα ὀργῆς εἶναι φαίης, ὦρα σοι καὶ τὸν Ἑλύμαν ἐξ ὀργῆς αὐτὸν πεπηρωκέναι καὶ ὕβρικέναι, καὶ τὸν Ἀνανίαν καὶ τὴν Σάπφειραν τὸν Πέτρον ἐξ ὀργῆς ἀπεκτονέναι. Ἀλλ' οὐδεὶς οὕτως ἀνόητος καὶ ἡλίθιος ὥς ταῦτα εἰπεῖν. Καὶ ἕτερα δὲ πολλὰ εὐρίσκομεν αὐτὸν καὶ λέγοντα καὶ ποιῶντα, δοκοῦντα εἶναι φορτικά, καὶ ταῦτα μάλιστά ἐστιν, ἃ τὴν ἐπιείκειαν αὐτοῦ δείκνυσι. Καὶ γὰρ ὅταν τῷ σατανᾷ παραδῶ τὸν ἐν Κορίνθῳ πεπορνευκότα, ἐξ ἀγάπης αὐτὸ πολλῆς ποιεῖ καὶ φιλοστόργου διανοίας· καὶ τοῦτο δείκνυσι καὶ ἐκ τῆς δευτέρας ἐπιστολῆς. Καὶ ὅταν Ἰουδαίοις ἀπειλῇ καὶ λέγῃ· [282] Ἐφθασεν αὐτοὺς ἡ ὀργὴ εἰς τέλος, οὐ θυμοῦ πληρούμενος αὐτὸ ποιεῖ, — ἀκούεις γοῦν αὐτοῦ συνεχῶς ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν εὐχομένου—, ἀλλὰ βουλόμενος φοβῆσαι καὶ σωφρονεστέρους ἐργάσασθαι.

6.11. Ἀλλὰ τὸν ἱερέα, φησὶν, ὕβρισε, λέγων· Τύπτειν σε μέλλει ὁ Θεός, τοῖχε κεκονιαμένε. Καὶ οἶδα μὲν ὅτι τινὲς πρὸς τοῦτο ἀπολογούμενοι, προφητεῖαν εἶναι φασὶ τὸ εἰρημένον. Καὶ οὐκ ἐγκαλῶ τοῖς λέγουσι· καὶ

24. By the “rewording topos,” John seeks to clarify what Paul meant by what he did not say.

25. With ἀνθίσταται for ἀνθέστηκεν.

26. οἱ ἐπηρεάζοντες, likely with resonances of Luke 6:28 for John (προσεύχεσθε ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐπηρεαζόντων ὑμᾶς).

27. With ἡμᾶς for ὑμᾶς.

28. With αὐτοῖς for ὑμῖν.

29. δοκοῦντα εἶναι, part of the rhetoric of ζητήματα καὶ λύσεις (to grant the possible appearance of a problem only later to deny the reality of it).

30. Minus δὲ ἐπ' before αὐτοῦς.

31. John's solution to the problem of Paul's apparent anger is that it was justified by his motivation on behalf of those who would be its target and hence beneficiaries.

32. Either the same speaker as at §10, or another (John simply has φησὶν).

treason on behalf of the truth. Yet the pain he suffered wasn't for his own sake, but because Alexander stood in opposition to the gospel proclamation. For Paul didn't say "*He strongly opposed*" "me"²⁴ but "*our words*" (2 Tim 4:15).²⁵ Consequently, the curse not only proved Paul's burning love for the truth, but it also provided his disciples with consolation, since he said these things because likely all were scandalized when the people heaping abuse on the word²⁶ weren't suffering in the least. But what about the fact that [280] Paul sometimes prayed against other people, saying, "*if it is just for God to repay with affliction those who are afflicting us*" (2 Thess 1:6)?²⁷ In saying this, he wasn't desiring to inflict punishment on them (God forbid!), but he was zealous for the abused to receive consolation. That's why he added, "*and rest to the very ones who are being afflicted*" (2 Thess 1:7).²⁸ And when he himself suffers something unpleasant, hear how philosophically he takes it and how he treats his opponents in return: "*Reviled, we bless; persecuted, we tolerate it; blasphemed, we offer comfort*" (1 Cor 4:12–13). But if you would say that the things he said or did for the others were born of anger, then this is the moment for you also to mention how Paul from anger had blinded and insulted Elymas (Acts 13:9–11), and how Peter from anger killed Ananias and Sapphira (Acts 5:1–11). But no one is so stupid and silly as to say such things. Indeed, we find Paul both saying and doing many other things that appear to be²⁹ severe, and these things are what demonstrate especially his gentleness. For example, when he hands the sexual malefactor in Corinth over to Satan (cf. 1 Cor 5:3–13), he does it from much love and an affectionate heart, as he shows from his second epistle (cf. 2 Cor 2:1–11). And when he threatens Jews and says, [282] "*The wrath has come upon them at last*" (1 Thess 2:16),³⁰ he didn't do so because he was full of anger—for indeed you hear him continually praying on their behalf (cf. Rom 10:1)—but he was wishing to frighten them and bring them to a more sound frame of mind.³¹

6.11. "But," someone³² says, "he insulted the priest, declaring, '*God is going to smite you, you whitewashed wall*'" (Acts 23:3). Now, I know³³ that some people, in defense of this,³⁴ say that Paul spoke it by way of prophecy, and I don't condemn those who say it, for indeed this happened, and

33. Reading οἶδα μὲν with AP, instead of οἶδαμεν (HS and all successors). AP 282 says all the manuscripts separate the two words (and also presumably have or assume the appropriate accents).

34. One possible solution to the problem—i.e., a defense of Paul (ἀπολογούμενοι) against the charge of insolent and abusive behavior (ὕβριζεν).

γὰρ συνέβη τοῦτο, καὶ οὕτως ἐτελεύτησεν. Εἰ δέ τις δριμύτερος ὢν ἐχθρὸς ἀντιλέγοι, καὶ περιεργότερόν τι ποιῶν ἀνθυποφέρῃ λέγων· καὶ εἰ προφητεία ἦν, τίνος ἕνεκεν ἀπελογεῖτο λέγων· Οὐκ ἤδειν ὅτι ἀρχιερεὺς ἐστὶν τοῦτο ἂν εἴποιμεν ὅτι τοὺς ἄλλους παιδεύων καὶ νουθετῶν πρὸς τοὺς ἄρχοντας ἐπεικῶς διακεῖσθαι, ὥσπερ καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ἐποίει. Μυρία γὰρ ῥήτὰ καὶ ἄρρητα περὶ τῶν γραμματέων εἰπὼν καὶ Φαρισαίων, φησὶν· Ἐπὶ τῆς καθέδρας Μωϋσέως ἐκάθισαν οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι· πάντα οὖν, ὅσα ἂν λέγωσιν ὑμῖν ποιεῖν, ποιεῖτε. Οὕτω δὴ καὶ ἐνταῦθα ὁ Παῦλος, ὁμοῦ καὶ τὸ ἀξίωμα διετήρησε, καὶ τὸ μέλλον ἔσσεσθαι προανεφώνησεν.

6.12. [284] Εἰ δὲ καὶ τὸν Ἰωάννην ἀπέτεμε, καὶ τοῦτο ἀξίως τῆς ὑπὲρ τοῦ κηρύγματος προνοίας. Τὸν γὰρ τὴν διακονίαν ταύτην ἐγκεχειρισμένον, οὐχὶ χαῦνόν τινα εἶναι χρή, οὐδὲ ἀναπεπτωκότα, ἀλλὰ ἀνδρεῖον καὶ εὐτόνον, μηδὲ ἄπτεσθαι τῆς καλῆς πραγματείας ταύτης, εἰ μὴ μέλλοι μυριάκις ἀντεπιδίδοναι τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχὴν εἰς θάνατον καὶ κινδύνους, καθὼς καὶ αὐτὸς φησιν ὁ Χριστὸς· Εἴ τις θέλει ὀπίσω μου ἔλθειν, ἀπαρνησάσθω ἑαυτόν, καὶ ἀράτω τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀκολουθεῖτω μοι. Ὁ γὰρ μὴ οὕτω διακεῖμενος πολλοὺς καὶ ἐτέρους προδίδωσι, καὶ μᾶλλον ἡσυχάζων ὠφελεῖ καθ' ἑαυτόν ὢν, ἢ παριῶν εἰς μέσον, καὶ φορτίον δεχόμενος τῆς δυνάμεως ἑαυτοῦ μείζον· καὶ γὰρ καὶ ἑαυτόν καὶ τοὺς ἐμπιστευθέντας προσαπολλύει. Πῶς γὰρ οὐκ ἄτοπον, εἰ μὲν τις κυβερνητικὴν ἀγνοεῖ, καὶ τὴν πρὸς τὰ κύματα μάχην, μηδὲ μυρίων ἀναγκαζόντων ἐλέσθαι ἐπὶ τῶν οἰάκων καθίσαι, τὸν δὲ ἐπὶ τὸ κήρυγμα ἰόντα, ἀπλῶς καὶ ὡς ἔτυχεν ἐπὶ τοῦτο χωρεῖν, καὶ ἀπερισκέπτως καταδέχεσθαι πρᾶγμα μυρίων θανάτων πρόξενον; Οὔτε γὰρ κυβερνήτην, οὔτε τὸν πρὸς τὰ θηρία πυκτεύοντα, οὐ τὸν μονομαχεῖν ἐλόμενον, οὐκ ἄλλον οὐδένα [286] οὕτω πρὸς θανάτους καὶ σφαγὰς παρατεταγμένην ἔχειν δεῖ τὴν ψυχὴν, ὡς τὸν τὸ κήρυγμα ἀναδεχόμενον. Καὶ γὰρ οἱ κίνδυνοι μείζους, καὶ οἱ ἀντίπαλοι χαλεπώτεροι, καὶ τὸ οὕτω σφαγῆναι, οὐ περὶ τῶν τυχόντων. Οὐρανὸς γὰρ τὸ ἔπαθλον κεῖται, καὶ γέεννα τοῖς ἁμαρτάνουσι τὸ ἐπιτίμιον, καὶ ψυχῆς ἀπώλεια καὶ σωτηρία. Οὐ τὸν τὸ κήρυγμα δὲ μόνον ἀναδεχόμενον οὕτω παρατετάχθαι δεῖ, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀπλῶς τὸν πιστόν· ἅπασι γὰρ παρακελεύεται τὸν

35. Minus ἀδελφοί after ἤδειν; with transposition of ἐστὶν and ἀρχιερεὺς. John identifies (hypothetically) a problem with that first solution, as well as a solution to it, in turn.

36. With transposition of Μωϋσέως and καθέδρας; with ἂν for ἑάν; λέγωσιν for εἴπωσιν; ποιεῖν, ποιεῖτε for τηρεῖν, τηρεῖτε καὶ ποιεῖτε.

the priest thus died. On the other hand, if some enemy with a sharper eye contests this and, taking a more inquisitive look into it, rejoins, "Well, if it were prophecy, then why would Paul defend himself, saying, '*I didn't know that he was the high priest?*'" (Acts 23:5),³⁵ then we would reply that Paul said this in order to instruct and admonish the others to be kindly disposed toward the leaders, just as Christ himself did. For after saying countless things (both speakable and unspeakable) about the scribes and the Pharisees, Jesus declared: "*The scribes and the Pharisees sit upon the seat of Moses; therefore, do everything that they tell you to do*" (Matt 23:2–3).³⁶ In the same way, here, too, Paul in a single breath both preserved the dignity of the high priesthood and prophesied what was going to take place.

6.12. [284] Furthermore, although he did cut off John (Acts 15:37–39), the act was a worthy expression of the forethought he had for the gospel. For it's necessary for the person who takes this ministry in hand³⁷ not to be at all sluggish or fainthearted, but brave and vigorous. One must not undertake this excellent occupation unless they were likely in turn to give their life over countless times to death and dangers, just as Christ himself said: "*If someone wishes to come after me, let them deny themselves, let them take up their cross, and let them follow me*" (Matt 16:24). The one who isn't disposed in this way betrays many others and does better if they keep quiet and remain concerned with themselves than if they come forward into the public eye and receive a burden that exceeds their ability, because in the process, they destroy both themselves and those entrusted to their care. How isn't it absurd if someone who knows nothing about how to pilot a ship or how to battle the waves, even when thousands of people try to force them, chooses not to sit at the rudder, whereas the person who comes to the preaching ministry advances to it simply and haphazardly, and thoughtlessly receives an important task that can cause countless deaths? For neither a pilot, nor the man who fights the beasts, nor the one who chooses the part of the gladiator, nor anyone else **[286]** needs to have a soul so prepared for various forms of death and slaughter as the one who takes up the preaching ministry. This is because the dangers are greater, the antagonists more terrible, and this act of being slaughtered is not for ordinary gains. For the prize in store is heaven, and the punishment for sinners Gehenna, the destruction and salvation of the soul. Not only must the one who takes up the preaching ministry be so prepared, but also the faithful

37. AP 285 n. 2 points to parallels in thought and language between this passage and *Sac.* 3.8 (SC 272:160, ed. Malingrey).

σταυρὸν αἶρειν καὶ ἀκολουθεῖν· εἰ δὲ πᾶσι, πολλῶ μᾶλλον τοῖς διδασκάλοις καὶ ποιμέσιν, ὧν καὶ Ἰωάννης ἦν τότε, ὁ καὶ Μάρκος λεγόμενος. Διὸ καὶ δικαίως ἐξετέμενετο, ὅτι ἐν αὐτῷ τάξας ἑαυτὸν τῷ μετώπῳ τῆς φάλαγγος, σφόδρα ἀνάνδρως εἰστήκει· διὸ καὶ ἀπέστησεν αὐτὸν ὁ Παῦλος, ὥστε μὴ τὴν ἐκείνου νωθεῖαν τῶν τόνων αὐτῶν τὸν δρόμον ἐκκόψαι.

6.13. [288] Εἰ δὲ λέγοι Λουκᾶς, ὅτι ἐγένετο παροξυσμός μεταξὺ αὐτῶν, μὴ τοῦτο ἔγκλημα εἶναι νόμιζε. Οὐ γὰρ τὸ παροξυνθῆναι χαλεπόν, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἀλόγως καὶ ἐπ' οὐδενὶ δικαίῳ. Θυμὸς γὰρ ἄδικος, φησὶν, οὐκ ἀθωωθήσεται· οὐχ ἀπλῶς θυμός, ἀλλὰ ὁ ἄδικος. Καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς πάλιν· Ὁ ὀργιζόμενος τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ εἰκῇ· οὐχ ἀπλῶς ὀργιζόμενος. Καὶ ὁ προφήτης δέ φησιν· Ὅργιζεσθε, καὶ μὴ ἁμαρτάνετε. Εἰ γὰρ μὴ δεῖ κεχρηῆσθαι τῷ πάθει, μὴδὲ καιροῦ καλοῦντος, εἰκῇ καὶ μάτην ἡμῖν ἔγκειται· ἀλλ' οὐκ εἰκῇ. Διὸ καὶ ὁ δημιουργὸς τοῦτο κατεφύτευσε πρὸς διόρθωσιν τῶν ἁμαρτανόντων, ἵνα διεγείρῃ τὸ νωθρὸν τῆς ψυχῆς καὶ παρειμένον, ἵνα ἀφυπνίσῃ τὸν καθεύδοντα καὶ διαλελυμένον, καθάπερ στόμωμα σιδήρῳ, οὕτω τὸ τῆς ὀργῆς εὐτονον ἐνθεῖς ἡμῶν τῇ διανοίᾳ, ἵνα αὐτῷ χρησώμεθα εἰς δέον. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ὁ Παῦλος πολλάκις αὐτῷ ἐκέχρητο, καὶ ποθεινότερος μᾶλλον τῶν μετὰ ἐπιεικείας διαλεγόμενων ἦν ὀργιζόμενος, πάντα μετὰ τοῦ προσήκοντος καιροῦ ποιῶν ὑπὲρ τοῦ κηρύγματος. Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐπιεικεία **[290]** ἀπλῶς καλόν, ἀλλ' ὅταν ὁ καιρὸς ἀπαιτῇ· ὥς, ἐὰν τοῦτο μὴ προσῇ, καὶ ἐκείνη νωθεία, καὶ ἡ ὀργὴ θρασύτης γίνεται.

6.14. Ταῦτα δὲ πάντα οὐχ ὑπὲρ Παύλου ἀπολογούμενος εἶπον· οὐδὲ γὰρ δεῖται τῆς ἡμετέρας γλώττης· ὁ γὰρ ἔπαινος αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων, ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ· ἀλλ' ἵνα παιδεύσωμεν τοὺς ἀκροατὰς εἰς δέον ἅπασι κεχρηῆσθαι, καθάπερ καὶ ἔμπροσθεν εἶπον. Οὕτω γὰρ δυνησόμεθα πάντοθεν κερδαίνειν,

38. Minus οὖν before παροξυσμός.

39. Another piece of evidence for the “apparent problem,” termed an ἔγκλημα, “charge” or “accusation.”

40. Certainly an allusion, as well as a partial quotation: Οὐ δυνήσεται θυμὸς ἄδικος δικαιωθῆναι.

41. As expected, Chrysostom reads plus εἰκῇ after τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ with 98.

42. John offers three other pieces of scriptural evidence, from both OT and NT, for justifiable anger, based upon motivation and occasion.

43. After the scriptural solution, John offers an ontological and philosophical one: since anger is natural, it must have a purpose and have been a part of creation.

44. John's concluding solution to the “apparent problem” of Paul's anger is to praise him as a man of the virtuous mean, such as Aristotle's theory of τὸ μέσον might allow. See, e.g., *Eth. Nic.* 2.6.11–12, 1106a, treating, among other emotions, that of becoming angry (ὀργισθῆναι): “to feel these feelings at the right time, on the right occasion,

generally, for all are exhorted to take up the cross and follow. Yet if this is the case for all, then how much more so the teachers and pastors, among whom John (who is also called Mark) was once numbered? Therefore, he was justly cut off, given that after stationing himself in the front of the line of battle, he comported himself in an extremely cowardly way (cf. Acts 13:13). Hence, Paul kept him at a distance so that his sluggishness wouldn't hinder the course of their efforts.

6.13. [288] Now, if Luke says, “*There was provocation*” between them (Acts 15:39),³⁸ don't consider this a cause for blame.³⁹ Being provoked to anger isn't terrible, but becoming so irrationally and for no just reason is. As Scripture says, “*Unjust anger* will not be held guiltless” (cf. Sir 1:22)⁴⁰—that is, not simply anger but “*unjust*” anger. And again, Christ says, “*the one who is angry with his brother in vain*” (Matt 5:22),⁴¹ not simply “is angry.” And the prophet says, “*Be angry, and do not sin*” (Ps 4:5).⁴² For if one shouldn't employ the emotion, not even when the occasion calls for it, then it's been placed in us in vain and without reason. But it's not in vain.⁴³ The creator implanted this emotion in us for the correction of sinners, so that it might rouse the elements of sluggishness and resignation in the soul, awaken the sleeping and the slackened. He placed the vigorous emotion of anger in our mind in the same way we add steel to iron, so that we might employ it suitably. For this reason, Paul, too, frequently employed this emotion and, though more loving than those who spoke gently, was provoked to anger, because everything he did was for the sake of the gospel, in relation to what suited the occasion. For gentleness is not **[290]** a virtue in general, but is so when the moment requires it; likewise, if this weren't the case, then gentleness would become sluggishness, and anger rash overconfidence.⁴⁴

6.14. But I haven't said all these things in order to defend Paul,⁴⁵ for he has no need of our voice. His praise isn't from human beings but from God (cf. 1 Cor 4:5). But, as I said before, the reason for this discourse is so that we might instruct the hearers to employ all things suitably. For in this

toward the right people, for the right purpose and in the right manner, is to feel the best amount of them, which is the mean amount—and the best amount is of course the mark of virtue” (τὸ δ' ὅτε δεῖ καὶ ἐφ' οἷς καὶ πρὸς οὓς καὶ οὗ ἕνεκα καὶ ὡς δεῖ, μέσον τε καὶ ἄριστον, ὅπερ ἐστὶ τῆς ἀρετῆς [ed. Bywater, trans. Rackham, LCL 73]).

45. ἀπολογούμενος; John denies what he has clearly just been doing (perhaps itself in imitation of Paul's example, as in 2 Cor 12:19).

καὶ μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς εὐπορίας εἰς τὸν ἀκύμαντον λιμένα καταπλεῖν, καὶ τῶν ἀκηράτων ἐπιτυχεῖν στεφάνων, ὧν γένοιτο πάντας ἡμᾶς καταξιωθῆναι, χάριτι καὶ φιλανθρωπίᾳ τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ᾧ ἡ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος νῦν καὶ αἰεὶ καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Ἀμήν.

way we'll be able to derive profit from all directions, and with great ease sail into the waveless harbor and attain the undefiled crowns, of which may we all be found worthy, by the grace and loving-kindness of our Lord Jesus Christ, to whom be the glory and the power, now and always, and forever and ever. Amen.

Τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἐγκώμιον εἰς τὸν ἅγιον ἀπόστολον Παῦλον, λόγος ζ'.

7.1. [292] Ὅταν οἱ τὰ σημεῖα βαστάζοντες τὰ βασιλικά, σάλπιγγος πρὸ αὐτῶν ἡχούσης καὶ πολλῶν στρατιωτῶν προηγουμένων, εἰς τὰς πόλεις εἰσίσωσιν, ἅπας ὁ δῆμος συντρέχειν εἴωθεν, ὥστε καὶ τῆς ἡχῆς ἀκοῦσαι, καὶ τὸ σημεῖον ἰδεῖν ἐφ' ὑψηλοῦ φερόμενον, καὶ τοῦ βαστάζοντος τὴν ἀνδρείαν. Ἐπεὶ οὖν καὶ Παῦλος εἰσέρχεται σήμερον, οὐκ εἰς πόλιν, ἀλλ' εἰς τὴν οἰκουμένην, συνδράμωμεν ἅπαντες. Καὶ γὰρ οὗτος σημεῖον βαστάζει, οὐ τοῦ κάτω βασιλέως, ἀλλὰ τὸν σταυρὸν τοῦ ἄνω Χριστοῦ, καὶ προηγούνται οὐκ ἄνθρωποι, ἀλλ' ἄγγελοι, καὶ εἰς τιμὴν [294] τοῦ βασταζομένου καὶ εἰς ἀσφάλειαν τοῦ φέροντος. Εἰ γὰρ τοῖς τὸν ἴδιον βίον οἰκονομοῦσι, καὶ οὐδὲν τῶν κοινῶν πράττουσιν, ἄγγελοι παρὰ τοῦ τῶν ὅλων Δεσπότης εἰσὶ δεδομένοι φύλακες, καθὼς καὶ Ἰακώβ φησιν· Ὁ ἄγγελος ὁ ῥυόμενός με ἐκ νεότητός μου· πολλῶ μᾶλλον ἐπὶ τῶν τὴν οἰκουμένην ἐγχειρισθέντων καὶ τηλικούτων βασταζόντων ὅγκον δωρεῶν πάρεισιν αἱ δυνάμεις αἱ ἄνω. Οἱ μὲν οὖν παρὰ τῶν ἔξωθεν ταύτης ἡξιωμένοι τῆς τιμῆς, ἱμάτια περικεῖνται καὶ περιαυχένιον κόσμον χρυσοῦν, καὶ πάντοθεν εἰσι λαμπροί· οὗτος δὲ ἄλυσιν ἀντὶ χρυσοῦ περικείμενος βαστάζει τὸν σταυρόν· οὗτος ἐλαυνόμενος, οὗτος μαστιζόμενος καὶ λιμώττων.

7.2. Ἀλλὰ μὴ στυγνάσης, ἀγαπητέ. Καὶ γὰρ ὁ κόσμος οὗτος ἐκείνου πολλῶ βελτίων καὶ λαμπρότερος, καὶ Θεῷ φίλος· διὸ καὶ βαστάζων οὐκ

1. Text: as indicated in the introduction (pp. 62–64), we reprint the Greek text of Auguste Piédagnel (AP) SC 300 (1982) for each of the seven homilies *De laudibus sancti Pauli*. The footnotes within the translations on *Laud. Paul.* 1.14; 3.6; 4.15; 4.16; 5.3; 5.7; 6.5; 6.11; and 7.2 document the nine places where Piédagnel's text (AP) diverges from HS. See abbreviations, p. xvi above, for the sigla for AP's manuscripts. The translation and notes do not attempt a comprehensive assessment of the variants in the textual tradition of *Laud. Paul.*; readers should consult the Piédagnel edition for a full *apparatus criticus*. Translation: This translation is replicated from HT 482–87, with some minor adjustments; see HT 261–70 for an analysis of the argument of this homily.

2. On this image of the imperial standards (bearing εἰκόνες of the emperor) and *adventus*, and John's argument that Paul is the standard-bearer of Christ, see HT 173–76.

Hom. 7 De laudibus sancti Pauli apostoli
CPG 4344 (SC 300:292–320)¹

In praise of saint Paul the apostle by the same author, homily 7.

7.1. [292] When those who bear the imperial standards enter into the cities, with a trumpet sounding before them and many soldiers leading the way, the whole populace customarily runs out at once, both to hear the sound and to see the standard borne aloft and the bravery of its bearer.² Therefore, since today Paul, too, makes an entrance, not into a city but into the world, let's all run out together. For he also bears a standard, not of the king here below, but the cross of the Christ above, and his advance troops aren't humans, but angels. He does so both for the honor [294] of what is borne and for the safety of the one carrying it. For if angels are given as guardians by the Lord of all creation to the people who manage just their own lives and do nothing for the common good³—as also Jacob said, “*the angel who rescues me from the time of my youth*” (Gen 48:15–16)⁴—then how much more do the powers above accompany those who've had the world placed in their hands and bear such a great weight of gifts? Now those whom the outsiders⁵ deem worthy of this honorable post wear fine garments and an ornamental gold necklace and are magnificently arrayed all over. But Paul, on the contrary, wearing a chain instead of gold, carries the cross. He's persecuted; he's whipped and famished.

7.2. But don't be sad at this, beloved. For indeed the latter's raiment was far superior and more magnificent than the former's—and he was a friend of God (cf. Jas 2:23)! That's why he didn't grow weary in bearing it. For the truly amazing thing is that with bonds and whippings and branding

3. For an entryway into the sources about “guardian angels” among Jews and later Christians, in relation to the key verse, Matt 18:10, see W. D. Davies and Dale C. Allison Jr., *Matthew 8–18*, ICC (London: T&T Clark, 1991), 770–72.

4. A composite quotation, with the first part from Gen 48:16 and *ἐκ νεότητος* taken from the prior verse (Gen 48:15).

5. οἱ παρὰ τῶν ἑξωθεν, one of John's phrases for “pagans” (even as he is characterizing the imperial honor guard of a Christian emperor).

ἔκαμνε. Τοῦτο γάρ ἐστι τὸ θαυμαστόν, ὅτι μετὰ δεσμῶν καὶ μαστίγων λαμπρότερος τῶν τὴν ἀλουργίδα καὶ τὸ διάδημα ἐχόντων ἦν. Ὅτι γὰρ [296] λαμπρότερος, καὶ οὐ κόμπος τὰ εἰρημένα, ἐδήλωσεν αὐτοῦ τὰ ἱμάτια. Διαδήματα μὲν γὰρ μυρία καὶ πορφυρίδας τοσαύτας ἂν ἐπιθῆς ἀρρωστοῦντι, οὐδὲ μικρόν τι τῆς φλογὸς ὑποτεμέσθαι δυνήσῃ· τὰ δὲ ἐκείνου σιμικίνθια ὁμιλοῦντα τοῖς σώμασι τῶν καμνόντων, πᾶσαν νόσον δραπετεύειν ποιεῖ, καὶ εἰκότως. Εἰ γὰρ λησται τοῦτο ὀρώντες τὸ σημεῖον οὐ τολμῶσιν ἐπελθεῖν, ἀλλ' ἀμεταστρεπτί φεύγουσι, πολλῶ μᾶλλον νόσοι καὶ δαίμονες ὀρώντες ἐκεῖνο τὸ σημεῖον φεύγουσιν. Ἐβάσταζε δέ, οὐχ ἵνα αὐτὸς αὐτὸ φέρῃ μόνος, ἀλλ' ἵνα ἅπαντας τοιούτους ποιήσῃ καὶ διδάξῃ βαστάζειν· διὸ καὶ ἔλεγε· Μιμηταί μου γίνεσθε, καθὼς ἔχετε τύπον ἡμᾶς· καὶ πάλιν· Ἄ ἡκούσατε καὶ εἶδετε ἐν ἐμοί, ταῦτα πράσσετε· καὶ πάλιν· Ἡμῖν ἐχαρίσθη, οὐ μόνον τὸ εἰς αὐτὸν πιστεύειν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ πάσχειν. Τὰ μὲν γὰρ τοῦ παρόντος ἀξιώματα βίου τότε μείζονα φαίνεται, ὅταν εἰς ἓνα περιστῇ μόνον· ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν πνευματικῶν τούναντίον· τότε μάλιστα λάμπει τὸ τῆς τιμῆς, ὅταν πολλοὺς τῆς προεδρίας ἔχῃ κοινωνοὺς, καὶ ὅταν ὁ [298] μετέχων μὴ εἰς ἧ, ἀλλὰ πολλοὺς ἔχῃ τοὺς τῶν αὐτῶν ἀπολαύοντας. Ὅρᾳς οὖν πάντας σημειοφόρους, καὶ ἕκαστον τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ βαστάζοντα ἐνῶπιον ἐθνῶν καὶ βασιλέων, αὐτὸν δὲ καὶ ἐνώπιον γεέννης, καὶ ἐνώπιον κολάσεως. Ἄλλ' οὐκ εἶπεν οὕτως· οὐ γὰρ ἡδύναντο ἐκεῖνοι βαστάζειν.

7.3. Εἶδες ὅσης ἐστὶν ἀρετῆς ἡ φύσις ἡ ἡμετέρα δεκτικῆ; ὡς οὐδὲν ἀνθρώπου τιμιώτερον καὶ θνητοῦ μένοντος; Τί γάρ μοι τούτου μείζον ἔχεις εἰπεῖν; τί δὲ ἴσον; πόσων δὲ ἀγγέλων καὶ ἀρχαγγέλων οὐκ ἔστιν ἄξιός ὁ τοῦτο εἰπὼν τὸ ῥῆμα; Ὁ γὰρ ἐν σώματι θνητῷ καὶ ἐπικήρῳ πάντα ὑπὲρ τοῦ Χριστοῦ προδούς, ὧν κύριος ἦν, μᾶλλον δὲ ὧν οὐκ ἦν, —καὶ γὰρ καὶ τὰ ἐνεστῶτα, καὶ τὰ μέλλοντα προέδωκε, καὶ ὕψωμα καὶ βάθος καὶ κτίσιν ἑτέραν—, οὗτος

6. I adopt the reading καὶ στιγμαίων after καὶ μαστίγων, which has by far the best manuscript attestation (two families, BDM AL E). Oddly, in this case, AP nonetheless prefers the less well-attested reading of CFGP on the internal grounds that because the previous two terms, δεσμῶν and μαστίγων, are echoed in the context, but στιγμαίων is not (AP 294–95), it must be a scribal gloss inspired by Gal 6:17. Much more likely is that it is a Chrysostomic allusion to Gal 6:17 (a favored text) that has been dropped by homoioteleuton [-ων]. HS had included καὶ στιγμαίων, but in brackets; in PG it stands without brackets.

7. With μιμηταί (cf. 1 Cor 4:16; 11:1) for συμμιμηταί; ellipsis of ἀδελφοί ... περιπατοῦντες before καθὼς ἔχετε.

8. With ellipsis of καὶ ἐμάθετε καὶ παρελάβετε καὶ before ἡκούσατε.

9. With ἡμῖν for ὑμῖν; with ellipsis of τὸ ὑπὲρ Χριστοῦ before οὐ μόνον.

10. John is democratizing the prophecy to Ananias about Paul's call onto all who

marks⁶ (cf. Gal 6:17) he was more magnificent than those who possess the purple robe and the diadem. Now, that [296] he was more magnificent—my words are no boast—his own garments show. For if you put thousands of diadems and many purple robes upon a man sick with fever, you'll not be able to reduce the flame of the fever even a little bit. But Paul's handkerchiefs, when placed on the bodies of the sick, set every illness to flight (cf. Acts 19:12), and for good reason. For if thieves upon seeing the imperial standard don't dare to enter, but run away without a backward glance, how much more do illnesses and demons flee when they see the standard Paul bears. And he bore it not so that he might carry it alone, but so that he might make all people to be such as himself and might teach them to carry it. That's why he said, "*Be imitators of me, just as you have us as an example*" (Phil 3:17),⁷ and again, "*What you heard and saw in me, do these things*" (Phil 4:9).⁸ And yet again, "*It was granted to us not only to believe in him but also to suffer on his behalf*" (Phil 1:29).⁹ For whereas the dignified positions in the present life appear greater when they devolve upon a single person only, it's the opposite with spiritual ones. With those, the position of honor shines especially when one has many companions in the preeminent post and when the one [298] who shares it isn't a lone individual but has many enjoying the same dignities. Hence you see that all are standard-bearers and each one bears Christ's name "*before nations and kings*" (Acts 9:15).¹⁰ But Paul carried it even before Gehenna and eternal chastisement (cf. Rom 9:3), though he didn't command this,¹¹ because those he was speaking to weren't able to bear it.

7.3. Do you see what great virtue our nature is capable of? How nothing is more honorable than a human being, even if they remain mortal? For what could you tell me is greater than this human being, Paul? What his equal? Of how many angels and archangels is the one who said this thing (i.e., Rom 9:3) not worthy? For the one who in a finite and mortal body gave up everything that he owned for Christ (cf. Phil 3:7–8), and, more than that, things he didn't own—for he gave up both the things present and things to come, both height and depth, and another creation (Rom 8:38–39)¹²—if this man had been in a bodiless nature, what wouldn't he

proclaim the gospel in his likeness (though he leaves out the mission to the Jews that completes the sentence in Acts: *υἱὸν τε Ἰσραήλ*).

11. The sense is that Paul alone asked to be *ἀνάθεμα* for the sake of his people, but he does not command others who preach Christ to do this.

12. Very close to a quotation, but by John's syntax (because of *προέδωκε*), all these substantives are accusative, not nominative as in Rom 8:38–39.

εἰ ἐν ἀσωμάτῳ φύσει ἦν, τί οὐκ ἂν εἶπε; τί δὲ οὐκ ἂν ἔπραξε; Καὶ γὰρ καὶ τοὺς ἀγγέλους διὰ τοῦτο θαυμάζω, ὅτι κατηξιώθησαν τοιαύτης τιμῆς, οὐχ ὅτι ἀσώματοι ἔτυχον ὄντες· ἐπεὶ καὶ ὁ διάβολος ἀσώματός τέ ἐστι καὶ ἀόρατος, ἀλλ' ὅμως πάντων ἐστὶν ἀθλιώτερος, ἐπειδὴ τῷ ποιήσαντι προσέκρουσε Θεῷ. Ἐντεῦθεν καὶ ἀνθρώπους ἀθλίους εἶναί φαμεν, οὐχ ὅταν σάρκα περι-[300] κειμένους ἴδωμεν, ἀλλ' ὅταν μὴ εἰς δέον αὐτῇ χρωμένους· ἐπεὶ καὶ ὁ Παῦλος σάρκα περιέκειτο. Πόθεν οὖν τοιοῦτος ἦν; Καὶ οἴκοθεν, καὶ παρὰ Θεοῦ, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο παρὰ Θεοῦ, ἐπειδὴ οἴκοθεν· οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶ προσωπολήπτης ὁ Θεός. Εἰ δὲ λέγοις· καὶ πῶς δυνατόν ἐκείνους μιμήσασθαι, ἄκουσον τί φησι· Μιμηταί μου γίνεσθε, καθὼς καὶ γὰρ Χριστοῦ. Ἐκεῖνος τοῦ Χριστοῦ γέγονε μιμητής, σὺ δὲ οὐδὲ τοῦ συνδούλου; ἐκεῖνος Δεσπότην ἐζήλωσε, σὺ δὲ οὐδὲ τὸν ὁμόδουλον; καὶ ποῖαν ἔξεις ἀπολογίαν;

7.4. Καὶ πῶς αὐτὸν ἐμιμήσατο, φησί; Τοῦτο ἐξ ἀρχῆς σκοπεῖ καὶ ἀπ' αὐτῶν τῶν προοιμίων. Ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἀπὸ [302] τῶν θείων ναμάτων τοσοῦτον πῦρ ἔχων ἀνῆλθεν, ὥς μὴδὲ ἀναμεῖναι διδάσκαλον· οὐ γὰρ περιέμενε Πέτρον, οὐδὲ ἦλθε πρὸς Ἰάκωβον, οὐδὲ πρὸς ἄλλον οὐδένα, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ τῆς προθυμίας ἀρθείς, οὕτω τὴν πόλιν ἀνῆψεν ὥς πόλεμον ἀναρριπισθῆναι κατ' αὐτοῦ χαλεπόν· ἐπεὶ καὶ Ἰουδαῖος ὢν, τὰ ὑπὲρ τὴν ἁλίαν ἐποίει, δεσμεύων, ἀπάγων, δημεύων. Οὕτω καὶ Μωσῆς, οὐδενὸς χειροτονήσαντος αὐτόν, τὴν ἀδικίαν τῶν βαρβάρων ἐκώλυσε τὴν κατὰ τῶν ὁμοφύλων. Ταῦτα γὰρ ψυχῆς γενναίας ἀπόδειξις καὶ γνώμης ἐλευθέρας, οὐκ ἀνεχομένης σιγῇ φέρειν τὰ ἐτέρων κακά, κἂν μηδεὶς

13. A brief allusion to the problem of what John regards as a contemptuous anthropology held by Marcionites, Manichaeans and others.

14. As AP notes, the first instance of *σάρξ* in this sentence (to which this singular pronoun must refer) is, in all the manuscripts, plural, *σάρκας* (as is read by HS). We follow AP (who follows Mf) in the conjectural emendation to the singular, *σάρκα*, positing a confusion due to the ligature with the following word (AP 298 *app. crit.*, 300 n. 1).

15. Once again, the “problem” is advanced by a hypothetical protagonist introduced by John, and again the issue is Paul’s moral perfectibility in body and soul, as well as the perfectibility of all who would seek to imitate him.

16. On Paul as a *δοῦλος Χριστοῦ*, see, e.g., Rom 1:1; Gal 1:10; Phil 1:1; Titus 1:1.

17. This translation reflects Chrysostom’s point of view on Paul’s “conversion,” i.e., that at that moment (as described by Luke in Acts 9:3–18, 22:6–21, and 26:12–18, and by Paul in Gal 1:15–16), Paul became a “Christian” and was no longer a “Jew.” One can see this clearly in what follows two sentences later: *ἐπεὶ καὶ Ἰουδαῖος ὢν* (“even when he was a Jew”). One needs to appreciate this to comprehend John’s late fourth-century argument; this was not the case, however, with the historical-epistolary Paul, who was called as a prophet within Judaism and remained a Jew his whole life. See the seminal

have said? What wouldn't he have done? For I admire the angels, too, for the reason that they were deemed worthy of such great honor, not due to the fact that they happened to be bodiless. Since even the devil was bodiless and invisible, but nevertheless he was more wretched than all because he offended the God who had created him. Consequently, we say that human beings are wretched, not when we see that they're clothed in flesh,¹³ [300] but when we see them not using that flesh¹⁴ properly. Since Paul, too, was clothed in flesh. From what source, then, was he such as he was? Both from his own nature and from God; and this is the reason it was from God, since it was from his own nature. For "*God does not show partiality*" (Acts 10:34; cf. Rom 2:11). Now if you say, "How is it possible to imitate such people?"¹⁵ listen to what he says: "*Be imitators of me, as also I am of Christ*" (1 Cor 11:1). Paul has become the imitator of Christ, and you can't even imitate your fellow slave?¹⁶ He emulated the Lord, and you can't even emulate someone who is a slave like yourself? What sort of excuse will you have?

7.4. "And how did he imitate him?" someone says. Well, look at how this was the case from the outset and from his very beginnings as a Christian.¹⁷ Because [302] he came up from the divine waters of baptism (cf. Acts 9:18) with such great fire that he didn't even wait for a teacher. He didn't wait for Peter, nor did he go to James or to anyone else (cf. Gal 1:17), but, raised up by zeal for action, he so ignited the city¹⁸ that a terrible war was kindled against him. Even when he was a Jew, he used to do things beyond his own station, binding, leading, confiscating property (cf. Acts 9:1–2).¹⁹ This is just like Moses who, although no one had appointed him, prevented the barbarians' injustice against his compatriots (cf. Exod 2:11–14). These actions are proof of a noble soul and a free intent, not a soul that would tolerate the endurance of evil acts from others in silence just because no one had appointed him to rectify it. But by later appointing Moses (cf. Exod 3:10), God demonstrated that he'd justly hastened to the leadership, which

essay of Krister Stendahl, *Paul among Jews and Gentiles* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976), 7–23 ("Call Rather Than Conversion"), and more recently Paula Fredriksen, *Paul, The Pagans' Apostle* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2017), 61, 94, etc., with further literature.

18. I.e., Damascus (cf. Acts 9:19–25; 2 Cor 11:32–33).

19. The potential "problem" of Paul's having arrogated authority to himself is "solved" by John by appeal to the example of Moses and what Chrysostom claims is an established pattern of divine retrospective endorsement of bold leaders.

ὁ χειροτονῶν ἦ. “Ὅτι γὰρ δικαίως ἐπεπήδησε τῇ προστασίᾳ, ἔδειξεν ὁ Θεὸς χειροτονήσας αὐτὸν ὕστερον· ὁ καὶ ἐπὶ Παύλου πεποίηκεν.” Ὅτι γὰρ καὶ οὗτος καλῶς ἐποίησε τοῦ λόγου ἀψάμενος τότε καὶ τῆς διδασκαλίας, καὶ τοῦτο ἐδήλωσεν ὁ Θεός, ταχέως αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸ τῶν διδασκάλων ἀξίωμα ἀγαγών.

7.5. [304] Εἰ μὲν γὰρ τιμῆς ἕνεκεν καὶ προεδρίας ἐπεπήδων τοῖς πράγμασι, καὶ τῆς αὐτῶν θεραπείας εἰκότως ἂν ἐνεκλήθησαν. Ἐπειδὴ δὲ κινδύνους ἡγάπων, καὶ θανάτους ἐπεσπῶντο, ἵνα τοὺς ἄλλους διασώσωσιν ἅπαντας, τίς οὕτως ἄθλιος ὥστε ἐγκαλέσαι προθυμίᾳ τοσαύτῃ; Ὅτι γὰρ τῆς τῶν ἀπολλυμένων σωτηρίας ἐρῶντες ταῦτα ἔπραττον, ἐδήλωσε καὶ ἡ τοῦ Θεοῦ ψῆφος, ἐδήλωσε καὶ ἡ τῶν κακῶς ἐρασθέντων τὸν ἔρωτα τοῦτον ἀπώλεια. Ἐπεπήδησάν ποτε καὶ ἕτεροι ἀρχῇ καὶ προστασίᾳ, ἀλλὰ πάντες ἀπέθανον, οἱ μὲν ἐμπρησθέντες, οἱ δὲ γῆς διαστάσει καταποθέντες. Οὐ γὰρ διὰ προστασίαν τοῦτο ἐποιοῦν, ἀλλὰ διὰ προεδρίας ἔρωτα. Ἐπεπήδησε καὶ Ὀζίας, ἀλλὰ καὶ οὗτος ἀκάθαρτος γέγονεν· ἐπεπήδησε καὶ Σίμων, ἀλλὰ κατεδικάσθη, καὶ περὶ τῶν ἐσχάτων ἐκινδύνευσε· ἐπεπήδησε καὶ Παῦλος, ἀλλ’ ἐστεφανώθη, οὐχὶ ἱερωσύνη καὶ τιμῇ, ἀλλὰ διακονίᾳ καὶ πόνοις καὶ κινδύνοις. Καὶ ὅτι ἀπὸ ζήλου πολλοῦ καὶ προθυμίας [306] ἐπέδραμε, διὰ τοῦτο ἀνακηρύττεται καὶ λαμπρὸς ἐκ προοιμίων ἦν.

7.6. Ὡςπερ γὰρ ὁ χειροτονούμενος ἄρχων, ἂν μὴ δεόντως τὸ πρᾶγμα μετή, καὶ μείζονός ἐστι κολάσεως ἄξιος, οὕτω καὶ μὴ χειροτονηθῇ τις, μεταχειρίζῃ δὲ προσηκόντως, οὐ λέγω τὰ τῆς ἱερωσύνης, ἀλλὰ τὰ τῆς τῶν πολλῶν προνοίας, τοῦ παντὸς ἁξίός ἐστι. Διὰ τοῦτο οὐδεμίαν ἀνέμεινεν ἡμέραν ἡσυχάζων ὁ πυρὸς οὗτος σφοδρότερος, ἀλλ’ ὁμοῦ τε ἀνέβη ἀπὸ τῆς ἱερᾶς τῶν ὑδάτων πηγῆς, καὶ πολλὴν ἀνῆψεν ἑαυτῷ τὴν φλόγα, καὶ οὔτε κινδύνους ἐνενόησεν, οὐ τὸν γέλωτα καὶ τὴν αἰσχύνην τὴν παρὰ Ἰουδαίων, οὐ τὸ ἀπιστεῖσθαι παρ’ αὐτοῖς, οὐκ ἄλλο τῶν τοιούτων οὐδέν· ἀλλ’ ἐτέρους λαβὼν ὀφθαλμούς, τοὺς τῆς ἀγάπης, καὶ ἐτέραν διάνοιαν, μετὰ πολλῆς ἐνέπιπτε τῆς ῥύμης, ὥςπερ τις χειμάρρου, ἅπαντα παρασύρων τὰ Ἰουδαίων, καὶ διὰ τῶν

20. Again one “solution” introduces another possible “problem,” that Paul (and Moses) acted in self-interest.

21. I.e., by attempting to take the priests’ role in burning incense in the temple.

22. John seeks en passant to avert sharply a possible new “problem” from this line of argument: that it would be acceptable for people to jump into the tasks of the priest without authorization.

23. On the combination of images for Paul here as both fire and water, see HT 265.

24. John’s paraphrastic interpretation of Acts 9:22: συνέχυνεν τοὺς Ἰουδαίους τοὺς κατοικοῦντας ἐν Δαμασκῷ.

is what God has done also in the case of Paul. For God showed that Paul had done well by engaging in the word and teaching at that moment, and quickly led him to the dignified status of the company of teachers.

7.5. [304] Now, if they'd been hastening to do these things for the sake of honor and preeminence, then with reason they'd be accused of serving their own interests.²⁰ But since they loved dangers and were drawn to forms of death so that they might save all the others, who is so miserable as to bring an accusation against such willingness? For that they did these things because they were passionate for the salvation of the lost even God's resolve shows, as does the destruction of those who were incited by this passion, but for an evil intent. In the past, others, too, hastened to rule and preeminence, but all died—some were burned up (cf. Judg 9:49), some were swallowed up in an earthquake (cf. Num 16:31–32). This was because they didn't do it for the sake of leading but on account of love for preeminence. Also, King Uzziah hastened to act,²¹ but he became a leper (cf. 2 Par 26:16–21). And Simon, too, acted in haste, but he was condemned and met with the worst dangers (cf. Acts 8:18–24). Paul acted in haste as well, yet he was crowned not with priesthood and honor but with service and labors and dangers. And because it was from great eagerness and ethical zeal [306] that he rushed out, that's why his praise is proclaimed and he was magnificent right from the beginning.

7.6. For just as the appointed leader is worthy of a greater punishment if he doesn't discharge his task properly, so even if one isn't appointed, but manages the job suitably (and I'm not speaking of the duties of the priesthood,²² but those of the oversight of the many), he's worthy of all reward. That's why Paul, this man more fervent than fire, couldn't wait quietly for a single day, but at once he rose up from the holy font of the baptismal waters (cf. Acts 9:18), kindled a great flame in himself, and wasn't even conscious of dangers—not the ridicule and shame from Jews, not being held in disbelief by them, or any other of such things. But receiving another pair of eyes, the eyes of love, and another mind, he rushed in with great force like a raging torrent,²³ sweeping away all the assumptions of the Jews²⁴ and demonstrating through the Scriptures that “he *is the Christ*” (Acts 9:22).²⁵ Although he didn't yet have many spiritual gifts of grace,²⁶ nor was

25. With αὐτός for οὗτος.

26. Alternatively, “he did not yet perform many miracles [i.e., divine favors] of grace” (so AP 307).

Γραφῶν δεικνὺς ὅτι αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ Χριστός. Καίτοι γε οὕτω χαρίσματα πολλὰ τῆς χάριτος ἦν αὐτῷ, οὕτω τοσούτου Πνεύματος κατηξίωτο· ἀλλ' ὅμως εὐθέως ἐφλέγετο, καὶ ψυχῇ θανατώσῃ πάντα ἔπραττε, καὶ ὥσπερ ἀπολογούμενος ὑπὲρ τοῦ παρελθόντος χρόνου, οὕτω πάντα ἐποίει, καὶ ἐπραγματεύετο εἰς τὸ πονοῦν μάλιστα τοῦ πολέμου μέρος ἑαυτὸν ἐμβάλλων, καὶ ὁ κινδύνων ἔγεμε καὶ φόβων.

7.7. [308] Καὶ ὅμως οὕτω τολμητῆς ὢν καὶ ὁρμητίας καὶ πῦρ πνέων, οὕτω πάλιν πειθήνιος ἦν καὶ εὐήνιος τοῖς διδασκάλοις ὥστε μὴ ἐν τοσαύτῃ ῥύμῃ προθυμίας αὐτοῖς ἀντιπεσεῖν. Καὶ γὰρ ζέοντι τότε καὶ μαινομένῳ προσελθόντες εἶπον ὅτι δεῖ ἀπελθεῖν εἰς Ταρσὸν καὶ Καισάρειαν, καὶ οὐκ ἀντεῖπεν· εἶπον ὅτι χρὴ διὰ τοῦ τείχους χαλασθῆναι, καὶ ἡνέσχετο· συνεβούλευσαν ξυρᾶσθαι, καὶ οὐκ ἀντέπεσεν· εἶπον μὴ εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὸ θέατρον, καὶ εἶξεν. Οὕτως ἐνός ἦν πανταχοῦ τοῦ συμφέροντος τοῖς πιστοῖς, τῆς εἰρήνης, τῆς ὁμονοίας, καὶ πανταχοῦ ἑαυτὸν ἐτῆρει τῷ κηρύγματι.

7.8. Ὡστε ὅταν ἀκούσης ὅτι τὸν ἀδελφιδοῦν πέμπει πρὸς τὸν χιλιάρχον, βουλόμενος ἑαυτὸν ἐξαρπάσαι τῶν κινδύνων, καὶ ὅταν ἐπικαλῆται Καίσαρα, καὶ ὅταν εἰς [310] τὴν Ῥώμην σπεύδῃ, μὴ νομίσης ἀνανδρείας εἶναι τὰ ῥήματα. Ὁ γὰρ στένων, ἐπειδὴ παρῆν ἐν τῷ βίῳ τούτῳ, πῶς οὐκ ἂν εἴλετο μετὰ Χριστοῦ εἶναι; καὶ ὁ τῶν οὐρανῶν καταφρονῶν καὶ ἀγγέλων δι' αὐτὸν ὑπερορῶν, πῶς ἂν ἐπεθύμησε τῶν παρόντων; Τίνος οὖν ἕνεκεν τοῦτο ἐποίει; Ἵνα ἐνδιατρίψῃ τῷ κηρύγματι, καὶ μετὰ πολλῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀπέλθῃ, πάντων ἐστεφανωμένων. Καὶ γὰρ ἐδεδοίκει μήποτε πτωχὸς καὶ πένης τῆς τῶν πολλῶν σωτηρίας ἀποδημήσῃ ἐντεῦθεν. Διὸ καὶ ἔλεγε· Τὸ ἐπιμεῖναι τῇ σαρκὶ ἀναγκαιότερον δι' ὑμᾶς.

7.9. Διὸ καὶ ὁρῶν τὸ δικαστήριον τὴν βελτίῳ ψῆφον περὶ αὐτοῦ κατατιθέμενον, ὡς πρὸς τὸν Φῆστον Ἀγρίππας ἔλεγεν· Ἀπολεῦσθαι ἡδύνατο ὁ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος, εἰ μὴ ἐπεκέκλητο Καίσαρα, καὶ δεθείς, καὶ μετὰ μυρίων

27. A deliberate carryover of the zealous disposition of the “preconversion” Paul (Acts 9:1) to the “Christian” Paul by Chrysostom.

28. Both accounts have this phrase, διὰ τοῦ τείχους.

29. As AP notes (309 n. 3), all the manuscripts except A and L add τῆς συμφωνίας (“and harmony”) after τῆς ὁμονοίας. Like HS before him, he accepts the minus. We translate AP’s text here but cautiously since, in view of the strong attestation as well as Chrysostom’s love for piling up synonyms of these terms for unity—e.g., *Res. Chr.* §3 (PG 50:438); *Laud. Max.* §4 (PG 51:231)—there is also a strong case for the longer reading.

30. Although distinguishing Paul’s special role, John argues he worked for the common good.

31. While the accommodation stressed in the previous paragraph can be a virtue,

he yet found worthy of such a great endowment of the Spirit, nonetheless he was immediately inflamed and performed all his deeds with a soul that was unafraid of death. He did everything as though justifying himself for the time that had passed, and, throwing himself into the part of the battle most filled with dangers and fears, he devoted himself to the work.

7.7. [308] Despite the fact that he was so daring and impetuous and breathing fire,²⁷ yet again he was obedient and compliant toward those who gave him instructions, so that the abundant force of his ardent will didn't bring him into conflict with them. For when they approached him at the time that he was fuming and raging and said that he should go off to Tarsus and Caesarea, he didn't contradict them (cf. Acts 9:30). They said it was necessary for him to be lowered down "*through the wall*" (Acts 9:25; 2 Cor 11:33),²⁸ and he put up with it. They advised him to be shaved, and he didn't oppose them (cf. Acts 21:23–25). They said not to enter into the theater, and he yielded to them (cf. Acts 19:29–30). Thus he held a common interest with the other believers—for peace, for concord²⁹—and everywhere he preserved himself for the proclamation of the gospel.³⁰

7.8. Consequently, when you hear that he sent his nephew to the chiliarch (cf. Acts 23:16–18), wishing to extrapolate himself from the dangers, and when he calls upon Caesar (cf. Acts 25:10–11) and [310] hastens to Rome, don't think these words betray cowardice.³¹ For the man who groaned because he remained in this life (cf. Rom 8:23; 2 Cor 5:4), how would he not choose to be with Christ (cf. Phil 1:22–23)? And the one who had contempt for the heavens and disdained the angels on account of Christ (cf. Rom 8:38–39), how could he be desirous of present realities? Then why was he doing this? So that he might devote his life to proclaiming the gospel and depart this life with many others who had received their crowns (cf. 2 Tim 4:8). For he was afraid lest he might depart from here poor and impoverished when it came to the salvation of the many. This is the reason he said, "*To remain in the flesh is more necessary for your sakes*" (Phil 1:24).³²

7.9. Consequently [he called upon Caesar], because he saw that the tribunal was going to impose a positive verdict in his case (as Agrippa said to Festus, "*This man could have been released, if he had not called upon Caesar*" [Acts 26:32]). Then, bound and led away with innumerable other

it is a "problem" if it involves downright cowardice, *ἀνανδρεία*. John introduces this problem only to disprove it in what follows.

32. Minus δέ before τό; with ἐπιμεῖναι for ἐπιμένειν; minus ἐν before τῇ σαρκί.

ἐτέρων δεσμωτῶν ἀπαγόμενος μυρία εἰργασμένων δεινά, οὐκ ἡσχύνετο τῷ συνδεδέσθαι ἐκείνοις, ἀλλὰ καὶ προενόει πάντων τῶν συμπλεόντων, καίτοι γε ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ θαρρῶν καὶ εἰδῶς ὡς ἐν ἀσφαλείᾳ ἦν, καὶ πέλαγος τοσοῦτον ἀνῆγετο δεδεμένος, καὶ ἔχαιρεν ὡς ἐπὶ μεγίστην ἀρχὴν προπεμπόμενος. Καὶ γὰρ οὐδὲ μικρὸς ἄθλος αὐτῷ τῆς Ῥωμαίων πόλεως ἢ διόρθωσις προῦκειτο. Ἄλλ' ὅμως οὐδὲ [312] τῶν ἐν τῷ πλοίῳ κατωλιγώρησεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐκείνους ἐρρύθμισε, διηγησάμενος τὴν αὐτῷ φανεῖσαν ὄψιν, ἐξ ἧς ἐμάνθανον ὅτι πάντες οἱ πλείοντες μετ' αὐτοῦ δι' αὐτὸν σώζονται. Τοῦτο δὲ ἐποίει, οὐχ ἑαυτὸν ἐπαίρων, ἀλλ' ἐκείνους ἑαυτῷ πειθηνίους παρασκευάζων. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ὁ Θεὸς συνεχώρησε διεγερθῆναι τὴν θάλασσαν, ἵνα καὶ δι' ὧν παρηκούσθη, καὶ δι' ὧν ἠκούσθη, διὰ πάντων δειχθῇ ἡ Παύλου χάρις. Καὶ γὰρ συνεβούλευσε μὴ ἀναπλεῦσαι, καὶ παρηκούσθη, καὶ γέγονε κίνδυνος περὶ τῶν ἐσχάτων· καὶ οὐδὲ οὕτως ἦν φορτικός, ἀλλὰ πάλιν ὡς παίδων πατὴρ προενόει, καὶ ὅπως μηδεὶς ἀπόλοιτο πάντα ἔπραττεν. Ἐπειδὴ δὲ καὶ τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἐπέβη, κακῆί πῶς μετὰ ἐπεικειάς διαλέγεται; πῶς μετὰ ἐλευθερίας τοὺς ἀπειθοῦντας ἐπιστομίζει; Καὶ οὐδὲ ἐνταῦθα ἴσταται, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐκεῖθεν εἰς Ἰσπανίαν ἔδραμε.

7.10. Καὶ γὰρ κινδυνεύων μᾶλλον ἐθάρρει, καὶ τολμηρότερος ἐγένετο ἐντεῦθεν, οὐκ αὐτὸς δὲ μόνος, ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ μαθηταὶ δι' αὐτόν. Ὡς περ γὰρ εἴπερ ἑώρων αὐτὸν ἐνδιδόντα καὶ ὀκνηρότερον γινόμενον, ἴσως ἂν καὶ αὐτοὶ καθυφῆκαν· οὕτως, ἐπειδὴ εἶδον αὐτὸν ἀνδριότερον γινόμενον, καὶ ἐπηρεαζόμενον, καὶ μᾶλλον ἐπιτιθέμενον, [314] μετὰ παρρησίας ἐκήρυττον. Καὶ τοῦτο δηλῶν ἔλεγεν· Ὡς τοὺς πλείονας τῶν ἀδελφῶν, πεποιθότας τοῖς δεσμοῖς μου, περισσοτέρως τολμᾶν ἀφόβως τὸν λόγον λαλεῖν. Ὅταν γὰρ ὁ στρατηγὸς ἢ γενναῖος, οὐχὶ σφάττων μόνον οὐδὲ ἀποκτιννύς, ἀλλὰ καὶ τιτρωσκόμενος, τοὺς ὑπ' αὐτῷ ταττομένους θρασυτέρους ποιεῖ, καὶ μᾶλλον τιτρωσκόμενος ἢ τιτρώσκων. Ὅταν γὰρ ἴδωσιν αὐτὸν αἵματι πεφυρμένον καὶ τραύματα περιφέροντα, καὶ μηδὲ οὕτω παραχωροῦντα τοῖς ἐχθροῖς, ἀλλ' ἐστῶτα γενναίως, καὶ δόρυ σείοντα, καὶ βάλλοντα τοὺς ἐναντίους, καὶ πρὸς τὰς ἀλγηδόνας οὐκ ἐνδιδόντα, μετὰ πλείονος παρατάττονται καὶ αὐτοὶ τῆς προθυμίας· ὁ δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ Παύλου γέγονεν. Ὅρωντες γὰρ αὐτὸν δεδεμένον

33. With ὡς for καί; minus ἐν κυρίῳ before πεποιθότας.

34. See the same argument in *Hom. Phil. 1:18* §§7–8 (PG 51:315–17).

prisoners who had done innumerable terrible things, he wasn't ashamed to share the bonds with them, but he even looked out for all his sailing companions (although he was fully confident on his own behalf and knew that he was safe). And so, he was conducted in bonds over so vast a sea, and went rejoicing, as though sent forth to take a most important official assignment. And, indeed, it was no small task that was awaiting him—setting straight the city of Rome. Nevertheless, he didn't [312] treat those in the boat with contempt, but he brought them to order by telling them the vision that had appeared to him, from which they learned that all those who were sailing with Paul were going to be saved on his account (cf. Acts 27:22–25). And he was doing this not to exalt himself, but to get them to obey his instructions. This is why God allowed the sea to be roiled up, so that through all circumstances, both in disobedience and in obedience to him, Paul's grace might be demonstrated. For when he advised them not to put out to sea (cf. Acts 27:9–11, 21) and they disobeyed, a hazard of the worst proportions ensued. Yet he wasn't stern, but again he looked out for them as a father would for his children (cf. Acts 27:21–26, 33–36; 1 Thess 2:11–12) and did everything so that not one of them would be lost. And when he set foot in Rome, even there, how gently did he speak (Acts 28:17–20)! How freely did he stop the mouths of the unpersuaded (cf. Acts 28:25–31)? Nor did he stop there, but he even ran off from Rome to Spain (cf. Rom 15:24).

7.10. Paul was even more confident when faced with dangers, and from them he became even more daring—not only he himself, but also his disciples because of him. For just as they would surely have slackened up if they'd seen him giving in and becoming more timid, so also when they saw him becoming more brave and, when insulted, going even more on the attack, [314] they preached the gospel with great boldness. Showing this, he said, “as *the majority of the brothers and sisters ... with confidence born from my chains, have become all the more bold in fearlessly speaking the word*” (Phil 1:14).³³ Because, when the general is noble, not only when slaying or killing, but even when wounded, he makes those commanded by him more confident, even more so when he is wounded than when wounding others. For when they see their general damp with blood and bearing lacerations and not even thus giving way to his enemies, but standing nobly, shaking his spear, attacking his enemies, and not giving in to his pain, they, too, draw themselves up for battle with a more ardent zeal for action. And this is precisely what happened in Paul's case.³⁴ For upon seeing him bound and yet preaching in prison, scourged and yet subduing

καὶ ἐν τῷ δεσμωτηρίῳ κηρύττοντα, καὶ μαστιζόμενον, καὶ τοὺς μαστίζοντας χειρούμενον, πλείονα ἐδέχοντο παρρησίαν. Διὸ καὶ τοῦτο δηλῶν, οὐχ ἀπλῶς Πεποιθότας εἶπεν, ἀλλὰ προστίθησι· Περισσοτέρως τολμᾷν ἀφόβως τὸν λόγον λαλεῖν· τουτέστι, μᾶλλον νῦν ἢ ὅτε λελυμένος ἦμην, ἐπαρρησιάζοντο οἱ ἀδελφοί. Τότε πλείονα προθυμίαν καὶ αὐτὸς ἐλάμβανε· μᾶλλον γὰρ τότε παρῶ-**[316]**ξύνετο κατὰ τῶν ἐχθρῶν, καὶ αἱ προσθήκαι τῶν διωγμῶν προσθήκαι πλείονος παρρησίας ἦσαν αὐτῷ καὶ μείζονος θάρρους ὑπόθεσις.

7.11. Συνεκλείσθη γοῦν ποτε, καὶ τοσοῦτον ἐξέλαμψεν, ὥστε καὶ τὰ θεμέλια τινάξαι, καὶ τὰς θύρας ἀναπετάσαι, καὶ τὸν δεσμοφύλακα μεταστῆσαι πρὸς ἑαυτόν, καὶ τὸν δικάζοντα μικροῦ μεταπείσαι, ὡς καὶ αὐτὸν ἐκέϊνον λέγειν· Ἐν ὀλίγῳ με πείθεις Χριστιανὸν γενέσθαι. Πάλιν ἐλιθάζετο, καὶ τὴν καταλεύουσαν πόλιν εἰσελθὼν μετέθηκεν. Ἐκάλεσαν αὐτὸν ὡς μέλλοντες κρίνειν, ποτὲ μὲν Ἰουδαῖοι, ποτὲ δὲ Ἀθηναῖοι, καὶ γεγόνασιν οἱ δικασταὶ μαθηταί, οἱ ἀντίδικοι ὑπήκοοι. Καὶ καθάπερ πῦρ ἐμπεσὼν εἰς διαφόρους ὕλας μᾶλλον αὖξεται, καὶ προσθήκην λαμβάνει τὴν ὑποκειμένην ὕλην· οὕτω καὶ ἡ γλῶσσα Παύλου, ὅσοις ἂν συνεγένετο, πρὸς ἑαυτὸν αὐτοὺς μεθίστη, καὶ οἱ πολεμοῦντες αὐτῷ τοῖς ἐκείνου **[318]** λόγοις ἀλόντες τροφή ταχέως ἐγίγνοντο τῷ πνευματικῷ τούτῳ πυρί, καὶ δι' αὐτῶν πάλιν ὁ λόγος ἤρετο, καὶ ἐφ' ἑτέροισι προΐει. Διὸ καὶ ἔλεγε· Δέδεμαι, ἀλλ' ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ οὐ δέδεταί. Ἐφυγάδευον αὐτόν· καὶ τὸ μὲν πρᾶγμα δίωξις ἦν, τὸ δὲ συμβαῖνον, ἀποστολὴ διδασκάλων. Καὶ ὅπερ ἂν ἐποίησαν φίλοι καὶ συντεταγμένοι, τοῦτο ἐποιοῦν οἱ πολέμιοι, οὐκ ἐῶντες ἐν ἐνὶ ἰδρυθῆναι χωρίῳ, ἀλλὰ πανταχοῦ περιάγοντες τὸν ἱατρόν, δι' ὧν ἐπεβούλευον, δι' ὧν ἤλαυνον, ὡς πάντας ἀκοῦσαι τῆς ἐκείνου γλώττης. Ἐδησαν πάλιν αὐτόν, καὶ μᾶλλον παρώξυναν· τοὺς μαθητὰς ἤλασαν, καὶ τοῖς οὐκ ἔχουσι διδάσκαλον ἔπεμψαν· ἐπὶ μείζον ἤγαγον δικαστήριον, καὶ τὴν μείζονα ὠφέλησαν πόλιν.

7.12. Διὸ καὶ ἀλγοῦντες οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι περὶ τῶν ἀποστόλων ἔλεγον· Τί ποιήσομεν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τούτοις; Δι' ὧν, φασί, προαιρούμεθα, διὰ τούτων

35. John uses the “rewording topos” to have Paul himself (via John’s ventriloquism) translate the meaning of his original sentence.

36. I.e., Agrippa.

37. I.e., Lystra and Derbe, cities of Lycaonia (Acts 14:6).

38. Paul’s opponents.

39. Plus δέδεμαι (cf. Col 4:3) before ἀλλ' ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ οὐ δέδεταί.

40. Pithier in the Greek: ἀποστολὴ διδασκάλων.

41. I.e., Rome (cf. Acts 28:16–31, with an emphasis on 28:30–31).

the scourgers, they received a greater share of boldness. To show this, he didn't simply say, "*with confidence*," but he adds, "*have become all the more bold in fearlessly speaking the word*" (Phil 1:14). That is to say, "the brothers and sisters were more boldly outspoken now than when I'd been freed."³⁵ Then he himself received a greater fervency for action. For indeed, then he was incited [316] against his enemies, and the circumstances of persecution were for him the circumstances of greater boldness and the basis for greater confidence.

7.11. Once, when Paul was shut up in prison, he shone forth to such a degree that the walls shook, the doors opened wide, and the jailer switched over to Paul's own cause (cf. Acts 16:23–34). And his judge³⁶ was almost won over, such that even he said, "*You are almost persuading me to become a Christian!*" (Acts 26:28). Again, he was pelted with stones, and, going into the city that was assailing him,³⁷ he transformed them (cf. Acts 14:19–21). At one time Jews, and at another Athenians summoned him for an impending trial (cf. Acts 18:12; 22:30–23:9; 17:18–34), and the judges became disciples, the opponents subjects. Just as fire spreads more when it sets upon different materials and receives an increase from the flammable matter lying underneath, so also Paul's tongue converted to his own cause the people with whom it came into contact. Those who were fighting against him, taken captive by his [318] words, swiftly became fuel for this spiritual fire. And through them,³⁸ the gospel was raised up again and advanced continually toward others. That's why he said, "I have been bound, *but the word of God has not been bound*" (2 Tim 2:9).³⁹ They set him to flight as an act of persecution, but the result was the sending of the teachers out into the world!⁴⁰ His enemies were doing the very things his friends and associates would have done. They wouldn't allow him to be fixed in one place, but through their plots and their exiles they circulated this physician everywhere, so all heard the words his tongue spoke. They bound him again and incited him all the more. They drove out his disciples and thereby sent a teacher to those who didn't have one. They led him before a greater tribunal and brought benefit to an even greater city.⁴¹

7.12. That is why the Jews, embittered over the apostles, said, "*What shall we do with these men?*" (Acts 4:16). They said, "Through the things we intend against them, we're actually promoting their growth."⁴² They handed Paul over to the jailer so that he might securely restrain him, but

42. John is personifying the voice of Jewish opposition to Paul and the other apostles (as he imagines them); so also AP 319 n. 4.

αὔξομεν. Παρέδωκαν τῷ δεσμοφύλακι, ἵνα ἀκριβῶς αὐτὸν κατάσχη· ὁ δὲ ἀκριβέστερον ἐδέθη ὑπὸ Παύλου. Μετὰ δεσμωτῶν ἔπεμψαν, ἵνα μὴ φύγη· ὁ δὲ τοὺς δεσμώτας κατήχησε· διὰ τῆς θαλάσσης ἔπεμψαν, ἵνα καὶ ἄκοντες παρασκευάσωσι ταχέως ἀνυσθῆναι τὴν ὁδόν· καὶ τὸ [320] ναυάγιον τὸ συμβὰν ἐγένετο διδασκαλίας ὑπόθεσις τοῖς συμπλέουσι· μυρίας ἠπείλουν κολάσεις, ἵνα σβεσθῇ τὸ κήρυγμα, τὸ δὲ ἤρετο μᾶλλον. Καὶ ὥσπερ ἐπὶ τοῦ Δεσπότης ἔλεγον οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι· Ἀποκτείνωμεν αὐτόν, ἵνα μὴ ἔλθωσιν οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι, καὶ ἄρωσιν ἡμῶν τὴν πόλιν καὶ τὸ ἔθνος, καὶ τοῦναντίον συνέβη, —ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἀπέκτειναν αὐτόν, διὰ τοῦτο ἦραν οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι καὶ τὸ ἔθνος αὐτῶν καὶ τὴν πόλιν, καὶ ἅπερ ἐνόμιζον εἶναι κωλύματα, ταῦτα ἐγένετο βοηθήματα τοῦ κηρύγματος—, οὕτω καὶ Παύλου κηρύττοντος, ἅπερ ἐπῆγον ἐκεῖνοι τὸν λόγον ἐκκόπτοντες, ταῦτα αὐτὸν ἠύξησε, καὶ εἰς ὕψος ἐπῆρεν ἄφατον.

7.13. Διὰ δὴ ταῦτα πάντα εὐχαριστήσωμεν τῷ εὐμηχνάνῳ Θεῷ, μακαρίσωμεν τὸν Παῦλον, δι' οὗ ταῦτα γέγονεν, εὐξώμεθα καὶ αὐτοὶ τῶν αὐτῶν ἐπιτυχεῖν ἀγαθῶν, χάριτι καὶ φιλανθρωπία τοῦ Κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι' οὗ καὶ μεθ' οὗ τῷ Πατρὶ δόξα, ἅμα τῷ ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Ἀμήν.

he was more securely bound by Paul (cf. Acts 16:23, 27–34). They sent him with other prisoners so that he might not escape, but he instructed those prisoners in the gospel (cf. Acts 27:1, 21–26). They sent him by sea passage so that they might involuntarily provide for a quick end to the journey, and the [320] shipwreck that resulted became a platform for him to teach his shipboard companions (cf. Acts 27:1–44). They continually threatened him with countless punishments so that the gospel message might be extinguished, but it was raised up all the more. This is just like what happened in the case of the Lord,⁴³ when the Jews said, “Let’s kill him, lest *the Romans come and destroy our city and our nation*” (John 11:48),⁴⁴ but the opposite resulted. For it was because they killed him that the Romans destroyed both their nation and their city. The things they thought were hindrances became acts of assistance to the gospel. Likewise, when Paul was preaching the gospel, the things his foes brought against him to eradicate the word were the very factors that made it increase and elevated it to an indescribable height.

7.13. Therefore, for all these things, let’s give thanks to our ingenious God, let’s pronounce a blessing on Paul, that man through whom these things took place, and let’s pray that we, too, might attain the same good things, by the grace and loving-kindness of our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom and with whom be glory to the Father, together with the Holy Spirit, forever and ever. Amen.

44. More a paraphrased dramatic retelling than a quotation. John creates a *proso-poeia* with his addition of the first-person hortatory subjunctive ἀποκτείνωμεν αὐτόν (cf. John 11:53, συνεβουλεύσαντο ἵνα ἀποκτείνωσιν αὐτόν). From there the wording follows: with ἵνα μὴ ἔλθωσιν for καὶ ἐλεύσονται; καὶ ἄρῳσιν for καὶ ἀροῦσιν; and τὴν πόλιν for τὸν τόπον.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF WORKS CITED

Textual Editions and Translations

- Allen, Pauline. *John Chrysostom, "Homilies on Colossians."* WGRW 46. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2021.
- . *John Chrysostom, "Homilies on Philippians."* WGRW 36. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013.
- Babbitt, Frank Cole, ed. and trans. *Plutarch's Moralia*. Vol. 2. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1928.
- Bailey, Cyril, ed. *Lucretius: "De rerum natura."* Editio altera. OCT. Oxford: Clarendon, 1922.
- Bardy, Gustave, ed. and trans. *Eusèbe de Césarée, "Histoire ecclésiastique."* 3 vols. SC 31, 41, 55. Paris: Cerf, 1952–1958.
- Bareille, Jean-François, ed. *Oeuvres complètes de S. Jean Chrysostome: Traduction nouvelle*. 21 vols. Paris: Vivès, 1864–1878.
- Bellucci, C. "Per l'edizione critica dell'omelia *In illud: 'Oportet et haereses esse'* di S. Giovanni Crisostomo." Master's thesis, Università degli studi di Firenze, 1989–1990.
- Berger, Albrecht. *Life and Works of Saint Gregentios, Archbishop of Taphar*. Millenium Studies 7. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006.
- Biagiotti, G. "Per un'edizione critica dell'omelia 'De profectu evangelii' di San Giovanni Crisostomo." Master's thesis, Università degli studi di Firenze, 1992–1993.
- Boulenger, Fernand, ed. and trans. *Grégoire de Nazianze, Discours funèbres en l'honneur de son frère Césaire et de Basile de Césarée*. Paris: Picard, 1908.
- Braun, René, and Claudio Moreschini, trans. and eds. *Tertullien, "Contre Marcion."* Vol. 5. SC 483. Paris: Cerf, 2004.
- Burnet, John, ed. *Platonis opera*. 5 vols. OCT. Oxford: Clarendon, 1900–1907.

- Bywater, Ingram, ed. *Aristotelis ethica Nicomachea*. OCT. Oxford: Clarendon, 1894.
- Calvet-Sébasti, Marie-Ange, ed. and trans. Grégoire de Nazianze, "Discours 6–12." SC 405. Paris: Cerf, 1995.
- Cataldo, Antonio. *Giovanni Crisostomo, Mi opposi a lui a viso aperto* ("Hom. illud: In faciem ei restiti"): introduzione, testo, traduzione e commento. Testi e studi, Università degli studi di Lecce, Dipartimento di filologia classica e medioevale 16. Galatina: Congedo, 2007.
- Coeli, R. "Per un'edizione critica dell'omelia *De gloria in tribulationibus* di S. Giovanni Crisostomo (PG 51, 155–164)." Master's thesis, Università degli studi di Firenze, 1996.
- Commelin, Hieronymus, ed. *Expositio perpetua in Nouum Jesu Christi Testamentum*. 4 vols. Heidelberg: Commelin, 1603.
- Cramer, Johann Andreas, ed. *Des heiligen Kirchenlehrers Johannes Chrysostomus Erzbischofs und Patriarchen zu Constantinopel, Predigten, und Kleine Schriften: Aus dem Griechischen übersetzt*. 10 vols. Leipzig: Johann Gottfried Dyck, 1748–1751.
- Crouzel, Henri, and Manlio Simonetti, eds. and trans. Origène, "Traité des principes." 5 vols. SC 252, 253, 268, 269, 312. Paris: Cerf, 1978–1984.
- Diels, Hermann, ed. *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*. Revised by Walther Kranz. 6th ed. 3 vols. Berlin: Weidmann, 1952.
- , ed. *Simplicii in Aristotelis Physicorum libros quattuor posteriores commentaria*. Vol. 10 of *Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca*. Berlin: Reimer, 1895.
- Divjak, Johannes, ed. *Expositio quarumdam propositionum ex epistula ad Romanos, etc.* Vol. 4.1 of *Sancti Aurelii Augustini opera*. CSEL 84. Vienna: Hoelder-Pichler-Tempsky, 1971.
- Donato, Bernardino, ed. *Divi Ioannis Chrysostomi in omnes Pauli apostoli epistolas accuratissima, vereque aurea, et divina interpretatio*. Verona: Stephanus et fratres, 1529.
- Ducaeus, Fronto, ed. and trans. *Panegyrici Tractatus XVII sanctis apostolis, martyribus et patriarchis dicti*. Bordeaux: Simon Millanges, 1601.
- . *Quo miscellanea eius opera continentur, hoc est homiliae, quae in certa Scripturae loca non sunt habitae, sed de festis, de Sanctis, deque variis eiusmodi argumentis, itemque libri, & epistolae*. Vol. 5 of *S. Ioannis Chrysostomi archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani opera*. 6 vols. Paris: Morel, 1614.

- . *Sancti patris nostri Ioannis Chrysostomi archiepiscopi Constantino-
politani: De diversis novi Testamenti locis Sermones LXXI, nunc primum
Graece et Latine coniunctim editi*. Paris: A. Estienne, 1616.
- . *Sancti patris nostri Ioannis Chrysostomi archiepiscopi Constanti-
nopolitani opera omnia in 12 tomos distributa*. Paris: Morel, 1633 and
subsequent reprints. See also next entry.
- . *Sancti patris nostri Ioannis Chrysostomi archiepiscopi Constantino-
politani explanationes in Novum Testamentum in sex tomos distributa*.
Frankfurt am Main: Balthasar Christopher Wustius, 1697. Reprint of
vols. 7–12 of the previous entry.
- . *Sancti patris nostri Ioannis Chrysostomi tractatuum decas de diver-
sis Novi Testamenti locis, nunc primum graece et latine in lucem edita,
opera*. Bordeaux: apud Franciscum Buderium, 1604.
- Eastman, David L., ed. and trans. *The Ancient Martyrdom Accounts of Peter
and Paul*. WGRW 39. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015.
- Geiger, Marie-Ève. “La gloire et la patience dans les épreuves: Introduction,
traduction et notes de commentaire de deux homélies (CPG 4373 et
4374) de Jean Chrysostome, avec édition critique de la seconde homé-
lie.” Master’s thesis, École Normale Supérieure, 2012–2013.
- Gelenius, Sigismund, ed. and trans. *Opera D. Ioannis Chrysostomi Archi-
episcopi Constantinopolitani, quotquot per Graecorum exemplarium
facultatem in Latinam linguam hactenus traduci potuerunt*. 5 vols.
Basel: Hieronymus Froben, 1547.
- Goldbacher, Alois, ed. *Sancti Aurelii Augustini operum sectio II: Epistulae*. 5
vols. CSEL 34.1–2, 44, 57, 58. Vienna: F. Tempsky, 1894–1923.
- Halton, Thomas P., trans. “*In Praise of Saint Paul*” by John Chrysostom.
Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1963.
- Harmar, John, ed. *D. Ioannis Chrysostomi: Homiliae sex, ex manuscriptis
codicibus Novi Collegii*. Oxford: J. Barnes, 1586.
- Heikel, Ivar A., ed. *Eusebius Werke I. Über das Leben Constantins. Constan-
tins Rede an die Heilige Versammlung. Tricennatsrede an Constantin*.
GCS 7. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1902.
- Helmreich, Georg, ed. *Galen De temperamentis libri iii*. Leipzig: Teubner,
1904.
- Hilberg, Isidore, ed. *Sancti Eusebii Hieronymi epistulae*. 3 vols. CSEL 54–56.
Vienna: Hoelder-Pichler-Tempsky, 1910–1918.
- Hoeschel, David, ed. *Catalogus Graecorum codicum qui sunt in bibliotheca
reip. Augustanae Vindelicae*. Augsburg: Augustae Vindelicorum, 1595.

- Holl, Karl, ed. *Epiphanius* ("Ancoratus" und "Panarios"). Vol. 3 of *Panarion haer.* 65–80. *De fide*. GCS 37. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1933.
- Jeannin, Jean-Baptiste, ed. *Saint Jean Chrysostome, Oeuvres complètes traduites par la première fois en français*. Vol. 4: *Homélies sur divers textes du Nouveau Testament...* Bar-le-Duc: Guérin et Cie, 1864.
- Kassel, Rudolf, ed. *Aristotelis, "De arte poetica liber."* OCT. Oxford: Clarendon, 1922.
- Krynicka, T., and S. Longosz, trans. "Ze wzgledu na niebezpieczenstwo rozpusty nalezy sie zenic." *Vox Patrum* 31 (2011): 579–95.
- Kühn, Carl Gottlob, ed. *Claudii Galeni opera omnia*. 22 vols. Leipzig: Knobloch, 1821–1833.
- Lolos, Anastasios, and Vasilis L. Konstantinopulos, eds. *Ps.-Kallisthenes: Zwei mittelgriechische Prosa-Fassungen des Alexanderromans*. 2 vols. Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 141, 150. Meisenheim am Glan: Hain, 1983.
- Lloyd-Jones, Hugh, and Peter Parsons, eds. *Supplementum Hellenisticum*. 2 vols. TK 11. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1983.
- Malherbe, Abraham J., ed. *The Cynic Epistles: A Study Edition*. Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1977.
- Malingrey, Anne-Marie, ed. and trans. *Jean Chrysostome, "Lettre d'exil à Olympias et à tous les fidèles."* SC 103. Paris: Cerf, 1964.
- . *Jean Chrysostome, "Lettres à Olympias, seconde édition augmentée de la Vie anonyme d'Olympias."* 2nd ed. SC 13. Paris: Cerf, 1968.
- . *Jean Chrysostome, "Sur l'incompréhensibilité de Dieu."* 2nd ed. SC 28. Paris: Cerf, 1970.
- . *Jean Chrysostome, "Sur la vaine gloire et l'éducation des enfants."* SC 181. Paris: Cerf, 1972.
- . *Jean Chrysostome, "Sur le sacerdoce" (Dialogue et homélie).* SC 272. Paris: Cerf, 1980.
- Maraval, Pierre, ed. and trans. *Grégoire de Nyse, "Vie de sainte Macrine."* SC 178. Paris: Cerf, 1971.
- Mayer, Wendy, and Pauline Allen, trans. *John Chrysostom*. ECF. London: Routledge, 2000.
- Mazzoni Dami, Daniela, ed. *Giovanni Crisostomo, prima omelia sul matrimonio: "In illud, Propter fornicationes uxorem."* Studi e testi 14. Florence: Università degli Studi di Firenze, 1998.
- Merrill, William Augustus, ed. *Lucretius, "De rerum natura" libri sex*. New York: American Book Company, 1907.

- Migne, Jacques-Paul, ed. *S[ancti] P[atris] N[ostri] Joannis Chrysostomi archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani opera omnia quae exstant*. PG 47–64. Paris: Migne, 1859–1863.
- Mitchell, Margaret M., trans. “English Translation of *De laudibus sancti Pauli* 1–7.” Appendix I, pages 440–87 in *The Heavenly Trumpet: John Chrysostom and the Art of Pauline Interpretation*. HUT 40. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2002.
- Mitterrutzner, Johann Chrysostomus, ed. *Des heiligen Kirchenlehrers Johannes Chrysostomus ausgewählte Schriften, aus dem Griechischen übersetzt*. 10 vols. Bibliothek der Kirchenväter. Kempten: Kösel, 1869–1884.
- Montfaucon, Bernard de, ed. *Sancti patris nostri Joannis Chrysostomi archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani opera omnia quae exstant*. 13 vols. Paris: Sumtibus Ludovici Guerin, Caroli Robustel, Joannis and Josephi Barbou, Guillelmi Desprez, and Joannis Desessartz, 1718–1738.
- , ed. *Sancti patris nostri Joannis Chrysostomi archiepiscopi Constantinopolitani opera omnia quae exstant*. Editio parisina altera, emendata et aucta. Paris: Gaume fratres, 1835–1839.
- Mühlh, Peter von der, ed. *Homeri Odyssea*. Basel: Helbing Lichtenhahn, 1962.
- Musurillo, Herbert, ed. *Jean Chrysostome, “La virginité.”* Translated and annotated by Bernard Grillet. SC 125. Paris: Cerf, 1966.
- Niese, Benedikt, ed. *Flavii Iosephi opera*. 4 vols. Berlin: Weidmann, 1887–1890.
- Nock, A. D., and A.-J. Festugière, ed. and trans. *Fragments extraits de Stobée, XXIII–XXIX*. Vol. 4 of *Hermès Trismégiste, “Corpus Hermeticum.”* 4 vols. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1954.
- Olivier, Jean-Marie, ed. *Commentarii in psalmos I–L*. Vol. 1 of *Diodori Tarsensis commentarii in psalmos*. CCSG 6. Turnhout: Brepols, 1980.
- Page, Denys L., ed. *Aeschylus septem quae supersunt tragoedias*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1972.
- Perrone, Lorenzo, with Marina Molin Pradel, Emanuela Prinzivalli, and Antonio Cacciari, eds. *Origenes XIII, Die Neuen Psalmenhomilien: Eine kritische Edition des Codex Monacensis Graecus 314*. GCS NS 19. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2015.
- Phrantzoles, Konstantinos G., ed. *Ὅσιου Ἐφραίμ τοῦ Σύρου ἔργα*. 7 vols. Thessaloniki: τὸ περιβόλι τῆς Παναγίας, 1988–1998.
- Piédaguel, Auguste, ed. and trans. *Jean Chrysostome, “Panégyriques de Saint Paul.”* SC 300. Paris: Cerf, 1982.

- Piédagnel, Auguste, and Louis Doutreleau, eds. and trans. *Jean Chrysostome, "Trois catéchèses baptismales."* SC 366. Paris: Cerf, 1990.
- Plumer, Eric, trans. *Augustine's Commentary on Galatians: Introduction, Text, Translation, and Notes.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Pohlenz, Max, ed. *Plutarchi moralia.* Vol. 3. Leipzig: Teubner, 1929.
- Rabe, Hugo, ed. *Aphthonii Progymnasmata.* Rhetores Graeci 10. Leipzig: Teubner, 1926.
- . *Hermogenis opera.* Rhetores Graeci 6. Leipzig: Teubner, 1913.
- Rackham, Harris, trans. *Aristotle, "Nicomachean Ethics."* LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1934.
- Radermacher, Ludwig, and Hermann Usener, eds. *Dionysii Halicarnasei quae exstant.* Vol. 6. Leipzig: Teubner, 1929.
- Robinson, Maurice A., and William G. Pierpont, compilers and arrangers. *The New Testament in the Original Greek: Byzantine Textform 2018.* Nürnberg: VTR, 2018.
- Rolfe, John C. *Ammianus Marcellinus, "Roman History," Volume II: Books 20–26.* LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1940.
- Roth, Catharine P., and David Anderson, trans. *St. John Chrysostom On Marriage and Family Life.* Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1986.
- Russell, Donald A., and David Konstan, eds. and trans. *Heraclitus, "Homeric Problems."* WGRW 14. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005.
- Russell, Donald A., and Nigel G. Wilson, eds. and trans. *Menander Rhetor, Edited with Translation and Commentary.* Oxford, Clarendon, 1981.
- Savile, Henry, ed. Τοῦ ἐν ἁγίοις πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἰωάννου ἀρχιεπισκόπου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου τῶν εὐρισκομένων τόμοι ὀκτώ. Eton: Ioannes Norton, 1611–1612.
- Schaff, Phillip, ed. *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Series 1.* 1886–1889. Vols. 11–14. Repr., Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994.
- Siebeking, Wilhelm, ed. *Plutarchi moralia.* Vol. 3. Leipzig: Teubner, 1929.
- Soler, Patrice, trans. *Jean Chrysostome, Homélie sur saint Paul.* Les Pères dans la foi. Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1980.
- Staab, Karl, ed. *Pauluskommentare aus der griechischen Kirche: Aus Katenenhandscriften gesammelt und herausgegeben.* Münster: Aschendorff, 1933.
- Wenger, Antoine, ed. and trans. "Une homélie inédite de Jean Chrysostome sur l'épiphanie." *Revue des études byzantines* 29 (1971): 117–35.
- . "Une homélie inédite (de Sévérien de Gabala?) sur l'épiphanie." *AnBoll* 95 (1977): 73–90.

- . *Jean Chrysostome, "Huit catéchèses baptismales inédites."* 2nd ed. SC 50. Paris: Cerf, 1970.
- Winkelman, Friedhelm, ed. *Eusebius Werke, 1,1: Über das Leben des Kaisers Konstantin.* GCS 57. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1975.
- Zamagni, Claudio, ed. and trans. *Eusèbe de Césarée, "Questions évangéliques."* SC 523. Paris: Cerf, 2008.

Reference Works

- Aldama, José A. de. *Repertorium Pseudochrysostomicum.* Documents, études et répertoires publiés par l'Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes 10. Paris: CNRS, 1965.
- Bayerische Staatsbibliothek. "Münchener DigitalisierungsZentrum: Digitale Bibliothek." <https://digitale-sammlungen.de>.
- Bibliothèque nationale de France. "Gallica: The BnF digital library." <https://gallica.bnf.fr>.
- Centre for Early Christian Studies, Australian Catholic University. "Editions and Translations of Chrysostom's Works." http://www.cecs.acu.edu.au/onlineresources_editions.html.
- Oxford English Dictionary.* 2nd ed. 20 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989. Continually updated at <https://oed.com>.
- Pinakes | Πίνακες: Textes et manuscrits grecs. Institut de recherche et d'histoire des textes, CNRS. pinakes.irht.cnrs.fr.
- Smyth, Herbert Weir. *Greek Grammar.* Revised by Gordon M. Messing. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1980.
- Thesaurus Linguae Graecae. A Digital Library of Greek Literature. Project Director Maria Pantelia. University of California, Irvine, 2013. Continually updated at stephanus.tlg.uci.edu.
- Webster's Third New International Dictionary of the English Language, Unabridged.* Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster, 1993. Continually updated, as *Merriam-Webster Unabridged*, at <https://www.merriam-webster.com>.

Secondary Literature

- Addey, Crystal. "Plato's Women Readers." Pages 411–32 in *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Plato in Antiquity.* Edited by Harold Tarrant, François Renaud, Dirk Baltzly and Danielle A. Layne. Brill's Companions to Classical Reception 13. Leiden: Brill, 2018.

- Agamben, Giorgio. *The Time That Remains: A Commentary on the Letter to the Romans*. Translated by Patricia Dailey. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2005.
- Allen, Pauline, and Wendy Mayer. "Chrysostom and the Preaching of Homilies in Series: A New Approach to the Twelve Homilies *In epistulam ad Colossenses* (CPG 4433)." *OrChrAn* 60 (1994): 21–39.
- . "Chrysostom and the Preaching of Homilies in Series: A Re-examination of the Fifteen Homilies *In epistulam ad Philippenses* (CPG 4432)." *VC* 49 (1995): 270–89.
- . "The Thirty-Four Homilies on Hebrews: The Last Series Delivered by Chrysostom in Constantinople?" *Byzantion* 65 (1995): 309–48.
- Anderson, R. Dean, Jr. *Glossary of Greek Rhetorical Terms*. CBET 24. Leuven: Peeters, 2000.
- Astruc-Morize, Gilberte, and Alain Le Boulluec, "Le sens caché des Écritures selon Jean Chrysostome et Origène." *StPatr* 25 (1993): 1–26.
- Aubineau, Michel. "Soixante-six textes, attribués à Jean Chrysostome, découverts dans le codex Athos, Ivrons 255." *VC* 29 (1975): 55–64.
- Backer, Augustin de, with Alois de Backer and Charles Sommervogel, eds. *Bibliothèque des écrivains de la compagnie de Jésus, ou notices bibliographiques*. 3 vols. Liège: Alois de Backer; Paris: Carlos Sommervogel, 1869–1876.
- . *De tous les ouvrages publiés par les membres de la compagnie de Jésus depuis la fondation de l'ordre jusqu'à nos jours*. Vol. 1 of *Bibliothèque des écrivains de la compagnie de Jésus, ou notices bibliographiques*. Liège: Alois de Backer; Paris: Carlos Sommervogel, 1869.
- Bady, Guillaume. "L'editio Parisina altera des oeuvres de Jean Chrysostome et la Patrologie Grecque de Migne." *Eruditio Antiqua* 4 (2012): 1–17.
- Barclay, John M. G. "Household Networks and Early Christian Economics: A Fresh Study of 1 Timothy 5.3–16," *NTS* 66 (2020): 268–87.
- Bardy, Gustave. "La littérature patristique des 'quaestiones et responsiones' sur l'écriture sainte." *RB* 41 (1932): 210–36.
- Barnes, Timothy D. "A Lost Prince in a Sermon of Nestorius." *StPatr* 39 (2006): 3–6.
- Bauer, Walter. *Orthodoxy and Heresy in Earliest Christianity*. Edited by Robert A. Kraft and Gerhard Krodel. Translated by the Philadelphia Seminar on Christian Origins. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971. Translation of *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1934.

- Baur, Chrysostomos. *Jean Chrysostome et ses oeuvres dans l'histoire littéraire*. Université de Louvain Recueil de Travaux 18. Louvain: Bureaux du Recueil; Paris: Fontemoing, 1907.
- Berzon, Todd S. *Classifying Christians: Ethnography, Heresiology, and the Limits of Knowledge in Late Antiquity*. Oakland: University of California Press, 2016.
- . “‘O, Foolish Galatians’: Imagining Pauline Community in Late Antiquity.” *CH* 85 (2016): 435–67.
- Betz, Hans Dieter. “The Concept of the ‘Inner Human Being’ (ὁ ἑσω ἄνθρωπος) in the Anthropology of Paul.” Pages 23–52 in *Paulinische Theologie und Religionsgeschichte: Gesammelte Aufsätze V*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.
- Bloch, R. Howard. *God’s Plagiarist: Being an Account of the Fabulous Industry and Irregular Commerce of the Abbe Migne*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994.
- Blowers, Paul M., and Peter W. Martens, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Biblical Interpretation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019.
- Bowersock, Glen W. *Julian the Apostate*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1978.
- Boyarín, Daniel. *Borderlines: The Partition of Judaeo-Christianity*. Divinations: Rereading Late Ancient Religion. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006.
- Brändle, Rudolf. *John Chrysostom: Bishop, Reformer, Martyr*. Early Christian Studies 8. Translated by John Cawte and Silke Trzcionka, with revised notes by Wendy Mayer. Strathfield, NSW: St Paul’s Publications, 2004.
- . *Matthäus 25:31–46 im Werk des Johannes Chrysostomus: Ein Beitrag zur Auslegungsgeschichte und zur Erforschung der Ethik der griechischen Kirche um die Wende vom 4. zum 5. Jahrhundert*. BGBE 22. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1979.
- Brown, Peter. *The Body and Society: Men, Women, and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity*. 2nd ed. Lectures on the History of Religions 13. New York: Columbia University Press, 2008.
- Bussières, Marie-Pierre, ed. *La littérature des questions et réponses dans l’antiquité profane et chrétienne: de l’enseignement à l’exégèse*. Instrumenta patristica et mediaevalia 64. Turnhout: Brepols, 2013.
- Calhoun, Robert Matthew. “The Gospel(-Amulet) as God’s Power for Salvation.” *Early Christianity* 10 (2019): 21–55.

- Cavadini, John C. "From Letter to Spirit." Pages 126–48 in *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Biblical Interpretation*. Edited by Paul M. Blowers and Peter W. Martens. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019.
- Cimosa, Mario. "John Chrysostom and the Septuagint (Job and Psalms)." Pages 117–30 in *XII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, Leiden, 2004*. Edited by Melvin K. H. Peters. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.
- Clark, Elizabeth A. *Founding the Fathers: Early Church History and Protestant Professors in Nineteenth-Century America*. Divinations: Rereading Late Ancient Religion. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2011.
- . *Reading Renunciation: Asceticism and Scripture in Early Christianity*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999.
- Clark, Kenneth W. "Exploring the Manuscripts of Sinai and Jerusalem." *BA* 16/2 (1953): 21–43.
- Colman-Norton, P. R. "St. Chrysostom's Use of the Greek Poets," *CP* 27 (1932): 213–21.
- Cook, James Daniel. *Preaching and Popular Christianity*. Oxford Theology and Religion Monographs. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019.
- Cook, John Granger. *The Interpretation of the New Testament in Greco-Roman Paganism*. Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 3. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.
- Cooper, Kate. *The Virgin and the Bride: Idealized Womanhood in Late Antiquity*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1996.
- Courtney, Edward. "Fescennini versus." *BNP*. http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1574-9347_bnp_e410960.
- Crawford, Matthew R. "The *Problemata* of Tatian: Recovering the Fragments of a Second-Century Christian Intellectual." *JTS* 67 (2016): 542–75.
- Davies, W. D., and Dale C. Allison, Jr. *Matthew 1–7*. ICC. London: T & T Clark, 1988.
- . *Matthew 8–18*. ICC. London: T & T Clark, 1991.
- Dawson, David. *Allegorical Readers and Cultural Revision in Ancient Alexandria*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992.
- Dawson, John David. *Christian Figural Reading and the Fashioning of Identity*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.
- Di Berardino, Angelo, ed. *Encyclopedia of Ancient Christianity*. 3 vols. Consulting editors Thomas C. Oden and Joel C. Elowsky. Downer's Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2014.

- Dill, Ueli. "Johannes Chrysostomos im Baseler Buchdruck des 16. Jahrhunderts." Pages 255–65 in *Chrysostomosbilder in 1600 Jahren: Facetten der Wirkungsgeschichte eines Kirchenvaters*. Edited by Martin Wallraff and Rudolf Brändle. Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte 105. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008.
- Downey, Glanville. *A History of Antioch in Syria from Seleucus to the Arab Conquest*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961.
- Drijvers, Jan Willem. "Jovian between History and Myth." Pages 234–56 in *Imagining Emperors in the Later Roman Empire*. Edited by P. W. Burgersdijk and Alan J. Ross. Cultural Interactions in the Mediterranean 1. Leiden: Brill, 2018.
- Duff, Paul Brooks. "Vision and Violence: Theories of Vision and Matthew 5:27–28." Pages 63–75 in *Antiquity and Humanity: Essays on Ancient Religion and Philosophy Presented to Hans Dieter Betz on His 70th Birthday*. Edited by Adela Yarbro Collins and Margaret M. Mitchell. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001.
- Dulk, Matthijs den. *Between Jews and Heretics: Refiguring Justin Martyr's "Dialogue with Trypho."* New York: Routledge, 2018.
- Epp, Eldon Jay. *Junia: The First Woman Apostle*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005.
- Faraone, Christopher A. *Ancient Greek Love Magic*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1999.
- Ferguson, Everett. "Preaching at Epiphany: Gregory of Nyssa and John Chrysostom on Baptism and the Church." *CH* 66 (1997): 1–17.
- Finn, Richard. *Almsgiving in the Later Roman Empire: Christian Promotion and Practice (313–450)*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *Romans*. AB 33. New York: Doubleday, 1993.
- Fotopoulos, John. *Food Offered to Idols in Roman Corinth: A Social-Rhetorical Reconsideration of 1 Corinthians 8:1–11:1*. WUNT 2/151. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.
- Foucault, Michel. *Les aveux de la chair*. Vol. 4 of *Histoire de la sexualité*. Edited by Frédéric Gros. Paris: Éditions Gallimard.
- Frank, Georgia. "'Taste and See': The Eucharist and the Eyes of Faith in the Fourth Century." *CH* 70 (2001): 619–43.
- Frazer, Margaret English. "Hades Stabbed by the Cross of Christ." *Metropolitan Museum Journal* 9 (1974): 153–61.
- Fredriksen, Paula. *Paul, The Pagans' Apostle*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2017.

- Glachant, Paul, and Victor Glachant. "Frédéric Dübner d'après sa correspondance inédite." Pages 195–290 in *Papiers d'Autrefois*. Paris: Hachette et Cie, 1899.
- Goodall, Blake. *The Homilies of St. John Chrysostom on the Letters of St. Paul to Titus and Philemon*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1979.
- Greenslade, S. L. "A Printer's Copy for the Eton Chrysostom." *StPatr* 7 (1966): 60–64.
- Harkins, Paul W. "The Text Tradition of Chrysostom's Commentary on John." *Theological Studies* 19 (1958): 404–12.
- Harper, Kyle. "Marriage and Family." Pages 667–714 in *The Oxford Handbook of Late Antiquity*. Edited by Scott Fitzgerald Johnson. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Harrisville, Roy A., III. "ΤΗΣΤΕΙΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ: Witness of the Fathers." *NovT* 36 (1994): 233–41.
- Hays, Richard B. *The Faith of Jesus Christ: The Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1–4:11*. 2nd ed. The Biblical Resource Series 56. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.
- Hieronymus, Frank. "Griechischer Geist aus Basler Pressen." Basel: Universitätsbibliothek, 1992. Accessed online at <https://www.ub.unibas.ch>.
- Hock, Ronald F. *The Social Context of Paul's Ministry: Tentmaking and Apostleship*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980.
- Holman, Susan R. *The Hungry are Dying: Beggars and Bishops in Roman Cappadocia*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- , ed. *Wealth and Poverty in Early Church and Society*. Holy Cross Studies in Patristic Theology and History. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic; Grand Rapids: Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology, 2008.
- Huizenga, Annette Bourland. *Moral Education for Women in the Pastoral and Pythagorean Letters: Philosophers of the Household*. NovTSup 147. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Hünemörder, Christian. "Dove/Pigeon." *BNP*. http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1574-9347_bnp_e1201400.
- Jackson, Donald F. "Augsburg Manuscript Acquisitions 1545–1600." *Codices manuscripti* 29 (2000): 1–10.
- Jacobs, Andrew S. "A Jew's Jew: Paul and the Early Christian Problem of Jewish Origins." *JR* 86 (2006): 258–86.

- Joly, Robert. *Le vocabulaire chrétien de l'amour est-il original? Φιλεῖν et Ἀγαπᾶν dans le grec antique*. Brussels: Presses universitaires de Bruxelles, 1968.
- Kalleres, Dayna S. "Drunken Hags with Amulets and Prostitutes with Erotic Spells: The Re-Feminization of Magic in Late Antique Christian Homilies." Pages 219–51 in *Daughters of Hecate: Women and Magic in the Ancient World*. Edited by Kimberly B. Stratton and Dayna S. Kalleres. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Kelly, J. N. D. *Golden Mouth: The Story of John Chrysostom, Ascetic, Preacher, Bishop*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1995.
- Kenny, Anthony. "Was St. John Chrysostom a Semi-Pelagian?" *ITQ* 27 (1960): 16–29.
- Klauck, Hans-Josef. "Accuser, Judge and Paraclete—On Conscience in Philo of Alexandria." *SK* 20 (1999): 107–18.
- Kuefler, Mathew. *The Manly Eunuch: Masculinity, Gender Ambiguity, and Christian Ideology in Late Antiquity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2001.
- . "The Marriage Revolution in Late Antiquity: The Theodosian Code and Later Roman Marriage Law." *Journal of Family History* 32 (2007): 343–70.
- Le Boulluec, Alain. *La notion d'hérésie dans la littérature grecque, IIe–IIIe siècles*. Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1985.
- Levenson, David B. "The Ancient and Medieval Sources for the Emperor Julian's Attempt to Rebuild the Jerusalem Temple." *JSJ* 35 (2004): 409–60.
- Leroy, F. J. "Les manuscrits de Montfaucon et l'édition de S. Jean Chrysostome: Notes sur quelques manuscrits du Supplément Grec, Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris." *Traditio* 20 (1964): 411–18.
- Leyerle, Blake. *Theatrical Shows and Ascetic Lives: John Chrysostom's Attack on Spiritual Marriage*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001.
- Litwa, M. David. *Hermetica II: The Excerpts of Stobaeus, Papyrus Fragments, and Ancient Testimonies in an English Translation with Notes and Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018.
- MacDonald, Margaret Y. *Early Christian Women and Pagan Opinion: The Power of the Hysterical Woman*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Malosse, Pierre-Louis. "Jean Chrysostome a-t-il été l'élève de Libanios?" *Phoenix* 62 (2008): 273–80.

- Martens, Peter W. "Revisiting the Typology/Allegory Distinction: The Case of Origen." *J ECS* 16 (2008): 283–317.
- Martinez, David G. *Baptized for Our Sakes: A Leather Trisagion from Egypt*: P. Mich. 799. Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 120. Stuttgart: Teubner, 1999.
- Maxwell, Jaclyn L. *Christianization and Communication in Late Antiquity: John Chrysostom and His Congregation in Antioch*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Mayer, Wendy. *The Homilies of St John Chrysostom: Provenance, Reshaping the Foundations*. OrChrAn 272. Rome: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 2005.
- . "John Chrysostom: Extraordinary Preacher, Ordinary Audience." Pages 105–37 in *Preacher and Audience: Studies in Early Christian and Byzantine Homiletics*. Edited by Mary B. Cunningham and Pauline Allen. A New History of the Sermon 1. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- . "Preaching Hatred? John Chrysostom, Neuroscience, and the Jews." Pages 58–136 in *Revisioning John Chrysostom: New Approaches, New Perspectives*. Edited by Chris L. de Wet and Wendy Mayer. Critical Approaches to Early Christianity 1. Leiden: Brill, 2019.
- . "The Sequence and Provenance of John Chrysostom's Homilies *In illud: Si esurierit inimicus* (CPG 4375), *De mutatione nominum* (CPG 4372) and *In principium Actorum* (CPG 4371)." *Aug* 46 (2006): 169–86.
- , and Pauline Allen. *The Churches of Syrian Antioch (300–638)*. Late Antique History and Religion 5. Peeters, 2012.
- McLynn, Neil. "The Persian Expedition." Pages 293–325 in *A Companion to Julian the Apostate*. Edited by Hans-Ulrich Wiemer and Stefan Rebenich. Brill's Companions to the Byzantine World 5. Leiden: Brill, 2020.
- Meiser, Martin. *Galater*. Novum Testamentum Patristicum 9. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2007.
- Methuen, Charlotte. "The 'Virgin Widow': A Problematic Social Role for the Early Church?" *HTR* 90 (1997): 285–98.
- Miller, Samantha L. *Chrysostom's Devil: Demons, the Will, and Virtue in Patristic Soteriology*. New Explorations in Theology. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2020.
- Mitchell, Margaret M. "The Continuing Problem of Particularity and Universality within the *corpus Paulinum*: Chrysostom on Romans 16:3." *ST* 64 (2010): 127–37.

- . *The Heavenly Trumpet: John Chrysostom and the Art of Pauline Interpretation*. HUT 40. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2002.
- . “John Chrysostom on Christian Love Magic: A Spellbinding Moment in the History of Interpretation of 1 Cor 7.2–4.” *NTS* 68 (2022): 119–43.
- . “John Chrysostom on Philemon: A Second Look.” *HTR* 88 (1995): 135–48.
- . “John Chrysostom on the Sermon on the Mount: φιλοσοφία as the Basis for the Christian πολιτεία.” Pages 19–42 in *The Sermon on the Mount through the Centuries*. Edited by Jeffrey P. Greenman, Timothy Larsen, and Stephen R. Spencer. Grand Rapids: Brazos, 2007.
- . “A Patristic Perspective on Pauline περιавтоλογία.” *NTS* 47 (2001): 354–71.
- . “Patristic Rhetoric on Allegory: Origen and Eustathius Put 1 Kingdoms 28 on Trial.” Pages lxxxv–cxxiii in *The “Belly-Myther” of Endor: Interpretations of 1 Kingdoms 28 in the Early Church*. Edited and translated by Rowan A. Greer and Margaret M. Mitchell. WGRW 16. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.
- . *Paul and the Emergence of Christian Textuality: Early Christian Literary Culture in Context*. WUNT 393. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2017.
- . *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians*. HUT 28. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1991; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1993.
- . *Paul, the Corinthians and the Birth of Christian Hermeneutics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- . “Pauline Accommodation and ‘Condescension’ (συγκατάβασις): 1 Cor 9:19–23 and the History of Influence.” Pages 197–214 in *Paul Beyond the Judaism-Hellenism Divide*. Edited by Troels Engberg-Pedersen. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001.
- . “Peter’s ‘Hypocrisy’ and Paul’s: Two ‘Hypocrites’ at the Foundation of Earliest Christianity?” *NTS* 58 (2012): 312–34.
- . “Problems and Solutions in Early Christian Biblical Interpretation: A Telling Case from Origen’s Newly Discovered Greek Homilies on the Psalms (codex Monacensis Graecus 314).” *Adamantius* 22 (2016): 40–55.
- . “Reading Rhetoric with Patristic Exegetes: John Chrysostom on Galatians.” Pages 333–55 in *Antiquity and Humanity: Essays on Ancient Religion and Philosophy Presented to Hans Dieter Betz on His 70th*

- Birthday*. Edited by Adela Yarbro Collins and Margaret M. Mitchell. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001.
- . “Silver Chamberpots and Other Goods Which Are Not Good: John Chrysostom’s Discourse against Wealth and Possessions.” Pages 88–121 in *Having: Property and Possession in Religious and Social Life*. Edited by William Schweiker and Charles Mathewes. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.
- . “‘A Variable and Many-Sorted Man’: John Chrysostom’s Treatment of Pauline Inconsistency.” *J ECS* 6 (1998): 93–111.
- Moiseeva, Evgeniia. “The Old Testament in Fourth-Century Christian-Manichaeic Polemic,” *Journal of Late Antiquity* 11 (2018): 274–97.
- Natali, Alain. “Mariages chrétiens à Antioche au IV^e siècle.” Pages 111–16 in *Sociabilité, pouvoirs et société; Actes du colloque de Rouen 24/26 Novembre 1983*. Edited by Françoise Thelamon. Rouen: Publications de l’université de Rouen, 1987.
- Nygren, Anders. *Agape and Eros*. Translated by Philip S. Watson. London: SPCK, 1953.
- Papadoyannakis, Yannis. “Instruction by Question and Answer: The Case of Late Antique and Byzantine Erotapokriseis.” Pages 91–106 in *Greek Literature in Late Antiquity: Dynamism, Didacticism, Classicism*. Edited by Scott Fitzgerald Johnson. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2006.
- Park, Young-ho. *Paul’s Ekklesia as a Civic Assembly: Understanding the People of God in Their Politico-Social World*. WUNT 2/393. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015.
- Penella, Robert J. “Fire Parallelisms in Some Christian Accounts of the Termination of Julian’s Attempt to Rebuild the Temple of Jerusalem.” Pages 71–74 in *Tria Lustra: Essays and Notes Presented to John Pinsent*. Edited by H. D. Jocelyn and Helena Hunt. Liverpool Classical Papers 3. Liverpool: Liverpool Classical Monthly, 1993.
- Perrone, Lorenzo. “Questions and Responses.” Pages 198–209 in *The Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Biblical Interpretation*. Edited by Paul M. Blowers and Peter W. Martens. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019.
- Quantin, Jean-Louis. “Du Chrysostome latin au Chrysostome grec: Une histoire européenne (1588–1613).” Pages 267–346 in *Chrysostomosbilder in 1600 Jahren: Facetten der Wirkungsgeschichte eines Kirchenvaters*. Edited by Martin Wallraff and Rudolf Brändle. Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte 105. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008.
- . “Les jésuites et l’érudition anglicane.” *Dix-septième siècle* 237 (2007): 691–711.

- Raczka, Gary Philippe. "The Lectionary at the Time of Saint John Chrysostom." PhD diss., University of Notre Dame, 2015.
- Reydam-Schils, Gretchen. "'Becoming like God' in Platonism and Stoicism." Pages 142–58 in *From Stoicism to Platonism: The Development of Philosophy, 100 BCE–100 CE*. Edited by Troels Engberg-Pedersen. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.
- Ritter, Adolf Martin. *Studia Chrysostomica*. Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 71. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.
- Roskam, Geert. "Plutarch's Influence on John Chrysostom." *Byzantion* 85 (2015): 341–63.
- Sandwell, Isabella. "Preaching and Christianisation: Communication, Cognition, and Audience Reception." Pages 137–74 in *Revisioning John Chrysostom: New Approaches, New Perspectives*. Critical Approaches to Early Christianity 1. Edited by Chris L. de Wet and Wendy Mayer. Leiden: Brill, 2019.
- . *Religious Identity in Late Antiquity: Greeks, Jews and Christians in Antioch*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Sauget, Joseph-Marie. "Barlaam." *Encyclopedia of Ancient Christianity* 3:330–31.
- Scherbenske, Eric W. "Marcion's Antitheses and the Isagogic Genre." *VC* 64 (2010): 255–79.
- Schäublin, Christoph. *Untersuchungen zu Methode und Herkunft der antiochenischen Exegese*. Theophania 23. Bonn; Cologne: Hanstein, 1974.
- Segaar, Carolus. *Daniel secundum Septuaginta ex Tetraplis Origenis*. Utrecht: J. van Poolsum, 1775.
- Shapin, Steven. "Why Was 'Custom a Second Nature' in Early Modern Medicine?" *Bulletin of the History of Medicine* 93 (2019): 1–26.
- Shepardson, Christine. "Between Polemic and Propaganda: Evoking the Jews of Fourth-Century Antioch." *JJMJS* 2 (2015): 147–82.
- . *Controlling Contested Places: Late Antique Antioch and the Spatial Politics of Religious Controversy*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2014.
- . "Rewriting Julian's Legacy: John Chrysostom's *On Babylas* and Libanius' *Oration* 24." *Journal of Late Antiquity* 2 (2009): 129–68.
- Shoemaker, Karl. *Sanctuary and Crime in the Middle Ages, 400–1500*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2011.
- Spicq, Ceslas. *Agapè dans le nouveau testament*. 3 vols. Paris: Gabalda, 1958–59.
- Stählin, Gustav. "χῆρα." *TDNT* 9: 440–65.

- Stendahl, Krister. *Paul among Jews and Gentiles*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976.
- Stephens, W. R. W. *Saint John Chrysostom, His Life and Times: A Sketch of the Church and the Empire in the Fourth Century*. London: Murray, 1883.
- Still, Todd D. "Did Paul Loathe Manual Labor? Revisiting the Work of Ronald F. Hock on the Apostle's Tentmaking and Social Class." *JBL* 125 (2006): 781–95.
- Stilting, Jean. "De S. Joanne Chrysostomo, episcopo Constantinopolitano et ecclesiae doctore, prope comana in Ponto, commentarius historicus." Pages 401–704 in *Acta Sanctorum Septembris IV*. Antwerp: Bernard Albert van der Plassche, 1753.
- Struck, Peter T. *The Birth of the Symbol: Ancient Readers at the Limits of Their Texts*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004.
- Theissen, Gerd. *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity: Essays on Corinth*. Translated by John H. Schütz. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982.
- Thompson, D'Arcy Wentworth. *A Glossary of Greek Birds*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1895.
- Thonnard, François-Joseph. "Saint Jean Chrysostome et saint Augustine dans la controverse pélagienne." *Revue des études byzantines* 25 (1967): 189–218.
- Tillemont, Louis-Sébastien Le Nain de. *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique des premiers siècles*. Vol. 11. Paris: Robustel, 1701.
- Tov, Emanuel. "The Composition of 1 Samuel 16–18 in Light of the Septuagint." Pages 333–62 in *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint*. Edited by Emanuel Tov. VTSup 72. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- VanVeller, Courtney Wilson. "John Chrysostom and the Troubling Jewishness of Paul." Pages 32–57 in *Revisioning John Chrysostom: New Approaches, New Perspectives*. Edited by Chris L. de Wet and Wendy Mayer. Critical Approaches to Early Christianity 1. Leiden: Brill, 2019.
- Webb, Ruth. *Demons and Dancers: Performance in Late Antiquity*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2009.
- Wet, Chris L. de. "John Chrysostom on Homoeroticism." *Neot* 48 (2014): 187–218.
- . *Preaching Bondage: John Chrysostom and the Discourse of Slavery in Early Christianity*. Oakland, CA: University of California Press, 2015.
- . "Virtue and the (Un)Making of Men in the Thought of John Chrysostom." Pages 227–50 in *Men and Women in the Early Christian*

- Centuries*. Edited by Wendy Mayer and Ian J. Elmer. Early Christian Studies 18. Strathfield, NSW: St Paul's Publications, 2014.
- , and Wendy Mayer, eds. *Revisioning John Chrysostom: New Approaches, New Perspectives*. Critical Approaches to Early Christianity 1. Leiden: Brill, 2019.
- Wenger, Antoine. "La tradition des oeuvres de Saint Jean Chrysostome." *Revue des études byzantines* 14 (1956): 5–47.
- . "Notes inédites sur les empereurs Théodose I, Arcadius, Théodose II, Léon I." *Revue des études byzantines* 10 (1952): 47–59.
- Wilken, Robert L. *John Chrysostom and the Jews: Rhetoric and Reality in the Late 4th Century*. The Transformation of the Classical Heritage 4. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1983.
- Woodbury, Leonard. "The Date and Atheism of Diagoras of Melos," *Phoenix* 19 (1965): 178–211.
- Young, Frances M. *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- . "Typology." Pages 29–48 in *Crossing the Boundaries: Essays in Biblical Interpretation in Honour of Michael D. Goulder*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter et al. BibInt 8. Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- Zamagni, Claudio. "Is the Question-and-Answer Literary Genre in Early Christian Literature a Homogenous Group?" Pages 241–68 in *La littérature des questions et réponses dans l'antiquité profane et chrétienne: de l'enseignement à l'exégèse*. Edited by Marie-Pierre Bussières. Instrumenta patristica et mediaevalia 64. Turnhout: Brepols, 2013.
- . "Une introduction méthodologique à la littérature patristiques des questions et réponses: Le cas d'Eusèbe de Césarée." Pages 7–24 in *Erotopokriseis: Early Christian Question-and-Answer Literature in Context*. Edited by Annelie Volgers and Claudio Zamagni. CBET 37. Leuven: Peeters, 2004.

INDEX OF BIBLICAL PASSAGES CITED

Old Testament		29:15–30	705
		29:21–30	257
The references follow the book titles and enumeration of the Septuagint, except as noted.		29:22	256 n. 38
		39:7–20	705
		48:15	801 n. 4
		48:15–16	801
Genesis		48:16	801 n. 4
1	29 n. 83, 203		
1:11	203	Exodus	
1:26–27	623 n. 121	1:14	679
1:27	293	2:4–10	237
1:28	265	2:11–14	805
2	29 n. 83, 294 n. 46, 383 n. 34	3:7	678 (<i>app. crit.</i>), 679
2:18	287	3:10	805
2:24	272 n. 109, 273	3:17	678 (<i>app. crit.</i>), 679
3:13	562 n. 29	8:1–11	341
3:16	271	9:18–26	341
3:19	203	10:21–22	341
4:4	701	10:21–23	341
6:6	413 n. 39	13:21–22	341
6:9	703	14–15	312 n. 3
8:6–7	703	14:15–31	341
9:2	174 n. 144	14:16	679
12:1	703	15:16	174 n. 144
13:13	323	15:21	236 n. 102
14:12–16	705	15:22	679
14:14	201	16	321 n. 37, 335, 337, 338 n. 100,
15:5–6	643	341	
18	201	16:4	339 n. 103
18:1–8	359	16:13	341
18:19	613	16:18	338 n. 99
19:1–26	323	16:18–20	339
22	705	16:20	338 n. 100
22:1–18	789	16:24	338 n. 100
24:67	257	16:25–30	339
26:15–33	705	16:27	339
27	781 n. 28	16:27–29	338 n. 100

<i>Exodus (cont.)</i>		6:5	618 n. 112
19:18	769	6:6	264 n. 67
20:13	425	6:7	283 n. 158
20:15	425	6:9	265 n. 69
21:16	235, 607, 607 n. 78, 609 n. 85	7:12–14	455
21:24	173	11:14	455 n. 57
22:23	261	12:1–14	341
23:15	150 n. 51	16:16	151
32:1–6	423	19:21	173
32:4	743	24	294 n. 46
32:6	315, 343	24:1	295, 295 n. 51
32:11–14	237	24:1–4	6, 295
32:32	709	24:4	295, 297
33:3	678 (<i>app. crit.</i>), 679	28:4–5	455 n. 57
		28:4–12	455, 455 n. 57
Leviticus		28:8	455 n. 57
24:30	173	28:12	455 n. 57
26:4–5	455		
		Joshua	
Numbers		2:1–24	743
11	321 n. 37	12:4	341 n. 109
11:4–9	335, 337, 341	13:12	341 n. 109
11:31–35	341	22:5	618 n. 112
12:1–15	235		
12:13	237	Judges	
12:14–15	236 n. 103	4:24–26	781 n. 28
13:33	341 n. 109	7:1	494 n. 77
16:31–32	807	9:49	807
16:32	235		
16:35	235	1 Kingdoms (1 Samuel)	
20:7–13	337	2:12	608
21:5–9	315	2:24	609
21:6	321 n. 37	3:13	609, 609 n. 85
25:1–9	315, 343	4:11–18	611
26:62	315, 343	11:14–15	489 n. 59
31:17–18	425	12:1–3	490 n. 60, 491
		12:1–5	779
Deuteronomy		12:2	490 n. 60
1:28	341 n. 109	12:3	490 n. 60, 493, 493 n. 72
4:16	423	12:4	493
4:23	423	12:5	491, 493
4:25	423	12:6–10	494 n. 76
5:17	425	12:11	495
5:18	425	16:6–7	486 n. 51
6:4	423	16:7	486 n. 50

16:13	486 n. 50	6:7	240 n. 117
17 [1 Samuel]	341, 486 n. 49, 487	12:13	709
17:3	487	18:2	172 n. 135
17:11	487		
17:12–31	486 n. 52	3 Kingdoms (1 Kings)	
17:24	487	2:1–9	613 n. 97
17:28–29	486 n. 49	17	199
17:31	487 n. 53	17:7–16	709
17:32	487	17:12	624 n. 123
17:33	487	17:14	625 n. 126
17:34–36	489	18:1–6	709
17:34–37	779	18:36–39	709
17:38–54 [1 Samuel]	781 n. 28	20:2	619
17:41–51	169 n. 126	20:17–29	231
18:7	168 n. 125		
18:8	169 n. 129	4 Kingdoms (2 Kings)	
18:25	169 n. 129	1:9–14	709
19–29	240 n. 113	4:13	733
19:22	169 n. 129		
20:27	169 n. 128	1 Paralipomenon (1 Chronicles)	
20:30	169 n. 129	13:9–10	241
20:31	169 n. 129	13:10	240 n. 117
21:12	168 n. 125		
22:7	169 n. 129	2 Paralipomenon (2 Chronicles)	
22:8	169 n. 129	26:16–21	807
22:13	169 n. 129		
24	170 n. 133	Judith	
24:1–22	168 n. 124	10:11–13	781 n. 28
24:6	171 n. 133, 175		
24:7	170 n. 131	2 Maccabees	
24:22	267	7:3–5	94 n. 27
25:2–35	174 n. 146		
26 170 n. 133, 171 n. 133, 172 n. 135		Psalms	
26:1–26	168 n. 124	1:1–2	253
26:7	171 n. 133	2:11	174 n. 144
26:8	171 n. 135	4:5	797
26:9	241	11:7	249
26:11	171, 241	21:23	327
26:11–12	175	24:10	371 n. 85
26:12	171 n. 133	37:5–6	675
26:13–20	175	44:2	11, 248 n. 8, 249
26:15–16	171 n. 133	44:11–12a	473
		44:14	201, 695
2 Kingdoms (2 Samuel)		45:1 [MT]	248 n. 8
6:6–7	241	49:5	6

<i>Psalms (cont.)</i>		5:13	579
49:16	235	7:5	707
49:16–17	153	18:17	266 n. 76
49:20	235		
50	709	Wisdom	
53:6	612 n. 96	9:14	641, 641 n. 19
54:13	446 n. 34	19:6–7	340 n. 105
54:13–14	447	19:10–11	340 n. 108
61:8	612 n. 96		
77	70 n. 240	Sirach	
93:12	687	1:22	797
102:14	731	2:1–2	453
102:20	711	2:5	453
103:4	713	3:13	243
105:37	293	5:7	663
106:10	139	5:9	675
109:1	513	7:23	607
113:1–4	99	12:13	279
113:7a	99	18:13	681
115:1	377, 407, 425, 439, 457	23:18	279
118:103	11, 247–49	23:19	279, 281 n. 150
120:1–2	612 n. 96	25:7	638 n. 7
131:1	175	25:8–9	638 n. 7
		25:9	639
Proverbs		30:7	615
3:12	687	33:28	203
5:3	280 n. 150		
5:3–4	279	Hosea	
5:15–18	280 n. 150	2:1	683, 683 n. 76, 685
5:18	280 n. 150, 281	2:25	683
5:19	281	4:2	293
5:21	281 n. 150	12:11	769
8:22a	359		
18:19	569	Micah	
25:21	168 n. 121, 169	3:10	293
25:27	249	7:6	92 n. 19
Ecclesiastes		Jonah	
18:12	681 n. 64	3:1–10	743
Job		Habakkuk	
1:5	612 nn. 91–92, 613	2:3	448 n. 37
2:8	707		
2:9	707	Zechariah	
2:9b	266 n. 76, 267	13:7	572 n. 68

Malachi		38:34	264 n. 67
2:7	711	45:6	143
2:10	297 n. 61		
2:13	297	Lamentations	
2:14	296 n. 57, 297	1:4	99
2:14–15	297	2:18	98 n. 44, 99
2:15	296 n. 57, 297		
3:20	147	Daniel	
		3	141
Isaiah		3:8–30	789
1:3	528 n. 135	3:50	142
1:15	293, 589, 591	6	143
1:17–18	591	6:14–24 (Θ)	142 n. 31
6	642 n. 21	6:16–24 (Θ')	142 n. 31
6:3	154 n. 60	8:7	662 n. 1011
8:18	673	10:21	723
9:1	54 n. 185, 139 n. 23, 677	12:1	723
9:2	677 n. 44		
14:12–20	624 n. 122	Bel and the Dragon	
19:16	174 n. 144	23–27	58
24:7	99		
24:20	98	New Testament	
25:8	685		
26:20	448 n. 37	Matthew	
43:25	485	1:21	682 (<i>app. crit.</i>), 683, 685
49:8	251 n. 17	3:2	679
53:12	225	3:11	672 (<i>app. crit.</i>)
58:9	125	3:12	54 n. 183, 673, 673 n. 26
59:20	729	3:13–17	54, 54 nn. 183 and 185
63:9	101	4:16	139 n. 23
66:24	276 n. 126, 277, 317–19	4:18–20	651
		4:19	162 n. 102
Jeremiah		5:7	392 n. 72
1:5	415	5:13–14	139, 139 n. 22
1:10	251 n. 16, 256 n. 36	5:14–16	139 n. 23
6:13	757	5:17	550 n. 218, 675 n. 35
8:7	528 n. 135	5:18	181
10:23	731	5:20	291
14:2	98 n. 45	5:21	411
14:7	731	5:21–22	411
23:23	125	5:21–48	411 n. 30
24:6	251 n. 16, 256 n. 36	5:22	779, 797
33:8	757	5:23–24	177–79
33:11	757	5:27–28	275
38:31–32	415	5:27–32	6

Matthew (cont.)

5:28	58, 668 n. 5, 669, 670 n. 10, 671	10:10	213–14, 214 n. 27, 215
5:31	80	10:11	192 n. 48, 193, 193 n. 48, 626 n. 127
5:32	291	10:11–12	627
5:39	223	10:12–13	626 n. 127
5:40	395	10:13–15	627
5:43–48	392 n. 72	10:13b	627 n. 129
5:44	223	10:14a	627 n. 129
5:44–45	727	10:15	627 n. 129
5:45	166 n. 115, 167, 392 n. 73, 393, 427, 727 n. 3	10:16	150 n. 53
6:1–7	558 n. 12	10:27	225
6:4	245	10:34	92 n. 20
6:6	275 n. 118	10:35–36	759
6:12	177, 178–79 n. 157	10:40	255
6:14	177	10:42	621, 632 n. 146
6:14–15	178–79 n. 157	11:5	639
6:16–18	391 n. 72	12:46	255 n. 32
6:20	361	12:50	255, 255 n. 32
6:25–34	339, 340 n. 105	13:1–23	503
6:34	339	13:3–8	473
7:2	239	13:10	645
7:3	243	13:13	645
7:5	242 n. 125	13:16	639, 641, 643, 644 n. 33, 645, 645 n. 38
7:7–12	580 n. 99	13:24–30	387, 523
7:21–23	387	13:24–35	353
7:22–23	319	13:30	563
7:23	318 n. 26, 451	13:31–32	140 n. 27
7:25	675 n. 34	13:33–34	140 n. 27
7:26–27	559	13:33–35	644 n. 30
8:2–4	641	13:35	644 nn. 30 and 32
8:12	317, 319	13:36–43	387, 523
8:26	443	13:40	646 n. 44
9:2–8	640 n. 14	13:47–50	128 n. 47
9:20	174 n. 145	13:49	646 n. 44
9:24	288 n. 21	13:52	409
9:30	652 n. 66	14:3–12	231
10:5	683	14:31	385
10:6	215	14:36	174 n. 145
10:8	215	15:15	525 n. 122
10:8–9	215	15:16–20	251 n. 18
10:9	217	15:21–27	558 n. 11
10:9–10	6, 213, 217 n. 43, 219, 222 n. 56, 226 n. 81, 229	15:21–28	580 n. 102
10:9–15	339	15:22	581
		15:23	583–85

15:24	583	20:19–20	54 n. 183
15:26	583	22	281 n. 153
15:27	583	22:1–14	259 n. 50, 260 n. 52, 281 n.
15:28	583	153	
16:6	652 n. 66	22:7	781 n. 28
16:13	515	22:11–13	281, 319
16:13–28	515 n. 79	22:13	136 n. 13, 317, 319
16:14	515	22:30	389
16:15	514 n. 74, 515	22:37	264 n. 67
16:16	515	22:43	249 n. 10
16:18	511	23:2–3	239, 795
16:20	644 n. 28	24:3	646 n. 44, 649, 660 n. 98, 663
16:21	514 n. 75	24:6	659, 660 n. 98, 661
16:22	515	24:7	661
16:23	507 n. 41, 515	24:7b	660 n. 98
16:24	795	24:42–44	663 n. 105
16:26	148 n. 48	24:43	663
17:1–8	515 n. 79	24:48	663
17:2	515	24:51	136 n. 13
17:4	515	25:1–12	217, 393 n. 77
17:20	385, 407	25:1–13	319, 389, 631, 663 n. 105
18:6	632 n. 146	25:3	389
18:10	632 n. 146, 652 n. 66, 801 n. 3	25:8	389
18:14	377, 632 n. 146	25:8–12	603
18:15	7, 33, 507, 509	25:12	389, 391
18:28	281 n. 153	25:14–30	135, 270 n. 99, 371
19:3–9	6, 293 n. 45	25:24	137
19:4	293	25:25	135
19:5	273	25:27	137
19:7	290 n. 27, 293	25:30	136 n. 13, 137, 317, 319
19:8	293, 293 n. 42	25:31–46	259 n. 51, 623 n. 121
19:9	301	25:34	381 n. 68, 391, 633 n. 150
19:12	391 n. 72	25:35	162 n. 101, 631–32, 632 nn.
19:16	652 n. 64	145 and 148, 633	
19:19	653	25:37	359, 632 n. 145, 633
19:20	217	25:40	629, 633
19:21	217	25:41	319, 399
19:23	652 n. 66	25:42	217
19:24	653	25:42–43	319
19:25	652 nn. 68–69	26:17–30	365
19:27	223, 651, 653	26:20–25	365
19:27–29	395	26:21	517
19:28	653	26:28	291 n. 35, 368 n. 76
19:29	435	26:31	572 n. 68
20:19	514 n. 75, 515	26:33	787

<i>Matthew (cont.)</i>		2:40	201
26:47	225 n. 74	3:16	672 (<i>app. crit.</i>), 673
27:38	755	3:16–17	673 n. 25
28:16	683 n. 78	3:17	54 n. 183, 673, 673 nn. 25–26
28:19	685, 689	4:17	274
28:19–20	690 n. 117	4:23	573
28:20	646 n. 44, 689	6:27	167
		6:28	223, 792 n. 26
Mark		7:22	639
1:2	711	8:44	174 n. 145
1:6	711	8:52	288 n. 21
1:16–20	128 n. 47	9:4	192 n. 48
1:17	162 n. 102	9:25	148 n. 48
1:24	123	9:28	515
1:34	122 n. 26	9:58	201
2:1–12	640 n. 14	10:1	539 n. 177
3:11	122 n. 26	10:5	626 n. 127, 627
4:33–35	644 n. 30	10:8	627 n. 129
5:7	122 n. 26	10:10	627 n. 129
5:39	288 n. 21	10:10–12	627
6:17–20	711	10:20	385
6:56	174 n. 145	11:4	179 n. 157
8:33	507 n. 41	12:33	371
8:34	767	12:51–53	92 n. 20
8:36	148 n. 48	12:53	92 n. 19, 443, 759
9:2	515	13:18–19	140 n. 27
9:44	317	13:20–21	140 n. 27
9:48	276 n. 126, 317	14:12–14	259 n. 50
10:17	653	14:16–24	259 n. 50, 260 n. 52
10:23	652 n. 66	14:17	184 n. 22
10:26	653, 653 n. 68, 655	15:3–7	377
11:25	179	16:1–8	462 n. 88
11:25b	178 n. 157	16:1–9	781 n. 28
11:25c	179 n. 157	16:8	291
12:9	781 n. 28	16:9	463, 553 n. 234
12:41–44	619, 651	16:18	289
14:24	291 n. 35, 368 n. 76	16:19–31	29 n. 83
14:27	572 n. 68	16:25	453
15:27	755	17:10	485
		18:9–14	237, 239, 485, 555
Luke		18:10–14	361
1:3	440 n. 13	18:11	556 n. 8
1:79	139, 677 n. 44	18:12	773
2:12	201	18:13	555 n. 5
2:24	151 n. 53	18:18	217

18:24	652 n. 66	9:37	644 n. 28
18:26	653, 653 n. 68, 655	9:38	351, 644 n. 28
21:1–4	619, 651	9:39	350 n. 22, 351
22:20	291 n. 35	9:39–41	642 n. 21
22:35	221	10:11–16	650 n. 53
22:35–36	219	11:48	815
22:35–38	222 n. 56	11:53	815 n. 44
22:36	219, 223, 225 n. 74, 226 n. 81	12:3	647 n. 45
22:36b	225	12:37–41	122 n. 25, 642 n. 21
22:36–37	225	12:37–43	528 n. 136
22:38	227	12:43	222 n. 61, 743
22:39	227	13:1–11	623
22:47–52	225 n. 74	13:1–17	365
23:18–23	512 n. 67	13:21–30	365
23:39–43	743	13:23–25	516 n. 82
23:43	557	13:24	517
24:44	249 n. 10	13:34	692 n. 124
		13:37	787
John		14:26	304 n. 88, 656 n. 84
1:15	678 n. 51	15:12–17	365
1:16	670	15:14	689 n. 108
1:16–17	678 n. 51	15:16	679, 741
1:17	320 n. 31, 352 n. 25, 414 n. 41	15:22	153, 355
1:17–18	679	18:3	224 n. 68
1:18	679 n. 55	18:12	224 n. 68
2:1–12	253	20:9	227
2:19	227	20:17	335
2:22	227	20:29	645, 646 n. 39, 647
3:13	335	21:15	651
4	29 n. 83	21:15–17	471 n. 3
4:3	516 n. 83	21:15–19	539
4:14	143	21:16	650 n. 53, 651
5:2	330 n. 74	21:17	650 nn. 51–52
5:2–9	641, 689	21:18	787
5:10–47	640 n. 14		
5:14	689, 690 n. 117	Acts	
5:39	438	1:9	523
6:62	335	1:14	179 n. 160
7:38	143	1:18	745, 746 n. 23
9	351, 644 nn. 29 and 33	2	360 n. 50
9:8	642 n. 23, 643, 643 n. 27, 645	2:14	511 n. 62
9:9	642 n. 23, 643–45	2:14–36	513
9:16	642 n. 23	2:22	511 n. 63
9:18	642 nn. 21 and 24, 643	2:23	512 n. 67
9:22	513, 642, 653	2:24	511, 517, 684 n. 86

<i>Acts (cont.)</i>		9:30	809
2:24–36	513	9:36–43	261 n. 58, 267 n. 80
2:25–31	249 n. 10	10:6	199 n. 70
2:29	512 n. 66	10:32	763
2:34–45	513	10:34	805
2:36	512 n. 67	10:45	682 n. 69
2:41	357	11:26	518 n. 93
2:46	179 n. 160	12:8	6, 213
3:1–10	741	12:23	745, 745 n. 23
4	360 n. 50	13:9–11	793
4:4	357	13:11	190 n. 36
4:10	512 n. 67, 517, 517 n. 89	13:13	797
4:13	512 n. 66, 525	13:45–48	527
4:16	813	13:46–48	683 n. 71
4:20	517	14:6	812 n. 37
4:24	179 n. 160	14:10	190 n. 36
4:32	179 n. 160, 199 n. 71, 357	14:19	705
4:32–35	361, 362 n. 52	14:19–21	813
4:34–35	359	15	534 n. 156
4:35	359	15:2	534 n. 157, 535
4:37	359	15:7	535
5:1–11	793	15:10–11	535
5:15	767	15:22–29	535
5:16	741	15:37–39	795
5:36–37	757	15:39	797
5:41	107	16	121
6:1	591	16:3	771
6:1–6	627	16:12	119 n. 16
6:13	758 n. 51, 759	16:14	199 n. 70
6:15	741	16:16–18	119, 121
7	742 n. 14	16:16–34	118 n. 14
8:7	741	16:17	123
8:18–24	807	16:18	190 n. 36
8:26–40	10, 185	16:19–20a	121
9:1	240 n. 113, 512 n. 67, 527, 542 n. 187, 767, 808 n. 27	16:19–23	114 n. 1
9:1–2	805	16:22–25	143
9:3–18	804 n. 17	16:23	121, 815
9:9–19	739	16:23–24	126 n. 38
9:15	483, 699, 803	16:23–34	813
9:18	805, 807	16:24	123
9:19–23	767	16:25	123
9:19–25	805 n. 18	16:26	125
9:22	806 n. 24, 807	16:27	127
9:25	767, 809	16:27–31	126 n. 38
		16:27–34	815

16:28	127	21:26	533
16:29–30	127	21:28	759, 759 n. 51
16:30	129	22:3	525, 525 n. 120
16:31	129	22:3–4	239 n. 111
16:33–34	129	22:6–21	804 n. 17
16:35–40	783	22:17	527 n. 129
17:5–6	239 n. 111	22:17–18	527
17:18–34	813	22:18	527 n. 129
18:3	189, 199 n. 70, 751	22:19	528 n. 131
18:9–10	377	22:19–20	529
18:10	376 n. 13	22:20	528 n. 131
18:11	193, 193 n. 50	22:21	527 n. 128, 529
18:12	813	22:24–25	705
18:18	195 n. 56	22:25	783
18:24–26	13, 197	22:30–23:9	813
18:26	195 n. 56	23:3	239, 793
19:11–12	108 n. 78, 735	23:4	241
19:12	190 n. 36, 195, 573 n. 72, 767, 803	23:5	241, 795
19:19	276 n. 127	23:16–18	809
19:29–30	809	25:10–11	809
20:7–12	735	26:12–18	804 n. 17
20:10–12	190 n. 36	26:28	813
20:18	655	26:32	809
20:19	658 n. 90	27	705
20:20	654 n. 73, 655, 659	27:1	815
20:26	655	27:1–44	815
20:28	655, 657, 659	27:9–11	811
20:28–29	658 n. 91	27:21	811
20:29	656 nn. 78 and 82, 657, 659	27:21–26	811, 815
20:31	658 nn. 88 and 90, 659, 719	27:22–25	811
20:32	709	27:33–36	811
20:34	203, 707, 735	28:16–31	812 n. 41
20:35	205, 359	28:17–20	811
21	509 n. 51	28:25–31	811
21:18	509 n. 50	28:30–31	812 n. 41
21:20	510 n. 53, 530 nn. 141 and 142	Romans	
21:20–21	531, 533	1:1	187 n. 28, 253 n. 25, 804 n. 16
21:20–24	511	1:8	385
21:20–26	541	1:13–14	565
21:21	510 n. 53, 542 n. 187	1:14	709
21:23	510 n. 53	1:21–22	381
21:23–25	809	1:23	381
21:24	510 n. 53	1:26–27	323
21:24–26	771	2:11	763, 805

Romans (cont.)

2:13	153	9:3	527, 709, 711, 719, 721, 785, 803
2:15	280 n. 143	9:14–15	12 n. 27
2:19–20a	153	9:25	683
2:21	153	9:25–26	682 n. 68
3	100 n. 51, 101	9:26	683, 684 (<i>app. crit.</i>), 685
3:1	100 n. 51	10:1	527, 729, 793
4	100 n. 51	10:2	528 n. 135, 729
4:1–22	101	10:2–3	352 n. 27
4:5	387	10:4	146 n. 39
4:18	387	10:10	378 n. 20, 379, 387
4:19	641, 643	11:13	420 n. 69, 527 n. 128
4:19–20	101 n. 53	11:20–21	729
4:19–24	101	11:26	729
4:20	643	11:29	729
4:22	101	11:31	729
4:23–24	101 n. 53	12:3	158 n. 84
4:25	101	12:3–8	139 n. 21
5	95 n. 33	12:3–19	159
5:1–2a	103	12:4–5	140 n. 26, 179 n. 159, 461 n. 83, 660 n. 94
5:2	87 n. 3, 103, 103 n. 60	12:5	144 n. 35
5:2b	103	12:10	691 n. 119
5:3	87, 88 n. 9, 91, 100 n. 51, 106 n. 74, 109, 113 n. 90	12:14	157 n. 76, 159 n. 88
5:3b–5a	111	12:16	158 n. 84, 161 n. 97, 578 n. 90
5:5	87 n. 3	12:17	157 n. 76, 159 n. 88
5:12	265 n. 72	12:18	161 n. 97
5:12–21	684 n. 63	12:20	6, 66, 133, 145 n. 37, 157, 157 n. 76, 167, 168 n. 121
5:14	266 n. 74	12:20a	159
5:20	350 n. 22, 353	12:20–21	157 n. 76
6:3–11	334 n. 87	12:21	165–67
6:6	333	13:8	115 n. 3, 117
8:17	451	13:9	735
8:18	95	13:10	735
8:21	97	13:13	365 n. 62
8:22	97, 99	14:1	567
8:23	786 n. 9, 787, 809	14:10	430 n. 121
8:28	115, 117, 118 n. 14, 119	14:15	566 n. 47, 567
8:32	567	15:2	606 n. 72
8:35	783–85	15:5	578 n. 90
8:38	717	15:6	179, 179 n. 160
8:38–39	705, 719, 721, 803, 803 n. 12, 809	15:16	420 n. 69
8:39	711	15:24	811
9:2	721, 729	15:25	753
		15:33	179 n. 158

16	181 n. 4	4:15	462 n. 84
16:1–2	569, 733	4:16	802 n. 7
16:3	6, 13, 180 n. 1, 181 n. 2, 185,	4:18	675 n. 31
	185 n. 24, 187, 188 n. 32, 195 n. 56,	4:19	675 n. 31
	201, 201 n. 77, 209 n. 6, 229	5	2, 731
16:4	229, 568 n. 53, 569	5–7	2
16:6	197 nn. 61–62	5:1	254 n. 27
16:7	196 n. 59, 197 n. 62	5:1–11	453
16:8	185 n. 24	5:1–13	567
16:11	185 n. 24	5:3–13	793
16:12	185 n. 24, 197 nn. 61–62	5:5	452 n. 52, 453
16:13	185 n. 24	5:6	140 n. 27
		5:10	318 n. 24
1 Corinthians		6:3	767
1:2	317	6:9	258 n. 46, 322
1:13–15	335	6:10	365 n. 62
1:22	753	6:11	102 n. 58
1:23	749, 753	6:14	384 n. 44, 385
1:24–26	317	6:15	144 n. 35, 259 n. 47
1:26	337, 747, 753	6:18	280 n. 144, 300 n. 75
1:27–28	753	7	6, 597, 600 n. 56, 630 n. 138
2:1–2	753	7:1–2	253, 285
2:1–10	317	7:1–24	303
2:4	753	7:2	247, 254 n. 27, 264 n. 66, 265,
2:6–3:4	324 n. 48		265 n. 70, 300 n. 76
2:9	371, 399, 399 n. 89, 427	7:2–3	279
3:1–2	412 n. 37	7:2–4	6, 252 n. 23, 264 n. 67, 283, 285
3:10	113	n. 4	
3:10–17	558 n. 13	7:3	269, 271
3:12	674 n. 29	7:4	270 n. 97, 271
3:12–13	675	7:5	597, 597 n. 49
3:15	675	7:5–6	597
3:16	201	7:6	597 n. 49
3:18	739	7:13	198 n. 66, 199
3:19	579	7:16a	199
4:1	772 n. 11	7:25	305, 630 n. 137
4:2	651 n. 58	7:25–38	303
4:3–5	280 n. 143	7:25–40	631
4:4	466 n. 97	7:26	305
4:5	797	7:28	305
4:6	675 n. 31	7:32	631
4:9	105 n. 68	7:32–34	694 n. 134
4:11	211, 751	7:33–34	630 n. 140
4:12	205	7:34	630 n. 141, 631
4:12–13	793	7:35	631

1 Corinthians (cont.)

7:39	80 n. 261, 287, 288 n. 21, 289, 301, 303, 307	10:9–10	318 n. 23
7:39–40	80, 285–87, 303, 601	10:10	315 n. 9
7:40	303, 305, 307	10:11	324 n. 50, 341 n. 110, 343, 345, 419 n. 66, 445, 447 n. 35
8–10	316 n. 14	10:16–22	337
8:1	316 n. 14, 773	10:20–21	317
8:1–3	317	10:21	249 n. 12, 316 n. 17, 91
8:2	773	10:24	317, 605–7, 655
8:4	316 n. 14	10:31	307
8:7–12	317	10:33	317, 393, 655
8:10	316 n. 16	10:33–11:1	769
8:10–12	567	11:1	83, 287, 727, 802 n. 7, 805
8:11	162 n. 103, 566 n. 47, 567	11:3	271, 271 n. 104
9:6	539	11:10	271 n. 105
9:14–18	213	11:17	363, 367
9:16	203	11:17–26	366 n. 70
9:17	772 n. 11	11:17–34	337
9:18	203, 713	11:18	363
9:19	520 n. 100, 521	11:19	6, 347, 348 nn. 10 and 13, 349, 351, 353, 355, 365, 371
9:19–22	139	11:20	365, 367
9:19–23	292 n. 37, 508 n. 44	11:21	361 n. 51, 365, 365 n. 63, 371
9:20	420 n. 68	11:22	367
9:20–21	769	11:23	367
9:20–22	731	11:23–25	369
9:22	6, 509	11:23–26	365
9:22–23	769	11:27	369
9:24–27	131	11:30	261
9:25	303, 384 n. 46	11:30–32	453
9:26	104 n. 62	11:31–32	245
9:27	104 n. 62, 222 n. 58, 348 n. 10, 789, 791	11:33	363
10:1	311, 312 n. 3, 321, 327, 337	11:33–34	369
10:1–4	329	12:3	389
10:1–10	315, 317 n. 19, 324 n. 52	12:7	391, 393
10:2	315 n. 9, 335	12:8	579
10:3	315 n. 9, 335, 337	12:9	385
10:3–4	343	12:12–27	144 n. 35, 179 n. 159, 461 n. 83, 660 n. 94
10:4	337	12:12–31	139 n. 21, 140 n. 26
10:5	343	12:13	330 n. 74
10:6	329, 341, 342 n. 113, 419 n. 66	12:31	737
10:6–7	343	13	727
10:7	314 n. 9, 342 n. 113, 343	13:2	385
10:8	319, 343	13:3	395
10:9	315 n. 9	13:9	773

13:12	679, 693 n. 127	4:16	154 n. 63
14:12	250 n. 15	4:17	95, 383, 715
14:35	611	4:17–18	97, 639, 785
15	107 n. 76	4:18	88 n. 8, 382 n. 34, 383, 486
15:3–8	530 n. 143	n. 48	
15:8	483, 773	5:1	377, 377 n. 17
15:8–9	483	5:4	769, 787, 809
15:9	521	5:8–9	334 n. 87
15:10	521	5:10	135, 430 n. 121, 431 n. 122,
15:11	530 n. 143	673 n. 23	
15:26	58	5:13	773
15:31	519, 568 n. 51, 701, 765, 785	5:14	719
15:32	705	5:20	523
15:54	684 (<i>app. crit.</i>), 685	6:2	251 n. 17
15:54–56	58, 684 n. 87, 686 n. 92	6:3–5	449
15:56	408 n. 17, 684 (<i>app. crit.</i>), 687	6:4–5	570 n. 58
16:2	753	6:7	717
16:15–16	733	6:12	707
16:18	733	7:5	93, 93 n. 23, 443
16:19	181 n. 2, 185 n. 24, 188 n. 32,	7:8	375
568 n. 53, 569		7:8–9	375
		7:9	375
2 Corinthians		7:15	174 n. 144
1:5	108 n. 79, 755	8:1–4	359
1:5–7	451 n. 45	8:2	358 n. 48, 621
1:7	755	8:4	752 n. 38
1:8b	786 n. 9	8:13	128 n. 44
1:14	673 n. 22	8:14	397
2:1–11	793	8:15	338 n. 99
2:4	658 n. 90, 731	8:18	571
2:8	731	8:19–20	752 n. 38
2:14	717	9:1	752 n. 38
2:17	477	9:6	427, 635
3:4–18	679 n. 53	9:7	359
3:6	408 n. 17	9:12–13	752 n. 38
3:18	693 n. 127	10–13	2, 108 n. 80, 448 n. 40
4:4	408 n. 17, 623 n. 121	10:1	158 n. 84
4:10	701	10:1–2	477 n. 24
4:13	6, 373, 377, 377 n. 17, 378–79,	10:1–11	476 n. 18
383 n. 36, 385, 387, 401, 405, 407,		10:2	477
408 n. 17, 425, 437, 439, 441, 452		10:4–5	759
n. 54, 453, 456 n. 65, 457, 464 n. 93,		10:8	251 n. 16, 773
486 n. 48		10:10	477, 477 n. 24
4:13–14	384 n. 44	10:11	477 n. 24, 479
4:14	384 n. 44, 385	10:13	540 n. 182

2 Corinthians (cont.)

10:18	222 n. 58, 348 n. 10	11:33	809
11	705	12:1	777
11–12	478 n. 31, 492 n. 65, 497 n. 82	12:2	485, 779
11:1	356, 471, 479, 481, 485, 495	12:2–4	721, 775–77
11:1–2	474 n. 12, 475, 479	12:2–5	205
11:2	470 n. 2, 694 n. 135, 695, 695 n. 140	12:4	94 n. 28
11:2–3	561–63, 705	12:5	775–77
11:5	448 n. 40	12:5–10	121
11:6	751	12:6	777
11:7	158 n. 84, 477	12:7	791
11:10	477	12:9	121, 572 n. 69, 573
11:11	775	12:9–10	108 n. 79, 109
11:11–12	477	12:10	121, 717
11:13	479, 757, 759, 775	12:11	108 n. 80, 448, 479, 481, 775, 777
11:13–15	449 n. 40, 479	12:11–13	779
11:15	578 n. 89	12:15	735
11:16	479, 481	12:18	571
11:16–12:9	773	12:19	797 n. 45
11:17	479, 481, 485, 495, 775, 777	12:20	731
11:18–19	479, 481	12:21	731
11:19	477	13:3	182 n. 12, 193, 222 n. 58, 286 n. 12
11:21	479, 481, 485, 775	13:5–7	222 n. 58, 348 n. 10
11:22–23	481	13:7	348 n. 10
11:22–29	773	13:10	251 n. 16
11:23	109, 448–49, 481	13:11	578 n. 90
11:23a	109	14:33	179 n. 158
11:23–25	791		
11:23–26	728 n. 5	Galatians	
11:23–28	451	1:8	350 n. 19
11:23–29	709	1:8a	561 n. 27
11:23–33	109 n. 82	1:8–9	351, 561, 771
11:24–25	705	1:9	350 n. 350
11:25	705	1:9b	561 n. 27
11:26	131	1:10	253 n. 25, 804 n. 16
11:27	705	1:13–14	239 n. 111, 739–41
11:27–28	405 n. 3	1:15–16	741, 804 n. 17
11:28	148 n. 47, 187 n. 29, 521, 564 n. 39, 568 n. 51	1:17	805
11:29	719, 759	1:18	518 nn. 90–91, 519, 520 n. 102, 521
11:30	109, 121	1:22–24	527
11:30–33	773	1:23	542 n. 187
11:31–33	767	1:23–24	527
11:32–33	805 n. 18	2	2

2:1	509 n. 49, 518 n. 90, 519, 539	4:9	678 n. 50
2:1–6	509	4:15	233
2:2	509 n. 49, 545	4:19	405 n. 4, 731
2:3	539	4:21–22	419
2:6	509 n. 49	4:21–31	424 n. 91
2:7	420 n. 69	4:21–5:3	289 n. 24
2:7–9	527 n. 128	4:22	419, 421, 423
2:8	525	4:22–24	6
2:8–9	539	4:24	418 n. 64, 419, 419 n. 65, 421
2:9	504 n. 21	5:1	422 n. 87
2:11	499–500, 500 nn. 4–5, 501, 503, 505, 507, 507 n. 37, 509, 511, 545, 551, 553	5:2	351
2:11–12	536 n. 169, 537	5:9	140 n. 27, 428 n. 109
2:11–14	6, 13, 14 n. 31, 498 n. 1, 499 n. 3, 505, 508 n. 43, 521 n. 103, 524 n. 119	5:9–21	508 n. 43
2:12	511, 517, 535, 536 n. 165, 537, 541, 551	5:11	549 n. 216
2:13	537, 537 n. 170, 539, 547, 769 n. 8	5:20	346 n. 2, 508
2:14	500 n. 4, 505, 507, 531 n. 146, 536 n. 166, 537, 545, 547, 547 n. 209, 551, 553	5:21	365 n. 62
2:14c	546 n. 205	5:22	385
2:15	547, 549	6:2	414 n. 94
2:16	534 n. 159, 548 n. 213, 549	6:4	557
2:17	549, 551, 551 n. 223	6:10	549 n. 216
2:18	309 n. 105, 551	6:14	705, 789, 791
2:20	567, 691 n. 123, 791	6:17	802 n. 6, 803
2:21	549 n. 216, 691 n. 123		
3:1	641, 779	Ephesians	
3:3	779	1:6	672 n. 21
3:4	755	1:12	672 n. 21
3:7	549 n. 216	2:5	679
3:13	408 n. 17	2:8	679
3:15	432 n. 126	2:16	679
3:21	352 n. 25	3:8	483, 521
3:24	412 n. 36, 424 n. 93	3:12	386 n. 48
3:24–25	413 n. 39	3:13	109 n. 84
3:26	327	3:19	126 n. 37
3:28	326 n. 60, 327, 330 n. 74	4:1–16	347 n. 7
3:29	549 n. 216	4:7	677
3:29–4:7	432	4:11–14	381
4:1–11	289 n. 24	4:13	348 n. 8, 349
		4:15–16	348 n. 8, 660 n. 94
		4:20–24	675 n. 35
		4:22	332 n. 82
		4:29	249–50, 250 n. 15, 251
		4:31	158 n. 82
		5:1	727
		5:1–2a	692 n. 124
		5:2	691, 727

5:21	614 n. 103	2:17–18	701
		2:18	717
<i>Ephesians (cont.)</i>		2:25	232 n. 92, 542 n. 190
5:22	271, 271 n. 105	2:27	233
5:23	271 n. 104	2:30	233, 569
5:25	692 n. 124	3:1	231, 790 n. 17
5:25–33	694 n. 135	3:2	512 n. 67
5:28	271 n. 105	3:2–3	771
5:33	271, 615	3:6	239 n. 111, 525
6:4	619	3:7–8	803
6:5	174 n. 144, 614 n. 102	3:12	679
6:12	521, 767	3:13	497, 717, 773
6:22	570 n. 60	3:14	497
		3:17	803
<i>Philippians</i>		3:20	147, 231
1:1	253 n. 25, 804 n. 16	4:1	231
1:7	565, 570 n. 58	4:3	578 n. 90
1:11	672 (<i>app. crit.</i>), 673	4:4	790 n. 17
1:12	80, 567, 571	4:5	158 n. 83
1:12–14	563, 790 n. 17	4:5–6	449
1:12, 14–18	757	4:7	94 n. 26, 126 n. 37
1:13	570 n. 58, 571	4:9	803
1:13–14	568 n. 50		
1:14	570 n. 58, 571–73, 811, 813	<i>Colossians</i>	
1:15	575	1:7	232 n. 92, 300 n. 77
1:16	575–77, 757	1:9	579 n. 94
1:17	570 n. 58, 577	1:16	719
1:17–18	577	1:17	644 n. 28
1:18	6, 555, 558 n. 16, 559 n. 17, 561, 575 n. 78, 577	1:18	644 n. 28
1:21–23	107 n. 76	1:21	618 n. 112
1:22–23	809	1:24	104 n. 63, 105
1:23	769, 787	1:28	731
1:23–24	719	2:14	162 n. 103
1:24	579, 711, 769, 809	3:8	158 n. 82
1:29	719, 803	3:9	332 n. 82
2:2	578 n. 90	3:11	326 n. 60
2:3	158 n. 84, 691, 691 n. 119	3:14	735
2:4	655	4:3	812 n. 39
2:5–8	691	4:6	475
2:6–7	560 n. 18	4:7	300 n. 77
2:7	291, 327, 681, 691, 691 n. 120	4:8	570 n. 59, 571
2:12	174 n. 144	4:12	232 n. 92
2:16	672 nn. 19–20, 673 n. 22	4:18	658 n. 88
2:17	231		

1 Thessalonians

1:2	690 n. 111	1:5	735
1:6	447	1:9	613
1:6–8	232 n. 91	1:10	252 n. 20, 561 n. 22
1:8	385	1:12–13	483
2:4–6	222 n. 61	1:15	481, 483
2:6	743	1:15–16	483
2:9	203, 205, 658 n. 88	1:16	483
2:11	462 n. 84	1:18–19	401
2:11–12	811	1:19	399
2:14	447	1:20	791
2:14–15	753	2:5	275 n. 118
2:14–16	232 n. 91	2:7	527 n. 128, 532 n. 149, 547
2:16	793	2:8	158 n. 82
2:17	663–65	2:8–9	628 n. 133
2:19	384 n. 46	2:9	257 n. 41
3:2–3	399	2:9–15	13
3:5	570 n. 61, 571, 665, 665 n. 110	2:11–15	6
4:3	272 n. 112	2:12	13, 197, 198 n. 65, 199
4:8	272 n. 112, 273	3:2	158 n. 84
4:13	27, 33 n. 100, 288 n. 21, 586	3:2–4	192 n. 45
n. 1, 587		3:6	624 n. 122
4:13–5:11	107 n. 76	3:7	129 n. 48
4:15	461	3:15	195
5:2	663	4:1	660 n. 97, 661
5:6	444 n. 24	5	595 n. 38, 597, 600 n. 56, 630
5:17	579	n. 138	
5:19	389	5:3–16	597 n. 47
5:23	179 n. 158	5:4	604 n. 69, 614 n. 104

2 Thessalonians

1:6	793	5:9	587, 590 n. 14, 591, 593, 594 n. 33, 595, 596 n. 43, 597, 602 n. 62, 603
1:6–7	128 n. 44, 449, 461	5:9–10	593 n. 23, 629 n. 135
1:7	793	5:10	201, 592 n. 20, 593, 597, 599, 602 n. 62, 603–5, 614 n. 104, 618 n. 110, 619, 621, 627, 629
2:4	624 n. 122	5:11	594 n. 33, 595–97, 597 n. 48, 600 n. 55
2:11	781 n. 28	5:11–14	306 n. 98
3	428 n. 110	5:13	596 n. 40, 597, 597 n. 48
3:8	205	5:13–14	595
3:10	203, 429, 431	5:14	595, 596 n. 43, 597
3:13	429, 430 n. 117, 431	5:15	597, 597 n. 48
3:14	431	5:16	592 n. 20, 593
3:15	431	5:23	27 n. 78

1 Timothy

1:4	455, 455 n. 61
-----	----------------

6:4	324 n. 49, 552 n. 227	2:11	52–53, 54 n. 185, 667, 677,
6:5	263		679, 681, 681 n. 54, 690 n. 117, 692
6:8	211, 229		n. 126
		2:11–12	55, 675–77, 687, 689
1 Timothy (cont.)		2:12	7, 158 n. 84
6:10	357, 357 n. 42, 401	2:13	371 n. 85
6:20	579 n. 95	3:2	158 n. 83
		3:5	678 (<i>app. crit.</i>), 679
2 Timothy		3:13	733
1:10	685 n. 90		
1:11	527 n. 128	Philemon	
1:12	579 n. 95	2	542 n. 190
1:13	252 n. 20	23	232 n. 92
1:14	579 n. 95		
2:7	579 n. 94	Hebrews	
2:9	575, 813	1:1	529
2:12	451	2:3	559
2:24–26	731	2:13	673
2:26	129 n. 48	2:14	327
3:1	637, 647, 655, 658 n. 91, 659,	2:14–15	684 n. 85
	660 n. 97, 661	2:16–17	327
3:12	451	4–11	381 n. 29, 382 n. 30
3:17	425	4:12–13	92 n. 20
4:3	252 n. 20, 561 n. 22	4:16	86 n. 48, 426 n. 100
4:6	701	5:12–14	413 n. 37
4:7–8	461, 723	6:19	381
4:8	156 n. 71, 303, 371 n. 85, 384	6:20	383
	n. 46, 461, 809	8:5	331 n. 81
4:13	6, 213	8:13	409
4:14	199 n. 70	9:1–5	382 n. 30
4:15	793	9:11	382 n. 30
4:17	707	9:24	314 n. 8, 382 n. 30, 419 n. 66
4:19	188 n. 32	10:1	147, 331, 331 n. 81
		10:19	86 n. 48
Titus		10:32	445
1:1	253 n. 25, 804 n. 16	10:32–34	753
1:9	252 n. 20, 561 n. 22	10:33	445
1:11	299 n. 68, 562 n. 33	10:34	444 n. 28, 445
1:12	779	10:35	448 n. 36
1:13	560 n. 22	10:35–36	449
2:1	561 n. 22	10:37	449
2:2	158 n. 84, 560 n. 22	11:1	382 n. 31, 382 n. 34, 639
2:4–6	257 n. 41	11:1–2	486 n. 48
2:8	252 n. 20	11:3	639, 641
		11:13	457, 458 n. 73, 459

11:13–40	232 n. 91
11:21	457
11:37	105 n. 69, 459, 789
11:37–38	105, 457, 721
11:38	105 n. 69, 459
11:39	457 n. 69, 458 n. 76, 459
11:40	459
12:6	687
12:23	459 n. 78
13:3	629
13:8	323 n. 45
13:17	655
James	
1:23–24	693 n. 127
2:2	281 n. 153
2:23	801
2:26	401, 401 n. 97
5:10	105
1 Peter	
2:10	683 n. 75
2:22	685
3:18–19	686 n. 92
3:19	58
2 Peter	
2:18	126 n. 40
2:22	309 n. 104
1 John	
1:7	644 n. 28
3:2	166 n. 115
4:9	291 n. 33

