JOHN CHRYSOSTOM: HOMILIES ON SPIRITUAL GIFTS

by

Mark R. Hanson, BA, MTS

A dissertation submitted to
the Faculty of McMaster Divinity College
in partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the degree Doctor of Philosophy (Christian Theology)

McMaster Divinity College
Hamilton, Ontario
2024

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
(Christian Theology)

McMaster Divinity College
Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: John Chrysostom: Homilies on Spiritual Gifts

AUTHOR: Mark R. Hanson

SUPERVISORS: Dr. Gordon L. Heath and Dr. James R. Payton, Jr.

NUMBER OF PAGES: vi + 259

ABSTRACT

"John Chrysostom: Homilies on Spiritual Gifts"

Mark R. Hanson
McMaster Divinity College
Hamilton, Ontario
Doctor of Philosophy (Christian Theology), 2024

When John Chrysostom preaches on the topic of spiritual gifts, he does so from a context prior to modern charismatic developments. His concerns and pastoral goals differ from modern ones shaped by the charismatic waves. Much of Chrysostom's theology cannot be separated from the homilies in which it is communicated. An evaluation of how Chrysostom approaches the spiritual gifts must also take the homiletic context of that approach into consideration. This study looks at two homilies on First Corinthians, which have gifts as their primary focus. The thesis of this study is that Chrysostom sees the Spirit's gift-giving as a revelatory event. The Spirit uses the gifts to show the newfound friendship between God and humans through Christ. The gifts also have a pedagogical function. The Spirit uses them to teach Christians how to live a life of love in God, which is to look for the common benefit. Thus, from their gifts Christians learn to reciprocate God's kindness by being generous towards others. In so doing, the gifts become a means of progressing in the deifying life of God.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I want to thank Dr. Steve Studebaker for all his help and encouragement to me in pursuing a PhD and for his guidance as my primary supervisor for many years. I also want to thank Dr. Gordon Heath for taking up the reins as my primary supervisor, and to Dr. James Payton Jr. It has been a pleasure and a blessing to work with you.

I want to thank my parents John and Kathryn and my sister Karen and my brother-in-law Nick whose love and support has been unwavering throughout this PhD project. I want to thank my grandparents John Sr. and Carol Hanson as well as Barbara Jane Stevens and in memory of Robert Stevens for their love and support over the many years. I also want to extend thanks to my extended family who have always been encouraging and supportive throughout this journey.

I want to thank Dr. Adam Rudy and Dr. Kevin Foth for their support as we walked through the PhD program together, and I also want to extend thanks to Dr. Merrill Greene, Mr. Ben Bedecki, and Mr. Darren Howse. Their friendship, encouragement, and support were invaluable.

Finally, I want to thank the many people at Rivercross Church for their support and care over these past few years. I am grateful for such kindness and consideration.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY ii

ABSTRACT iv

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS v

TABLE OF CONTENTS vi

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION 1

CHAPTER 2: METHODOLOGY 38

CHAPTER 3: THE STRUCTURE OF HOMILY 29 54

CHAPTER 4: THE STRUCTURE OF HOMILY 35 98

CHAPTER 5: SEEING THE SPIRIT THROUGH GIFT-GIVING 141

CHAPTER 6: THE PASTORAL MOTIVE OF GIFT-GIVING 176

CHAPTER 7: A THEOLOGY OF THE GIFTS 209

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION 223

APPENDIX 1: HOMILY 29 228

APPENDIX 2: HOMILY 35 238

BIBLIOGRAPHY 249

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Chrysostom has not often been considered as a theologian but only as a moralist and a preacher. One Protestant encyclopedia entry by E. Preuschen states: "the history of dogma has scarcely any reason for devoting a chapter to Chrysostom: In the history of pastoral theology he deserves a whole book."[1] This is due, as Panayiotis Papageorgiou argues, to modern scholarly approaches to theology, which classify "as 'non-theological' those works which pertain to the practical nature of the Christian life and contain little or no philosophical speculation and argumentation."[2] Ashish J. Naidu argues "Chrysostom could not conceive of interpreting the Scriptures in a manner divorced from the church's needs. In his view, interpretation and application were not mutually exclusive."[3] Theology could not be separated from life, morality, and pastoral care towards the church. Papageorgiou argues there is a need "to examine closely the writings of Chrysostom and the other fathers within the context of their own time taking into account their own presuppositions, as well as preoccupations, without superimposing on them our modern contemporary categories of what is theological or spiritual and what is

[1] Baur, *John Chrysostom*, 1:355.
[2] Papageorgiou, "Theological Analysis," 1–4.
[3] Naidu, *Transformed in Christ*, 78.

moral."[4] A re-examination of Chrysostom's texts without superimposing modern paradigms on them supplies a capacity for renewal.[5]

Chrysostom's Homiletic Rhetoric

The Classical world "regarded logical and eloquent speech, effectively delivered, as the most characteristic feature of civilized life."[6] Oratory is "first and foremost a moral virtue, not a mere technique of speaking."[7] It was a psychagogic tool used to help communities and to advance agendas.[8] Rhetors addressed the anxieties of their audiences and "worked to alleviate those anxieties as much as they sought recognition for greatness in their fields."[9] Rhetoric was central for the performance of "Greco-Roman civilization."[10] The Classical tradition of Greek writers were important for rhetors in order to perform Greco-Roman culture. For the fourth century rhetor Libanius authors such as Demosthenes, Plato, Homer, Hesiod, Aesop, and Theognis held "paramount importance."[11] Other authors like Herodotus, Thucydides, Aelius Aristides,

---

[4] Papageorgiou, "Theological Analysis," 3.

[5] Ricoeur, *Hermeneutics*, 120. Ricoeur argues that an interpretation of a text is mediated by the cultural signs of the author and his/her text. To interpret a text is to engage in self-interpretation. Thus, the one who undertakes this task "understands himself better, understands himself differently, or simply begins to understand himself" (120). A reader must take a detour to learn how a document forms and presents itself through cultural signs, and then implement them in their understanding of the text (120). Thus, an interpretation of the text with this understanding appropriates it. It "'brings together,' 'equalises,' renders 'contemporary and similar,' thus genuinely making one's *own* what was initially *alien*" (121). The process of studying a text is to meet it in its alien, that is in its own context. Then when one begins to understand it there, they can interpret it for their own context in a genuine fashion. Chrysostom's texts exist prior to many of the theological developments which shape modern Christianity, from the Protestant Reformation to the rise of Pentecostalism to Vatican II. And for these texts to speak meaningfully to a modern audience, they must first be understood within their own context, which is foreign to modern Christians. Thus, with his homilies on spiritual gifts, a reader must unlearn modern presuppositions to be able to listen to what Chrysostom is communicating within his own time. To then take what Chrysostom is saying and communicate it to a modern context.

[6] Kennedy, *Greek Rhetoric*, 3.

[7] Quiroga Puertas, *Dynamics of Rhetorical Performance*, 31.

[8] Quiroga Puertas, *Dynamics of Rhetorical Performance*, 60.

[9] Espinosa, "Men between Worlds," 202.

[10] Quiroga Puertas, *Dynamics of Rhetorical Performance*, 31

[11] Nesselrath, "Libanius and the Literary Tradition," 246–47.

Pindar, Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, Aristophanes, Xenophon, Lysias, Isocrates, and Porphyry were also important.[12]

For Christians, rhetoric and homiletics were intertwined. They expressed truth to the congregation. Christian worship is defined by "the shape, structure, and content of the liturgy."[13] The liturgy "juxtaposes past, present, and future, and the visible and invisible, all in the same image, while making a unique point out of the harmonious diversity of the divine plan to deify man."[14] The core of the liturgy is the preaching of the gospel, for "Through the word of the Gospel, the person of Christ permeates the being of the person he addresses."[15] Thus, the exegesis of scripture became an "integral aspect of Christian rhetoric. In a sense, exegesis is the discovery of truth, and thus corresponds to dialectic, but it is based on the authority of the message and the desire of the interpreter to make it consistent with the one great message, the kerygma."[16] Rhetoric is an adornment linked "intimately and immediately" to the truth.[17] Rhetoric is not a container for truth, but is a compliment to it.[18] Just as rhetoric was central to the performance of the Greco-Roman civilization, Christian rhetoric in preaching was central to Christian life and worship.

Christian preaching used the Scriptures as the textual basis for their rhetoric. However, some Christians referenced Greek authors when preaching. Some preachers like Gregory Nazianzus cited them often while John Chrysostom represents preachers

---

[12] Nesselrath, "Libanius and the Literary Tradition," 246.
[13] Mayer, "Dynamics of Liturgical Space," 104.
[14] Streza, "Divine Liturgy in Orthodox Spirituality," 142.
[15] Streza, "Divine Liturgy in Orthodox Spirituality," 147.
[16] Kennedy, *Greek Rhetoric*, 182–83.
[17] Auxentios, "Notion of Rhetoric," 45.
[18] Auxentios, "Notion of Rhetoric," 45–46.

who used them sparingly.[19] Chrysostom cited both Greek philosophers and poets in his homilies. He only had a few direct references to Greek poets, and those were made with contempt for them.[20] He cited the Greek philosophers more often. Although he seldom read them for recreation, "his retentive memory enabled him to point and adorn his arguments with illustrations and quotations from them."[21] He drew upon Diogenes Laertius's work *Lives of the Eminent Philosophers*. His work is part history and part comedy, with a dry sense of humor that includes odds and amusing anecdotes of various philosophers. It is "filled frequently with puns and wordplay meant to amuse, he almost never praises of criticizes directly the characters he describes, nor does he venture any unambiguous opinion of his own about how one might best undertake philosophy as a way of life."[22] Chrysostom cited his work because it is likely that the stories Diogenes recorded were well known by the population.

Rhetoric "needs and looks for an audience. Inspired spectators and adoring crowds were elements essential to the rhetorical shows of the Second Sophistic. Rhetoric as an art of persuasion presupposes an interaction between the speaker and audience, a context, and a forum."[23] An orator needs an audience, not solely hearers. This audience can be "as large as humankind or more limited to specific groups, such as the cultured public, pagans, or Christians."[24] The audience in turn would share the speech with others. The oration was distributed, often not as a written text, but as a reproduced speech. The audience may memorize parts of the speech as it was delivered so that it

---

[19] Kennedy, *Greek Rhetoric*, 244.
[20] Coleman-Norton, "St. Chrysostom's Use of the Greek Poets," 213.
[21] Coleman-Norton, "St. Chrysostom and the Greek Philosophers," 305.
[22] Miller, "Introduction." ix.
[23] Cribiore, *Libanius the Sophist s*, 79.
[24] Cribiore, *Libanius the Sophist*, 80.

was published "by being engraved in memory."[25] One exercise Libanius gave his students involved that memorization. His students "would memorize parts of his oration as he delivered them and then meet to reconstruct the whole of the speech."[26] Chrysostom's audience is not filled with students of rhetoric. Rather, it involves a variety of people. Both men and women, ascetic or married, slaves, children, the poor and disenfranchised as well as the wealthy, and both clerics and laypeople attended any given liturgical service where Chrysostom preached.[27]

The fear of boring an audience remained "an ongoing concern in the late antique philosophical milieu."[28] It was also a means for making religious orthodoxy. Bishops in the fourth century gained new status and influence in society and so they had "to prove their oratorical *savoir faire*, which led to a reconsideration of their approach to rhetoric and oratory."[29] John Chrysostom, Gregory of Nazianzus, and Gregory of Nyssa had to navigate the need "to transmit a message accessible to the common people, without surrendering to the demands of a public with a taste for sophistical shows when they attended sermons, homilies, funeral speeches, orations on the memory of martyrs or the consecration of sacred spaces."[30] While Chrysostom used rhetoric in his preaching Thomas Ameringer argues it was never "oppressive as in the pagan sophists, nor even as powerful as in Gregory of Nyssa and Gregory Nazianzen."[31] The form of the speech never overcomes the message being conveyed. However, the form of Greek rhetoric was still a factor. He does "make abundant, even excessive, use of the stylistic devices of the

---

[25] Cribiore, *Libanius the Sophist*, 80, 83.
[26] Cribiore, *Libanius the Sophist*, 80.
[27] Mayer, "Who Came to Hear John Chrysostom Preach," 86.
[28] Quiroga Puertas, *Dynamics of Rhetorical Performance*, 62.
[29] Quiroga Puertas, *Dynamics of Rhetorical Performance*, 72–73.
[30] Quiroga Puertas, *Dynamics of Rhetorical Performance*, 73–74.
[31] Ameringer, "Stylistic Influence of the Second Sophistic," 103.

sophists."[32] Rhetorical devices like "pleonasm, such as anaphora, or sound, such as paronomasia, or vivacity, such as rhetorical question or question and answer" often appear.[33] "Progymnasmatic forms appear, such as the ecphrasis of deserted Antioch or of the works of creation or the human body.[34] Despite his use of sophistic devices, he "does not seek to imitate their structural forms and topics."[35] His works "are true homilies, elucidations of the scriptural reading of the day for the theological and moral edification of his congregation."[36] Chrysostom had to account for his visibility, audibility, and his gestures when preaching. He needed to account for the size and composition of the audience. "When the audience is large and he preaches for too long, the noise level and fidgeting increases and he can see the attention of the audience noticeably diminishing."[37] The audience also responds in various ways "by breaking into applause, laughter or grumbling, or by uttering exclamations or exhibiting signs of distress. Some at different times move toward or away from John as he preaches."[38] The preacher and the audience influence each other making the homily a dynamic speaking event.

The context of the homily means Chrysostom's theology has a paraenetic and paideutic nature. He looks to "foster in his hearers the life of faith which is set forth in scripture, which is the Word of God."[39] This life of faith is described as asceticism without mysticism.[40] It is understood as "an all-encompassing way of life and literal cure

---

[32] Kennedy, *Greek Rhetoric*, 248.
[33] Kennedy, *Greek Rhetoric*, 248.
[34] Kennedy, *Greek Rhetoric*, 248.
[35] Kennedy, *Greek Rhetoric*, 249.
[36] Kennedy, *Greek Rhetoric*, 249–50.
[37] Mayer, "John Chrysostom: Extraordinary Preacher," 131–32.
[38] Mayer, "John Chrysostom: Extraordinary Preacher," 132–33.
[39] Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 249.
[40] Hill, "Spirituality of Chrysostom's Commentary," 572.

of the human soul."[41] Chrysostom's approach to theology in this manner allows him to grasp the thrust of the biblical text. Chrysostom's theological and homiletic activity are connected by his interest for the audience's benefit. Catherine Broc-Schmezer argues, "Cette mise à la portée de l'auditoire, en effect, est à la fois observée dans le texte biblique, et pratiquée par Chrysostome. Elle concerne donc à la fois, et indissociablement, son activité de commentateur et celle d'orateur, son activité de théologien et celle de prédicateur."[42] Chrysostom expresses theological ideas in ways the audience can easily understand.[43] In approaching his preaching in this way he adapts the Greek rhetorical tradition.[44]

To achieve this, Chrysostom uses audience-oriented criticism of the rhetors to encourage virtuous living among the congregation.[45] Chrysostom's use of rhetoric in his homilies stems from his education in the rhetorical schools in Antioch and the exegetical school of Diodore. It is assumed that Chrysostom studied rhetoric under the famous teacher Libanius.[46] However, that relationship has never been secured with certainty.[47] J. N. D. Kelly argues that "any reconstruction of John's schooling is inevitably conjectural, devoid for the most part of hard facts."[48] Regardless of their relationship, an important

---

[41] Mayer, "John Chrysostom: Moral Philosopher," 201.

[42] Broc-Schmezer, "Théologie et Philosophie en Prédication," 190, "This interest for the audience's ability is, in effect, observed both in the biblical text and practiced by Chrysostom. So, the concern for both is inextricably linked, his activity as a commentator and as an orator, his activity as a theologian and a preacher."

[43] Broc-Schmezer, "Théologie et Philosophie en Prédication," 196.

[44] Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*, 19.

[45] Young, "Rhetorical Schools," 192.

[46] Baur, *John Chrysostom*, 1:23.

[47] See Baur, *John Chrysostom*, 1:22–24.

[48] Kelly, *Golden Mouth*, 7. Some remarks on the connection between Chrysostom and Libanius can be made. Two church historians attest to Chrysostom studying under Libanius. Socrates ("Ecclesiastical History," *NPNF* 2/2:137–53) is the first author to mention their link (*NPNF* 2/2:138). Sozomen ("Ecclesiastical History," *NPNF* 2/2:398–415) claims that Libanius claims Chrysostom would have been his successor had he not become a church leader (*NPNF* 2/2:399). Carter ("Chronology of Saint John Chrysostom," 357–64) argues Sozomen heavily relies on Socrates and Chrysostom's work *Ad*

point remains that what Chrysostom learned while studying rhetoric was more important than "whose lectures young John attended."[49] Chrysostom would remark later in his life

Theodorum lapsum and offers "little independent value" (357). On the topic of Libanius's successors Van Hoof ("*Libanius's* Life," 7–38) writes that Libanius did not have many orators to succeed him. Libanius's defense on this allegation is that "most promising students died an early death (§§151–3) — an apologetic argument taken up at greater length in *Oration* 62" (23). Pierre-Louis Malosse ("Jean Chrysostome," 273–80) points out Chrysostom calls his teacher "mon sophist" (my sophist) which is not identical to Libanius's title of "le sophiste de la cité" (the sophist of the city). These two sophists are not proven to be the same person (276).

Another difficulty with Socrates and Sozomen is that they are wrongfully claimed as students of Libanius. Cribiore (*Libanius the Sophist*, 132–82) argues Libanius did write to his students, and he even supported his Christian students and developed intimate relationships with Christian relatives and friends (154, 160). Two Christians with whom he corresponded are Basil the Great and Gregory Nazianzus. Socrates ("Ecclesiastical History," *NPNF* 2/2:96–117) claims these two frequented Libanius's school in Antioch "where they cultivated rhetoric to the utmost" (*NPNF* 2/2:111). Cribiore (*Libanius the Sophist*, 1–17) comments on the exchange of letters between Basil and Libanius. There is still work to sort the genuine letters from later fabrications, but their correspondence "testifies to a courteous relationship based on mutual esteem and a common value of classical paideia and furthermore shows the desire of Christian readers to focus on the aspects of Libanius's character and biography least offensive to them" (13). And later Cribiore argues the correspondences between Libanius and Gregory of Nazianzus ought to be taken with some skepticism "because Libanius's name may have been added later; but even if that is the case, they show a forger's desire to attenuate the pagan side of the sophist and to enroll him in the company of cultivated, eminent Christians" (13). No suggestion of a student-teacher relationship seems to exist in their correspondence. Nesselrath and Van Hoof ("Reception of Libanius," 160–84) argue it is doubtful that either Basil or Gregory were pupils of Libanius. And certainly did not study under him in Antioch, which both Socrates and Sozomen claim (168). The fabricated relationship between Libanius, Basil, and Gregory lends skepticism towards Socrates and Sozomen's statements that connect Chrysostom to Libanius.

There is no surviving correspondence between Chrysostom and Libanius. Libanius has a break in his letter collection from 365 to 388 CE. One theory by Cabouret ("Libanius' *Letters*," 144–59) is that this gap is an intentional self-censorship starting in the reign of Emperor Valens and until he regained his former authority under Emperor Theodosius I (149). And his first letter from 388 is stylized as a "new epistolary start" to his life (149–50). This gap in Libanius's letters is most of the time when both Chrysostom and Libanius were in Antioch together. Chrysostom's letter collection does not help to fill in this gap. Allen ("Rationales for Episcopal Letter-Collections,") argues no letter from Chrysostom's time in Antioch survive save for one (loc 898). Mayer ("Ins and Outs of the Chrysostom Letter-Collection,") argues the vast majority of his letters were composed when Chrysostom was exiled from his Constantinopolitan post (loc 4501). Chrysostom's letters were likely collected after his death to shape memory of him (loc 4755–4838). So, no correspondence between Libanius and Chrysostom can be reconstructed.

Despite the skepticism surrounding their relationship it can be shown that Chrysostom borrows from the writings of Libanius. Hunter ("Borrowings from Libanius," 525–31) argues when Chrysostom writes about Emperor Julian that "he has taken expressions which Libanius applied to the ascetic habits of Julian and used them instead to portray the Christian monks" (526).

[49] Baur, *John Chrysostom*, 1:23–24. What Chrysostom encountered during his rhetorical training is as follows. Chrysostom would have gone through to at least an intermediate level of learning. Robert Penella ("Libanius's *Declamations*," 107–27) show this level of education was "focused on the close reading and explication of classical poetic texts, especially Homer, Hesiod, Euripides and Menander" (108). Young ("Rhetorical Schools," 182–99) shows school exegesis consisted of "*diorthōsis* – the establishment of agreement about the text to be read; (ii) *anagnōsis* – the construal and correct reading of it; (iii) *exēgēsis* – the *methodikē* and *historikē* described earlier, comments on language and explanatory notes on all kinds of narrative references" and "*krisis* – the discernment of the good, the judgement of the poets" (186). Students would engage in *Progymnasmata* "preliminary exercises." Students would

that "the art of speaking comes, not by nature, but by instruction, and therefore even if a man reaches the acme of perfection in it, still it may forsake him unless he cultivates its force by constant application and exercise."[50] The point being his rhetorical prowess owes more to his continual practice of it while preaching than it does his education.

While Chrysostom's link to Libanius is uncertain it is known that Chrysostom studied under Diodore.[51] As a teacher Diodore focused more on traditional categories for exegeting a text. That is its ὑπόθεσις ("theme," or "narrative setting"), σκοπός ("purpose," "thrust") and πρόσωπον ("person," "point of view").[52] Diodore never moralizes the text.[53] However, Chrysostom's exegesis of the biblical texts differs from Diodore "due to the difference in genre between works composed at the desk and homilies delivered to a congregation in a church."[54] As a homilist, he was an observer of society, appealing to his audience's daily experience and calling for behavioural change.[55] Chrysostom wanted to reform "a decadent pagan society and the pale cultural representations of Christianity within it."[56] He "applied the monastic spirit and rigor to his critique of society."[57] He advocated for a common lifestyle of piety for everyone in

---

compose prose to be orally delivered. Gibson ("Libanius' *Progymnasmata*." 128–43) lists up to fourteen separate exercises, which do not need to be repeated extensively here, but some examples of what students practiced are *Diēgēma*, "narration," *anaskeuē*, "refutation," and *synkrisis*, "comparison" (128). The crown of the rhetorical education was the Declamations. Penella ("Libanius's *Declamations*," 107–27) argues students would speak on imaginary subjects, sometimes competitively, before audiences during public gatherings. They were meant to show off the rhetor's skills (108–109). The Declamations emphasizes the rhetor's ability to properly structure their oration, their *stasis*, "stance" on an issue being argued about, and their representation of the *ēthos*, "the character they impersonate" (118).

[50] Kennedy, *Greek Rhetoric*, 245–46.
[51] Hill, *Reading the Old Testament in Antioch*, 117.
[52] Hill, *Reading the Old Testament in Antioch*, 118.
[53] Hill, *Reading the Old Testament in Antioch*, 119.
[54] Hill, *Reading the Old Testament in Antioch*, 117.
[55] Hill, "St. John Chrysostom: Preacher," 275.
[56] Guroian, "Family and Christian Virtue in a Post-Christendom World," 347.
[57] Guroian, "St. John Chrysostom," 88.

the city which would reinterpret the Greco-Roman city an a Christian one.[58] In this vision the clergy play a central role as patrons.[59] The clergy were patrons of the poor, needy, widows, and orphans.[60]

Chrysostom's homilies are better understood "not as public speeches, with a clear structure and obeying the set of conventions of classical rhetoric, but rather as the more informal and partly extemporaneous reflections of a teacher before a classroom of students, and meeting a variety of perceived pastoral and liturgical needs of the moment."[61] Each homily presents a distinct interest in promoting a social vision, "and

---

[58] Hartney, *John Chrysostom and the Transformation of the City*, 11–12.

[59] Hartney, *John Chrysostom and the Transformation of the City*, 9–10.

[60] Rapp, *Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity*, 223. Furthermore, she argues bishops were not continuators of the priestly tradition in the OT and they were not solely examples of Christian conduct, but they were also "paragons of civic virtue" (223). The patronage role of Bishops introduces a complex dynamic surrounding their trustworthiness. Teresa Morgan (*Roman Faith and Christian Faith*, 36–76) argues that while friendship language describes the patron-client relationship, it is sometimes used to cynically describe the exploitation of the patron towards the client (63). Alicia Batten (*Friendship and Benefaction in James*, 9–55) argues that business partners would use fictive, familial terms, specifically ἀδελφός "brother/sister" to denote their relationship (46–47). The preference for calling a close friend a brother is founded on a philosophical idea, citing Plutarch, that "most friendships are in reality shadows and imitations and images of that first friendship which Nature implanted in children towards parents and in brothers toward brothers" (48).

Géza Alföldy (*Social History of Rome*, 94–156) argues there is a disproportional weight to social stratification in the Roman World. It was not only fixed positions within the social hierarchy that matters, but also "the personal relations between individuals placed higher and lower, which were always of the greatest importance" (148). People on the lower hierarchical strata had close connections with their masters and patrons (148). John Kloppenborg (*Christ's Associations*, 186–209) calls this a "ladder of *connectivity*." That is, "the slave who belonged to a wealthy and powerful family was much better off, and had a much higher real social standing, than a freeborn worker or shop owner who was poorly connected" (202). This means Christian bishops and clergy occupied an important role as patrons for the poor. They would be able to give the poor a better social standing. They needed to conduct themselves towards the poor with genuine *pistis*, faithfulness. Morgan (*Roman Faith and Christian Faith*, 36–76) argues that honest *pistis* forged "new relationships which enable new social networks to develop, which in turn benefit both individuals and society as a whole. In this vision, *pistis*/*fides* "faith" not only sustains society in its existing forms; it also renews and reconfigures it" (64).

Peter Van Nuffelen ("A War of Words," 201–17) argues Christian leaders could receive patronage due to the success of their preaching. A successful sermon could "be reward with gifts, especially when it attracted the elite" (210). Retaining elite patrons was important for the social connections. Clients of those elite patrons "might come to listen to a certain preacher so as to be seen by their patron" (212). Christian preaching was more than an instructional sermon. As a social event it linked rhetorical success with the struggle for status and promotion (212). This complex social network could be used for personal interest or for ulterior ends "such as the defence of orthodoxy and the care of the poor" (212).

[61] Cook, "Preaching and Christianization," 68–69.

that those interests were intimately connected both with the community within which it was produced and with its target audience."[62] However, Chrysostom's goal is not solely

[62] Mayer, "Audience(s) for Patristic Social Teaching," 86. McLuhan (*Understanding Media*, 23–35) argues the formative power of media is not its content, but "the media themselves" (35). Media like modern print, radio, television, and the internet shape human awareness and experience by their presence alone (35). For Chrysostom the dominant form of media was public speaking, rhetoric. Butts (*Language Change in the Wake of Empire*, 25–43) argues this shows how during the period of Seleucid dominance the Aramaic speaking Levant was brought into contact with the Greek language. However, Greek never fully supplanted Aramaic as the dominant language (26). The Roman Empire did not significantly alter the Greek language's function for international communication and commerce. Greek remained a strong influence in metropolitan centers like Antioch (26–27). Larger number of Syriac speaking people in Syria and Mesopotamia "had little or no knowledge of Greek" (32), but there still existed a good portion who knew Greek or mastered Greek (37). On the other hand, there are "no attested cases in which a native Greek speaker is known to have learned Syriac" (38). Greek was the language of the Empire and Syria-speaking elites who wanted to participate in the broader Greco-Roman world had "very good reasons to learn Greek" (39). Kondoleon (*Antioch: The Lost Ancient City*, 13–21) argues the Roman empire exacerbated the divide between urban Greek-speaking people in Antioch and the rural Syriac-speaking people (17). During their control of the city Antioch became more Romanized and bound to the empire, while the rural areas had little stake in the culture of the Roman Empire (17). Greek language public speaking is a core media for the Greco-Roman culture and its use promoted a Greco-Roman social vision rather than a Syriac one. Moreover, Christianity did not offer an absolute alternative to Greco-Roman culture. Rather it provided a new interpretation of it. Many Christian leaders came from the same "upper echelons of society that produced defenders of traditional culture" (18).

E. G. Clark ("Pastoral Care," 265–84) argues many of the great preachers in the fourth and early fifth century such as Basil, Chrysostom, Ambrose, and Augustine were "products of the traditional Greco-Roman education system" (266). Christian preaching was a transformation of Greco-Roman. It was no longer a rhetorical performance solely for the educated elite (266) but was open to the uncultured and uneducated (279–80). In Late-Antiquity communication mattered as much as content so it "might not even matter if the congregation did not understand all the sermon" as the event itself was important for participating in this new Christian version of Greco-Roman culture (279–80). Krupp (*Shepherding the Flock of God*, 7–23) argues Chrysostom depreciated Syriac and Hebrew and held Greek as the most beautiful language (13). Mayer ("Audience(s) for Patristic Social Teaching," 85–99) argues Chrysostom would commonly preach to audiences who were bilingual (92–93). However, he only ever preached in Greek and even if there were translators there it is likely that many non-Greek speakers would not understand his message nor "would readily have identified with or accepted his social message" (93). E. G. Clark ("Pastoral Care," 265–84) shows how even when Syriac-speaking guests were in the congregation Chrysostom would preach of their virtues in Greek. Possibly only a few of those visitors could understand him. The reason is Chrysostom's message "is obviously aimed at exhortation of his urban audience rather than praise of the visitors" (274). McLuhan (*Understanding Media*, 23–35) recounts a story of "one African who took great pains to listen each evening to the BBC news, even though he could understand nothing of it. Just to be in the presence of those sounds at 7 p.m. each day was important for him" (34). It is possible that a similar reasoning motivated Syriac-speaking people to visit urban churches to hear spoken Greek homilies. And for Syriac speakers who aspired to a deeper connection with the Roman Empire, the church supplied a free opportunity to engaged with its culture and build connections. Thus, Chrysostom's homilies are not solely a continuation and a new interpretation of Greco-Roman culture but are also a gateway into that culture for non-Greek speakers and for the lower classes.

Ekaputra Tupamahu ("I Don't Want to Hear Your Language," 64–91) focuses on the linguistic issues immigrants face while in a dominant society. Foreign-language speaking immigrants may have had some interactions with Greek but preferred to speak in their native language (85). He argues Paul sees "this multilingual and heteroglossic [sic] phenomenon as something that is disorderly, chaotic, and useless for the church" (85). The solution is to accommodate the immigrants by translating the dominant language

social in nature. He operates within the developing theological tradition of theosis.[63] Seppälä argues that patristic authors speak of deification "without actually *defining* the concept."[64] A variety of vocabulary terms were used to address this topic, but the first proper definition is provided by Pseudo-Dionysios in the sixth century.[65] Thus, as Mayer argues, one should not look for standard words like θέωσις "deification" in Chrysostom's corpus. Rather, to say he is part of the developing tradition of theosis is to describe how his "entire homiletical method, scriptural exegesis included, is directed towards the same end—teaching individuals to live a deified life in response to God's gracious adaptation in Christ and in response to the transformation that has already taken place in baptism."[66] Chrysostom uses the classroom as an analogy for the church's liturgy so that "coming to church was akin to going to school" where people would come to learn lessons, both on the nature of God and how to live in response.[67] Chrysostom's preaching was similar to that "of a schoolteacher teaching in a classroom."[68] Chrysostom draws Christians into a mimetic relationship with the saints found in the biblical text.[69] Rather than producing "budding orators in his congregation," Chrysostom is trying to make saints.[70]

---

used in the church for these immigrants and foreigners to minimize the effects of linguistic barriers (84–85).

[63] Mayer, "Audience(s) for Patristic Social Teaching," 99.
[64] Seppälä, "Concept of Deification in Greek and Syriac," 442.
[65] Seppälä, "Concept of Deification in Greek and Syriac," 442.
[66] Mayer, "John Chrysostom: Moral Philosopher," 208.
[67] Cook, "Preaching and Christianization," 70.
[68] Cook, "Preaching and Christianization," 85–86.
[69] Naidu, *Transformed in Christ*, 85.
[70] Cook, "Preaching and Christianization," 81–82.

Chrysostom and Spiritual Gifts

Bradley Cochrane argues that Eastern theologians are treated superficially or ignored entirely by West-centric views on Christian dogma. The Protestant-Catholic dialectic often forces Eastern theological figures to fit in with Western paradigms.[71] Furthermore, Protestant examinations of Chrysostom are often done to suit their own goals. They ignore his Eastern tradition and use isolated texts to formulate their own arguments.[72] Margaret Mitchell agrees with this assessment and shows that Chrysostom does not use later Western exegetical approaches to Paul's text. Rather, he reads Paul as both a pastor and as a practical demonstration for Christian living.[73] Chrysostom's exegesis of Paul occurs within a pastoral framework of preaching to an audience, with intention to address existing problems within his community, his work must be contextualized by that pastoral goal.[74]

Modern discourse in spiritual gifts, especially the gift of tongues, uses patristic literature to "demonstrate either the cessation or the continuation of the charismatic gifts."[75] A survey of modern Western perspectives on spiritual gifts is beyond the scope of this project. However, here are some introductory remarks. Protestant Christianity in the twentieth century was heavily impacted by various charismatic movements which gave "special emphasis upon healing and speaking in tongues."[76] Traditionally

---

[71] Cochran, "Superiority of Faith," 3.
[72] Cochran, "Superiority of Faith," 1–2.
[73] Mitchell, *Heavenly Trumpet*, 17–22.
[74] Mitchell, *Heavenly Trumpet*, 21.
[75] Busenitz, "Gift of Tongues," 62. For a study that shows the cessation of gifts see Rogers, "Gift of Tongues," and Bansah, "Is Speaking in Tongues Real Today?" For studies on the continuation of the gifts see Oropeza, "When Will the Cessation of Speaking?"
[76] Gromacki, *Modern Tongues Movement*, 1. Coleman (*Globalisation of Charismatic Christianity*, 17–48) argues the twentieth century saw a consolidation of various strands of Christianity, i.e. Methodist, Holiness Movement, and early Pentecostalism (20). Early Pentecostals held the gift of tongues as an initial sign of being baptized in the Holy Spirit (21). Later charismatic movements see tongues as one example of the Holy Spirit actively empowering Christians (21–22). Atherstone et al., eds.

Pentecostal scholarship has been focused on spiritual gifts "and their normative implications for charismatic manifestations in the congregation."[77] Recent Pentecostal trends no longer focus on speaking in tongues. One African pastoral influence is Nicholas Bhengu who did not promote speaking in tongues, though was also never against them. He argued, "a spiritual salvation provided the moral fibre required for people to begin to rise up form their social and economic degradation."[78] Amos Yong's work on spiritual gifts is another example of this trend. He presents the spiritual gifts "as specific expressions of the most fundamental gift of love."[79] He argues against the idea that "the more gifts are present the more the power of the Spirit is at work" and instead argues the weaker and less prominent gifts are more honoured by God.[80] The gifts are no evidence of human achievement, nor are they status indicators of power in worldly terms, but are signs of God's generosity and his "counterconventional [sic] *modius operandi*."[81] Thus, the most powerful expression of God's grace is through those who "are neither strong nor powerful in their own eyes."[82] He concludes that Paul presents a new paradigm "of Christian life and ecclesial relations, one defined by love that challenges the Corinthian congregation's charismatic self-understanding."[83]

(*Transatlantic Charismatic Renewal*, 25–28) recounts how David du Plessis, an early figure in the American Pentecostal movement, makes the signs of the Spirit's power the essential element in Apostolic Christianity, saying that in every generation the Spirit "wants to repeat what he did in the first Christian church through the first leaders and members" (28).

[77] Yong, *Spirit of Love*, 116. One example is Oyetade, "Study of Speaking in Tongues in Acts," who explores its use and abuse in modern Nigeria.

[78] Resane, "From Small Country Churches to Explosion into Megachurches," 8. See also Stibbs, "Putting the Gift of Tongues in its Place."

[79] Yong, *Spirit of Love*, 116.

[80] Yong, *Spirit of Love*, 117.

[81] Yong, *Spirit of Love*, 117

[82] Yong, *Spirit of Love*, 117.

[83] Yong, *Spirit of Love*, 120.

Chrysostom uses gift language to talk about salvation and the Christian life. To Christian initiates who stand on the precipice of their baptism Chrysostom remarks, "Now you stand at the threshold; soon you will enjoy the benefits of so many gifts."[84] The best gifts are given first: Christians become "a dwelling place for the Holy Spirit" and they "put on Christ Himself, wherever they go they are like angels on earth, rivaling the brilliance of the rays of the sun."[85] They are led to the royal throne of God who as King gives gifts. Other gifts include "sanctification, justice, filial adoption, and inheritance."[86] Christians are also encouraged to ask God for gifts. Chrysostom urges initiates to "show every ambition in your requests. Only ask for nothing worldly or human; make your petition worthy of Him who grants the gifts."[87] These requests include "peace among the churches," for "those who are being led astray," and for those "who are in sin."[88] God's gifts draw Christians to participate in the divine life as they become vessels of the Spirit and wearers of Christ. In fact, due to God's gifts Christians "participate in the fullness of the Trinity."[89]

Chrysostom emphasizes the soteriological aspects of God's gifts and their result on Christians. That is, God's gifts produce a virtuous life that imitates Christ, and love is the greatest virtue that signifies one's belonging to Christ. This belonging to Christ is seen through love. Drawing upon John 13:35, he asks, "Was it by raising the dead or by cleansing lepers or by driving out demons? No, Christ passed over all these signs and wonders" and says that "his disciples are recognized not by miracles but by love."[90]

---

[84] Chrysostom, *Baptismal Instruction*, 47.
[85] Chrysostom, *Baptismal Instruction*, 53.
[86] Chrysostom, *Baptismal Instruction*, 57.
[87] Chrysostom, *Baptismal Instruction*, 54.
[88] Chrysostom, *Baptismal Instruction*, 54.
[89] Oden, *Life in the Spirit*, 3:59.
[90] Chrysostom, *Incomprehensible Nature*, 52–53.

Gifts such as prophecy or speaking in another language were given to help the church, but their passing does "not hinder or thwart the preaching of piety."[91] In *Hom. 1 Cor.* 36 he argues that "the church was a heaven then, the Spirit governing all things, and moving each one of the rulers and making him inspired. But now we retain only the symbols of those gifts." He likens the church in his day to "a woman who hath fallen from her former prosperous days, and in many respects retains the symbols only of that ancient prosperity." However, this fall from prosperity is not "in respect of gifts, for it were nothing marvelous if it were this only, but in respect also of life and virtue."[92] The absence of virtue from Christian leadership was a greater issue than the absence of certain gifts.

What is missed from a brief survey on Chrysostom's views on gifts is how he incorporates them into larger discussions. His inclusion of the spiritual gifts in his homilies on the incomprehensible nature of God is used for pastoral reasons. He calls that homily "my discourse on love" and moves on to address the part of 1 Cor 13:8 where Paul says, "Knowledge will pass away."[93] He argues the present life is filled with imperfect knowledge of God. To accept this state of affairs is to advance towards a better state. However, those who "say that they have attained the totality of knowledge in the present life are only depriving themselves of the perfect knowledge for the life hereafter."[94] Chrysostom wants his congregation to avoid the Anomoeans who thought

---

[91] Chrysostom, *Incomprehensible Nature*, 53–54 (citing 1 Cor 13:8). This project translates γλῶττα/γλῶσσα from Chrysostom's works as "the gift of foreign speech" or "foreign language" rather than using the standard term: "gift of tongues." The reason behind this is to avoid anachronistic interpretation. Chrysostom does not operate within the modern charismatic context so the language used to translate his work should reflect his own context rather than a modern one.

[92] Chrysostom, "To the Corinthians 36," *NPNF* 1/12:219–20.

[93] Chrysostom, *Incomprehensible Nature*, 53–54.

[94] Chrysostom, *Incomprehensible Nature*, 58.

they could fully understand God in his essence through their own power of reasoning.[95] Chrysostom's use of the gifts of prophecy and foreign speech here is done to serve a larger purpose of proving the folly of the Anomoeans and showing the incomprehensibility of God's essence. Chrysostom's use of gifts in his *Baptismal Instructions* is done to motivate the initiates to be concerned with the salvation of their neighbours and the benefit of others in the congregation.[96] And he uses gifts in *Hom. 1 Cor.* 36 to promote a proper treatment of the liturgy. Christians should be silent during the liturgy to learn and allow their neighbours to learn as well. No one should "utter any other sound but those which are spiritual."[97] If Christians cannot do this, Chrysostom tells them "Well then, go out, not to become a mischief to others also."[98] The context of the homily is required to understand how Chrysostom uses spiritual gifts in his preaching.

Hom. 1 Cor. 29 and 35

An examination of Chrysostom's use of spiritual gifts should consider the wider pastoral goals he is looking to achieve. A good case study is to look at exegetical homilies where spiritual gifts are the focus. This dissertation will look at two homilies that have spiritual gifts as their focus. The first is *Hom. 1 Cor*. 29 which covers 1 Cor 12:1–11. This homily addresses the difficulty of discerning between true gifts of God and gifts that come from other sources. Some examples are between biblical prophets and Greek oracles as well as discerning when wealth comes from God and when it does not. The second homily is

[95] Chrysostom, *Incomprehensible Nature*, 59–60.
[96] Chrysostom, *Baptismal Instruction*, 54–55.
[97] Chrysostom, "To the Corinthians 36," *NPNF* 1/12:220.
[98] Chrysostom, "To the Corinthians 36," *NPNF* 1/12:221.

Hom. 1 Cor. 35 which covers 1 Cor 14:1–19.[99] In this homily Chrysostom attacks the self-seeking motive of church leaders who put their own interest and advancement ahead of their pastoral duty to benefit the congregation. These texts are important for the study of spiritual gifts in Chrysostom because they consist of Chrysostom's exegesis of the relevant passages in First Corinthians on the topic alongside *Hom. 1 Cor.* 36.[100] During these homilies he interweaves the topic of spiritual gifts with his pastoral concerns for his audience. He does this by collapsing the time between the early Corinthian church and his own Antiochene congregation. He does this so he can apply Paul's pastoral approach to the Corinthians to his own church. Moreover, the majority of scholarly research on this topic has focused on these homilies, with a specific interest in *Hom. 1 Cor.* 29. Thus, these homilies are, at the time of writing, the best starting point for evaluating the homiletic context for his approach to spiritual gifts.

The Greek text of these homilies can be accessed through two collections. First is *Patrologia Graeca* (PG) volume 61 and the second is Fredrick Field's *Omnium Epistolarum Paulinarum per Homilias Facta* volume 2, often called Field's text (F). However, neither of these collections are critical editions. At the time of this project, Chrysostom's series on First Corinthians is not available in *Source Chrétiennes* (SC), which will eventually become the standard source for the Greek text of this series. While

---

[99] Originally this project was going to look at three homilies, including *Hom. 1 Cor*. 36 along with the other two mentioned. These three homilies have spiritual gifts as their focus within the First Corinthian homiletic series. Other homilies, such as *Hom. 1 Cor*. 6 include references to spiritual gifts, but it is not the exegetical focus of the homily. *Hom. 1 Cor*. 36 was dropped from this project primarily due to time restraints. As the third homily of the ones studied, it clarifies several of the themes from *Hom. 1 Cor*. 29 and 35, while not adding essential arguments for them. Thus, *Hom. 1 Cor*. 36 was, unfortunately, the best candidate to drop to allow this project to be completed in time.

[100] Other homilies that could be considered are *Hom. Acts* 2–4 and *Hom. Rom* 21. These texts are important for the goal of constructing a systematic understanding of Chrysostom's theology of the gifts. However, that comprehensive construction of his thought is beyond the scope of this project. As individual homilies they face the same hermeneutic challenge as *Hom. 1 Cor.* 29 and 35. That is, how to understand the topic within the homiletic context.

PG remains a common standard text for many early Christian works, some scholars argue for the use of Field's text over it when researching Chrysostom. James Cook argues that Field's text presents "something that takes us potentially very close to the sermon as preached."[101] It is closer to being a critical edition than *PG*, but he "was heavily dependent on one manuscript of the rough recension, which he judged to be superior."[102] Pauline Allen notes how "there is considerable discrepancy between the text of Montfaucon[103] and that of Field, the edition of the latter being in general better but terser, sometimes to the point of incomprehensibility."[104] She argues that "until new text editions are made of Chrysostom's work employing modern scientific principles, Field must remain the guiding light, although many questions of a textual nature, especially with regard to the homilies on the Pauline epistles, have to be considered tentative."[105] This project will use Field's Greek text, as despite its drawbacks, it is still the better option, even if the less frequent textual option chosen.[106]

According to Chrysostomus Baur, Chrysostom's series on First Corinthians was written and preached during his time in Antioch in the early 390s CE. The series was composed sequentially after the series on Romans, John, and Matthew.[107] Antioch had

---

[101] Cook, "Preaching and Christianization," 56.

[102] Cook, "Preaching and Christianization," 56.

[103] Montfaucon is an alternative title for *Patrologia Graeca.* The project of *PG* was started by Montfaucon, but finished by Migne, so Migne and Montfaucon are used interchangeably in scholarship to refer to the same text.

[104] Allen, "Introduction," xxxiii.

[105] Allen, "Introduction," xxxi.

[106] Citations to Field's text will look like this: Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:1:14 (F 2:350–51) The author and title of the work are followed by numbers indicating the passage's location in my translation of the text. The first number, 29, is the homily's number. The second number, 1, corresponds to the sections, which follow the section-division found in the *NPNF* translation of the text. The third number, 14, refers to the line number, which is my own addition, use solely for the ease of citating the passage. The Bracketed number shows the Field's text (F), with the volume (2) and page (350–51) numbers.

[107] Baur, *John Chrysostom*, 1:298.

many small churches, chapels, and *martyria* for Christians. There were a few notable churches within the city. The first of these is the "Great Church" where Chrysostom often preached because it was "the only episcopal or patriarchal church in Antioch in which the Patriarch held divine service attended by his priests."[108] It also had an older church called *Palaia*, ("Old Church," or "Apostolic Church"). This older church was loved and venerated by the whole Christian community in Antioch and Chrysostom had stints where he preached there.[109] Chrysostom preached in the same location as Flavian, his bishop. "It sometimes happened that both of them preached at the same divine service, one after the other."[110] This did not seem to stir up competition between them. Their "affectionate relations of sincere mutual honor and love . . . remained untroubled to the end."[111] Chrysostom would also preach to other members of the clergy, and even to other bishops who visited the city.[112] These homilies were likely preached at the Great Church in Antioch.

Robert Carter offers a chronology of Chrysostom's life. He was born in 349 CE, completed his rhetorical studies in 367; he was baptized in 368 and became a lectorate in 371. In 372 CE he began his monastic life away from Antioch and returned in 378. In either 380 or 381 CE Chrysostom was made a deacon and in 385 or 386 CE he was elevated to the priesthood.[113] In autumn of 397 CE Chrysostom was chosen to be the bishop of Constantinople after Nectarius who had died earlier that year.[114] This news was so sudden, and Chrysostom was taken away so quickly, that news of his elevation

---

[108] Baur, *John Chrysostom*, 1:30–31; and Mayer, "John Chrysostom and his Audiences," 72.
[109] Baur, *John Chrysostom*, 1:29–30; and Mayer, "John Chrysostom and his Audiences," 72
[110] Baur, *John Chrysostom*, 1:390.
[111] Baur, *John Chrysostom*, 1:394.
[112] Baur, *John Chrysostom*, 1:391.
[113] Carter, "Chronology of Saint John Chrysostom," 364.
[114] Baur, *John Chrysostom*, 2:6.

was learned by Flavian, the bishop of Antioch, and the rest of the city only after Chrysostom was taken away to Constantinople.[115]

Chrysostom's time in Antioch had a few notable moments. Chrysostom became a deacon around the time of the Council of Constantinople.[116] Meletius, the bishop who consecrated Chrysostom as deacon, attended the council and died shortly thereafter in June of 381.[117] Flavian was ordained bishop in his place while the competing pro-Nicene faction, governed by Paulinus, was passed over.[118] The schism between these two factions would continue throughout Chrysostom's time in Antioch. In 388 Paulinus died and his successor, Evagrius, lived for another ten years as the head of a dwindling faction. Evagrius "did not succeed in attaining anything of any significance."[119] The schism between the Meletian, and later Flavian, faction and Paulinus's factions ended with Evagrius's death. His death occurred around the time Chrysostom was elevated to the bishop of Constantinople. One of Chrysostom's first actions as bishop was to send an ambassador to Rome for the recognition of Flavian as the rightful bishop of Antioch. To this Rome agreed and the Antiochene schism ended in 398.[120]

Another result of the Council of Constantinople was that Nicene Christianity became the official religion of the Roman Empire. Thus, the final Arian leader, Dorotheus, was forced to leave the Antioch in 381 and no successor was granted to the Arian congregation, "So Arianism slowly died out."[121]

---

[115] Baur, *John Chrysostom*, 2:6.
[116] Baur, *John Chrysostom*, 1:146.
[117] Baur, *John Chrysostom*, 1:146.
[118] Baur, *John Chrysostom*, 1:147–48.
[119] Baur, *John Chrysostom*, 1:396–97.
[120] Baur, *John Chrysostom*, 1:397.
[121] Baur, *John Chrysostom*, 1:396.

An iconic moment of Chrysostom's career came in 387. Just prior to Lent of that year the emperor Theodosius issued a new tax. It was met with protest and rioting in Antioch. These riots overturned and destroyed the emperor's statues. Soon the people's anger over the tax gave way to fear as Theodosius passed judgment on the city. Various diplomates, and bishop Flavian, went to Constantinople to appease his anger and to save the city from total destruction. Much of Lent occurred after the riots and prior to the emperor's sentencing. Chrysostom would preach every day during this period. His homilies address the fear and desperation of the city. He tries to restore hope in being rescued from destruction and to convince the citizenry to live virtuous lives. Chrysostom's Lenten homilies are thus called "On the Statues" due to this unique context.[122]

Chrysostom's homilies on the Corinthians occur at a time between major events. The Council of Constantinople happened a decade earlier, and the events surrounding his homilies "On the Statues," half a decade earlier. The homilies in this study were preached before to the great earthquakes in 394 and 396, and before the Hunnic invasion of 395.[123] It was a period of time where Flavian's pro-Nicene faction was slowly solidifying its legitimacy against the Paulinus faction. Non-Nicene Christian factions were also losing power within the Roman Empire.

[122] van de Paverd, "Introduction," xxi–xxii.
[123] Baur, *John Chrysostom*, 1:397–98.

History of Research on Chrysostom and Gifts

This project engages the topic of Spiritual gifts in Chrysostom's homilies. Earlier research projects on this topic are summarized below to supply a backdrop for this dissertation.

Frances Young argues Chrysostom perceives the Corinthian situation correctly, that "the issues are pride, status, attitude, finance and morality, rather than false doctrines, gnostic or otherwise."[124] Other issues include "the one who had intercourse with his stepmother, the gluttony of those eating idol-meat, the contentiousness in going to court over money, wearing long hair, not sharing with the needy, being arrogant and jealous over spiritual gifts, and weak on the doctrine of resurrection because of the madness of heathen philosophy."[125] Moreover, she praises Chrysostom's reading of the text: he "was asking the right questions of the text. He was not much interested in piecing together historical jig-saw puzzles of the kind that preoccupy modern critics, but rather in discerning what Paul was saying and why."[126] However, she also argues, "there are, of course, places where Chrysostom clearly goes astray — he has no idea, for example, what speaking in tongues was."[127] Young's assessment raises the question of how Chrysostom does not understand the gift of tongues, if his approach to the text allows him to often discern Paul's meaning so clearly. What, then, did Chrysostom miss?

Andrew T. Floris writes a short article on Chrysostom and the spiritual gifts. He argues Chrysostom holds to the continuation of the spiritual gifts among those who are

---

[124] Young, "John Chrysostom on First and Second Corinthians," 350.
[125] Young, "Rhetorical Schools," 250.
[126] Young, "John Chrysostom on First and Second Corinthians," 351.
[127] Young, "John Chrysostom on First and Second Corinthians," 350.

baptized in the Spirit and that miracles could still be seen in Christian homes.[128] However, these gifts were less common than they were earlier in Christian history. This is "not because the Church had no need of them anymore, but because the lives of a great number of Christians were not conformable to the will of the Lord."[129] Gifts were given "only to those who live lives of prayer, devotion, and dedication."[130] Moreover, he cites Chrysostom saying the charismatic element to the liturgy is the foundation and rule of Christianity.[131] He argues that Chrysostom preaches a baptism of the Spirit, as a separate event than the baptism in water. He uses the example of the Samaritans, who were baptized in water but did not receive the signs of the Spirit, and cites Chrysostom, saying, "'It is not all one, to obtain remission of sins, and to receive such a power.' In other words it is one thing to be born of the Spirit and become a child of God and it is another thing to be baptized in the Spirit and receive power."[132] He argues that the gifts were given "for edification of the faithful and for the amendment of the lives of their fellowmen."[133] Floris finds in Chrysostom an early representation of Pentecostal thought.

Eusebius A. Stephanou devotes a page to Chrysostom in his article on the charismatic gifts in the Patristic tradition. He argues that members of the congregation pressed him for the reason Christians no longer speak in tongues when they are baptized. However, he adds the following words to the citation: "I hear this from many continuously and always they seek an answer for it."[134] There is no evidence for these

---

[128] Floris, "Chrysostom and the Charismata," 20.
[129] Floris, "Chrysostom and the Charismata," 19.
[130] Floris, "Chrysostom and the Charismata," 22.
[131] Floris, "Chrysostom and the Charismata," 21.
[132] Floris, "Chrysostom and the Charismata," 19–20.
[133] Floris, "Chrysostom and the Charismata," 18.
[134] Stephanou, "Charismata in the Early Church Fathers," 139.

words, not in *PG*, in Field's text, or in Floris's article, which he gives as the source for the quotation. This misquotation skews how he sees Chrysostom's approach to this topic of spiritual gifts. He includes the story of Romanos during the Diocletian persecution, whose tongue was cut out, yet he was still able to speak comfort, displaying a gift of tongues.[135] However, he argues Chrysostom sees the gifts as having ceased. This does not deter Stephanou from concluding, however, that "despite the progressive cessation of the gifts, the theology of the church fathers remains basically Spirit-centered and Pentecostal."[136]

Harold Hunter writes an article on tongue-speech, which surveys the gift of tongues in Patristic authors. When he arrives at Chrysostom, he argues the preacher comments on the cessation of the gift of tongues. Formerly, people did speak in the Persian, Roman, Indian, or some other language, but it no longer happens.[137] He argues that Chrysostom proved this with two reasons, "the superiority complex of tongues-speaking Christians led to schism, and tongues were no longer necessary after the faith has been established."[138] He suggests in a footnote that "Chrysostom seems to have waged an all-out war on tongues-speech."[139]

Stanley Burgess surveys perspectives on the Holy Spirit from the early church. He argues that for Chrysostom the indwelling Spirit is the gift which causes Christians to live a virtuous life. Chrysostom emphasizes the fruit of the indwelling spirit more than the miraculous gifts.[140] Burgess further argues that for Chrysostom the miraculous gifts,

---

[135] Stephanou, "Charismata in the Early Church Fathers," 139–40.
[136] Stephanou, "Charismata in the Early Church Fathers," 140.
[137] Hunter, "Tongues-Speech," 134.
[138] Hunter, "Tongues-Speech," 134.
[139] Hunter, "Tongues-Speech," 134.
[140] Burgess, *Holy Spirit*, 125.

such as speaking in tongues, played a role in preaching Christianity to the Greco-Roman world, but as Christianity became more established within the Greco-Roman world the gifts no longer were given. However, the Spirit is still given to Christians, and the love and virtue that comes from receiving the Spirit as a gift remain at the heart of Christian living.[141]

Thomas Oden uses Chrysostom's homilies as his primary dialogue partner for his discussion on the spiritual gifts in his third volume of his systematic theology. He uses Chrysostom to formulate six conclusions on the gifts. First, the Spirit freely gives gifts to the church, not for personal honour, but to serve each other.[142] Second, each Christian is responsible to use their gifts.[143] Third, no Christian can live upon their gift alone, but need to be complemented by other members of the church.[144] Fourth, there is a variety of gifts, but every gift is needed in the redemption of human life.[145] Fifth, Christians receive gifts, which benefit them in their ministry, especially leadership within church communities.[146] Finally, the New Testament suggests that there are more gifts than is mentioned therein, so the church should expect new expressions of the Spirit's gifts.[147] Oden's study highlights the pastoral nature of Chrysostom's theology. He argues that "one's calling to be an evangelist or pastor or servant or teacher is being authenticated and enabled by spiritual gifts commensurable with those tasks."[148] Oden combines the call to ministry with the reception of spiritual gifts.

---

[141] Burgess, *Holy Spirit*, 125–26.
[142] Oden, *Life in the Spirit*, 3:186.
[143] Oden, *Life in the Spirit*, 3:186–87.
[144] Oden, *Life in the Spirit*, 3:187.
[145] Oden, *Life in the Spirit*, 3:188.
[146] Oden, *Life in the Spirit*, 3:189.
[147] Oden, *Life in the Spirit*, 3:189.
[148] Oden, *Life in the Spirit*, 3:189.

Gocha Kuchukhidze explores Chrysostom's understanding of how the apostles received the Spirit first from Jesus, and then on Pentecost. He cites Chrysostom saying the gifts of the Spirit come in different kinds, one to remit the sins of others and another kind of gift to work miracles.[149] These gifts correspond to different actions of the Spirit. Kuchukhidze argues, procession of the Spirit is the first action, "which in Christian theology represents personal property or an image of personal, hypostatic, existence of God the Holy Spirit." This procession gives a person grace to forgive others, and this procession comes from the Father through the Son.[150] The second of the Spirit's action is that of descending. When the Spirit descends upon people they receive "the power to raise the dead, heal the infirm and other miraculous powers. This descent is connected to spiritual advancement of the individual.[151]

Kilian McDonnell and George T. Montague cover Chrysostom throughout two chapters in their book *Christian Initiation and Baptism in the Holy Spirit*. McDonnell explores Chrysostom within the developing baptismal traditions of the early church. Montague studies how Chrysostom's change in language from *charisma* to *dōrea* reveals his theology on the gifts.

In the chapter entitled "John Chrysostom: From Jordan to Calvary," Kilian McDonnell looks to understand Chrysostom's understanding of Spirit baptism in relationship with Christian initiation traditions. He situates Chrysostom within a developing baptismal rite, which "had its roots in the Syriac rite, but then, ostensibly, moved away from the Syriac understanding of baptism."[152] His focus is on how baptism

---

[149] Kuchukhidze, "John Chrysostom on the Holy Spirit," 3.
[150] Kuchukhidze, "John Chrysostom on the Holy Spirit," 3–5.
[151] Kuchukhidze, "John Chrysostom on the Holy Spirit," 3–4.
[152] McDonnell and Montague, *Christian Initiation and Baptism*, 226.

moves from emphasizing Jesus' baptism in the Jordan and the charismatic underpinning of his ministry towards Jesus' death on the cross.[153] McDonnell argues this development moves away from Jesus's Spirit anointing and away from the spiritual gifts that work within Jesus' ministry.[154] It is a transition away from a charismatic expression of the Christian faith. This earlier, charismatic Syrian Christianity considered Jesus' baptism as the "prototype of the Spirit's creative power, the normative manifestation. So much was this so that in the eucharistic prayer, the anaphora, the epiclesis (the calling down of the Spirit on the gifts) is cast in terms of the baptism of Jesus while omitting any mention of the Spirit's role in the incarnation."[155] He argues the Syrian baptismal practice presents "a Christology which is dependent on pneumatology" as the Spirit is imparting through anointings prior to being baptized into Christ.[156] Chrysostom departs from this tradition by placing the Christological aspects first. Pre-baptismal anointings are done to bring the initiate into union with Christ. The pneumatic element happens after the baptism when the bishop places their hands on the initiate to signify their reception of the Spirit.[157] Jesus' baptism is a sign of his dependence on the Spirit. Jesus' Spirit dependent ministry is seen by the various charisms he received to fulfill his mission, these include healing, prophesy, and other kinds of miracles.[158] To move Christian initiation away from this moment and towards Jesus' redemptive death is to distance a Christian's ministry from the charisms imparted by the Spirit. McDonnell places Chrysostom within an initiation tradition which moves away from charismatic elements associated with Jesus' ministry.

---

[153] McDonnell and Montague, *Christian Initiation and Baptism*, 227.
[154] McDonnell and Montague, *Christian Initiation and Baptism*, 231.
[155] McDonnell and Montague, *Christian Initiation and Baptism*, 232.
[156] McDonnell and Montague, *Christian Initiation and Baptism*, 237.
[157] McDonnell and Montague, *Christian Initiation and Baptism*, 235
[158] McDonnell and Montague, *Christian Initiation and Baptism*, 247.

Thus, Chrysostom's approach to the spiritual gifts is contextualized by their de-emphasis within the ministry of the Christian. For Chrysostom the spiritual gifts are not essential to the nature of Christian ministry. Understanding his de-emphasis of gifts helps to frame his approach to the gifts.

George T. Montague asks how much Chrysostom's terminological shift from using the term *charisma* to *dōrea* can reveal about his approach to the role of spiritual gifts in Christian initiation.[159] Montague argues Chrysostom handling of the spiritual gifts in the First Corinthians, Romans, and Ephesians series reveals that he is "a lecturer commenting on a historical text which is alien to the lives of his people."[160] Montague offers a possible explanation of this: Chrysostom, in contrast to earlier writers such as Tertullian, Origen, Hilary, and Cyril, "did not think that prophetic charisms were real possibilities for the life of the local church."[161] There were no examples in Chrysostom's contemporary church which could help illuminate Paul's text of First Corinthians. Thus, Chrysostom calls the topic of the spiritual gifts "very obscure."[162] Montague argues Paul never calls love a charism. However, Chrysostom does and holds it as the greatest spiritual gift. Montague argues that Chrysostom "does not seem to go far enough in distinguishing the charisms from the gift of love."[163] Chrysostom is more concerned with the visitation of the Spirit and his transforming effect, producing love and virtue in the Christian's life, than with what gifts the Spirit brings.[164] Montague's conclusion is that Chrysostom does not suggest that "the gifts of 1 Cor 12 are matters of expectation.

---

[159] McDonnell and Montague, *Christian Initiation and Baptism*, 282.
[160] McDonnell and Montague, *Christian Initiation and Baptism*, 285.
[161] McDonnell and Montague, *Christian Initiation and Baptism*, 285.
[162] McDonnell and Montague, *Christian Initiation and Baptism*, 286.
[163] McDonnell and Montague, *Christian Initiation and Baptism*, 288.
[164] McDonnell and Montague, *Christian Initiation and Baptism*, 288–89.

This want of any awareness that the charisms are available to the community seems to be confirmed by Chrysostom's use if *dōrea* instead of *charisma* in instructing the catechumens on what is to be expected in baptism."[165] The reason for this lack of charismatic expectation in baptism is that the apostolic signs were for unbelievers, as "a demonstration of the power of the gospel." Meanwhile God held greater esteem for Christians during Chrysostom's time "because we do not need them. Now that we are mature we believe without the signs, as becomes adults."[166] However, Chrysostom's rejection of the contemporary use of the gifs, Montague argues, does not consign them solely to the apostolic age. In a sense, Chrysostom wants his congregation to understand the gifts continue to be given, yet not to expect them because they are mature, and have no more need for them.[167] Montague calls Chrysostom's approach to the gifts "tortuous," but his study works in tandem with McDonnell's chapter on Chrysostom's baptismal tradition. Chrysostom is a part of a tradition that is moving away from the charismatic emphasis of the Christian faith.

In his thesis Chris Len de Wet explores how Chrysostom interprets the gifts of the Spirit as an Antiochene exegete.[168] He achieves this by studying four homilies in a series, homilies 29 through 32 on First Corinthians using an inductive-deductive method.[169] This hourglass approach, as he calls it, is a qualitative approach, situating Chrysostom's statements about the spiritual gifts within the broader context of

[165] McDonnell and Montague, *Christian Initiation and Baptism*, 290.
[166] McDonnell and Montague, *Christian Initiation and Baptism*, 292.
[167] McDonnell and Montague, *Christian Initiation and Baptism*, 293.
[168] de Wet, "Homilies of John Chrysostom on 1 Corinthians 12," 8.
[169] de Wet, "Homilies of John Chrysostom on 1 Corinthians 12," 8.

Antiochene exegesis.[170] Most relevant to this project is his analysis of *Homily 29* on First Corinthians.

His study of this homily is split into three sections: the historical context, the social background, and his response against hierocracy. First de Wet engages Chrysostom's exegesis. He argues that the homily is primarily concerned with the cessation of the gifts.[171] Chrysostom avoids a deep theological discussion on the gifts, de Wet argues, opting instead to explain why the gifts related to baptism.[172] Chrysostom believed that the Corinthians held to a hierocracy of the gifts and those with the gifts of tongues were the main cause of division in the community.[173]

Next, de Wet explores the relationship between Christian and Greek prophets to discern the nature of prophecy. For Chrysostom, true prophecy is shown in two ways, first it accurately predicts the future, and second, the conduct of the prophet is neither mad nor raving, but controlled and meek.[174] Returning to the argument on hierocracy, de Wet finds three arguments from Chrysostom. The first is that the Giver is greater than the gift. Here, Chrysostom argues from a trinitarian perspective: the unity of the Trinity suggests a unity among the gifts.[175] The second argument is how Paul's discussion of the gifts is meant to heal the Corinthians' wounds, which were caused by thinking there were hierarchies.[176] The last argument is that Chrysostom uses the analogy of the rich and the poor to highlight the problem of the gifts. There are spiritual riches and material

[170] de Wet, "Homilies of John Chrysostom on 1 Corinthians 12," 30.
[171] de Wet, "Homilies of John Chrysostom on 1 Corinthians 12," 65.
[172] de Wet, "Homilies of John Chrysostom on 1 Corinthians 12," 70.
[173] de Wet, "Homilies of John Chrysostom on 1 Corinthians 12," 71.
[174] de Wet, "Homilies of John Chrysostom on 1 Corinthians 12," 74–76.
[175] de Wet, "Homilies of John Chrysostom on 1 Corinthians 12," 81–82.
[176] de Wet, "Homilies of John Chrysostom on 1 Corinthians 12," 88.

riches, but God is the giver of both.[177] The mystery of how they are distributed works in the same way, so the believer should accept their spiritual gift as the will of God.[178]

Chris Len de Wet follows his thesis with an article on Chrysostom's exegesis of spiritual gifts. His goal is to discuss what each gift is supposed to be with consideration to Chrysostom's Antiochene exegesis.[179] He compares Chrysostom's understanding with those of modern Biblical commentators. Some gifts, such as apostles, prophets, and teachers, are embodied in persons and not actions. The outcome of these gifts is the edification of the assembly. The gifts of teaching and prophecy are similar, both speak in the Spirit, but teaching includes an additional human element in presenting information to others.[180] Other gifts, such as miracles and healings are actions, which people may perform.[181] Chrysostom interprets the gift of administration as the gift of patronage, which helps the poor and supports the weak through generosity.[182] Love is not comparable to the other gifts, it is the glue which holds all things together. The problems in the Corinthian assembly come from a lack of love, and it is love that would mend their schisms.[183]

Constantine Kleanthous argues in his thesis that the gifts given to the church as a dowry.[184] These are given through the sacrament of baptism but are given as added gifts to the cleansing work of the bath.[185] The greatest gift received during baptism is the

---

[177] de Wet, "Homilies of John Chrysostom on 1 Corinthians 12," 98.
[178] de Wet, "Homilies of John Chrysostom on 1 Corinthians 12," 101.
[179] de Wet, "John Chrysostom's Exegesis on the Resurrection," 105.
[180] de Wet, "John Chrysostom's Exegesis on the Resurrection," 109.
[181] de Wet, "John Chrysostom's Exegesis on the Resurrection," 109–110.
[182] de Wet, "John Chrysostom's Exegesis on the Resurrection," 110–11.
[183] de Wet, "John Chrysostom's Exegesis on the Resurrection," 113.
[184] Kleanthous, "Chrysostom's Doctrine of Baptism," 29.
[185] Kleanthous, "Chrysostom's Doctrine of Baptism," 29.

Holy Spirit himself, who comes upon the person through the hands of the bishop.[186] Baptism and the new birth of a person in Christ are each a gift "of divine philanthropy."[187] The Spirit gives the Christian, through baptism, the "gift of sonship" so they will have boldness in God's presence.[188] It is the gift of salvation through faith, and "the possession of God as a Father, and the participation of everyone in the same grace," which functions as the most important of all gifts.[189] As a sign of these greater gifts, the charismatic gifts are donated to Christians as signs of all the greater gifts they have received.[190] These gifts, given by the Comforter, exist to comfort, or benefit the community of the church.[191] These gifts are not the sanctifying work of the Spirit, but are signs of that work, for it is the active work of the Spirit who enlightens and cleanses the soul "completely from any dirt, but also fills it with its breath and holiness."[192]

This Project's Thesis

This study explores Chrysostom's theology on the spiritual gifts and how he adapts it as a topic as he preaches to his audience. Thus, this study explores how Chrysostom combines his exegesis of the text and his paraenesis for the audience to build a context for understanding the topic of spiritual gifts. The thesis of this dissertation is that, for Chrysostom, the spiritual gifts are used by the Holy Spirit to demonstrate the newfound friendship that exists between Christians and God through Christ's work. They are given to Christians to help them step into a deifying life in God. The gifts act as a kind of

---

[186] Kleanthous, "Chrysostom's Doctrine of Baptism," 53.
[187] Kleanthous, "Chrysostom's Doctrine of Baptism," 64.
[188] Kleanthous, "Chrysostom's Doctrine of Baptism," 68.
[189] Kleanthous, "Chrysostom's Doctrine of Baptism," 107.
[190] Kleanthous, "Chrysostom's Doctrine of Baptism," 108.
[191] Kleanthous, "Chrysostom's Doctrine of Baptism," 108–110.
[192] Kleanthous, "Chrysostom's Doctrine of Baptism," 128.

tutorial of a life of love, which is to live for the common benefit. The gifts are not an end in themselves but a means of progressing in the life of God.

Chrysostom's homilies on the spiritual gifts are concerned with correcting their abuse, which harmed the early church, and to contextualize their givenness within the now-existing salvation between them and God. He looks to turn his audience's thoughts "to God and the contemplation (θεωρία) of the divine on the one hand, and away from earthly concerns on the other."[193] The gifts were misused because of the desire to have honour in the present life, which causes a reaction of grief and envy in those who did not have the same gifts. Chrysostom argues that in wanting honour, people become slaves to the present world.[194]

Chrysostom preaches on the gifts to heal his audience of these diseases: pride and the desire for honour. Furthermore, he addresses how the gifts show the Holy Spirit's friendship and pastoral care towards Christians. Christians must have an appropriate response to the Spirit's work. They ought to imitate the Spirit's friendship and care for each other. In the same way the Holy Spirit gives consideration and *synkatabasis* ("adaptation") to the Christian in his gift-giving, the Christian in turn must treat others with the same consideration and *synkatabasis* in their gift-use. The Christians with the gift of foreign speech thought themselves to be special, as above other Christians, and possessing the gift gave them permission to be self-seeking and self-promoting at the expense of being concerned for the other Christians. Being focused on their own gifts, they neglected the experience of other Christians surrounding them. They were unaware of how they were hurting these other Christians. Thus, by being absorbed in their own

[193] Cook, "Preaching and Christianization," 125.
[194] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:9:18. (F 2:363).

gifts, Christians were unable to use those gifts to help others. Chrysostom considers this a kind of theft. Using the Corinthian assembly as an analogue for his own congregation, Chrysostom uses Paul's address on the spiritual gifts to show how the clergy and laity are infected with the same disease, but in a different context.

This project has some overlap with Chris Len de Wet's thesis as both studies will cover *Homily* 29. He argues that Chrysostom interprets the charismata as a "typical Antiochene exegete," and that his methodology reflects that goal. He uses an inductive-deductive method where "each homily is examined in light of its contents, with specific reference to certain traits typical of Antiochene exegesis, such as sensitivity to history, social- and cultural customs, as well as to the grammar and rhetoric of, in this instance, Paul the Apostle." [195] The end result of his study shows how "the homilies depict an insightful image on how the Antiochene exegetical school viewed the charismata, which in turn, also provides valuable insights for modern interpreters."[196] This study, for the most part, is not going to situate Chrysostom within an Antiochene context. This study is concerned with examining how Chrysostom integrates the topic of spiritual gifts into his pastoral goals during his homilies. As such, this study does not examine the homilies as to their correlation to Antiochene exegetical categories, but it looks at the homilies as independent entities, for their inner connections and parallels. It asks how *Homily* 29 functions as a unit and how its parts correspond to each other so as to give a clearer understanding of how this homily functions.

[195] de Wet, "Homilies of John Chrysostom on 1 Corinthians 12," 8.
[196] de Wet, "Homilies of John Chrysostom on 1 Corinthians 12," 9.

Major studies on Chrysostom's homiletics have been released since de Wet's thesis, such as research done by Rylaarsdam,[197] Miller,[198] Leyerle,[199] and Laird, who all have contributed major developments to an understanding of Chrysostom's thought.[200] This project will supply an updated look at the topic of spiritual gifts from within Chrysostom's thought. Instead of being concerned over the gifts' continuation or cessation, this study looks at how Chrysostom mingles the topic with pastoral concerns: how people with fewer gifts envy those with more, believing more gifts shows a greater blessing from God. A study like this one will help advance the study of Chrysostom's theology of the gifts without forcing him to conform to modern, Western paradigms. Any examination of Chrysostom's theology, from within its homiletic context, needs to take seriously the perspective that life and practice are key contributors to Chrysostom's overall thought. The way Chrysostom applies the topic of spiritual gifts to the Christian life is important to correctly summarizing his theology on this topic.

Chapter 2 will outline the method used for this dissertation along with a history of homiletic interpretation. Chapter 3 will analyze the structure of *Hom. 1 Cor.* 29 while Chapter 4 will do the same for *Hom. 1 Cor.* 35. This study of the text will produce a structural outline of the homilies and will cover the content of the text in detail and how they interact and relate within the wider context of the homily. Chapter 5 will examine how Chrysostom attaches an epiphanous quality to the gifts and how the gifts ought to draw Christians into a beneficial relationship with each other. Christians should have gratitude for the gifts the Spirit has given them and not envy Christians who have

---

[197] Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*.
[198] Miller, *Chrysostom's Devil*.
[199] Leyerle, *Narrative Shape of Emotion*.
[200] Laird, *Mindset, Moral Choice*.

different gifts. Chapter 6 will show how Chrysostom uses spiritual gifts to speak to the responsibility of the clergy towards the church. Gifts are not used for personal advantage; rather, they illustrate the pastoral rule of the church to help others. Chapter 7 will combine the theology from both homilies and present Chrysostom's theology on Spiritual gifts as manifestations of the Holy Spirit. The Spirit draws Christians living as imitations of God. This life of virtue requires Christians to receive God's generous grace and to reciprocate it towards others. The study will end with a summary of the project followed by two appendixes. Appendix 1 offers a translation of *Hom. 1 Cor.* 29 while Appendix 2 offers a translation of *Hom. 1 Cor.* 35.

CHAPTER 2: METHODOLOGY

Chrysostom's vast corpus of more than eight hundred homilies makes the study of his theology an immense challenge. Panayiotis Papageorgiou offers one approach to the study of Chrysostom's theology within his homilies. His study is a comprehensive look at Chrysostom's thirty-two exegetical homilies on the book of Romans. He argues that previous studies on Chrysostom's homilies were preoccupied by specific exegetical problems, themes of interest, or specific sections of the work.[1] He evaluates the entire homiletic series on Romans and compiles the various theological themes and presents them "as a unified whole to the greatest extent possible" to provide a fuller portrait of Chrysostom's theological contribution to the church.[2]

Another approach is taken by Geert Roskam who calls for "in-depth case studies of individual homilies."[3] His study looks at preacher-audience interactions. Previous studies compile a careful selection of key passages how Chrysostom deals with his listeners. He cautions that despite its contribution such an approach can be "fairly arbitrary," and almost never considered "the specific context in which John makes his comments."[4] The result from such surveys is "an intelligent collection of isolated

[1] Papageorgiou, "Theological Analysis," 1.
[2] Papageorgiou, "Theological Analysis," 4.
[3] Roskam, "Emancipatory Preaching," 178.
[4] Roskam, "Emancipatory Preaching," 177–78.

passages presented in a framework that is structured *a posteriori*. To a certain extent, they ignore John's own exegetical rule to bear in mind the authorial goal (σκοπός), and they insufficiently examine to what extent these passages remain relevant beyond their immediate context."[5] His method is to look at preacher-audience passages within the broader context of the homily where they occur. He argues that "What we need, in other words, is in-depth case studies of individual homilies."[6]

Papageorgiou and Roskam offer complementary approaches to Chrysostom's corpus. This project will adapt Roskam's approach to Chrysostom's homilies. While Papageorgiou's method is useful for surveying various theological themes across a homiletic series, it is not efficient for evaluating only one theological theme. Roskam's approach is better for evaluating a single theological theme within Chrysostom's corpus as it will provide case-studies for those homilies which cover it. This dissertation will use Roskam's call for in-depth study of individual homilies to explore two homilies that cover his exegesis of spiritual gifts and show how those passages remain relevant within the broader homiletic context in which they occur. To accomplish this task this project will be evaluating Chrysostom's homily for its structure and theme. Then his exegesis of spiritual gifts will be situated within those homiletic aspects.

Homiletic Structure

Henry Toczydlowski's thesis is an early study on Chrysostom's homiletic structure. A homily generally can be divided into two larger parts. He explains, "The argumentation forms one-half the body of the homily. This is the exposition, paraphrasing, and

[5] Roskam, "Emancipatory Preaching," 178.
[6] Roskam, "Emancipatory Preaching," 178.

explaining the text. The second half, because it is a half, can hardly be called a peroration. It consists in making the application of what has been explained to the lives of the hearers."[7] The major sections of Chrysostom's homilies can be considered to have up to seven parts in their construction. Toczydlowski argues:

> Every successful speech, sacred or profane, is built up of the following parts: (1) An Introduction or Exordium—the speaker introduces himself or his subject to the audience; (2) Narration or Explanation—he narrates certain facts which the audience must know or explains his position; (3) The Proposition—declared or implied; (4) The Argumentation or Proofs—these many be preceded by an outline with the arguments clearly divided from each other, and may be followed by a recapitulation; (5) The Pathetic—stirring the passions; (6) The Refutation—answering any remaining objections or difficulties before concluding; (7) The conclusion or Peroration.[8]

Yet, the identification of these parts is not rigid because, as Toczydlowski notes, "all these parts may occur, but they need not all occur. Nor need they occur in the order given."[9] At minimum, "the preacher has but to announce the section to be explained and, if he explains the text and makes a suitable application, his homily perforce has a degree of unity."[10]

For Toczydlowski, the preacher has a difficult tax on their ingenuity: "His great problem is to make the moral lesson follow from the text he has belaboured."[11] Often the preacher must bridge two seemingly separate topics and combine them meaningfully to the congregation. He argues that the preacher must show how the separate topics relate. An effective way of achieving this is through "the use of connectives: words, phrases, and clauses. Even whole paragraphs may be necessary to make transitions when a

---

[7] Toczydlowski, "Analysis of the Rhetoric of St. John Chrysostom," 52.
[8] Toczydlowski, "Analysis of the Rhetoric of St. John Chrysostom," 48.
[9] Toczydlowski, "Analysis of the Rhetoric of St. John Chrysostom," 48–49.
[10] Toczydlowski, "Analysis of the Rhetoric of St. John Chrysostom," 57.
[11] Toczydlowski, "Analysis of the Rhetoric of St. John Chrysostom," 61.

mental gap has to be filled so the mind may ride smoothly from one idea to another."[12] Toczydlowski gives an example of how Chrysostom achieves this. In one sermon Chrysostom compares the indifference of Jerusalem towards the birth of Christ with Antioch's passion for the theater. Toczydlowski writes:

> He does this through the following steps: First, he contrasts the coldness of the Jews to the fire of the Wisemen, and our coldness to things spiritual with the fire of St. Paul and the first Christians. Then he points out that we need to be warmed by the tears and compunction after the example of Anna, St. Paul, Our Lord, and the Saints. Not that Christianity is opposed to laughter, but only immoderate laughter because this dissipates the mind, which in turn leads to weakness and sensuality, and these are at once the causes and effects of the theatre where the jokes are coarse and the sights worse. All of which leads to the grossest immorality.[13]

Anatole Moulard argues that Chrysostom's exegetical homilies are often constructed using a two-part structure, "un exposé exégétique et dogmatique, puis un exhortation morale."[14] His homilies "rarement construite autour d'un seul problème méthodiquement discuté."[15] Chrysostom is not held prisoner by rhetorical constraints and forms; rather, "Il dit simplement tout ce qu'il juge devoir dire, dans l'ordre qui lui semble avantageux, glissant sur les idées secondaires, insistent sur les plue importantes, sans se sourcier de compre le bel équilibre des parties. Le tout est de faire du bien aux auditeurs."[16] Moulard concludes that "C'est pourquoi, quand nous disons que l'enseignement homilétique de Jean n'a rien de thématique, il faut bien entendre cela.

---

[12] Toczydlowski, "Analysis of the Rhetoric of St. John Chrysostom," 61.

[13] Toczydlowski, "Analysis of the Rhetoric of St. John Chrysostom," 62.

[14] Moulard, *Saint Jean Chrysostome*, 62. "an exegetical and dogmatic exposition plus a moral exhortation."

[15] Moulard, *Saint Jean Chrysostome*, 62. ". . . rarely built around a single problem methodically discussed."

[16] Moulard, *Saint Jean Chrysostome*, 62. "He simply says everything he thinks should be said, in the order that seems to him advantageous, slipping on the secondary ideas, insisting on the most important, without worrying about understanding the beautiful balance of the parts. The whole thing is to do good to the listeners."

Du point de vue de la forme, c'est vrai de la plupart des sermons, mais non du point de vue de l'action practique."[17]

Pierre Molinié argues the bipartition of Chrysostom's homilies into a separate exegesis and application needs nuance. He argues that there can be an absence "of a clear boundary between one part and the other; second, because the so-called parenetic part provides a place of exegesis in its own right; lastly, because in some cases the two parts are intertwined and thereby indistinct."[18] He shows how Chrysostom's exegesis of a biblical text includes both moral and spiritual comments. Chrysostom often "engages his audience using the imperatives and fictional dialogues typical of diatribe style." The use of such exhortations "rarely occur in exegetical commentaries."[19] Chrysostom will also use the biblical text in a variety of exegetical ways in his paraenetic section. He will bring multiple verses together so that they "receive a theological insight by being brought together as a full dossier" on whatever topic he is speaking. This means the paraenesis provides "a true exegetical teaching."[20] Molinié argues there is a need for flexibility when approaching Chrysostom's homiletic structure.

Margaret Mitchell warns that Chrysostom does not search the biblical text solely for the main ideas of the text "as is the predominant characterization of western exegesis." Thus, "such a template should not be imposed upon Chrysostom's homilies; nor should his interpretation of any text be uncharacteristically systematized, or theological 'concepts' extracted from their own literary, historical, liturgical and

---

[17] Moulard, *Saint Jean Chrysostome*, 62. "This is why, when we say that the homiletical teaching of John has nothing thematic about it, we must understand that clearly. From the point of view of form this is true of most sermons, but not from the point of view of practical action."

[18] Molinié, "Hyphenation in John Chrysostom's Exegetical Homilies," 274–75.

[19] Molinié, "Hyphenation in John Chrysostom's Exegetical Homilies," 271, 278.

[20] Molinié, "Hyphenation in John Chrysostom's Exegetical Homilies," 274.

rhetorical contexts."[21] Zofia Latawiec notes how the rhetorical structure of Chrysostom's homilies has not received much attention by scholars. She argues an analysis of the rhetorical structure of Chrysostom's homilies can reveal how "relevant the rhetorical devices are to the appropriate understanding of the content of the homilies."[22]

Exegesis Section

Chrysostom's exegesis follows a typical Christian pattern to discern "the *hupothesis* of the book to be studied, or of the passage to be treated. Details of the text are then examined point by point."[23] This was done to "ensure that context and thrust were not lost under the mass of detailed commentary."[24] Elizabeth Clark argues further that intertextuality is important for Chrysostom's exegesis. She argues that "through such intertextual exegesis Scripture could be affirmed as self-interpreting, as if the interpreter played no role in the production of meaning, as if no conceptual cracks existed between the texts, and as if no political consequences attended the choice of intertexts. *Which* dominant texts control the interpretation of others was, in fact, fiercely contested."[25] Chrysostom differentiates his homilies from a school lesson by reading alternative versions of a verse; he will moralize the text, use intertextualities generously, and will break into "oratorical crescendos" to help stave off the crowd's boredom.[26]

One important element for Chrysostom's exegesis is the method of *theoria* ("insight"). Bertrand de Margerie argues *theoria* uses a Messianic lens to interpret the

---

[21] Mitchell, *The Heavenly Trumpet*, 19.
[22] Latawiec, "Rhetorical Structure of John Chrysostom," 57.
[23] Young, "Rhetorical Schools," 190.
[24] Young, "Rhetorical Schools," 190.
[25] Clark, "Reading Asceticism," 89.
[26] Hill, *Reading the Old Testament in Antioch*, 118–22.

scriptures.[27] He says, "Quand il ya *theoria*, aux yeux des premiers, l'auteur sacré vise tout d'abord un événement [sic] de l'histoire d'Israël et cet événement est figure d'une réalité messianique. Mais ces deux series d'objets, ordonnées l'une à l'autre comme le type à l'antitype, relèvent toutes deux du sens littéral que l'auteur humain avait en vue et qu'il 'intentionnait.'"[28] Richard Perhai expands the role of *theoria* for interpreting the New Testament as well. Antiochene exegesis "linked OT passages to Christ in the NT and made application to their readers."[29] Authors such as Theodore, Theodoret, and Chrysostom use this prophetic vision to maintain historical integrity of the text as well as using "typological exegesis" to draw out its deeper meaning.[30]

---

[27] de Margerie, *Les Pères Grecs et Orientaux*, 189.

[28] De Margerie, *Les Pères Grecs et Orientaux*, 189. "When there is *theoria*, in the eyes of the primitives, the sacred authors always aimed first for the event of Israel's history and this event is a figure of a Messianic reality. But these two series of objects, ordered one after another like type and antitype, reveal both the literal sense they saw and which they meant."

[29] Perhai, *Antiochene Theōria*, 205.

[30] Perhai*, Antiochene Theōria*, 208. Chrysostom is usually placed within the Antiochene exegetical tradition and is pitted against an Alexandrian exegetical tradition. Darren Stade ("Patristic Exegesis," 155–76) argues both approaches affirm deeper meanings to the scriptural text including literal and spiritual interpretations (167–68). Origen and other Alexandrian writers tried to minimize arbitrary allegorical interpretations by ensuring it was tied to the literary context of the text and agreed with other biblical passages (167–68). Robert Heine (*Origen*, 104–26) further argues that Origen's allegorical method relies upon a core assumption that all ideas accepted in the church must "harmonize with the traditional doctrines received from Jesus" (222). Origen was a main target of Antiochene writers like Diodore and Theodore. Martens ("Origen Against History," 635–56) evaluates their critique that Origen rejects the history of the text its literal meaning. However, Origen was one of the early writers "who distinguished between an 'historical' and a 'spiritual' interpretation of Scripture" (636). Origen maintained a policy when allegorizing "*to affirm* the historicity of the figures and events narrated in Scripture" (641), but he was also inconsistent as he would deny the historicity of the text on some occasions (636).

The allegorical interpretation was not meant to be arbitrary. Young (*Biblical Exegesis*, 161–85) argues the two traditions borrow from separate, though mutually interactive "approaches to texts" (170). Allegory was a typical method of "tracing doctrines, or universal truths, or metaphysical and psychological theories" (170). Meanwhile Antiochene typology was influenced by grammar and rhetorical schools and looked to "derive moral principles, useful instruction and ethical models from their study of literature" (170). Despite their difference she argues Antiochene *theoria* and Alexandrian *allegoria* "had much in common" (164). She argues modern views on Alexandrian allegory approaches it as out of tune with the Bible because [it] has no historical sense" (166). At the same time modern views on Antiochene typology treats it as working with "historical events with a family likeness" (166). This means the allegorical interpretation of a text must be done within a common tradition of Christian belief. Stade ("Patristic Exegesis," 155–76) concludes "in application, there was no substantive difference between Alexandrian allegorizations and Antiochene *theōria* because both derived from the Platonic goal of achieving a higher level of spirituality" (169). What differed was how this goal was reached. Young

Another feature of Chrysostom's exegesis is *akribeia* ("precision"). Robert Hill suggests that this term "sums up best his approach to scriptural exegesis."[31] It "marks the narrative and description to be found in the Scriptures, demanding, a like precision or care on our part by way of appropriate response to God speaking."[32] Chrysostom holds the conviction "that *every item in the text of Scripture is valuable* and therefore not to be 'passed over heedlessly.'"[33] To achieve this Chrysostom attempts to present "biblical passages as they were originally intended by their authors."[34] Frederic Chase lays out two rules Chrysostom follows to do this. The "first rule is put thus: 'We must not examine the words as bare words, else many absurdities will follow, nor must we investigate the language by itself, but we must mark the mind of the writer.'"[35] The second rule is "little more than a special application of the first. A close attention to the context will illuminate a difficult paragraph or phrase. 'Paul himself interprets his

---

(*Biblical Exegesis*, 161–85) shows how Chrysostom was against an allegorical exegesis that "shattered the narrative coherence of particular texts, and the Bible as a whole" (182). However, he was not against using allegory as a figure of speech, only that "the text should give some sign to the reader that the figure of speech was in play" (177).

Scholars have noticed some Alexandrian influences on Chrysostom. Bertrand de Margerie (*Les Pères Grecs et Orientaux*, 214–39) argues Chrysostom's heavy use of *synkatabasis* is an influence from Origen and Athanasius (1:217). David Rylaarsdam (*John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*, 22–30) expands upon that assessment and argues that Chrysostom uses *synkatabasis* far more than the Cappadocians who prefer other terms and that Chrysostom is influenced by both Alexandrian and Cappadocian thinkers (29). Grillmeier (*Christ in the Christian Tradition*, 1:334–338) argues Chrysostom has "a Christology which is very like that of the younger Cyril of Alexandrian and his model, Athanasius" (1:334). In fact, Chrysostom "is far more Alexandrine than Antiochene in his Christology" (1:338). Naidu (*Transformed in Christ*, 247–60) argues "In Chrysostom one sees elements of both Alexandrian and Antiochene traditions. The unitive aspects of his Christology, which are foundational to his soteriological thought, are consistent with the thought of Athanasius and later Alexandrians like Cyril" (258). His sacramental thought "also bears resemblance to the Alexandrian tradition" (258). His hermeneutic methodology is characteristically Antiochene and is similar to that of Theodore's. The ethical and moral emphases of Chrysostom's preaching are consistent with the Antiochene tradition and complement his Christology" (258). Chrysostom's Christology, he argues, "can be cited as evidence that these two parallel traditions overlapped (259). Rather than being two separate traditions, the Antiochene and Alexandrian traditions were "trying to approximate what they commonly and uniquely maintained" (259).

[31] Hill, "Akribeia," 32.

[32] Hill, "Akribeia," 32.

[33] Hill, "Akribeia," 33.

[34] Nassif, "Antiochene Θεωρία in John Chrysostom." 54.

[35] Chase, *Chrysostom: A Study*, 157.

meaning in the words which follow.'"[36] Chrysostom will also speak as the author to present their authorial intention. He "slips seamlessly from quoting Paul in the third person, to taking on his character and playing the role of Paul himself. One moment Paul is standing next to Chrysostom, the next the two have merged into one."[37] This approach to preaching is done to examine the author's words more closely.[38] Young argues that Chrysostom's approach to preaching is "no more historical or literal than Origen's allegory. It has its basis in the search for morals in literature characteristic of the rhetorical schools."[39] Thus, Chrysostom removes the time-gap between Paul's letters and his own congregation.[40]

Application Section

Anthony Guthrie evaluates the composition of the homily to understand Chrysostom's approach to exegesis and his understanding of a text. That is, the application helps reveal the exegetical understanding.[41] He argues, "Because the majority of applications came at or near the conclusions, his approach with the bodies was to explain and expand upon the biblical theme. In most cases Chrysostom's homilies took the form of a planned argumentation in which he gradually built a case toward the concluding

---

[36] Chase, *Chrysostom: A Study*, 159.

[37] Cook, "Preaching and Christianization," 83–84.

[38] Gibson, ("Libanius' *Progymnasmata*." 128–43) states the exercise of speaking as another person is an exercise in impersonation, "which was especially application to declamation and letter-writing, presents an imitation of a character speaking in an emotional situation" (136). Penella ("Libanius's *Declamations*," 107–27) says the practice of *ēthopoiia* made the student strive "to represent convincingly the character of the individual he was impersonating." Moreover, the student was "to maintain throughout "what is distinctive and appropriate to the person imagined as speaking and to the occasions" (120). Thus, there may be a connection between Chrysostom's performance as Paul and this rhetorical practice of *ēthopoiia*, a speech in character. Though not identical in its function, as Chrysostom's homilies are not preached while entirely within the Pauline character, their brief appearance may be his own spin on the genre.

[39] Young, "Rhetorical Schools," 192–93.

[40] Young, "Rhetorical Schools," 192.

[41] Guthrie, "Investigation into the Use of Application," 88.

application(s)."[42] One example Guthrie gives of this progression is from *Hom. Rom 24*, which covers Rom 13:11–14. He deduces that the theme of the sermon is the imminence of God's judgment. Guthrie comments, "Within the homily Chrysostom promoted the idea that his congregants were to engage in the battle for righteousness because the time for God's judgement was drawing closer."[43] Chrysostom "seemingly attempted to motivate his hearers into willing submission by explaining that wearing the armor of God was not a burden, but rather a joyous blessing. Being available for God's service would allow them to enjoy the best of God's blessings."[44] This is achieved through social application: drinking wine only in moderation and sex is to be conducted between a husband and wife.[45] Chrysostom further appeals to Christians to avoid "gluttony, harlotry, feasting without consideration for the poor, and concern for beautiful attire" due to wearing the armor of God. This is tied with the call to "shun the worldly distractions of the present life and strive to become more aware of the sinfulness of the present reality."[46] Banquets become the final topic for Chrysostom's sermon, for they provide great opportunity for adultery and revelry.[47] Guthrie's argument suggests the exegesis of the text is done with the application in mind; that it is not an attachment to the exegesis, but a core component of it.

Chrysostom uses Greek rhetorical elements in his applications. Chris Len de Wet and Hendrick F. Stander show how in *Homilies on John* 65 he uses an Aristotelian virtue-discourse against greed.[48] Chrysostom denounces greed, calling it bitter slavery, a

---

[42] Guthrie, "Investigation into the Use of Application," 88.
[43] Guthrie, "Investigation into the Use of Application," 99.
[44] Guthrie, "Investigation into the Use of Application," 100.
[45] Guthrie, "Investigation into the Use of Application," 101.
[46] Guthrie, "Investigation into the Use of Application," 101.
[47] Guthrie, "Investigation into the Use of Application," 102.
[48] de Wet and Stander, "John Chrysostom's Exegesis of the Anointing at Bethany," 144.

merciless tyrant, the beginning of all evils, a disease, and idolatry. He even uses the distinctly Aristotelian word θηριωδία ("brutality")[49] to help show how greed elicits neither "conscience nor friendship, neither fellowship nor salvation"—In fact, it removes virtues from humans.[50] Chrysostom's appropriation of Aristotelian thought is consistent with the inter-school philosophic context of Late Antiquity. Geert Roskam shows how a strong common property of many intellectual traditions, specifically Stoic thought, created a "a kind of philosophical *lingua franca* that could be used in different contexts and for different purposes."[51]

The examination of Chrysostom's homiletic structure is achieved by examining Chrysostom's statements, which function to highlight the transitions, arguments, and proofs of his homily. It looks to the functionality of Chrysostom's homily in the following ways: (1) Introduction: does Chrysostom carry material over from earlier homilies? Does Chrysostom set up a main argument for the homily? (2) Rhetoric: Does Chrysostom's use of rhetoric help clarify his arguments, or does it obscure it? (3) Exegesis: how is it arranged, argued, and structured; how does Chrysostom move from one exegetical argument to the next. (4) Application: How is it structured, and how does Chrysostom move from exegesis into the application?

The Homily's Theme

Henry Toczydlowski argues an important part of the homily is its climax, to which the homily progresses. He argues, "The climax or outcome is hinted at, but not given away

[49] LSJ, s.v. "θηριότης."
[50] de Wet and Stander, "John Chrysostom's Exegesis of the Anointing at Bethany," 144.
[51] Roskam, "Emancipatory Preaching," 183.

prematurely. There are also minor climaxes and strong points to a sermon as to a play."[52] This observation suggests there is a movement within Chrysostom's homilies. This aligns with Guthrie's observation noted above on the argumentative goals building towards the application. And Roskam argues Chrysostom will use exegetical parts of his homilies as hermeneutical keys for "better understanding of the moral part of his homilies."[53] The two parts, exegesis and application, are connected. Chrysostom does not reduce scripture to the service of a moralizing message. Instead, he looks to enrich his moral teaching by connecting it with "the scriptural perspective." He tries to "connect the words of the Bible more closely with the concrete, daily life and concerns of his listeners."[54] Chrysostom's homilies can have a theme, a central argument or moral message, which underlines its whole.[55] However, this connection is not always immediately obvious. While Chrysostom will sometimes present the theme of the homily early on, "more often, he leaves his audience to discover it by themselves through a process of trial and error, with clues that gradually contribute to the construction of a coherent theme . . . In some cases, the listener may even not have grasped the meaning of the Chrysostomian approach until he reaches the end of the homily!"[56] In cases where Chrysostom reveals the theme of his homily at its end, or climax, readers can analyze that homily for how it develops and foreshadows the revelation of that theme. Thus, a re-reading of the homily with an understanding of its progression will clarify the steps Chrysostom takes to build up that theme.

---

[52] Toczydlowski, "Analysis of the Rhetoric of St. John Chrysostom," 135.
[53] Roskam, "Emancipatory Preaching," 187.
[54] Roskam, "Emancipatory Preaching," 200.
[55] Harkness, "Imitation and Theme," 500.
[56] Molinié, "Hyphenation in John Chrysostom's Exegetical Homilies," 280–81.

Frances Young offers a different perspective. She argues that Chrysostom's application section often "abandons the text and develops a long exhortation on one of his favourite themes, the latter bearing precious little relation to the text or commentary preceding it. The themes are repeated over and over again."[57] Moreover Chrysostom has the habit of repeatedly speaking on the same topics for his application. Young categorizes Chrysostom's applications from the homiletic series on the Gospel of Matthew and shows how "he spoke on almsgiving forty times, poverty thirteen times, avarice over thirty times, and wealth wrongfully acquired or used about twenty times."[58] Together the general topic of wealth makes up a vast majority of his applications to the text.[59] This turn to wealth in his applications may be explained by his social context. One persistent issue in Antioch during Chrysostom's life was poverty.[60] Ashish Naidu argues, "The interpretation of Scripture severed from the devotional life would have been unthinkable, meaningless even."[61] The scriptural text had to be applied to the lives of the hearers and lived out.[62] Chrysostom's common use of wealth in his application connects scripture with the needs of the church. Chrysostom often points to almsgiving as one of the greatest applications of Christian virtue.[63] What this means is that

---

[57] Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 249.

[58] Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 249.

[59] Clapsis ("Dignity of the Poor," 55–87) surveys Chrysostom's corpus and shows how "he spoke forty times on almsgiving alone, some thirteen times on poverty, more than thirty times on avarice, and about twenty times against wrongly acquired and wrongly used wealth" (55).

[60] Clapsis, "Dignity of the Poor," 55.

[61] Naidu, *Transformed in Christ*, 78.

[62] Naidu, *Transformed in Christ*, 78.

[63] Sitzler, "Indigent and the Wealthy," 477. For other works on Chrysostom's focus on almsgiving see: Bae, "John Chrysostom on Almsgiving"; Allen, "Introduction"; Clapsis, "The Dignity of the Poor"; Karras, "Overcoming Greed"; Leyerle, "John Chrysostom on Almsgiving"; Mayer, "John Chrysostom on Poverty"; Holman, *Wealth and Poverty*; O'Brien, "Initiation, Chrysostom, and the Moral Life"; Dumitraşcu, "Poverty and Wealth"; Weaver, "Wealth and Poverty"; Young, *Biblical Exegesis*; Papageorgiou, "Theological Analysis"; Cook, "John Chrysostom's Therapy of the Soul"; Kalantzis, "Crumbs from the Table"; Miller, "Chrysostom's Monks"; Tonias, "Iconic Abraham as High Priest of Philanthropy."

Chrysostom's common use of wealth is not strictly a break with his exegesis of the biblical text. Jan H. Barkhuizen offers a different view of Chrysostom's homiletic structure. He argues it would be "an injustice to Chrysostom to define his exegetical homilies as exhibiting a disjointed structure with no systematic construction of thought."[64] He shows how some homilies do show a homiletic and thematic unity. Using Homily 50 on Matt 14:23–36 he gives one such example.[65] Barkhuizen argues Chrysostom develops multiple themes on this passage that make it a thematic unit. In the exegesis of the text Chrysostom develop three themes: searching for quietness in our prayers, endurance amidst trials and struggles, and drawing near to Christ with faith.[66] The ethical application of the homily has its own theme: almsgiving versus avarice.[67] These four themes are the argumentative center for this homily. Barkhuizen argues Chrysostom "has also succeeded in linking the section on Jesus' retiring to the mountain to pray with the storm, which the disciples were experiencing at the same time on the sea, by means of antithetical association of ideas: quietness in prayer as opposed to turmoils at sea."[68] And the storm at sea is linked with the healing miracles at Gennesaret through two themes "endurance amid turmoils, and approaching Christ with faith."[69] Thus, the individual parts of the text are linked together through their common themes.

The method used in this project will outline the structure, and with that outline it will look at how the homily advances its theme, both in the exegetical and application. It looks at whether Chrysostom tries to preserve his arguments from his exegesis into his

---

[64] Barkhuizen, "John Chrysostom, *Homily 50* on Matthew," 43.
[65] Barkhuizen, "John Chrysostom, *Homily 50* on Matthew," 43.
[66] Barkhuizen, "John Chrysostom, *Homily 50* on Matthew," 43–44.
[67] Barkhuizen, "John Chrysostom, *Homily 50* on Matthew," 50.
[68] Barkhuizen, "John Chrysostom, *Homily 50* on Matthew," 54.
[69] Barkhuizen, "John Chrysostom, *Homily 50* on Matthew," 55.

application section despite its change in topic, or, whether he drops the theme he developed in the exegetical section in favour of a new, disconnected theme. If it is found that the theme continues from the exegetical section, it explores how Chrysostom expands his theme. Does he parallel the content of the exegesis with the application? Does he recontextualize his exegesis by using moral exhortations? Does the application have any relevance to Chrysostom's theological thought?

Studying the theme in this way will produce a summary of how it progresses throughout the homily. It will show how Chrysostom hints at a theme in the introduction, how he develops it throughout the exegesis section, and how he expands upon it in the application section.

Conclusion

An understanding of Chrysostom's theology requires the homiletic context to first be studied. This will occur in two parts. The first is to construct an overview of all the homily's parts and to make an outline of the homily's structure. Secondly, this project will trace the theme(s) of the homily throughout its sections. The method used in this dissertation looks to do what Roskam has called for. It looks to place Chrysostom's theological reflection of the spiritual gifts within the contours of individual homilies. Specifically, *Hom. 1 Cor*. 29 and *Hom. 1 Cor*. 35. The steps taken to achieve this are as follows. First the homilies will be outlined. The sub-sectioning of Chrysostom's content will be found, breaking down where the introductory remarks are, what his major topics are, where they begin and end, and how Chrysostom transitions between these topics. Categorizing the homilies in this manner is done to outline their structure. Because Chrysostom preaches without giving away the major developments of his sermon, the

coherency of the separate topics can be difficult to find. With an outlined overview of the content of these homilies, they can be placed within the progression of the homily. This is the second step, to show whether the homily uses its sub-topics to develop a coherent theme within the homily. An outline of how the different sub-topics of the homily interact with its theme, or themes, supplies the backdrop, against which theological reflection is done. Studies on Chrysostom's theology ought to consider these elements as vital for assessing Chrysostom's thought. In regard to individual theological topics, Chrysostom's approach is not to create a systematic and comprehensive entry, but to engage with the texts supporting it to draw out lessons for Christians to follow and imitate.

This project now turns to an evaluation of the structure of both *Hom. 1 Cor.* 29 and *Hom. 1 Cor.* 35. The next chapter will examine the first of these homilies to outline its structure and give a brief explanation of its content.

CHAPTER 3: THE STRUCTURE OF HOMILY 29

This chapter contributes to an understanding of *Hom. 1 Cor*. 29 by creating a structure for the homily. A translation of this homily can be found in the first appendix at the end of this study. This outline departs from de Wet's assessment of the homily's structure in a few ways. First, de Wet approaches this homily as an example of Antiochene Exegesis and sees its structure as typical of an Antiochene approach to exegesis. This chapter does not attempt to situate Chrysostom's homiletic structure within a broader Antiochene tradition. Instead, this chapter highlights the structural features of the homily, such as the layout of the argumentation, the transitions, and identifies the homily's structural and thematic unity. Second, the introduction needs further clarification as Chrysostom approaches the topic of spiritual gifts in a nuanced way. He places the Spirit's gift-giving to Christians within the Spirit's pedagogy, and Chrysostom attempts to restore a community's mutual love, which was divided by the envy arising from the difference in gifts. This chapter presents the homily as having four major topical sections. The exegetical section of the homily covers two separate topics, which inform each other. The first being a comparison between Grecian oracles and Christian prophets. The second section addresses the envy and hurt caused by those with the gift of foreign speech. The application of this homily also has two separate topics. First, Chrysostom argues not all wealth is given by God, but rests within the Spirit's pedagogical purpose.

Some benefit from wealth, while others from poverty. In the second half of his application Chrysostom rebukes his audience for not adopting a Christian mindset. One insight de Wet offers is the importance of Trinitarian discourse within *Hom. 1 Cor*. 29. He examines Chrysostom's theological similarities with Athanasius and Theodoret.[1] His discussion looks to contribute to Chrysostom's placement within trinitarian discourse of the late fourth century. In contrast to de Wet's analysis, this study argues that Chrysostom is not primarily engaging in the wider Post-Nicene trinitarian discussion. Rather the passages about the Holy Spirit are better understood through references within the same homily.

Hom. 1 Cor. 29 is the first homily in this project. In this homily Chrysostom responds to remarks made by his congregation about the spiritual gifts and why they are no longer active in the Antiochene community. This homily establishes arguments, which Chrysostom will continue to develop in *Hom. 1 Cor*. 35. This homily has previously been studied by Chris Len de Wet. In his thesis he argues the text is divisible into three sections. The first of them introduces the contours of the biblical text, and in which Chrysostom discusses the nature of the Holy Spirit. de Wet also outlines the historical context of the gift of tongues and the schisms it caused. The second section forms a response to mantics and oracles,[2] differentiating them from Christian prophets. The third section argues against a hierocracy among the gifts. Finally, Chrysostom ends the homily with a discussion of wealth and poverty.[3] The transition statement is a sentence or paragraph, which signals the end of one topic within a homily and the

[1] de Wet, "John Chrysostom's Exegesis on the Resurrection," 81–82.

[2] de Wet, "Homilies of John Chrysostom on 1 Corinthians 12," 73. de Wet translates θεομάντεις as "mantic" throughout his thesis.

[3] de Wet, "John Chrysostom's Exegesis on the Resurrection," 64.

movement towards a new topic. Often, they are used to bridge the two topics together, showing their relation. In *Hom. 1 Cor*. 29 the application of the homily is not a social analogy, as de Wet interprets it, but as a parallel topic to the one of gifts. Chrysostom includes questions raised by members of the community as reasons for his choice of topics for this homily. Just as people wondered why they do not have the same gifts they ask why some are rich while others are poor. In creating an outline for this homily, this chapter will look to clarify the relationship between the homily's exegesis and its application sections.

Section 1: Chrysostom's Exegesis of 1 Cor 12:1–11

To create an outline for the homily, this chapter specifies the function of individual sentences as illustrating the homily's structure. Thus, to better pinpoint these features, this chapter will use the line numbering system that I used in the translation of the homilies. The opening of *Hom. 1 Cor.* 29 is from 1:1–1:21 and has three subsections. First, Chrysostom introduces the abuses and cessation of the spiritual gifts, but delays talking about their cessation (1:1–1:4). Second, Chrysostom introduces some history of the gifts and their abuse, which Paul attempts to correct and heal (1:5–1:18). Third, Paul introduces a second topic on clairvoyants and prophets (1:19–1:21). The first section of the exegesis is concerned with discerning true prophets from false ones, called oracles. It has two subsections. First, Chrysostom speaks to the history of the Oracle of Delphi and the manner in which Greek clairvoyants prophesied along with the suggestion that these are demonic and also slip into the congregation. He compares them with the manner in which Jewish Prophets prophesied (2:1–2:27). Second, Chrysostom argues the

confession of Jesus Christ as Lord is central for determining who is a true prophet and who is false (3:1–3:10).

The Homily's Introduction: 1:1–1:27

The text of *Hom. 1 Cor*. 29 starts with a Question-and-Answer approach to the Corinthian text. This is an essential dimension of Chrysostom exegesis, as he harnesses "the dynamic of exegetical traditions for the purposes of his own staged dialogue with the audience."[4] This homily uses such a formula to help clarify the goal of his argument, σκοπός, from the text.[5] Chrysostom uses the "ὑπόθεσις or *argumentum*" ("subject proposed for discussion")[6] of the homily to introduce "the basic subject matter and argument of the epistle, its historical background, the identity and character of the recipients, and the cause and purpose of Paul's letter."[7] Because the whole "literary field of the bible was conditioned according to various stages of moral pedagogy," the historical details of the text are placed in relationship to this goal of reforming the lives of the congregation.[8] Thus, as Adolf Ritter argues, it is "necessary to keep in mind to whom Chrysostom is speaking and what he is seeking to achieve, then the danger of making wrong deductions from rhetorical questions and exaggerations can be overcome."[9] In *Hom. 1 Cor*. *29* Chrysostom gives his intent for this homily, but it is

[4] Pomeroy, *Chrysostom as Exegete*, 34.
[5] Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*, 271.
[6] LSJ, s.v. "ὑπόθεσις."
[7] Mitchell, "Reading Rhetoric with Patristic Exegetes," 342–43.
[8] Pomeroy, *Chrysostom as Exegete*, 38.
[9] Ritter, "Between 'Theocracy' and 'Simple Life'," 175.

easy to misunderstand it. This section will look to deduce Chrysostom's intent for the homily as he presents it.[10]

Opening Lines: 1:1–1:4

Chrysostom starts by relating concerns made by the audience, "This subject is very unclear."[11] As Samuel Pomeroy points out, the terms "obscure" and "clear" are used in a technical sense, "pertaining to biblical exegesis," they are used to address exegetical difficulties in the text.[12] While in some cases Chrysostom uses the word "unclear" to concentrate on single issues within the text, here the unclearness is not produced from the text, but rather from the congregation. He says the difficulty of the passage "is really produced from our ignorance of the matter and then from the lack of their occurrences, which now no longer take place."[13] The text itself is not unclear. Rather, the difficulty in exegeting the passage lay in the congregation's ignorance of the phenomenon discussed.[14] In addition to the congregation's ignorance of the topic, Chrysostom argues for two other factors obscuring an understanding of this passage. The first of these is the

[10] Heath, ("John Chrysostom, Rhetoric and Galatians," 369–400) cautions against forcing a homily to only have a single σκοπος, and that "a text may have multiple functions simultaneously" and that a text can have multiple goals without subordinating any of them to an overarching aim (375).

[11] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:1:2 (F 2:349). Field's placement of the punctuation in this first sentence suggests it is its own statement: "Τουτο ἅπαν τὸ χωρίον σφόδρα ἐστιν· τὴν δὲ ἀσάφειαν…"

[12] Pomeroy, *Chrysostom as Exegete*, 57–58.

[13] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:1:2 (F 2:349).

[14] See de Wet, "Homilies of John Chrysostom on 1 Corinthians 12," 64–65 for a discussion on the meaning of the πνευματικῶν. Traditionally, the term πνευματικῶν is understood as spiritual people or spiritual gifts, see Thiselton, (*First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 909–12). Thiselton suggests a translation of "now about things that 'come from the Spirit.'" (910–11). However, Chrysostom uses πνευματικῶν more generally throughout *Hom. 1 Cor. 12*. In 2:1–2:2 Chrysostom uses πνευματικών as denoting the struggle of discerning between true and false prophets. This suggests the term has a broader application than spiritual people or gifts. Later Chrysostom contrasts πνευματικοῖς (spiritual matters) with σαρκοκοῖς (physical matters). However, Chrysostom does assume the spiritual gifts are part of the topic of πνευματικῶν. It is better to translate the term more generally in this homily to account for the various ways he uses it throughout this homily.

defect of the occurrences of the πνευματικῶν. The term for "lack" is ἔλλειψις.[15] Chris Len de Wet translates this sentence as "ignorance of the spiritual things referred to and their cessation–those things which did occur then but not anymore."[16] de Wet's translation follows the *NPNF* version closely.[17] This translation has influenced previous readings of this homily.[18] Its translation of ἔλλειψις into "cessation" deserves a reconsideration. The word denotes a "lacking," the opposite of an "excess."[19] Chrysostom is saying there are a lack of examples of πνευματικῶν from which to learn about this topic. Then, Chrysostom argues the occurrence of πνευματικῶν happened back in earlier times, but no longer takes place. This statement allows Chrysostom to use a Question-and-Answer format to express the purpose for this homily. The question arises, "And why do they not happen now?"[20] Chrysostom answers, "look again, even the cause of the unclearness has produced for us another question. For why do you suppose that they actually happened then, but now no longer?"[21] Chrysostom uses this formula to move away from addressing the cessation of spiritual activities, "let us delay this until a later time, and in the meantime let us lecture on the things occurring then."[22] He wants to look at why they occurred earlier in the church's history.

---

[15] LSJ, s.v. "ἔλλειψις."

[16] de Wet, "Homilies of John Chrysostom on 1 Corinthians 12," 102.

[17] Chrysostom, "To the Corinthians 29," *NPNF* 1/12:168.

[18] See Floris, "Chrysostom and the Charismata," 19; and Stephanou, "Charismata in the Early Church Fathers," 139.

[19] LSJ cites Pl.*Prt*.356a as a reference for ἔλλειψις. There Plato writes, "καὶ τίς ἄλλη ἀναξία ἡδονῇ πρὸς λύπην ἐστίν, ἀλλ' ἢ ὑπερβολὴ ἀλλήλων καὶ ἔλλειψις; ταῦτα δ' ἐστὶ μείζω τε καὶ σμικρότερα γιγνόμενα ἀλλήλων κεὶ πλείω καὶ ἐλάττω καὶ μᾶλλον καὶ ἧττον. . . ." (Pl.*Prt.*356a). The English citation, courteous of The Perseus Digital Library, reads, "What unworthiness can there be in pleasure as against pain, save an excess or defect of one compared with the other? That is, when one becomes greater and the other smaller, or when there are more on one side and fewer on the other, or here a greater degree and there a less" ("Plato, *Protagoras*" [n.d.], http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=urn:cts:greekLit:tlg0059.tlg022.perseus-grc1:356a).

[20] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:1:3 (F 2:349).

[21] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:1:3–4 (F 2:349).

[22] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:1:4 (F 2:349).

Introducing the First Topic: 1:5–1:18

Chrysostom uses historical details to explain why spiritual manifestations occurred in the past. He does this to help his audience understand the charismatic phenomena.[23] He specifies the reason for the gifts of the Spirit: "For since they were coming from idols, not knowing clearly, nor being brought up in the ancient writings, when they were baptized, they immediately received the Spirit. But they did not see the Spirit because it is invisible, and so the gift gave perceptible proof of that activity."[24] Chrysostom later remarks, "Indeed, for me, a believer, the one having the Spirit is visible from being baptized. But for the unbeliever this is nowhere made clear except from the miracles."[25] The gifts were given in the early church because the people coming to faith were ignorant of the religion, and did not know the scriptures, and so God gives them perceptible proof of his salvific activity. The gifts are this perceptible appearance of the Spirit. Chrysostom argues, "So this is what he calls it, saying 'but to each the appearing of the Spirit is given, for benefit,' naming the gift 'the appearing of the Spirit.'"[26] While there were many perceptible proofs, or signs, of having received the Spirit, and "they

---

[23] de Wet, ("Homilies of John Chrysostom on 1 Corinthians 12," 65–73) argues Chrysostom refers "to the events in Acts of non-Christians being baptized and suddenly spoke in tongues and some prophesied. To Chrysostom, the remarkable thing is that these people did not have any previous knowledge of the Christian faith" (70). However, no story in Acts depicts this statement made by Chrysostom. In Acts 2 Peter speaks to Jews and depends on the Old Testament for his Pentecost sermon. Acts 8 tells of the baptism of the Samaritans. Meier, ("Historical Jesus and the Historical Samaritans," 202–32) says the Samaritans accepted the Pentateuch to the exclusion of the Prophets and Writings (205). This acceptance of the Pentateuch makes them unlikely to be the group Chrysostom is speaking about. And Acts 10 shows Peter baptizing Cornelius, who is described as "an upright and God-fearing man, who is well spoken of by the whole Jewish nation" (Acts 10:22). Acts 19 tells of Paul baptizing disciples of John the Baptizer, who are neither idol-worshippers nor ignorant of the Biblical tradition. No baptism story from Acts reflects the people Chrysostom speaks of. He is probably speaking of Greek peoples in Corinth, who became Christian.

[24] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:1:6 (F 2:349).

[25] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:5:4 (F 2:356)

[26] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:1:7 (F 2:349).

had gifts too, some received fewer, others more," including gifts like waking the dead and driving demons away.[27] Chrysostom then states Paul's purpose for writing this text:

> But more than all was the gift of foreign speech among them, and this was responsible for the divisions among them, "not because of its own nature," he says, "but because of the foolish pride of the ones receiving it." For those who had more were exalted against them who had acquired fewer. And they again were grieved and were envious towards them who had more. But most of all they were grieved by those having the gift of foreign speech. And Paul proceeds to display this. Since, therefore, they received here a mortal wound, breaking off their love, he spends much effort in trying to restore it, for this also happened in Rome, but not like this.[28]

The words μείζονα "more" and ἐλάττονα "fewer" can be understood as "greater" and "lesser," as de Wet translates them.[29] Chrysostom seems to use the terms in a nuanced way, combining both meanings. With Chrysostom's later parallel between the gifts and material wealth, it makes sense to hint towards that disparity in riches within the disparity of the gifts. The envy and grief in the community comes from certain Christians boasting of their own gifts, which others did not have. This disparity may have created the presupposition that such gifts were greater, as de Wet argues.[30] The terms are used to reflect the disparity of the gifts from within the community. The conflict arises from the arrogance of those with gifts, and the envy of those without the gifts. The terms "more" and "fewer" reflect this disparity. Certainly, the gifts are not the prime cause of the conflict, rather it is the mindset, or γνώμη, of those who did or did not receive them.[31]

---

[27] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:1:9 (F 2:349).

[28] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:1:10–14 (F 2:349–350).

[29] LSJ, s.vv. "μέγᾱς," "ἐλάσσων."

[30] de Wet, "Homilies of John Chrysostom on 1 Corinthians 12," 71–72.

[31] Laird, (*Mindset, Moral Choice*, 31–41) argues the Corinthian division is not due to belief or doctrine, such as the belief in the hierocracy of the gifts as de Wet suggests, but rather Chrysostom lays "the blame for the schisms at Corinth to the division in γνώμη and not to differences of faith, that is of the understanding. This division in γνώμη, he charges, comes from the human love of rivalry and contention (ἀνθρωπίνην φιλονεικίαν). Chrysostom sees the issue as one of disposition and attitude, that is, of mindset

Introducing a Second Topic: 1:19–1:27

However, Chrysostom also brings in a third injury. He says, "And this was not their only disturbance, but there were even many oracles (μάντεις) in that place, as the city was more disposed to Grecian customs, and this with the other was upsetting and agitating them."[32] Rather than addressing the cessation or continuation of the gifts, Chrysostom starts his preaching on 1 Cor 12 by bringing up community questions about the topic, but he moves the conversation away from details about the gifts specifically, and towards the way people treated each other based on what gifts they had or did not have. Christians with certain gifts, especially the gift of foreign speech, looked down on others with arrogance. Christians who lacked gifts were envious towards those who had acquired them. Plus, there were Grecian oracles in the city and the community could not differentiate between the oracles and the prophets. Thus, Chrysostom stylizes his homily through a pastoral pedagogy, saying Paul wishes to restore the broken love and unity of the community by correcting the contention caused by its members.[33] Secondly, Paul, Chrysostom argues, wants to teach the community how to tell "who was the one really prophesying and who was deceiving."[34] He begins with the topic he introduces last, how to differentiate between oracles and prophets.

---

and not of intellect and doctrine. It is not enough to agree to a form of words. Only when unity of γνώμη is attained can it be said that true heartfelt harmony is present" (37–38).

[32] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:1:19 (F 2:350).

[33] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:1:14, 27 (F 2:350–51). See Benevich, "Spirit, Soul and Letter," 41–55) where he argues Chrysostom's exegesis is deeply pastoral, and "it is based on a presupposition that in this case St Paul was a teacher of morality, who correlated his words with the notions, abilities and weakness of his audience" (52) and often sought reconciliation between "offended and the offender" (52). Benevich's assessment of Chrysostom's exegesis helps clarify the approach in *Hom. 1 Cor*. 29. Chrysostom understands Paul as wanting to bring reconciliation to a divided community, and he understands Paul as addressing the weaknesses of the congregation (arrogance and envy) by bringing encouragement on this topic.

[34] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:41:22 (F 2:351).

First Part of Exegesis: Oracles and Prophets: 2:1–3:10

Before embarking on his talk about the gifts, Chrysostom makes a comparison between Grecian oracles and biblical prophets so the hearer can learn to distinguish between them.[35] He then expands his comparison by examining how demons do not confess Christ, but true prophets do.

Grecian Oracles Compared with Biblical Prophets: 2:1–2:27

Chrysostom attributes the Grecian oracular experience to demonic possession:[36]

> "In the idol's temple," he says, "if anyone is possessed by an unclear spirit and gives an oracle, he is just like someone being dragged into prison. He is being dragged away in chains by the spirit, not knowing what he says." For this is characteristic of oracles, to be driven out of the senses, to be under compulsion, to be thrusted out, to be torn asunder, to be dragged away as a raving lunatic.[37]

The prophet, however, is filled with the Holy Spirit and speaks "with self-controlled thought, and with moderation, and in stillness. He knows what he utters."[38] The Spirit, which causes the person to speak, is reflected in the conduct of the person while

---

[35] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:1:21–2:1 (F 2:350–51). de Wet's analysis of this section includes only a minor discussion of the demonic element. He argues Chrysostom highlights four major considerations: 1. The Role of the Human Faculties, 2. The Conduct of the Prophet and the Inspired Mantic, 3. The Individual Freedom of the Prophet, and 4. the Confession of the Prophet and the Volition of Invisible Beings. See, de Wet, "Homilies of John Chrysostom on 1 Corinthians 12," 73–79. His thesis was written prior to Samantha Miller's work on Chrysostom and demons, and thus his analysis requires an update.

[36] Miller argues Chrysostom sees demonic possession as the fault of the person. A demon can only possess a person if that individual allows it ("No Sympathy for the Devil," 123–29). Sin makes the human soul an inviting place for demons and prepares the soul for the demon (128). Demon-possessed individuals are to be pitied because they are unable to control themselves (127). In this passage, the demon possession occurs within the idol's temple. Thus, the intentional practice of idolatry invites the demon to possess the person. Later Chrysostom makes this more explicit in 29:2:14 (F 2:352) "the compulsion, which withholds the demon like slaves, and the act of violence, which is submitted to by those offering themselves to them once for all and become separated from their own mind."

[37] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:2:3–4 (F 2:351). Chrysostom is speaking as Paul.

[38] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:2:5 (F 2:351). It is no accident that the attributes of the prophet here will resurface later for the gift of tongues and prophesy. Chrysostom is setting up the resolution to the problem of those with the gift of foreign speech. They need self-control and moderation to avoid speaking without an interpreter. Likewise, the prophet knows what he utters, but the one with the gift of foreign speech does not. This places the one using the gift of foreign speech without an interpreter as closer to the Grecian oracle than to the prophet.

prophesying.[39] A further comparison is which person knows what they are saying. The Grecian oracle has no knowledge, but the biblical prophet knows what they are saying.

Chrysostom uses Plato[40] and Porphyry[41] to defend his depiction of Grecian oracles. Chrysostom often uses Greek accounts to portray his own arguments as more comprehensive and "advantageous for attaining virtue."[42] de Wet notes that Chrysostom uses the Grecian authors to give himself a rhetorical edge "by showing that not only believers would agree with Chrysostom, but even a great philosopher like Plato and the poets, and even a critic of the Christians, namely Porphyry."[43] His citations of these texts are similar to the rhetorical culture of Libanius, in which short excerpts are used instead of lengthy meditations on extended texts. [44] Here Chrysostom uses these texts to argue his perception of Grecian oracles follows along with how non-Christians understand them. With his depiction of the oracles established, he uses the Pythian as an example of how Grecian oracles are possessed by demons.[45] Chrysostom comments on the embarrassing nature of such an example, "for I am now compelled,[46] another of their

---

[39] See de Wet, "Homilies of John Chrysostom on 1 Corinthians 12," 74.

[40] See Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:2:11–13 (F 2:352). Chrysostom cites Plato, *Apol*, *Soc. C. 7.*, which says Ὥσπερ οἱ χρησμῳδοὶ καὶ οἱ θεομάντεις λέγουσι μὲν πολλὰ καὶ καλὰ, ἴσασι δὲ οὐδὲν ὧν λέγουσιν. "Even as the ones chanting oracles and being maddened by gods, they speak indeed many and excellent things, but they do not perceive what they are saying."

[41] Coleman-Norton ("St. Chrysostom's Use of the Greek Poets," 213–21) says this citation is "From Eusebius, who incorporated parts of Porphyry's treatise on oracles (which has now no independent existence) in his *Praeparatio evangelica* for refutation, we learn that these oracles were in the collection made by Porphyry (v. 9)" (216). The text is made of two statements, "Λύσατε λοιπὸν ἄωανκτα βροτὸς θεὸν οὐκέτι χωρεῖ καὶ πάλιν," and "Λύσατέ μοι στεφάνους, καὶ μεν πόδας ὕδατι λευκῷ Ῥάνατε, καὶ γραμμὰς ἀπαλείψατε, καὶ υε μολοῖμι." "Unbind me already, the strong god can hold mortal flesh no longer" and "unbind my wreaths and bathe my feet in clear water and wipe off these letters and let me go."

[42] Pomeroy, "John Chrysostom's *Timaeus* Quotations in Rhetorical Context," 465.

[43] de Wet, "Homilies of John Chrysostom on 1 Corinthians 12," 75.

[44] Pomeroy, "John Chrysostom's *Timaeus* Quotations in Rhetorical Context," 465.

[45] See de Wet, "Homilies of John Chrysostom on 1 Corinthians 12," 76. In footnote 168 de Wet mentions that Delphi was originally called Pytho and housed the priestess of Apollo, who was controlled by the Pythian spirit.

[46] This statement is both a pun and a signal that the inclusion of the Pythian is likely included through a "spur of the moment." Earlier Chrysostom said the demon holds the human as a slave through

disgraceful conducts which would be good to be omitted because it would be indecent of us to speak of such things, but in order to learn more clearly of their shame it is necessary to speak so that you may also here of their derangement and their great absurdity of making use of oracles."[47] After describing the way a demon enters the woman priestess,[48] Chrysostom remarks, "I know that you are ashamed and embarrassed hearing this, but they themselves even greatly boasted because of both this disgrace and this madness."[49] Chrysostom finds this illustration enough of a proof, and brings his homily back to the scriptural text with a concluding statement:

> Therefore, these and all such things Paul brings up when he said, 'You know that when you were foreigners, you were carried away to the voiceless idols.' And since he knew those he was discoursing with, he did not state everything with precision. He did not desire to annoy them but only to remind them, and to always lead them into reflection. He quickly departs from this hurrying himself to the proposed subject. [50]

ἀνάγκην, "compulsion," and now that Chrysostom is speaking of the demonic treatment of the human, he says δέ ἀναγκάζομαι, "but now I am compelled." A demon may compel a person to act shamefully, and now Chrysostom is compelled to openly talk about the shame of demonic possession.

[47] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:2:15 (F 2:352). Gregory Smith ("Myth of the Vaginal Soul," 199–225) argues there is not classical precedent for claiming the daemon enters the oracle of Apollo through the vagina. Rather, the first attestation of such an allegation comes from Origen (199). Thus, Chrysostom follows Origen and a "'dogmatized *Volksvorstellung*' of the mysterious process by which the Pythia was inspired" (200).

[48] Chrysostom comments "the Pythian herself, being some woman, was seated upon the three-footed seal of Apollo with risen legs, where thus a wicked spirit ascends from below and slips through a part of her genitals, filling the woman with frenzy, and she loosens her hair and begins to produce a Bacchic enthusiasm, foaming from the mouth and so she begins to utter her mad speech in her frenzy." *Ad Corinthios*, 29:2:16 (F 2:352).

[49] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:2:17 (F 2:352–3).

[50] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:2:18–19 (F 2:353). Thiselton, (*First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 912–27) includes many theories about the Greek of 1 Cor 12:2, especially the double use of ἄγω/ἀπάγω, ἤγεσθε ἀπαγομενοι. Among these is the understanding of people being caught up in religious festivals and parades (912). The theory Thiselton shares is that the citizens were literally caught up in pagan festivals and carried to the temples. Chrysostom's interpretation carries more demonic overtones. It is the demon who enslaves and brings the human to the temple as a spoil of war. Miller, ("No Sympathy for the Devil," 78–86) comments on Christian traditions about demons, stating that deceit is the demon's primary weapon, and "When a demon successfully deceives a person, she is under the demon's power and will be 'dragged' where the demon wishes, regardless of the person's wishes (85). Chrysostom implies that demons use their oracles to deceive people, leading them to their temples and shrines, "To take them as prisoners in chains and making their deceit altogether plausible." *Ad Corinthios*, 29:2:21 (F 2:353). Chrysostom describes the demon's deceit as making it seem the lifeless stone is alive (2:22). The demons wish to make themselves seem great in the eyes of the Greeks, and so exert control over them. The use of

Chrysostom continues to highlight the forcefulness of the demon's hold over humans, taking them as prisoners in chains, and they "fasten the people to the idols so that their own name might be written upon them."[51] He compares this demonic slavery to the biblical prophets. These acted "with quick comprehension and entire freedom, as was fitting." They "had power to speak or to not speak, for they were not seized with compulsion, but were honoured by their permission."[52] The enslavement of the Grecian oracles is compared with the freedom of the biblical prophet. Chrysostom makes this comparison clearer, "God did not push them forward with compulsion, but with counsel, recommendations, and warnings, not darkening their minds. For truly demons produce confusion, madness, and much gloom, but God illuminates and astutely teaches needful things."[53] The argument Chrysostom makes is that God treats his prophets with respect

---

festivals may play a part in this demonic deception scheme, but Chrysostom does not refer to pagan festivals in this homily.

[51] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:2:22 (F 2:353).

[52] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:2:23–24 (F 2:353). de Wet, ("Homilies of John Chrysostom on 1 Corinthians 12," 77–79) comments on how "True prophecy is a Spirit-driven endeavour, with no human attributes. This may be a weakness in Chrysostom's argument, precisely because it would be impossible to have a total absence of the human faculties" (79). de Wet is linking the practice of Biblical prophecy with an earlier statement made by Chrysostom about the πνευματικῶν, "Calling the sign 'spiritual' because they certainly are the works of the Spirit alone, nothing from humans contributes at all to the working of such miracles." *Ad Corinthios*, 29:2:1 (F 2:351). However, Chrysostom is making the comparison between the demonic oppression of the human and the Divine *synkatabasis* toward the human. God explicitly does not "push them forward with compulsion," but gives the human prophet "counsel, recommendations, and warnings." In other words, God respects and accommodates the human's will and approach to taking divine matters and communicating them to others. Rather than an absence of the human faculties, Chrysostom is stating that God honours and respects the human faculties and allows the person to use them in the practice of the prophesying.

[53] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:2:26–27 (F 2:353). Rylaarsdam, (*John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*, 31–37) states how Chrysostom places God as a teacher, who "reveals the truth about all things and his powers of pedagogy are unmatched" (36). This is what Chrysostom is explicitly saying at the end of this section in his homily. The emphasis, which Chrysostom places upon teaching within the spiritual gifts is connected to God's ability as a teacher, as showing a core aspect of who God is. God is an excellent teacher, and his gifts take part in the excellence of his pedagogy. Whereas, by comparison, the demons cannot make coherence, but produce only "confusion, madness, and much gloom." The demons have no pedagogy; they only destroy, deceive, and mislead. It is noteworthy, then, that the madness and confusion, which the demons produce, is later reused when addressing the abuse of the gift of foreign speech. See *Ad Corinthios*, 36:2:14 (F 2:451) where when the gift of foreign speech is used, it results in the Christians being ridiculed as 'mad.' And *Ad Corinthios*, 35:6:8 (F 2:440) where the use of the gift of

and care. God shows concern for the individuality of the prophet, their personhood, and grants them the prophetic gift without violating them as humans. Demons, however, show no respect to the Grecian oracle, and enslave them, hurting and violating their personhood.

Confession of Christ: 3:1–3:10

Chrysostom uses a transition statement to pivot from the first comparison between oracles and prophets into the second comparison. He says, "Therefore, this is the first difference between oracles and prophets, but a second and different one is what he states next, saying, 'so I give you insight, that no one speaking in the Spirit of God says that Jesus is cursed.' And then another, 'and no one is able to say that Jesus is LORD except by the Holy Spirit.'"[54] Chrysostom uses this statement to help his audience stay with him as he moves into the next subject, who is it who can confess Jesus as Lord.[55] This discussion is continued through a rhetorical technique of *hypophora*. He says, "What then, has no demon ever called on God'? Do not the demons say, 'We know who you are, the Son of God'? Did they not say of Paul, These humans are slaves of the Highest God'?"[56] These questions object to the previous statement that no one can call Jesus is Lord except by the Holy Spirit. Chrysostom answers, "They were the ones being flogged

---

foreign speech does not teach the layperson, "but that one does not understand, nor what is being said. He stands without receiving any benefit." Chrysostom is not calling the use of foreign speech without an interpreter a 'demonic' use, but he creates the parallels, which allow for that comparison to be made.

[54] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:3:1–2 (F 2:353).

[55] Chrysostom allows for a brief interjection that his audience may have, "what of the catechumen," who "are calling on his name, but who are deprived of the Spirit?" *Ad Corinthios*, 29:3:5 (F 2:353–54). Due to their not being baptized, they have not received the Spirit in Chrysostom's conception. However, he waves away this question, "but this present argument is not about those people." What is interesting is his statement, "for there were no catechumens then, but it was about believers and unbelievers." It is unclear when catechumens first appear. Chrysostom leaves this historical comment unaddressed in this homily.

[56] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:3:6 (F 2:354).

and the ones being under compulsion, and they never spoke willingly, and never without being whipped."[57] Now it is the demons who are enslaved by God and are compelled to proclaim Christ.

Chrysostom proceeds to clarify this argument further, saying that "it is proper here to inquire for what reason did the demons utter this and why Paul did censure them."[58] The reason for this is that Paul imitates Christ, who also silenced demons from speaking.[59] Moreover, demons spoke to deceive, "to take away the Apostle's honour and to persuade many to come to them. If it happened that way, they would easily appear trustworthy and would be able to bring things in from themselves."[60] Thus, "so that this might not happen, nor fraud to have its beginning he silences them when they speak the truth so that no one would pay attention to them and their lies, and generally to stop the hearers from haring the things they were saying."[61] God compels the demons to confess Christ, but both Christ and Paul censure them so they cannot use their compulsion to deceive the church into thinking they are sent from God.[62]

Chrysostom does not often conclude his arguments with a recap. Instead, he uses transition statements to move to his next argument. Here Chrysostom says, "Therefore,

---

[57] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:3:6 (F 2:354).

[58] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:3:7 (F 2:354).

[59] See Mitchell, *Heavenly Trumpet*, 396–401 for a more detailed study of Paul's imitation of Christ in Chrysostom's mind.

[60] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:3:9 (F 2:354). Chrysostom seems to backpedal on the reasons for which the demons praise Jesus as the Highest God. First, it is being they are being compelled and forced to say it, but then Chrysostom switches and emphasizes the demon's desire to deceive people and sneak into the movement Jesus started and to add their own element to it. Likely Chrysostom first imagines the demon's motive of sneaking into the Kingdom of God via deceit, but the demons are punished for these plans by being forced to confess Christ and then are silenced. Thus, instead of bringing false lies into the Kingdom, they are forced to profess the Lordship of Christ.

[61] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:3:10 (F 2:354).

[62] The dynamic between the demon being compelled by God, and the demon deceiving the church by means of that compulsion is not expanded upon.

he made oracles and prophets clear both from the first and second sign. Next, he lectures about wonders."[63]

Second Part of Exegesis: The Distribution & Dignity of the Gifts: 4:1–7:3

Chrysostom starts the second part of his exegesis by framing it within the author's intent. He "does not seek to interpret a text in itself as an artifact removed from its author but to explicate the text as an avenue into the mind and character of the author, as the author interacts with people for a particular pedagogical purpose."[64] In this section, Chrysostom shows the purpose for Paul's talk about spiritual gifts, saying, "Next, he lectures about wonders, not simply coming to the topic but to remove this disagreement and to persuade the ones having the fewer gifts not to grieve, and the ones having acquired more not to be excited."[65] This thesis statement is overlooked by scholarship on this issue.[66] Rather than giving a full, systematic treatment of spiritual gifts Chrysostom argues Paul is extending pastoral encouragement to those with fewer gifts. As a secondary goal, Paul warns those with more gifts not to be arrogant.[67]

---

[63] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:4:1 (F 2:354). Compare *Ad Corinthios*, 29:2:1 to 29:4:1, "Yet, for the meanwhile he begins the lecture of the oracles like this, saying…" with "There, he made oracles and prophets clear both from the first and second sign. Next he lectures about wonders…"

[64] Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*, 126–27.

[65] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:4:1 (F 2:354).

[66] de Wet, ("Homilies of John Chrysostom on 1 Corinthians 12," 79–84) comes the closest to acknowledging this thesis through his focus on the hierocracy of the gifts, and Chrysostom's desire to heal a schism, due to it (79).

[67] Margaret Mitchell, (*Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation*, 267–70) argues for a similar interpretation of the Pauline text as Chrysostom. She argues Paul urges the Corinthians to reconcile over the contention about spiritual gifts. "The pain of the 'unglorious' [sic] at feeling inferior to the 'glorious' should in fact be shared by the glorious, not inflicted upon them or rejoiced over. Likewise, the glory of the 'glorious' should also be shared by the 'unglorious,' for as members of the same body they too should rejoice because they are honored by the honor given to a fellow member. The members of the concordant body are united in both grief and joy, which is another *topos* in texts urging concord, often in conjunction with the body metaphor, as here in Paul's argument (269).

The Free Gift: 4:1–4:11

Chrysostom outlines the encouragements Paul gives to those with fewer gifts. "Therefore, he began like this, 'now there is a distribution of gifts, but the same Spirit.' And he first attends the ones having fewer gifts, who were grieving because of this."[68] Not content with citing the biblical text Chrysostom reframes the text,[69] "'What is the reason for which you are disheartened? Is it that you did not receive as much as another? But consider that it is a gift and not a debt, and you will be able to soothe your distress.' This is why he spoke frankly, 'now there are a distribution of gifts.'"[70] Chrysostom recalls the nature of the gift as free, and for the person to be thankful.[71] Chrysostom follows this by saying, "'And with this in mind, consider this,' he says, 'that even in being granted the smaller measure, from that you are deemed worthy to receive'."[72] The

---

[68] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:4:2 (F 2:354).

[69] Cook, ("Preaching and Christianization," 79–86) writes, "In commenting on Paul's epistles, for example, he may engage Paul directly in conversation, asking questions to elucidate his meaning: 'What are you saying? You established [Titus] on Crete, but now you summon him back again to yourself?' But he can go further even than this, taking on the very persona of Paul himself and re-enacting the apostle's message to his original audience: 'For I would not, he says [to Philemon], call him my child unless he were very useful. What I called Timothy, this I call also him.'

[70] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:4:3–4 (F 2:354). Verhoeff, ("More Desirable than Light Itself," 73–86) argues Chrysostom sees the gifts of grace as "bestowed upon the newly baptized and not just a future eschatological condition" (73). Regarding "the gift of the Spirit Chrysostom applies the convention that friendship is the basis of gift-giving" (78). The Spirit is giving gifts to friends and is not placing debts upon strangers. This discussion about the Spirit's gifts happens within the context of human-divine friendship having been previously established. God is showing goodwill to his friends in this gift-giving.

[71] Barclay, (*Paul and the Gift*, 24–38) surveys the Greco-Roman anthropology of gift-giving. A number of Chrysostom's arguments for a person's encouragement are founded on these anthropological understandings. Thanksgiving is part of gift-reciprocity by the one receiving the gift.

[72] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:4:6 (F 2:355). Barclay, (*Paul and the Gift*, 24–38) writes, "… the elite are given not financial but social rewards (*Eth*. *Nic*. 1123b16–24). It is in this connection that Aristotle speaks of 'worth' (ἡ ἀξία), a concept frequently applied to prestigious gifts and their return. Like Aristotle, the inscriptions often speak of 'fitting' honors, to those who are 'worthy' or 'deserving' of such public recognition. It is honour above all of which 'great men' are worthy (ἀξιόω, *Eth*. *Nic*. 1123b24), while recipients are careful to show 'fitting gratitude' (ἀξία χάρις) to those who have benefited the community (e.g., *SIG* 834). At the same time, donors are careful to seek out 'worthy' recipients of their benefactions: as Aristotle sees it, a generous person will give lavishly but certainly not indiscriminately (τοῖς τυχοῦσι), 'so he can give to the right people at the right time, where it is noble to do so' (*Eth*. *Nic*. 1120b3–4)" (33–34). Being called "worthy," for Chrysostom carries a soteriological nuance. Miller, (*Chrysostom's Devil*, 139–69) argues Chrysostom uses these terms with unparalleled frequency to refer to those who are rewarded the Kingdom of God or who are punished with Gehenna (162). Christ makes a person worthy through his atoning death on the cross. "Having been made worthy by Christ's action,

same honour is shared by both the person with more gifts and the one with fewer gifts because neither had a mere messenger give them their gift, but everyone received from the Spirit's free choice to give them a gift.[73]

The Gift is Work: 4:12–4:20

Chrysostom's next point is introduced in 4:12 when he says, "And again he calls this gift by another name, and consider this, he intends to encourage. And so, he says this, 'but there is a diversity of servants, but the same master.'"[74] The gift is also called work, which is referring to pastoral work. Thus, Chrysostom says, "'Why then do you grieve,' he says,' if another is called to far harder work, while you are spared?'"[75] Chrysostom's view is that those who have fewer gifts are spared from the pastoral office. Georgios Oikonomou argues it is the difference in gifts that distinguishes the clergy from the laity.[76] Chrysostom is part of the ascetic tradition and sees the promotion to the priesthood as an extraordinary burden and weight.[77] He sees how the Holy Spirit not

---

Chrysostom also insists that we act as those who have put on Christ" (163). Verhoeff, ("More Desirable than Light Itself," 1–21) argues Chrysostom envisions friendship to be "an essential category of his soteriology" (5). And that "Chrysostom's portrayal of divine-human friendship in terms of an economic exchange of gifts and obligations and asks to what extent Chrysostom perceives the human-divine relationship as a reciprocal bond of affection (21). In this homily, Chrysostom shows how the Spirit honours and confirmed a Christian's worth before God through the act of gift-giving. It is one of the confirmations of a person's salvation. Thus, a return of fitting gratitude is in order. The Spirit gives gifts to the church because Christ chose the right people to make worthy of receiving God's gifts.

[73] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:4:7 (F 2:355).

[74] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:4:12 (F 2:355).

[75] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:4:14 (F 2:355).

[76] Oikonomou, "ΚΛΗΡΙΚΟΙ ΚΑΙ ΛΑΪΚΟΙ," 48–49.

[77] Chrysostom, (*Six Books on the Priesthood*, 1:6, *NPNF* 1/9 33–38), writes "A report suddenly reaching us that we were about to be advanced to the dignity of the episcopate. As soon as I heard this rumor I was seized with alarm and perplexity: with alarm lest I should be made captive against my will, and perplexity, inquiring as I often did whence any such idea concerning us could have entered the minds of these men; for looking to myself I found nothing worthy of such an honor. But that noble youth having come to me privately, and having conferred with me about these things as if with one who was ignorant of the rumor, begged that we might in this instance also as formerly shape our action and our counsels the same way: for he would readily follow me whichever course I might pursue, whether I attempted flight or submitted to be captured" (35). Chrysostom tells of how he betrayed Basil, "But after a short time, when one who was to ordain us arrived, I kept myself concealed, but Basil, ignorant of this, was taken away on

calling someone into the priesthood is an encouragement because they avoid the burdens of the pastoral office.[78] Chrysostom supports his interpretation of the spiritual gifts as a call to hard work through intertextual links. Citing 2 Tim 1:6, 4:5, Rom 11:13, and Gal 2:8 he builds his case for linking God's gift-giving to the call to ministry. These passages help inform Chrysostom's interpretation of 1 Cor 12:5, "And a diversity of servants but the same master."[79] There are various servants, whether Peter or Paul, or whether someone is part of the clergy or a part of the laity.

Chrysostom also sees the diversity of servants as juxtaposed with the unity of the Godhead. Chrysostom argues, "Do you see how he shows there is no difference in the

---

another pretext, and made to take the yoke, hoping from the promises which I had made to him that I should certainly follow, or rather supposing that he was following me" (35). Chrysostom holds the priesthood to be a position of honour, but feels himself unworthy of such a role, and is afraid to take up the pastoral responsibilities. Another person exemplifying this tradition is Gregory Nazianzus, (*Oration II: In Defence*, *NPNF* 2/7 204–27) who writes about how he fled from his appointment to the priesthood, saying, "What then were my feelings and what was the reason of my disobedience? . . . In the next place, there came over me an eager longing for the blessings of calm and retirement, of which I had from the first been enamored to a higher degree, I imagine, than any other student of letters, and which amidst the greatest and most threatening dangers I had promised to God, and of which I had also had so much experience, that I was then upon its threshold, my longing having in consequence been greatly kindled, so that I could not submit to be thrust into the midst of a life of turmoil by an arbitrary act of oppression, and to be torn away by force from the holy sanctuary of such a life as this" (206). The ascetic life was considered as an easier life than the pastoral office. The practice of virtue was seen as easier than the guidance of other humans towards a virtuous life.

[78] Rapp, (*Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity*, 100–52) surveys the ascetic authority of Bishops in Late Antiquity, and writes, "Many monks expressed their fear of losing their spiritual gifts or slackening in their ascetic discipline if they assumed the concrete responsibilities of ecclesiastical office. They did not want to suffer the fate of Theodore of Sykeon and refused to even entertain the idea of receiving ordination. They were convinced, as Athanasius thinks Dracontius was, that 'the bishop's office is an occasion for sin' and 'from it comes opportunity for sinning'" (142–43). There is another tendency within the ascetic tradition that "leads to indifference to the prospect of ordination and, when it is offered, to its rejection" (143–44). There is an understanding that not everyone is called to the pastoral office, but everyone can live a life of virtue, the goal of the ascetic tradition. Moses is one exemplar whose ascetic authority "is manifest in his many virtues, especially meekness (*praotēs*), for which he became proverbial" (125). Moses is "set forth as a common example for all those who look to virtue" (126). The layperson could live a life of virtue and pursue the ascetic ideal as a layperson, while those who are elevated to the pastoral office face many dangers in pursuit of the same virtuous life. Thus, one's gifts acting as a preventative measure against elevation to the pastoral office is helpful because it distances a Christian from the dangers of the priesthood.

[79] In 4:10 Chrysostom cites 1 Cor 12:5 as Καὶ διαιρέσεις διακονιῶν εἰσιν, ὁ δὲ αὐτος κύριος. And in 4:12 he cites it as Διαιρέσεις δὲ διακονοιῶν εἰσιν, ὁ δὲ αὐτος κύριος. The change from καὶ to δὲ is probably only a stylistic choice.

gifts of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit? Not minimizing the natures, let that never be, but showing the equality of the natures."[80] Speaking as Paul Chrysostom says, "'For what the Spirit gives,' he says, 'this God also operates, this the Son also appoints and grants.' And indeed if it were less than that, or that less than this, he would not have set it down, nor would he have encouraged the one suffering like this."[81] The Holy Spirit's gifts carry with them the approval of both the Father and the Son.[82] As Oikonomou argues, the clergy and laity have different gifts, but not different honour.[83] He argues, τόσο οι κληρικοί όσο και οι λαϊκοί είναι εξίσου απαραίτητοι στην Εκκλησία και στη λατρεία και πρέπει να υπάρχει επίγνωση αμοιβαίος σεβασμός και αγάπη, ώστε "τὸ εἰς ἡμᾶς χάρισμα" και η "λογική λατρεία" να προσφέρονται εκ πολλών προσώπων, "ἐν ἑνί στόματι καὶ μιᾷ καρδίᾳ".[84] Both the laity and the clergy contribute to the diversity of servants within the church. Both are necessary and are given the same

---

[80] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:4:18 (F 2:355).

[81] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:4:19–20 (F 2:355–56).

[82] de Wet, ("Homilies of John Chrysostom on 1 Corinthians 12," 79–84) argues Paul uses a triadic formula, referring to Paul's use of same Spirit, same Lord, and same God, to imply "equality among the gifted against a hierocracy, as Chrysostom implies, then it must also imply equality among the members of the Godhead" (80). de Wet notes how some claimed "that the Holy Spirit was not divine. This was especially prevalent in Chrysostom's time, coming most notably from those who proclaimed subordinationism, especially found among the Arians. . . . If this was true, then a gift from the Spirit would be necessarily frowned upon in light of gifts from the Son and the Father" (80). There is a defense of the equality of the Godhead in this homily, but I do not think Chrysostom is intending to defend against Subordinationism in this homily. The reason for defending the Godhead's equality comes from another issue. Chrysostom previously argued, "For you surely are not able to say that the Spirit freely gave to them, but a messenger gave to you, for the Spirit gave it both to you and to them." *Ad Corinthios*, 29:4:7 (F 2:355). After this section Chrysostom argues a person receives the appearing of the Spirit "so that no one might say, 'so what if it is the same Lord, the same Spirit, and the same God if I am receiving less?" *Ad Corinthios*, 29:5:3 (F 2:356). The Holy Spirit is not devalued as being less than the Father and Son, and thus his gifts being less. Rather, it is that some might say the Spirit gave the better gifts, and angels or messengers gave the lesser gifts. When the equality of the Godhead is defended, the issue is still the amount or value of the gifts being received. Why does the equality of the Godhead matter, when I am only getting a small gift, or an unimportant gift? The gift itself was seen as having value, while Chrysostom is arguing the gift itself does not have its own 'greatness' but each gift has the same worth, which is found in the Holy Spirit.

[83] Oikonomou, "ΚΛΗΡΙΚΟΙ ΚΑΙ ΛΑΪΚΟΙ," 28.

[84] Oikonomou, "ΚΛΗΡΙΚΟΙ ΚΑΙ ΛΑΪΚΟΙ," 28–29. "Both the clergy and the laity are necessary in the church and in worship, and there must be an awareness of mutual respect and love, so that 'our gift of grace' and 'reasonable worship' may be offered by many people, 'in one mouth and one heart.'"

honour by God. The diversity of servants is connected through the unity of the Godhead. The God who calls one to the clergy is the one who honours the laity.

The Gift is Beneficial: 5:1–5:9

Chrysostom transitions into this next point by saying, "Now after this he encourages him in another kind of way. The measure, even if it is small, is given to benefit him."[85] This is "each one is given the display of the Spirit, to benefit."[86] The Spirit himself appears at the baptism. Chrysostom argues, "Indeed for me, a believer, the one having the Spirit is visible from being baptized. However, to the unbeliever this is nowhere made clear except from the miracles, so here again there is no small encouragement."[87] This means the different gifts produce the same visible effect, showing that the person now has the Holy Spirit. Thus, "if you are eager to show that you have the Spirit, you have enough of a proof."[88] The Holy Spirit personally attends the baptism of the Christian and makes it clear to those who are outside the assembly that this is someone who is now a part of God's assembly.

Chrysostom summarizes his arguments for encouraging the person with fewer gifts, saying, "Therefore, since the Giver is one and the gift is a free gift, and here the appearance happened, this is a great benefit for you. Do not grieve as if you were despised. For he does not think you unworthy, nor did he declare that you are worse than

[85] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:5:1 (F 2:356).
[86] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:5:2 (F 2:356).
[87] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:5:4 (F 2:356).
[88] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:5:6 (F 2:356).

another, but he has consideration[89] for you and has the aim to help you profit."[90] The climax of encouragement is the Holy Spirit's motivation of goodwill towards the Christian.[91]

The Inconsistency of the Gifts: 5:10–5:31

Chrysostom proceeds to cover 1 Cor 12:8–11 where he discusses the individual gifts listed by Paul.[92] Chrysostom does not seem to be concerned with giving a detailed explanation of the gifts but is only giving an overview.[93] For some gifts, such as a word of wisdom, Chrysostom gives a brief sentence, "That which Paul had, that which John

---

[89] LSJ, s.v. "φείδομαι." Chrysostom uses this term as a double entendre. On one hand God's consideration for the Christian contrasts "he does not think you unworthy, nor did he declare that you are worse than another…" Chrysostom follows up with a nuance to spare the Christian "for the one who received more, but is not able to bear it, is harmed and damaged, and gives good reason to despair." *Ad Corinthios*, 29:5:9 (F 2:356). A Christian is not hurt by receiving too few gifts but can be harmed by being given more gifts and responsibilities than they can handle. This follows Chrysostom's point that those with fewer gifts are spared from ministry. Not being called to ministry is a blessing because God is sparing them from work too difficult for them.

[90] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:5:7–8 (F 2:356).

[91] Hill, ("Chrysostom's Terminology," 367–73) argues "where c. in his usual sense of 'considerateness' is always free of any suggestion of patronizing behaviour, the unfortunate and unvarying version in the English literature is 'condescension' — never C.'s thought; and one would never get the impression of the richness of the term from lexicons, like G. W. H. Lampe's *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, Oxford 1961, which briefly refers to Origen and C. (one NT, no OT ref.) under the sense, 'on the part of God, 'accommodation, concession to human limitations' — a very jejune representation of one of the richest (in C.'s usage) veins of patristic thinking on Scripture" (373). Rylaarsdam, (*John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*, 22–30) argues, "Chrysostom's vocabulary for adaptation appears more solidified than that of his predecessors, and *συνκατάβασις* seems to be employed more self-consciously in his thoughts. Chrysostom's use of the term builds on the ways in which the rhetorical and theological traditions employed the concept of adaptation. Given the elastic vocabulary for adaptability in Chrysostom's theological predecessors. . . . The concept is larger than any single term, even in Chrysostom" (24). Other words for speaking on this concept include "*οἰκονομία*, *τάξις*, *διάθεσις*, *συνκατάβασις*, *συμπεριφορά*, *τροποφορέω*, *ἐπίωοια*, *τὸ πρέπον* and *ἁρμόζω*" (23). However, Rylaarsdam does not explore those terms, nor the full breath of vocabulary Chrysostom uses to speak on this idea. In *Hom. 1 Cor*. *29:5*:8 Chrysostom uses the term φειδόμενος (LSJ, s.v. "φείδομαι."), to spare, to have mercy on, to have consideration for. The term φείδομαι is closer to Robert Hill's assessment of the συνκατάβασις as communicating God's consideration of the human.

[92] See de Wet, "Homilies of John Chrysostom on 1 Corinthians 12," 84–88.

[93] Young, ("Rhetorical Schools," 182–99) argues the Antiochene theologians take the *historia* of the text seriously (189) because it becomes exemplary for the audience (192). Yet, Chrysostom's exegesis often features ahistorical characteristics (192). Here, Chrysostom gives brief details about the gifts, but the *historia* of these gifts plays no major role in this homily.

the Son of Thunder had."[94] For other gifts, like the gift of faith, Chrysostom gives intertextual parallels, for example, "this faith is not that of beliefs but that of signs, about which he says, 'If you have faith as the mustard seed, you may say to this mountain, 'be removed' and it will be removed. The Apostles requested it, saying 'increase our faith.' For it is the mother of signs."[95] Chrysostom quickly covers these gifts to stay focused on the encouragement they bring. "See how everywhere he makes this addition, 'in the same Spirit,' and saying, 'according to the same Spirit?' For he knew its great comfort."[96] "This is the universal medicine of encouragement: All the gifts they received are form the same root, from the same storehouse, from the same spring. And so, he continually pours a flood of words over this topic. He resolves what seems to be an inconsistency and encourages them."[97]

This inconsistency is about the gift of foreign speech, which "was considered to be great, since the Apostles had received it first, and many among the Corinthians had acquired it."[98] But it is listed last among the gifts, not first. Chrysostom suggests that some think Paul is inconsistent by listing the greatest gift last.[99] Chrysostom solves the inconsistency by showing that the gift of teaching is the greatest, saying, ". . . but the word of teaching was not like this. Because teaching was placed first, but this one last. For both this and that, even all the others, prophesy, acts of power, different languages,

---

[94] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:5:17 (F 2:357).
[95] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:5:19–20 (F 2:357).
[96] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:5:11 (F 2:356).
[97] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:5:14–15 (F 2:357).
[98] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:5:29 (F 2:357–38).
[99] Mitchell, (*Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation*, 267–70) argues Paul lists gifts, not coincidentally, connected with the Corinthian controversy (268). For unity within the church, there is hierarchy of the gifts, with the distributions of tongues coming last (270). de Wet, ("Homilies of John Chrysostom on 1 Corinthians 12," 84–92) argues, though, most commentators on First Corinthians do not "see significance in Paul mentioning these last" (84). He further argues Mitchell sees this hierarchy correctly (84). Chrysostom argues the placement of the gift of foreign speech last is of some significance.

translating languages, nothing is equal to this."[100] The Corinthians erroneously thought the gift of foreign speech was the greatest gift, so its placement at the end was seen as inconsistent. Chrysostom points out that it is wrong to think of the gift of foreign speech as the greatest gift. This solves the inconsistency.

The Spirit who Gives: 6:1–7:3

Chrysostom transitions into his final arguments for his exegesis when he states, "And so that encouragement he stated above saying, 'the same Spirit,' he also states here saying, 'but the one and same Spirit works all this, distributing privately to each as he desires.' But he does not only encourage, but he also silences the opposition by saying, 'distributing privately to each as he desires.' It is necessary to silence, not only to cure."[101] The problem of the Corinthians' schism was due to those with the gift of foreign speech being overly proud. The cure has been Paul's encouragement towards those with fewer/lesser gifts. Now, Chrysostom argues it is important to silence the opposition, which consists of those who do think the gift of foreign speech is great.[102]

Chrysostom starts to accuse others in this section, saying, "For when he said, 'the one working all things in everything,' he says about humans. I presume you do not also count the Spirit along with humans, even if you do have immense dementia and infinite

---

[100] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:5:30 (F 2:358). Mitchell, (*Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation*, 267–70) argues Love is the greatest gift, which is given to the church (270). Chrysostom considers teaching to have that honour.

[101] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:6:1–3 (F 2:358).

[102] de Wet, ("Homilies of John Chrysostom on 1 Corinthians 12," 88–92), argues "In *Hom. 1 Cor.* 29:6 Chrysostom curiously returns to the trinitarian controversy" (88). de Wet picks up on Chrysostom's ruthless rhetoric (89), but he uses the reintroduction of the Holy Spirit as the focus to conclude Chrysostom is speaking about subordinationists (89). de Wet frames this section within the Nicene debates. In contrast to de Wet's analysis Chrysostom's return to the statement "the same Spirit," connects the argumentation here with the previous section, 5:10–5:31 where some thought, incorrectly, that the gift of foreign speech was the greatest gift.

madness. For he said, ‘through the Spirit,’ so that you might not consider the word ‘through’ to mean ‘less,’ nor is he worked through, he adds, ‘the Spirit works,’ not ‘is worked,’ and ‘he works as he desires,’ not ‘as he is ordered.”[103] Chrysostom’s argument is that the Holy Spirit distributes to each person privately as he desires, citing 1 Cor 12:11. The Christian does not demand a gift from the Spirit, the Spirit gives freely to each person. Chrysostom includes an interjection from someone, “But one says, ‘it is being worked from God,’ but nowhere does he say this, you only invented it.”[104] This interjection helps show the argument being made. Some people argued the Spirit was not the acting agent in the gift-giving. However, the Spirit “truly works with all authority, and nothing hinders him, for the line, ‘he blows where he desires’ is said about the Spirit. It is also fitting to prove this here, that he works everything as he desires. But also learn from another place, that he is not being forced to act, but that he is working.”[105] The defense of the Spirit’s authority silences the argument that the gift of foreign speech is greater than other gifts.[106] The encouragement for each Christian is that the gifts derive their worth from the nature of the Spirit, so the Spirit’s divinity gives clear value to each gift. The gift and its amount are given by the Spirit’s freewill and goodwill. Not

[103] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:6:6–7 (F 2:358).
[104] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:6:5 (F 2:358).
[105] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:6:8–9 (F 2:358).
[106] de Wet, (“Homilies of John Chrysostom on 1 Corinthians 12,” 79–84), argues the equality among the gifted against a hierocracy implies an equality among the members of the Godhead. In this section, the reverse of this argument is used. The equality of the Godhead proves an equality of the gifted. de Wet focuses on subordinationism as a subordination of the Spirit would lead to the implication that “a gift from the Spirit would be necessarily frowned upon in the light of the gifts form the Son and the Father” (80). However, shortly thereafter Chrysostom makes a comparison between gifts supposed to be given by the Spirit, and gifts supposed to have been given by an Angel. Here Chrysostom uses the status of the Spirit as a baseline for all gifts, and argues “‘Therefore, let us not be anxious,’ he says, ‘nor let use grieve saying ‘why did I receive this and not receive that?’ Let us not demand the Holy Spirit to explain himself to us.’ For if he freely gave from care, consider that the measure given is from the same care.” 29:7:2–3 Chrysostom draws the active gift-giving of the Spirit, and his Kingly authority as a final basis for being encouraged. The measure of the gift given carries with it the same glory.

even Apostles could demand gifts from the Spirit, but rather the Spirit freely gave to them.[107] The nature of the Spirit is a kingly nature. Due to the equality of the Godhead, the Spirit shares in the kingship of God, so Chrysostom argues, "For truly, the one receiving something great from the King, he keeps it as a comfort, for he himself gave to him. But if from the slave, then he greatly grieves for someone insults him with this. Thus, it is also clear here, the Holy Spirit does not have the nature of a slave, but of a king."[108] Chrysostom concludes his exegetical section with a final exhortation to the audience. There is a diversity of gifts, but the same Master, the same God, the same Spirit, who gives to each as he wishes:

> "Therefore, let us not be anxious," he says, "nor let us grieve, saying, 'why did I receive this and not that?' Let us not demand the Holy Spirit to explain himself to us." For if he freely gave from care, consider that the measure given is from the same care. Be satisfied and rejoice over what you received, and do not be displeased over what you did not receive, but only accept the goodwill: that you did not receive things greater than your ability.[109]

Chrysostom appeals to the audience to view their gifts with the Spirit's goodwill in mind.[110] The Christian is not to make a fuss about what gifts they did or did not receive,

---

[107] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:6:14 (F 2:359).

[108] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:6:17–18 (F 2:359). de Wet ("Homilies of John Chrysostom on 1 Corinthians 12," 84–92) argues "In this analogy, the king would represent the Father and the slave the Spirit in the sense of subordinationism. Chrysostom then implies that subordinationism, with Arianism, have an inherent tendency and drive to schism. Schism in the Trinity leads to schism in the church, especially in the sense of the distribution of the gifts and implied hierocracy therein" (91). While de Wet is concluding this section, his interpretation of this analogy presumes the topic of subordinationism. This analogy is more likely referring to the actual Roman ruler. If the βασιλεύς personally gives a gift to someone, it is a great occasion, and something to be treasured, but if someone gives a gift through a slave then it is a socially disrespectful action. The implication is that the Holy Spirit does not give gifts via slaves, but as the βασιλεύς of all things, he personally gives gifts to each Christian.

[109] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:7:2–3 (F 2:359–60).

[110] See Barclay, (*Paul and the Gift*, 24–32), "Strabo's remarks also reflect something of the difference in ethos felt to distinguish gifts from trade: for gifts, it matters greatly whom you receive them from (in Menelaus's case, from those of his own social class), why they are given (as a mark of social worth), and in what spirit they are given (with "goodwill," εὐνοία). As we have seen, gifts, like trade or pay, involve *reciprocity*: in all these spheres, there is a common structure of *quid pro quo*. What distinguishes the sphere of gift is not that it is 'unilateral,' but that it expresses a social bond, a mutual recognition of the value of the *person*. It is filled with sentiment because it invites a personal, enduring, and reciprocal relationship — an ethos very often signaled by the use of the term χάρις" (31).

but to be reminded of the Holy Spirit's goodwill towards them. The gifts the Holy Spirit gives to each person is to help them, not to hurt them.

Section 2: Transition: 7:4

Chrysostom uses a transition statement to move from his exegesis to his application. Henry Toczydlowski argues, a transition connects related thoughts, and shows the flow of that relationship, which "is where the homily taxes the ingenuity of the preacher; his great problem is to make the moral lesson follow from the text he has belaboured."[111] *Hom. 1 Cor*. 29 appears to be constructed on separate topics of spiritual gifts and wealth. This sentence connects the two topics together. It reads, "But if in spiritual matters it is not necessary to waste one's time, how much more with physical matters? So, be at rest and do not be deeply perplexed at why such a one is rich, while such another is poor."[112] de Wet translates this sentence as, "And if we should not be greedy regarding the spiritual things, much more should we not be greedy in the material things."[113] He understands the term περιεργάζεσθαι as "greedy." I argue that a better translation is "to waste one's time."[114] Chrysostom's talk about the spiritual gifts was a response to a question from his congregation. His final conclusion is to accept the Spirit's goodwill, and now he adds to not waste one's time on this topic more than necessary. This then becomes the conclusion to the parallel topic of wealth. It is not necessary to waste one's

---

Chrysostom's approach to the Spirit's gift-giving is close to the Grecian ethos John Barclay speaks of in this citation. This will be explored in more detail in a later chapter.

[111] Toczydlowski, "Analysis of the Rhetoric of St. John Chrysostom," 61.

[112] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:7:4 (F 2:360). "Εἰ δὲ ἐν τοῖς πνευματικοῖς οὐ χρὴ περιεργάζεσθαι, πόλλῳ μᾶλλον ἐν τοῖς σαπκικοῖς." Chrysostom shows his rhetorical skills here by saying one's lack of concern with physical matters should be "πόλλῳ μᾶλλον," much greater than their lack of concern with spiritual matters.

[113] de Wet, "Homilies of John Chrysostom on 1 Corinthians 12," 97.

[114] LSJ, s.v. "περιεργάζομαι."

time asking why one person is rich, while another is poor. This parallel is seen again by how Chrysostom constructs this talk on wealth. His talk is stylized as a response to the congregation's question, "'For he did not command one to be rich, how did he give that which he did not command to be received?' But so that I will silence the profit of wealth to those who make these counterclaims to us. Come, let us return to the earlier argument, where he gave the wealth from God, and answer me. Why was Abraham rich but Jacob needed bread?"[115]

Chrysostom's transition assumes a continuation of thought. As a comparison, it assumes the approach to the topic of spiritual gifts is analogous to the topic of wealth. The same approach to one's reception more/greater or fewer/lesser gifts in spiritual matters will still be the same in approach physical matters. This unites the homily together through a means other than its topic. Jan H. Barkhuizen denotes this kind of unity as a *thematic* unity.[116]

Section 3: Application: 7:5–9:22

Chrysostom argues for the goodwill of the Spirit in distributing spiritual gifts, and those with fewer ones should not grieve. Likewise, in material wealth, the Spirit distributes it with goodwill, and the poor person should not grieve for being poor.[117]

---

[115] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:7:6 (F 2:360).

[116] Barkhuizen, "John Chrysostom, *Homily 50* on Matthew," 43.

[117] Guthrie ("Investigation into the Use of Application," 1–7), argues one kind of application for a homily is to address the needs and circumstances of the contemporary listener by relating the principles discovered in the biblical text (7). Toczydlowski, ("Analysis of the Rhetoric of St. John Chrysostom," 56–66) argues if the preacher "explains the text and makes a suitable application, his homily perforce has a degree of unity" (57). Here, it is this transition statement, which creates a sense of coherence among the two differing topics of spiritual gifts and wealth. The application of the former is paralleled in the latter topic.

Wealth is Not Necessarily from God: 7:5–7:10

In the first part of his application, Chrysostom establishes his argumentative goal, to prove that "not every rich person is really from God, but many are rich from injustice, theft, and greed."[118] Chrysostom asks his congregation to consider various figures from the Hebrew Bible. God was God of Abraham and Jacob so "why was it that one was rich, but the other a hired labourer?"[119] While Jacob was poor, Esau was rich, and their father Isaac lived his whole life in safety.[120] Why did David, a prophet and a king, live "his whole life in distress,'" yet his son Solomon "spent forty years in the most security above all humans enjoying abundant peace, glory, honour, and having all kinds of luxuries?"[121] The solution to these contrary cases is that "it was beneficial to each one."[122] For "if God did not train the great and wonderful in the same way, but the one through poverty and the other through wealth, the one through relaxation but the one through affliction. How much more is it necessary to consider this!"[123] Chrysostom's argument draws upon the earlier parts of the homily. God is depicted as a teacher, who educates in personally styled ways.[124] The way God educated these Patriarchal figures with wealth directly parallels his earlier comment on how God interacts with the Hebrew prophets: "they were not seized with compulsion, but were honoured by their permission. Therefore, Jonah fled; therefore, Ezekiel delayed; therefore, Jeremiah begged. But God did not push them forward with compulsion, but with counsel,

---

[118] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:7:5 (F 2:360).
[119] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:7:6 (F 2:360).
[120] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:7:7 (F 2:360).
[121] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:7:8 (F 2:360).
[122] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:7:8 (F 2:360).
[123] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:7:10 (F 2:360).
[124] Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*, 30. *συνκατάβασις*, which Rylaarsdam translates as Adaptability, is the key term for expressing this stylized pedagogy. Chrysostom's argument is exactly as Rylaarsdam explains. God trains people in personally styled ways, which are beneficial to each.

recommendations, and warnings, not darkening their minds."[125] God educates people with *synkatabasis* ("adaptation"). Whether in wealth or in spiritual gifts, God's pedagogy benefits the recipient. Chrysostom ends this section on God's pedagogical use of wealth with the exclamation, "How much more is it necessary to consider this!"[126] Chrysostom wants his audience to think about God's pedagogical care for them.

Outward Appearance vs. Inward Suffering: 8:1–8:14

Chrysostom then moves into the next part of his discussion on wealth. He says, "But, after this it is necessary to account this, that many of the things happening happen not according to our mind, but from our wickedness."[127] He states:

> Therefore, do not ask for what reason the wealthy person is in a sorry state, but the poor is righteous. Rather, an argument for this is given to say that the righteous has no harm from poverty but has greater aid to his reputation. And the wicked in wealth has acquired more supplies of punishment if he does not turn around. But even before the chastisement wealth is often responsible for many of the evils happening to him and leads him into ten thousand pits. But God allows both together showing the freedom of choice and to teach others not to rage nor to be fanatical about money.[128]

God's motivation in wealth disparity, Chrysostom argues, is given with respect to human αὐτεξοὐσιον τῆς προαιρέσεως, their "freedom of choice."[129] This is done to

---

[125] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:2:24–26 (F 2:353).

[126] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:7:10 (F 2:360).

[127] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:8:1 (F 2:360–61). Previously, in his transition statement, Chrysostom said it is not worth one's time to think too much about the distribution of spiritual gifts or wealth. However, now, God's pedagogy is given top priority for consideration.

[128] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:8:2–3 (F 2:361).

[129] Laird (*Mindset, Moral Choice*, 88–112) argues that human self-determination, αὐτεξούσιος is a core part of humanity, and Chrysostom often makes pains to clarify that God's actions towards humans never takes away their self-determination. But self-determination also has responsibilities, to be virtuous and loving (88–89). The human ability to make moral choices is προαίρεσις. It is a term with a long history in Greek philosophy, and Chrysostom makes wide use of it. It is "one of the greater faculties: that it is a vital part of the autonomy given by God to humans beings; that its intended function is to operate in a way that its freedom is used to mould us into God-likeness; that it is, like the late-Stoic προαίρεσις, teleologically oriented; that it is our task to beautify it, that is to use it, and to persuade others to use it, as God intended, to make the right choices toward the destiny of our beauty; and that it is invested with the power and autonomy to realise that destiny" (104–105).

instruct people not to be zealous about acquiring wealth. Chrysostom then expects negative feedback to what he said, "What you will then say is, 'why then is some wicked person wealthy but does not suffer terrible things?' For if he is good and just, he then is wealthy, but if he is wicked what will we say? So, show mercy to this one. For wealth added to wickedness aggravates the passions."[130] There is a confusion among Chrysostom's audience, that having wealth is paired with being righteous, while being poor is paired with being wicked. And some people found it difficult to understand why a wicked person could be rich, but not suffer. Chrysostom points out that the wicked person does suffer from having wealth:

> But such a one says, 'he received wealth from his forefathers, and he scatters it upon prostitutes and parasites, and does not suffer anything terrible.' What do you mean? He prostitutes himself, and you say he does not suffer anything terrible? He is drunk, do you consider him to be luxurious? He spends money on nothing needful and you say he is happy? And what can be worse than these that ruin the soul?[131]

The people who believe the wicked, rich person does not suffer are only looking at their bodies, not their inner life. Chrysostom points this out, "But you say if the body is distorted and mutilated, he is merited measureless weeping, but upon seeing his soul being mutilated you consider him to be prosperous?"[132] Chrysostom gives a conclusion to this topic:

> You say this one is prosperous? Tell me, but do not marvel, for most are ignorant of philosophy. Because of this we pay the greatest penalty, being punished, and now being delivered to vengeance. This is why there are passions, depressions, and continual confusion since God is demonstrating to us a life without grief: the one of virtue. We give it up, we cut out another path, the one of wealth and money, the one being full of countless evils.[133]

---

[130] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:8:4–5 (F 2:361).
[131] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:8:7–8 (F 2:361).
[132] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:8:8 (F 2:361).
[133] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:8:11–12 (F 2:361–62).

God gives wealth disparity to show how acquiring wealth does not make life better but acquiring virtue does. One must look at the inner life, not the appearance. Throughout this homily there is a theme that possession equates more with having a better lot. Yet, Chrysostom has been disassociating the causal relationship between possessing gifts from the state of being righteous and virtuous. Wealth does not have a causal relationship with being righteous. Chrysostom goes so far to say poverty can help the righteous person while wealth can damage a wicked person. Likewise, the quantity of gifts does not cause a person to be righteous. However, virtue does have a causal relationship with righteousness. Chrysostom sums up the inability to discern this difference with an illustration:

> And we do this, like one who does not know to determine beautiful bodies but attributing all to the clothes being worn and to the decorations being displayed. Indeed, ignoring the beautiful woman upon seeing her who had acquired natural beauty. And viewing the shameful and ugly woman with a mutilated body, but having beautiful clothes, he takes her as a wife. And now something similar happens with many about virtue and vice, one boasts in the dishonoured one, believing the external decorations, but turns away from the beautiful and elegant one because of her unadorned beauty, through which they especially ought to choose her.[134]

Christians can have misplaced priorities. When they value wealth or plenitude over virtue they boast about their own dishonour and ignore the true value which arises from virtue. Christians who boast over how many gifts they have received or over what kind of gifts they have received have misplaced priorities and fail to see that virtue, and not the gifts, is the important core of righteousness. Christians can pursue virtue despite not having an abundance of gifts, or particular ones such as the gift of foreign speech. Thus,

[134] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:8:13–14 (F 2:362).

Christians should not envy those with more gifts because having more gifts does not give those Christians an unfair advantage.

Chrysostom's Rebuke: 9:1–9:21

Chrysostom uses this illustration as a rebuke towards his audience, or more specifically, towards those who raise the questions he has been addressing. He laments that it is not only Greeks who value the external benefits of vices while ignoring the natural beauty of virtue, but also that "there are some among us who do not believe this, but they have their judgement corrupted. And this happens, the Scriptures sing up and down to us."[135] Chrysostom backs up his assertion with selections from the scriptures, and apocrypha, saying "The wicked is considered nothing before him, but he honours the one fearing the Lord. The Fear of the Lord surpasses all. Fear God and keep his commandments because this is the whole of humanity. Do not be jealous of wicked people Do not fear when humans are wealthy. All flesh is grass, and all human honour is as the flowers of the grass."[136]

---

[135] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:9:1 (F 2:362).

[136] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:9:2–6 (F 2:362). Chrysostom cites, in order, Ps 15:4, Sir 25:11, Qoh 12:13, Ps 37:1, Ps 49:16, and Isa 40:7. This selection of texts appears in both the *NPNF* translation and Christ Len de Wet's translation, which is in the appendix to his chapter on *Hom. 1 Cor*. 29. Both translations have errors. It should be noted that there is no discrepancy between the passages cited in *Patrologia Graeca* (PG 61:267) and Field's text, (F 2:362). The *NPNF* text (*To the Corinthians*, 168–75) reads "In his sight the vile person is contemned, but he honoreth them that fear the Lord: (Ps. xv. 4.) the fear of the lord excelleth every thing (with a footnote saying "Or, the love of the Lord. Sirach xxv. 14.); fear God, and keep His commandments; for this is the whole of man; (Eccles. xii. 13;) be not thou envious of evil men; (Ps. xlix. 13;) all flesh is grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of the grass; (Isa. xl. 7.)" (174). de Wet, ("Homilies of John Chrysostom on 1 Corinthians 12," 102–19) reads, "'In his sight the vile person is contemned, but he honours them that fear the Lord' (Ps 15:4). 'The fear of the Lord supersedes all other things. Fear God and keep His commandments, for this is the entire task of a person (Eccl 12:13); do not be envious of evil people (Ps 49:16); all flesh is grass, and all the glory of humanity as the flower of the grass (Isa 40:7).'" (118). Both the *NPNF* and de Wet's text cite Psalm 37:1 as Psalm 49:16 but omit the actual text of Psalm 49:16. In both Field's text and in PG, the two Psalms are included as such: Μὴ παραζήλου ἐν πονηρευομένοις. Μὴ φοβοῦ, ὅταν πλουτήσῃ ἄνθρωπος." The first sentence is cited from Ps 37:1 (36:1 in LXX). The second sentence is from 49:16 (48:16 in LXX). The text should read, "Do not be jealous of wicked people (Ps 37:1). Do not be afraid when people are wealthy" (Ps

Because some Christians believed the outward appearance of vice to be attractive, he rebukes his audience for being "just like ignorant children continually learning the basic principles."[137] In fact, "whenever we quiz you here on the same order, you follow us in every way whatsoever, but when we ask you when you are dispersed what is first and what is the second of the matter, and how to properly put things into order, and what goes with what, you do not know what to say. You become the object of ridicule."[138] Chrysostom's rebuke reaches its climax:

> Tell me, is this a great joke, thinking on immortality and the good, which the eye has not seen, nor which the ear has heard, nor which has entered into the human heart, to contend for the things remaining here, and to consider them enviable? For if it is necessary for you to learn this, that wealth is nothing that, that the present things are a shadow and a dream, that it dissolves in the way of smoke and flies away. Until then, stand outside the sanctuary, remain in the gateway, for you are not yet worthy of entering into the heavenly Kingdom. For if you do not know how to distinguish their natures, which ones are short-lived and constantly changing, when are you going to be able to despise them? But if you say you do know, cease to be busybodies, and stop wasting your time on why it is that such a one is rich and why such a one is poor.[139]

Chrysostom reuses the language of wasting one's time, περιεργαζόμενος, which he used previously in his transition statement. It functions as a bookend. Chrysostom begins by arguing it is not important to waste time with questioning why one is rich and why one is poor. And he ends with a strong rebuke for those who are wasting their time on this matter. They should know that acquiring virtue is far more important than acquiring wealth. Chrysostom argues, "Even if you are a poor worker, you are able to live cheerfully with philosophy. And even if you are rich, you can be more wretched than

---

49:16). de Wet takes the Sirach reference as part of the text of Qoheleth. The *NPNF* places the Sirach citation in a footnote, instead of in the body of the text with the other citations.

[137] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:9:8 (F 2:362).

[138] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:9:8 (F 2:362).

[139] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:9.9–10 (F 2:362–63).

everyone if you are avoiding virtue. For the important way for us is this: that of virtue, which if this is not added to us, there is no other advantage.[140] Chrysostom accuses his audience of not learning this Christian perspective. They value honour in the present world rather than heavenly honour. Chrysostom uses the rhetorical technique of the *hypophora* to create, and then answer, multiple questions in succession :

> One asks, 'and how have we desired this?' From not greatly desiring that one. 'But how does this very thing happen?' From laziness. 'And how is it laziness?' From despising it. 'And how is it being despised?' From folly and from clinging to the present things, and not desiring to investigate the nature of things with precision. And again, 'how does this very thing happen?' From neither being devoted to reading the Scriptures, nor keeping company with holy men, and by pursuing the gathering of wicked people.[141]

Closing Benediction: 9:22

Chrysostom uses his final rebuke to segue into his benediction to end the homily, he uses a maritime metaphor to urge his audience:

> So that this might not always be, causing wave after wave to receive and lead us off into the wicked sea and altogether to drown and destroy us, while there is time, let us be raised, standing upon the rock. I am speaking of the decrees and arguments of God, let us look down on the swelling sea of this present life. For thus we may escape this, and we may draw up others suffering shipwreck, we may attain to the future good through the grace and mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ, to whom be honour into the ages, amen.

Conclusion

In this section some conclusions about *Hom. 1 Cor*. 29's structure and core argument will be made.

---

[140] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:9:13–14 (F 2:363).
[141] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:9:19–20 (F 2:363).

Outline of Homily 29

Hom. 1 Cor. 29 is made up of an Introduction, an exegesis of the text, a transition between the exegesis and application, and the application itself. An outline of the homily looks like this:

Introduction: 1:1–1:27

- Opening Lines: 1:1–1:4
- Introducing First Topic: 1:5–1:18
- Introducing a Second Topic: 1:19–1:27

Exegesis: 2:1–7:3

- First Part: 2:1–3:10
  - Grecian Oracles compared with Biblical Prophets: 2:1–2:27
  - Confession of Christ: 3:1–3:10
- Second Part: 4:1–7:3
  - The Free Gift: 4:1–4:11
  - The Gift is Work: 4:12–4:20
  - The Gift is Beneficial: 5:1–5:9
  - The Inconsistency about Gifts?: 5:10–5:31
  - The Spirit who Gives: 6:1–7:3

Transition Statement: 7:4

Application: 7:5–9:22

- Wealth is not always from God: 7:5–7:10
- Outward Appearance: 8:1–8:14
- Chrysostom’s Rebuke: 9:1–9:21

Benediction: 9:22

Transitions between Major Topics

Chrysostom transitions between topics and communicates the topic he is speaking on with clear language. When he moves from the introduction to the next section he says, "Yet, for the meanwhile he begins the lecture of the oracles like this, saying . . ."[142] and shortly after he repeats the first topic at hand saying, "And he is intending to lecture on them first, as I said, he sets down the difference between oracles and prophecy."[143] Chrysostom is explaining how Paul is speaking about oracles and prophets, and so he will show how the two compare with each other. He is creating the expectation of a comparison, and so it is no surprise that this section is that comparison between the oracle and the prophet.

When he is done with this topic and moves to the next one, he says, "Next, he lectures about wonders, not simply coming to the topic but to remove this disagreement and to persuade the ones having fewer gifts not to grieve, and the ones having acquired more not to be excited."[144] Chrysostom is again showing a clear presentation of the topic, now switching to the gifts of the Spirit. He also presents his argument that Paul is not simply talking about the gifts generally but is trying to persuade the ones with fewer gifts not to grieve, and those with more not to be excited. Both of these examples show Chrysostom commenting on Paul's authorial intent. An understanding of the text, with precision, is made only when the reader understands Paul's motive.

---

[142] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:2:1 (F 2:351).
[143] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:2:2 (F 2:351).
[144] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:4:1 (F 2:354).

Chrysostom ends his exegetical section with a concluding statement and application. He ends his talk on the spiritual gifts with such a command: "Be satisfied and rejoice over what you received and do not be displeased over what you did not receive, but only accept the goodwill: that you did not receive things greater than your ability."[145] He also includes a transition statement, which indicates a change in topics. This transition statement is different than the one he makes when he moves from comparing oracles and prophets to the topic of spiritual gifts. This statement made a more general comparison between spiritual gifts and wealth, "But if in spiritual matters it is not necessary to waste one's time, how much more is it necessary with physical matters? So, be at rest and do not be deeply perplexed at why such a one is rich, while such another is poor."[146] By creating a parallel for gifts and wealth, Chrysostom is suggesting that arguments for one's approach to the topic of gifts are relevant for the topic of wealth. It may be that the same is true in reverse, that his upcoming arguments for the topic of wealth might be relevant for one's approach to spiritual gifts. Chrysostom also uses this statement to clarify his change in topics, from gifts to wealth, and to address the question of why some are rich, while some are poor. Chrysostom also uses questions from his audience, whether real or fictional to direct the homily. One person asks, "'For he commanded one not to be rich, how did he give that, which he did not command to be received?' But so that I will silence the profit of wealth to those who make these counterclaims to us. Come, let us return to the earlier argument."[147] Chrysostom uses rhetorical devices to show his transitions from one topic to another so

[145] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:7:3 (F 2:360).
[146] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:7:4 (F 2:360).
[147] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:7:6 (F 2:360).

they can keep pace with him. They help show the structure of the homily because the individual sections can be identified through these transitionary statements.

Conclusions about the Homily's Argument

Some conclusions can be made about the coherence of Chrysostom's arguments within *Hom. 1 Cor*. *29*. In his introduction Chrysostom begins with audience questions but wishes to delay his answer for a future time, so he says: "but let us delay this until a later time, and in the meantime let us lecture on the things occurring then."[148] Chrysostom sets up his own argument about the gifts, that those with the gift of foreign speech were causing division and grievances within the community.[149] He then includes a second topic, saying, "There were even many oracles in that place because the city was more disposed to Grecian customs, and this with the other was upsetting and agitating them."[150] These are the two arguments explored in Chrysostom's exegetical section, the grief caused by gifts, and the inability to distinguish between oracles and prophets.

Later in the homily, when Chrysostom has explained these two arguments in detail, he transitions into his application, which focuses first on wealth, and then turns into a rebuke. His transition statement retains some form of coherency, as the conclusion about the grief caused by having fewer/lesser gifts is stated to be the same conclusion for approaching the topic of wealth. Thus, Chrysostom's statement, "Be satisfied and rejoice over what you received, and do not be displeased over what you did not receive, but only accept the goodwill: that you did not receive things greater than your ability" can

[148] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:1:4 (F 2:349).
[149] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:1:10–12 (F 2:349–50).
[150] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:1:19 (F 2:350).

apply to both the spiritual gifts and wealth.[151] Chrysostom, then, signals to his audience that the conclusions made in the exegesis can be applied to the topic of wealth.[152] Another parallel can be made. When talking about oracles and prophets, Chrysostom says the difficulty came from the inability to distinguish between them.[153] Chrysostom's rebuke at the end of his homily is about some Christians' inability to distinguish between the good of virtue and the vice of wealth. He says, "Like one who does not know to determine beautiful bodies but attributing all to the clothes being worn and to the decorations being displayed. . . . And now something similar happens with many about virtue and vice, one boasts in their dishonour, one believing their external decorations but turns away from the beautiful and elegant one because of her unadorned beauty, through which they especially ought to choose her."[154] While the Corinthian church was grieved by two causes, failure to discern prophets from oracles, and the spiritual gifts causing divisions, so too does Chrysostom's Antiochene congregation have two problems: a failure to discern between virtue and vice, and a flawed opinion that having more wealth is better.

Another point of connection within this homily is Chrysostom's appeal to the Holy Spirit's *synkatabasis* care for each human. In his comparison between oracles and prophets Chrysostom points to God's treatment of the Biblical prophet: "They had power to speak or to not speak, for they were not seized with compulsion, but were

---

[151] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:7:3 (F 2:360).

[152] It may be the case that the opposite is true as well, that conclusions made in the application can be applied to the spiritual gifts. Chrysostom (*Ad Corinthios*, 29:8:3 [F 2:361]) states, "But God allows both together, showing the freedom of choice and to teach others not to rage nor to be fanatical about money." This may also be applied to the disparity between the gifts received, to teach people not to be fanatical about spiritual gifts.

[153] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:1:20–22 (F 2:350).

[154] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:8:13–14 (F 2:361–62).

honoured by their permission."[155] God's treatment of the prophet is the opposite of how demons treat Grecian oracles. God "did not push them forward with compulsion, but with counsel, recommendations, and warnings, not darkening their minds."[156] Thus, Jonah flees, and Ezekiel delays in speaking, and Jeremiah begs with God.[157] God treats each prophet individually with care. This care is designated as "honouring" the individual prophet. It proves that the Spirit treats them with *synkatabasis*. This is further shown when Chrysostom describes God's activity as teaching, For God "illuminates and astutely teaches needful things."[158] As Rylaarsdam notes, God's *synkatabasis* is a description of God's pedagogy, who reveals himself. God is an adaptive teacher.[159] Here, God honours each prophet and cares for them on an individual basis, giving them counsel, recommendations, and warnings, but never forcing them with compulsion.

During Chrysostom's coverage of the spiritual gifts, he constantly appeals to the Spirit's care for the Christian, in such a way that shows the Spirit's *synkatabasis*. Those with more gifts have the same honour as those with fewer, everyone is considered "worthy to receive."[160] God considers the individual Christian as worthy of the salvation Jesus achieves for them. The Spirit is the one giving each gift, no one receives a gift through an angelic intermediary agent.[161] Each gift is given with the motivation to benefit the one receiving it.[162] Each gift is given to display the Holy Spirit, so that each person can show they have received the Spirit of God.[163] These arguments are summed

---

[155] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:2:24 (F 2:353).
[156] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:2:26 (F 2:353).
[157] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:2:25 (F 2:353).
[158] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:2:27 (F 2:353).
[159] Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*, 17–18.
[160] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:4:6 (F 2:355).
[161] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:4:7 (F 2:355).
[162] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:5:1 (F 2:356).
[163] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:5:5 (F 2:356).

up in a recap statement about God's *synkatabasis* in gift-giving: "For he does not think you unworthy, nor did he declare that you are worse than another, but he has consideration for you and has the aim to help you profit."[164] The Spirit also refrains from giving gifts that would harm the individual.[165] The Spirit is not forced to act, but gives freely to each person.[166] Moreover because the Spirit has a kingly nature, each gift is a kingly gift.[167] Chrysostom's conclusions on the gifts are founded on the Spirit's care: "For if he freely gave from care, consider that the measure is given from the same care."[168]

Early, God treated the prophets with care. Now, God treats various Old Testament figures with the same care, "Why was Abraham rich, but Jacob needed bread? . . . why was it that Esau was rich, who was unjust and murdered his brother, but this one was in slavery for such a long time? Again, why was it that Isaac lived his whole life in safety by Jacob in distress and hard labour? . . . Why was it that David was a prophet and a king and the same lived his whole life in distress, but his Solomon spent forty years in the most security above all humans, enjoying abundant peace, glory, honour, and having all kinds of luxuries?"[169] Why is this? Because "it was beneficial to each one."[170] "For if God did not train the great and wonderful in the same way, the one through poverty but the other through wealth, the one through relaxation but the other through affliction. How much more is it necessary to consider this!"[171] God uses both

---

[164] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:5:8 (F 2:356).
[165] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:5:8–9 (F 2:356).
[166] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:6:8 (F 2:359).
[167] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:6:17–18 (F 2:359).
[168] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:7:3 (F 2:360).
[169] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:7:6–8 (F 2:360).
[170] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:7:8 (F 2:360).
[171] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:7:10 (F 2:360).

wealth and poverty within his pedagogy to help train each person and to show "a life without grief: the one of virtue."[172]

Chrysostom rebukes his audience because they are not learning what God is trying to teach them. Instead of accepting and obeying God's illumination, they are constantly relearning the basic principles of the Christian perspective and cannot even remember those basic instructions. They are busybodies, wasting their time with unimportant questions. Because they are not accepting God's teaching on living virtuously, they will continue to consider unimportant things to be of great importance but give no thought of virtue and philosophy.[173] This rebuke is constructed on the topic of the people's unwillingness to learn from God's teaching.

Hom. 1 Cor. 29 has a common theological understanding of God's motive, his *synkatabasis*, which is explained through two arguments, which Chrysostom makes in most every section. First, Chrysostom is always pointing his congregation towards God's adaptive and personal care for each person. God honours each prophet by giving them counsel, recommendations, and warnings, but never seizing them with compulsion.[174] God's gift-giving is done with consideration for the human,[175] and both the gift and the measure are given with care.[176] God distributes poverty and wealth in a way which is beneficial to each one.[177] The second common argument is God's pedagogical purpose, his goal of teaching humans. God is the one who "illuminates and astutely teaches needful things."[178] Teaching is considered the great gift with no

---

[172] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:8:12 (F 2:361).
[173] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:9:15–16 (F 2:363).
[174] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:2:24–26 (F 2:353).
[175] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:5:8 (F 2:356).
[176] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:7:3 (F 2:359–60).
[177] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:7:10 (F 2:360).
[178] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:2:27 (F 2:353).

equal,[179] and God allows wealth disparity to "teach others not to rage nor to be fanatical about money."[180] God is teaching a life without grief, the life of virtue.[181] However, the congregation is failing to learn even the basic lessons, which have been proclaimed to them.[182] With these two arguments made throughout the homily, *Hom. 1 Cor*. 29 can be said to have a form of coherence, which is founded on God' *synkatabasis*. This connects the individual topics together.

This chapter also argued this homily is not focused on the cessation of gifts. Instead, Chrysostom highlights the inability to distinguish between God's work and human abuse. This is seen in the comparison between Grecian oracles and the true prophets. Chrysostom explores this theme within the topic of wealth. God uses wealth distribution within his pedagogy so that while some benefit from riches other people receive help from poverty. Therefore, those who point to wealth as a sign of God's blessing do not see beyond the outward appearance. This theme is also explored with spiritual gifts. Some Christians thought that certain gifts, namely the gift of foreign speech, revealed a greater honour or blessing from God. Christians without those gifts believed them to be better off. However, Chrysostom calls the congregation to look beyond this and to see God's pedagogy at work. The next chapter will explore the content of *Hom. 1 Cor*. 35 for its structure and argumentative theme.

[179] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:5:30 (F 2:358).
[180] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:8:3 (F 2:361).
[181] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:8:12 (F 2:361).
[182] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:9:8–9 (F 2:362–63).

CHAPTER 4: THE STRUCTURE OF HOMILY 35

Hom. 1 Cor. 35 is the second homily studied in this project. A translation of this homily can be found in the second appendix at the end of this study. Despite being separated from *Hom. 1 Cor. 29* by five other homilies, it is the next homily to continue the topic of spiritual gifts. This chapter outlines the structure of *Hom. 1 Cor. 35* by examining the major sections of the homily, their rhetorical features, their arguments and proofs, and their transitions. *Hom. 1 Cor. 35* has three major sections. The first section contains Chrysostom's exegesis. The second compares conceit to the pastoral ethic Chrysostom proposes in this homily. The third covers the dishonour which wealth causes. Each section is made up of various subsections.

Chrysostom's exegesis of 1 Cor 14:1–19 is done in seven parts. From 1:1 to 1:17 Chrysostom begins the homily with an exhortation to pursue love before introducing the topic of gifts. He argues the gift is not superior by itself. From 1:18 to 1:27 Chrysostom makes a comparison between the gifts of foreign speech and prophecy, showing how prophecy is superior as it helps more people. From 2:1 to 2:11 he argues that Paul does not attack the gift of foreign speech because he is envious of those who have it; rather, Paul wants the church to use the gift correctly. From 3:1 to 3:11 Chrysostom uses the illustrations of musical instruments and war trumpets to show how clearness is integral to the function of vocal communication. From 4:1 to 4:20 Chrysostom argues that the

gift of foreign speech is not self-sufficient and lays down a pastoral rule for clergy members who use the gift publicly. From 5:1 to 6:8 Chrysostom argues that the clergy who have the gift of foreign speech should seek the gift of interpretation to be helpful to the congregation. The last part is from 7:1 to 7:15. Here Chrysostom places Paul as the prime pastoral example for the clergy to follow because Paul did not use the gift to seek his own honour, but to speak for a common benefit. This is the pattern for the clergy to follow.

Chrysostom has two application sections in *Hom 1 Cor.* 35. The first application expands on the difference between seeking the common benefit and the conceited desire for one's own honour. First, from 8:1 to 8:19 Chrysostom draws a comparison between the characters of the Apostles and the character of the Greek culture. From 9:1 to 9:9 Chrysostom draws a comparison between Diogenes the Cynic and Paul. From 10:1 to 11:3 Chrysostom uses both Abraham and Paul as exemplary portraits for overcoming conceit. The second application of this homily has Chrysostom speaking on the dishonour wealth brings. From 12:1 to 12:21 he argues the purpose of a Christian pedagogy is to make the soul competent in all scenarios. He further argues humans hate being dishonoured, but it is wealth, not poverty, which brings that dishonour. From 13:1 to 13:22 Chrysostom shows how wealth brings dishonour after death due to the maltreatment of grave robbers. The last section, from 14:1 to 14:7 shows how almsgiving protects the soul from the dangers of wealth. Wealth is beneficial for Christians, especially for the clergy, when it is given to those who are in need. This also functions as the benediction of the homily.

Introduction: 1:1–1:17

This subsection is the introduction to the homily. It begins with a scriptural passage and ends at 1:17. Chrysostom opens with an illustration born from the word pursue, διώκετε. It runs from 1:1 through 1:9. The *NPNF* translates this illustration as an officer chasing after a fugitive. The *NPNF* translations reads, "He that is in chase, when by himself he cannot, by those that are before him he doth overtake the fugitive, beseeching those who are near with much eagerness to seize and keep it so seized for him until he shall come up."[1] The *NPNF* translates τὸν φεύγοντα as "the fugitive," but it is better to translate it in more general way, "the one fleeing." The context for this term better fits the imagery of hunting a wild animal rather than hunting down a fugitive. He says, "Next, whenever we have taken hold, we must no longer let go of it, so that it will not escape us again. For it is constantly leaping away from us because we do not have it correctly, rather we honour everything other than it. So, we must do everything to accurately restrain it."[2] The image of a hunter having captured their prey, some deer or other animal, they need to take care to restrain it so that it does not escape again. This provides a basis for a later part of the homily where Chrysostom uses hunting imagery again.[3] The later use of hunting imagery suggests a coherence with this illustration, lending its interpretation to be of hunting an animal, rather than capturing a fugitive.

In 1:10 Chrysostom transitions from this illustration to the topic of the spiritual gifts. Chrysostom uses the phrase, Εἶτα ἵνα μὴ νομίσωσιν ("Next, so that you will not assume"). This short clause is used throughout the homily to indicate a transition.[4] Here,

---

[1] *NPNF* 1/12:208.
[2] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:1:5–7 (F 2:434).
[3] See Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:12:18–19 (F 2:445).
[4] See, Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:2:1 (F 2:436), 4:14 (F 2:438), 7:1 (F 2: 440).

Chrysostom transitions from the illustration of love to the topic of the spiritual gifts. He follows the clause with the statement, "Next, so that you will not believe he introduces this discussion on love to cancel the spiritual gifts, he continues."[5] This is a statement which draws attention to the break between 1 Cor 12 and 14. Chrysostom indicates that Paul returns to the topic of the gifts. Chrysostom arrives at 1 Cor 14:1–3, which contains the thesis for his exegesis.[6] Chrysostom is not solely focused on exegeting the scriptural text but engaging in argumentation:

> Now here he makes a comparison of God's gifts and attacks that one of foreign speech showing it neither altogether useless nor as exceedingly beneficial by itself. For they were very proud about this because they believed it to be a great gift. And they believed it to be great because the Apostles receives it first and were often displaying it. It was not, however, more valuable than the others.[7]

Frances Young argues that a preacher's exegesis "had a subject to cover or thesis to propound, like those set as exercises for the budding rhetor."[8] However, little direct comparison between Chrysostom's thesis and those of the rhetorical schools has been made. Here is a thesis exercise from Libanius's Progymnasmata for a comparison:

> In many other areas, the majority of people seem to me to fail to have the right opinion, but those who shun marriage as being one of the most terrible things have especially suffered this. Then they pride themselves on having deliberated over it well, although they have chosen the most disastrous course of all. And because of this they make many people imitate them, injuring human life in two ways: by what they do themselves, and by what they induce the rest to do. Let us

---

[5] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:1:10 (F 2:434).

[6] Kennedy (*New History*, 97–101) talks of Hermagoras's rhetoric handbook for students going into a judicial setting. In this context the political questions were divided into thesis, "a disputation that does not involve specific individuals or situations" and hypothesis "specific cases involving persons and occasions" (97). Gibson (*Libanius's Progymnasmata: Model Exercises*, 509–25) shows how Hermagoras's distinction is prevalent in more than political discussion and further expands that the thesis can be practical, answering questions of whether one should marry, or theoretical, which covers topics of the science or of the gods. A thesis is often "an inquiry into a subject that is in doubt" (509). It does not seem outlandish for a Christian homily to be structured around arguing a thesis. However, exegesis is not seen as argumentative, but rather explanatory. de Wet ("John Chrysostom's Exegesis on the Resurrection, 91–114) shows the general belief about Chrysostom, who "may be categorized as an Antiochene exegete who places much emphasis on the history and language of a text, and avoids exaggerated allegorism" (93).

[7] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:1:11–14 (F 2:435).

[8] Young, "Rhetorical Schools," 186.

> hand the matter over, if it seems best, to reasoning, and let us change some men's minds, if possible, but let us compel others to do what belongs to a man with good sense.[9]

Both Libanius and Chrysostom's text argue against a certain position. For Libanius it is against those who shun marriage. For Chrysostom it is against those who think the gift of foreign speech was great. Libanius's text outlines two reasons why shunning marriage injures human life, which is the act of shunning marriage itself and inciting others to do the same.[10] The way Chrysostom establishes the main argument for this homily fits within the rhetorical culture of the time and it is similar to rhetorical exercises put forward by rhetors like Libanius. Chrysostom establishes the main reason why the Corinthians thought the gifts were great, the Apostles had it and used it, then he argues against this Apostolic use of the gift as an acceptable argument for the gift's greatness.

The argumentative nature of Chrysostom's homily, against the position that Apostolic reception and use of the gift makes it greater, enhances his exegesis of the text. Jaclyn Maxwell argues that Chrysostom "used rhetorical devices to keep the attention of one's hearers."[11] Chrysostom stylizes his exegesis to help bring the text to life for his audience. Furthermore, Chrysostom exegetes the passage to change his audience's conception about the gift of foreign speech. He seeks to persuade them of his position. He understands Paul to be writing to prove this same point. Chrysostom argues Paul writes both to καθαιρεῖ ("to attack") and to ἐπαίρει ("to promote") the gift of foreign speech, showing that it is "neither altogether useless nor as exceedingly beneficial by itself."[12]

---

[9] Gibson, *Libanius's Progymnasmata: Model Exercises*, 511.
[10] One cannot help but wonder if Libanius's example is set up against Christian monks.
[11] Maxwell, *Christianization and Communication in Late Antiquity*, 92.
[12] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:1:11, 17 (F 2:435).

Chrysostom does engage in the history of the text, which Cook argues is "an explanation of background details alluded to in the text, be they myths, legends or historical events."[13] Chrysostom explains two details of history. First, the Apostles received the gift of foreign speech due to their missionary enterprise. They were meant to "go abroad everywhere."[14] Second, the gift itself allowed the person to speak "articulately in Persian, in Roman, in Indian, and in many other languages."[15] Young comments that Chrysostom details the introductory material in such a way, which "ensures that context and thrust were not lost under the mass of detailed commentary."[16] This section achieves this set up, as the historical details of the gift of foreign speech are established, and Chrysostom lays out his exegetical roadmap: proving the gifts are not useful by themselves, yet neither are they altogether useless.

Prophecy and Foreign Speech: 1:18–1:26

This second subsection starts with the scriptural passage in 1:18 and ends with 1:26. This subsection contains a comparison between the gift of prophecy and of foreign speech. Chrysostom starts the comparison by reciting the scriptural text, which had previously been quoted, and repeats the thesis, "When saying, 'the one speaking in foreign speech does not talk to humans but to God, for no one understands,' he attacks it, proving it was not greatly useful. And when introducing how the Spirit speaks mysteries, again he elevates it, so you will not imagine it to be superfluous, unprofitable, and given in vain. 'However, the one prophesying speaks to edify, encourage, and comfort

[13] Cook, "Preaching and Christianization," 80–81.
[14] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:1:15 (F 2:435).
[15] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:1:16 (F 2:435).
[16] Young, "Rhetorical Schools," 191.

humans.'"[17] By isolating the citation from Paul's text, Chrysostom is able to present the comparison clearly. The gift of foreign speech is attacked and elevated, while the gift of prophecy is only praised. This is also the first hint of a pastoral emphasis as the criteria for being the better gift lies in its effect upon the audience. Cook argues Chrysostom draws out moral lessons from the text because that is part of the purpose for the text.[18] Young argues Chrysostom's process of exegesis is paraenetical, focusing on moral formation.[19] This pastoral emphasis acts as a hint towards the climax of the homily. Henry Toczydlowski argues the climatic main point is not given away too early in the homily; rather, at the beginning it is only hinted at.[20] Chrysostom delivers the hint: "See he shows how exceptional this gift is from its common benefit. And why is the profit of many given this special honour everywhere?"[21] Often, Chrysostom employs a wider use of vocabulary terms to highlight a single idea. David Rylaarsdam notes this phenomenon in his book *John Chrysostom On Divine Pedagogy*. He argues, "Although *συγκατάβασις* represents a more solidified vocabulary for the notion of adaptation than Chrysostom's predecessors used, the concept is broader in his work than a single term. . . . *Συγκατάβασις* is his conventional term, but he is not bound by it."[22] This happens throughout *Hom. 1 Cor. 35* where terms such as benefit, profit, and advantage express a mutual idea, one which encompasses the ideas of edification, encouragement, and comfort. This idea of 'benefit' becomes central to the pastoral emphasis, which Chrysostom will address later.

---

[17] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:1:18–19 (F 2:435).
[18] Cook, "Preaching and Christianization," 82.
[19] Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 249.
[20] Toczydlowski, "Analysis of the Rhetoric of St. John Chrysostom," 135.
[21] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:1:20 (F 2:435).
[22] Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*, 30.

In 1:22 Chrysostom uses the question-and-answer format to explain Paul's words. He says, "But of the ones speaking in foreign speech, no one without the gift understands them. Why? Did they even edify anyone? 'Yes,' he says, 'only themselves,' which is why he adds, the one speaking in foreign speech edifies himself."[23] Here, Chrysostom speaks of those who have the gift of foreign speech and argues only those with the gift of interpretation could understand them and no one else had the ability to understand them. The anonymous work *Rhetorica ad Herennium*[24] treats the question-and-answer format as an exegetical tool: "Through the figure, Reasoning by Question and Answer, we ask ourselves the reason for every statement we make, and seek the meaning of each successive affirmation."[25] Here, Chrysostom uses this device to further explore the meaning of the scriptural sentence. He gives words to Paul as the one answering the question, which gives further clarification as to his own statement. Chrysostom presents Paul as saying, "Yes, only themselves." This is an affirmation of how those with the gift of foreign speech only benefit themselves. Chrysostom then repeats a scriptural passage: ". . . which is why he says the one speaking in foreign speech edifies himself."[26]

The sentences comprising 1:24–1:26 function as the concluding point to this subsection and show the first proof for his thesis. Chrysostom argues, "The one prophesying edifies the congregation. In the same way the difference between one person and the congregation is great, the same is the difference between these. See his

---

[23] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:1:22 (F 2:435)

[24] Bizzell and Herzberg, (*Rhetorical Tradition*, 241–82) argue the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* is the oldest surviving complete rhetoric manual in Latin. The book shows Roman rhetoric in its Greek foundations. They argue "the main influences upon this work are the Greek thinkers Aristotle, Theophrastus, and Hermagoras" (241).

[25] Bizzell and Herzberg, *Rhetorical Tradition*, 256.

[26] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:1:23 (F 2:436)

wisdom, how he in no way excludes the gift but shows that it truly has some gain, albeit little, and can satisfy only the one who possesses it."[27] The gift of foreign speech has less honour because it does not benefit the congregation to the same capacity as the gift of prophecy. Even though the gift of foreign speech is shown to be less honourable than the gift of prophecy, Chrysostom argues it still has some benefit for its use.

Paul, Envy, the Gift of Foreign Speech: 2:1–2:11.

Subsection 3 builds upon the conclusion of the previous subsection. It begins with a repetition of the phrase Εἶτα ἵνα μὴ νομίσωσιν ("Next, so that you will not assume"). Chrysostom repeats this phrase to answer the objection before it is raised.[28] Chrysostom dismisses the thought that Paul attacks the gift due to envy as quickly as he introduces it as, "actually the majority had this gift, he says this to amend their suspicion."[29] Chrysostom again uses the history of the text to further clarify Paul's argument. Paul does approve of the majority of Corinthians using the gift, but he wants them to use it appropriately. The correct use of the gift is when it is used for the edification of the congregation. Chrysostom begins to point to Paul as an example for using the gift. Margaret Mitchell argues, "Chrysostom's portraits of Paul had a predominantly catechetical and exhortatory purpose."[30] The Corinthians thought the gift of foreign speech was highly honoured because the Apostles used it, so Chrysostom uses Paul, an Apostle, to provide a counterargument. Thus, Chrysostom can place the Apostolic intention before his audience to persuade them towards a different mindset. Chrysostom

[27] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:1:24–26 (F 2: 435–36).
[28] Bizzell and Herzberg, *Rhetorical Tradition*, 261.
[29] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:2:1 (F 2:436).
[30] Mitchell, *Heavenly Trumpet*, 396.

argues, “It is clear he does not slander the gift, rather he leads them towards the better one, displaying both his care for them and a way of life, which is free from all envy.”[31] Paul’s pastoral intention is the proof, which refutes the accusation that he attacks the gift through envy. This suspicion of envy is put aside because Paul wanted all of the Corinthians to speak in foreign speech, with one condition, that they should use it properly through an interpreter. In 2:8 Chrysostom argues, “He speaks, showing that he is seeking their benefit. Not hating the one who has the gift, nor anyone else at any rate, he pleads before his friend’s face, showing its unprofitableness.”[32] Chrysostom brings up the term benefit again. Just as prophecy benefits more people, Paul sought to benefit the Corinthians by arguing the gift of foreign speech needs an interpreter. Chrysostom uses Paul as a demonstration, and argues a gift is great because it can benefit people, not because an Apostle used it. To further support this, Chrysostom claims it is impossible for the gift of foreign speech to benefit anyone without an interpreter. He says, “For even if Paul is the one uttering foreign speech, there will be no advantage to those listening.”[33] This is an inherent weakness of the gift. Chrysostom explains Paul’s meaning: “What he says, is this: ‘if I cannot speak words, which you are easily able to understand, nor am able to make it clear, but only demonstrate that I have the gift of foreign speech, speech which you do not understand, you will depart without gaining anything. For how is that possible from the sound, which you do not understand?”[34] Thus, Chrysostom attacks the idea the Apostolic use of the gift made it great because even if the Apostles used it, it will not be beneficial unless there is an interpreter. In

[31] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:2:4 (F 2:436).
[32] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:2:8 (F 2:436).
[33] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:2:7 (F 2:436).
[34] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:2:10–11 (F 2:436–37).

doing so, he undermines the original assumption of what made the gift of foreign speech honourable. Even if the Apostles had it and used it, without an interpreter they would not have benefited anyone.

Example from Musical Instruments: 3:1–3:11

George Kennedy argues Chrysostom follows Paul's text very closely.[35] This subsection exemplifies his argument as Chrysostom follows Paul's example of musical instruments. Paul's text is a part of what Chrysostom seeks to explain. However, he integrates Paul's words as his own to use in constructing this subsection.

Chrysostom transitions into this subsection after arguing that people do not understand a foreign language being spoken to them. He writes: "How is that possible from the sound, which you do not understand?"[36] He expands on this thought, saying, "After all, inanimate objects give a sound, whether the pipe or the lyre. If they cannot give distinction to their sound how will it be known what is being played?"[37] Chrysostom argues in a way which tries to make the example seem obvious. It should be obvious that a musical instrument needs to be played clearly and appropriately. So too should it be obvious that the gift of foreign speech needs to be used with an interpreter to bring clarity to the spoken voice. Chrysostom argues, "For whether it be a pipe or a lyre if it has no rhythm nor proper stringing but is being played and breathed indiscriminately and without reserve, it will by no means attract those listening."[38] This example

[35] Kennedy, *Greek Rhetoric*, 246.
[36] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:2:11 (F 2:437).
[37] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:3:1 (F 2:437).
[38] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:3:4 (F 2:437).

produces the conclusion that "It is more necessary in human life and reason to give legibility to the spiritual gifts."[39]

The second part of this example focuses on the trumpet. Chrysostom explains Paul's reason for going on to the trumpet, saying that "he leads from the superfluous towards the indispensable and more useful argument."[40] Chrysostom calls the trumpet a more indispensable argument because of its association with war: "If the trumpet gives an uncertain sound, who will get ready for battle?"[41] The trumpet is used to make signals for armies. Sometimes it signals the charge, other times the retreat. If it is not played clearly, it will be disastrous for the army.[42] Thus, if it is unclear what signal the trumpet is sending, the army cannot properly get ready. He concludes this subsection with a question, "And why does he say this to us?"[43] It may be assumed most of the congregation were not soldiers, so the example might seem out of place. However, Chrysostom argues that it applies all the more to them, claiming, "Also in you, if you do not give a clear message through your speech, you will be speaking to air. That is to say, uttering to no one, speaking to no one, and showing its unprofitableness everywhere."[44] This subsection is another hint towards a pastoral emphasis. After all, who is given the responsibility of speaking to the congregation but the priests?

---

[39] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:3:6 (F 2:437).
[40] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:3:7 (F 2:437).
[41] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:3:7 (F 2:437).
[42] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:3:8–9 (F 2:437).
[43] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:3:10 (F 2:437).
[44] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:3:10–11 (F 2:437–38).

The Communal Context of the Gift of Foreign Speech: 4:1–20.

Chrysostom begins this section with the question and answer, "One asks, 'but if it is unprofitable why was it given?' So as to be useful to the one receiving it, and if it is likely to be useful to others, an interpreter is necessary."[45] This question-and-answer functions as a recap of the argument thus far. Chrysostom maintains the usefulness of the gift of foreign speech for the individual, with the condition that it needs an interpreter to be useful to others. With this transition he establishes the argumentative proof for this subsection, arguing, "He says this, gathering them towards one another, so that the one without the gift of interpretation may take another having it and he may produce a profit through him. Therefore, he everywhere shows its incompleteness so that he may bind them together."[46] The unprofitableness of the gift is restated as a reason to bring the community closer together. The gift is meant to be used communally with one speaking and one interpreting. Unlike the Corinthians, who thought the gift by itself was honourable, Chrysostom argues it is only useful when it "has one clarifying what is being spoken."[47]

From 4:6 to 4:8 Chrysostom uses a few small examples for comparison. First is the finger, which when detached from the body is of no use. Second is a return to the trumpet, which when its sound is unclear it is damaging for the army. The third example is of craftsmanship, wherein which a statue cannot be made without material given for the project, and it cannot take shape unless someone forms it.[48] Chrysostom ends these brief examples by saying, "Assume the sound is the material and the distinctness is the

[45] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:4:1 (F 2:438).
[46] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:4:2–3 (F 2:438).
[47] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:4:5 (F 2:438).
[48] Chrysostom, *As Corinthios*, 35:4:6–7 (F 2:438).

form, which if it is not present, it is not helpful for the matter."[49] If the gift of foreign speech has no interpreter it is just a block of stone, which is not being carved into a statue.

In his exegesis of 1 Cor 14:10 Chrysostom comments on the multifaceted nature of language. It is the second list of languages in this homily. The first is in 1:15 where the Roman, Persian, and Indian languages are named. These three languages are repeated here in addition with Scythian, Thracian, Maurian, and Egyptian.[50] This list shows the general diversity of human language.[51] Chrysostom uses them as examples of contemporary languages to work with Paul's thought. He continues "If, therefore, I do not know the meaning of the language, I will be a foreigner to the one speaking. 'For do not then believe that this happens only to us,' he says, 'but rather this can be seen taking place everywhere.'"[52] Chrysostom comments on the natural difficulty of inter-lingual exchange. If a Greek speaker does not know Scythian, they will not understand someone speaking in Scythian. The list of languages is meant to make this argument obvious. Foreign languages are not understood unless they are interpreted. Thus, Paul is not attacking the gift for no reason, but commenting on the nature of foreign languages.

---

[49] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:4:8 (F 2:438).

[50] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:4:10 (F 2:438), The exclusion of Greek in these lists makes sense because it was Chrysostom's spoken language, the language of this homily, and the language most of his congregation understood. Shepardson (*Controlling Contested Places*, 129–62) argues there was significant linguistic diversity in Antioch during the 4th century. The dichotomy of Greek and Syriac does not accurately cover the reality of the urban/rural divide as "there were clearly also some people in the city whose first language was Aramaic, some in the countryside who spoke Greek, and some in both contexts who were functionally bilingual" (140). Syriac is likely excluded from these lists because despite being a distinct language from Greek, its presence was common in Antioch and belonged to the Syrian countryside.

[51] All these languages, except Maurian, were spoken in the Eastern Mediterranean world. All of these languages would be familiar to Chrysostom's audience in Antioch. The Egyptian language here likely refers to Coptic. See Zetterholm's chapter "The Setting: Antioch-on-the-Orontes" in *The Formation of Christianity in Antioch*, and Kondoleon, ed. *Antioch: The Lost Ancient City*, for more information on the social history of Antioch.

[52] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:4:11–12 (F 2:438).

Chrysostom addresses Paul's methodology for going over the gift of foreign tongues. Chrysostom argues Paul has been building his argument to talk about a specific group, the priests. This explanation of Paul's methodology occurs in 4:15–17. Chrysostom says, "Do you see how by small steps he leads them upon the familiar subject? . . . For since he spoke about the pipe and the lyre where it is mostly inferior and unprofitable, he has now come to the trumpet, a more useful thing, then from there he also comes to the remaining sounds."[53] Chrysostom argues Paul had been using small steps to lead his audience from mundane instruments like the pipe and lyre towards a more practical one, the trumpet. He relates the instruments to social classes, arguing, "When he was lecturing about the proof, that it was not forbidden for the Apostles to receive it, beginning first with the farmers, shepherds, and soldiers, he then continues the argument to that, which is closer to what is being set before them: the priests, the ones in the past."[54] In Chrysostom's estimation, Paul held the priests as a primary audience for his discussion. Chrysostom in turn speaks to his own audience: "But I am speaking to you, examine how he is diligent everywhere to give the gift relief from the accusations and the narrow the complaint against the one receiving it."[55] This revelation functions as the climax of the exegesis section. Here, the goal is to isolate the priests as the primary audience for this homily.[56] Chrysostom argues that Paul is seeking to reduce the

---

[53] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:4:15–16 (F 2:438).

[54] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:4:17 (F 2:438–39)

[55] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:4:18 (F 2:439).

[56] It is believed multiple clergymen attended the same Synaxis, a liturgical gathering and often more than one preached. Mayer, ("John Chrysostom: Extraordinary Preacher," 105–37) prompts several questions about Chrysostom's audience, "what relationship does John bear to the rest of the clergy who are present? Why is he preaching? If other clergy are preaching at the same synaxis, in what order does he preach? How does John begin and conclude his homily? What relationship does the subject matter of his homily bear to the other parts of the liturgy? Does his homily reflect the liturgical understanding of that particular day?" (115). Elsewhere, Mayer ("Who Came to Hear John Chrysostom Preach," 73–87) cites *Laus Diodori* as an example when Chrysostom addresses a visiting Bishop directly, who was supposed to

complaint against the priests who have the gift. Chrysostom turns to address the misuse of the gift of foreign speech by the priests. He clarifies Paul's statement, "For he does not say, 'I will be a foreigner,' but 'a foreigner to the one speaking.' And again, he does not say, 'the foreign will be the one speaking,' but 'the one speaking is a foreigner to me.'"[57] The perspective is from a member of the audience, who cannot understand the one speaking, when speaking in a foreign language. Thus, the complaint is likely to arise against the one having the gift, the priests, because the audience cannot understand them when they speak.

Pray to Interpret: 5:1–6:8

In 5:1 Chrysostom continues talking to the priests through Paul. He transitions into this subsection with a *hypophora*,[58] "'Therefore,' one asks, 'what is necessary to happen? For one ought not attack it only, but to recommend and teach it.' And he certainly does this."[59] The person asking the question, following from the previous subsection, is likely an imagined priest. The imagined priest expresses a desire to teach and recommend the gift of foreign speech. To accomplish this desire, Chrysostom retorts that the priests should seek the benefit of the congregation. Chrysostom creates a Pauline pastoral rule for the priests to follow. He uses 1 Cor 14:12 to create this rule, saying, "since you are admiring the spiritual, search for the edification of the congregation so you may have a

---

preach afterwards" (84). The next subsection will clarify that Chrysostom is indeed talking to priests as his primary audience.

[57] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:4:19–20 (F 2:439).

[58] Here, the use of the question is not a question-and-answer but a hypophora. The fictional speaker has multiple questions, suggesting a dialoguing nature to this subsection between Chrysostom and the priests.

[59] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:5:1 (F 2:439).

surplus."[60] Chrysostom argues this is a pastoral rule, handed down by Paul, arguing, "See his aim everywhere, how he continually looks through everything for one purpose: the advantage for the most people. Does the congregation profit from placing this down as a rule?"[61] Chrysostom believes the answer is yes, for "he does not say 'so you may acquire the gifts,' rather, 'so you may have a surplus,' that is to say, 'so you all may have them in abundance.'"[62] Chrysostom then speaks as Paul: "I do not greatly desire to keep you from having them, rather, I desire you to grow more abundantly in them, only that you manage them for the common advantage."[63] Again, the imagined priest asks, "'How is it that this is to be done'?"[64] Chrysostom replies by quoting 1 Cor 14:13–15 in full. He uses the imagined priest to help frame Paul's text as giving directions to the priests on how to approach the gift of foreign speech.

From 5:7 through 5:15 Chrysostom unpacks these lines from Paul's text. Chrysostom uses this text to further his argument on the uselessness of the gift of foreign speech. Previously, Chrysostom argued the gift is useless to others if it does not have an interpreter. Here, he argues the gift is useless to the one using it if they cannot interpret it as the individual does not know what they themselves are saying. Chrysostom reaffirms Paul's method, arguing that he "continues the argument little by little, showing how such a person is useless to others and also to himself."[65] Chrysostom argues, "If he utters something only in the Persian language, or something in another one, and does not know what he says, then he will remain a foreigner to himself and not only to others because

[60] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:5:2 (F 2:439).
[61] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:5:3 (F 2:439).
[62] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:5:3 (F 2:439).
[63] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:5:4 (F 2:439).
[64] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:5.5 (F 2:439).
[65] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:5:11 (F 2:439–40).

he does not know the meaning of the language."[66] Chrysostom uses history to further explain this argument: "For there were many ancient people who had the gift of prayer with foreign speech. And truly they prayed, and the language was uttered, the sound of their prayer was in Persian or Roman, but the mind did not know what was being said."[67] This passage is the first time the gift of foreign speech is associated with prayer. Previously, Chrysostom explained the gift as speaking in various foreign languages, but now he frames it as praying in the Persian or Roman language. This association is made because Paul also connects the gift with praying in his text. Chrysostom offers a conclusion by sequencing two questions, "What then is best and most helpful? And how ought one to act or what is to be asked from God? To pray both with the Spirit, that is to say the gift, and with knowledge."[68] The individual wanting the gift of foreign speech should accept the gift's inability to be useful by itself, and to desire the gift of interpreting so they can benefit the congregation.

Chrysostom continues this argument and says that the gift of foreign speech can be understood by the one using it. He says, "Again here he plainly shows the foreign language can be spoken, and the mind may not be ignorant of what is being said."[69] He discusses 1 Cor 14:16–17 and again addresses Paul's pastoral rule that "he contemplates how to bring the stone to the measuring line, searching everywhere for the edification of the congregation."[70] Chrysostom uses repetition to reinforce Paul's pastoral rule, to seek the common benefit. He wants the priests to emulate Paul's example and approach this

[66] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:5:11 (F 2:439–40).
[67] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:5:12 (F 2:440).
[68] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:5:14 (F 2:440).
[69] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:6:1 (F 2:440).
[70] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:6:4 (F 2:440).

subject in the same way he does. Here, Chrysostom shows that Paul's concern and motive is to help the layperson. Chrysostom argues that the layperson suffers when they hear the gift of foreign speech without an interpreter. They cannot follow the liturgy, so they cannot respond with "amen" at the appropriate place. They cannot do this because they do not know when the speaker says, "Forever and ever."[71] Chrysostom concludes this subsection by reinforcing the benefit from the gift of foreign speech. The gift gives an individual encouragement because they speak to God through the Spirit. However, despite praying appropriately, the layperson does not understand: "He stands without receiving any benefit."[72] Earlier, Chrysostom attached the gift of foreign speech to prayer. Here, he talks as if the priests were giving the liturgy, or offering a prayer within the liturgy, in a foreign language.

The larger, public churches were governed by the State and would use the Greek language for their liturgy. The idea of delivering the entire liturgy in a foreign language such as Persian seems farfetched. However, the use of foreign speech in a smaller synaxis may have its logic. Peter Van Nuffelen, writing on the social context of public speaking in Late Antiquity, argues "It was clearly thought possible to achieve social and ecclesiastical prestige through preaching in Constantinople and popularity as a preacher was seen as a threat to the status of the bishop of the city."[73] If a priest or deacon preached a good sermon, or left a good impression on the wealthy, they may attract patrons.[74] This, Van Nuffelen argues, plays into the complex social and competitive network of the clergy. A priest's promotion by a patron may allow them to preach in a

[71] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:6:6–7 (F 2:440).
[72] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:6:8 (F 2:440).
[73] Van Nuffelen, "A War of Words," 205–6.
[74] Van Nuffelen, "A War of Words," 210–11.

larger venue and attract larger crowds. The priest's motive is not limited to personal gain, but even goals "such as the defence of orthodoxy and the care of the poor, may have driven these strategies."[75] Van Nuffelen's study focuses on a Constantinopolitan context, but as he argues, Antioch held a similar craze for rhetoric.[76] Kim Bowes explores private and public churches in both Rome and Constantinople. She argues the wealthy patrons were vital for private churches. In Constantinople, Bowes argues, "the vast majority of Constantinopolitan churches, monasteries, and other pious foundations were founded and controlled by urban elite."[77] Bowes's text does not cover Antioch, though little archaeology has been done due to the city being buried beneath the city of Antakya.[78] However, the urban setting in Antioch is not likely to be vastly different than Rome or Constantinople. Christine Shepardson notes, after indexing the public churches in Antioch,[79] that "church buildings were not the only local places of Antiochene Christian assembly and worship."[80] A competitive market for priests within an urban setting provides the clergy with an opportunity for advancement. A priest may try to offer a section of the liturgy, whether in the sermon or in a prayer, in a foreign language. The use of Persian or Latin could be used to gain the notice of patrons, who may want to support a priest, who is perceived to have the gift of foreign speech. This patronage could give the priest access to a larger venue or crowd. However, in their ambition, whether from a motive for personal gain or for Christian orthodoxy, if the priest is

[75] Van Nuffelen, "A War of Words," 212–13.
[76] Van Nuffelen, "A War of Words," 215–16.
[77] Bowes, *Private Worship, Public Values*, 107–8.
[78] Shepardson, *Controlling Contested Places*, 19.
[79] See Shepardson, *Controlling Contested Places*, 20ff.
[80] Shepardson, *Controlling Contested Places*, 25.

focused on using the gift, they overlooked the effect it has on the layperson. As Chrysostom argues, they have benefited themselves, but not the audience.[81]

Paul as Pastoral Demonstration: 7:1–7:15.

This subsection contains the last portion of Chrysostom's exegesis for this homily. Chrysostom transitions into the subsection by saying, "Next, because he attacked the ones having this gift, as not having acquired something great, so they may not suppose they are being defrauded of it if he reduces it, see what he says, 'I give thanks to God that I speak in foreign languages more than all of you.'"[82] Chrysostom gives a variation of Εἶτα ἵνα μὴ νομίσωσιν by stating ἵνα μὴ δόξῃ ὡς ἀπεστερημένος ("So that they may not suppose they are being defrauded"). To show they are not being robbed of something great, Chrysostom shows Paul is seeking their benefit. The appeal to use an interpreter is not meant to harm the congregation but benefit it.

Chrysostom then uses intertextuality to explain Paul's words. Chrysostom uses Phil 3:4–7 to illuminate the meaning of 1 Cor 14:18. Chrysostom has Paul say, "'Whatever was gain to me, this I consider loss because of Christ.' Thus, he also does here, saying, 'I speak in foreign languages more than all of you.'"[83] Chrysostom interprets this to mean Paul counts his ability to speak in foreign languages as a loss, not

---

[81] Chrysostom is not overtly talking about the social mobility of the priest here. In his application Chrysostom draws attention to the motive of vain-glory, or self-promotion, which implicitly covers a priest's desire for advancement. Van Nuffelen ("A War of Words," 201–17) argues Chrysostom' *Six Books on the Priesthood* showcases how the competition is driven by the audience. If a priest or Bishop does not give a good sermon, or cannot debate an opponent well, they may be rejected by the audience. The audience demanded rhetoric and they often got it. Van Nuffelen argues, "all in all, *On Priesthood* shows that the social mechanism that underpinned public oratory during the Second Sophistic remained largely intact: rhetorical prowess could lead to an increase in social status, even in the Church" (208). If Chrysostom addresses these issues in *Six Books on the Priesthood*, see section 4:5–7, then its inclusion in *Hom. 1 Cor. 35* shows a continuity within Chrysostom's pastoral thought.

[82] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:7:1 (F 2:440).

[83] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:7:5–6 (F 2:441).

a gain. So, still speaking as Paul, he concludes "Do not be greatly arrogant as if you alone have the gift, for I possess it and more than you."[84] Chrysostom uses this statement to build a context for 1 Cor 14:19, "I desire to speak five words in the presence of the congregation through my understanding, so that I might instruct others."[85] Chrysostom uses Paul for two purposes. First, he is a demonstration of one having a greater ability to speak in foreign languages, and second, he represents the Apostolic motivation. In the introduction to *Hom. 1 Cor. 35* Chrysostom argues the Corinthians valued the gift of foreign speech because the Apostles had it first. Here, however, the Apostle Paul is put forward to show what the Apostles genuinely cared about, not speaking in foreign languages, but instructing the congregation with clarity. In 7:11–12 Chrysostom summarizes this point, "For the one has but exhibition only, but the other helps the many. For what he seeks everywhere is this: the common benefit."[86] This pastoral rule is used repeatedly throughout the homily to reinforce its importance.

Chrysostom ends this subsection, and so also the exegesis, by using history to explain why the gift of foreign speech was valued so much. Chrysostom argues that "the gift, the one of foreign speech, was unfamiliar, but the one of prophecy was familiar, ancient, and by this time was given to many, and then this was first, but all the same he did not greatly desire it."[87] The gift of prophecy was well-known throughout Greek history, but the gift of foreign speech represents a new occurrence. The newness of the gift made it attractive as it was unfamiliar. Yet, the novelty of the gift did not make it attractive to Paul who sought the common benefit, not novelty. The final sentences are

---

[84] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:7:6 (F 2:441).
[85] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:7:7 (F 2:441).
[86] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:7:11–12 (F 2:441).
[87] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:7:13 (F 2:441).

summative statements on Paul's motivation: "Therefore, he did not use it not because he did not have it, but because he sought the more useful things. For he was free from all conceitedness and looking for one thing only, how he will improve those listening."[88] Here Chrysostom repeats the same pastoral imperative, which Paul used as a concluding argument. Paul is placed before the priests as the example to follow when approaching this gift. Chrysostom places the same Apostolic example for the gift of foreign speech as was used by the Corinthians to argue for a different conclusion. Chrysostom uses the Corinthian's own values against them. If the priests valued the Apostles, they ought to follow the Apostolic example and teach the congregation with clarity. The priests should not seek to demonstrate they have the gift of foreign speech, but to benefit the listeners.

Section 2: A Comparison between Seeking Benefit and Conceit

The coherence of *Hom. 1 Cor. 35* is maintained between the exegesis and the application. The final argument of the exegesis is that Paul was free from conceit and looked to benefit those listening.[89] This is, first, an argument that looks back over the exegesis. Paul did not flaunt the gift of foreign speech because he was not conceited. By contrast, priests who do use the gift without an interpreter do so because of their conceit. Instead of desiring public honour, the priests should be operating from a motive of seeking the common benefit. This approach to the priesthood is not solely the application of the exegesis on the gift of foreign speech. Chrysostom's argument in this section is that the Apostles demonstrate the pastoral rule of seeking the common benefit through their rejection of public honour. Thus, the coherence of the homily is maintained

[88] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:7:14–15 (F 2:441).
[89] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:7:15 (F 2:441).

through the continuation of the discussion of this pastoral rule, which Chrysostom established in the exegesis. To seek the common benefit, the priest must not only teach in understandable language, but they must also reject the desire for public honour.

This section is split between three subsections. The first two are comparisons. First, Chrysostom compares the Apostles's behaviour and motive with that of the Greek world, using general statements. The second comparison is between Diogenes and Paul. In the third subsection, Chrysostom uses Abraham and Paul as examples of individuals who overcame the desire for public honour.

Apostles Compared: 8:1–8:19

The transition out of the exegesis and into the next section is contained both in 7:15, mentioned above, and in 8:1 where Chrysostom says, "And on this account he is able to look for the useful thing, both for himself and for others since he is set free from empty praise."[90] The terms "for himself and for others" build on the exegetical section, where Chrysostom argued that those who used the gift of foreign speech without an interpreter could benefit neither themselves, nor anyone else. In contrast to that conclusion of the gift's ineffectiveness, Paul demonstrates the ability to be useful to himself and to others. Paul achieves this, Chrysostom argues, because he was not conceited; Paul rejected public honour to seek the common benefit. This comparison is built on arguments established in the exegesis. While the spiritual gifts are not mentioned in the rest of the homily, the core pastoral principles remain. Chrysostom finishes the transition by saying:

[90] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:8:1 (F 2:441).

> Indeed, the one who is enslaved is not able to perceive the benefit, not only for others, but not even for himself. Such was Simon Magus, who because he looked for empty praise was not able to look for his own profit. Such also were the Jews, who through this freely gave up their own salvation to the Deceiver. Here idols were born, and by the worthless judgements of outside philosophers they were urged on from these and ran aground from madness. So, observe the perversion of the passion! How because of this some became poor, while others were eager for wealth. The tyrant has so much of it as to prevail against the opposition. Indeed, one thinks conceitedly upon self-control, and again another upon adultery, and this one upon righteousness, and another upon unrighteousness, and upon luxuries, and upon fasting, and upon reasonableness, and upon over-confidence, and upon riches, and upon poverty. For some from outside, being present to receive, did not receive through their amazement.[91]

Chrysostom ties together a number of introductory examples for this comparison. These are examples of conceit, the desire for public honour. Chrysostom uses numerous terms to express the same idea: κενοδοξίαν ("conceit"), δόξης ("glory"), and love for φιλοτιμίαν ("honour"). The multiplicity of terms refers to the desire to be publicly praised. Chrysostom does not stick to a single vocabulary term. In this introduction to the application, Simon Magus is said to have desired empty praise, the Jews rejected their salvation through conceit, likely referring to the rejection of Jesus, and idolatry is created, urged on by outside philosophers.[92] Through conceit some became poor while others desired wealth. In 8:6 Chrysostom argues that tyrants have a lot of conceit to prevail against their opposition. He includes a list of conceit actions mixing positive ones such as self-control, righteousness, fasting, reasonableness, and poverty with negative ones like adultery, unrighteousness, luxuries, over-confidence, and riches. In

---

[91] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:8:1–8 (F 2:441–42).

[92] Greek = ἔξωθεν. Sandwell (*Religious Identity in Late Antiquity*, 63–90) argues there are multiple terms Christian leaders used to create religious identity. Terms such as Greek, outsider, unbeliever and Judeans, were terms used to distinguish between Christians and other religious groups. The term, ἔξωθεν is one of the terms describing "those who were not 'subject to the doctrines and laws of Christ' and had not received the Gospel" (63–64). Jones (*Between Pagan and Christian*, 1–8) argues the term 'outside' as used here is "less opprobrious" (3) than alternative words used to construct religious identities.

mixing the two together, Chrysostom may be implying conceit turns positive actions into negative ones. They are, however, listed without any obvious ordering. He ends this introductory list in 8:8 with a reference to the crowds at Pentecost, who did not receive the Holy Spirit because they were awestruck by the sight of the Apostles speaking in foreign languages.[93] This long list shows the dangers of conceit and of the desire for public honour. Chrysostom, in 8:9, says, "But the Apostles were not like this. For they were pure from empty praise as was seen through was they did."[94] Chrysostom uses Acts 14:8–18 to highlight the Apostles's rejection of public praise. Chrysostom argues that the Apostles both forbade others from worshipping them and considered being worshiped as shameful, so they tore their clothes. They further diverted wonder away from them when they healed the lame man in a town.[95] They became all things to all people, choosing poverty when in the company of those honouring it, and honouring wealth when in the presence of the rich.[96] They kept neither money nor possessions but offered it up to the needy. Thus, "they did not do anything through conceit but accomplished everything through kind-heartedness."[97] This description of the Apostles is both contrasted with the introductory list, which outlined the dangers of conceit, and the Greek philosophers, who Chrysostom proceeds to mention. He says, "On the contrary these did everything as though being enemies and corrupters of our common nature."[98] He then proceeds to offer an example. In 8:14 he refers to an individual who "threw everything of his into the sea without purpose and without reason, imitating the

[93] Chrysostom addresses this topic in more detail in *Ad Corinthios*, 35:2:15–17 (F 2:451).
[94] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:8:9–10 (F 2:442).
[95] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:8:11–12 (F 2:442).
[96] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:8:12 (F 2:442).
[97] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:8:13 (F 2:442).
[98] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:8:13 (F 2:442).

delirious and the enraged and elsewhere let all of his land become a sheep pasture."[99] The *NPNF* cites this passage as talking about two figures: Aristippus and Democritus.[100] P. R. Coleman-Norton offers a different view. He argues that Chrysostom is talking about a single individual, Crates.[101] Coleman-Norton's suggestion of the figure being Crates is more convincing. The *NPNF* cites Latin sources; for Aristippus it is Horace and Cicero,[102] and for Democritus, only Horace is cited.[103] These citations match, at first, as Aristippus loses his wealth in the ocean and Democritus let his fields be eaten by sheep. However, Chrysostom did not speak Latin. The likelihood of him referencing Latin texts is low. Aristippus's story is cited in Diogenes Laertius's *Lives of the Eminent Philosophers*, and so offers a Greek source for Chrysostom to cite. However, the connection between Democritus and the field does not appear in Diogenes's text. During his rhetorical education Chrysostom would have learned from "the best classical Greek authors, both poets and philosophers. Of their sentiments he retained little admiration when he entered the Christian life and to their writings he probably seldom recurred for recreation, but his retentive memory enabled him to point and adorn his arguments with illustrations and quotations from them."[104] Diogenes's text, filled with stories, is likely one of these texts, of which Chrysostom retains memory.[105] Furthermore, Jaclyn Maxwell argues, Chrysostom's sermons were less complex than those of his contemporaries. He used allusions to a common culture, shared by elite and common

---

[99] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:8:14 (F 2:442).
[100] *NPNF* 1/12, 212.
[101] Coleman-Norton, "St. Chrysostom and the Greek Philosophers, 308.
[102] Horace, *Satires*, *Epistles*, *Art of Poetry*, 3; Cicero, *On Invention*, 58.
[103] Horace, *Satires*, *Epistles*, *Art of Poetry*, 12.
[104] Coleman-Norton, "St. Chrysostom and the Greek Philosophers," 305.
[105] For an introduction to Diogenes's text and its reception in modern scholarship, see Miller, "Introduction," vii–xviii.

people, to make his sermons accessible.[106] Diogenes's text contains stories, which were likely common enough to be known among Chrysostom's audience. However, this story of Aristippus is unlikely the one Chrysostom references. Aristippus's loss of money is described as ὡς μὴ θέλων παρακατέβαλε, "not desiring to throw it in."[107] Chrysostom's illustrations imply the intentionality of throwing the possessions into the sea. Like Aristippus, Crates's story is contained in Diogenes's text, which reads φησὶ δὲ Διοκλῆς πεῖσαι αὐτὸν Διογένην τὴν οὐσίαν μηλόβοτον ἀνεῖναι καὶ εἴ τι ἀργύριον εἴη, εἰς θάλατταν βαλεῖν.[108] Crates has three advantages over Aristippus for being the candidate. First, Crates throws his possessions into the sea with intentionality. Second, Crates also lets his field be consumed by the flock. Third, Crates is persuaded to do these actions by Diogenes the Cynic, who appears in the next subsection. Because Crates does both actions cited by Chrysostom, both in the same story, and the story relates to Diogenes, he is likely the figure mentioned, as Coleman-Norton argues.

Chrysostom takes a strong, negative appraisal of Crates's story, with which to compare the Apostles. Chrysostom argues that the Apostles "were accepting of what was given to them and distributed it to the needy with all freedom and even lived with continual hunger."[109] Unlike Crates, the Apostles demonstrate what it is like to live with the desire to benefit others. Chrysostom clarifies, "If they were grateful for glory, they would not have done this, the receiving and distributing. They were cautious so that no suspicion might arise against them."[110] Unlike Crates, the Apostles were careful to build

---

[106] Maxwell, *Christianization and Communication in Late Antiquity*, 93.
[107] Hicks, trans., *Diogenes Laertius* [1925], 1:207.
[108] Hicks, trans., *Diogenes Laertius* [1925], 2:91. "Diocles relates how Diogenes persuaded Crates to give up his fields to sheep pasture and throw into the sea any money he had" (translated by R. D. Hicks).
[109] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:8:16 (F 2:442).
[110] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:8:17 (F 2:442).

a good reputation. In 8:18 Chrysostom concludes, “The one who throws away his own glory, he will more greatly not accept it from others as not to appear to need others, and not to be suspicious.”[111] Instead of throwing their possessions into the sea: the Apostles threw away their desire for glory, thus they did not receive glory from others, nor did they need the praise from others. Chrysostom ends with a final evaluation at the Apostles and determined that they did not look for their own glory, but they were constantly serving and even begging for the poor. Chrysostom calls them “more tender-loving than any father.”[112]

Apostolic Teaching Compared: 9:1–9:9

In this subsection Chrysostom compares Paul with Diogenes the Cynic whom he calls the Sinopean. Chrysostom transitions into this subsection with the main point, “And contemplate their moderate instructions, they are free from conceit.”[113] Paul is shown to be free from conceit, while Diogenes does everything through it.

Chrysostom attacks Diogenes for the famous aspects of his life: living in a jar and scorning his contemporaries. Chrysostom says Diogenes was dragged down by his madness for glory.[114] Chrysostom’s association of Diogenes with pride is not new. One story of Diogenes tells of an exchange with Plato. It is said, “One day when Plato had invited to his house friends coming from Dionysius, Diogenes trampled upon his carpets and said, ‘I trample upon Plato’s vainglory.’ Plato’s reply was ‘How much pride you expose to view, Diogenes, by seeming not to be proud.’ Others tell us that what

[111] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:8:18 (F 2:442).
[112] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:8:19 (F 2:442).
[113] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:9:1 (F 2:442).
[114] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:9:4 (F 2:443).

Diogenes said was, 'I trample upon the pride of Plato,' who retorted, 'Yes, Diogenes, with pride of another sort.'"[115] However, Paul was not like Diogenes. Paul "did not look for distinction but was both clothed with graceful clothing and continually lived in a house and displayed every other virtue with rigid discipline."[116] In this comparison, the appearance of Paul is put forward as a positive. He both dressed and lived in a normal fashion and did nothing to stand out, unlike Diogenes. Chrysostom argues Paul rented his house in Rome instead of owning his own estate.[117] Thus, Paul associated with the poor. Chrysostom ends this brief comparison with praise for Paul, who could do everything more vigorously than Diogenes because "he did not look for glory, that dangerous beast, that horrific demon, that corruption of the world, that venomous viper."[118]

Abraham and Paul as Portrait: 10:1–10:13.

Chrysostom had just cited the dangers of desiring glory. He now asks, "Where will anyone find the medicine to this diverse disease?"[119] This question is the transition into the next subsection. Here, Chrysostom uses Abraham as a portrait for how to overcome the desire for glory. Because Chrysostom displays the desire for glory as almost unconquerable, he can elevate the individuals who conquer it as heroic. Here, Chrysostom appeals to two individuals, Abraham and Paul. These two individuals are important for the ideal depiction of the Christian life.[120]

---

[115] Hicks, trans., *Diogenes Laertius* [1925], 1:8.
[116] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:9:4 (F 2:443).
[117] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:9:6 (F 2:443), citing Acts 28:30.
[118] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:9:7–8 (F 2:443).
[119] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:10:1 (F 2:443).
[120] See: Tonias, *Abraham in the Works of John Chrysostom*; and Mitchell, *The Heavenly Trumpet*, for more detailed examinations of these two figures in Chrysostom's works.

When Chrysostom mentions Abraham in this section, he stops to address the audience and to defend his choice of using him, saying, "Do not accuse me of repeating what I have already said if I mention him frequently and on every occasion. For this shows that he is all the more wonderful and deprives them that do not emulate him from every excuse."[121] One might imagine that the audience groaned when hearing of Abraham. In the previous homily, *Hom. 1 Cor.* 34, Chrysostom also appeals to Abraham.[122] Chrysostom portrays Abraham as an individual who was able to conquer the desire for glory before grace. He writes "What defense have they made, who being after the law and grace are not able to come first in measure when compared with those before the law and grace? How, therefore, did this Patriarch prevail and conquer this beast when he had a dispute with his nephew?"[123] Chrysostom attempts to shame his audience by suggesting Abraham was better than they, and he lived before both Moses and Jesus. Chrysostom recounts the story of Abraham and Lot from Genesis 13 where they split the land. Then, Chrysostom summarizes four stories involving Abraham, which are meant to show his rejection of glory. First, Abraham rejects honour when dealing with Lot, "for even being disadvantaged and failing to obtain the first quality he was not grieved."[124] Chrysostom relates this story to a common experience of his audience when he writes "But you know that in these things the shame is worse than the loss to the mean-spirited, and it is more so when the one having all the power, just as

[121] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:10:3–4 (F 2:443).

[122] Chrysostom (*Ad Corinthios*, 35:10:1–13) says "but do not accuse me of repeating what I have already said if I mention him frequently and on every occasion (10:3) upon his mention of Abraham. If *Hom. 1 Cor.* 35 is preached sequentially following *Hom. 1 Cor.* 34 then his reusing of Abraham in quick succession may have evoked a negative response. Thus, this line may be Chrysostom defending himself against such a reaction.

[123] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:10:6 (F 2:443).

[124] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:10:7 (F 2:443).

Abraham had, first shows honour yet does not receive honour in return."[125] Chrysostom draws sympathy to Abraham by describing Lot as mean-spirited and not showing proper honour to his elder who deserved it. Abraham's response, however, was not to get angry with Lot. Chrysostom says: "None of these things were able to sting him, but he even acquiesced to have the second place and the old man was wronged by the youth. He, the uncle by the nephew, was not displeased nor annoyed, but he loved him the same as always and provided for him."[126] Abraham shows how to conquer the desire for glory through love. Abraham was not upset at being treated wrongly but allowed it to happen because his love for his nephew was greater than his desire to have honour.

Abraham's life is further paralleled to the culture of Late Antiquity. Abraham won a battle but gave no military parade, he only wished to save lives, not to demonstrate his strength.[127] Abraham received strangers and presented himself and his wife as their servants, and treating their presence as honour done to him, instead of using it as an opportunity to display his own goodness.[128] Chrysostom shows Abraham's treatment of Sarah in Egypt as a positive example. Abraham was honoured because he did not brag about the beauty of his wife; the remainder of the story is skipped over entirely, but Chrysostom uses its conclusion, saying, "Even the inhabitants were calling him royalty."[129] Abraham gave a down payment for his tomb, and when he sent his servant to get a wife for Isaac, he commanded not to boast about his son, but to merely bring the bride.[130] These stories depict Abraham as humble. Abraham does not brag

---

[125] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:10:8 (F 2:443–44).
[126] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:10:9 (F 2:444).
[127] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:10:10 (F 2:444), referring to Gen 14:13–16.
[128] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:10:11 (F 2:444), referring to Gen 18:1–9.
[129] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:10:12 (F 2:444), referring to Gen 12:10–20.
[130] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:10:12–13 (F 2:444), referring to Gen 24:1–9.

about his own wealth or honour. Rather, he accepts dishonour and hardship and treats others with love. Thus, Chrysostom depicts how one can overcome the desire for honour by seeking another's benefit through love and humility.

Paul demonstrates a Christian example of how to overcome this desire. Paul never brags about his own success but gives all the credit to God. Instead, he recalls all his faults.[131] Chrysostom then argues Paul yields the first place to Peter, which is a twist on Apostolic primacy.[132] Paul is so humble he does not desire to be the greatest Apostle but allows Peter to take that honour, nor is Paul ashamed to work with less famous people like Priscilla and Aquila.[133] Chrysostom praises Paul further by stating that he is "everywhere eager to show himself lowly, not swaggering into the markets, nor carrying the crowds around with himself, but assimilating himself among the insignificant."[134] Unlike famous teachers, rhetors, or philosophers, Paul never draws attention to himself but intentionally tries to be insignificant. More than this, Paul showed contempt for heavenly honour, and even wished to be accursed from Christ for Christ's glory, and to suffer on behalf of the Judeans.[135] Chrysostom's argument follows this line: "If Paul despised heavenly honour, why would it be surprising to see him reject human honour?"[136]

Abraham is used to illustrate the need to love others with humility. Paul demonstrates the need to intentionally be humble and insignificant. The combination of

---

[131] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:11:1 (F 2:444).
[132] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:11:1 (F 2:444).
[133] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:11:1 (F 2:444).
[134] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:11:1 (F 2:444).
[135] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:11:2–3 (F 2:444).
[136] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:11:3 (F 2:444).

love and humility allow an individual, specifically the priest, to avoid becoming proud when they are praised, and depressed when they are mistreated.

Section 3: Wealth Brings Dishonour After Death

After the examples of Abraham and Paul, Chrysostom moves into the second section of the application. The focus of the first section was contrasting the pastoral rule of seeking the common benefit with the desire for glory. In this second part, Chrysostom focuses on the fear of dishonour. He argues that these people "are altogether overwhelmed, not only by the desire for glory, but additionally by insolence and fear of dishonour."[137] This section remains connected with the previous section because it functions as an expansion to the application on the desire for glory. Abraham was used to show how being mistreated and dishonoured could be overcome by humble love. In this section, Chrysostom does not make a comparison between the fear of dishonour and seeking the common benefit but argues the hoarding of wealth brings dishonour.

Pastoral Goal for the Soul and Dishonour: 12:1–12:21

Chrysostom turns from public honour to the topic of dishonour. He retains cohesion through the transition, in which he says:

> But now these are altogether overwhelmed, not only by the desire for glory but additionally by insolence and fear of dishonour. For, should anyone praise you it would puff you up. If anyone should blame you it would make you depressed. And just as the weak bodies are under the chance of being injured, so are the souls that grovel on the ground. For in such a way, not only poverty but wealth kills, not only grief but also joy, and the prosperity is greater than the adversity.[138]

[137] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:12:1 (F 2:444–45).
[138] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:12:1–4 (F 2:445).

To demonstrate the fear of dishonour Chrysostom proceeds to pair it with wealth. It is wealth, not poverty, which brings dishonour.[139] If people fear dishonour, then they ought to reject the source of such dishonour, which is wealth. Chrysostom expands upon the previous pastoral rule in 12:7 by saying, "We do not flee from poverty nor admire wealth, but we prepare the soul to be competent in all things."[140] Priests should not simply seek the common benefit, but they seek to construct an individual to be competent in every circumstance.[141] Chrysostom establishes this principle through three brief examples. First is the builder of a house who does not think much about weather patterns but builds the house to endure every type of weather.[142] The second is the builder of a ship who does not think of ways to stop waves from hitting the ship but how to build a ship that can endure any condition.[143] The third example is a doctor who does not think about how a patient may avoid feeling ill on any given day but how to have their patient endure all things.[144]

Chrysostom states the thesis for this section, "Therefore, let us also act upon the soul, let us not be anxious to flee from poverty, nor seek how we may become rich but how each one may conduct himself in all of these for our own safety. Therefore, let us

---

[139] Van Nuffelen ("A War of Words," 201–17) summarises Chrysostom's teaching to priests, include a reference to *Six Books on the Priesthood* 5:7, arguing that "the preacher should avoid feeling flattered by praise, so as to avoid vainglory when applauded and disappointment when booed. Such an attitude permits the priest to focus on educating his audience rather than pleasing it" (9:207). Van Nuffelen's summary is similar to Chrysostom's line in 12:2: "should anyone praise you it would puff you up. If anyone should blame you it would make you depressed."

[140] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:12:7 (F 2:445).

[141] This addition to the pastoral rule can also apply to the earlier sections of the homily. Chrysostom seeks to make individuals competent in the use of spiritual gifts. He does not consider how to give each person each gift, but to enable everyone to use their gifts appropriately.

[142] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:12:8 (F 2:445).

[143] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:12:9 (F 2:445).

[144] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:12:10 (F 2:445).

leave this and let us construct the soul to be competent both in wealth and in poverty."[145] The person who can manage to live with both wealth and poverty is able to endure all trials in life. Chrysostom continues with the following comparison, "And just as the one who has confidence in the strength of his body and skill in fighting is a better soldier than the one who only has strong armour, so too is the one having confidence in wealth worse than the one who has a strong defense from virtue."[146] This comparison is constructed in a strange way. The comparison sets up the expectation that the person with virtue is equivalent to the skilled fighter, and would read, "so too is the one having a strong defense from virtue greater than the one having confidence in wealth." However, the comparison is reversed. The skilled fighter is paired with the one having confidence in wealth. Thus, the skilled fighter is better than the one having only armor, but the one having wealth is worse than the one having virtue. In 12:7 Chrysostom uses a line that is connected with the opening illustration, saying, "Though it might be possible not to fall into poverty it is impossible to be unafflicted, for wealth has many billows and trouble. But not virtue, it only has pleasure and safety."[147] This passage is tied back to 1:7 where Chrysostom describes the effects of pursuing love and virtue: "If this is accomplished, we will have no more hard labour to do, and nothing more to obtain, but we will be living in luxury and celebrating festivals as we walk on the narrow path of virtue."[148] Chrysostom repeats this sentiment to reinforce the argument that virtue is better than wealth. Here, Chrysostom is building the case that having virtue is

---

[145] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:12:11–12 (F 2:445). Chrysostom's use of the first person here draws the audience to participate in the construction of their own souls. This can be seen as a call to the clergy to engage in proper pastoral care. Chrysostom wants to deter the desire for glory, the fear of dishonour, and the hoarding of wealth.

[146] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:12:15 (F 2:445).

[147] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:12:16–17 (F 2:445–46).

[148] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:1:7 (F 2:434).

"to be competent in all things," which brings real joy in life, while wealth is disastrous and dangerous.

Chrysostom further expands on this argument in 12:18–20 where he compares virtue and wealth to animals. Wealth is an easy animal to catch. It is naturally cowardly like the deer or rabbit, always being scared and having anxiety. However, virtue is like the strong animals, the boar or lion, which avoid traps.[149] Chrysostom concludes this subsection with a slough of questions before continuing into his next argument. He asks, "For which rich man is not anxious? Are there not thieves? Are there not rulers? Are there not slanderers? Are there not secret agents? And why do I speak of thieves and secret agents? Truly, he is always suspicious of his own household. And why do I talk of life? Not even in death is he free from the villainy of thieves, nor is death able to vigilantly keep him safe, but evildoers loot the corpse."[150]

The Wealthy Dead: 13:1–13:22

The questions, which end the previous subsection, act as the transition into this subsection. The series of questions end with the topic of grave robbing and looting the corpse, which is the focus for this subsection. While speaking on the topic of wealth is common in Chrysostom's homilies, he shows remarkable diversity in the ways he speaks against it. Here, the discussion is almost entirely confined to the treatment of corpses of wealthy individuals while being robbed. The purpose of this subsection is to display the dishonour that wealth brings to a corpse. The main part of this subsection starts in 13:3 and goes through 13:22. In this subsection Chrysostom argues that wealth's wounds are

[149] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:12:18–20 (F 2:445–46).
[150] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:12:21–13:1 (F 2:445–46).

like the ways grave robbers treat the corpse of a rich person. Grave robbers do not rob the poor but allow them to be kept safely.[151] Even robbers themselves enjoy peace in their tomb as no one disturbs them.[152] Furthermore, the law only pursues people until death but does not attack them afterwards.[153] However, wealth causes the individual to be haunted in life and after death. When a rich person is robbed during their life the robbers do not touch their body, but after death the grave robbers strip everything from the body.[154] The dead body is shamed by being stripped naked, treated brutally, and remains desecrated and mocked.[155] He argues the sight of a dead body brings even rivals to tears and causes them to weep for their enemy as if they were a dear friend as people have reverence for the dead.[156] However, wealth does not share in that reverence: "It does not give up its wrath to those who have been put to death, but it appoints them enemies of death."[157] Wealth attacks an individual even after their death. Chrysostom concludes, "Thus, wealth is a faithless thing and not only for those who have it, but also to those who are attempting to seize it. So, this is a useless argument, being eager to show that wealth is irresistible when they do not happen to have this security even in the day of their death."[158] He ends this section by reinforcing his argument:

> For the passion of the love of money, like some cruel tyrant over us, is cheering on those inhuman demands and makes them wild beasts and so is leading them into tombs. For like beasts attacking the dead they do not even abstain from flesh, if supposing any limb is useful to them. Such is our enjoyment of wealth, being mocked even after death and being deprived of tombs, which even the boldest of the dying criminals get to enjoy.[159]

---

[151] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:13:10 (F 2:447).
[152] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:13:22 (F 2:448).
[153] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:13:7 (F 2:446–47).
[154] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:13:4 (F 2:446).
[155] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:13:5, 9 (F 2:446–47).
[156] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:13:13–15 (F 2:447).
[157] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:13:16 (F 2:447).
[158] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:13:11–12 (F 2:447).
[159] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:13:20–22 (F 2:447–448).

Wealth robs people of honour, while poverty protects a person's honour after death.

Concluding Remarks: 14:1–14:7

The last subsection of this final part is the homily's conclusion. In 14:1 Chrysostom asks his audience if they wish to hoard wealth. He says, "Are we still then affectionate towards it, tell me, to such an enemy? No! I appeal to you, no, brothers, but let us flee without turning back, and when it comes into our hands let us not hoard it inside but let us fasten it to the hands of the poor."[160] Here, Chrysostom is appealing to the priests to live a life of almsgiving. Generally, the assumed audience for almsgiving is the rich.[161] In *Six Books on the Priesthood*, the expenditure of money is an important consideration for the clergy. Chrysostom tells of a clergyman who hoarded money:

> One who was entrusted not long ago with this ministry, and got together a large hoard of money, neither consumed it himself, nor expended it with a few exceptions upon those who needed it, but kept the greater part of it buried in the earth until a season of distress occurred, when it was all surrendered into the hands of the enemy. Much forethought, therefore, is needed, that the resources of the Church should be neither over abundant, nor deficient, but that all the supplies which are provided should be quickly distributed among those who require them.[162]

The priests should not hoard money but distribute it to those who need it. Likewise, in *Hom. 1 Cor. 35* Chrysostom argues the priests should not hoard wealth, but "fasten it to the hands of the poor."[163] The imagery of fastening money to the hands of the poor relates back to the introduction, where Chrysostom argued love is constantly leaping

---

[160] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:14:1 (F 2:448).

[161] See Bae, "John Chrysostom on Almsgiving," and Clapsis "Dignity of the Poor" for more detailed studies on almsgiving in Chrysostom's works.

[162] *NPNF* 1/9:56.

[163] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:14:1 (F 2:448).

away and "we must do everything to restrain it accurately."[164] Here, the enemy of wealth is properly restrained by almsgiving. Love is an animal, which when caught, needs to be secured. Wealth is a ravenous beast, which unless properly restrained, will attack, and hurt its owner.[165] Chrysostom argues that "these chains are greatly able to hold it and from these treasuries it will nevermore escape, and so this faithless one remains forever faithful, subdued, and tame because the right hand of alms is doing this. Therefore, even if it actually comes to us let us give it away, but if it does not come let us not seek it, nor be anxious about ourselves, nor deem those having it as happy."[166] Thus, the application is that priests should not be concerned with wealth but should rather seek a life of almsgiving. Chrysostom ends the homily with a repetition of his argument:

> But let us make this beast tame. And it will be tame, not when we shut it up but when we bring it into the hands of the needy. And thus, we will hence reap the greatest good living both in the present life with security and a useful hope and standing with frankness in the day that is coming, which all of us are able to attain to through the grace and mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ, whom together with the Father and the Holy and Good Spirit be glory into the ages, amen.[167]

Conclusion

In *Hom. 1 Cor. 35* the structure is split between three major sections. It has an exegesis followed by a comparison between Apostles and other figures and then it ends with a discourse on the dishonour wealth brings.

Outline of Homily 35

An outline of the homily looks like this:

---

[164] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:1:7 (F 2:434).
[165] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:14:5–6 (F 2:448).
[166] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:14:2–3 (F 2:448).
[167] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:14:7–9 (F 2:448).

Introduction: 1:1–1:17

- Opening Illustration of Chasing an Animal: 1:2–1:9
- Returning to Topic of Spiritual Gifts: 1:10
- Introducing the Argument on Foreign Speech: 1:11–1:17

Exegesis: 1:8–7:15

- Prophecy and Foreign Speech Compared: 1:18–26
- Paul, Envy, and the Gift of Foreign Speech: 2:1–2:11
- Musical Instruments as an Example: 3:1–3:11
- The Communal Context for Gift of Foreign Speech: 4:1–20
- Pray to Interpret Foreign Speech: 5:1–6:8
- Paul as a Pastoral Demonstration: 7:1–7:15

Comparing Conceit with Seeking Common Benefit: 8:1–10:13

- Apostles Compared with Others: 8:1–8:19
- Apostolic Teaching Compare with Diogenes: 9:1–9:9
- Abraham and Paul as Portraits: 10:1–10:13

Wealth Brings Dishonour After Death: 12:1–14:7

- Pastoral Goal for the Soul: 12:1–12:21
- The Wealthy Dead: 13:1–13:22
- Concluding Remarks: 14:1–14:7

In the exegesis, Chrysostom argues that the gift of foreign speech is not greater than the other gifts. He supports his argument by saying that the gift of foreign speech does not benefit more people than other gifts. The gift requires an interpreter as language needs to be spoken clearly. Moreover, Chrysostom argues that Paul does not attack the gift due to envy, but because he wants the Christians to use the gift properly. The proper use of the

gift follows along a pastoral rule, seeking the common benefit. Paul demonstrates this pastoral rule by not using the gift of foreign speech to gain honour for himself. Instead, Paul humbled himself so he could benefit his audience.

This pastoral rule enjoins the desire for public praise in a comparison between them. Chrysostom leaves the topic of spiritual gifts behind and argues the priests should reject the desire for public praise. He argues that the Apostles were greater than Crates, Diogenes, and others in the Greek world. Chrysostom uses Abraham and Paul to showcase how to overcome the desire for public honour, which is done through love and humility.

Chrysostom adds to his application by arguing that the priests fear dishonour. Priests should teach others how to be competent in every circumstance, whether in wealth or poverty. Chrysostom argues that it is wealth that brings dishonour, not poverty. Priests are warned of the damage wealth causes to a dead corpse through the desecrating acts of grave robbers. Chrysostom warns the priests to not hoard wealth, but to give it to the poor through almsgiving.

Throughout the course of his homily, Chrysostom uses rhetoric as a clue, indicating when he switches subsections. He primarily uses the question-and-answer format to indicate this switch. He also uses the phrase “Next, so you will not assume” or a variation of it. In his exegesis, Chrysostom uses each subsection to contribute to the demonstration of his thesis. When he establishes the pastoral rule, which he argues describes the proper approach to using spiritual gifts, Chrysostom uses it to construct his application. In the application of *Hom. 1 Cor. 35* Chrysostom argues that following the pastoral rule of seeking the common benefit necessitates the rejection of public praise and the hoarding of wealth, which brings dishonour. The primary audience for this

homily is the priests. However, the use a primary audience does not negate any application for others. Everyone is allowed to come and learn how to seek the common benefit and reject both public honour and dishonour.

CHAPTER 5: SEEING THE SPIRIT THROUGH GIFT-GIVING

John Chrysostom's exegesis of Paul's text operates with a paraenetical purpose,[1] namely to remediate the envy and grief of the congregation. He argues the gifts are tangible expressions of the salvific friendship in which they now partake. The envy and grief arise from the community's improper interpretation of the gifts. Rather than seeing their honour derived from the salvific work of Christ, they thought that their honour came from what gifts they received. Blake Leyerle argues that for Chrysostom grief is triggered by a perception of significant loss.[2] Often sorrow and grief stem from "misplaced values and faulty beliefs" and require correction.[3] Everyone grieves that "they do not have more."[4] Chrysostom remarks how the gift of foreign speech was "considered to be great since the Apostles had received it first, and many among the Corinthians had acquired it,"[5] so a lack of this gift creates a perception of lacking something great. Moreover, those with fewer gifts were "grieved and envious towards them who had more."[6] Chrysostom states elsewhere, "Everyone from scavenger to king

[1] Mitchell (*Paul, the Corinthians*, 1–17) argues that inquiries into early Christian interpreters must not solely focus on how they "commented on the Pauline text, but how they commented with the Pauline text" (11).

[2] Leyerle, *Narrative Shape of Emotion*, 64.

[3] Leyerle, *Narrative Shape of Emotion*, 64.

[4] Leyerle, *Narrative Shape of Emotion*, 69.

[5] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:5:28 (F 2:357).

[6] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:1:11 (F 2:349).

grieves that he does not have more."[7] Christians who lacked the gift of foreign speech perceived that they received a lesser portion, or fewer, gifts than others and that belief created a sense of envy and grief. Despite God having given the gifts, these Christians state, "So what if it is the same Lord, the same Spirit, and the same God, if I am receiving less?"[8] Chrysostom's goal in preaching this text involves ending the grief and envy felt by those who did not receive certain gifts, or who received fewer gifts. People envy those who are socially close to them, whose status is only slightly higher than themselves.[9] Chrysostom, in his own words, is preaching first to "the ones having fewer gifts, who were grieving because of this. 'What is the reason for which you are disheartened? Is it that you did not receive as much as another?'"[10] It is implied that those who received more gifts were more valued by the Spirit, which is a cause of envy and grief for those with fewer gifts. Chrysostom looks "to persuade the ones having fewer gifts not to grieve, and the ones having acquired more not to be arrogant."[11] de Wet argues the gift of tongues was meant to bring people together rather than splitting them apart.[12] Yet, the Corinthian community was split and their communal love was broken off, but not due to the nature of gifts, but because of the "foolish pride of the ones receiving it."[13] The consequences of elevating the gift of foreign speech above others is the spread of "foolish pride," "arrogance," "grief," and "envy" rather than

[7] Chrysostom, *Hom. 1 Cor*. 38:6 (PG 61:330) in Leyerle, *Narrative Shape of Emotion*, 69.
[8] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:5 (F 2:356).
[9] Leyerle, *Narrative Shape of Emotion*, 70.
[10] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:4:2–3 (F 2:354).
[11] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:4:1 (F 2:354).
[12] de Wet, "Homilies of John Chrysostom on 1 Corinthians 12," 71.
[13] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:1:10–14 (F 2:349–50).

love.[14] There is a connection between the belief of the superiority of the gift of foreign speech and the behaviour within the community.[15]

This chapter explores Chrysostom's theological approach to this topic of spiritual gifts and argues he calls his audience to gain a better understanding of the gifts. The baptismal moment when Christians receive gifts from the Spirit is a revelatory event. God shows himself in a tangible way. The Spirit's gift-giving expresses friendship between God and humans, which is created from Jesus' soteriological work. Chrysostom highlights Jesus' work of giving worth and honour to humans through grace. He states, "Even before we have begun to suffer or to prove our worth, He anticipates our response and shows us the honor He bestows. Thus, His many favors move us to look to our own salvation."[16] As a confirmation, and a celebration of the salvation of humans, the Spirit freely gives gifts to those who have never given evidence of any excellence.[17] The gifts are to be seen properly as an expression of God's *synkatabasis* as a tangible revelation of the salvific friendship and honour God has bestowed upon them.

While an unequal distribution of gifts exists, Christians share in a common bond of honour and friendship with God through their baptism in Christ. The friendship between Christians and God exists prior to the gift-giving. The gifts are not given to win friendship but to express it. Thus, the gift distribution does not create an unequal hierarchy of friends. Chrysostom's paraenetic purpose is to persuade his audience that the gifts do not bestow a special honour above the salvific honour Christ has given. The

---

[14] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:1:10–13 (F 2:349–50).

[15] Chrysostom's homily has some tension built into it. On the one hand he does not argue for a hierarchy of gifts so no one should grieve over what gift they did not receive. On the other hand he does place teaching as the best gift with nothing being equal to it, see *Ad Corinthios*, 29:5:30.

[16] Chrysostom, *Baptismal Instruction*, 43–44.

[17] Chrysostom, *Baptismal Instruction*, 43.

difference in gift distribution is not a cause for a difference in value between Christians. The envy of those with fewer gifts or the pride of those with the gift of foreign speech are misplaced due to wrong perception of what those gifts bestow. Thus, by realigning the congregation's view of the gifts as tangible expressions of God's salvific friendship, he calls his audience to participate in that friendship by responding to the Spirit's gift-giving with thanksgiving as the Spirit gives to them from a motive of goodwill.

Gifts as Revelation

The interaction between God and humans, for patristic authors, happens through *synkatabasis*.[18] This method of interaction is one of God's hospitalities towards humans.[19] God adapts to human limitations in every theophanic act.[20] In this homily Chrysostom situates the reception of spiritual gifts within God's self-disclosure during baptism. The Spirit comes upon the newly baptized Christian and indwells them. Yet, because the Spirit is not visibly seen, the gifts give "perceptible proof of that activity."[21] The proof is given as an accommodation to the human inability to see God. For each Christian "the appearing of the Spirit is given, for benefit, naming the gift 'the appearing of the Spirit.'"[22] McDonnell and Montague argue that each gift is itself a demonstration of the person of the Holy Spirit.[23] The Holy Spirit is embodied in the gift. One cannot have the gift without the accompaniment of the Spirit. The connection between the Spirit and the gift means that the reception of the gift is a demonstration of God's own self to

[18] Boersma, *Scripture as Real Presence*, 58.
[19] Boersma, *Scripture as Real Presence*, 58.
[20] Boersma, *Scripture as Real Presence*, 59.
[21] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:1:6 (F 2:349).
[22] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:1:7 (F 2:349).
[23] McDonnell and Montague, *Christian Initiation and Baptism*, 292.

humans, a self-disclosure. God treats human inability to see him with hospitality and kindness.[24] Chrysostom argues that this accommodation is given through each gift and is extended to every Christian. He says, "Even if there are different gifts, still the proof is the same. For whether you have much or whether you have a few, both are equally visible."[25]

Rylaarsdam argues that the core of Chrysostom's theology is God's *synkatabasis* towards humanity. His theology is one of God's self-revelation. Because of the centrality of God's self-disclosure, Chrysostom finds himself a dialogue partner for other theological reflections on God's self-revelation. Doron Mendels gives proper caution: "I have been working at history long enough to know that analogies between modern and ancient phenomena are dangerous and sometimes even misleading. However, with caution modern examples and analogies may still be used to sharpen our understanding of life in antiquity."[26] While Mendels studies the media of early Christianity, his warning pertains to drawing analogies and through-lines between ancient and modern thinkers. With caution, some through-lines can be drawn between Chrysostom and modern theologians to help clarify aspects of Chrysostom's thought. Here, a brief connection between Jean-Luc Marion and Chrysostom will be made as both individuals give a central importance to God's revelation and the human response to it.

---

[24] Rylaarsdam (*John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*, 17–18) argues that for Chrysostom "God does not reveal himself in his incomprehensible essence, but he is represented in a way that is knowable to those with whom he is communicating."

[25] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:5:5 (F 2:356).

[26] Mendels, *Media Revolution of Early Christianity*, x.

Marion writes on the nature of God's revelation, which touches upon Chrysostom's core of *synkatabasis*. Marion argues, "Apparition is sufficient for Being only inasmuch as, in appearing, it already perfectly *gives* itself; but it thus gives itself perfectly by the sole fact that it appears only inasmuch as it is *reduced* to its givenness for consciousness."[27] Marion argues for a link between the substance of God's appearance and his action of giving himself. A phenomenon "only shows itself to the extent that it *gives itself*."[28] God's presence appears "only by becoming a present—in the sense of present time, but also, inseparably, in the sense of a gift."[29] Thus, God's self-disclosure is at once both an act of gift-giving, and an act of *synkatabasis*, being able to faithfully express himself through a reduction according to the limits of human weakness.[30] Marion argues that God's self-revelation is a saturated phenomenon.[31] The

---

[27] Marion, *Reduction and Givenness*, 203.

[28] Marion, *Givenness and Revelation*, 6. Marion's work shows a close connection with the theology of *synkatabasis* in Chrysostom. Marion (*Reduction and Givenness*, 203–5) states "givenness is deployed according to the direct measure of the reduction: the more the reduction is radicalized, the more givenness is deployed. Or rather, they progress in inverse proportion . . . The more the reduction reduces (itself), the more it extends givenness" (203). As humanity tries to know God, they are confronted by their limits, what Marion calls reduction. Rylaarsdam (*John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*, 14–18) argues, for Chrysostom no one "can ever discover what God is in his nature and essence" (14). Humans do not have exact knowledge of anything, "God especially is not known with exactness" (16). Sin limits human knowledge of God in this life (17). Only God knows God perfectly (16). Thus, Marion speaks of human reduction, Chrysostom of human limits. Both concepts are interconnected with God's transcendence and disclosure. For Chrysostom God acts with *synkatabasis*, while Marion describes God's revelation as givenness. God is known only as far as he gives himself to be known. Rylaarsdam continues, "For God, out of philanthropy, has revealed himself in a manner which humanity can understand" (17). God gives knowledge of himself in proportion to the humanity inability to understand him.

[29] Marion, *Givenness and Revelation*, 6.

[30] Robinette, "Marion's 'Saturated Phenomenon'," 88–89.

[31] Horner ("Revelation as a Problem for Our Age," 96–98) summaries the theory of a saturated phenomenon. He states, "The technical means Marion proposes for the appearing of phenomena that might otherwise be considered impossible has to do with how they are given to intentionality. To put this very briefly, within the doublet of consciousness (intuition and intention) Marion argues that particular phenomena are given to intuition in such a way (as 'content' of a sort) that they cannot be delimited by the intentional aim (the intentional aim being that which identifies and makes sense of that content). He calls such phenomena "saturated," and they are characterized by their excessiveness with regard to consciousness, and excessiveness that makes univocal interpretation impossible. As saturated, Marion identifies phenomena including the event, the idol (or painting), the icon (or the face of the other), flesh, and revelation (as a type combining the previous four). While Marion tends to privilege 'seeing' in phenomenology, he often speaks of the saturated phenomenon in terms of hearing ("the call"), and on at

Holy Spirit is an active agent in uncovering mysteries. The greatest manifestation of God, being given in the person of Jesus, is uncovered to Peter "in the Holy Spirit, and thus from the Father."[32] The Spirit is the one who allows for mysteries to be uncovered and become a phenomenon.[33] Marion argues that the Trinity belongs "to the phenomenal field of uncovering Christ, as the paradox of pre-eminent saturated phenomenon, Revelation."[34] Marion's work contributes to an understanding of Chrysostom by linking God's revelation and the giving of himself together. Andrew Purves offers a shorthand formulation of the Trinity's action as "to the Father, in and through union with the Son, in the Holy Spirit, and of our sharing through the same Spirit in the life and ministry of the Son given from the Father."[35] Chrysostom also argues that the Trinity's work is united, "'For what the Spirit gives,' he says, 'this God also operates, this the Son also appoints and grants.'"[36] God's unity is manifested in its own way.[37] This is like Karl Barth when he speaks of the Trinity. For Barth "Revelation is, indeed, God's self-interpretation, and so an event that does not allow itself to be separated into form and content." God in his unity is "the revealer, the revelation and the revealedness" of the revelatory event.[38] God does not reveal himself apart from the gift of himself. Marion argues that "he shows himself from himself, that he bursts forth into the visible on his own initiative, as the passive aorist (*ōphthē*) indicates: he *rendered himself visible*, *made*

---

least one occasion he identifies revelatory phenomena that are felt and not seen, nothing that might respond to them in fear, or fascination (97).

[32] Marion, *Givenness and Revelation*, 81.
[33] Marion, *Givenness and Revelation*, 82.
[34] Marion, *Givenness and Revelation*, 89.
[35] Purves, *Reconstructing Pastoral Theology*, 83.
[36] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:4:19 (F 2:355–56).
[37] Marion, *Givenness and Revelation*, 91.
[38] Jüngel, *God's Being is in Becoming*, 28.

himself seen."[39] Chrysostom emphasizes the Spirit's freedom in self-giving, stating, "He was not required to be forced to act in order to give gifts to the Apostles."[40] The gift of Christ incarnate, and the gift of the Spirit indwelling are events that reveal God to human limitations, and is, at the same time, God coming close to humans in relationship. God's gift-giving is an event, which causes a conversion, a change in the recipient. God gives according to human limits to raise them up beyond their limits into a greater understanding of himself. For Chrysostom the spiritual gifts are received during baptism. The Spirit's indwelling and gift-giving show the intermingling of the person of the Spirit and the gift itself. As a revelatory event, the form and content of this gift-giving is the same. It is an event where God gives a self-disclosure of himself to Christians. To use Marion's words, the Spirit shows himself from himself, making himself visible on his own initiative through his gift-giving. Thus, the Spirit's indwelling becomes a parallel to Jesus' incarnation. Marion holds Christ's incarnation as a saturated phenomenon, and thus the Spirit's appearance at baptism should be considered as a saturated phenomenon as well.

Fotiade and Jasper describe Marion's saturated phenomenon of God as having "a unique regime of manifestation which requires the 'anamorphosis' or 'the conversion of the gaze' of the subject before the subject can see and understand that which gifts itself as *mystērion*, as hidden.[41] They argue that Marion is recalling Augustine's tract *de fide rerum quae non videntur*, that God's revelation is a gift and a call, which requires the recipient's response.[42] Augustine in his text argues for the necessity of seeing God with

[39] Marion, *Givenness and Revelation*, 48–49.
[40] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:6:14 (F 2:359).
[41] Fotiade and Jasper, "Foreword: Jean-Luc Marion," viii.
[42] Fotiade and Jasper, "Foreword: Jean-Luc Marion," xiv.

spiritual eyes instead of mortal ones, arguing that folly has made people disbelieve anything not seen through carnal eyes.[43] Augustine builds a case for the necessity of faith for aspects of human behaviour unseeable by the eyes, such as mutual trust in friendship and familial relationships. He argues that faith in God's revelation is required far more from humans, and that failing to believe the matters about God from scripture, despite their unseen nature, means they have violated the "very chiefest [sic] bond of piety" and brings about the "chiefest [sic] misery."[44] The Augustinian roots of Marion's understanding of converting the human's gaze to see God is similar to Chrysostom's hermeneutic of the human gaze and God's mystery. Margaret Mitchell argues that Chrysostom uses basic education as a parallel to divine revelation. Some children gaze at books but cannot understand the meaning of the letters, so they do not know what they are looking at. They have a veil over their understanding. Chrysostom then argues Christians who see the divine mysteries with clarity are those "who by the Holy Spirit have the experience of what lies in store there, whereas to those without faith the gospel is veiled. The gospel is neither fully disclosed nor undisclosed, but rests in an 'in-between state,' which remains, nonetheless, open to all. Not even Christians have full clarity, but they gaze at God through a dimly lit mirror."[45]

Earlier, Chrysostom denoted the gift as an appearing of the Spirit. The appearing of the Spirit accompanies the Christian's baptism. Constantine Kleanthous argues that baptism reveals to the newly-illumined the union with Christ.[46] The awareness of the union with Christ does not happen without an accompanied appearing of the Spirit.

---

[43] Augustine, "Concerning Faith," *NPNF* 1/3:337.
[44] Augustine, "Concerning Faith," *NPNF* 1/3:339.
[45] Mitchell, *Paul, the Corinthians*, 60–61.
[46] Kleanthous, "Chrysostom's Doctrine of Baptism," 46.

Chrysostom calls for Christians to look at what transpires during baptism with eyes of faith, with which they will see God.[47] Faith brings a Christian to see beyond the visible actions of the bishop and the submergence into water.[48] Faith sees the invisible actions of the Spirit, who is working through these means.[49] In baptism, Christians are buried with their sin and are resurrected with Christ. They are a new person who has put on Christ himself.[50] The Christian, belonging to Christ in baptism, is received by the Spirit with gifts. The call to view baptism through eyes of faith allows for various understandings of the event. To those who understand the baptismal rite, "The one having the Spirit is visible from being baptized. But to an unbeliever this is nowhere made clear except from the miracles."[51] The believer, with eyes of faith, understands the impartation of the Spirit and that the baptized Christian now belongs to Christ. However, to those without faith the indwelling of the Spirit has an unclear connection to the rite of baptism. God, who adapts his revelation to the capacity of humans, show hospitality to those who do not readily perceive the Spirit's indwelling at baptism by providing a visible proof of this gift so they can understand what transpired during the baptismal

[47] Chrysostom, *Baptismal Instruction*, 46.

[48] McDonnell and Montague (*Christian Initiation and Baptism*, 233–40) argue Chrysostom is part of a liturgical change, he no longer continues in the Syriac tradition, which places the impartation of the Spirit in the pre- and post- baptismal anointings. Instead, the impartation of the Spirit is done through the bishop's hand on the head, and the actual submergence under water (235).

[49] Chrysostom, *Baptismal Instruction*, 47.

[50] Chrysostom, *Baptismal Instruction*, 47.

[51] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:5:4 (F 2:356).

rite.[52] The spiritual gifts become the visible sign of this event.[53] "Contemplation of the things that are above entails a passage from the visible to the invisible, which, however, the eyes of the spirit see even more clearly than our bodily eyes see sensible things."[54]

Baptism and spiritual gifts bring into connection the human's phenomenal experience of baptism and God's revelation. The Christian's ability to make sense of their participation in God through the baptismal event is dependent upon faith. For Chrysostom Christians encounter God both through clarity and obscurity. The mystery of God's salvific grace remains nestled between being veiled and revealed. Margaret Mitchell argues that while theoretically available to everyone, the gospel is hidden from fleshly people, but it is not fully disclosed, even to Christians.[55] Clarity and obscurity "become combined in the image of the veil, since a veil both focuses attention and

---

[52] McDonnell and Montague (*Christian Initiation and Baptism*, 226–48) explore how "Chrysostom is part of a development which had its roots in the Syriac rite, but then, ostensibly, moved away from the Syriac understanding of baptism" (226). The Syriac rite emphasized the baptism of Jesus, and his ministry, as dependent on the Holy Spirit (237, 246). Chrysostom's theological emphasis on baptism moves away from Jesus' baptism in the Jordan and towards the death of Jesus (247). Because of this, it is not the Spirit and charisms, but exorcisms and purgative themes, which dominate the catechumenate (246). McDonnell and Montague conceive of the charisms as expressing Christ and his ministry as being dependent on the Spirit (239). The concept of Christ's ministry is at the forefront of their approach to this subject. In *Hom. 1 Cor*. 29, it is not the ministry of Christ, nor the ministry of the church, but the knowledge of a new relationship with God. The Syriac rite includes a second anointing with oil, which "has the theme of union with Christ, but it also has a purgative function" (235). In *Hom. 1 Cor*. 29, the charisms are suggested to be perceptible proof of this union. They reveal the mystical salvific relationship, which now exists between the Christian and Christ.

[53] Marion, (*Givenness and Revelation*, 1–7) expresses the tension imbedded within the event of revelation, "all manifestations of God in Jesus Christ, all the biblical 'theophanies' (here provisionally allowing this too imprecise term) consist only in this paradox which defines revelation in terms of phenomenality: the appearing, among the phenomena that our world never tires of making bloom, of a phenomenon coming forth *from elsewhere* than from the world, the appearing of the pre-eminently inapparent, the visibility of the invisible *as such*, *and which remains so in its very visibility*. No serious theology of revelation can be developed without tackling this phenomenological paradox. Revelation, if it can ever be conceived, arises from the question of phenomenality much more than from the question of beings and their being (existence), and certainly infinitely more than from the question of a knowledge of objects (demonstration). What do we see, what can one ever see, of the invisible? That is the question" (5). Chrysostom's argument suggests the *synkatabasis* of God is what can be seen of the invisible. That the phenomenon itself is a gift, given to show what cannot be seen.

[54] Mazza, "John Chrysostom," 143.

[55] Mitchell, *Paul, the Corinthians*, 61.

blocks it, allows some glimpse and denies access to the whole. A veil can both allure and repel, promise and yet impede access."[56] Those without faith are led astray due to what Paul Yazigi argues are the bodily eyes.[57] Because humans are corrupted by sin, they reject God for the sake of material and ephemeral things.[58] Indeed, humans often fail to comprehend the "many wonders of creation, let alone God's activity."[59] Without the working of God's grace, humans cannot see God correctly.[60] For Chrysostom, people without faith are fleshly people, and lack the ability to perceive the spiritual world and the nature of an eschatological future.[61] "St John Chrysostom compares this man to a blind [man] who cannot see everything that a spiritual man can, or to an illiterate person who, when he receives a letter, perceives in it nothing but paper and ink."[62] Without God's grace, humans cannot develop a hermeneutic that can perceive God and his work correctly. These people have a veil on their hearts, which inhibits their vision.[63]

Brian Robinette argues that humans are incapable of finding God. "We aim at the divine, but end up gazing at ourselves."[64] Humans remain unaware about their need for faith to see God.[65] As a result, Chrysostom argues, "The majority consider the unimportant things to be important, but they do not give any thought of the real

---

[56] Mitchell, *Paul, the Corinthians*, 61–62.
[57] Yazigi, "Fleshly, Psychic and Spiritual Man," 10.
[58] Papageorgiou, "Theological Analysis," 139–40.
[59] Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*, 14.
[60] Rylaarsdam (*John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*, 14–17) expands on the human inability to see God correctly: "Only God knows God perfectly. Not even heavenly beings are able to know God's essence" (16). In fact, "All things concerning Him are precisely known only by the Son and the Holy Spirit and by no one else" (16). Human inability to see God correctly reflects God's incomprehensible nature.
[61] Yazigi, "Fleshly, Psychic and Spiritual Man," 11.
[62] Yazigi, "Fleshly, Psychic and Spiritual Man," 12.
[63] Mitchell, *Paul, the Corinthians*, 61.
[64] Robinette, "Marion's 'Saturated Phenomenon'," 89.
[65] Yazigi, "Fleshly, Psychic and Spiritual Man," 10.

important things."[66] Christians must be recipients of God's grace to see and interpret the baptismal events correctly. They must have possessed "the experience given by the Holy Spirit as an additional eye" seeing deeper and perceiving "all those things that are hidden to others. These eyes are more truth worthy than those of the body."[67] God's work of redemption in humans raises them up to a higher knowledge, "using the eyes of the body as well as the eyes of faith."[68] Bogdan Bucur argues that the human ascent through faith is reciprocal to God's condescension in his theophanies, creating a "deifying theophany."[69] The Spirit's appearance at baptism raises the Christian to a higher understanding of the event itself. Rather than seeing the event through human eyes, the Spirit gives a divine gaze, who envisages the Christian through the union with Christ.[70] The human soul is led by the Holy Spirit towards a recognition of the coming eschatological realities and living appropriately in anticipation of them.[71] For Chrysostom, to not see beyond the gifts to the reality of the salvation is to approach the gifts with the same ignorance as those outside the church. They are to see the appearing of the Spirit through faith, and through his gift-giving understand that they have no need

[66] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:9:15–16 (F 2:363). Yazigi ("Fleshly, Psychic and Spiritual Man," 11–13) argues Chrysostom retains the designation of humans as "man" only for those who are living virtuously. Sinners are categorized as fleshes, dogs, horses, serpents, and wolves. Thus, a man "is the one who is destined to true life, whereas '*the multitude*' is much more considered to be a substance destined to fire" (12). The categorization of the multitude, or the majority, indicates Chrysostom is making a statement about those outside Christ. Without God, humans consider unimportant things in life to be of highest value, all the while they ignore what truly matters. Yazigi expands on what an "unimportant thing" is, naming it as the cares of the flesh: luxury, extravagance, greed, and every sin. A person who values these "is attached to the present world and its affairs for ever, being away from the energy of the Spirit" (12).

[67] Yazigi, "Fleshly, Psychic and Spiritual Man," 12.

[68] Yazigi, "Fleshly, Psychic and Spiritual Man," 11.

[69] Bucur, "Condescension, Anticipation, Reciprocal Ecstasies," 439.

[70] Robinette, "Marion's 'Saturated Phenomenon'," 89.

[71] Yazigi, "Fleshly, Psychic and Spiritual Man," 11–12.

to envy those with gifts different than the ones they received. Every Christian is baptized into one body, in Christ, and every Christian receives gifts from the same Spirit.

What the Gifts Reveal

Chrysostom calls his audience to look at the spiritual gifts, not as measurements of their value, but as God showing hospitality towards their inability to see him. Through his gift-giving God is revealing himself to Christians. Even if there is a disparity in the gift-giving, some receiving more while others fewer, God "is willing to use expressions which are unworthy of him, because he considers weak humans worthy of such *συγκατάβασις*."[72] God's self-revelation also reveals a purpose and promises.[73] Chrysostom will not allow his audience to forget God's "love for humanity and concern for its salvation."[74] When God gives gifts to Christians, it is out of philanthropy and in anticipation of bestowing future honours,[75] for "the one who proves himself worthy of the gifts already received, would deserve to enjoy greater gifts."[76] Chrysostom uses the terms "worthy" and "unworthy" as soteriological vocabulary.[77] Instead of seeking out great individuals, Christ makes people worthy to receive through his incarnation, death, and resurrection.[78] Christ's reconciliation of humans turns "his enemies into friends" and

---

[72] Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*, 42.

[73] Wells, *The Christic Center*, 45.

[74] Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*, 42.

[75] Rylaarsdam (*John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*, 39–45) argues Chrysostom constantly characterizes God's salvific work as philanthropic. He "pictures God as a lover who relentlessly chases his people after the fall, repeatedly forgiving insults and seeking to draw them into a friendly conversation" (40).

[76] Chrysostom, *Baptismal Instruction*, 46. Laird, (*Mindset, Moral Choice*, 94–101) argues God responds to the well-disposed mindset (εὐγνώμονας) of Christians by lavishing them with further gifts (97).

[77] Miller, *Chrysostom's Devil*, 162.

[78] Miller, *Chrysostom's Devil*, 160–62.

is the first stage of the salvific life.[79] Spiritual gifts are given to Christians out of concern for their salvation, and to help them receive greater honours. This section covers what the spiritual gifts reveal to Christians. The lesson Chrysostom draws from God's gift-giving is the call to live a life of virtue. Living in virtue is characterized as friendship with God.

Maria Verhoeff argues that Chrysostom extensively uses "social relations to describe the divine-human relationship."[80] The primary relationship used to describe salvation is friendship, which is a gift given to Christians at baptism,[81] and it is the basis for the Spirit's gift-giving. Christ's work turns humans into friends, thus making them "ready to receive the gift of the Holy Spirit."[82] Because believers are now friends with God, "a further bestowal of good things is to be expected."[83] First the Spirit responds to Christ's redemptive work by acknowledging the new worth of Christians as they participate in Christ's death through baptism,[84] and emerge as resurrected friends.[85] Then the Spirit gives further bestowal of good things.[86] The gifts of the Spirit carry a kingly dignity. As Chrysostom argues, "The Holy Spirit does not have the nature of a slave, but of a king."[87] Thus, someone receives "something great from the King, he keeps it as a comfort, for he himself gave to him."[88] The gifts confer a great honour on Christians, regardless of what they receive. This honour should inspire a sense of

[79] Verhoeff, "More Desirable than Light Itself," 89.
[80] Verhoeff, "More Desirable than Light Itself," 2.
[81] Verhoeff, "More Desirable than Light Itself," 73.
[82] Verhoeff, "More Desirable than Light Itself," 78.
[83] Verhoeff, "More Desirable than Light Itself," 89.
[84] Miller, *Chrysostom's Devil*, 152
[85] Verhoeff, "More Desirable than Light Itself," 74.
[86] Verhoeff, "More Desirable than Light Itself," 78.
[87] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:6:18 (F 2:359).
[88] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:6:17 (F 2:359).

happiness and contentment for Christians through a recognition of the honour they have received.[89] God personally conveys his friendship to Christians through gift-giving. These are perceptible proofs of their honour and worth.

---

[89] Leyerle (*Narrative Shape of Emotion*, 64–70) argues that a common argument in Chrysostom's work is to show how accumulating wealth does not bring happiness. Many people "held tightly to whatever they had managed to acquire and who firmly believed that they would be happier and more content if only they had more" (69). Chrysostom (*Ad Corinthios*, 29) addresses this same mentality with spiritual gifts, "Be satisfied and rejoice over what you received, and do not be displeased over what you did not receive" (29:7:3).

For Chrysostom, the church's wealth is its virtue, not the spiritual gifts it has received. Just as accumulating wealth does not bring happiness, neither does the desire to have more gifts. What truly benefits Christians is the accumulation of virtue. He (*Ad Corinthios*, 36) states "Now the assembly is like a venerable woman who has fallen from prosperity, and in many respects only possesses the receipts of that former welfare. And indeed, the golden money-chest and the box are displayed but are deprived of the wealth. The present assembly resembles this. And I do not say this on account of the gifts, for if it was only this then that is nothing awful, but it is of life and moral virtue" (36:7:8–9). Chrysostom's description of his own congregation uses two measures of wealth. The first is the widow's almsgiving, whose wealth is found in "the things of hospitality, of the love for the poor, and of the patience in things prayed for" (36:7:12). Widows should not seek a second marriage but should look for "zealous service among the needy, through which the venerable women shone most of all" (36:7:14). For, "then, instead of gold they wore ornaments from almsgiving. But now, putting this off, they wear clumps of gold of their sins being twined on all sides" (36:7:15). The second source of wealth is the unity of the church. Chrysostom states, "I speak also of the many money-chests being emptied of their hereditary honour? They assembled together in the ancient days and sang songs together. We do this now, but then one life was in everyone, and one heart. But now unity cannot be seen in any person, rather there is much war everywhere. The director of the assembly prays for common peace for all, even now as he enters into the Father's house. But of this peace, the name is frequent, but the occurrence is nowhere" (36:7:17–18). For Chrysostom, the lack of gifts would not nearly be as bad as the lack of virtue described through almsgiving and unity. McDonnell and Montague, (*Christian Initiation and Baptism*, 295–98) comment on this passage, but misinterpret Chrysostom's language. Stating, "The church of tokens looks back to the apostolic age, when all was 'heavenly.' Persons, endowed with wonderous charisms, were truly guided by the Spirit" (298). They argue Chrysostom's perspective, which they interpret at the church's maturing faith minimizes the need for charismas, has a theological rationale, but is torturous (296–97). They argue, "the church is determined in its most intimate essence by the charisms" (297). This perspective provides the lens, through which they read Chrysostom's homilies. However, Chrysostom does not place the charisma as the intimate essence of the church. Verhoeff ("John Chrysostom's Use of Celestial Imagery," 251–68) argues that Chrysostom uses celestial imagery, such as 'heavenly' as an expression of the moral behaviour or the life of virtue (252). Chrysostom, she argues, lays within the "common trope in monastic literature" of using celestial imagery to describe how Christians should live (252). Moreover, she argues Chrysostom uses celestial imagery in a broader sense of describing the human participation in the divine life (252–53). The ascetic expressions of celestial imagery appear "to be just one facet of a much more colourful and profound understanding of salvation by Chrysostom (253). One way Chrysostom uses celestial imagery to show one someone keeps "untarnished the soul's nobility, as gratitude for what He has already given, guarding his great gifts" (256). The heavenly life expresses a love for Christ along with "living for the common good and looking to the advantage of each" (263). Verhoeff argues the pinnacle method for Christian perfection is the practice of *synkatabasis* (266). Humans are to devote themselves in imitating God's *synkatabasis* towards other people "in order to enjoy a communal ascent" (267). Verhoeff's analysis of celestial imagery better clarifies what Chrysostom intends by calling the early church heavenly. He is not referring to the abundance of the charisma, but to the response of the church to God's salvation, and their treatment of each other by imitating God. Chrysostom expands on the need to use the gifts for the common benefit of the congregation in *Hom. 1 Cor*. 35. The Spirit treats humans with

The connection between the salvation of humans and the distribution of gifts lies in what John Barclay calls the unconditioned gift, that God acts without regards "to ethnic, social or moral worth."[90] He argues the Greek tradition emphasized the worth of an individual in gift-giving:

> The elite are given not financial but social rewards (*Eth*. *Nic*. 1123b16–24). It is in this connection that Aristotle speaks of 'worth' (ἡ ἀξία), a concept frequently applied to prestigious gifts and their return. Like Aristotle, the inscriptions often speak of 'fitting' honors, to those who are 'worthy' or 'deserving' of such public recognition. It is honour above all of which 'great men' are worthy (ἀξιόω, *Eth*. *Nic*. 1123b24), while recipients are careful to show 'fitting gratitude' (ἀξία χάρις) to those who have benefited the community (e.g., *SIG* 834). At the same time, donors are careful to seek out 'worthy' recipients of their benefactions.[91]

Unlike the Greek elite, God does not privilege some people over others, but chooses people based on the Christ-event. All have an equal worth before God because they all share in Christ's work.[92] Chrysostom argues the distribution of spiritual gifts is also determined by an equal "worth" shared by the community in Christ.[93] The Spirit's gift-giving is born out of the salvific relationship, which now exists between Christ and Christians.[94] Each person, then, is given perceptible proof of this now existing relationship through this gift.[95] Chrysostom argues, "Even in being granted the smaller measure, from that you are deemed worthy to receive. That is also the same with the one

---

consideration and care, to help the congregation ascend towards a heavenly life in union with God. The Spirit's gifts are means to help Christian ascend to a heavenly life, but are not, as McDonnell and Montague suggest, the heavenly life itself.

[90] Barclay, "Gift and its Perfection," 332.

[91] Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 33–34.

[92] Barclay, "Gift and its Perfection," 332.

[93] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:4:6 (F 2:355).

[94] Kleanthous ("Chrysostom's Doctrine of Baptism," 16–17) argues in Baptism, the invisible action of the Holy Spirit and the mystery of Christ are expressed in a tangible way (17). Spiritual gifts work in the same revealing manner as baptism. Both events occur to reveal the transformative work God has worked in the individual.

[95] Kleanthous, ("Chrysostom's Doctrine of Baptism," 34–36) argues baptism gives one brotherly equality to all Christians, which includes in it the spiritual charisms and goods. Previously causes for distinction and honour, or dishonour, are washed away, and all share in one dignity, one gift, and one grace (36).

receiving more, you have the same honour."[96] Calling the spiritual gift a gift removes any distinction in honour or value from between Christians. Chrysostom argues, "Even if there is a difference in the gifts, there cannot be a difference in the one giving, for you and they draw water from the same fountain."[97] Because the gifts share the same source, the Holy Spirit, they share the same value, and bestow on Christians the same honour. The gift-giving from the Spirit shows a common worth among the community.[98] Chrysostom argues that the Spirit gives gifts not debts, nor loans, he emphasizes Paul's deliberate use of a gift.[99] In some material exchanges, the transaction may seem to take the form of a gift. But if the donor looks for an equal or greater return the transaction is seen more as a loan than a gift. If this return is not met then "a grievance arises because the deal ends in a different spirit from the way it began." This is due to the donor's desire to make a profit from their transaction.[100] Yet, God is not looking to make a profit from his gifts. Rather, he is looking to give his recipients that profit through his gift distribution.

God's economy of salvation is one of an unfolding theophany. Chrysostom has "deep *theological* convictions about how God has revealed himself to humanity

---

[96] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:4:6 (F 2:355).

[97] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:4:9 (F 2:355).

[98] McDonnell and Montague, (*Christian Initiation and Baptism*, 226–48), argues baptism intersects the removal of all aspects of the kingdom of darkness, and the inclusion in the Holy Spirit and kingdom of God (236). The impartation of the Spirit was equally a purgation and exorcism. They argue this gives baptism a more "pronounced purgative, a less pneumatological character" (237). Their analysis argues Jesus' baptism in Jordan is a more fitting image for charisms, while Jesus' death is more fitting for exorcistic overtones (247–48). This distinction between the ministry of Christ being more charismatic and Christ's death being more purgative creates an impression that they are different from each other. And some skepticism is called for as to whether creating such a sharp distinction is valid. As discussed above, the death of Christ is the cause of a Christian's worth before God, and the cause of their friendship, which is the basis for gift-giving. McDonnell and Montague lean towards an "either or" relationship between exorcism and charism, whereas the relationship is better expressed as "both and." Baptism has elements of both the purgative and the charismatic.

[99] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:4:4–5 (F 2:354–55).

[100] Konstan, "Economy of Gifts in Amorous Relations," 98.

throughout history and unfolded a plan of redemption in theophanies, inspired writings, Christ, the Spirit, and the sacraments."[101] God's economy of salvation is theophanic, and God teaches humans "the message of God's love and His desire to save us."[102] Humans are called to participate in this salvation.[103] This participation is achieved through the gift of the Holy Spirit, which "was and continues to be a cataclysmic event in the life of man transforming man and showing again God's infinite love."[104] The Spirit lives within Christians and is constantly "renewal of oneself where one attains to a clear discernment of the will of God."[105] The relationship is one of God's continual self-disclosure through his indwelling presence and the Christians' continual reciprocation of that insight.

The salvific work of Christ enables Christians to live a life in cooperation with God.[106] Chrysostom argues this cooperation is the pursuit of virtue.[107] Because Christ enables humans to be virtuous, God requires them to be virtuous.[108] Once a human is chosen for salvation, the human's cooperation with God is required.[109] Chrysostom, as part of the Hellenic culture,[110] filters his understanding of gift-giving with the

---

[101] Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*, 148.

[102] Papageorgiou, "Theological Analysis," 136.

[103] Rylaarsdam, (*John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*, 144–51) argues that "Christ came down to our level by taking on flesh and descended to death for our sin; then he raised human flesh and ascended with it to heaven. Christ's 'descent has become our ascent [*ἡ κατάβασις αὕτη πάντων ἀναβασις*].' Since our flesh has been raised to heaven with Christ, we are expected to participate in a heavenly way of life" (148).

[104] Papageorgiou, "Theological Analysis," 139.

[105] Papageorgiou, "Theological Analysis," 157.

[106] Naidu, *Transformed in Christ*, 103.

[107] Miller, *Chrysostom's Devil*, 164.

[108] Miller, *Chrysostom's Devil*, 139.

[109] Miller (*Chrysostom's Devil*, 140–69) argues against a synergistic interpretation for Chrysostom's soteriology. God is not cooperating with the human will to save them. She shows how Chrysostom only uses the word "synergy" to describe salvation once and does not use *synergeō* in any specific manner (155).

[110] Niebuhr (*Christ and Culture*, 65–76) argues, humans cannot help but speak through the aid of culture. No one can "dismiss the philosophy and science of his society as though they were external to him; they are in him—through in different forms from those in which they appear in the leaders of culture. He cannot rid himself of political beliefs and economic customs by rejecting the more or less external institutions; these customs and beliefs have taken up residence in his mind" (69).

reciprocation of gifts, "and not just any gifts but equivalent gifts." The reciprocation of equivalent gifts is defined as "acts of generosity and solidarity."[111] The reciprocation of generosity is given instead of a material return. The immaterial response of gratitude or the "acknowledge of the benefit received" were important and they established a faithful friendship between the partners. As friends involved in gift-giving they were "expected to help one another selflessly and without setting conditions for compensation."[112] These are acts of virtue, and by arguing for their necessity Chrysostom is navigating the tension between God's salvific work and human freedom.[113] Christ's salvific work takes up most of the responsibility for human salvation, but because God upholds human freedom, humans must respond to Christ's salvation.[114] God's commitment to human freedom is the foundation for humanity's part of salvation. However, human contribution to salvation is not a human work, but one of God's gifts.[115] What humans contribute to their salvation is to take part in the new-found friendship with God, Chrysostom states, "if you have been freed from the ills more grievous by far, and greed by grace only, much more will you be freed from the lesser, now you have become friends too, and contribute your own share likewise."[116] Rylaarsdam also likens the human contribution in salvation to their participation in Christ.[117] The human contribution to their salvation is their participation in Christ. Christ makes humans his

---

[111] Gygax, "Gift-Giving and Power Relationships," 45–46.

[112] Konstan, "Economy of Gifts in Amorous Relations," 99.

[113] Papageorgiou ("Theological Analysis," 113–28) argues that obedience is "the ultimate and perfect use of the human will" (122). Humans must respond to God's salvation with "repentance and obedience seeking the grace from above" (124).

[114] Papageorgiou, "Theological Analysis," 129–30.

[115] Miller, *Chrysostom's Devil*, 144.

[116] Verhoeff, "More Desirable than Light Itself," 89.

[117] Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*, 135.

own, and brings them into a place of belonging, into his close circle of friends,[118] so Christians contribute to their salvation by living as friends with God.

Friendship with God is living a life that cultivates virtue.[119] One of Chrysostom's chief interests is to promote and praise virtue.[120] He does this by contrasting Christianity with the Greco-Roman culture.[121] By drawing limits to Greek philosophies, Chrysostom elevates a Christian understanding of virtuous living.[122] For Chrysostom, Christ has appropriated human weakness through his incarnation and the human's reciprocation to Christ's salvation is their "*oikeiosis* with Christ."[123] *Oikeion* is conceptually tied to

---

[118] Verhoeff, "More Desirable than Light Itself," 185, 188.
[119] Verhoeff, "More Desirable than Light Itself," 85.
[120] Ritter, "Between 'Theocracy' and 'Simple Life'," 179.
[121] Coleman-Norton, "St. Chrysostom and the Greek Philosophers," 305–6.
[122] Ritter, "Between 'Theocracy' and 'Simple Life'," 179.
[123] Ramelli, "Stoic Doctrine of Oikeiosis," 125. There is no present in-depth study of *oikeiosis* in Chrysostom's works but following the methodology of Maria Verhoeff ("More Desirable than Light Itself," 19–20) an exhaustive search of the *Thesaurus Linguae Graeca* database would prove fruitful (20). Maslov ("Οἰκείωσις πρὸς θεόν: Gregory of Nazianzus" 311–43) has recorded a similar search with this database and notes "In the corpora of the three Cappadocians and of John Chrysostom the word occurs at least 133 times" (321n34). Preliminary search results show 548 instances of οἰκείων, 147 instances of οἰκείοις, 204 instances of οἰκεῖον, 26 instances of οἰκειου/οἰκειοῦ, 70 instances of οἰκείου, and 127 instances of οἰκείους in the works of John Chrysostom, (accessed November 22, 2022). While such a study is beyond the scope of this dissertation, some remarks can be made. Mayer ("John Chrysostom: Moral Philosopher," 193–216) captures some of the emerging perspectives on Chrysostom. She argues there is a movement away from seeing Chrysostom as a theological light-weight due to his emphasis on virtue and the moral health of humans and towards exploring Chrysostom as a contributor to the development of core concepts in eastern Christian theology (197). Specifically, Chrysostom is beginning to be placed within the developing tradition of theosis (208). Maslov ("Οἰκείωσις πρὸς θεόν: Gregory of Nazianzus," 311–43) argues Gregory of Nazianzus often treats θέωσις as synonymous with οἰκείωσις πρὸς θεόν, and argues "for this reason, the conceptual metaphor of οἰκείωσις can help us clarify the meaning of θέωσις, which would become the cornerstone of Eastern Christian therapeutic discourse (330). Maslov also includes a small citation from Chrysostom from "*Homiliae in Romanos* 8,4,17 (PF 60:60:460,15-17): 'God is [our] father not through physical kinship but through οἰκείωσις of faith'" (321n34).

Verhoeff ("John Chrysostom's Use of Celestial Imagery," 251–68) argues "An analysis of celestial imagery shows that Chrysostom prefers to express main theological and soteriological concepts through this imagery" (253). Pak-Wah ("Exemplary Portraits," 15–71) argues comparisons between humans and angels are teleological, "in that they are meant to highlight the glorious fact that the Christian life is, essentially, participation in the divine life of God" (68). "Chrysostom's portrayal of Christians as participants in the *politeia* of the angels is, fundamentally speaking, a re-conceptualization of the Christians' *oikos* to that of a heavenly realm, rather than his earthly *oikos* or *polis*" (66). Chrysostom uses celestial imagery to describe salvation and human divinization. It becomes likely then that it also describes Christian οἰκείωσις. As Verhoeff ("John Chrysostom's Use of Celestial Imagery," 268) concludes, Chrysostom uses celestial imagery to "present to his audience a vivid portrayal of the heights of the Christian life" (268). Reducing Chrysostom to a "mere call to asceticism" fails to recognize Chrysostom's theological nuances. Chrysostom "presents salvation as a restored communion between the inhabitants of

belonging.[124] Stoic thought starts with how one is "*oikeion* to itself"[125] whereas Christians adapt this thought through a theology of the image, which argues all humans are an image of God and "thus endowed with divine beauty" and because of this humans can "contemplate the one through the other, as through a mirror and an image."[126] Chrysostom's anthropology holds the *imago Dei* as a central tenet. Humans are on earth what God is in heaven.[127] Humans have authority on earth, the ability of govern it, and the power to create, which allows Chrysostom to say, "make your earth heaven."[128]

---

heaven and earth. Therefore, he uses celestial imagery with the pedagogical objective of helping his congregation in the mystagogical process of understanding its transformed condition in Christ, of comprehending the mystery of union with Christ and of communion with God" (268).

[124] Engberg-Pedersen, *Stoic Theory of Oikeiosis*, 68–69.

[125] Engberg-Pedersen, *Stoic Theory of Oikeiosis*, 68. For Stoics, belonging to oneself starts with a self-consciousness, described as seeing oneself. Belonging to oneself is belonging to an awareness of oneself (70). An awareness of oneself is requires to then develop a consciousness of others, as "with consciousness of self (understood as under *i*) there *arises* a self to consider what lies *outside* the self" (70). Before the awareness of oneself exists, there is a disconnect with the rest of the world because there is "no genuine self, no entity to be contrasted with the *rest* of the world. By contrast, once it *has* been so placed, there is such an entity" (70). Kim ("Paul and the Stoic Theory of οἰκείωσις," 75–79) responds to Engberg-Pedersen's work and argues that he has a Cartesian flavour to his interpretation of Stoic self-awareness (76). Kim offers an alternative to a modern perception of the self by pointing towards Hierocles's *Element of Ethics*, that being *oikeion* to oneself meaning "perceiving oneself" (76). Perceiving oneself here means the awareness of one's whole body and soul, which has an equivalent to a neurological system rather than 'something that fills in the self" (76–77). Kavin Rowe (*Stoics and Early Christians as Rival Traditions*, 207–15) argues that one aspect of seeing oneself correctly, for Stoics, is to see the human as mortal. It is part of human nature to die, "to think human being is simultaneously to think mortal thing" (210).

Where Stoics start with an awareness of oneself, Christians start with an awareness of God. God's *synkatabasis* is required for the creation of this awareness. God comes down and adapts himself to human limitations and weakness so as to self-disclose himself to humans, creating an awareness of God in humans, through faith. Engberg-Pedersen (*Stoic Theory of Oikeiosis*, 68–72) argues, "There exists a relationship of belonging between the bearer of consciousness and the consciousness itself. For so understood consciousness of self may be said to *create* a proper self (an I) that will constitute an unchangeable point of view from which everything *outside* that self will henceforth be seen" (70). God's self-disclosure creates a place of belonging for humans, where human identity can be said to be created, or newly-created by an understanding of God. Paul argues "what we are is plain to God and I hope it is also plain to your conscience" (2 Cor 5:11 NRSVA). "So from now one we regard no one from a worldly point of view. Though we once regarded Christ in this way, we do so no longer. Therefore, if anyone is in Christ, the new creation has come: The old has gone, the new is here! All this is from God, who reconciled us to himself through Christ" (2 Cor 5:16–18). Humans are re-envisioned through Christ's salvific work, and when this is self-disclosed from God humans become transformed according to this new reality.

[126] Ramelli, "Stoic Doctrine of Oikeiosis," 130. Ramelli argues *oikeiosis* is a trans-school doctrine, not belonging only to Stoicism, but that Christians primarily focus on the Stoic version of the doctrine (116–17).

[127] Verhoeff, "John Chrysostom's Use of Celestial Imagery," 266.

[128] Verhoeff, "John Chrysostom's Use of Celestial Imagery," 266.

Humans are created with an *oikeiosis* to the Good, but sin alienates humans from their nature of belonging to the beauty of God. Thus, to belong to God is to become alienated from evil.[129] The notion of *oikeiosis* is associated with friendship, so to make humans friends with God, "Christ-Logos makes them *oikeioi* with all virtues, which . . . are the Logos itself."[130] Boris Maslov argues *oikeiosis* is a claim to kinship, and is understood as making something one's own.[131] As Christ makes humans his own, humans make Christ their own.[132] Making Christ one's own is part of the Christian's active

---

[129] Ramelli, "Stoic Doctrine of Oikeiosis," 131.

[130] Ramelli, "Stoic Doctrine of Oikeiosis," 125. Later Ramelli argues one can only become *oikeiosis* to God through virtue (131).

[131] Maslov, "Οἰκείωσις πρὸς θεόν: Gregory of Nazianzus," 313.

[132] Stoic conception of God differs from a Christian conception. This difference in theology causes a divergence in how both groups understand living virtuously.

Stoics conceive of God as existing within an eternal cosmos. Ralph Stob ("Stoicism and Christianity," 217–19) argues that God is the primal, or ultimate, substance, which lacks personality and spirituality. It is monistic, but not monotheistic (218–19). C. Kavin Rowe (*Stoics and Early Christians as Rival Traditions*, 207–15) argues Stoics see God, not as transcendent and governing the cosmos from outside it, but as a native pattern or flow of "that which is" (208). It is the way Reason is embedded in the whole of the cosmos and moves it. God, for Stoics, is "the word for the ultimately rational pattern of that which is and for the way this pattern works in the never-ending cycle of fiery end-beginning" (209). Stoic theology is solely immanent. The Reason, which governs the flow of the cosmos is the same as human rationalist, and in that understanding Stoics can say that "god is in us" (210). By the time of the Roman Stoics, "Stoicism was a complete narrative about human life. It offered the possibility of fortification against the world by living with the world, claiming that this 'with' was the deeper truth of all things" (214). Stoicism did not, as Stob ("Stoicism and Christianity," 217–19) argues, bring someone "face to face with a living, loving, and just personality (218). This creates a context for Stoic conceptions of virtue, which Robin Weiss ("Stoicism and its Telos," 345–49) argues is "a state of mind that makes for harmony in the whole of life," while vice is "a condition or state of being inconsistent and out of agreement with oneself over one's whole life" (346). However, this is not a lifestyle that results in consistent decisions, but consists in the ability to make decisions, which are consistent with each other across time (348). Humans are to take Nature as the guide to virtue. Rowe (*Stoics and Early Christians as Rival Traditions*, 27–30) argues that for Seneca, "to follow Nature by using our reason is to pursue the alignment of the divine with the divine, the aspect of God that is in every human being with the reasonable aspect of the world, that is with God" (29).

Chrysostom's theology stays within the bounds of Christian orthodoxy. He accepted the Nicene Creed and as Stylianos G. Papadopoulos, ("Holy Trinity and the Parousia of the Holy Spirit," 97–99) argues "particularly knew the distinction of the three divine Hypostases and the one nature in God. In fact, he was the first non-Cappadocian theologian to discern the absolute significance of this distinction, analyzing and applying it broadly" (97). Rylaarsdam (*John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*, 14–17) argues that Chrysostom takes "God's incomprehensibility and transcendence [as] a basic theological presupposition which must bever be compromised" (16). While only God knows God perfectly, He reveals himself to humanity, allowing humans to come to a knowledge of God, even if only in an extremely limited way. For Chrysostom, coming to a knowledge of the Triune God is the act of doing theology (14–16). Papageorgiou ("Theological Analysis," 1–3) argues, that rather than living in accordance with nature, the task of the Christian is to respond to the divine revelation of human fallenness,

participation in salvation God has won for them. For Chrysostom, the essence of this participation is a "a rightly disposed γνώνη" (mindset)."[133] And God wants Christians to show their own rightmindedness ("εὐγνωμοσύνη") through their actions.[134] This rightmindedness is the practice of virtue. Leo Ohleyer argues, Christ "is the personification and source of absolutely all virtue. The conclusion is naturally implied: and Christ will produce virtue in him who has put Him on."[135] Living virtuously is how humans participate in their salvation.[136] By doing so they appropriate Christ as their own.[137] Thus, Christians are "expected to participate in a heavenly way of life."[138]

---

the need for salvation, and the redemptive work God has worked through Christ, and to participate in this salvation, which is the process of deification (2). And as Kamimura ("Deification and the Foundation," 1–4) argues, the call to live virtuously is firmly within the discourse of deification (1). The Christian life is confirmed in a participation in the likeness of Christ (4). Miller (*Chrysostom's Devil*, 140–69) notes how virtue is a vital element of the salvific process, for it "snatches us from hell and bestows on us the kingdom" (145). Thus, as Trakatellis ("Being Transformed," 225–29) argues, for Chrysostom virtue is "not a term limited semantically to ethics, but a code term pointing to the new transformed condition in Christ" (226).

[133] Laird, *Mindset, Moral Choice*, 97.

[134] Laird, *Mindset, Moral Choice*, 107–8.

[135] Ohleyer, "Pauline Formula 'Induere Christum'," 36.

[136] Miller, *Chrysostom's Devil*, 144–45. O.V. Levko, ("Доброчесність (ἡ αρετή)," 123–30) defines virtue as moral virtues, such as piety, sincerity, chastity, kindness, and purity (125–26). George S. Bebis, ("Saint John Chrysostom: On Materialism," 227–37) adds other virtues: modesty, piety, almsgiving, benevolence, love, kindliness, reasonableness, mildness, forbearance; which all culminate the summit of holiness (236).

[137] Maslov, ("Οἰκείωσις πρὸς θεόν: Gregory of Nazianzus," 311–15) argues one of the basic definitions of *oikeiosis* is to claim or assert kinship with someone (313). Laird, (*Mindset, Moral Choice*, 85–112) argues that for Chrysostom humans play an active role in the divine-human relationship (95). For Chrysostom, the mindset (γνώμη) is an important part of the human contribution to their relationship with God. The essence of the human response to God's love and generosity is "A rightly disposed γνώνη" (97). The practice of virtue is to be found in the προαίρεσις (deliberate choice) and in the γνώμη (mindset) (107). So, for Chrysostom the *oikeiosis* of Christians and Christ is founded in their well-disposed mindset (εὐγνώμονας). Levko ("Доброчесність (ἡ αρετή)," 123–30) argues αρετή was understood as virtue and moral virtue in Christian discourse (124) but was understood in the Hellenistic era as a general sense of "an unchanging state of mind (124). Laird (*Mindset, Moral Choice*, 85–112) shows that Chrysostom has a similar emphasis on the important on a steady mindset. In one use of Noah as a portrait of virtue, Chrysostom argues that Noah received divine assistance due to all he could contribute to his relationship with God, which is "the steeliness of his mindset, the steadiness of his choice, and the faith which he displayed in God" (99).

[138] Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*, 148. Chrysostom argues the appropriate response to Christ's salvation is "making ourselves like God as much as is possible for us" (148). This is not ethical improvement to earn salvation, but as the proper *oikeiosis* of Christians, a "response to what God has already done in adopting us as children" (148). Humans have the capacity and responsibility to response appropriately to the grace of God's divine economy because God has "graciously mingled with us" (149).

Levko argues that virtue ("αρετή") has a general sense of an "unchanging state of mind."[139] This unchanging mindset, set towards living virtuously in Christ is displayed in a person's προαίρεσις ("deliberate choice").[140] Living a heavenly life, or an angelic life, is the telos of practicing virtue and is modeled by Christ and the saints.[141] In one example, Noah is depicted as such a model of virtue. Chrysostom argues that "the steeliness of his mindset, the steadiness of his choice, and the faith which he displayed in God" are all that Noah could contribute to his relationship with God and are why God gives him aid.[142] The practice of virtue is not a work achieved by Christians, rather God is the one transforming them.[143] Most poignantly, God gives Christians the Holy Spirit, whose indwelling transforms human flesh making it light, more spiritual, and "equipping it with wings."[144]

For Chrysostom, the spiritual gifts show the friendship between Christians and God. Through their baptism they not only receive the impartation of the Spirit, and the Spirit's gift-giving, but are also brought into "the life of the Spirit which entails the Spirit's lead in the life of the believer."[145] In this new relationship with God, Christians are encouraged to ask God for every gift they want, "so long as the things they ask for are spiritual as opposed to being carnal."[146] Chrysostom shows how the Christian community grieved over and had envy for the gifts they did not receive. Towards these passions he argues "This is why there are passions, depressions, and continual confusion

---

[139] Levko, "Доброчесність (ἡ αρετή)," 124.
[140] Laird, *Mindset, Moral Choice*, 107.
[141] Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*, 149.
[142] Laird, *Mindset, Moral Choice*, 99.
[143] Ohleyer, "Pauline Formula 'Induere Christum'," 36.
[144] Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*, 147–48. Wings refer to living an angelic life, or a heavenly life.
[145] Kleanthous, "Chrysostom's Doctrine of Baptism," 77.
[146] Kleanthous, "Chrysostom's Doctrine of Baptism," 46.

because God is demonstrating to us a life without grief: the one of the virtue. We give it up, we cut out another path, the one of wealth and money, the one being full of countless evils."[147] His indictment is that "the majority consider the unimportant things to be important, but they do not give any thought of the real important things. For the important thing to us is this: virtue and philosophy."[148] The gifts reveal the friendship, in which Christians live through the pursuit of virtue.[149]

The spiritual gifts also encourage the virtuous life by sparing them from the weight of ministry. Adolf Ritter that argues Chrysostom "made the journey from monasticism to church ministry, without abandoning the monastic ideal intellectually."[150] Chrysostom integrates monasticism with a Pauline framework, with "its special calling, its special gifts and its special possibilities: 'all' has to contribute 'to the common benefit.'"[151] This monastic tradition views ministry as a difficult work and a burden to carry. Chrysostom alludes to ministry as he calls spiritual gifts hard work.[152]

---

[147] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:8:12 (F 2:361).

[148] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:9:16 (F 2:363).

[149] Later Chrysostom, (*Ad Corinthios*, 36) argues "Now, I do not account the difference of gifts for much. One thing concerns me, that I am eager to do all things for edification. Thus, the one having the trivial gifts will overtake the greater if you devote yourself to this. For the bestowing of gifts is for this, that each may be edified" (36:4:6–8.). A root cause of the grief caused by the gift of foreign speech is the desire for glory, Chrysostom argues "Thus here, whereas they were excited concerning this gift, the one of foreign speech, because of the glory he shows that this indeed is certainly shameful, not only depriving them of glory but also involving them in the suspicion of madness" (36:3:16). The virtue of building up one's neighbor is greater than the spiritual gifts that Chrysostom can argue if the goal of the gifts is to edify one's neighbour, "then it is also possible to construct another way without them. He in possession of the gift has no great understanding, do not call yourself unhappy, the one being deprived of the gifts" (36:4:9).

[150] Ritter, "Between 'Theocracy' and 'Simple Life',"171.

[151] Ritter, "Between 'Theocracy' and 'Simple Life'," 172.

[152] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:4:13–20 (F 2:355). Chrysostom states, "for that which is a gift this is also a work, and he calls it hard labour, 'so, fulfill your work,' and 'I honour my work.' And writing to Timothy he says, 'that which I cause you to remember, to rekindle the gift of God, the one which is in you.' And again in writing instruction to the Galatians he said, 'for the one who made Peter to be sent abroad also worked in me to go to the gentiles'" (29:4:16–17). Chrysostom use of 2 Tim 4:5, Rom 11:13, 2 Tim 1:6 and Gal 2:8 show he conceives of the gifts as connected to ministerial work.

The clergy and laity are separated only by their gifting.[153] Some gifts, like teaching, would tempt them to go into ministry, while other gifts do not. Chrysostom remarks, "'Why then do you grieve,' he says, 'if another is called to far harder work, while you are spared?'"[154] For "the one who received more, but is not able to bear it, is harmed and damaged, and gives good reason to despair."[155] Chrysostom argues that Christians should understand that not being called into ministry is an encouragement from the Holy Spirit, "For he does not think you unworthy."[156] God does not despise the laity, rather he treats them with kindness, and being spared from ministry is a merciful blessing. The gifts act as preventative measures against elevation to the pastoral office and help distance a Christian from the dangers of the priesthood. The layperson can live a life of virtue and pursue the ascetic ideal, while those who are elevated to the pastoral office face many dangers in pursuit of the same virtuous life.

Having An Appropriate Response

A common goal for Chrysostom's homilies is to engage in a spiritual contest of entering into Christ's salvation, and to "win the crowns of victory already prepared for them by Christ."[157] This contest is waged against the Devil, who attempts to steal spiritual treasures from Christians by "weighing us down with evil thoughts and desires, by confusing our thoughts and minds, and by showing us things that aren't there."[158] And by striking Christians with "the things of this world, with pleasure, with wealth, and all

[153] Oikonomou, "ΚΛΗΡΙΚΟΙ ΚΑΙ ΛΑΪΚΟΙ," 48–49.
[154] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:4:14 (F 2:355).
[155] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:5:9 (F 2:356).
[156] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:5:8 (F 2:356).
[157] Papageorgiou, "Theological Analysis," 245.
[158] Papageorgiou, "Theological Analysis," 250.

the goods of this life."[159] As Chrysostom preaches on the gifts, he calls his audience to perceive the revelatory nature of the gifts with eyes of faith. The gifts show the now established friendship between Christ and the Christian. He calls his audience to have an appropriate response to the salvific friendship. Rather than responding with envy and grief, they ought to receive their gifts from the Spirit with thanksgiving.[160] On obstacle to the Christian response is a non-recognition of God's pedagogy in human behaviour. This non-recognition results, "not from a lack in the revelation itself, but in the ignorance of willful denial its intended recipients."[161] Christians, attacked by the Devil, can become blind to the heavenly realities present in their lives. Chrysostom argues, "For when they fall from that higher honour and from the heavenly love, desiring the present honour, they become slaves and prisoners."[162] By seeing only the present reality,

---

[159] Papageorgiou, "Theological Analysis," 252.

[160] Mitchell, (*Paul, the Corinthians*, 105–14) argues the Christian tradition used the concept of *epieikeia* (Latin: *aequitas*, "equity") as a means of balancing the letter of the text and the needs of the hearers (108). The preacher accommodates the fixed text to present circumstances, and for Christian authors, they read scripture to foster people's capacity for love (108). Hans Boersma, (*Scripture as Real Presence*, 51–56) argues, "One of the reasons the playfulness of patristic exegesis often frustrates modern readers is that the church fathers refuse to treat the literal or historical level of meaning as a strictly independent endeavor, entirely separated from the supernatural end of their encounter with the sacred text. The fathers refused to separate the supernatural end of the beatific vision from the natural desire that leads up to it. They were persuaded that only a participatory, holistic approach takes seriously that, from the very outset of our earthly pilgrimage, the supernatural end of the beatific vision is our ultimate fulfillment" (56). The tradition, in which Chrysostom operates, is one, which conceives the reading of scripture as part of one's theosis, their belonging to God and participation in the salvation provided by God. For Chrysostom, Mitchell (*Paul, the Corinthians*, 105–14) argues Chrysostom uses the language of *akribeia* to denote the "whole-hearted attention to what the text says, a rigorous application of the human and self to the task that Gregory calls threshing out the sense, preparing the text for human consumption and delectation" (108).

[161] Robinette, "Marion's 'Saturated Phenomenon'," 93.

[162] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:9:18 (F 2:363), the language of slaves and prisoners are previously used in *Hom*. 29 to refer to demonic possession of humans. As Papageorgiou previously stated, for Chrysostom the Devil uses present honours to ensnare Christians. Chrysostom continues "One asks, 'and how have we desired this?' From not greatly desiring that one. 'But how does this very thing happen?' From laziness. 'And how is it laziness?' From despising it. 'And how is it being despised?' From folly and from clinging to the present things, and not desiring to investigate the nature of things with precision. 'And again, how does this very thing happen?' From neither being devoted to reading the scriptures, nor keeping company with holy men, and by pursuing the gathering of wicked people (29:9:19–20). Papageorgiou ("Theological Analysis," 256–72) argues the Christian is required to be watchful of their salvation and lives. God helps Christians along the way, "and the only thing required of

Christians can risk manufacturing an idol out of God's revelation.[163] Human behaviour is influenced by spiritual forces. Thus, a spirit's nature is discernable through the behavioural response they cause. When people are demon possessed they are "dragged away in chains," "driven out of the sense," "under compulsion," "thrusted out," "torn asunder," and "dragged away as a raving lunatic."[164] The Pythian woman, when possessed, is brought to "a Bacchic enthusiasm, foaming from the mouth and so she begins to utter her mad speech in her frenzy."[165] When giving an oracle the human "was thrown down and convulsed. He was not able to endure the invasion of the demon but was going to die like that while convulsing."[166] The demon forces compulsion and then

---

him is to not be slothful." Laziness, or sloth, will bring a Christian back into the mire of their previous life prior to Christ (265). For Chrysostom, refraining from constant devotion is laziness and opens Christians up to the Devil's scheme. The goal of the Christian struggle is to take the human and transform and perfect them in "the likeness of God" (264). The salvific goal of Christianity, for Chrysostom, is a therapeutic one. He "seems to be a 'spiritual doctor' with great insight into the human condition and the spiritual struggle, offering preventive medicine to his flock to help them avoid falling into sin, a condition that would require more drastic treatment" (269). Chrysostom aims to have his hearers develop an ardent love towards God and their neighbour, which then produces virtues and "an active control of the passions, which renders man dead to sin and makes him a living sacrifice to God" (269).

[163] Robinette, "Marion's 'Saturated Phenomenon'," 91. Robinette is working with the thought of Emanuel Levinas and its influence on Jean-Luc Marion, writing "The Other is no manipulable thing, something to be comprehended-through-representation under a generic category, such as humanity, ethnicity, gender or ethnicity (91). To reduce an Other is a violent act (91). Levinas's phrase, the face of the other, is situated within the language of revelation. "The face is infinite, reversing my gaze in a 'counter-experience', so that I am now a 'witness'. I receive my 'me', not through self-constitution, but in my hospitality to the Other, who is gift" (91). Marion, who uses the idea of 'the face of the other,' to relate to God, argues "that to be a 'me' is to respond to a call or a summons" (91). The face makes an appeal, "it therefore calls me forth as gifted" (91). God's revelation "can only be received in its self-presentation" (92). While the Christ-event is a manifestation of God, "Having come among its own, they did not recognize it; having come into phenomenality, the absolutely saturated phenomenon could find no room there for its display. But this opening denial, and thus this disfiguration, still remains a manifestation" (92–93). Here, Robinette's coverage of Marion's can give voice to Chrysostom's preaching on the gifts of the spirit. The Spirit's gift-giving is an act of revelation, a manifestation of God coming into phenomenality, in a parallel way to the Christ-event. The baptism of the Christian is a merging of the divine-human relationship, where the human becomes indwelled with the Spirit. The Spirit's indwelling becomes a parallel revelatory event to Christ's incarnation. Chrysostom's core argument is that his audience does not recognize God's revelation in the Spirit's gift-giving, causing a distorted understanding of the gifts as a result. The gifts morph into a kind of idol because they are removed from their place as a revelatory event.

[164] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:2:3–4 (F 2:351).

[165] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:2:16 (F 2:352).

[166] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:2:13 (F 2:352).

acts with violence to harm the one they are possessing.[167] The demonic possession is harmful and violent towards humans, and it reveals the hostility and malice of demons towards them. In contrast, the Spirit's possession of the prophets reveals the Spirit's nature and disposition towards humans. The prophet speaks "with self-controlled thought, and with moderation, and in stillness."[168] They had "quick comprehension and entire freedom," they were "not seized with compulsion, but were honoured by their permission."[169] The Spirit treats the prophet with respect giving the prophet virtue alongside an understanding of what they were saying. The behaviour of the possessed human is so telling that Chrysostom remarks "even before the event you discover the oracle and the prophet."[170] Whereas demons demean and devalue humans, treating them as slaves, producing "confusion, madness, and much gloom," the Holy Spirit honours humans and "illuminates and astutely teaches needful things."[171] Chrysostom points out how the response of envy, grief, and pride towards receiving spiritual gifts resulted in passions, depression, and continual confusion, which coincides with a rejection of God's demonstration of a virtuous life. The response towards the gifts was more demonic in behaviour and lacked the appropriate behavioural response towards the Spirit's goodwill.

In *Hom 1 Cor*. 29 Chrysostom uses the topic of wealth in addition to spiritual possession to show the human failure to recognize God's pedagogy. He calls his audience to look "beyond external appearances and consider the internal turmoil the

[167] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:2:14 (F 2:352).
[168] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:2:5 (F 2:351).
[169] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:2:23–24 (F 2:353).
[170] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:2:6 (F 2:351).
[171] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:2:27 (F 2:353).

wealthy suffer: the suffering that comes from guilt."[172] Leyerle argues Chrysostom often refutes the idea that wealth is a sign of divine favor and blessing.[173] Chrysostom argues, "Not every rich person is really from God, but many are rich from injustice, theft, and greed."[174] Christians would see wealthy people spend their money on prostitutes, and social parasites, they would be getting drunk and spend frivolously and wondered why they did not suffer.[175] Chrysostom's response is telling: "You say if the body is distorted and mutilated, he is merited measureless weeping, but upon seeing his soul being mutilated you consider him to be prosperous?"[176] Chrysostom is rebuking his audience for not being able to perceive how the external behaviour of the rich is indicative of the state of their soul. In his critique he states, "Indeed, ignoring the beautiful woman upon seeing her who had acquired natural beauty. And viewing the shameful and ugly woman with a mutilated body, but having beautiful clothes, he takes her as a wife."[177] The distribution of wealth is not the cause of a virtuous life but is part of God's pedagogy. God does not train people in the same way, but "the one through poverty, but the other through wealth, the one through relaxation, but the other through affliction."[178] Abraham was rich, but Jacob poor, Esau was rich and rejected while Jacob lived in slavery but was accepted by God. Isaac lived a long, peaceful life, and Jacob had distress and hard labour. David lived in distress his whole life, but Solomon lived in abundance and peace. Some prophets were oppressed more, but others less. Each person benefits from their state in life. God uses both wealth and poverty in his pedagogy. However, The

---

[172] Leyerle, *Narrative Shape of Emotion*, 72–73.
[173] Leyerle, *Narrative Shape of Emotion*, 72.
[174] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:7:5 (F 2:360).
[175] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:8:4 (F 2:361).
[176] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:8:8 (F 2:361).
[177] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:8:13 (F 2:362).
[178] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:7:6–10 (F 2:360).

accumulation of wealth is not the purpose of God's interaction with humans. Rather, "God allows both together, showing the freedom of choice and to teach others not to rage nor to be fanatical about money."[179] Chrysostom calls his audience to recognize God's pedagogy at work in both wealth and poverty. Thus, Christians are to look beyond one's possessions. The actions and behaviour of humans reveals to whom they belong.

The discussion of spiritual possession and physical possessions create a framework for understanding the error of responding to the Spirit's gift-giving with envy and grief. Chrysostom rebukes his congregation for their inability to see beyond the outward appearance towards the spiritual realities. In other words, they do not approach the topics in this homily with eyes of faith, but with a carnal vision. He states, "Tell me, is thinking on immortality and the good, which the eye has not seen, nor which the ear has heard, nor which has entered into the human heart, a great joke to be contentious about the things here and to consider them enviable?"[180] Chrysostom asks his congregation, "For if you do not know how to distinguish their natures, which ones are short lived and constantly changing, when are you going to be able to despise them?"[181] He makes it clear that the envy over the spiritual gifts, and also the wealth disparity, is not an appropriate response to God's pedagogical work in their lives. To see other's possessions with envy is to treat God's salvific work as a joke. Chrysostom wants his congregation to stand upon the decrees and arguments of God to "look down on the swelling sea of this present life." Not only for their own sake, but for the sake of others holding on to the present life.[182] A way to escape the grasp of envy towards the gifts is to

[179] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:8:3 (F 2:361).
[180] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:9.9 (F 2:362–63).
[181] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:9:10 (F 2:363).
[182] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:9:21 (F 2:364).

respond to the Spirit's gift-giving with thanksgiving. At the beginning of his discussion on gifts he argues, "Now he did not say 'of miracles' nor 'of wonders,' but 'of gifts' persuading them by the name of 'free gift' not only to not grieve, but also to be thankful."[183] His section on the spiritual gifts is a call to be thankful for the gifts they have received. His section ends with a return to this call, "For if he freely gave from care, consider that the measure given is from the same care. Be satisfied and rejoice over what you received, and do not be displeased over what you did not receive, but only accept the goodwill: that you did not receive things greater than your ability."[184] The Spirit's pedagogy works adaptively, whether through fewer gifts or more gifts, through an absence of gifts or through their plentitude. The Spirit does not give gifts from a motive to cause despair. Rather, it is out of goodwill that the Spirit gives consideration and helps Christian profit through gift-giving.[185] "Therefore, just as he encourages them, saying that there is a diversity of services but the same Master, and a diversity of activities, but the same God. Thus, also he says above, there is a diversity of gifts, but the same Spirit. And with this saying again, but the same Spirit works in all these, distributing privately to each as he desires."[186]

Chrysostom intersects the topics of wealth and grief with his goal of encouraging people who have received fewer gifts, whether spiritual or material, and to remediate them from their grief and envy. In Chrysostom's own words, "If in spiritual matters (πνευματικοῖς) it is not necessary to waste one's time, how much more with physical

[183] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:4:5 (F 2:354–55).
[184] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:7:3 (F 2:360).
[185] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:5:8 (F 2:356).
[186] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:7:1 (F 2:359).

matters (σαρκικοῖς).”[187] Chrysostom argues that Paul’s motivation in this text is “to persuade the ones having fewer gifts not to grieve, and the ones having acquired more not to be arrogant.”[188] Likewise, in parallel with his discussion on wealth, Chrysostom argues the righteous receive no harm from poverty, “but has greater aid to his reputation.”[189] God allows the wealth disparity to “show the freedom of choice (προαίρεσις) and to teach others not to rage nor to be fanatical about money.”[190] So, the parallel opens up the thought that God gives a diversity of gifts to achieve the same pedagogical purpose, to show the freedom of human προαίρεσις and to teach Christians not to be obsessive over gifts.[191] Neither gifts nor wealth can recreate the advantages of virtue. Chrysostom argues:

> Even if you are a poor worker, you are able to live cheerfully with philosophy. And even if you are rich, you can be more wretched than everyone if you are avoiding virtue. For the important way for us is this: that of virtue, which if this is not added to us, there is no other advantage. Because of this you will continue to ask these questions seeing that the majority consider the unimportant things to be important, but they do not give any thought of the real important things. For the important thing to us is this: virtue and philosophy.[192]

Conclusion

The appropriate response towards the Spirit’s gift-giving is to receive those gifts with thanksgiving and accept God’s goodwill. The gifts are given to Christians in conjunction

---

[187] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:7:4 (F 2:360).
[188] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:4:2 (F 2:354).
[189] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:8:2 (F 2:361).
[190] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:8:3 (F 2:361).
[191] Laird, (*Mindset, Moral Choice*, 101–12) argues προαίρεσις is, for Chrysostom, the autonomy given to humans by God. It is a vital part of the human mind, and its function is “to operate in a way that its freedom is used to mould [sic] us into God-likeness; that it is, like the late-Stoic προαίρεσις, teleologically oriented; that it is our task to beautify it, that is to use it, and to persuade others to use it, as God intended, to make the right choices toward the destine of our true beauty; and that it is invested with power and autonomy to realise [sic] that destiny” (104–5).
[192] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:9:13–16 (F 2:363).

with their baptism into Christ. Christ has given them honour and value. In response to Christ's salvific work the Spirit honours and celebrates the friendship between Christians and God through gift-giving. The appearance of the Spirit through the gifts helps convey this new friendship in a tangible manner. The appropriate response to such a transformation is to participate in that friendship with thanksgiving.

CHAPTER 6: THE PASTORAL MOTIVE OF GIFT-GIVING

> For the pursuer only sees what is being pursued and he aims towards it and does not give up until he has caught it. Whenever the pursuer is not able to restrain the one fleeing by himself, he quickly calls those nearby to restrain and guard it, holding it down until he arrives. Now we must also do this, whenever we ourselves do not overtake love, let us call out to those nearby to restrain it until we arrive to it. Next, whenever we have taken hold, we must no longer let go of it, so that it will not escape us again. For it is constantly leaping away from us because we do not have it correctly, rather we honour everything other than it.[1]

With these words Chrysostom opens *Hom. 1 Cor.* 35. It captures the core lesson he looks to impart upon his audience, primarily the clergy. With the image in mind, when Christians fail to capture love by themselves, they must seek the support of others. Chrysostom argues that the gift of foreign speech requires the help of those with the gift of interpretation to produce a beneficial effect for others. He argues, "The one without the gift of interpretation may take another having it and he may produce a profit through him. Therefore, he everywhere shows its incompleteness so that he may bind them together."[2] The gift of foreign speech embodies the core lesson of this homily because it cannot bring a benefit to others unless it receives help from an interpreter.

This chapter argues that Chrysostom uses the gift of foreign speech as a means to communicate a Christianized vision for the priesthood. First, this chapter shows how Chrysostom stylizes the message of this homily towards the clergy as his primary

[1] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:1:3–6 (F 2:434).
[2] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:4:2–3 (F 2:438).

recipients. Because of this, Chrysostom adapts this subject to the challenges facing the clergy, namely social advancement, and the desire for honour. This desire for honour is disastrous for the priesthood and is one of the greatest dangers a church leader faces. Then, through the use of portraits Chrysostom shows clergy their responsibility as leaders: to embody the virtues of God and participate in God's revelatory pedagogy towards others. And, finally, Chrysostom wants the clergy to refrain from using the church's liturgy as a platform for their over advancement. Instead, he calls them to prioritize benefiting the laity through their words. Chrysostom uses almsgiving as a parallel. Like the gift of foreign speech, wealth can be ruinous towards humans, but gives a great benefit when it is given to someone in need.

A number of indications throughout this homily show the clergy as Chrysostom's primary targeted audience. In the middle of the homily he argues that when Paul was lecturing on this topic he began "first with the farmers, shepherds, and soldiers, he then continues the argument to one that is closer to what is being set before them: the priests, the ones in the past."[3] By situating the scripture's audience to be that of the ancient clergy, Chrysostom adapts the topic to his present-day clergy. Later, Chrysostom brings the experience of the laity to the forefront in contrast to the one using the gift of foreign speech:

> And he talks about the common person, the layperson, and proves that he suffers no small penalty when he is unable to say the amen. And what he says is this, 'when you give thanks in a foreign language, the laity do not know what you are saying, nor are able to interpret, nor are able to respond to the amen.' For not understanding the forever and ever, which is that the end, they are not able to say amen.[4]

[3] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:4:17 (F 2:438–39).
[4] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:6:5–7 (F 2:440).

Here Chrysostom strongly implies the clergy are praying or delivering part of the liturgy in a non-Grecian language. In so doing, the laity cannot follow along, so they miss their participatory response. Chrysostom concludes his searing indictment of the clergy by showing that despite giving thanks "beautifully," speaking while being moved by the Spirit, "that one does not understand, nor knows what is being said. He stands without receiving any benefit."[5]

This homily also features common talking points on the priesthood, which are brought up when Chrysostom addresses the priesthood in *Six Books on the Priesthood*. Specifically, it dealt with the desire for glory and fear of dishonour. When Chrysostom characterizes his audience in the following passage, it is similar to how he addresses the clergy. He writes, "But now these are altogether overwhelmed, not only by the desire for glory but additionally by insolence and fear of dishonour. For, should anyone praise you it would puff you up. If anyone should blame you it would make you depressed."[6] Furthermore, Chrysostom calls his target audience to avoid glory, calling it "that dangerous beast, that horrific demon, that corruption of the world, that venomous viper."[7] The problem, Chrysostom argues, is that people give honour to everything

---

[5] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:6:8 (F 2:440).

[6] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:12:1–2 (F 2:444–45). Compare with passages from (*Six Books on the Priesthood*, 33–83) where Chrysostom states his soul does not know "how to bear insults or honors temperately. But these do exceedingly elate it, while those depress it" (80). Chrysostom argues that priests suffer from many people who provoke them. Priests must "be trained to despise the praises of the multitudes" (78). Chrysostom argues, "For I know not whether any man ever succeeded in the effort not to be pleased when he is praised, and the man who is pleased at this is likely also to desire to enjoy it, and the man who desires to enjoy it will, of necessity, be altogether vexed and beside himself whenever he misses it. For as they who revel in being rich, when they fall into poverty are grieved, and they who have been used to live luxuriously cannot bear to live shabbily; so, too, they who long for applause, not only when they are not constantly being praised, become, as by some famine, wasted in soul, particularly when they happen themselves to have been used to praise, or if they hear others being praised" (71).

[7] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:9:8 (F 2:443). Chrysostom (*Six Books on the Priesthood*, 33–83) argues "first of all is that most terrible rock of vainglory, more dangerous than that of the Sirens" (49). Chrysostom uses the image of a wild beast to describe "wrath, despondency, envy, strife, slanders, accusations, falsehood, hypocrisy, intrigues, anger against those who have done no harm, pleasure at the

except love. For the clergy this means that instead of seeking the benefit of the congregation, they are seeking their own honour and advancement.

Clergy Advancement

Chrysostom often warns against the pressures of using rhetoric for one's own gain. Early in his career, he writes:

> If a preacher be indifferent to praise, and yet cannot produce the doctrine "which is with grace seasoned with salt," he becomes despised by the multitude, while he gains nothing from his own nobleness of mind. And if on the other hand he is successful as a preacher, and is overcome by the thought of applause, harm is equally done in turn, both to himself and to the multitude, because in his desire for praise he is careful to speak rather with a view to please than to profit.[8]

The struggle of the priesthood is to balance the necessity of using rhetoric to benefit the congregation, yet to avoid be taken away by the congregation's reaction.[9] Peter van Nuffelen argues that rhetoric was an important factor for social advancement. Talented "preachers regularly became bishops," yet those same leaders often preached on the virtue of humility.[10] For van Nuffelen, there is enough evidence to argue "that rhetorical talent was consciously exploited to become big in Church and society—even when such ambitions were covered under the cloak of humility."[11] Large cities with multiple

---

indecorous acts of fellow ministers, sorrow at their prosperity, love of praise, desire of honour (which indeed most of all drives the human soul headlong to perdition), doctrines devised to please, servile flatteries, ignoble fawning, contempt of the poor, paying court to the rich, senseless and mischievous honors, favors attended with danger both to those who offer and those who accept them, sordid fear suited only to the basest of slaves, the abolition of plain speaking, a great affectation of humility, but banishment of truth, the suppression of convictions and reproofs, or rather the excessive use of them against the poor, while against those who are invested with power no one dare open his lips" (49). Public fame is called "this wild beast, so difficult to capture, so unconquerable, so fierce" and clergy need to 'cut of fits many heads, or rather to forbid their growth altogether. But he who has not freed himself from this monster, involves his soul in struggles of various kinds, and perpetual agitation, and the burden both of despondency and of other passions" (73).

[8] Chrysostom, *Six Books on the Priesthood*, 70–71.

[9] Chrysostom, *Six Books on the Priesthood*, 71.

[10] Van Nuffelen, "War of Words," 202–3.

[11] Van Nuffelen, "War of Words," 203.

churches created a space for this competition. Between different factions of Christianity and clergy from the same faction,[12] "preachers in different churches could compete in attracting the biggest crowd."[13] Chrysostom himself, due to his oratorical skills, drew large crowds when he preached, and often warned his audience not to be "too engrossed or even captivated with his preaching."[14] One example occurs during Chrysostom's episcopacy in Constantinople, where Antiochus and Severian sought to "achieve success through oratory, success that is measured in wealth (they accept money for their sermons) and in social status (they ingratiate themselves at court). A further accusation is implicit in Socrates and Sozomen but explicit in Pseudo-Martyrius: they compete with John Chrysostom for popularity and leadership of his Church."[15] This example opens up "quite a different world from our usual perspective on Christian sermons. They conjure up a world of competition and careerism apparently at odds with the traditional focus on instruction and humility. Indeed, they show that the view that rhetoric only serves instruction, reflected in the humility of the preacher, is a *topos* that serves to morally

[12] Clark (*Origenist Controversy*, 11–42) promotes the use of network theory, such as the work of J. Clyde Mitchell, and argues along with Rodney Stark that "in some contemporary religious groups, interpersonal ties are far more effective than ideology both in recruitment to the group and in maintenance of commitment" (18). And Clark argues the "themes emphasized by network analysts serve to enrich our historical understanding by calling attention to relationships that might otherwise be insufficiently noticed" (19). And while Clark analyzes the networks of the Origenist controversy, specifically both Jerome's and Rufinus's networks, the context has similarities to the competing Meletian and Paulinus networks within Antioch, and the broader Eastern Roman Empire. Ayres (*Nicaea and its Legacy*, 222–43) argues the Antioch schism only grew worse during the fourth century, and both Athanasius and Basil of Caesarea wished to heal it for the sake of the pro-Nicene cause (226–27). Yet reconciliation never came during their lifetime as Basil supported Meletius, while Athanasius supported Paulinus. Basil wanted to join with Athanasius in asking for Western support for Meletius, which did not arrive. Rather, the West supported Paulinus (227–28).

[13] Van Nuffelen, "War of Words," 213.

[14] Naidu, *Transformed in Christ*, 90.

[15] Van Nuffelen, "War of Words," 205.

rank individuals."[16] Within the church, a successful sermon could attract elite patrons who would give gifts reflecting their status and their esteem towards the preacher.

Rather than spend those gifts on oneself, a good member of the clergy would use what he received for charitable ends"; thus, "almsgiving was also a social practice that bought a good standing with God and man."[17] Patronage can also affect attendance. If a preacher receives patronage from a wealthy individual, clients of that person may be enticed to come and listen to the preacher so as to be seen by their patron. As a social event, the sermon "could also be part of a strategy of social promotion and a struggle for status in a world of complex and competing social networks."[18] These networks could serve personal interests, but also "ulterior ends, such as the defence of orthodoxy and the care of the poor," but what is inescapable is "such strategies were incarnated in the person of the successful preacher who competed with others."[19] Chrysostom argues that clergy should not aim to be popular with the laity with their sermons, like some public orator. Instead, they ought to be driven by the goal of saying what the people need to hear. This is because Chrysostom is "bothered by applause, because the theater and hippodrome become the context of the homily rather than worship and heaven."[20] Priests need to be wary of the dangers honours and public popularity bring. For:

---

[16] Van Nuffelen, "War of Words," 206.

[17] Van Nuffelen, "War of Words," 210–11.

[18] Van Nuffelen, "War of Words," 212.

[19] Van Nuffelen, "War of Words," 212. Antioch also displays such competition. Schor ("Theodoret on the 'School of Antioch'," 517–62) argues Antioch was hampered by "Factionalism and confusion over episcopal authority" which "hobbled church leadership on a local level" (537). Meletius is placed at the center of a pro-Nicene faction in Antioch. As bishop, his authority was promoted through two partisans, "Flavian and Diodore" (538). These two men were adept at swaying crowds through preaching and argumentation. In addition, they invented a "powerful propaganda weapon, the antiphonal chant, a tool they let loose in prayer meetings, on the streets, and even in Leontius's churches." (538). When Flavian became bishop after Meletius, he divided up the operations between him and Diodore. "Diodore researched arguments, while Flavian preached them to the crowds" (538). This helped their faction gain prominence within Antioch.

[20] Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*, 210.

> The man who is contending in no wise differs from those who are untrained. He who thus enters this list should despise glory, be superior to anger, full of great discretion. But for the exercise of these qualities there is no scope in his case who affects a secluded life. For he does not have many to provoke him in order that he may practise chastising, the force of his anger: nor admirers and applauders in order that he might be trained to despise the praises of the multitudes.[21]

Applause and praise are dangerous in themselves. When it comes from women, Chrysostom warns that it ruins the "vigor of self-restraint" and overthrows a priest who does not know how to guard against his own desires. Meanwhile when flattery comes from men, the priest is threatened with pride and sees himself as a servant to his flatterers. He kneels to his patrons and acts arrogantly towards his inferiors. Because of the honours others confer upon him, he "is driven into the gulf of arrogance." Thus, applause and praise cause great harm. In fact, "how harmful they actually are, no one could well learn without experience."[22]

During Chrysostom's lifetime, Nicene Christianity became increasingly entangled with the Roman State. Piety became an important characteristic for imperial legitimacy, and one's association with holy men or one's patronage of skillful preachers became a key strategy in climbing the social ladder and "ingratiating oneself with the court."[23] Bishops were "powerful figures, who, with inspiring preaching, were able to steer crowds. However, it seems that more important than crowds were small but efficient 'professional' groups who acted under the command of local bishops."[24] Both bishops and those professionals under them had their own clients, as "the relationship between a bishop as a patron and his parishioners as his clients was one variation of the

---

[21] Chrysostom, *Six Books on the Priesthood*, 78.
[22] Chrysostom, *Six Books on the Priesthood*, 75.
[23] Pigott, "Capital Crimes," 766.
[24] Kahlos, "Pacifiers and Instigators – Bishops," 64. In a technical sense, Chrysostom, during his time in Antioch, would be closer to one of these professionals, first under Meletius then under Flavian.

client system."[25] Patronage was important for maintaining episcopal influence.[26] Alternative choices of patrons, aside from the Bishop and the Imperial government, existed in large cities, like Constantinople. Disgruntled clergy could network with visiting bishops to create pathways for advancement and could organize resistance to the ruling bishop behind the scenes, as Chrysostom found out when he was bishop in Constantinople.[27] Popular preachers and aspiring churchmen "gave the bishop grave cause for concern. The threat such highly ambitious clerics posed to the city's official bishop was significant. Popular preachers could siphon money and potential audience members away from the local bishop and undermine his reputation."[28] One example is Chrysostom's accusations towards the Paulinus faction, another pro-Nicene network in Antioch, that they only want control of the church, not the unity of the church. For Chrysostom, "L'unité spirituelle, necessaire à l'Eglise, y est assure par l'autorité incarnée dans la hiérarchie."[29] He views competition between clergy, not solely through a social-political lens, but through a pastoral theological lens. Chrysostom is concerned with the unity and benefit of the church, and his distaste of clerical ambition results from how it harms the ordinary person. A centralized hierarchy, consolidated in the Bishop, is important for the health of the church. As Anatole Moulard argues, "Rien ne divise autant l'Eglise que le désir de commander, et rien n'irrite autant Dieu que de voir déchirer l'unitéde l'Eglise. . . . C'est l'ambition qui est la cause du mal."[30] He laments

[25] Kahlos, "Pacifiers and Instigators – Bishops," 64.
[26] Pigott, "Capital Crimes," 770.
[27] Pigott, "Capital Crimes," 767, 770.
[28] Pigott, "Capital Crimes," 767.
[29] Moulard, *Saint Jean Chrysostome*, 115. "Spiritual unity, which is necessary for the church, is assured in authority, incarnated in the hierarchy."
[30] Moulard, *Saint Jean Chrysostome*, 115. "Nothing divides the church as much as the desire to be in charge, and nothing irritates God as much as seeing the unity of the church torn apart. . . . It is ambition, which causes the harm."

that "many of the ordinations now-a-days do not proceed from the grace of God, but are due to human ambition."[31] The dangers of this are paramount. "For they certainly would be deserving of the greatest punishment who, after obtaining this dignity through their own ambition, should then either on account of sloth, or wickedness, or even inexperience, abuse the office."[32] And the one "who gives authority to any one who is minded to destroy the Church, would be certainly to blame for the outrages which that person commits."[33] Chrysostom is concerned that human ambition for advancement will negate the benefit the clergy bring to the church.

The Role of the Clergy

Chrysostom conceives of the church's mission as participating the transmission of the mysteries of God. He emphasizes the importance of the διδασκαλία πνευματική, "l'enseignement spirituel, transmis par l'Église."[34] Although God is incomprehensible in his essence, even to the angelic beings, " mais dont la révélation chrétienne affirme qu'il s'est fait connaître en Jésus-Christ, par son Esprit, est-il enfin accessible au croyant par l'Écriture Sainte?"[35] Moreover, the revelation of God is further expressed in the liturgical celebration of baptism and the eucharist. Adolf Ritter argues, "Die Würde des

[31] Chrysostom, *Six Books on the Priesthood*, 62.
[32] Chrysostom, *Six Books on the Priesthood*, 62.
[33] Chrysostom, *Six Books on the Priesthood*, 62.
[34] Astruc-Morize and Le Boulluec, "Jean Chrysostome et Origène," 6. "Spiritual teaching, transmitted by the church."
[35] Astruc-Morize and Le Boulluec, "Jean Chrysostome et Origène," 1. "Does not Christian revelation affirm that he made himself known in Jesus Christ, by his Spirit, is he finally accessible to the believer by Holy Scripture?"

kirchlichen Amtes findet für Chrysostomos ihren höchsten Ausdruck ohne Frage in seiner Funktion bei der Feier der 'schauererregenden' göttlichen Mysterien."[36]

The rituals of the church, which celebrate the mysteries of God are the means through which the clergy help give divine relation to others. Because *synkatabasis* is the foundation of God's revelation to humans, "une adaptation à la capacité d'un autre. Aux yeux de Chrysostome, it sert magnifiquement à exprimer la manière dont le Dieu transcendant met sa Révélation et son œuvre de salut à la portée de l'homme petit et faible, soit dans l'Ancien, soit dans le Nouveau Testament, soit encore à travers l'action pastoral de l'Eglise."[37] The clergy join in God's pedagogy by presenting the knowledge of God to the laity, in a way which adapts to their weakness. The clergy then, join in with God's missional work, "qui conduit progressivement l'humanité de l'abîme où elle s'était précipitée jusqu'au salut réalisé par l'incarnation, jusu'au dialogue entre l'homme et Dieu, restauré initialement dans la Liturgie et totalement dans la vision béatifique de l'homme ressuscité d'entre les morts."[38] The whole of the church's liturgy brings people close to God. "L'homme distant de Dieu, auquel s'adressait la letter divine de l'Ecriture, devient, face au prédicateur, celui qui écoute le Dieu proche qui lui parle et qui même se fait sa nourriture dans l'Eucharistie."[39] Within this framework for understanding pastoral

---

[36] Ritter, *Charisma im Verständnis des Joannes Chrysostomos*, 99. "For Chrysostom, the dignity of ecclesiastical ministry undoubtedly finds its highest expression in his function in the celebration of the dreadful divine mysteries."

[37] De Margerie, *Les Pères Grecs et Orientaux*, 218. "An adaptation to the capacity of another. In the eyes of Chrysostom, it serves magnificently to express the way in which the transcendent God places his revelation and his work of salvation within the reach of the small and weak man, whether in the Old, or in the New Testament, or again through the pastoral action of the church."

[38] De Margerie, *Les Pères Grecs et Orientaux*, 234. "Which progressively leads humanity from the abyss where it had precipitated up to the salvation realized by the incarnation, up to the dialogue between man and God, restored initially in the liturgy and totally in the beatific vision of man risen from the dead."

[39] De Margerie, *Les Pères Grecs et Orientaux*, 234. "The man distant from God, to whom the divine letter of scripture was addressed, becomes, facing the preacher, the one who listens to the close God who speaks to him and who even finds his nourishment in the eucharist."

ministry, the preacher speaks with *synkatabasis*, helping make the knowledge of God understandable. In so doing, the preacher presents the incomprehensible God through an adaptation to the benefit of the common person. “Il reste que la lecture de l’Ecriture facilite beaucoup l’élanvers cette vision face à face dans laquelle elle disparaître définitivement.”[40] Thus, “la lecture de l’Ecriture devient un moyen privilégié du retour à Dieu par l’exercise des vertus.”[41] Through preaching the scriptures, clergy call people, individuals and families, to return to God, and to anticipate the eschatological fulfillment of God’s work, “la vision béatifique.”[42]

Angelic Life

Pak-Wah Lai argues that Greek and Syriac Christians appropriated the motif of angelic life from Second Temple Judaism to describe the Christian life.[43] The motif of an angelic life denotes the ability of humans to take part in divine likeness, which has roots

[40] De Margerie, *Les Pères Grecs et Orientaux*, 235. “The fact remains that the reading of scripture greater facilitates the catalyst towards this face-to-face vision in which it definitively disappears.”

[41] De Margerie, *Les Pères Grecs et Orientaux*, 236. “The reading of scripture becomes a privileged means of returning to God through the practice of virtues.”

[42] De Margerie, *Les Pères Grecs et Orientaux*, 237. “The beatific vision.”

[43] Lai, “Hermeneutics of Exemplar Portraits,” 134. A Protestant soteriological perspective, Lai argues, hold a sharp divine between humans and spiritual beings and “it is entirely inappropriate, let alone relevant, to speak of human salvation as having any form of angelic association.” It is anachronistic to the soteriological lens Chrysostom employs (132). Fletcher-Louis (“Reflections on Angelomorphic Humanity,” 292–312) confirms this Jewish foundation for an angelic life. Adam was seen to be created as angelomorphic as “one created to bear God’s Glory.” Israel also “recapitulates the true Adam as the bearer of God’s Glory.” Thus, a community such as Qumran who saw themselves as the true Israel and the true Adam, would “believe that, at times, their own identity is angelic.” Indeed, such a view is not unique to Qumran, but is ubiquitous “among the Dead Sea Scrolls” (297). Papageorgiou (“Theological Analysis,” 16–136) shows how Chrysostom’s anthropology contains similar beliefs to the Second Temple period. For Chrysostom, it is important that humans are created “in His image and likeness,” which allows for humans, in their “own effort and ability to become like God in virtue” (23–25). In the beginning, humanity lived “an angelic life in that paradise created chiefly for him and was clothed with the glory of God until his disobedience and fall” (26–27). Christ is seen as “the second Adam who makes good what the first Adam had done wrong” (73). Part of Christ’s salvific work is to transform human flesh, making it “lighter and more spiritual” (75). Thus, Chrysostom is an inheritor of the Second Temple angelomorphic tradition as Lai suggests.

in Christian anthropology, the *imago dei*. For Chrysostom, humanity is both the εἰκών ("image") and the ὁμοίωσις ("likeness") of God. These qualities are distinct from each other as likeness denotes a conviction "that God intended all humanity to become like God, according to the human power."[44] Humans can become like God through "gentleness and mildness and according to the principle of *aretē*."[45] Yet, this telos of humanity, to achieve divine likeness, is "circumscribed by the image of the Christ."[46] Christ is the image of God "in which the first human being is made." Thus, "Then human salvation can only be understood as the renewal of humanity into this *imago dei*, that is, the image of Christ."[47] This is attained by Christians participating in Christ's recapitulation. Christ's divine exchange, God becoming man and man becoming God, lay at the heart of Chrysostom's soteriology.[48] Christ came down "not only to teach but, more importantly, to show, or make known how the Law may be performed easily."[49] Not merely as an example, Christ demonstrates a life "of obedience to God, rather than being subdued by sin." Christ's work of recapitulation "must surely be understood as a restoration of the *true order of humanity*, that is, the human *sarx* and the Law should cooperate to subdue sin, not vice-versa, in order that human life may be lived for the

[44] Lai, "*Imago Dei* and Salvation," 396. Lai argues in this conviction Chrysostom echoes both Basil of Caesarea and Clement of Alexandria, noting how Chrysostom is "far more in line with the Alexandrian-Cappadocian traditions than that of Theodore."

[45] Lai, Hermeneutics of Exemplar Portraits," 144. citing Chrysostom, *Hom. In Gen.* 9:7 (PG 53:78b). Mitchell, (*Heavenly Trumpet*, 43–47) highlights the importance of human likeness for God's revelation. scripture is a relic of saints, saying "the grace of the Holy Spirit left us in written form through the Holy Scriptures the lives and mode of living of all the saints" (43–44). Religious authority is rooted in the lives of the saints and brings their virtues to the public eye (44). God's self-revelation to humans is not divorced from humanity's likeness to him and transformation by him. God revealed is, in part, shown through humans who demonstrate likeness with him.

[46] Lai, "Hermeneutics of Exemplar Portraits," 143.

[47] Lai, "Hermeneutics of Exemplar Portraits," 146.

[48] Lai, "Hermeneutics of Exemplar Portraits," 147–48.

[49] Lai, "Hermeneutics of Exemplar Portraits," 150.

sake of God."[50] For Chrysostom, salvation is one of transcending the weakness, limits, and sinfulness of the human nature "by the grace and power of God's Spirit, so that he might ascend to spiritual levels higher than that of the angels, namely, deification."[51] Chrysostom follows Basil of Caesarea in giving the Holy Spirit the central role of sanctifying humans.[52] A true perception and knowledge of "God through the Son occurs only by the illumination of the Holy Spirit."[53] Chrysostom also follows Gregory of Nyssa by giving the sacramental formulation of the Christians' union with Christ a place of prominence.[54] The process of theosis is connected with partaking in the sacraments of baptism and the eucharist. In baptism, "the soul is washed anew by the coming of the Holy Spirit into one's life."[55] Chrysostom follows both the Cappadocians and Alexandrian theologians such as Athanasius by arguing "this angelic or divine lifestyle can be realized, at least to some extent, in this present age." What is needed is "for Christians to cultivate *apatheia* and *arete* in their lives, so that they may attain the life of the angels or divine likeness."[56]

Within this soteriological framework Chrysostom situates Paul as its exemplar portrait. Chrysostom depicts Paul as having all the virtues of humanity to the highest degree, and even angelic virtues. These virtues are the reason why "the gift of the spirit was plentifully poured into him."[57] Chrysostom ties virtues and the gifts in the portrait of Paul. Paul "embodies what every Christian can and ought to be through the gift of the

---

[50] Lai, "Hermeneutics of Exemplar Portraits," 149–50.
[51] Lai, "Hermeneutics of Exemplar Portraits," 161.
[52] Lai, "Chrysostom's Reception of Basil," 73.
[53] Lai, "Chrysostom's Reception of Basil," 74.
[54] Lai, "Hermeneutics of Exemplar Portraits," 151–52.
[55] Lai, "Hermeneutics of Exemplar Portraits," 152n69.
[56] Lai, "Hermeneutics of Exemplar Portraits," 152.
[57] Lai, "Hermeneutics of Exemplar Portraits," 155.

Holy Spirit."[58] Due to Paul's virtue he "was not only able to 'teach and practice such a great philosophy,' but also able to 'persuade nations, both cities and countryside,' and to lead 'the entire human race—Romans, Persians, Indians, Scythians, Ethiopians, Sauromatians, Parthians, Medes and Saracenes—singly to the truth."[59] It is virtue, not the gift, which embodies the Spirit's power and transforms humans.

Chrysostom presents Paul as a portrait to "not only widen the breadth of what is conceivable as a deified life in the eyes of his audience but also to create a rich pool of analogies that his audiences can identify with and, hopefully, can appropriate for their lives."[60] Specifically, Paul demonstrated "the picture of the perfect priest."[61] Paul's "character and accommodating teaching set ideal standards for priests." In *Hom. 1 Cor.* 35 Chrysostom also uses the apostles as portraits for how the clergy should approach their ministry. The apostles were "pure from empty praise as was seen through what they did . . . they did not do anything through conceit but accomplished everything through kind-heartedness. . . ." They constantly served the poor and gave to the needy; "they were more tender-loving than any father."[62] Likewise, Paul "did not look for distinction;" rather, he "displayed every other virtue with rigid discipline." Thus, he "was able to do everything more vigorously" than Diogenes the Cynic who did everything by a desire for glory; "he astounded many but benefited no one."[63] Paul gives up the first place of honour "to Peter, and is not ashamed to be working with Priscilla

---

[58] Lai, "Hermeneutics of Exemplar Portraits," 156. Lai argues that Paul's portraits are "a clear meta-narrative of transcendence, or *hyperbathmios*, where a Christian exemplar is held up as an example of God's deifying work by laying stress on the ways in which he has transcended human nature or even the heavenly realms" (158).

[59] Lai, "Hermeneutics of Exemplar Portraits," 160.

[60] Lai, "Hermeneutics of Exemplar Portraits," 171.

[61] Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*, 206.

[62] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:8:10, 13, 17–19 (F 2:442).

[63] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:9:3–9 (F 2:442–43).

and Aquila, and is everywhere eager to show himself lowly, not swaggering into the markets, nor carrying the crowds around with him, but assimilating himself among the insignificant."[64] Paul does not even crave for heavenly glory, but even prays to be accursed so the Jews could be saved.[65] Paul searches "everywhere for the edification of the congregation."[66] Because what Paul "seeks everywhere is this: the common benefit."

Although Paul had the gift of foreign speech, "he did not use it, not because he did not have it, but because he sought the more useful things. For he was free from all conceitedness and looking for one thing only, how he will improve those listening."[67] The priest requires angelic virtue because "he is conducting an angelic ministry." Therefore, a priest must demonstrate the heavenly life through their service to the people on earth. They need to practice self-denial, self-discipline, and conform their life to virtue. Priests should view their ministry as "adapting to people caught in worldliness in order to lead them to heaven."[68]

What does Chrysostom Require from the Clergy

The apostolic portraits demonstrate to the clergy the necessary motivation for using the spiritual gifts. Clergy must not use them as a means of self-promotion. Rather, the gifts should be used to demonstrate the angelic life towards the laity as a means of presenting the mystery of God's salvation. Clergy should not use their gifts to "become a Diogenes," astounding many but benefiting no one. Just as the Holy Spirit gave consideration towards humans in *Hom. 1 Cor.* 29, so, too, do pastors need to consider

---

[64] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:11:1 (F 2:444).
[65] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:11:3 (F 2:444).
[66] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:6:4 (F 2:440).
[67] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:7:12–15 (F 2:441).
[68] Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*, 207–8.

the needs of the laity when they deliver elements of the liturgy. For Chrysostom, the clergy ought not to use their gifts as a means of fostering false trustworthiness for the sake of furthering their own careers, but as a means of giving a benefit to everyone. Thus, clergy are not to exemplify the exploitation of the patron-client relationships, but to embody a sense of trustworthiness through their deeds. Clergy held a prophetic role towards the city. They advocated for a truly philosophical life, which strengthens one's relationship with God.[69] The clergy are not to act as parasites on others by using social relationships solely for their own benefit. Rather, they are to exemplify true friendship, which Chrysostom holds as "the greatest of human relationships, surpassing that of family, and marked by total care for each other in Christ."[70] For Chrysostom, Christians are to embody friendship towards others, especially towards the poor,[71] to "be caught up into the network of divine friendship."[72]

Common Benefit of Gifts

Chrysostom understands love as "living for the common good, and looking toward the advantage of each."[73] Adolf Ritter argues that Christian living is not about pursuing an individual perfection, but a matter of edifying others, and all the gifts contribute to the common benefit.[74] This is the "means of imitation of Paul, Christ, and God." It is virtue, which brings a person near to God. Love is a divine virtue, which is "something

---

[69] Krupp, *Shepherding the Flock of God*, 197.
[70] Krupp, *Shepherding the Flock of God*, 146.
[71] Mayer, ("Patronage, Pastoral Care," 58–70) shows that social welfare as a core part of pastoral care in Late Antiquity (60).
[72] Sherwin, "Friends at the Table of the Lord," 397.
[73] Mitchell, *Heavenly Trumpet*, 160.
[74] Ritter, "Between 'Theocracy' and 'Simple Life'," 172.

common to us and to God."[75] Chrysostom begins his homily by outlining the difference between foreign speech and prophecy. Prophecy can benefit others on its own, but the gift of foreign speech needs an interpreter to benefit others. On its own, it lacks that ability because it is used, not to talk to humans, but to God "for no one understands" the language being spoken. Chrysostom argues that this proves the gift of foreign speech is "not greatly useful."[76] Meanwhile, "the one prophesying speaks to edify, encourage, and comfort humans." He argues Paul "shows how exception this gift is from its common benefit" and Chrysostom asks a pertinent question, "Why is the profit of many given this special honour everywhere?"[77] Both the gift of foreign speech and prophecy speak to humans, yet the former does not edify, encourage, nor comfort other humans. Thus, Chrysostom argues, prophecy "has the advantage as it is also profitable to the hearers. But of the ones speaking in foreign speech, no one without the gift understands them."[78] Chrysostom uses these gifts to show the important element for clergy, to speak for the common benefit of the hearers to edify, encourage, and comfort them rather than using a gift that no one understands.

Chrysostom also confers honour upon prophecy because it outperforms foreign speech. He attacks the desire for honour among the clergy. In using the gift of foreign speech, clergy miss the true honour that comes from giving a benefit to others. Maria Verhoeff concludes that for Chrysostom, the life of faith is a devotion "not so much to their own efforts to rise up as to an imitative συγκατάβασις towards other people in

[75] Mitchell, *Heavenly Trumpet*, 160.
[76] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:1:18 (F 2:435).
[77] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:1:19–20 (F 2:435).
[78] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:1:21–22 (F 2:435).

response to Christ."[79] Moreover, to participate in God's adaptation towards others is to manifest the Spirit, as "La manifestation de l'Esprit peut être le mieux contemplée dans la charité qui est la racine de toutes les vertus, et bien supérieure aux miracles."[80] The virtue of love, doing all things for common benefit, is a requirement for using the gifts. This creates an irony that to use the gift of foreign speech with love requires the person to refrain from using it when there is no interpreter. To not use the gift on its own is to use the gift in a way which manifests the Spirit through the virtue of love. In wanting to demonstrate their gift, they fail to measure up to the same demonstration of the Spirit. A priest must know "how to adapt himself profitably, where the circumstances of the case require it, and to be both kind and severe, for it is not possible to treat all those under one's charge on one plan, . . . and all these different matters have one end in view, the glory of God, and the edifying of the Church."[81] His adaptation is "coherent with his theology of divine and Pauline adaptation."[82] Just as God spoke in accommodating ways, "Now priests are his agents, called to imitate divine adaptation as exemplified by the greatest apostle."[83]

To Give Generously

Chrysostom holds salvation to be in a close relationship with philanthropy.[84] Abraham is used as a proto-Christian model of virtue. He is treated as "the high priest of

[79] Verhoeff, "John Chrysostom's Use of Celestial Imagery," 268.
[80] Baán, "L'aspect pneumatologique," 331. "The manifestation of the Spirit could be best seen in the charity, which is the root of all the virtues, and is far superior to miracles."
[81] Chrysostom, *Six Books on the Priesthood*, 76–77.
[82] Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*, 212.
[83] Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*, 212.
[84] Tonias, "Iconic Abraham as High Priest of Philanthropy," 563.

philanthropy."[85] Chrysostom posits Abraham as a portrait of salvation to emulate and his virtue holds a "decidedly eschatological character,"[86] which help Chrysostom make a pastoral point towards his congregation. To participate in the salvation of God is to join oneself to the virtues of Christ. Specifically, in showing hospitality and charity towards others, they will attract the person of Christ "in the form of the 'least of his brethren.'"[87] While every saint has a portion of virtue, Abraham is depicted as having all virtues despite living before both the law and grace.[88] He is depicted as having contempt for shame, glory, and material wealth, which he uses for the relief of others.[89] Abraham depicts the virtues to which Christians now belong in Christ. Chrysostom goes so far as to state, "For this shows that he is all the more wonderful and deprives them that do not emulate him from every excuse."[90]

Chrysostom maintains that greed, vainglory, and usury as diseases of the soul, which threaten spiritual health.[91] The desire for glory is "that dangerous beast, that horrific demon, that corruption of the world, that venomous viper."[92] Vainglory is a tyrannical passion because "it destroys the benefit of good works such as fasting, prayer and almsgiving."[93] And it threatens to destroy the heavenly reward of the saints.[94] Vainglory is "a main underlying factor in seeking power, wealth and luxurious life" and ascetics and monks are particularly vulnerable to it.[95] George S. Bebis argues that

---

[85] Tonias, "Iconic Abraham as High Priest of Philanthropy," 564.
[86] Tonias, "Iconic Abraham as High Priest of Philanthropy," 572.
[87] Tonias, "Iconic Abraham as High Priest of Philanthropy," 573.
[88] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:10:3–6 (F 2:443).
[89] Tonias, "Iconic Abraham as High Priest of Philanthropy," 567.
[90] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:10:4 (F 2:443).
[91] Bae, "John Chrysostom on Almsgiving," 55.
[92] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:9:8 (F 2:443).
[93] Bae, "John Chrysostom on Almsgiving," 57.
[94] Bae, "John Chrysostom on Almsgiving," 74.
[95] Bae, "John Chrysostom on Almsgiving," 133.

Chrysostom speaks many times about "the 'glitter of this world,' the 'love of glory,' and the people who 'are busy with temporal affairs' who are in reality 'citizens of this world' and who forget 'the things of God' and 'the things of heaven.'[96] Within the ecclesiological setting, and framework of salvation, combating materialism and greed requires people to follow "the evangelical way of a virtuous life."[97]

Abraham is used in *Hom. 1 Cor.* 35 as a portrait for curing the disease of desiring glory.[98] Abraham conquered the desire for glory by not grieving when he failed to "obtain the first quality" of land when he split the land with Lord. He showed honour to his nephew by allowing him to choose first, but he did "not receive honour in return. But, nevertheless, none of these things were able to sting him but he even acquiesced to have the second place."[99] In fact, Abraham "was not displeased nor annoyed, but he loved him the same as always and provided for him."[100] When Abraham won a military victory he did not hold a "military parade in victory," nor did he erect "a monument, for he only desired to save not to make an exhibition."[101] Abraham did not make a public display of his own achievements or greatness, but displayed his virtue of humility in all his actions. Abraham's life intersects with the clergy, who are rebuked for making an exhibition of themselves with their gifts, and in doing so forego their desire to save others.

Chrysostom's common association of vainglory with the desire for wealth is also used in *Hom. 1 Cor.* 35. He argues, "So, therefore, let us also act upon the soul. Let us

---

[96] Bebis, "Saint John Chrysostom: On Materialism," 231–32.
[97] Bebis, "Saint John Chrysostom: On Materialism," 235.
[98] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:10:1 (F 2:443).
[99] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:10:8–9 (F 2:443).
[100] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:10:9 (F 2:443–44).
[101] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:10:10 (F 2:444).

not be anxious to flee from poverty, nor seek how we may become rich but how each one may conduct himself in all of these for our own safety."[102] Those who seek safety in wealth are trusting in an empty hope, "for wealth has many billows an troubles" but those who trust in virtue have a "strong defense" as it "leaves unconquered by those who lay traps for it, but on the contrary wealth is always easy to attack and conquer."[103] Wealth invites tomb raiders to attack them after their deaths and steal their possessions. Wealth mocks humans "even after death" and deprives people of "tombs, which even the boldest of the dying criminals get to enjoy."[104] A further cure for vainglory is almsgiving.[105] For what is "most crucial in almsgiving is the disposition of the benefactors."[106] It is a way "to demonstrate the love of God" and reflects "the work of grace in the life of the Christian,"[107] in such a way that it "discloses the conscious participation of its practioners [sic] in the reality of the new creation that God has granted to the world."[108] To practice almsgiving is to imitate Christ and to become like God.[109] Chrysostom views mercy "as a practical way of demonstrating repentance and a beneficial remedy for the sinful soul. God's mercy "towards the Christian in turn demands the same attitude towards the needy . . . 'He has created for you countless ways of loving your neighbor.'"[110] For Chrysostom, "Christ's *kenosis* is viewed as a paradigm for the practice of charity, and the humiliation of God's Son is identified with God's

[102] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:12:11 (F 2:445).
[103] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:12:15–18 (F 2:445–46).
[104] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:13:20–22 (F 2:448).
[105] Roskam, "John Chrysostom on pagan Euergetism," 167.
[106] Bae, "John Chrysostom on Almsgiving," 74.
[107] Naidu, *Transformed in Christ*, 158.
[108] Clapsis, "Dignity of the Poor," 60.
[109] Bae, "John Chrysostom on Almsgiving," 183.
[110] Naidu, *Transformed in Christ*, 159.

grace and mercy."[111] Almsgiving is a material expression of *kenosis* through an emptying of one's wealth as a gift towards those who have none, not based on the merit of the poor, but on the philanthropy of the giver. "The Christian's philanthropy is viewed as a willing response to the divine philanthropy which was the cause of the Son's economy."[112] Chrysostom holds that "imitation is participation, because the Christian life is lived out as a participatory response to one's sacramentally mediated union with Christ."[113] To partake of God's grace is to embody "this fellowship in practice."[114] Thus, Chrysostom appeals to his audience:

> Are we still then affectionate towards it, tell me, to such an enemy? No! I appeal you, no, brothers, but let us flee without turning back, and when it comes into our hands let us not hoard it inside but fasten it to the hands of the poor. For these chains are greatly able to hold it and from these treasuries it will nevermore escape, and so this faithless one remains forever faithful, subdued, and tame because the right hand of alms is doing this.[115]

Giving alms is more than giving wealth. It is a sacrament, μυστήριον, equal with the eucharist and is "nothing less than God's mercy and loving kindness."[116] Not only money, but almsgiving can also include the act of giving "words, teaching, protection, wealth, and so on."[117] According to Chrysostom, God gave us mouths, hands, feet, strength, intellect, and understanding, all of which should be ultimately used for the benefit of our neighbours. All talents are the same in value, and importantly, they need

---

[111] Naidu, *Transformed in Christ*, 242.

[112] Naidu, *Transformed in Christ*, 242. Morgan (*Roman Faith and Christian Faith*, 123–75) argues Christian theology draws from Greek social-political theories to characterize the model of divine-human relationships. She argues Christian conceptions of the economy of salvation is connected with an economy of *pistis*/*fides* in Greek and Roman religious thinking, "circulating through the divine and human spheres, from the gods to human beings and back again" (142).

[113] Naidu, *Transformed in Christ*, 256.

[114] Naidu, *Transformed in Christ*, 257.

[115] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:14:1–2 (F 2:448).

[116] Bae, "John Chrysostom on Almsgiving," 134–35.

[117] Bae, "John Chrysostom on Almsgiving," 72.

to be used for the common good."[118] The gifts from God are still under the sovereignty of God, who is the "ultimate owner of all things that people have, and our possessions are God's gifts for serving the poor."[119] Almsgiving is considered an exchange of gifts, which turns "passive recipients into active agents of giving spiritual benefit to the donors."[120] Thus it is "the best gift of God in the Christian journey of deification."[121] Further, using the gifts of the Spirit can be seen as a form of almsgiving. Not only as gift-giving towards the poor, but as a means of curing one's desire for glory. For the clergy, this parallel cuts to the core of their motivation. If they use their gifts for the benefit of others, they use their gifts as alms. Yet, if they refuse to use their gifts for the benefit of others, they become distorted, being consumed by vainglory.

Pastoral Rule for the Gifts

Chrysostom agrees with philosophers who argue a good speech should promote virtuous living. Chrysostom believes "teaching and living the Christian philosophy, preaching truth and exhibiting an exemplary character, are more important for ministry than classical rhetoric."[122] The goal of a sermon is not to embody the best of classical rhetoric, but to produce a life of virtue in the hearers. The clergy speak and teach within the context of the liturgy, which "is an *image* of saving realities. In the world of typology, the action that is the *image* really participates in the reality of which it is the *image*."[123] This context provides Chrysostom with a "properly sacramental conception

---

[118] Bae, "John Chrysostom on Almsgiving," 72.
[119] Bae, "John Chrysostom on Almsgiving," 7.
[120] Bae, "John Chrysostom on Almsgiving," 17.
[121] Bae, "John Chrysostom on Almsgiving," 182.
[122] Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*, 209.
[123] Mazza, "John Chrysostom," 144.

of preaching"[124] that participates in the nature of God, whom the preaching reveals.[125] It is, then, all the more important for clergy to not abuse this sacramental space by using it for their own promotion rather than for the demonstration and promotion of virtuous living.

The gifts of the Spirit are "not the property of anyone, so that he boasts of them, but they are given as a legacy of grace, to be cultivated and expressed in thanksgiving in the space of the Church. . . . Every projection of the gifts by individuals with a selfish purpose, for example as self-promotion, reveals problematic theology and is a curse to the Holy Spirit, who grants them."[126] The truly charismatic person is the one who does not boast in their gifts, but humbly works "in the vineyard of the Church, taking care not only of their own situation but of living interest. All the vines of the vineyard and all the members of the House."[127] Both the clergy and laity have "gifts that God has entrusted to them to serve the Church."[128] That the gifts are something entrusted means the gift-user bears responsibility to benefit others, to "glorify the giving God and not to flatter

---

[124] Mazza, "John Chrysostom," 116.

[125] Mazza, ("John Chrysostom," 1–49) argues Chrysostom gradually develops the image-imitation paradigm along Trinitarian lines (147). Mazza argues sacraments are an imitation of the actions of Christ (146), and thus participate in the actions of Christ so that it is not the minister who acts, but Christ (146–47). However, as Chrysostom moves from a Christocentric model to a more Trinitarian approach, where in his actions Christ is joined undividedly by the Father and the Spirit, the image-imitation paradigm takes on a new role, not as the basis for the sacraments, but as a spiritual foundation for the "true elevation of the soul" (148). Mazza ends his chapter before drawing out this idea further. He suggests that the image-imitation paradigm is intertwined, not only with the doctrine of Christian living, bridging moral and eschatological elements but is also an indicator of the concept of theosis. Chrysostom prioritizes the visual element of the liturgy above the spoken elements (141). Mazza does not develop the visual element of Christian living, but he lays the groundwork to suggest the moral life has both audio and visual components. The speech of Christians and the action of Christians represent the two different sacrament elements of their salvation. One can reflect on McLuhan's "the medium is the message" here with Chrysostom's image-imitation paradigm to see how the preacher is the medium. The motives of the preacher represent an integral element is presenting the goodness of God, whom they visually represent, sacramentally, to the congregation.

[126] Oikonomou, "ΚΛΗΡΙΚΟΙ ΚΑΙ ΛΑΪΚΟΙ," 66.

[127] Oikonomou, "ΚΛΗΡΙΚΟΙ ΚΑΙ ΛΑΪΚΟΙ," 66.

[128] Oikonomou, "ΚΛΗΡΙΚΟΙ ΚΑΙ ΛΑΪΚΟΙ," 67.

human passions."[129] For Chrysostom, the priest and bishop are not distinct from the laity, but "belong to them."[130] They do not stand between humans and God, nor are they "a representative of God on earth."[131] They are equal members of the people along with the laity. Because neither the priesthood nor bishopric is a higher category of believer, they do not exist to selfishly seek for one's own promotion. Rather, they are "charisma and service to the people of God, which presupposes a crucifixion, self-sacrifice, and humility to the measure of the Lord, who did not consider equality with God, but became a citizen until his death.[132]

The liturgy is a place of mystery and revelation. Enrico Mazza argues when Chrysostom expounds the mysteries of the liturgy, he "stresses an element not present like anything to the same extent in the mystagogy of the other Fathers of the Church: the continual emphasis on Christian moral behavior."[133] This is due to how Chrysostom connects the eschatological vision of the church with its ascetic practice. Mazza argues what Chrysostom develops is a theology of Christian living. Not simply a moralism, Chrysostom argues "if the soul is to live according to the Spirit it must be solidly established in temperance and in spiritual watchfulness," these being the essential conditions Chrysostom requires for any progress in virtue."[134] The Christian life is eschatological due to the imitation of Christ. Mazza argues, for Chrysostom, imitation is a special term, for "When he speaks of God acting with mercy and kindness towards his creatures, he usually says that God 'imitates His own goodness' when he so acts."[135]

---

[129] Oikonomou, "ΚΛΗΡΙΚΟΙ ΚΑΙ ΛΑΪΚΟΙ," 69.
[130] Oikonomou, "ΚΛΗΡΙΚΟΙ ΚΑΙ ΛΑΪΚΟΙ," 98.
[131] Oikonomou, "ΚΛΗΡΙΚΟΙ ΚΑΙ ΛΑΪΚΟΙ," 98.
[132] Oikonomou, "ΚΛΗΡΙΚΟΙ ΚΑΙ ΛΑΪΚΟΙ," 100.
[133] Mazza, "John Chrysostom," 109.
[134] Mazza, "John Chrysostom," 114.
[135] Mazza, "John Chrysostom," 121.

God's essential goodness is "the basic model for all of his activities; in all his actions, he *reproduces* his essential goodness *ad extra*."[136] God's imitation of his own goodness in his own actions becomes, for Chrysostom, the basis for Christians' imitation of Christ. Christians imitate Christ as Christ imitates the Father. Geoffrey Wainwright argues Christ is present through the actions of the clergy. When the gospels are read the congregation must "think that himself is now present and saying these things." Christ is "even now sitting at the well; he is not speaking with the Samaritan woman but with the whole city." "In his word, Christ 'even now stands in our midst.'" The conclusion, Wainwright argues, is "the gospels are the vehicles of Christ's presence and address to the assembled congregation."[137] The actions of the clergy are reading the gospels, and in preaching the sermon, overlap with the presence and action of Christ. "Christ speaks through the preacher. Christ, who is present in the midst of those who gather in his name, finds voice in the faithful preacher."[138]

Through their imitation of Christ, and of the Spirit's goodwill, they ought to give a mutual advantage for others and themselves through the use of their gifts. There "is to be individual, as well as collective upbuilding" through the liturgical service.[139] William Richardson argues that Paul objects to an understanding that personal, ecstatic enthusiasm as the central means of edification. Richardson posits that the Corinthians applied a literal interpretation of personal freedom, that all things are lawful, and "applied it to some aspects of their liturgical practices." This misunderstanding is being

---

[136] Mazza, "John Chrysostom," 121–22.
[137] Wainwright, "Sermon and the Liturgy," 339–41.
[138] Wainwright, "Sermon and the Liturgy," 344.
[139] Richardson, "Liturgical Order and Glossolalia," 79. Streza, ("Divine Liturgy in Orthodox Spirituality," 141–67) argues the term λειτοθργία "signifies the common ministration of the people" (141). The verb λειτουργεῖν "translates as 'doing something for the people,'" and λειτουργία is "used to signify an action or a work done for the benefit of the people" (141).

corrected by "inserting the practical emphasis on οἰκοδομή."[140] Citing Lührmann, Richardson argues, "The goals of the Divine services are οἰκοδομή, παράλησις and παραμυθίαν, which can only be attained through charisms ἐν νοϊ (in the mind)."[141] The liturgy brings the Christian community together to partake in "the visible ritualistic acts," which prepares them "for the mysteries of the life to come."[142] Christians must fix their gaze on heaven and their participation in it, "which in turn rests on the contrast between visible and invisible and requires the faithful to 'set' the invisible 'before them' or 'picture' it 'to themselves.'"[143] The clergy, situated in this liturgical context, participate in unveiling Christ's presence to the community. The clergy's words play a mystagogic role, uncovering "the incomprehensible depths of the divine word" and they "warm up the liturgical prayers through the explanations they offer and the way they initiate the faithful into the mystery of God's presence within the ecclesial rituals."[144] The appropriation of this activity for one's own self-promotion, especially with the gift of foreign speech, becomes a betrayal of their function. Rather than unveiling the knowledge of Christ, they hide it, so that the person in the congregation "does not understand, nor knows what is being said. He stands without receiving any benefit."[145]

The elements of the liturgy bring the presence of God close with the community of God. The whole of Orthodox spirituality expresses "the whole motion of man's transition from the image to the likeness of God."[146] This is fulfilled by communion with Christ through "the holy mysteries," which is understood as "spiritually partaking of

---

[140] Richardson, "Liturgical Order and Glossolalia," 82.
[141] Richardson, "Liturgical Order and Glossolalia," 81.
[142] Streza, "Divine Liturgy in Orthodox Spirituality," 142.
[143] Mazza, "John Chrysostom," 143.
[144] Streza, "Divine Liturgy in Orthodox Spirituality," 148.
[145] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:6:8 (F 2:440).
[146] Streza, "Divine Liturgy in Orthodox Spirituality," 154.

him, through the activation of the gifts received from him through the holy mysteries."[147] To partake in the liturgy is to participate in the presence of Christ and to "be replenished with the sweet fragrance of the grace of the Holy Spirit."[148] To participate in the Spirit is to be joined to his virtues and to belong to the community of the Spirit, the church. In this setting, the use of the gifts by the clergy ought to reflect the virtuous nature of the Spirit, from whom the gifts are given.[149] Theresa Morgan argues Christian ideas of the divine-human community is believed to be good because "people practice in it qualities which they believe are also practiced by God or commanded by

---

[147] Streza, "Divine Liturgy in Orthodox Spirituality," 154–55.

[148] Streza, "Divine Liturgy in Orthodox Spirituality," 154.

[149] If we turn to the theological phenomenology of Jean-Yves Lacoste and his Liturgical experience. Schrijvers ("Jean-Yves Lacoste," 314–33) argues that for Lacoste liturgy "is defined not only as the celebration of Mass, but also, more generally, as the relation of human beings to God. What happens when the believer prays and praises?" (315). The liturgical experience "breaks with the 'world' and 'earth' to lose itself in the enthusiastic vision of God's kingdom" (319). A similar question can be asked of spiritual gifts, what happens to the people who use and experience another person's use of the gifts? This is a theme better suited to Chrysostom's *Hom. 1 Cor.* 36 where he addresses the different reaction to the gift of foreign speech and of prophecy. He argues that when Peter used prophecy to convict Sapphira "everyone humbled themselves, but when he spoke with foreign speech, he took for himself the reputation of being delirious" (36:2:20 [F:452]). Chrysostom follows Paul in arguing that the gift of prophecy brings people close to the presence of God as "the secrets of his heart are made known and falling on his face he will worship God declaring that God is actually in you" (36:2:18 [F:452], citing 1 Cor 14:25). Soon after he states this, Chrysostom recapitulates the message of *Hom. 1 Cor.* 35. Paul is "eager to order the gifts and this is to restrain them, . . . For whereas they were not looking for this, but only to display them, and many proclaimed their love for distinction. Most of all from this he returns to point out that their distinction is injury, acquiring for themselves the suspicion of being mad" (36:3:7 [F:452]). Thus, Chrysostom points out how "they were excited concerning this gift, the one of foreign speech, because of the love of glory he shows that this indeed is certainly shameful, not only depriving them of glory but also involving them in the suspicion of madness" (36:3:16 [F:453]). In some capacity, the gifts point to the presence and glory of God in the midst of the community. Yet, when they are used incorrectly, Chrysostom associates their use with madness. Wendy Mayer ("Madness in the Works of John Chrysostom," 349–73) observes how for Chrysostom, the soul that sins after Baptism "is drawn out into excessive babbling, saying unintelligible things like the elderly and delirious and full of drivelling [sic] and a great deal of derangement and forgetfulness" (353). Although Chrysostom has a rational, humanistic understanding of pathology Mayer argues a person's "excess of passions of the soul provides fertile ground for daemons, attracting them and supplying them with something to feed on" (360). And Chrysostom does not situate daemonic forces as the reason for madness, but he often uses daemonic terminology in reference to madness (360). Another, and more relevant, nuance of madness is its application to heterodox Christian groups. "It attributes to the heterodox a genuine naturalistic illness of the soul that requires real spiritual therapy in order to restore the interior balance" (370). Chrysostom's association of the gift of foreign speech with the suspicion of madness may help him define orthodoxy in its liturgical practice. And there may be a subtext of inter-religious competition here where Chrysostom is addressing other Christian groups who allow for non-Grecian languages to be used for their liturgies within Antioch.

God."[150] In this community some qualities like "*pistis*, *agapē*, and *dikaiosynē*, are practiced by everyone (very much as they are in a Stoic community of sages). Others, like wisdom or the gift of healing in 1 Cor 12:8–9, are practiced by some for the benefit of all."[151] In the Spirit's community, the gifts ought to be used with the virtues, which belong also to God.

Chrysostom wants the clergy to search for the edification of the congregation, and he sets this down as a pastoral rule from Paul's authority.[152] Clergy should "manage them for the common advantage."[153] Practically, this means to "not ask to only have the gift of foreign speech but also to interpret so that you will be useful to everyone, and so that you will not shut the gift up within yourself alone."[154] Because the clergy demonstrate the virtues of God to the congregation, they should "speak through their understanding to instruct others," to "speak with intelligence and to teach those listening" rather than speaking "countless words in foreign speech."[155] Those who pray or speak in a foreign language only have an exhibition of the gift, but those with the ability to interpret "helps the many."[156] Paul is placed before them as an example to follow. He is able to "look for the useful thing, both for himself and for others" because he is free from "empty praise."[157] The gift of foreign speech requires a measure of humility and co-operation with others to be useful. For Chrysostom, Paul "says this, gathering them towards one another so that the one without the gift of interpretation may

---

[150] Morgan, *Roman Faith and Christian Faith*, 494.
[151] Morgan, *Roman Faith and Christian Faith*. 494–95.
[152] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:5:2–3 (F 2:439).
[153] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:5:4 (F 2:439).
[154] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:5:9 (F 2:439).
[155] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:7:9 (F 2:441).
[156] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:7:8–11 (F 2:441).
[157] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:8:1 (F 2:441).

take another having it and he may produce a profit through him. Therefore, he everywhere shows its incompleteness so that he may bind them together."[158] Spiritual gifts must be understandable. Musical instruments require "clearness, harmony, and separation" of their notes to "inspire significance" and the battle trumpet signals various tactics: marshalling or retreating and needs to be clear so that the army will benefit. Likewise, the gift of foreign speech needs to give a clear message. If it does not the person is "uttering to no one, speaking to no one, and showing its unprofitableness everywhere."[159] Clergy who use the gift of foreign speech without an interpreter violate a pastoral responsibility towards the congregation and fail to benefit them.[160] For

[158] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:4:2–3 (F 2:438).

[159] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:3:6–11 (F 2:437–38).

[160] Papageorgiou ("Theological Analysis," 1–5) argues Chrysostom connects his anthropology to Christology and soteriology to form "the basis of the 'ethical life' of the Christians, which in connection with his faith in God comprise the Christian life of *askesis*." In this combination Chrysostom is "a representative of patristic theology as he inherited it and adapted it to the needs of his flock" (2). Regarding ethics Chrysostom comes into proximity with twentieth-century author Emmanuel Levinas. This connection may be made within a larger philosophical divide. As Maslov ("Οἰκείωσις πρὸς θεόν: Gregory of Nazianzus," 311–43) notes, "At a risk of simplification, one might contrast a religious ethics based on the Platonic 'care of oneself' (ἐπιμέλεια ἑαυτοῦ), emphasized in Michel Foucault's influential work on private confession in the West, with an ethics based on the Stoic notion of 'naturalization' to another" (314). Levinas (*Alterity and Transcendence*, 26–29) ties the ethical responsibility towards another with the command of God. "It demands me, requires me, summons me. Should we not call this demand or this interpellation or this summons to responsibility the word of God?" (27). Later on Levinas (*Alterity and Transcendence*, 97–110) explains the ethical responsibility is an evolution of Martin Buber's *I-Thou* relationship. Rather than seeing the relationship between people as reciprocal, Levinas focuses on the individual's responsibility towards the other without demanding reciprocity. The *I-Thou* relationship is asymmetrical and requires generosity towards the other because of their presence (100–1). Marcus, (*Being for the Other*, 41–44) argues this responsibility towards the other is the basis of Levinas's ethics. The self is "pressed into service, service to others. It does not volunteer, it is enlisted 'for-the-Other' prior to being 'for-itself,' chosen or commanded before choosing" (42). Chrysostom also prominently places human responsibility as a core component of ethics. Nicu Dumitraşcu ("St. John Chrysostom and the Responsibility," 230–40) argues, for Chrysostom "A sense of social solidarity was always accompanied with one of co-responsibility" (233). Within the context of social injustice and inequalities, Chrysostom develops a social concept, "in which people cannot be complete except by means of personal co-responsibility in order to heal the trauma which society encounters in the course of everyday life" (233). This social concept is paired with Chrysostom's awareness of communal identities and collective consciousnesses. For Chrysostom, "to be a Christian means to take responsibility not only for oneself but also for others. For him co-responsibility is the evidence of the transition from a personal moral conscience to one which is communal, or ecclesial, which is the only one that fulfills the Christian ideal of love as it is in the gospel of Christ" (233).

Chrysostom, "not to share one's resources is robbery."[161] Chrysostom is deeply opposed to people who have an uncaring attitude for others, yet gain, or seek to gain, "the respect of the entire community through their evangelical behavior."[162] For Chrysostom, the

[161] Bebis, "Saint John Chrysostom: On Materialism," 232.

[162] Dumitraşcu, "John Chrysostom and the Responsibility," 233. For Levinas, "A free being alone is responsible, that is, already not free" (42). Rather, as Hutchens (*Levinas: A Guide for the Perplexed*, 14–35) argues Levinas "propounds the controversial claim that *freedom itself would be impossible without responsibility*. In some intriguing ways, this entails that freedom is *subordinate* to responsibility." He argues against the claim that humans must be free to be morally responsible. Instead, "if freedom is vital to the exercise of responsibility, then that indicates only a criticism of any philosophical refusal to recognize the vital role of responsibility in human existence" (18). Marcus (*Being for the Other*, 41–44) argues that Levinas ties responsibility in with social arrangements. Freedom needs an encounter with an Other. "In the face-to-face encounter, the Other provides my freedom with purpose because I am confronted with the often tough choices between, on the one hand, responsibility and obligation towards the Other, and, on the other, contempt and violent rejection or indifference" (43). "The heteronomy of our response to the human other, or to God as the absolutely other, precedes the autonomy of our subjective freedom" (43). Chrysostom, meanwhile, as Papageorgiou ("Theological Analysis," 21–34) argues, holds an anthropology based on humanity's creation by God. Humanity is given "the ability and freedom to make decisions on his own" and when used correctly "bring him closer to God and shape him into God's 'likeness'" (26). In this sense humans are created with a responsibility to do what is good and avoid evil. This is seen when humanity's fall is characterized as disobedience. As Papageorgiou notes, "it was this disobedience to the command of God that caused their downfall and brought punishment upon them and upon all their descendants" (27). God's commands place a responsibility upon humanity. In shirking that duty humanity is punished. Sin describes this shirking of responsibility. It is human "sluggishness and indifference of man" (29). Papageorgiou ("Theological Analysis," 203–24) argues later that "For Chrysostom, a self-centered or egotistical cultivation of virtue is impossible. He goes beyond the Stoics in placing tremendous emphasis on love, compassion, service to one's neighbour and even service to one's bitter enemy. . . . Chrysostom is very conscious of the relationship which exists between the *praxis* of man and the possibility of participation in the divine life, which culminates in the perfection of the likes of God in him" (204–5). Freedom and slavery are situated as subsequent to a person's actions. Humans are enslaved by their passions and live miserable lives "filled with fear and trembling." But those who practice virtue spend their life with "great tranquillity [sic] and freedom" (207–8). Like Levinas, then, Chrysostom places human freedom in a subordinate relationship to the pursuit of virtue, the highest of which is love for others (209–10).

Chrysostom goes further than Levinas by placing moral responsibility within the tradition of theosis. Loving one's neighbour "brings Christ in our midst, and not only Christ but also the Father and the Holy Spirit as well" (210). Human's virtuous actions towards the Other is not simply a fulfillment of their responsibility towards them but acts in an epiphanous manner. Love for the other brings the Triune God close to all parties involved. Furthermore, one's love towards an Other is a participation in God's love for humans. Chrysostom's theological ethics bring to attention the impossibility of loving others without the prior love, which God has shown. And one can ask whether humans can fulfill their ethical responsibility towards the other without taking part in God's love towards us. Harakas ("Integrity of Creation and Ethics," 27–42) argues precisely that Christian ethics cannot be divorced from faith. Humans are microcosms of the physical world, that "the material created reality is deeply involved with us. Should we move in the direction of deification of our nature in progress toward God, we will somehow carry the created material world with us" (30–31). The material world presses humanity into its proper responsibility, stewardship. The "bodily aspect of our existence makes claims upon us for its proper treatment, so do the mineral, vegetative and animal aspects of creation" (37).

Due to God's salving mercy, Mazza ("John Chrysostom," 105–49) argues, he redeems humans "without any merit on their part" (111). Thus, "if God shows mercy when human beings are still sinners, much more does he show it when they respond positively to him" (111–12). Responding positively to

final judgement reveals true wealth and poverty, wealth being the practice of virtue.[163] Likewise, true glory and shame are not what they seem, but are reflective of participating in the virtues of God. Bae argues that according to Chrysostom, "The renunciation of earthly praise ensures heavenly praise in abundance." People whose only concern is their own fame are condemned and dishonoured, but "almsgivers who performed their charity in secret will receive honour in heaven beyond their imagination."[164] Chrysostom uses the apostles as portraits for how they ought to treat fame. They threw away their own glory and did "not accept it from others;" rather, they served and begged on behalf of the needy. "They were more tender-loving than any father. And contemplate their moderate instructions, they are free from conceit."[165] They become a model for clergy to follow. So, Chrysostom urges his audience, "Let us not regard what is present, but consider what is to come. Let us examine not the outer garments, but the conscience of each person. Let us pursue the virtue and joy which come from righteous actions."[166]

God's love to the other, to humans, is to belong to that same love towards other humans. The ethical responsibility towards another becomes intertwined with belonging to Christ and his salvific love. This connectivity is contained in the Christian's οἰκείωσις with God, as Maslov ("Οἰκείωσις πρὸς θεόν: Gregory of Nazianzus," 311–43) argues (316). Specifically, Gregory Nazianzus contributes most to a Christian understanding of οἰκείωσις through "his sustained interest in ethical praxis: How is the kinship with the divine to be achieved through philosophical life, and how can it then be made available to the non-philosophical majority?" (321). The process of divinization, (θἐωσις) is connected with striving for "ethical perfection" (327). Chrysostom, as Papageorgiou ("Theological Analysis," 16–136) argues also connects virtue to divinization. Humans are to become like God in virtue" (25).

[163] Cardman, "Poverty and Wealth as Theater," 166–67.

[164] Bae, "John Chrysostom on Almsgiving," 135.

[165] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:8:18–9:1 (F 2:442).

[166] Bebis, "Saint John Chrysostom: On Materialism," 235.

Conclusion

At the beginning of the homily Chrysostom highlights the need of Christians to ask for help from others when they cannot overtake love on their own. This call for help finds application with the gift of foreign speech. Where it cannot benefit another on its own, due to speaking in a foreign language, the person must call out for help from an interpreter. It is only in the communal support that the gift can then benefit others. Likewise, wealth, as a parallel, needs a partner in the poor to bring mutual benefit to each party involved. This chapter argued Chrysostom uses the gifts of foreign speech to communicate a Christianized vision of the priesthood. Clerics should not be driven by a motivation of self-promotion as was common during the time. They should neither use the liturgy nor the rhetoric of the homily to achieve a higher status or patronage for themselves and their networks. Instead, the clergy ought to prioritize their responsibility of love towards the church by benefiting them through teaching. This teaching is done both with clear speaking and in demonstrating the angelic life of virtue. Through their actions the clergy demonstrate towards others what it is to participate in Christ. Caught up in this pastoral address is the gift of foreign speech, which is used to highlight this pastoral rule of benefiting the church. The abuse of the gift, using it without an interpreter, is a conduit to show the detriment of clerics using the liturgical space for their own self-promotion. The remedy for this vainglory is the genuine motive of love in gift-giving, both spiritually and monetarily.

CHAPTER 7: A THEOLOGY OF GIFTS

The subjects within Chrysostom's homilies are interrelated. A study of his theology of spiritual gifts becomes interwoven with his preaching on separate issues. A dissection of how Chrysostom mingles his topics together is important for getting a full picture of his message. This is part of Chrysostom's dynamism of using both the exegesis and the paraenesis to highlight common themes between the various topics discussed. While wealth and spiritual gifts may not seem to have much in common, Chrysostom uses both of them in *Hom. 1 Cor.* 29 to draw out parallel lessons on God's pedagogy and human self-understanding in regard to salvation, and to wealth, whether in terms of the gifts received or wealth received. Ultimately, they serve to emphasize the necessity of virtue. These homilies do not simply cover an exegesis on the gifts then move on to a moral discussion on wealth. Rather, the homilies show an integration of theological, spiritual, moral, and exegesis elements.[1] Chrysostom has a complex relationship "between approaching the biblical text for its mimetic value and the addressing of exegetical problems." He expects the textual issues of scripture to be connected with social concerns of his own day. He is working within the practice of biblical commentary developed more widely in his own time.[2] "The whole literary field of the bible was

[1] Molinié, "Hyphenation in John Chrysostom's Exegetical Homilies," 281.
[2] Pomeroy, *Chrysostom as Exegete*, 75.

conditioned according to various stages of moral pedagogy, a pedagogy aimed at the reformation of mankind. Biblical language does not present matters as they are in themselves but in constant relation to man's power to apprehend the divine accommodation.[3] Chrysostom's concern for moral living enables "him to discern the presence of a moral dynamic in the text which is given little attention in modern discussion."[4] Here, a moral dynamic towards the theological content of First Corinthians is a valuable insight. Modern commentators can prove to be misled "as to the meaning of these verses and therefore fail to perceive that they have an important function in their present context."[5] Young's faith in Chrysostom's exegetical abilities allows her to conclude that "he perceived the Corinthian situation generally along the right lines" despite some errors, one of which Young argues is that Chrysostom does not know what the gift of tongues is.[6] While Young is speaking about the unity of Second Corinthians, the same sentiment is applicable to the spiritual gifts.

Chrysostom's homilies use transitional sections between the exegesis of the text and the paraenesis. This transition should not be overlooked, but held as an important, albeit small, section of the homily alongside Chrysostom's exegesis and paraenesis. How Chrysostom moves from exegesis to paraenesis is as important to understanding the whole of the homily as the topics he addresses in each of these parts of his homily. The transition helps identify the relationship between these two differing topics. For instance, in *Hom. 1 Cor.* 29 the spiritual gifts and material wealth are paralleled quite clearly. While in *Hom. 1 Cor.* 35 Chrysostom pairs vainglory and spiritual gifts to draw

[3] Pomeroy, *Chrysostom as Exegete*, 38.
[4] Young, "John Chrysostom on First and Second Corinthians," 352.
[5] Young, "John Chrysostom on First and Second Corinthians," 350.
[6] Young, "John Chrysostom on First and Second Corinthians," 350.

out pastoral rules for the clergy to follow. Awareness of the interplay between the different sections of the homily will contribute to a fuller understanding of Chrysostom's theology within his homilies. In *Hom. 1 Cor.* 29 Chrysostom uses parallelisms as the mechanism to support the common theme between the gifts and wealth. The transition in *Hom. 1 Cor.* 35 establishes the connection between the pastoral rule of seeking the common benefit and the necessity of rejecting public honour, both for the gifts and in a more general sense. The use of such dynamics may not be apparent on a first reading of the homiletic text. While Chrysostom does make effort to clearly community arguments and section transitions. He also leaves the audience "to discover it by themselves through a process of trial and error, with clues that gradually contribute to the construction of a coherent theme."[7] As noted by Toczydlowski earlier in the study, "The climax or outcome is hinted at, but not given away prematurely."[8] What may be required is a re-reading of the text with the coherent theme and climax in mind. The development of the homily towards a coherent theme, or as Molinié shows, how sections interact with each other may not be apparent if the exegesis is solely considered. The exegesis may need to be read with the paraenesis in mind, and with the homily's movement towards it. This means that once the theme is understood, then the homily can be examined for how Chrysostom develops it. Subsequently, this chapter will draw conclusions on Chrysostom's theology of the spiritual gifts taken from examining it within the homiletic context of *Hom. 1 Cor.* 29 and 35.

[7] Molinié, "Hyphenation in John Chrysostom's Exegetical Homilies," 278–81.
[8] Toczydlowski, "Analysis of the Rhetoric of St. John Chrysostom," 135.

Evaluation of Chrysostom's Theology of the Gifts

The studies done on Chrysostom's approach to spiritual gifts occurred prior to major scholarly developments. Thus, they do not consider the importance of *synkatabasis* to his thought. Neither do they consider the use of theosis, oikeiosis, to frame salvation and the Christian life. For Chrysostom, the Spiritual gifts are used to speak to the worth Christians have in Christ, and how the Spirit confirms the now existing friendship. For Chrysostom, theology is embodied in the life of faith. Christians are required to live what they believe. His preaching looks to persuade people of their need to live in a certain way, not solely to align their beliefs to a certain point of view. To understand Chrysostom's theology from within his homilies, the reader must inquire as to how Chrysostom incorporates it into his purpose of persuading people to live a virtuous life in Christ. On one hand Chrysostom acknowledges the cessation of spiritual gifts, saying "These charismatic gifts served us preachers for a time and now have ceased. But their passing can do harm to the word we preach. See how now, at least, there is no prophecy nor gift of tongues. Still, this did not hinder or thwart the preaching of piety."[9] On the other hand Chrysostom preaches on spiritual gifts without regard to their status as given or ceased. In *Hom. 1 Cor*. 29 he avoids the topic of their cessation altogether and says he will talk about it at a later occasion.[10] Yet he does not return to the subject of the gifts' cessation in *Hom. 1 Cor.* 35 nor *Hom. 1 Cor*. 36 in any major way.[11] Thus, the cessation

[9] Chrysostom, *Incomprehensibility*, 54.

[10] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:1:1–4 (F 2:349).

[11] Chrysostom (*Ad Corinthios*, 36:7:1–18) does make mention of the gift's cessation in *Hom. 1 Cor.* 36 but it does not contribute to his argument in any major way. He compares his present congregation with the early church. And while the church was a "heaven" back then the current church "only possess the receipt of those gifts" (36:7:5). However, he makes clear "I do not say this on account of the gifts for it was only this then that is nothing awful, but it is of life and moral virtue" (36:7:9). He argues the poverty of his present church is determined by their lack of virtue not their lack of spiritual gifts like speaking in a foreign language.

of the gifts is not important for his arguments in these homilies. He adapts the topic of spiritual gifts to address the concern of his congregation and to show the nature of the Holy Spirit, and the requirement of the pastoral office. His adaptive use of the spiritual gifts still speaks to the gifts themselves, not dismissing them as utilitarian tools to speak about unrelated topics.

The Holy Spirit: Giver and Gift

For Chrysostom, the Spirit "truly works with all authority, and nothing hinders him, for the line 'he blows wherever he desires' is said about the Spirit. . . . learn from another place that he is not being forced to act, but that he is working."[12] The freedom and authority of the Spirit are important foundations for the Spirit's gift-giving. The Spirit was not forced to give gifts to the Apostles and is not forced to give gifts to Christians. It is given to Christians by the Spirit's free initiative. Additionally, the Spirit's knowledge of God and of humans is tied to his freedom. Just as the human soul "is not required to be forced to act to clearly understand everything of itself" so to does the Holy Spirit know everything belonging to himself, to God, without being forced.[13] Thus, when the Spirit acts, it is God acting. The Spirit is not an intermediary between God and humanity so when Christians receive gifts, one cannot say "the Spirit freely gave to them, but an angel gave to you, for the Spirit gave it both to you and to them."[14] And people cannot say the gift from the Spirit is "being worked from God" for the Spirit is the one working "all things in everything." And Chrysostom argues that the gifts being given through the

[12] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:8–9 (F 2:359).
[13] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:6:11–13 (F 2:359).
[14] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:4:7 (F 2:355).

Spirit so "that you might not consider the word 'through' to mean 'less.'"[15] So Chrysostom shows the equality of the nature of the Trinity: "Do you see how he shows there is not difference in the gifts of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit? . . . 'For what the Spirit gives,' he says, 'this God also operates, this the Son also appoints and grants.'"[16] The Spirit is the one who takes initiative to give gifts to Christians. This gift-giving is done out of philanthropy, out of consideration for Christians and the desire to profit them through the gifts.[17] The gifts and their measure are given from this goodwill.[18]

Chrysostom argues that despite the diversity of gifts, "still the proof is the same." For Chrysostom the fundamental purpose of the spiritual gifts is to display the Holy Spirit, and this is achieved through every gift. Chrysostom argues "whether you have much or whether you have a few, both are equally visible."[19] The gifts are not characterized as separate entities from the presence of the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit is himself the primary gift given to Christians. What is perceived as a spiritual gift is charactered as perceptible proof of the Spirit's indwelling.[20] The invisible Spirit is made tangible to human senses, especially to those with no prior experience with Christianity. Each person is given a "display of the Spirit, to benefit" and if "you are eager to show that you have the Spirit, you have enough of a proof."[21] While Chrysostom can stand and stay "the one having the Spirit is visible from being baptized. But to the unbeliever

[15] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:6:7 (F 2:358).
[16] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:4:18–19 (F 2:355–56).
[17] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:5:8 (F 2:356).
[18] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:7:3 (F 2:360).
[19] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:7:5–6 (F 2:356).
[20] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:1:6 (F 2:349).
[21] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:7:2, 6 (F 2:356).

this is nowhere made clear except from the miracles."[22] These miracles, or signs as they are also called, "are the works of the Spirit alone, nothing from humans contributes at all to the working of such miracles."[23] The Spirit's distribution of gifts is conceived as a distribution of epiphanous experiences. The core method for their distribution is the *synkatabasis* of the Spirit, who from his philanthropy, gives to each Christian a beneficial and tangible appearance. This manifestation of the Spirit helps the Christian understand their new relationship of belonging to Christ, and helps the unbeliever come to an awareness of God's presence.[24] Thus, it is more appropriate to say Chrysostom characterizes the manifestation of the Spirit in baptism as a gift, which takes diverse forms: healing, exorcism, prophecy, speaking in foreign languages, among others. These are not new abilities that a Christian possesses but is the working of the Spirit in and among the community. It brings into question the paradigm of Christians having and using gifts, as the gifts are not divorced from the presence of the Spirit.

Chrysostom's contrast of demonic possession and the Holy Spirit's possession helps elucidate the manner in which the human faculties and the Spirit's work are mingled. The Spirit does not enslave the Christian, treating them with violence, compelling them with convulsions to speak. Instead, the Spirit treats Christians with kindness and friendship. In fact, the Spirit honours Christians "by their permission," a phrase indicating the Spirit looks for human co-operation in the working of his own miraculous manifestations. The manner in which the Spirit looks for human permission

---

[22] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:5:4 (F 2:356).

[23] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:2:1 (F 2:351).

[24] This is taken up in *Hom. 1 Cor.* 36 where Chrysostom argues the gift of prophecy leads to an awareness of God's presence among the community, it changes "that savage person and instructed him and lead him to faith" (36:3:32 [F 2:454]). And it is also taken up in the preceding citation that the unbeliever does not understand the indwelling of the Spirit except through the miracle.

is reminiscent to other homilies. In Psalm 49 (50) he says, "Why, you ask, did he say, Call on me? Why does he wait to be called by us? Because he wishes to achieve a closer relationship with us and a more ardent love for him by giving and calling and receiving."[25] The co-operation of the Spirit and Christians achieves the aim of "οἰκείωσις πρὸς θέον."[26] It is a way the Spirit pursues friendship with Christians by not forcing such miracles upon them. The Spirit's gift-giving is comparable to the gift-giving of a king. The honour a person would receive from a king's personal generosity, and thus his friendship, is exceeded in the Spirit's personal generosity, and friendship, towards Christians in his gift-giving.[27] The Spirit does not look to make slaves, but friends. From the perspective of Christians, they should see the spiritual gifts as experiences of the Spirit and be drawn into the friendship, which honours them, and they should not be overly concerned with the particular expression of the Spirit's manifestation they receive.

The Christian and the Gift

For Chrysostom the Spirit brings Christians into a pedagogical relationship where God trains them in knowledge of himself and in virtue so they may ascent to the likeness of God through virtue. He highlights God's pedagogical purposes throughout *Hom. 1 Cor.* 29. The line "For if God did not train the great and wonderful in the same way, the one through poverty but the other through wealth, the one through relaxation but the other through affliction" indicates a principle, which has applicability to spiritual gifts.[28]

---

[25] Verhoeff, "More Desirable than Light Itself," 104–105.
[26] Verhoeff, "More Desirable than Light Itself," 105.
[27] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:6:16–18 (F 2:359).
[28] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:7:10 (F 2:360).

Wealth, like the gifts, are unevenly distributed with some receiving more while others received fewer gifts. Yet, like wealth, these distributions fit into God's pedagogical scheme, which is to benefit each person. Because God's pedagogy is adaptive, the uneven distribution is not a cause for shame, but those with fewer gifts are protected from harm and despair. There is, then, a need to situate the gifts within God's pedagogical purpose as part of God's education to Christians.

When Chrysostom envisions the spiritual relationship between Christians and God, mystical is not the word, which comes to mind.[29] Chrysostom does not draw his audience into a mystical experience of the Holy Spirit. In their assessment of Chrysostom, McDonnell and Montague argue "the church is determined in its most intimate essence by the charisms. 'Prophecy,' Karl Rahner says, 'is to be a permanent endowment of the church and a proof of her supernatural mission.' One cannot relegate the prophetic charism to the apostolic age as if they were to be transient adornments."[30] They interpret Chrysostom's line of the early church being a heaven as having possession of all charisms.[31] Yet, Chrysostom himself further clarifies, "And I do not say this on account of the gifts, for if it was only this then that is nothing awful, but it is of life and moral virtue."[32] Chrysostom places the charisms on the foundation of virtue, without which the charisms cannot be faithful to the Spirit who gives them. Christians belong to God, and so they belong to his virtues. "Imitation and participation are coincident," argues Ashish Naidu, "Imitation is participation, because the Christian life is lived out as a participatory response to one's sacramentally mediated union with

[29] Hill, "Spirituality of Chrysostom's Commentary," 571.
[30] McDonnell and Montague, *Christian Initiation and Baptism*, 297.
[31] McDonnell and Montague, *Christian Initiation and Baptism*, 296.
[32] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 36:7:5, 9 (F 2:457–58).

Christ. In Chrysostom's view, to partake of God's grace is to be the recipient of his fellowship and embody this fellowship in practice."[33] The spiritual gifts, as revealing the new participation of Christians in God and as showing the now existing friendship, are heralds of the Christian's imitation of God. Because the spiritual gifts are manifestations of the Spirit, the use of such gifts brings Christians into this participation and imitation of the Spirit. One obvious example is how God "illuminates and astutely teaches needful things." God allows the wealth disparity to show "the freedom of choice and to teach others not to rage nor to be fanatical about money." Teaching is the spiritual gift with the greatest prominence. It is placed first, so that "even all the others, prophesy, acts of power, different languages, translating languages, nothing is equal to this."[34] The Christian who has the gift of teaching relates to God's teaching via imitation and participation. They look to imitate God's teaching in the same way Paul imitates his teacher.[35] In teaching the knowledge of God, they take part in God's pedagogical purpose.

The gift of foreign speech also imitates the speaking of the Holy Spirit. The dynamic of the gift of foreign speech is one of co-operation. The speaker and the interpreter work together to supply an edifying message. It is noteworthy how Chrysostom refers to 1 Cor 2, where the Spirit is characterized as an interpreter, "interpreting spiritual things to those who are spiritual."[36] The Spirit's pedagogical function recalls the teachings of Jesus, for the Spirit "will teach you everything, and

---

[33] Naidu, *Transformed in Christ*, 257.
[34] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:2:27 (F 2:353); 29:8:3 (F 2:361); 29:5:30 (F 2:358).
[35] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:3:8 (F 2:354).
[36] 1 Cor 2:13, NRSV.

remind you of all that I have said to you."[37] This occurs when the Spirit searches the depths of God and teaches them to humans. Likewise, the one with the gift of foreign speech "does not talk to humans but to God," which elevates the worth of the gift. Through it "the Spirit in him taught vocally," and the person "speaks mysteries, and he speaks to God, and he encourages himself, and that he prays in the Spirit" and so the Spirit is "speaking secrets," with the caveat that such speech is not understood by others without an interpreter.[38] Without an interpreter, the one speaking these secrets will be a foreigner to the congregation. Instead of building up the οἰκειωσις within the community, they will prevent it. The gift is meant to emulate the way the Spirit cooperates with Jesus and the Father, by interpreting the mysteries of God and communicating them to humanity. The interpreter of foreign languages is the one who brings that knowledge to the congregation. Both the interpreter and the one speaking in a foreign language imitate the Spirit. The pairing of these gifts is to bind the congregation together.[39] In providing the benefit for the congregation, the gift of foreign speech and its interpretation emulates the way the Spirit interprets and teaches the spiritual mysteries of God. Because the gift of foreign speech imitates the divine cooperation between the Trinity, the use of the gift to break the community's love is a serious wrongdoing. The situation of the Corinthians may be unique in its extreme condition, having those with the gift of foreign speech hurting others in the community. While Chrysostom acknowledges the church community in Rome suffered a similar fate, it was far worse in Corinth. He calls it an "extreme condition."[40] Moreover, the use of the gift

[37] John 14:26.
[38] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:1:16–18 (F 2:435); 35:6:8 (F 2:440); 35:1:10 (F 2:434).
[39] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:4:19–20 (F 2:439); 35:4:3 (F 2:438).
[40] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 29:1:12–18 (F 2:350).

of foreign speech produces the same confusion and grief associated with demonic possession. This characterization of the gift when it is abused shows how much harm the gifts can cause. One reading of the text may assume the ecstatic nature of demonic possession implies a total rejection of ecstatic behaviour within the Christian community. Yet, the comparison between demons and God is less of a denunciation of ecstasy, and more of a commentary on the treatment of humans by the spiritual agent. Chrysostom's preaching on the gifts lacks the ecstatic element, especially when used by pastors in the church. He does not envision delivering the liturgy as an ecstatic expression. Performing the liturgy, or parts thereof, in a language the congregation does not understand is inappropriate. The two homilies studied reveal an interconnection between the motivation for using the gifts. The Holy Spirit has the goal of benefiting Christians in his gift-giving. This is modeled by Paul who is always looking to edify the congregation. Chrysostom argues Paul lays the same motive down as a pastoral rule for the church to follow. When Christians ignore this rule and look to demonstrate they have this gift, the laypeople in the congregation go "without receiving any benefit." Christians must imitate the Spirit's motivation for goodwill when using their gifts.

The Gifts as Reciprocation

For Chrysostom, gift-giving is to serve the common good. The Spirit's gift-giving is not isolated to the individual experience but is meant to branch out and impact the whole community in some manner. Adolf Ritter's comment on how "Christian living is not about pursuing an individual perfection, but a matter of edifying others, and all the gifts

contribute to that common benefit" is apt.[41] Christians are to "be caught up into the network of divine friendship," which includes "loving one's neighbour and manifests itself in a variety of ways: hospitality, mercy or almsgiving, humility, meekness, patience, and forbearance."[42] Christian friendship with Christ involves reciprocity towards others, both to Christ and to other humans. The act of gift-giving towards others embodies this friendship, exemplified by almsgiving, which makes humans like God as friendship "between God and man is charactered by a shared pursuit of giving." This giving not only involves individuals but the entirety of Christ's community.[43] The gifts both imitate the actions of the Spirit and also the friendship of the Spirit. Just as the Spirit gives gifts to benefit Christians, so too are Christians called to use their gifts to benefit others. As Christians ask the Spirit to draw near with his presence, this manifestation is outward reaching towards others, namely, the gifts are good when they look for the benefit of others. The use of spiritual gifts is analogous to almsgiving. If the gift is shut up within oneself, only used for one's own benefit, then it causes harm. However, if it is used for the common advantage then it helps.

Likewise, Chrysostom argues wealth is a deadly beast when it is shut up within a person's coffers. It will become tame when "we bring it into the hands of the needy." Christians, especially church leaders, are urged "when it comes into our hand let us not hoard it inside but let us fasten it to the hands of the poor." Thus, "we will hence reap the greatest good living both in the present life with security and a useful hope and standing with frankness in the day that is coming."[44] Likewise, the gift of foreign

---

[41] Ritter, "Between 'Theocracy' and 'Simple Life'," 172.
[42] Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*, 53.
[43] Verhoeff, "More Desirable than Light Itself," 112–13.
[44] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:14:1–9 (F 2:448).

speech, if it is used without an interpreter, is shut up within the person alone. The goodness of the gift is given to others only "when it has one clarifying what is being spoken."[45] The gifts of the spirit fit within Chrysostom's concept of the divine-human relationship. It is an ongoing cooperative work involving God's grace and the pursuit of virtue.[46] The operation of the gifts is to be done with charity towards others. It is an act, which seeks their benefit and so draws the Christian into gift-giving towards others. Within the deified life, almsgiving help the believer to ascend towards God through moral virtue, to imitate God's mercy by practicing mercy towards the poor. If this is done with a desire for one's own honour, all gifts will result in a tremendous loss. Christians becoming like God "in giving alms; be like him in not making a display" about it.[47] The command to avoid drawing honour to oneself is an important aspect for Chrysostom on using the gifts. The spiritual gifts draw Christians into an imitation of God's gift-giving. Like almsgiving, the spiritual gifts help demonstrate the existing friendship with God.[48] What is important is not showing off one's gift, which is akin almsgiving for the sake of one's own honour. Instead, Christians are to demonstrate they have received the Spirit and belong to God.

[45] Chrysostom, *Ad Corinthios*, 35:5:9 (F 2:439); 35:4:5 (F 2:438).
[46] Bae, "John Chrysostom on Almsgiving," 175–76.
[47] Bae, "John Chrysostom on Almsgiving," 180–82.
[48] Verhoeff, "More Desirable than Light Itself," 107.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

For John Chrysostom the spiritual gifts are placed upon the foundation of the salvific friendship between Christians and God. Gifts express, and not do cause, this relationship. They are a part of the Spirit's pedagogical and revelatory actions towards Christians. The gifts do not function as an intermediary agent between the Spirit and Christians. Rather they are expressions of the Spirit's work in the lives of Christians. Thus, the gifts are not independent from the Spirit and Christian reflection on the gifts is, in actuality, to think about the Spirit at work in the church.

Chrysostom notes how Christians can place their value on what gifts they have received or on how many gifts they have received. He draws parallels between gifts and material wealth to illustrate how people also use wealth to determine their own worth. But for God, the gifts are not given to function in this manner because the worth or value of Christians is determined by their newly formed friendship with Christ. Christians share in the death and resurrection of Christ and so participate in the same union with God.

Gifts require an appropriate response. Chrysostom argues a correct response to the Spirit's gifts is a reciprocation of virtue and goodwill towards others. It is not properly reciprocated by a self-serving agenda for one's own advancement. Christians

receive the Spirit's gifts and in return they reach out and serve others for the other's "benefit." This almsgiving-like action draws the community together with mutual love and helps the Christian church develop along a "heavenly" life together as they participate in the Triune God.

The study of the homily is a constant element in Chrysostom research. Advancing the study of Chrysostom's works and theology requires an ability to understand his homilies. This study contributes to the advancement of the study of John Chrysostom. It does so by providing a framework both for evaluating individual homilies from his vast collection and for analyzing his theology from within this genre of work. This study shows the viability of connecting the major sections, the exegesis and paraenesis, together through themes and parallels. This study shows how the entirety of the homily can provide relevant context for a single topic. Passages remain relevant beyond their immediate context and provide a backdrop for statements made later in the homily. Thus, in *Hom. 1 Cor.* 29 Chrysostom construct an ongoing theme of "failure to discern different spirits." This is seen both in his discussion of oracles and prophets while it also plays a major role in his discussion on how indulging in wealth makes the soul suffer. This theme informs his discussion on spiritual gifts, where Christians fail to see how gifts express the Spirit's care. Future work on Chrysostom's theology can use this study as a template to better approach his thought as it is preached as his theology is not fully seen by only examining brief, isolated passages.

Another advancement this study provides relates to Chrysostom's theology of spiritual gifts. Chrysostom's approach to this topic is shaped by his concern to live a heavenly life of virtue or, to state it another way, that the spiritual gifts are shaped by the developing tradition of theosis. Thus, he cannot be easily mapped on modern paradigms.

Chrysostom does not separate the gift from the presence of the Holy Spirit, and the virtues of God accompany his presence. When Christians experience God, they encounter him with his virtues. Their participation in the Spirit's gift-giving is, at the same time, a participation in the virtues of God. This requires a reception and reciprocation of those same virtues. The whole package of the Spirit's gifts and virtues is taken together to promote the Christian's participation in and imitation of God. For Chrysostom, the vital element of this experience is the virtues of God, so even if certain gifts cease to be given, God continues to present himself and his virtues to Christians in various ways.

This study will help future studies on spiritual gifts in the early church. This study supplies insight into Chrysostom's preaching on the gifts. He does not separate the experience of the Spirit from the pastoral needs of the church. One may consider Chrysostom's approach a pastoral theological approach to this topic. At the same time Chrysostom is one part of a larger tradition in the early church. Future studies on spiritual gifts can expand the conversation and add more nuance to it by bringing modern paradigms into conversation with early Christian perspectives. This study on Chrysostom provides one case study where an early Christian perspective is explored, so it is a foundation for future studies on this topic.

This dissertation analyzed *Hom. 1 Cor.* 29 and *Hom. 1 Cor.* 35 as case studies for how the homiletic context characterizes Chrysostom's theology. It established the necessity of looking at the entire homily as important context for his theological statements. It proceeded to look at both of these homilies and to show their individual sections and parts. It showed how Chrysostom uses connecting statements to transition both between minor sections in his exegetical and paraenetic sections as well as to move

between these two major parts of his homily. These transition statements preserve the homily's themes and frame the paraenetical part of Chrysostom's homilies as informing the reader of themes stated in the exegetical section. After showing how each of these homilies is constructed, this study looked at how this method influences a reading of Chrysostom's theology of spiritual gifts from these texts. In chapter 4 this study showed how Chrysostom sees the gifts as revelatory events of the Holy Spirit. They show Christians the Spirit's motive of goodwill and love, and they show the method of God's pastoral care, his adaptation to each person. Christians must discern the work of the Spirit, and not mistake it as the accumulation of material wealth and respond to the Spirit's gift-giving with thanksgiving for what they received. Chapter 5 analyzes Chrysostom's preaching towards the clergy with regards to the gifts. The clergy do not stand between God and the laity but are with the laity as instructors in the heavenly life. Thus, they ought to imitate the pastoral care of the Holy Spirit and act as a demonstration of the heavenly life in God. This requires a reciprocation of the generosity and kindness on the part of the clergy. They ought not to use their spiritual gifts for self-promotion but for the common benefit. Chapter 6 consolidates the information from analyzing both *Hom. 1 Cor.* 29 and 35. It constructs an overview of Chrysostom's theology on spiritual gifts. He emphasizes the Holy Spirit as the giver of gifts. The Spirit gives from his own freewill and goodwill. The phenomenon of the gifts in the lives of Christians is the direct working of the Spirit; the gifts are not intermediaries between the Spirit and Christians. The Holy Spirit has a kingly quality, and his gifts, which hold the same value, are given to honour Christians. They reveal the friendship that now exists between them and God. Chrysostom heavily emphasizes the appropriate response Christians should have to receiving such distinguished gifts. The

core of an appropriate response is seeking the common benefit. Christians should not be self-serving, nor should they look for only their own benefit and advancement. They must display love towards others as reciprocation for the Spirit's gift-giving.

APPENDIX 1: HOMILY 29

(F:349)[1:1][1] *About the spiritual [matters], brothers, I do not want you to be ignorant. You know that when you were foreigners, you were led astray to the voiceless idols* (1 Cor 12:1–2). [1:2][2] 'This whole subject is very unclear.' But the unclearness is really produced from ignorance of the matter, and then from the lack[3] of their occurrences, which now no longer take place.[4] [1:3] 'And why do they not happen now?' Why look again, even the cause of the unclearness has produced for us another question. [1:4] For why do you suppose that they actually happened then, but now no longer? But let us delay this until a later time, and in the meantime let us lecture on the things occurring then. [1:5] Why therefore, did they happen then? When someone was baptized, he immediately spoke in foreign languages, and not only foreign speech, but many also prophesied, and some even displayed other mighty miracles. [1:6] For since they were coming from idols, not knowing clearly, nor being brought up in the ancient writings, when they were baptized, they immediately received the Spirit. But they did not see the Spirit because it is invisible, and so the gift gave perceptible proof of that activity. Immediately one uttered in the language of the Persians, and one in that of the Romans, and one in that of the Indians, and someone else in other such languages, and this appeared to those outside, that the Spirit, who is in them, was uttering. [1:7] So this is why he names it, saying, *but to each the appearing of the Spirit is given, for benefit* (1 Cor 12:7), naming the gift 'the appearing of the Spirit.' [1:8] For since the Apostles were the first to receive this sign, even the ones believing received this, the gift of foreign speech, and not only these ones, but also many others. [1:9] For many even awakened the dead, and drove demons away, and others worked many such wonders, and they had gifts too, some received fewer, others more. [1:10] But more than all was the gift of foreign speech among them, (**F:350)** and this was responsible for the divisions among them, 'not because of its own nature,' he says, 'but because of the foolish pride of the

---

[1] The bold text: **(F:349)** indicates the page number in Field's text. The non-bold text: [1:1] indicate the section and verse numbering.

[2] I am generally following the section numbers of Schaff's edition, aside from making a few corrections in Section 2 and 7. I do not see any reason to remove them as de Wet's translation does, rather I have added in line numbers to give more accurate references. Secondly, the references to First Corinthians, on which Chrysostom commentates are referenced in the text, while references to other sources are footnoted. Keeping First Corinthians citations in text show the exegetical progress and context more easily.

[3] ἔλλειψις, see Pl.*Prt*.356a

[4] *καὶ ἔλλειψις ποιεῖ ὧν τότε μὲν συμβαινόντων*: *NPNF* reads, "but the obscurity is produced by our ignorance of the facts referred to and by the their cessation, being such as then used to occur but now no longer take place." de Wet's translation reads: "but the obscurity is the result of our own ignorance of the spiritual things referred to and their cessation – those things which did occur then but not anymore."

ones receiving it.' [1:11] For those who had more were exalted against them who had acquired fewer. And they again were grieved and were envious towards them who had more. [1:12] But most of all they were grieved by those having the gift of foreign speech. [1:13] And Paul proceeds to display this. [1:14] Since, therefore, they received here a mortal wound, breaking off their love, he spends much effort in trying to restore it, for this also happened in Rome, but not like this. [1:15] Therefore, in the letter to the Romans he removes it, but by being obscure and brief, saying thus, *For just as we have many members in one body, but the many members do not share the same job, so too the many who are one body in the Christ, and where the one member is of another.* [1:16] *And having the differing gifts being given to us according to grace, whether the prophet according to the ratio of their faith, whether the servant in the serving, or whether the teacher in the teaching* (Rom 12:4, 8). [1:17] But that even they were henceforth falling into impropriety, he hints about this in the beginning, thus saying, *For I speak through the grace which is given to me to all who are in you, do not be more overly-proud than is necessary to think, but to think in moderation as God assigned a measure of faith to each* (Rom 12:3). [1:18] Therefore, not only did he talk to them about the disease, which is dissension and rebellion, but he discoursed here with much anxiety, for the extreme condition was spreading. [1:19] And this was not their only disturbance, but there were even many oracles[5] in that place because the city was more disposed to Grecian customs, and this with the other was upsetting and agitating them. [1:20] Because of this when beginning, he first distinguishes between oracles and prophets, for this also they received interpretation of spirits, so as to judge and to know who is really uttering from a genuine spirit, and who is uttering from a disingenuous one. [1:21] For it was not possible to immediately supply the proof of the one speaking, because prophecy does not provide the proof of its own truth in the time of speaking but in the time of the event. **(F:351)** [1:22] And it was not easy to decide who was the one really prophesying and who was deceiving. [1:23] For even the abominable Enemy came into the ones prophesying, introducing false prophets, pretending as though they could predict future events. [1:24] And so, the things being said were not accountable for a while, for the matter of the event which was predicted had not happened yet, they were easily mislead. [1:25] For the deceivers and the ones speaking truthfully were proven by the end. [1:26] But so that the listeners will not be deceived before the end, he gives them a sign, which is also before the event, to show the one from the other, and here he determines a sequence. [1:27] and he begins to extend the lecture about the gifts, and he corrects the ones being contentious here.

[2:1][6] Yet, for the meanwhile he begins the lecture of the oracles like this, saying, *now brothers, I do not want you to be ignorant about the spiritual [matters]*. Calling the sign 'spiritual' because they certainly are the works of the Spirit alone, nothing from humans contributes at all to the working of such miracles. [2:2] And he is intending to lecture on them first, as I said, he sets down the difference between oracles and prophecy, thus saying: *You know that when you were foreigners, you were being led*

[5] Μάντεις, "diviners," "soothsayers."

[6] I have decided to start section 2 a single sentence ahead of *NPNF*, where it starts after "saying," and with "now concerning the spiritual gifts" but it cuts the sentence in half, so to avoid any needless splicing of sentences, I decided to make the whole of it the start of section 2.

astray to the voiceless idols. [2:3] Now, what he is saying, is this: 'In the idol's temple,' he says, 'if anyone is possessed by an unclean spirit and gives an oracle, he is just like someone being dragged into prison. He is being dragged away in chains by the spirit, not knowing what he says.' [2:4] For this is characteristic of oracles, to be driven out of the senses, to be under compulsion, to be thrust out, to be torn asunder, to be dragged away as a raving lunatic. [2:5] 'But the one prophesying is not like this,' he says, ' but he says all these with self-controlled thought, and with moderation, and in stillness. He knows what he utters.' [2:6] Therefore, even before the event you discover the oracle and the prophet. [2:7] And consider how he makes his talk without suspicion. In making of a trial of the matter he calls them witnesses. [2:8] 'Because I am not lying,' he says, 'nor am I simply ridiculing the gentiles. I am not like an enemy fabricating these things to you. You bear witness to me!' [2:9] **(F:352)** For you also remember that when you were Greeks, how you were carried off, and then dragged away to prison. [2:10] But if someone says even these believers are suspicious, come and I make this clear from outsiders. [2:11] Hear, when Plato says thus: *Even as the ones chanting oracles and being maddened by gods, they speak indeed many and excellent things, but they do not perceive what they are saying.*[7] [2:12] Hear now from another poet this very demonstration. [2:13] For some mystic rites and use of magic trickery imprisoned a demon in a human and he gave an oracle, and in giving the oracle he was thrown down and convulsed. He was not able to endure the invasion of the demon but was going to die like that while convulsing. He says this to such ones using magic trickery: *Unbind me already, the strong god can hold mortal flesh no longer* and again *unbind my wreaths and bathe my feet in clear water and wipe off these letters and let me go*.[8] [2:14] On this and other such things one might make mention of much more, demonstrating both of these things to us: the compulsion, where the demon becomes the master, making them slaves, and the act of violence, which is submitted to by those offering themselves to them once for all, and become separated from their own minds. [2:15] And also of the Pythian,[9] for I am now compelled, another of their disgraceful conducts which would be good to be omitted because it would be indecent of us to speak of such things, but in order to learn more clearly of their shame it is necessary to speak, so that you may also learn here of their derangement and their great absurdity of making use of oracles. [2:16] Therefore, it is said that the Pythian herself, being some woman, was seated upon the three-footed seat of Apollo with risen legs, where thus a wicked spirit ascends from below and slips through a part of her genitals, filling the woman with frenzy, and she loosens her hair and begins to produce a Bacchic enthusiasm, foaming from the mouth and so she begins to utter her mad speech in her frenzy. [2:17] I know that you are ashamed and **(F:353)** embarrassed hearing this, but they themselves even greatly boasted because of both this disgrace and this madness. [2:18] Therefore, these and all such things Paul brings up when he said, *You know that when you were foreigners, you were carried away to the voiceless idols*. [2:19] And since he knew those he was discoursing with, he did not state everything with precision, he did not desire to annoy them but only to remind them, and to always lead them into reflection. He quickly departs from this, hurrying himself to the proposed subject. [2:20] But what does *to the*

---

[7] Plato *Apol. Soc. C. 7.*

[8] Porphyry, *Philos. Orac* in Eusebius, *Praep. Ev. 5. 9.*

[9] The Priestess of Pythian Apollo at Delphi, commonly referred to as the Oracle of Delphi.

voiceless idols mean? That they were led by these oracles. [2:21] But if they were voiceless, how did they proclaim to others? And why did the demons bring them before the images carved of wood? To take them as prisoners in chains and making their deceit altogether plausible. [2:22] To assure no opinion held it a voiceless stone, they were eager to fasten the people to the idols so that their own name might be written upon them. [2:23] But it is not like that in our case. But he did not state our case, I speak that of prophesying, for it was well known to them all that prophesy was with them, with quick comprehension and entire freedom, as was fitting. [2:24] Because of this, you see, they had power to speak or to not speak, for they were not seized with compulsion, but were honoured by their permission. [2:25] Therefore, Jonah fled, therefore Ezekiel delayed, therefore Jeremiah begged. [2:26] But God did not push them forward with compulsion, but with counsel, recommendations, and warnings; not darkening their minds. [2:27] For truly demons produce confusion, madness, and much gloom, but God illuminates and astutely teaches needful things.

[3:1] Therefore, this is the first difference between oracles and prophets, but a second and different one is what he states next, saying, *so I give you insight, that no one speaking in the Spirit of God says that Jesus is cursed.* [3:2] And then another, *and no one is able to say that Jesus is LORD except by the Holy Spirit.* [3:3] 'Therefore, when you see,' he says, 'someone not being able to utter his name or one who considers him cursed, he is an oracle.' [3:4] Again, when you see another uttering all things with his name, perceive that he is spiritual. [3:5] 'What then,' **(F:354)** he says, 'should we say about those catechumens?' 'For if no one is able to say that Jesus is LORD except by the Holy Spirit, what should we say of those who indeed are calling on his name, but are being deprived of the Spirit?' But this present argument is not about those people, for there were no catechumens then, but it was about believers and unbelievers. [3:6] What then, has no demon ever called on God? Do not the demons say, 'we know who you are, the Son of God' (Mark 1:24)? Did they not say of Paul, 'these humans are slaves of the Highest God' (Acts 16:17)? But they were the ones being flogged and the ones being under compulsion, and they never spoke willingly, and never without being whipped. [3:7] But it is proper here to inquire for what reason did the demons utter this and why Paul did censure them. [3:8] Because he is imitating his Teacher, for even the Christ censured them, for he did not desire to have any witness from them. [3:9] And what is the reason that the demons did this? They desired to confuse the order of things, and to take away the Apostles' honour, and to persuade many to come to them. If it happened that way, they would easily appear trustworthy, and would be able to bring things in from themselves. [3:10] Therefore, so that this might not happen, nor fraud to have its beginning, he silences them even when they speak the truth, so that no one would pay attention to them and their lies, and generally to stop the hearers from hearing the things they were saying.

[4:1] Therefore, he made oracles and prophets clear both from the first and second sign. Next, he lectures about wonders, not simply coming to the topic but to remove this disagreement and to persuade the ones having the fewer gifts not to grieve, and the ones having acquired more not to be arrogant. [4:2] Therefore, he began like this, *now there is a distribution of gifts, but the same Spirit* (1 Cor 12:4). And he first attends the ones having fewer gifts, who were grieving because of this. [4:3] 'What is

the reason for which you are disheartened? Is it that you did not receive as much as another? But consider that it is a gift, and not a debt, and you will be able to soothe your distress.' [4:4] This is why he spoke frankly, *now there are a distribution of gifts.* [4:5] Now he did not say **(F:355)** 'of miracles' nor 'of wonders,' but 'of gifts' persuading them by the name of 'free gift' not only to not grieve, but also to be thankful. [4:6] 'And with this in mind, consider this,' he says, 'that even in being granted the smaller measure, from that you are deemed worthy to receive. That is also the same with the one receiving more, you have the same honour. [4:7] For you surely are not able to say that the Spirit freely gave to them, but an angel gave to you, for the Spirit gave it both to you and to them. [4:8] Which is why he added, *but the same Spirit.* [4:9] And even if there is a difference in the gifts, there cannot be a difference in the one giving, for you and they draw water from the same fountain. [4:10] *And a diversity of servants, but the same master* (1 Cor 12:5). [4:11] For the sake of enriching the encouragement he also adds the Son and the Father. [4:12] And again he calls this gift by another name, and consider this, he intends to encourage. And so, he says this, *but there is a diversity of servants, but the same master.* [4:13] Indeed, for the one hearing of a gift but only receives a small amount, it is probable that he might grieve, but it is not the same with work, for the occurrence indicates sweat and hard work. [4:14] 'Why then do you grieve,' he says, 'if another is called to far harder work, while you are spared?' *And there is a distribution of activities, but the same God is operating everything in everyone*. *And to each one is given the display of the Spirit, to benefit* (1 Cor 12:6–7). [4:15] And so one asks, 'what is hard labour? What is a gift? What is work?' Only different names since the things are the same. [4:16] For that which is a gift this is also a work and he also calls it hard labour: *So, fulfill your work* (2 Tim 4:5) and *I honour my work* (Rom 11:13). [4:17] And writing to Timothy he says *that which I cause you to remember, to rekindle the gift of God, the one which is in you* (2 Tim 1:6). And again in writing instruction to the Galatians he said, *for the one who made Peter to be sent abroad, also worked in me to go the gentiles* (Gal 2:8). [4:18] Do you see how he shows there is no difference in the gifts of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit? Not minimizing the natures, let that never be, but showing the equality of the natures. [4:19] 'For what the Spirit gives,' **(F:356)** he says, 'this God also operates, this the Son also appoints and grants.' [4:20] And indeed if this were less than that, or that less than this, he would not have set it down, nor would he have encouraged the one suffering like this.

[5:1] Now after this, he encourages him in another kind of way. The measure, even if it is small, is given to benefit him. [5:2] For having said that it is the same Spirit, and the same Lord, and the same God, and having refreshed this, he again adds another comfort, saying this: *And to each one is given the display of the Spirit, to benefit*. [5:3] So that no one might say, 'so what if it is the same Lord, the same Spirit, and the same God, if I am receiving less?' He says that it is beneficial**,** and he reasonably calls the miracle 'the display of the Spirit.' [5:4] Indeed for me, a believer, the one having the Spirit is visible from being baptized. But to the unbeliever this is nowhere made clear except from the miracles, so here again there is no small encouragement. [5:5] For even if there are different gifts, still the proof is the same. For whether you have much or whether you have a few, both are equally visible. [5:6] Since, if you are eager to show that you have the Spirit, you have enough of a proof. [5:7] Therefore, since the Giver is one and the gift is a free gift, and here the appearance happened, this is a great benefit

for you. Do not grieve as if you were despised. [5:8] For he does not think you unworthy, nor did he declare that you are worse than another, but he has consideration for you and has the aim to help you profit. [5:9] For the one who received more, but is not able to bear it, is harmed and damaged, and gives good reason to despair. [5:10] *For indeed, a word of wisdom is given to one through the Spirit, and to another a word of knowledge according to the same Spirit. And to another faith by the same Spirit, and to another gifts of healing by the same Spirit* (1 Cor 12:8–9). [5:11] See how everywhere he makes this addition, 'in the same Spirit,' and saying, 'according to the same Spirit?' For he knew its great comfort. [5:12] *And to another works of power, and to another prophesying, and to another being able to recognize spirits, and to another various kinds of foreign speech,* **(F:357)** *and to another to translate foreign speech* (1 Cor 12:10). [5:13] For they greatly boasted in foreign speech, and because of this he placed it last, and added, *But all of these are operated in the same Spirit* (1 Cor 12:11). [5:14] This is the universal medicine of encouragement: All the gifts they received are from the same root, from the same storehouse, from the same spring. [5:15] And so, he continually pours a flood of words over this topic. He resolves what seems to be an inconsistency and encourages them. [5:16] And earlier both the Spirit and the Son and the Father were shown to abundantly supply the gifts. But here it was enough to say the Spirit, so that you may again learn that their nature is the same value. [5:17] But what is 'a word of wisdom'? That which Paul had, that which John the Son of Thunder had. [5:18] And what is 'a word of knowledge'? That which the many of the believers had, having knowledge but not being able thus to teach, nor easily conveying to another what they knew. [5:19] 'And to another faith,' that this faith is not that of beliefs but that of signs, about which he says, *If you have faith as the mustard seed, you may say to this mountain, 'be removed' and it will be removed* (Matt 17:20). [5:20] And the Apostles requested it, saying *increase our faith* (Luke 17:5). For it is the mother of signs. [5:21] And the one who possesses 'works of power,' but the gift of healing is not this.[5:22] For truly the one having the gift of healing only cures, but the one who has the acts of power also avenges. [5:23] For he is able, not only to cure, but also to punish, as Paul blinded, as Peter killed. [5:24] *And to another to prophesy, and to another to recognize spirits*. [5:25] What is to recognize spirits? To know who is spiritual and who is not spiritual, who is the prophet and who is the deceiver, as when he said to the Thessalonians, *do not scorn prophesy, but test everything, keep the good* (1 Thess 5:20-21). [5:26] For back then the impulse of false prophesy was great, the deceiver attempted to show a parallel between falsehood and truth. [5:27] 'And to another various kinds of foreign speech, and to another to interpret foreign speech.' [5:28] For truly the one knows what he himself said, but another is not able to interpret, but the one who had acquired both of these could do this and the other one. [5:29] Now **(F:358)** this gift was considered to be great since the Apostles had received it first and many among the Corinthians had acquired it, but the word of teaching was not like this. [5:30] Because teaching was placed first, but this one last. For both this and that, even all the others, prophesy, acts of power, different languages, translating languages nothing, is equal to this. Thus, he said, *The elders who govern well are considered worthy of twice the honour, especially the ones working hard in lecturing and teaching* (1 Tim 5:17). [5:31]

And he wrote to Timothy saying, *Devote yourself to reading, to preaching, to teaching. Do not neglect the gift that is in you* (1 Tim 4:13–14).[10] See how he also calls it a gift?

[6:1] And so that encouragement he stated above saying, 'the same Spirit,' he also states here saying, *But the one and same Spirit works all this, distributing privately to each as he desires* (1 Cor 12:11).[11] [6:2] But he does not only encourage, but he also silences the opposition by saying, *distributing privately to each as he desires.* [6:3] It is necessary to silence, not only to cure, as he also wrote in the letter to the Romans where he said, *Who are you that you are arguing against God* (Rom 9:20)? Thus also here, *distributing privately to each as he desires.* [6:4] And that, which was of the Father, this he shows to be of the Spirit, for just as he said about him, *but the same God is working all things in everyone*, thus also about the Spirit, *but the one and same Spirit works all this*. [6:5] But one says, 'it is being worked from God,' but nowhere does he say this, you only invented it. [6:6] For when he said, *the one working all things in everything*, he says about humans. I presume you do not also count the Spirit along with humans, even if you do have immense dementia and infinite madness. [6:7] For he said, *through the Spirit*, so that you might not consider the word 'through' to mean 'less,' nor is he worked through, he adds, 'the Spirit works,' not 'is worked,' and 'he works as he desires,' not 'as he is ordered.' [6:8] For where the Son said about the Father that *he raises the dead and makes them alive*, he equally says about himself that *he gladly makes them alive* (John 5:21). **(F:359)** So also, about the Spirit, that elsewhere he truly works with all authority, and nothing hinders him, for the line, *he blows where he desires* is said about the Spirit (John 3:8). It is also fitting to prove this here, that he works everything as he desires. [6:9] But also learn from another place that he is not being forced to act, but that he is working. [6:10] *For who knows*, he says, *the things of humans, except the human spirit? Thus, no one knows the things of God except the Spirit of God* (1 Cor 2:11). [6:11] Now such is the human spirit, the soul, it is not required to be forced to act to clearly understand everything of itself. [6:12] Surely then neither the Holy Spirit, to know the things of God. [6:13] 'For thus,' he says, 'The Holy Spirit knows the secret things of God, as the human soul does his own secrets.' [6:14] But if in this it is not forced to act, how much more is the one who understands the depths of God not forced to act. He was not required to be forced to act in order to give gifts to the Apostles. [6:15] Now apart from these things, when I spoke before, I will also speak again now. [6:16] Now what is this? If this Spirit is less and of another nature, the encouragement would have no profit, nor would hearing the words, 'the same Spirit.' [6:17] For truly, the one receiving something great from the King keeps it as a comfort, for he himself gave to him. But if from the slave, then he greatly grieves for someone insults him with this. [6:18] So, it is also clear here, the Holy Spirit does not have the nature of a slave, but of a king.

[7:1] Therefore, just as he encourages them, saying that *there is a diversity of services, but the same Master, and a diversity of activities, but the same God*. Thus, also he says above, *there is a diversity of gifts, but the same Spirit*. And with this saying again, *but the same Spirit works in all these, distributing privately to each as he desires*.

---

[10] Here I translate παρακλησει as preaching, where the *NPNF* has exhortation.

[11] This time it is the full verse.

[7:2] ‘Therefore, let us not be anxious,’ he says, ‘nor let us grieve, saying, “Why did I receive this, and not receive that?” Let us not demand the **(360)** Holy Spirit to explain himself to us.’ [7:3] For if he freely gave from care, consider that the measure given is from the same care. Be satisfied and rejoice over what you received, and do not be displeased over what you did not receive, but only accept the goodwill: that you did not receive things greater than your ability. [7:4] But if in spiritual matters it is not necessary to waste one’s time, how much more with physical matters? So, be at rest and do not be deeply perplexed at why someone is rich, while such another is poor. [7:5] For certainly not every rich person is really from God, but many are rich from injustice, theft, and greed. [7:6] ‘For he commanded one not to be rich, how did he give that, which he did not command to be received?’ But so that I will silence the profit of wealth to those who make these counterclaims to us. Come, let us return to the earlier argument, where he gave the wealth from God, and answer me. Why was Abraham rich but Jacob needed bread? Were not both the one and the other righteous? Was not the same thing said of the three, *I am the God of Abraham, and of Isaac, and of Jacob* (Exod 3:6)? Therefore, why was it that one was rich, but the other a hired labourer? [7:7] But rather, why was it that Esau was rich, who was unjust and murdered his brother, but this one was in slavery for such a long time? Again, why was it that Isaac lived his whole life in safety but Jacob[12] in distress and hard labour? On account of this he said, *My days were short and toilsome* (Gen 47:9). [7:8] Why was it that David was a prophet and a king and the same lived his whole life in distress, but his son Solomon spent forty years in the most security above all humans, enjoying abundant peace, glory, honour, and having all kinds of luxuries? Why do you suppose also in the prophets one was oppressed more but another less? Because it was beneficial to each one. [7:9] And therefore, it is proper to recount to each case, *Your many decisions are unfathomable* (Ps 36:6). [7:10] For if God did not train the great and wonderful in the same way, the one through poverty but the other through wealth, the one through relaxation but the other through affliction. How much more is it necessary to consider this!

[8:1] But, after this it is necessary to account for this, **(361)** that many of the things happening happen not according to our mind but from our wickedness. [8:2] Therefore, do not ask for what reason the wealthy person is in a sorry state, but the poor is righteous. Rather, an argument for this is given to say that the righteous has no harm from poverty but has greater aid to his reputation. And the wicked in wealth has acquired more supplies of punishment if he does not turn around. But even before the chastisement wealth is often responsible for many of the evils happening to him and leads him into ten thousand pits. [8:3] But God allows both together showing the freedom of choice[13] and to teach others not to rage nor to be fanatical about money. [8:4] What you then will say is, ‘why then is some wicked person wealthy but does not suffer terrible things?’ For if he is good and just, he then is wealthy, but if he is wicked will we inquire? So, show mercy to this one. [8:5] For wealth added to wickedness aggravates the passions. [8:6] But one is good, and he is poor, but he is not damaged, and one is wicked, but he is poor, then it is right and is greatly merited, and even is useful to him. [8:7] But such a one says, ‘he received wealth from his forefathers, and he scatters it

[12] ιαβωβ, a misspelling of ιακωβ.

[13] προαιρεσεως.

upon prostitutes and parasites, and does not suffer anything terrible.' [8:8] What do you mean? He prostitutes himself and you say he does not suffer anything terrible? He is drunk, do you consider him to be luxurious? He spends money on nothing needful, and you say that he is happy? And what can be worse than these that ruin the soul? But you say if the body is distorted and mutilated, he is merited measureless weeping, but upon seeing his soul being mutilated you consider him to be prosperous? 'But he does not perceive it,' one says. [8:9] Again because of that, have mercy on him just as on the delirious ones. [8:10] For indeed the one knowing that he is sick will always request the doctor and he will bear with the medicine, but the one not knowing will not be able to be delivered. [8:11] You say this one is prosperous? Tell me, but do not marvel, for most are ignorant of philosophy. [8:12] Because of this, we pay the greatest penalty, being punished, and now being delivered to vengeance. This is why there are passions, depressions, and continual confusion because **(362)** God is demonstrating to us a life without grief: the one of virtue. We give it up, we cut out another path, the one of wealth and money, the one being full of countless evils. [8:13] And we do this, like one who does not know how to determine beautiful bodies but attributing all to the clothes being worn and to the decorations being displayed. Indeed, ignoring the beautiful woman upon seeing her who had acquired natural beauty. And viewing the shameful and ugly woman with a mutilated body, but having beautiful clothes, he takes her as a wife. [8:14] And now something similar happens with many about virtue and vice, one boasts in their dishonour, one believing their external decorations but turns away from the beautiful and elegant one because of her unadorned beauty, through which they especially ought to choose her.

[9:1] Because of this, I am ashamed, because truly there are those who pursue this from the senseless Greeks, and if not in their affairs at least up until this time in their mind, and who know the mortality of the present things. However, there are some among us who do not believe this, but they have their judgement corrupted, and this happens, the scriptures sing up and down to us, saying, *The wicked is considered nothing before him, but he honours the one fearing the LORD* (Ps 15:4). [9:2] *The fear of the LORD surpasses all* (Sir 25:11). [9:3] *Fear God, and keep his commandments because this is the whole of humanity* (Qoh 12:13). [9:4] *Do not be jealous of wicked people* (Ps 37:1). [9:5] *Do not fear when humans are wealthy* (Ps 49:16). [9:6] *All flesh is grass, and all human honour is as the flowers of the grass* (Isa 40:7). [9:7] For we hear this and such great things everyday, yet we are nailed to the earth. [9:8] And just like ignorant children continually learning the basic principles, whenever he is separately quizzed about their order, they say one thing instead of another causing much laughter. Thus, it is with you, whenever we quiz you here on the same order, you follow us in every way whatsoever, but when we ask you when you are dispersed what is first and what is the second of the matter and how to properly put things into order, and what goes with what you do not know what to say. You become the object of ridicule. [9:9] Tell me, is thinking on immortality and the good, which the eye has not seen, nor which the ear has heard, nor which has entered into the human heart, a great joke[14] **(363)** to be contentious about the things here, and to consider them enviable? For if it is still necessary for you to learn this, that wealth is nothing great, that the present things are a shadow and a dream,

[14] Γέλωτος. LSJ suggest it is a probably a falsa lector for γελοῖος.

that it dissolves in the way of smoke and flies away. Then, stand outside the inner sanctuary, remain in the gateway, for you are not yet worthy of entering into the heavenly Kingdom.[15] [9:10] For if you do not know how to distinguish their natures, which ones are short lived and constantly changing, when are you going to be able to despise them? But if you say you do know, cease to be busybodies, and stop wasting your time on why it is that such a one is rich and why such a one is poor. [9:11] For you do this when questioning these things, like whenever you go around inquiring why in the world it is that such a one is white and why another is black, or why such a one is hooked-nosed and another is flat-nosed. [9:12] For even these things are not different for us, whether he may have thus or thus, so neither is to be poor nor to be rich, even more so than those things. For everything is from the manner of its employment. [9:13] Even if you are a poor worker, you are able to live cheerfully with philosophy. And even if you are rich, you can be more wretched than everyone if you are avoiding virtue. [9:14] For the important way for us is this: that of virtue, which if this is not added to us, there is no other advantage. [9:15] Because of this you will continue to ask these questions seeing that the majority consider the unimportant things to be important, but they do not give any thought of the really important things. [9:16] For the important thing to us is this: virtue and philosophy. [9:17] Therefore, now living far off and at length, from this is the confusion of reason, there are many waves, there is a storm. [9:18] For when they fall from that higher honour and from the heavenly love, desiring the present honour, they become slaves and prisoners. [9:19] One asks, 'and how have we desired this?' From not greatly desiring that one. 'But how does this very thing happen?' From laziness. 'And how is it laziness?' From despising it. 'And how is it being despised?' From folly and from clinging to the present things, and not desiring to investigate the nature of things with precision. [9:20] 'And again, how does this very thing happen?' From neither being devoted to reading the scriptures, nor keeping company with holy men,[16] and by pursuing the gathering of wicked people. [9:21] Therefore, so that this might not always be, so causing wave after wave **(364)** to receive and lead us off into the wicked sea and so altogether to drown and destroy us, while there is time let us be raised, standing upon the rock. I am speaking of the decrees and arguments of God, let us look down on the swelling sea of this present life. [9:22] For thus we may escape this, and we may draw up others suffering shipwreck, we may attain to the future good, through the grace and mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ, to whom be honour into the ages, amen.

[15] ἄνω Βασίλεια.

[16] Probably a reference to monks.

APPENDIX 2: HOMILY 35

(F:434)[1:1] *Pursue love, but seek the spiritual gifts, and more so that you may prophesy* (1 Cor 14:1).

[1:2] For since he accurately recites to them all the virtues of love and he advises them to remain clinging to it with eagerness, so he says *pursue*. [1:3] For the pursuer only sees what is being pursued and he aims towards it and does not give up until he has caught it. [1:4] Whenever the pursuer is not able to restrain the one fleeing by himself, he quickly calls those nearby to restrain and guard it, holding it down until he arrives. [1:5] Now we must also do this, whenever we ourselves do not overtake love, let us call out to those nearby to restrain it until we arrive to it. Next, whenever we have taken hold, we must no longer let go of it, so that it will not escape us again. [1:6] For it is constantly leaping away from us because we do not have it correctly, rather we honour everything other than it. [1:7] So, we must do everything to accurately restrain it.[1] [1:8] For if this is accomplished, we will have no more hard labour to do, and nothing more to obtain, but we will be living in luxury and celebrating festivals as we walk on the narrow path of virtue. [1:9] This is why he says *pursue it*. [1:10] Next, so that you will not believe he introduces this discussion on love to cancel the spiritual gifts he continues, saying, *but seek the spiritual gifts, and especially that you may prophesy. For the one talking in foreign speech does not talk to humans, but to God. For the spirit is speaking secrets, but no one understands. However, the one prophesying speaks to edify,* **(F:435)** *encourage, and comfort humans* (1 Cor 14:1–3). [1:11] Now here he makes a comparison of God's gifts and attacks that one of foreign speech showing it neither altogether useless nor as exceedingly beneficial by itself. [1:12] For they[2] were very proud about this because they believed it to be a great gift. [1:13] And they believed it to be great because the Apostles received it first and were often displaying it. [1:14] It was not, however, more valuable than the others. [1:15] For what reason, then, did the apostles receive it before other? Because they were destined to go abroad everywhere. [1:16] And just as in the time of building the tower[3] the one language was split into all of them. Thus, then, the many languages were often in one human, and he spoke articulately in Persian, in Roman, in Indian, and in many other languages. The spirit in

[1] The *NPNF* text interprets this opening section as talking about chasing a fugitive, overcoming, and capturing him. However, the illustration is more representative of a hunter chasing a wild animal. Chrysostom is using wordplay on διώκω: pursue love as a hunter (διωκων) pursues prey. Love is portrayed here as a deer, which leaps away from the hunter if it is able. Love is not likely to be portrayed as a criminal to capture, but as wild game to capture.

[2] The Corinthians

[3] πυργοποιϊας – building of the tower, i.e. The Tower of Babel.

him taught vocally,[4] so the gift was called the gift of foreign speech because he was suddenly able to speak many languages. [1:17] See, therefore, how he also attacks and exalts. [1:18] When saying, *the one speaking in foreign speech does not talk to humans but to God, for no one understands*, he attacks it, proving it was not greatly useful. And when introducing how the Spirit speaks mysteries, again he elevates it, so you will not imagine it to be superfluous, unprofitable, and given in vain. [1:19] *However, the one prophesying speaks to edify, encourage, and comfort humans*. [1:20] See he shows how exceptional this gift is from its common benefit, and why is the profit of many given this special honour everywhere? [1:21] Tell me, do not these speak to humans? But this is not so much to edify, encourage, nor to comfort. [1:22] Therefore, being possessed under the Spirit is common to both the one prophesying and to the one speaking in foreign speech, but to this one, I speak of the one prophesying, has the advantage as it is also profitable to the hearers. [1:23] But of the ones speaking in foreign speech, no one without the gift understands them. Why? Did they even edify anyone? 'Yes,' he says, 'only themselves,' which is why he adds, *the one speaking in foreign speech edifies himself* (1 Cor 14:4). [1:24] But how if he does not know what he says? Right now, he is lecturing about those who know what is being said. They themselves know but do not understand how to disclose it to others. [1:25] But the **(F:436)** one prophesying edifies the congregation. [1:26] In the same way the difference between one person and the congregation is great, the same is the difference between these. [1:27] See his wisdom, how he in no way excludes the gift but shows that it truly has some gain, albeit little, and can satisfy only the one who possesses it.

[2:1] Next, so that they will not imagine he attacks the foreign speech through envy, actually the majority had this gift, he says this to amend their suspicion, *I desire you all to speak in foreign speech, but more that you may prophesy* (1 Cor 14:5). [2:2] For prophesying is greater if speaking foreign languages is without an interpreter, so that the congregation may received edification. [2:3] The words "more" and "greater" do not show opposition but outperformance.[5] [2:4] Therefore, as it is clear he does not slander the gift, rather he leads them towards the better one, displaying both his care for them and a way of life, which is free from all envy. [2:5] For he does not say two or three, but *I desire all of you to speak in foreign speech*, and not this only but also to prophesy. And this one much more than the former because prophesying is greater. [2:6] For since he arranged and exhibited it, what remains then is to display it not without reserve but with assistance, for he adduces "if it is without an interpreter." Thus, if he is able to do this, I say to the interpreter, "he has become equal to the prophet," he says, "since many have enjoyed the profit from it." So, there is a greater need to carefully observe how throughout all this he seeks this before others.[6] [2:7] *But now brothers if I come to you speaking foreign speech, how will I benefit you unless I speak to you, whether in revelation, or in knowledge, or in the prophecy, or in teaching* (1 Cor 14:6)? "And why

---

[4] ἐνηχουντος

[5] Not of ἐναντίων but of ὑπερεχόντων. Not that prophecy and foreign speech are opposite, but prophecy outranks foreign speech at edifying.

[6] πρὸ τῶν ἄλλων – returning to an earlier world play. The Corinthians thought foreign speech was των αλλων, but the Apostles only received it first (των αλλων), the Apostles denoted by Paul seek the common benefit των αλλων. Thus, if the Corinthians and his own church wishes to emulate the Apostles, they should seek the common benefit first.

am I talking," he says, "of the others?" for even if Paul is the one uttering foreign speech, there will be no advantage to those listening. [2:8] But he speaks, showing that he is seeking their benefit. Not hating the one who has the gift, nor anyone else at any rate, he pleads before his friend's face, showing its unprofitableness. [2:9] And he always instructs on the vulgar before his friends' face, as he said at the beginning of his letter, *who is Paul, and who is Apollos, and who is Cephas?* So, he does here, saying I will not be profitable to you *unless I speak to you, whether in revelation, or in knowledge, or in the prophetic, or in* **(F:437)** *teaching.* [2:10] And what he says, is this: "if I cannot speak words, which you are easily able to understand, nor am able to make it clear, but only demonstrate that I have the gift of foreign speech, speech which you do not understand, you will depart without gaining anything. [2:11] For how is that possible from the sound, which you do not understand?

[3:1] After all, inanimate objects give a sound, whether the pipe or the lyre. If they cannot give distinction to their sound how will it be known what is being played? [3:2] "And why am I saying," he says, "that this is not profitable to us, but the clear and easily understood to the hearers is beneficial?" [3:3] For this is even something which is seen in inanimate musical instruments. [3:4] For whether it be a pipe or a lyre if it has no rhythm nor proper stringing but is being played and breathed indiscriminately and without reserve, it will by no means attract those listening. [3:5] For even in these inarticulate noises there is need of some distinctness, which if it is not struck nor breathed on the pipe according to the craft nothing has been produced. [3:6] But if in inanimate things we require so much clearness, harmony, and separation and if we strive and are meticulous[7] in all these unintelligible utterances to inspire significance, it is more necessary in human life and reason to give clarity to the spiritual gifts. [3:7] *For if the trumpet gives an uncertain sound, who will get ready for battle* (1 Cor 14:8)? For he leads from the superfluous towards the indispensable and more useful argument, and he says that it is not upon the lyre only, but this result is also seen on the trumpet. [3:8] For in it there are rhythms and indeed sometimes it creates a sound for battle, and at other times it does not. And sometimes indeed it leads for marshalling, and at others it signals retreat, and if someone does not know this they are in the greatest danger. [3:9] Thus, when the trumpet is clear and indicating harm he says, 'who will get ready for battle?' But not having this all will be ruined. [3:10] And why does he say this to us? It is especially true of you, which is why he adds, *Thus also in you, if you do not give a clear message through your speech, you will be speaking to air* (1 Cor 14:9). [3:11] That is to say, uttering to no one, speaking to no one, and **(F:438)** showing its unprofitableness everywhere.

[4:1] One asks, "but if it is unprofitable why was it given?" So as to be useful to the one receiving it, and if it is likely to be useful to others, an interpreter is necessary. [4:2] And he says this, gathering them towards one another so that the one without the gift of interpretation may take another having it and he may produce a profit through him. [4:3] Therefore, he everywhere shows its incompleteness so that he may bind them together. [4:4] At any rate he does not praise it like the one believing it to satisfy in itself, so destroying it, not permitting it to shine brightly through the interpretation. [4:5]

[7] φιλονεικουμεν

For the gift is good and necessary, only when it has one clarifying what is being spoken. [4:6] Forasmuch as the finger is indispensable, when it is removed from the rest the same finger is not longer useful. And the trumpet is necessary, but when its noise is unclear it is damaging. [4:7] For neither is craft revealed when no material is allocated to it, nor does a thing form without being placed in its shape. [4:8] Therefore, assume the sound is the material and the distinctness is the form, which if it is not present, it is not helpful for the matter. [4:9] *There are, it may be, so many kinds of languages in the world and none of them are without speakers* (1 Cor 14:10). [4:10] That is to say so many languages, so many to speak: Scythian, Thracian, Roman, Persian, Maurian, Indian, Egyptian, and innumerable other nations. [4:11] *If therefore, I do not know the meaning of the language, I will be a foreigner to the one speaking* (1 Cor 14:11). [4:12] "For do not then believe that this happens only to us," he says, "but rather this can be seen taking place everywhere." [4:13] I do not say this to slander the sound but to show that it is unprofitable to me as long as it is unknown. [4:14] Next, so that he does not make the accusation damaging he equals the accusation saying, "he will be to me a foreigner and I to them." Not from the nature of the sound, but from our ignorance. [4:15] Do you see how by small steps he leads them upon the familiar subject? It is his custom to do so, to tear down the illustration from afar and to establish the issue properly. [4:16] For since he spoke about the pipe and the lyre where it is mostly inferior and unprofitable, he has now come to the trumpet, a more useful thing, then from there he also comes to the remaining sounds. [4:17] So also earlier, when he was lecturing about the proof, that it was not forbidden for the Apostles to receive it, beginning first with the farmers, shepherds, and **(F:439)** soldiers, he then continues the argument to one that is closer to what is being set before them: the priests, the ones in the past. [4:18] But you, I am speaking, examine how he is diligent everywhere to give the gift relief from the accusations and to narrow the complaint against the one receiving it. [4:19] For he does not say, "I will be a foreigner," but "a foreigner to the one speaking." [4:20] And again, he does not say, "the foreigner will be the one speaking," but "the one speaking is a foreigner to me."

[5:1] Therefore, one asks, "what is necessary to happen? For one ought not attack it only, but to also recommend and teach it." And he certainly does this. [5:2] For since he accused and rebuked and showed its unprofitableness, thus, he now advises saying, *So you, since you are admiring the spiritual, search for the edification of the congregation so you may have a surplus* (1 Cor 14:12). [5:3] See his aim everywhere, how he continually looks through everything for one purpose: the advantage for the most people. Does the congregation profit from placing this down as a rule? But he does not say, "so you may acquire the gifts," rather "so you may have a surplus," that is to say, "so you all may have them in abundance. [5:4] I do not greatly desire to keep you from having them, rather, I desire you to grow more abundantly in them, only that you manage them for the common advantage." [5:5] And he asks, "how is it that this is to be done?" He adds this saying, *which is why the one speaking in foreign speech should pray so that he may interpret*. [5:6] *For if I pray in a foreign language, my spirit is praying but my mind is without fruit. So, what do I do? I will pray in the spirit and I will pray also with the mind, I will sing praises in the spirit and also sing praises with the mind* (1 Cor 14:13–15). [5:7] He shows here it is in them to receive the gift. [5:8] "For I will pray," he says, that is to say, "let him contribute for himself." For if you earnestly

request it, you will receive it. [5:9] Therefore, do not ask to only have the gift of foreign speech but also to interpret so that you will be useful to everyone, and so that you will not shut the gift up within yourself alone. [5:10] "For if I will pray in foreign languages," he says, "my spirit is praying, but my mind is without fruit." [5:11] See how he continues the argument little by little, showing how such a person is useless to others and also to himself. At any rate, how can the mind [profit] without fruit? For if he utters something only in the Persian language, or something in another one, and does not know what he says, **(F:440)** then he will remain a foreigner to himself and not only to others because he does not know the meaning of the language. [5:12] For there were many ancient people who had the gift of prayer with foreign speech. And truly they prayed, and the language was uttered, the sound of their prayer was in Persian or Roman, but the mind did not know what was said. [5:13] Which is why he said, "if I pray in a foreign language my spirit is praying," that is to say the gift given to me also changes my language, "but my mind is without fruit." [5:14] Therefore, what then is the best and most helpful? And how ought one to act or what is to be asked from God? To pray both with the spirit, that is to say the gift, and with knowledge. [5:15] This is why he says, "I will pray in the spirit and I will also pray in the mind, I will sing praises in the spirit and I will also sing praises in the mind."

[6:1] Again here he plainly shows the foreign language can be spoken, and the mind may not be ignorant of what is being said. [6:2] For if this is not so, there will be another confusion. [6:3] *For if you give thanks,* he says, *in the spirit, how will the common people filling this place say amen after your thanksgiving since what you said is not known? Indeed, you have given thanks beautifully, but the others are not edified* (1 Cor 14:16–17). [6:4] Here again he contemplates how to bring the stone to the measuring line, searching everywhere for the edification of the congregation. [6:5] And he talks about the common person, the layperson, and proves that he suffers no small penalty when he is unable to say the amen. [6:6] And what he says is this, "when you give thanks in a foreign language, the laity do not know what you are saying, nor are able to interpret, nor are able to respond to the amen." [6:7] For not understanding the "forever and ever," which is at the end, they are not able to say "amen." [6:8] Yet he again reassures this, so that he might not greatly reduce the glory of the gift, which he continues to speak on from earlier, that he speaks mysteries, and he speaks to God, and he encourages himself, and that he prays in the Spirit, he intends no small encouragement from these. This he also does here, saying, "indeed, you give thanks beautifully." For you may speak, being moved by the Spirit, but that one does not understand, nor knows what is being said. He stands without receiving any benefit.

[7:1] Next, because he assaulted the ones having this gift, as not having acquired something great, so they may not suppose they are being defrauded of it if he reduces it, see what he says, *I give thanks to God that I speak in foreign languages more than all of you* (1 Cor 14:18). [7:2] And he also does **(F:441)** this elsewhere. [7:3] So, to cleanse the advantage of Judaism and to show that now it is nothing, he declares that he had it first and with excess gain, and then he calls it loss, thus saying, *if anyone expects to have confidence in the flesh, I have more*. [7:4] *Circumcised on the eight day, being from Israel of the tribe of Benjamin, a Hebrew from Hebrews, a Pharisee according to the law, persecuting the congregations according to zeal, being blameless according to*

righteousness, the one in the law (Phil 3:4–7). [7:5] And then that he had demonstrated having all the advantages, he says, *but whatever was gain to me, this I consider loss because of the Christ*. [7:6] Thus, he also does here, saying, "I speak in foreign language more than all of you. Therefore, do not be greatly arrogant as if you alone have the gift, for I also possess it, and more than you." [7:7] *But I desire to speak five words in the presence of the congregation through my understanding, so that I might instruct others* (1 Cor 14:19). [7:8] What is, "to speaks through my understanding so that I might instruct others?" It is "understanding what I am saying," and "able both to interpret others and to speak with intelligence, and to teach those listening." [7:9] Rather than "countless words in foreign speech." [7:10] Why is this? "so that I might instruct others," he says. [7:11] For the one has but exhibition only, but the other helps the many. [7:12] For what he seeks everywhere is this: the common benefit. [7:13] And yet the gift, the one of foreign speech, was unfamiliar, but the one of prophecy was familiar, ancient, and by this time was given to many, and then this was first, but all the same he did not greatly desire it. [7:14] Therefore, he did not use it, not because he did not have it, but because he sought the more useful things. [7:15] For he was free from all conceitedness and looking for one thing only, how he will improve those listening.

[8:1] And on this account, he is able to look for the useful thing, both for himself and for others since he is set free from empty praise. Indeed, the one who is enslaved is not able to perceive the benefit, not only for others, but not even for himself. [8:2] Such was Simon Magus, who because he looked for empty praise was not able to look for his own profit. Such also were the Jews, who through this freely gave up their own salvation to the Deceiver. [8:3] Here idols were born, and by the worthless judgements of outside[8] philosophers they were urged on from these and ran aground from madness. [8:4] So, observe the perversion of the passion! [8:5] How **(F:442)** because of this some became poor, while others were eager for wealth. [8:6] The tyrant has so much of it as to prevail against the opposition. [8:7] Indeed, one thinks conceitedly upon self–control, and again another upon adultery, and this one upon righteousness, and another upon unrighteousness, and upon luxuries, and upon fasting, and upon reasonableness, and upon over-confidence, and upon riches, and upon poverty. [8:8] For some from outside, being present to receive, did not receive through their amazement.[9] [8:9] But the Apostles were not like this. [8:10] For they were pure from empty praise as was seen through what they did. [8:11] For when they called them gods and were getting ready to slay a wreathed bull to sacrifice to them, they did not simply forbid what was being done only but they also tore their own clothes. [8:12] And when they set the lame man upright before them, they all gaped. He said, *why are you looking intently as though we were able to make this man walk by our own power* (Acts 14:5)? And in fact, among the men honouring poverty, they chose poverty but among humans who are despising poverty they also applauded wealth. [8:13] And, if they received anything, they supplied the needy [with it]. Thus, they did not do anything through conceit but accomplished everything through kind–heartedness, but on the contrary these ones did everything, as though being enemies and corrupters of our common nature. Thus, they do such things.

---

[8] ἔξωθεν -outside (maybe self-reliant)

[9] In reference to those outside the house at Pentecost who were jeering at the Apostles but did not receive the gift of languages themselves.

[8:14] For the one threw everything of his into the sea without purpose and without reason, imitating the delirious and the enraged[10] and elsewhere let all of his land become a sheep pasture.[11] [8:15] They did everything through their love of honour. [8:16] But not these ones, because they were accepting of what was given to them and distributed it to the needy with all freedom and even lived with continual hunger. [8:17] But if they were grateful for glory, they would not have done this, the receiving and distributing. They were cautious so that no suspicion might arise against them. [8:18] For the one who throws away his own glory, he will more greatly not accept it from others, as not to appear to need others, nor be suspicious. [8:19] But see them serving and begging for the needy. They were more tender-loving than any father.

[9:1] And contemplate their moderate instructions, they are free from conceit. [9:2] *For having*, he says, *covering and food let us be content for these* (1 Tim 6:8). [9:3] Not like the Sinopean,[12] that one who was clothed in rages and his house was a wine–jar, for no good end, indeed he astounded many but benefited no one. [9:4] **(F:443)** But truly Paul did none of these things for he did not look for distinction, but he was both clothed with graceful clothing and continually lived in a house, and displayed every other virtue with rigid discipline, which The Cynic[13] despised, living extravagantly and publicly disgracing himself, and being dragged down by his madness for glory. [9:5] For if someone inquired of the motive for living in a wine–jar, he will find no other reason than conceit alone [9:6] But Paul even paid rent for the house he stayed in at Rome. [9:7] And indeed the one who was able to do everything more vigorously is much more able to do all of this. [9:8] But he did not look for glory, that dangerous beast, that horrific demon, that corruption of the world, that venomous viper. [9:9] For just like that beast, which tears through its parent's womb with its claws, so does this passion tear through the one giving it birth.

[10:1] Therefore, where will anyone find the medicine to this diversified disease? [10:2] They bring forward the ones who have trampled on it in its midst and who are looking at their own image, so that they may direct their own life. [10:3] For even the Patriarch, Abraham, but do not accuse me of repeating what I have already said if I mention him frequently and on every occasion. [10:4] For this shows that he is all the more wonderful and deprives them that do not emulate him from every excuse. [10:5] For if we show the accomplishment of someone's portion in this and another's portion in that, someone might say that it is hard to be successful in virtue. For it is not easy to be satisfied together in these perfections, but each of the saints have obtained their portion. [10:6] But whenever they find someone having all, what defense they have made, who being after the law and grace are not able to come first in measure when compared with those before the law and grace? How therefore, did this Patriarch prevail and conquer this beast when he had a dispute with his nephew? [10:7] For even being disadvantaged and failing to obtain the first quality he was not grieved. [10:8] But you know that in

---

[10] Crates. See: *op. cit.* vi. 87. *NPNF* reads: Aristippus. See Horace, *Satires*, *Epistles*, *Art of Poetry* 100; Cicero. *On Invention*, 58.

[11] Crates. See: *op. cit.* vi. 87. *NPNF* reads: Democritus. See Horace, *Satires*, *Epistles*, *Art of Poetry* 12.

[12] Diogenes the Cynic

[13] Diogenes Again

these things the shame is worse than the loss to the mean–spirited, and it is more so when the one having all the power, just as Abraham had, first shows honour yet does not receive honour in return. [10:9] But, nevertheless, none of these things were able to sting him but he even acquiesced to have the second place and the old man was wronged by the youth. He, the uncle by the nephew, was not displeased **(F:444)** nor annoyed, but he loved him the same as always and provided for him. [10:10] Again he conquered in that great and fearful battle and with power he drove the foreigners away not giving a military parade in victory, nor erecting a monument, for he only desired to save not to make an exhibition. [10:11] Again, he received strangers and he was not conceited here but he also ran towards them and prostrated himself, not as producing his goodness but as having good done to him, and he calls them masters not knowing who they were when they had arrived, even presenting his wife in the arrangement of a handmaid. [10:12] And also in Egypt before this time, there he appeared in such an extraordinary way and he received back this very same wife and he enjoyed so much honour as he did not show her off before anyone. But even the inhabitants were calling him royalty and he gave a down payment for the tomb. [10:13] And when he sent to seek a wife in marriage, he did not command him to speak greatly and brilliantly to the youth, but merely to bring the bride.

[11:1] Will you observe those who are under grace when the glory of the teaching was great on every side, wandering around them, and will you then see this passion being cast out? Consider, I pray, this Apostle who is saying this, how always he attributes everything to God, how he even persists in recalling all of his faults but never his virtuous actions unless in the case when it is needful to correct the disciples. And when he is compelled to do this, he calls the occurrence folly, and he yields the first place to Peter, and is not ashamed to be working with Priscilla and Aquila, and is everywhere eager to show himself lowly, not swaggering into the markets, nor carrying the crowds around with him, but assimilating himself among the insignificant. [11:2] Therefore he also said, *but the substance of his body is weak* (2 Cor 10:10), that is to say, is easy to despise and does not have any refinement. And again, *I am praying for you, so that you may not do anything evil, so that we may not appear to be distinguished* (2 Cor 13:7). [11:3] So why marvel if he is contempt of this glory? For he shows contempt for the glory from above and of the kingdom and of Gehenna for the sake of considering Christ. For he also prays to be accursed from Christ for the glory of Christ, for he also says he is even willing to suffer on behalf of the Jews, he speaks on account of this: that no one without understanding might not suppose to attain to the offers, those being made to them. If, therefore, he is ready to overtake this, why marvel if he shows disdain for human things?

[12:1] But now these are altogether **(F:445)** overwhelmed, not only by the desire for glory but additionally by insolence and fear of dishonour. [12:2] For, should anyone praise you it would puff you up. If anyone should blame you it would make you depressed. [12:3] And just as the weak bodies are under the chance of being injured, so are the souls that grovel on the ground. [12:4] For in such a way, not only poverty but also wealth kills, not only grief but also joy, and the prosperity is greater than the adversity. [12:5] For poverty truly compels one to be moderate, but wealth often leads someone into greater evil. [12:6] And just as those with fevers are displeased with

everything, so are those with corrupted souls struck from every side. [12:7] Therefore, knowing this, we do not flee from poverty nor admire wealth, but we prepare the soul to be competent in all things. [12:8] For when someone is building a house, he does not consider either the rain that pours down upon it nor the sunlight, which comes, for this is unmanageable, but how it is made capable to bear all things. [12:9] And the one building a ship does not produce or build in any such way as to stop the waves from dashing against it, nor from the storm rising in the sea, for even that is also unmanageable, but how he might make the sides of the ship ready for all things. [12:10] And again the one taking care of the body does not consider this, how it may not have any irregular temperature,[14] but how the body easily bears all things. [12:11] So, therefore, let us also act upon the soul. Let us not be anxious to flee from poverty, nor seek how we may become rich but how each one may conduct himself in all of these for our own safety. [12:12] Therefore, let us leave this and let us construct the soul to be competent, both in wealth and in poverty. [12:13] For even if no tragedy, that might happen to humans, occurs, which is impossible, better is the one not seeking wealth but knows to easily bear all things than always desiring wealth. [12:14]Why is this? First because such a person has safety from within, but the other from outside. [12:15] And just as the one who has confidence in the strength of his body and skill in fighting is a better soldier than the one who only has strong armour, so too is the one having confidence in wealth worse than the one who has a strong defense from virtue. [12:16] Secondly, though it might be possible **(F:446)** not to fall into poverty it is impossible to be unafflicted, for wealth has many billows and troubles. [12:17] But not virtue, it only has pleasure and safety. [12:18] For it even leaves unconquered by those who lay traps for it, but on the contrary wealth is always easy to attack and conquer. [12:19] And just as among animals, the deer and rabbit are most of all easy to overcome because of their natural cowardice, but the wild boar, and the bull, and the lion will not fall into those who recklessly lay traps, and certainly one can see this in the case of the wealthy and among the ones who are willingly living in poverty. [12:20] For truly one is like the lion and the bull, but the other like the deer and rabbit. [12:21] For which rich man is not anxious? Are there not thieves? Are there not rulers? Are there not slanderers? Are there not secret agents? And why do I speak of thieves and secret agents? Truly, he is always suspicious of his own household.

[13:1] And why do I talk of life? Not even in death is he free from the villainy of thieves, nor is death able to vigilantly keep him safe but the evildoers loot the corpse. Thus, wealth is a dangerous thing. [13:2] Now, not only do they dig into houses, but they also break into graves and tombs. [13:3] What can be more wretched than this, since not even death can supply this amnesty? But the wretched body, that is deprived of life, is not afforded the freedom from the evils in life. Those that commit these evil acts press on to make war with dust and ashes and make it much more grievous than when he lived. [13:4] For then[15] indeed entering into the chamber, they really will remove the boxes, but keep away from the body and not take so much as to strip the body naked. But now not even the defiled hands of these grave robbers will keep away, but they will move the body around and turn it over and they will mock it most crudely. [13:5] For

[14] ἀέρων

[15] Speaking about a living person being robbed.

even after it has been put to the ground, from there having been stripped both of its covering and from what clothes it had on, thus they leave it to be thrown out. [13:6] So, who is such an enemy as wealth, ruining the life of the living, and not even assenting for them to be buried in the ground? Which is common even of the condemned, and of them who are caught in shameful deeds. [13:7] For even they, the lawgivers, having demanded the punishment of death, investigate no further. However, this wealth, after demanding **(F:447)** the most bitter punishment of death, displays the stripped and unburied body, a terrible and pitiful spectacle. [13:8] For even compared with those who are suffering from the vote and from the anger of the judges, these suffer more harshly than they. [13:9] For indeed these ones remain unburied on the first and second day, then are buried in the ground, but these, when committed to the ground, then they are stripped naked and mocked. [13:10] But if the thieves depart without taking the coffin, it is no longer thanks to wealth but in this case to poverty, for it guards it. If we had truly entrusted it to wealth, leaving it to build from stone it forged from gold, we even lose this. [13:11] Thus, wealth is a faithless thing and not only for those who have it, but also to those who are attempting to seize it. [13:12] So, this is a useless argument, being eager to show that wealth is irresistible when they do not happen to have this security even in the day of their death. [13:13] And indeed who not reconciled with the departed, whether to the beasts, or whether to demonic spirits, or whether anything else? For even the sight is enough to bend even the one who is completely like iron and ruthless. [13:14] When, you know this someone sees a corpse, whether he sees it is of his public rival or an enemy, he weeps for him as for his dearest friend. And truly his wrath is dispelled with life, and mercy is brought in. [13:15] And no one is able to distinguish who an enemy is and who is not during the time of mourning and carrying out the body for burial. Thus, how much they have reverence for the common nature and the customs introduced about it. [13:16] But wealth does not obtain this, it does not give up its wrath to those who have been put to death, but it appoints them enemies of death, who have not been wronged. Indeed, the dead body being stripped naked is very bitter and hostile. [13:17] And truly nature can reconcile his enemies to it then, but wealth goes to war with those to whom there is no blame, and cruelly treats the body in its utter desolation. [13:18] And further there are many things being able to attract someone to compassion, it being a dead body, motionless, the fact that it is going into the ground and ashes, and with the neglect of someone to help it. [13:19] But not even these are able to soften those rogues because of the tyranny from those worthless desires. [13:20] For the passion of the love of money, like some cruel tyrant over us, is cheering on those inhuman demands and makes them wild beasts and **(F:448)** so is leading them into tombs. [13:21] For like beasts attacking the dead they do not even abstain from flesh, if supposing any limb is useful to them. [13:22] Such is our enjoyment of wealth, being mocked even after death and being deprived of tombs, which even the boldest of the dying criminals get to enjoy.

[14:1] Are we still then affectionate towards it, tell me, to such an enemy? No! I appeal to you, no, brothers, but let us flee without turning back, and when it comes into our hands let us not horde it inside but let us fasten it to the hands of the poor. [14:2] For these chains are greatly able to hold it and from these treasuries it will nevermore escape, and so this faithless one remains forever faithful, subdued, and tame because the right hand of alms is doing this. [14:3] Therefore, even if it actually comes to us let us

give it away, but if it does not come let us not seek it, nor be anxious about ourselves, nor deem those having it as happy. [14:4] For what is this happiness? Nothing except saying that those who are fighting with beasts are to be envied because those costly beasts are shut in and under guard by those who set such games for themselves. Indeed, they do not desire to approach to touch them, but being distressed and trembling with fear because of them hand them over to others. [14:5] For something like this also happens to the wealthy as shutting up all of their wealth in their treasuries like a savage beast and receiving millions of wounds from it day by day, this is opposite to the beasts. [14:6] For when you lead them out only then will they inflict injury on those approaching them, but this when it is shut up and is being preserved then it destroys those acquiring it and guarding it. [14:7] But let us make this beast tame. [14:8] And it will be tame, not when we shut it up but when we bring it into the hands of the needy. [14:9] And thus, we will hence reap the greatest good living both in the present life with security and a useful hope and standing with frankness in the day that is coming, which all of us are able to attain to through the grace and mercy of our Lord Jesus Christ, whom together with the Father and the Holy and Good Spirit be glory into the ages, amen.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alföldy, Géza. *The Social History of Rome*. Translated by David Braund and Frank Pollock. Ancient Society and History. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1988.

Allen, Pauline. "Introduction" In *John Chrysostom, Homilies on Paul's Letter to the Philippians*, edited by Pauline Allen, xi–xxxiv. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2013.

———. "Rationales for Episcopal Letter-Collections in Late Antiquity." In *Collecting Early Christian Letters: From the Apostle Paul to Late Antiquity*, edited by Browen Neil and Pauline Allen, loc 778–1365. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015. Kindle edition.

Ameringer, Thomas E. "The Stylistic Influence of the Second Sophistic on the Panegyrical Sermons of St. John Chrysostom: A Study in Greek Rhetoric." PhD diss., Catholic University of America, 1921.

Astruc-Morize, Gilberte, and Alain Le Boulluec. "Le sens cache des Écritures selon Jean Chrysostome et Origène." *Studia Patristica* 25 (1993) 1–26.

Atherstone, Andrew, et al., eds. *Transatlantic Charismatic Renewal, c.1950–2000*. Global Pentecostal and Charismatic Studies 41. Leiden: Brill, 2021.

Augustine, "Concerning Faith of Things not Seen." Translated by C. L. Cornish. In *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, edited by Philip Schaff. 28 vols. 1890–1990. 1887. Reprint, Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2012.

Auxentios, Hieromonk. "The Notion of Rhetoric in the Eastern Orthodox Patristic Tradition." *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 34 (1989) 45–58.

Ayres, Lewis. *Nicaea and its Legacy: An Approach to Fourth-Century Trinitarian Theology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Baán, István. "L'aspect pneumatologique de la vie morale du chrétien selon Jean Chrysostome." *Augustinianum* 37 (1997) 327–31.

Bae, Junghun. “John Chrysostom on Almsgiving and the Therapy of the Soul.” PhD diss., Australian Catholic University, 2018.

Bansah, Confidence Worlanyo. “Is Speaking in Tongues Real Today? An African Christian Perspective.” *Journal of Biblical Theology* 3 (2020) 146–52.

Barclay, John M. G. “The Gift and its Perfections: A Response to Joel Marcus and Margaret Mitchell.” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 39 (2017) 331–44.

———. *Paul & the Gift*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2015.

Barkhuizen, Jan H. “John Chrysostom, *Homily 50* on Matthew 14:23–36 (*PG* 58, 503–510). A Perspective on his Homiletic Art.” *Acta Classica* 38 (1995) 43–56.

Batten, Alicia J. *Friendship and Benefaction in James*. Emory Studies in Early Christianity. Dorset, UK: Deo, 2010.

Baur, Chrysostomus. *John Chrysostom and his Time*. Translated by Sr. M. Gonzaga. 2 vols. Westminster, MD: Newman, 1959.

Bebis, George S. “Saint John Chrysostom: On Materialism and Christian Virtue.” *Greek Orthodox Review* 32 (1987) 227–37.

Benevich, Grigory. “Spirit, Soul and Letter: on the exegesis of Maximus the confessor and John Chrysostom.” *Studi sull’Oriente Cristiano* 15 (2011) 41–55.

Bizzell, Patricia, and Bruce Herzberg, eds. *The Rhetorical Tradition: Readings from Classical Times to the Present*. 2nd ed. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin’s, 2001.

Boersma, Hans. *Scripture as Real Presence: Sacramental Exegesis in the Early Church*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2017.

Bowes, Kim. *Private Worship, Public Values, and Religious Change in Late Antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Broc-Schmezer, Catherine. “Théologie et Philosophie en Prédication: Le cas de Jean Chrysostome.” *Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques* 97 (2013) 187–212.

Burgess, Stanley M. *The Holy Spirit: Ancient Christian Traditions*. 1984. Reprint, Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994.

Busenitz, Nathan. “The Gift of Tongues: Comparing the Church Fathers with Contemporary Pentecostalism.” *The Master’s Seminary Journal* 17 (2006) 61–78.

Bucur, Bogdan G. “Condescension, Anticipation, Reciprocal Ecstasies: Theological Reflections on Early Christian Readings of Isaiah 6 and Daniel 3.” *Scottish Journal of Theology* 71 (2018) 425–40.

Butts, Aaron M. *Language Change in the Wake of Empire: Syriac in its Greco-Roman Context*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2016.

Cabouret, Bernadette. “Libanius’ *Letters*.” In *Libanius: A Critical Introduction*, edited by Lieve Van Hoof, 144–59. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

Cardman, Francine. “Poverty and Wealth as Theater: John Chrysostom’s Homilies on Lazarus and the Rich Man.” In *Wealth and Poverty in Early Church and Society*, edited by Susan R. Holman, 159–75. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008.

Carter, Robert E. “The Chronology of Saint John Chrysostom’s Early Life.” *Traditio* 18 (1962) 357–64.

Chase, Frederic Henry. *Chrysostom: A Study in the History of Biblical Interpretation*. Cambridge: Deighton, Bell, 1887.

Chrysostom, John. *The Homilies of Saint John Chrysostom Archbishop of Constantinople on the Epistles of Paul to the Corinthians*. Translated by Talbot W. Chambers. In *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, edited by Schaff, Philip, and Henry Wace. 28 vols. 1886–1889. 1889. Reprint, Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2012.

———. *Six Books on the Priesthood*. Translated by Rev. W. R. W. Stephens and Rev. T. P. Brandram. In *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, edited by Schaff, Philip, and Henry Wace. 28 vols. 1886–1889. 1889 Reprint, Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2012.

———. *St. John Chrysostom: Baptismal Instructions*. Translated by Paul W. Harkins. Ancient Christian Writers 31. New York: Newman, 1963.

———. *St. John Chrysostom: On the Incomprehensible Nature of God*. Translated by Paul W. Harkins. The Fathers of the Church: A New Translation 72. Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 1982.

Cicero. *On Invention. The Best Kind of Orator. Topics*. Translated by H. M. Hubbell. Loeb Classical Library 386. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1949.

Clapsis, Emmanuel. “The Dignity of the Poor and Almsgiving in St. John Chrysostom.” *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 56 (2011) 55–87.

Clark, Elizabeth. *The Origenist Controversy: The Cultural Construction of an Early Christian Debate*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992.

———. “Reading Asceticism: Exegetical Strategies in the Early Christian Rhetoric of Renunciation.” *Biblical Interpretation* 5 (1997) 82–105.

Clark, E. G. “Pastoral Care: Town and Country in Late-Antique Preaching.” In *Urban Centers and Rural Contexts in Late Antiquity*, edited by Thomas S. Burns and John W. Eadie, 265–84. East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 2001.

Cochran, Bradley R. “The Superiority of Faith: *John Chrysostom’s Eastern Theology of Justification*.” Unpublished Paper, Accessed: https://www.academia.edu/5610613/The_Superiority_of_Faith_John_Chrysostoms_Eastern%20Theology%20of%20Justification

Coleman, Simon. *The Globalisation of Charismatic Christianity: Spreading the Gospel of Prosperity*. Cambridge Studies in Ideology and Religion 12. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Coleman-Norton, P R. “St. Chrysostom and the Greek Philosophers.” *Classical Philology* 25 (1930) 305–17.

———. “St. Chrysostom’s Use of the Greek Poets.” *Classical Philology* 27 (1932) 213–21.

Cook, James D. ““Hear and Shudder!”: John Chrysostom’s Therapy of the Soul.” In *John Chrysostom: New Approaches, New Perspectives*, edited by Chris Len de Wet, and Wendy Mayer, 247–75. Critical Approaches to Early Christianity 1. Leiden: Brill, 2019.

———. “Preaching and Christianization: Reading the Sermons of John Chrysostom.” PhD diss., Oxford University, 2016.

Cribiore, Raffaella. *Libanius the Sophist: Rhetoric, Reality, and Religion in the Fourth Century*. Townsend Lectures/Cornell Studies in Classical Philology. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2013.

Diogenes Laertius. *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*. Translated by R. D. Hicks. 2 vols. Loeb Classical Library 184–85. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1925.

Dumitraşcu, Nicu. “Poverty and Wealth in the Orthodox Spirituality (with special reference to St. John Chrysostom).” *Dialog: A Journal of Theology* 49 (2010) 300–305.

———. “St. John Chrysostom and the Responsibility of a Free Conscience.” *Theology Today* 73 (2016) 230–40.

Engberg-Pedersen, Troels. *The Stoic Theory of Oikeiosis: Moral Development and Social Interaction in Early Stoic Philosophy*. Studies in Hellenistic Civilization II. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 1990.

Espinosa, Vanessa A. "Men Between Worlds: Aelius Aristides, Apuleius, Augustine, and Interdisciplinary Literature in the Second Sophistic." PhD diss., The University of Iowa, 2019.

Field, Frederick, ed. *Sancti Patris Nostril Joannis Chrysostomi, Interpretation Omnium Epistolarum Paulinarum*. 7 vols. Bibliotheca Patrum. Oxford: J. H. Parker, 1849–1862.

Fletcher-Louis, Crispin H. T. "Some Reflections on Angelomorphic Humanity Texts Among the Dead Sea Scrolls." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 7 (2000) 292–312.

Floris, Andrew T. "Chrysostom and the Charismata." *Paraclete* 5 (1971) 17–22.

Fotiade, Ramona, and David Jasper. "Foreword: Jean-Luc Marion: A Reflection." In *Givenness and Revelation*. Translated by Stephen E. Lewis, v–xviii. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.

Gibson, Craig A. *Libanius's Progymnasmata: Model Exercises in Greek Prose Composition and Rhetoric*. Writings from the Greco-Roman World 27. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2008.

———, "Libanius' *Progymnasmata*." In *Libanius: A Critical Introduction*, edited by Lieve Van Hoof, 128–43. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

Gregory Nazianzus, "Oration II: In Defence of his Flight to Pontus, and his Return, after his Ordination to the Priesthood, with an Exposition of the Character of the Priestly Office." Translated by Charles G. Browne and James E. Swallow. In *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, edited by Schaff, Philip, and Henry Wace. 28 vols. 1890–1900. 1894. Reprint, Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2012.

Grillmeier, Aloys. *Christ in the Christian Tradition: From the Apostolic Age to Chalcedon (451)*. Translated by J. S. Bowden. 2 vols. London: A. R. Mowbray & Co., 1965.

Gromacki, Robert G. *The Modern Tongues Movement*. Revised, 1972. Phillipsburg, NJ: P&R, 1967.

Guroian, Vigen, "Family and Christian Virtue in a Post-Christendom World: Reflections on the Ecclesial Vision of John Chrysostom." *St. Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 35 (1991) 327–50.

———. “St. John Chrysostom.” In *Christianity and Family Law: An Introduction*, edited by John Witte and Gary S. Hauk. Law and Christianity. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.

Guthrie, Anthony D. “An Investigation into the Use of Application in the Preaching of John of Antioch (Chrysostom).” PhD diss., New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, 1994.

Gygax, Marc Domingo. “Gift-Giving and Power Relationships in Greek Social Praxis and Public Discourse.” In *The Gift in Antiquity*, edited by Michael J. Satlow, 45–60. The Ancient World: Comparative Histories. Malden, MA: John Wiley & Sons, 2013.

Harakas, Stanley S. “The Integrity of Creation and Ethics.” *St. Vladimir’s Theological Quarterly* 32 (1988) 27–42.

Harkness, Bruce. “Imitation and Theme.” *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 12 (1954) 499–508.

Hartney, Aideen M. *John Chrysostom and the Transformation of the City*. London: Duckworth, 2004.

Heath, Malcolm. “John Chrysostom, Rhetoric and Galatians.” *Biblical Interpretation* 12 (2004) 369–400.

Heine, Ronald E. *Origen: Scholarship in Service of the Church*. Christian Theology in Context. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Hill, Robert C. “Akribeia: A Principle of Chrysostom’s Exegesis.” *Colloquium* 14 (1981) 32–36.

———. “Chrysostom’s Terminology for the Inspired Word.” *Estudios Bíblicos* 41 (1983) 367–73.

———. *Reading the Old Testament in Antioch*. Bible in Ancient Christianity 5. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

———. “The Spirituality of Chrysostom’s Commentary on the Psalms.” *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 5 (1997) 569–79.

———. “St. John Chrysostom: Preacher on the Old Testament.” *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 46 (2001) 267–86.

Holman, Susan R., ed. *Wealth and Poverty in Early Church and Society*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008.

Hoof, Lieve Van. "Libanius' *Life* and life." In *Libanius: A Critical Introduction*, edited by Lieve van Hoof, 7–38. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

Horace. *Satires. Epistles. The Art of Poetry.* Translated by H. Rushton Fairclough. Loeb Classical Library 194. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926.

Horner, Robyn. "Revelation as a Problem for Our Age." In *The Enigma of Divine Revelation: Between Phenomenology and Comparative Theology*, edited by Jean-Luc Marion, and Christiaan Jacobs-Vandegeer, 67–106. Contributions to Hermeneutics 7. Basel: Springer, 2020.

Hunter, David G. "Borrowings from Libanius in the 'Comparatio Regis et Monachi' of St John Chrysostom." *Journal of Theological Studies* 39 (1988) 525–31.

Hunter, Harold. "Tongues-Speech: A Patristic Analysis." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 23 (1980) 125–37.

Hutchens, Benjamin C. *Levinas: A Guide for the Perplexed*. New York: Continuum, 2004.

Jones, Christopher P. *Between Pagan and Christian*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2014.

Jüngel, Eberhard. *God's Being is in Becoming: The Trinitarian Being of God in the Theology of Karl Barth. A Paraphrase*. Translated by John Webster. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 2001.

Kahlos, Maijastina. "Pacifiers and Instigators – Bishops and Interreligious Conflicts in late Antiquity." In *The Role of the Bishop in Late Antiquity: Conflict and Compromise*, edited by Andrew Fear et al., 54–69. London: Bloomsbury, 2013.

Kalantzis, George. "Crumbs from the Table: Lazarus, the Eucharist and the Banquet of the Poor in the Homilies of John Chrysostom." In *Ancient Faith for the Church's Future*, edited by Mark Husbands and Jeffrey P. Greenman, 156–68. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2008

Kamimura, Naoki. "Deification and the Foundation of Spiritual Progress in John Chrysostom and Augustine." Paper presented at The Seventh St Andrew's Patristic Symposium "Saint John Chrysostom." Redfern NSW, September 23–24, 2016.

Karras, Valeria A. "Overcoming Greed: An Eastern Christian Perspective." *Buddhist-Christian Studies* 24 (2004) 47–53.

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

Kennedy, George A. *Greek Rhetoric under Christian Emperors*. Vol. 3 of *A History of Rhetoric*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983.

———. *A New History of Classical Rhetoric*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994.

Kim, Seon Yong. "Paul and the Stoic Theory of οἰκείωσις: A Response to Troels Engberg-Pedersen." *Novum Testamentum* 58 (2016) 71–91.

Kleanthous, Constantine. "St John Chrysostom's Doctrine of Baptism." MA thesis, Durham University, 1992.

Kloppenborg, John S. *Christ's Associations: Connecting and Belonging in the Ancient City*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2019.

Kondoleon, Christine. *Antioch: The Lost Ancient City*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000.

Konstan, David. "'Can't Buy Me Love': The Economy of Gifts in Amorous Relations," In *The Gift in Antiquity*, edited by Michael L. Satlow, 96–106. The Ancient World: Comparative Histories. Malden, MA: John Wiley & Sons, 2013.

Krupp, R. A. *Shepherding the Flock of God: The Pastoral Theology of John Chrysostom*. American University Studies Series VII: Theology and Religion 101. New York: Peter Lang, 1991.

Kuchukhidze, Gocha. "John Chrysostom on the Holy Spirit." *Georgian Electronic Journal of Literature* 4 (2010) [n.d.]. https://litinfo.ge/vol-4-iss-2/kuchukhidze.htm

Lai, Pak-Wah. "The *Imago Dei* and Salvation among the Antiochenes: A Comparison of John Chrysostom with Theodore of Mopsuestia." *Studia Patristica* 67 (2013) 393–402.

———. "John Chrysostom and the Hermeneutics of Exemplar Portraits." PhD diss., Durham University, 2010.

———. "John Chrysostom's Reception of Basil of Caesarea's Trinitarian Theology." *Scrinium* 15 (2019) 62–78.

Laird, Raymond. *Mindset, Moral Choice and Sin in the Anthropology of John Chrysostom*. Early Christian Studies 15. 2012. Reprint, Macquarie Centre, Australia: Sydney College of Divinity Press, 2017.

Latawiec, Zofia. "The Rhetorical Structure of John Chrysostom's Seventh Homily on Philippians in Relation to the Kenosis Hymn." *Classica Cracoviensia* 20 (2017) 55–70.

Levinas, Emmanuel. *Alterity and Transcendence*. Translated by Michael B. Smith. London: The Athlone, 1999.

Levko, O. V. “Доброчесність (ἡ αρετή) як предмет уславлення в епідейкичних промовах свтт. Григорія Ботослова та Іоанна Златоуста.” *Kyiv Theological Academy* 22 (2015) 123–30.

Leyerle, Blake. “John Chrysostom on Almsgiving and the Use of Money.” *Harvard Theological Review 87* (1994) 29–47.

———. *The Narrative Shape of Emotion in the Preaching of John Chrysostom*. Christianity in Late Antiquity 10. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2020.

Liddell, Henry George, et al. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. 9th ed. Oxford: Clarendon, 1996.

Malosse, Pierre-Louis. “Jean Chrysostome a-t-il été L’élève de Libanios?” *Phoenix* 62 (2008) 273–80.

Marcus, Paul. *Being for the Other: Emmanuel Levinas, Ethical Living and Psychoanalysis*. Marquette Studies in Philosophy 65. Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 2008.

Margerie, Bertrand de. *Les Pères Grecs et Orientaux*. Vol. 1 of *Introduction à L’histoire de L’exégèse*. Initiations. Paris: Latour-Maubourg, 1980.

Marion, Jean-Luc. *Givenness & Revelation*. Translated by Stephen E. Lewis. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016.

———. *Reduction and Givenness: Investigations of Husserl, Heidegger, and Phenomenology*. Translated by Thomas A. Northwestern University Studies in Phenomenology & Existential Philosophy. Carlson. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1998.

Martens, Peter W. “Origen Against History? Reconsidering the Critique of Allegory.” *Modern Theology* 28 (2012) 635–56.

Maslov, Boris. “Οἰκείωσις πρὸς θεόν: Gregory of Nazianzus and the Heteronomous Subject of Eastern Christian Penance.” *Zeitschrift für Antikes Christentum* 16 (2012) 311–43.

Mayer, Wendy. “The Audience(s) for Patristic Social Teaching: A Case Study.” In *Reading Patristic Texts on Social Ethics: Issues and Challenges for the Twenty-First Century*, edited by Johan Leemans et al., 85–99. 1st ed. Washington: Catholic University of America Press, 2012.

———. “The Dynamics of Liturgical Space: Aspects of the Interaction Between St John Chrysostom and his Audiences.” *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 111 (1997) 104–15.

———. “The Ins and Outs of the Chrysostom Letter-Collection: New Ways of Looking at a Limited Corpus.” In *Collecting Early Christian Letters: From the Apostle Paul to Late Antiquity*, edited by Browen Neil and Pauline Allen, loc 4399–5598. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015. Kindle edition.

———. “John Chrysostom and his Audiences: Distinguishing different Congregations at Antioch and Constantinople.” *Studia Patristica* 31 (1997) 70–75.

———. “John Chrysostom: Extraordinary Preacher, Ordinary Audience.” In *Preacher and Audience: Studies in Early Christian and Byzantine Homiletics*, edited by Cunningham, Mary B., and Pauline Allen, 105–37. A New History of the Sermon 1. Leiden: Brill, 1998.

———. “John Chrysostom: Moral Philosopher and Physician of the Soul.” In *John Chrysostom: Past, Present, Future*, edited by Doru Costache and Mario Baghos, 193–215. Sydney: Australian Institute for Orthodox Christian Studies, 2017.

———. “John Chrysostom on Poverty.” In *Preaching Poverty in Late Antiquity: Perceptions and Realities*, edited by Pauline Allen, et al., 69–117. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2009.

———. “Madness in the Works of John Chrysostom: A Snapshot from Late Antiquity.” In *The Concept of Madness from Homer to Byzantium: Manifestations and Aspects of Mental Illness and Disorder*, edited by Hélène Perdicoyianni-Paléologou, 349–73. Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 2016.

———. “Patronage, Pastoral Care and the Role of the Bishop at Antioch.” *Vigiliae Christianae* 55 (2001) 58–70.

———. “Who Came to Hear John Chrysostom Preach? Recovering a Late Fourth-Century Preacher’s Audience.” Paper presented at the Second Triennial International Conference on “Prayer and Spirituality in the Early Church.” Sydney, Australia, January 8–11, 1999.

Maxwell, Jaclyn L. *Christianization and Communication in Late Antiquity: John Chrysostom and his Congregation in Antioch*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Mazza, Enrico. “John Chrysostom.” In *Mystagogy: A Theology of Liturgy in the Patristic Age*. Translated by Matthew J. O’Connell. 105–49. New York: Pueblo, 1989.

McDonnell, Kilian, and George T. Montague. *Christian Initiation and Baptism in the Holy Spirit: Evidence from the First Eight Centuries*. 2nd ed. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 1994.

McLuhan, Marshall. *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man*. 5th ed. New York: Signet, 1964.

Meier, John P. "The Historical Jesus and the Historical Samaritans: What can be Said?" *Biblical* 81 (2000) 202–32.

Mendels, Doron. *The Media Revolution of Early Christianity: An Essay on Eusebius's Ecclesiastical History*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.

Miller, James. "Introduction." In *Lives of the Eminent Philosophers*, by Diogenes Laertius, vii–xviii. Translated by Pamela Mensch. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018.

Miller, Samantha L. *Chrysostom's Devil: Demons, the Will, and Virtue in Patristic Soteriology*. New Explorations in Theology. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Academic, 2020.

———. "Chrysostom's Monks as Living Exhortations to Poverty and the Rich Life." *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 58 (2013) 79–97.

———. "No Sympathy for the Devil: The Significance of Demons in John Chrysostom's Soteriology." PhD diss., Marquette University, 2016.

Mitchell, Margaret M. *The Heavenly Trumpet: John Chrysostom and the Art of Pauline Interpretation*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2002.

———. *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians*. First American ed. Louisville: Westminster, 1992.

———. *Paul, the Corinthians and the Birth of Christian Hermeneutics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

———. "Reading Rhetoric with Patristic Exegetes: John Chrysostom on Galatians." In *Antiquity and Humanity: Essays on Ancient Religion and Philosophy*, edited by Adela Y. Collins, and Margaret Mitchell, 334–55. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001.

Molinié, Pierre. "Hyphenation in John Chrysostom's Exegetical Homilies. A Case Study on the Link between Exegesis and Parenesis Take from the *Homilies on Philippians (CPG* 4432)." *Studia Patristica* 128 (2021) 269–82.

Morgan, Teresa. *Roman Faith and Christian Faith: Pistis and Fides in the Early Roman Empire and Early Churches*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2015.

Moulard, Anatole. *Saint Jean Chrysostome: Sa Vie Son Œuvre.* Paris: Procure Générale du Clergé, 1949.

Naidu, Ashish J. *Transformed in Christ: Christology and Christian Life in John Chrysostom*. Princeton Theological Monograph Series. Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2012.

Nassif, Bradley. "Antiochene Θεωρία In John Chrysostom's Exegesis." In *Exegesis and Hermeneutics in the Churches of the East: Select Papers from the SBL Meeting in San Diego, 2007*, edited by Vahan S. Hovhanessian, 51–66. New York: Peter Lang, 2009.

Nesselrath, Heinz-Günther, "Libanius and the Literary Tradition." In *Libanius: A Critical Introduction*, edited by Lieve Van Hoof, 241–67. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

Nesselrath, Heinz-Günther, and Lieve Van Hoof. "The Reception of Libanius: From pagan Friend of Julian to (almost) Christian Saint and Back." In *Libanius: A Critical Introduction*, edited by Lieve Van Hoof, 160–84. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

Nuffelen, Peter Van. "A War of Words: Sermons and Social Status in Constantinople under the Theodosian Dynasty." In *Literature and Society in the Fourth Century AD: Performing Paideia, Constructing the Present, Presenting the Self*, edited by Van Hoof, Lieve, and Peter Van Nuffelen. Mnemosyne Supplements 373. Leiden: Brill, 2015.

O'Brien, John J. "Initiation, Chrysostom, and the Moral Life." *Liturgical Ministry* 8 (1999) 91–99.

Oden, C. Thomas. *Life in the Spirit: Systematic Theology*. 3 vols. Peabody, MA: Prince, 2001.

Ohleyer, Leo J. "The Pauline Formula 'Induere Christum' with Special Reference to the Works of St. John Chrysostom." PhD diss., Catholic University of America, 1921.

Oikonomou, Georgios, I. "ΚΛΗΡΙΚΟΙ ΚΑΙ ΛΑΪΚΟΙ ΩΣ ΛΑΟΣ ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ ΣΤΟΝ ΑΓΙΟ ΙΩΑΝΝΗ ΤΟΝ ΧΡΥΣΟΣΤΟΜΟ. PhD diss., University of Thessaloniki, 2011.

Oropeza, B. J. "When Will the Cessation of Speaking in Tongues and Revelatory Gifts Take Place?" *Pneuma* 40 (2018) 489–97.

Oyetade, Michael Oyebowale. "A Study of Speaking in Tongues in Acts and 1 Corinthians and its Use and Abuse in Some Selected Contemporary Churches in Nigeria." *Stellenbusch Theological Journal* 6 (2020) 477–98.

Papadopoulos, Stylianos G. "The Holy Trinity and the Parousia of the Holy Spirit According to St. John Chrysostom." In *Agape and Diakonia: Essays in Memory of Bishop Gerasimos of Abydos*, edited by Peter A. Chamberas. 97–125. Brookline, MA: Holy Cross Orthodox, 1998.

Papageorgiou Panayiotis E. "A Theological Analysis of Selected Themes in the Homilies of St. John Chrysostom on the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans." PhD diss., Catholic University of America, 1995.

Paverd, Frans van de. "Introduction," In *St. John Chrysostom, The Homilies on the Statues: An Introduction*, xxi–xxxi. Orientalia Christiana Analecta 239. Rome: Pont. Institutum Studiorum Orentalium, 1991.

Penella, Robert J. "Libanius's *Declamations*." In *Libanius: A Critical Introduction*, edited by Lieve Van Hoof. 107–27. Cambridge: Cambridge University Pres, 2014.

Perhai, Richard J. *Antiochene Theōria in the Writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia and Theodoret of Cyrus*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress, 2015.

Pigott, Justin M. "Capital Crimes: Deconstructing John's 'Unnecessary Severity' in Managing the Clergy at Constantinople." In *Revisioning John Chrysostom: New Approaches, New Perspectives*, edited by Chris L. de Wet and Wendy Mayer, 733–77. Critical Approaches to Early Christianity 1. Leiden: Brill, 2019.

Plato, *Platonis Opera Tomus III Tetralogia V–VII*, edited by John Burnet. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1903. Accessed: http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=urn:cts:greekLit:tlg0059.tlg022.perseus-grc1:356a

Pomeroy, Samuel. *Chrysostom as Exegete: Scholarly Traditions and Rhetorical Aims in the Homilies on Genesis*. Leiden: Brill, 2021.

———. "Reading Plato through the Eyes of Eusebius: John Chrysostom's *Timaeus* Quotations in Rhetorical Context." In *Revisioning John Chrysostom: New Approaches, New Perspectives*, edited by Chris L. de Wet and Wendy Mayer, 464–92. Critical Approaches to Early Christianity 1. Leiden: Brill, 2019.

Purves, Andrew. *Reconstructing Pastoral Theology: A Christological Foundation*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2004.

Quiroga Puertas, Alberto J. *The Dynamics of Rhetorical Performances in Late Antiquity*. London: Routledge, 2019.

Ramelli, Ilaria. “The Stoic Doctrine of Oikeiosis and Its Transformation in Christian Platonism.” *Apeiron* 47 (2014) 116–40.

Rapp, Claudia. *Holy Bishops in Late Antiquity: The Nature of Christian Leadership in an Age of Transition*. Berkely: University of California Press, 2005.

Resane, Kelebogile T. “From Small Country Churches to Explosion into Megachurches: A Modern Pentecostal Cultural Fit for the Assemblies of God in South Africa.” *Verbum et Ecclesia* 43 (2022) 1–9.

Richardson, William E. “Liturgical Order and Glossolalia: 1 Corinthians 14:26c-33a and its Implications.” PhD diss., Andrews University, 1983.

Ricoeur, Paul. *Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences: Essays on language, Action and Interpretation*. Translated by John B. Thompson. 1981. Reprint, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016.

Ritter, Adolf M. “Between ‘Theocracy’ and ‘Simple Life’: Dio Chrysostom, John Chrysostom and the Problem of Humanizing Society.” *Studia Patristica* 22 (1989) 170–80.

———. *Charisma im Verständnis des Joannes Chrysostomos und seiner Zeit: Ein Beitrag zur Erforschung der griechisch-orientalishchen Ekklesiologie in der Frühzeit der Reichskirche*. Forschungen zur Kirchen -und Dogmengeschichte 25. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972.

Robinette, Brian. “A Gift to Theology? Jean-Luc Marion’s ‘Saturated Phenomenon’ in Christological Perspective.” *Heythrop* 48 (2007) 86–108.

Rogers, Cleon L., Jr. “The Gift of Tongues in the Post Apostolic Church (A.D. 100–400).” *Bibliotheca Sacra* 122 (1965) 134–43.

Roskam, Geert. “Emancipatory Preaching: John Chrysostom’s Homily *Peccata Fratrum non evulganda* (CPG 4389).” In *John Chrysostom: New Approaches, New Perspectives*, edited by Chris Len de Wet, and Wendy Mayer, 175–205. Critical Approaches to Early Christianity 1. Leiden: Brill, 2019.

———. “John Chrysostom on pagan Euergetism: A Reading of the First Part of De inani gloria et de educandis liberis.” *Sacris Erudiri* 53 (2014) 147–69.

Rowe, C. Kavin. *One True Life: The Stoics and Early Christians as Rival Traditions*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2016.

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

Sandwell, Isabella. *Religious Identity in Late Antiquity: Greeks, Jews and Christians in Antioch*. Greek Culture in the Roman World. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Schor, Adam M. "Theodoret on the 'School of Antioch': A Network Approach." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 15 (2007) 517–62.

Schrijvers, Joeri. "Jean-Yves Lacoste: A Phenomenology of Liturgy." *Heythrop* 46 (2005) 314–33.

Seppälä, Serafim. "The Concept of Deification in Greek and Syriac." *Review of Ecumenical Studies* 11 (2019) 439–55.

Shepardson, Christine. *Controlling Contested Places: Late Antique Antioch and the Spatial Politics of Religious Controversy*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2014.

Sherwin, Michael. "Friends at the Table of the Lord: Friendship with God and the Transformation of Patronage in the Thought of John Chrysostom." *New Blackfriars* 85 (2004) 387–98.

Sitzler, Silke. "The Indigent and the Wealthy in the Homilies of John Chrysostom." *Vigiliae Christianae* 63 (2009) 468–79.

Smith, Gregory A. "The Myth of the Vaginal Soul." *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 44 (2004) 199–225.

Socrates Scholasticus, "The Ecclesiastical History of Socrates Scholasticus." Translated by A. C. Zenos. In *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, edited by Schaff, Philip, and Henry Wace. 28 vols. 1890–1900. 1894. Reprint, Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2012.

Sozomen, "The Ecclesiastical History of Sozomen, Comprising a History of the Church from A.D. 323 to A.D. 425." Translated by Chester D. Hartranft. In *A Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church*, edited by Schaff, Philip, and Henry Wace. 28 vols. 1890–1900. 1894. Reprint, Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2012.

Stade, Darren M. "Patristic Exegesis: The Myth of the Alexandrian-Antiochene Schools of Interpretation." *Socio-Historical Examination of Religion and Ministry* 1 (2019) 155–76.

Stephanou, Eusebius A. "The Charismata in the Early Church Fathers." *The Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 21 (1976) 125–46.

Stibbs, Alan. "Putting the Gift of Tongues in its Place." *Churchman* 80 (1966) 295–303.

Stob, Ralph. “Stoicism and Christianity.” *The Classical Journal* 31 (1935) 217–24.

Streza, Ciprian Ioan. “The Divine Liturgy in Orthodox Spirituality: The Mystery of Man’ Personal Encounter with God through Worship and the Aseetieal Life.” *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 58 (2013) 141–67.

Thiselton, Anthony C. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.

Tonias, Demetrios E. *Abraham in the Works of John Chrysostom*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2014.

———. “The Iconic Abraham as John Chrysostom’s High Priest of Philanthropy.” In *John Chrysostom: New Approaches, New Perspectives*, edited by Chris Len de Wet, and Wendy Mayer, 563–86. Critical Approaches to Early Christianity 1. Leiden: Brill, 2019.

Toczydlowski, Henry A. “An Analysis of the Rhetoric of St. John Chrysostom with Special Reference to Selected Homilies on the Gospel according to St. Matthew.” MA thesis, Loyola University, 1949.

Trakatellis, Demetrios. “Being Transformed: Chrysostom’s Exegesis of the Epistle to the Romans.” *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 36 (1991) 211–29.

Tupamahu, Ekaputra. “‘I Don’t Want to Hear Your Language!’ White Social Imagination and Demography of Roman Corinth.” *The Bible & Critical Theory* 16 (2020) 64–91.

Verhoeff, Maria. “‘God on earth, Man in Heaven’ John Chrysostom’s Use of Celestial Imagery for the Christian Life.” In *Seeing Through the Eyes of Faith: New Approaches to the Mystagogy of the Church Fathers*, edited by Paul van Geest, 251–68. Late Antique History and Religion 11. Leuven: Peeters, 2016.

———. “More Desirable than Light Itself. Friendship Discourse in John Chrysostom’s Soteriology.” PhD diss., Evangelische Theologische Faculteit, Leuven, 2016.

Wainwright, Geoffrey. “The Sermon and the Liturgy.” Paper presented at the Saint John Chrysostom Lectures at the Holy Cross Greek Orthodox School of Theology, Brookline, NY, November 1982.

Weaver, Rebecca H. “Wealth and Poverty in the Early Church.” *Interpretation* 41 (1987) 368–81.

Weiss, Robin. “Stoicism and its Telos: Insights from Michel Foucault.” *Metaphilosophy* 51 (2020) 335–54.

Wells, Harold. *The Christic Center: Life-Giving and Liberating*. Maryknoll: Orbis, 2004.

Wet, Chris L. de. "The Homilies of John Chrysostom on 1 Corinthians 12: A Model of Antiochene Exegesis on the Charismata." MA thesis, University of Pretoria, 2007.

———. "John Chrysostom's Exegesis on the Resurrection in 1 Corinthians 15." *Neotestamentica* 45 (2011) 92–114.

Wet, Chris L. de., and Hendrik F. Stander. "John Chrysostom's Exegesis of the Anointing at Bethany (John 12:1–8)." *Ekklesiastikos Pharos* 89 (2007) 134–47.

Yazigi, Paul. "Fleshly, Psychic and Spiritual Man: Flesh's and Soul's Warfare According to the Apostle Paul and St. John Chrysostom." Paper presented at Cambridge University, Cambridge, November 8, 2002.

Yong, Amos. *Spirit of Love: A Trinitarian Theology of Grace*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2012.

Young, Frances M. *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture*. 1997. Reprint, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

———. "John Chrysostom on First and Second Corinthians." *Studia Patristica* 18 (1983) 349–52.

———. "The Rhetorical Schools and their Influence on Patristic Exegesis." In *The Making of Orthodoxy: Essays in Honour of Henry Chadwick*, edited by Rowan Williams, 182–99. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Zetterholm, Magnus. *The Formation of Christianity in Antioch: A Social-Scientific Approach to the Separation Between Judaism and Christianity*. London: Routledge, 2003.