

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Bachelor of Divinity

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

4-30-1943

Chrysostom A Study of his Theology, his Sermon Methods, and his Preaching

John Mager

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir_magerj@csl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv>



Part of the [Practical Theology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Mager, John, "Chrysostom A Study of his Theology, his Sermon Methods, and his Preaching" (1943).

Bachelor of Divinity. 75.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv/75>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Bachelor of Divinity by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

C H R Y S O S T O M

A STUDY OF HIS THEOLOGY,
HIS SERMON METHODS, AND HIS PREACHING.

A Thesis Presented to the
Faculty of Concordia Theological Seminary

in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

Bachelor of Divinity

By

John G. Mager

Concordia Seminary

April 30, 1943

Approved by:

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

INTRODUCTION

1

CHRYSOSTOM AND HIS THEOLOGY

2--38

I	Doctrine of Holy Scripture	3
II	Doctrine of God	6
III	Doctrine of Man	7
IV	The Freedom of The Will	9
V	The Doctrine of Christ	10
VI	Conversion, or The Bestowal of Faith	13
VII	Justification by Faith	19
VIII	The Doctrine of Sanctification and Good Works	23
IX	The Law and The Gospel	27
X	The Doctrine of Holy Baptism	27
XI	The Doctrine of The Lord's Supper	29
XII	The Doctrine of The Christian Church	33
XIII	The Doctrine of Eternal Election	36
XIV	The Doctrine of The Last Things	37

CHRYSOSTOM AND HIS SERMON METHOD

38-49

I	In a Homily on I Thess. 4,13.	40
II	In a Homily on I Tim. 5,2-3	45
III	In General	47

CHRYSOSTOM AND HIS PREACHING

49-62

I	The Riot of The Statues	51
II	The Fall of Eutropius	56
III	The Banishment of Chrysostom	58

CHRYSOSTOM'S LIFE

62-73

I	His Youth and Training Till His Conversion and Baptism, 347-380 A.D.	63
II	His Ascetic and Monastic Life, 370-381.	64
III	His Public Life As A Priest and Preacher at Antioch, 381-398.	65
IV	His Episcopate at Constantinople, 398-404.	67
V	His Exile and Death, 404-407.	70

BIBLIOGRAPHY

74

INTRODUCTION

Broadus in the concluding suggestions of his book, "Lectures on the History of Preaching," gives the following advice: "I think that young men should be specially exhorted to read old books. If you have an old friend in the ministry, urge him to read mainly new books, that he may freshen his mind, and keep in sympathy with his surroundings. "But must not young men keep abreast of the age?" Certainly, only the first good thing is to get abreast of the age, and in order to do this they must go back to where the age came from, and join there the great procession of its moving thought."¹ A study of the life and works of John of Antioch, later surnamed Chrysostom, the Golden Mouth, is then a valuable study for me, a young man, who wishes to go back to the sources and "get abreast of the age." It is an especially valuable study in these days, when young men are neglecting to go back to the historical origins of their church and their theology, when, because of the growing complexity of ministerial life and the increasing responsibilities and functions of the ministry there is the tendency and the temptation to a superficial following of current trends and thought, to study such a man and to study such a work as has proved itself by the test of time. No one can question that Chrysostom is important as a preacher. Dargan in his, "A History of Preaching" calls him "the greatest of the old Greek preachers."² Ker in his "Lectures on the History of Preaching" calls him "the greatest master of public rhetoric."³ Pattison in his, "The History of Christian

1. Broadus, "Lectures on the History of Preaching," pp. 230-231.
2. Dargan, "A History of Preaching," p. 66
3. Ker, "Lectures on the History of Preaching," p. 68.

Preaching," states: "In the matter of appeal surely never was preacher more powerful and certainly never was ^opreacher more effective."⁴ And Broadus in his, "Lectures on the History of Preaching", is the most ^{liberal}lavish in praise of them all: "But admit ^{when he speaks}what you please, criticize what you please, and the fact remains that Chrysostom has never had a superior, and it may be gravely doubted whether he has had an equal, in the history of preaching."⁵ No one, moreover, can question his value in the development of Christian dogma. He, ~~of course~~, does not come up to the standards of modern orthodoxy from the view point of the Bible. But when you approach him sympathetically, consider him in his historical background, you cannot help admit Chrysostom's contributions to the development of Christian doctrine and his value in curbing the extravagant and the extensive speculations of Origenistic philosophy.⁶

CHRYSOSTOM AND HIS THEOLOGY

In an examination of Chrysostom it is much easier to come to definite conclusions about his sermon method and his manner of preaching than it is to determine in detail as to just what was his theology. (In his intense religiousness and his consequent tendencies toward asceticism Chrysostom was much more interested in morals than in creeds, much more in life than doctrines. Therefore, unlike the great Augustine, the mental struggles of his age seem never to have affected him; ~~there are no remarkable epochs in his religious history.~~ He lived between the trinitarian

4. Pattison, "The History of Christian Preaching," p.71

5. Broadus, op. cit., p.77

6. Broadus, ibid., pp.74-75

and christological controversies and was only incidentally involved in the subordinate Origenistic controversy. He accepted the Nicene Creed, but he died before the rise of the Nestorian and Eutychian heresies. Therefore by the rulings of historical events and by his own personal predilections, Chrysostom was destined to avoid a great participation in doctrinal controversies and to involve himself very intimately in the religious and particularly moral life of his people.)

I Doctrine of Holy Scripture

Our first question as to his theology and a basic one is, "What is his attitude toward the Bible as a rule of doctrine and a norm of faith?" We are happy to say that (he had the orthodox view in general toward the Bible.) It would be a long study in itself to see just what constituted for him the Biblical canon. He quoted some of the apocryphal works of the Old Testament in his homilies, but on the other hand he rejects the New Testament apocryphal accounts of Christ's life and infancy. In his Hom. XVII of St. John he says: "Hence, it remains clear to us, that the miracles which they say belong to Christ's childhood, are false, and the invention of certain who bring them into notice."⁷ So that in general is his position: He rejects the fantastic apocryphal accounts of the New Testament, but he quotes Old Testament apocrypha and appealed to its authority as though it were on a level with Scripture.

But Chrysostom had the right view as to the inspiration of

7. Schoff, The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, XIV, p.60

Scripture. In his Hom.V of St. Matt. he says in effect that that which ^aIsiah had written in his book was that which was spoken by the Lord, that ^aIsiah in other words was a mouthpiece of God, and that God in employing Isaiah as His instrument did so while preserving Isaiah's individuality and not violating his dignity as a person. He says, "For this cause the angel, to make what he said easy to be received brings in Isaiah. And neither doth he here stop, but connects the discourse with God. For he doth not call the saying Isaiah's but that of the God of all things. For this cause he said not, 'that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of Isaiah', but 'which was spoken of the Lord.' for the mouth indeed was Isaiah's, but the oracle was wafted from above."⁸ For his own practical attitude toward the Bible as a preacher, Chrysostom had this view-point, that the first-duty of a preacher is to deliver God's message, to look for His approbation, and to think nothing of man's applause. He brings these thoughts out with particular force in his treatise on the Priesthood. He had the same attitude toward Scripture as far as its value for the people was concerned. In his zeal for Bible he spoke with great plainness to his congregations. "Which of you," he says, "goes home to occupy himself in a Christian manner after church? Who takes pains to read the book, and apply himself to discover the sense of Holy Scripture? No one will dare to say that he does his best. Which of you who hears me now would be able to say by heart a psalm or some other part of Scripture if I were to ask him?" (He urged upon his hearers family religion.).... What you hear that is useful, carry home in your mouth

8. Schaff, op. cit., X, p. 32

like a swallow, and put it in the mouths of mother and children."⁹ The church, Chrysostom reminds his people, is not only a place for prayer. Tied though he be to his courts, the lawyer may raise his altar by simply cherishing a devout serious spirit.

While we are now considering Chrysostom's attitude toward the Bible we might also make a few pertinent remarks about him as an exegete and a grammarian. Chrysostom was a student of Scripture under Diodore and he spent quite some time studying Holy Writ together with a fellow-student of his, Theodore. This school, which Chrysostom attended, was sober and realistic in its approach to the Bible as a written message and as such formed a wholesome reaction to the allegorizing tendency of the Origenistic school in Alexandria. Of course, when one reads the homilies of Chrysostom one is apt to be unfair in his judgment of Chrysostom's exegesis, because he compares it with the marvelous exegetical productions that have come forth since. But it is quite unjust to compare Chrysostom with the high lights in the world of exegesis of our day. He must be compared with his contemporaries and when this is done the almost unanimous verdict is that Chrysostom ranks very high as an exegete of the Bible. He was not of course equipped as our great exegetes are. He, for example, did not have a knowledge of the Hebrew and he had to rely on the LXX for the Old Testament. It was also to his disadvantage that the Greek was his native language. This seems at first to be a peculiar statement, but observation bears it out. Of course, Chrysostom's native Greek was not the same as the

9. Pattison, op. cit., pp. 65-66 quoting "Church Quarterly Review," April, 1902, p. 73

koine Greek of the New Testament. It is closer to modern classical Greek than to the koine. But even so, the Greek of the New Testament was not as foreign to him as it is to us and to our best exegetes and this formed a natural barrier, for, if the language is entirely foreign, a person translating it is more apt to have his acuteness of judgment aroused and is likely to bring better results than one could bring who was expounding on the same passage which might be found in his own native tongue. It is common experience that the Jewish rabbis are about the most unreliable and the least helpful when it comes to matters exegetical and also grammatical in regard to the Old Testament. Chrysostom, however, has also some helpful and accurate remarks as to grammar, but this is not the rule.

In Homily XVI on Romans Chrysostom sets down his own rule in regard to texts that have a figure of speech of some sort in them. "And this we ought to observe in all cases, that we are to take the illustrations quite entier, but after selecting the good of them, and that for which they were introduced, to let the rest alone."¹⁰

II Doctrine of God

The second doctrine of Christian theology that we wish to consider as to what Chrysostom taught concerning it is the doctrine of God. Here we find that he is entirely orthodox. In his homily on Matthew (Hom.LV) he expresses his concept regarding the Holy Trinity. "Seest thou how the glory of the Father and of the Son is all one? But if the glory be one, it is quite evident that the substance also is one."¹¹ In a homily on St. John

10. Schaff, op. cit., XI, p.467

11. Schaff, op. cit., X, p. 341

(Hom. XVII) Chrysostom gives us what seems to be a paraphrase of the Apostles' Creed. "We believe in the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, in the Resurrection of bodies, and in Life everlasting. Now if any heathen say, 'What is this Father, what this Son, what this Holy Ghost? How do you who say that there are three Gods, charge us with having many gods?'"¹² We see from these two instances that whenever we encounter doctrine of a distinct type in Chrysostom, it is always presented in a practical way and for a practical reason.

III Doctrine of Man

Chrysostom, as has been pointed out, was not a great thinker. He was interested mostly in practical results, but as many men who are interested in practical results fail in their attempt to achieve them with the proper means, so Chrysostom did not arrive at proper conclusions regarding the right and the best means for his practical goals. His goal, of course, was the moral transformation of man. He was ascetic by nature and learned to rely on his strength of will in order to achieve a better moral character and so he appealed to his people in the same manner. Perhaps he was influenced in his views on man by the Platonic lectures that he heard from the philosopher Andragathius. At any rate he has the Neo-Platonic doctrine of man. There are two principles in man - a good and an evil. The good principle is his soul which if it were freed from the body would return to the Maker from Whom it sprang. The other principle in man, the ^ematerial, was the body, the seat of all evil affections and vices, the agent that crippled the soul and that held it in its power

FRITZLAFF MEMORIAL LIBRARY
CONCORDIA SEMINARY

ST. LOUIS, MO.

12. Schaff, op. cit., XIV, p. 61

as prison walls and prison cells do a prisoner. The means of achieving higher moral character is through the weakening of the body which is the antagonist of the soul. In this doctrine of anthropology Chrysostom forms a great contrast with his contemporary, Augustine, who had very much the same doctrine of man that our Lutheran Church has today. In a homily on Matthew (Hom. LXXXII) Chrysostom speaks of the soul as being locked up in the body.¹³ In a homily on St. John (Hom. LXXVI) he by implication makes the body the greatest hindrance to virtue. According to our Lutheran conception it is the corrupt body as well as the corrupt soul that form the Old Adam and that constitute the impediment to righteousness. Chrysostom says: "All just men, for instance, whatever were their righteous deeds, did them while dwelling on earth, and having bodies. For they dwelt on earth as those who were strangers and pilgrims; but in heaven, as citizens. Then say not thou either, 'I am clothed with flesh, I cannot get the mastery, nor undertake the toils which are for the sake of virtue.' Do thou not accuse the Creator. For if the wearing of the flesh make virtue impossible, then the fault is not ours. But that it does not make it impossible, the bands of saints have shown."¹⁴ In a homily on St. John (Hom. LXVI) Chrysostom while defending the resurrection of the body says that only the body took part in the fall and that only the body is corruptible. "'Yea,' saith some one, 'but there is no resurrection of the body.' They hear not Paul saying, 'This corruptible must put on incorruption.' (I Cor. 15, 53) He speaks not of the soul, for the soul is not corrupted; moreover 'resurrection' is

13. Schaff, op. cit., X, 494.

14. Schaff, op. cit., XIV, p. 278.

said of that which fell, and that which fell was the body. But why wilt thou have that there is no resurrection of the body?"¹⁵

IV The Freedom of The Will

The fourth doctrine on which we wish to present Chrysostom's view-point is the doctrine of the freedom of the will. Here Chrysostom stands in glaring contrast to his younger contemporary, Augustine, who stood for the absolute subserviency of the will and of the complete sovereignty of God on the other side. His doctrine of free-will also enters into his stand on conversion, but here we will discuss merely this one idea. In his homily on the Hebrews (Hom.XII) he tries to solve the mystery of free will and necessity. He has the idea that we first make a decision for God and then God comes to us with His aid and with His gracious assistance in our endeavour to live for Him. It is the idea that we have in the Roman Catholic *meritum de congruo* and *meritum de condigno*. He says: "What then? Does nothing depend on God? All depends indeed on God, but not so that our free will is hindered. 'If then it depend on God', (one says) 'why does He blame us?' On this account I said, 'so that our free will is not hindered.' It depends then on us, and on Him. For we must first choose the good; and then He leads us to His own. He does not anticipate our choice, lest our free will should be outraged. But when we have chosen, then great is the assistance He brings us."¹⁶ In this same homily on the same page he has another statement to the same effect. "And secondly the other explanation may be given, that He speaks of all as His, whose the greater

15. Schaff, op. cit., XIV, p. 246
16. Schaff, op. cit., XIV, p. 425

part is. For it is ours to choose and to wish; but God's to complete and to bring to an end. Since therefore the greater part is of Him, He says all is of Him, speaking according to the custom of men."

V The Doctrine of Christ

In this section we wish to gather various views of Chrysostom on the doctrine of Christ, both of a positive and of a negative character. In the first place, we can say that Chrysostom believes in the virgin birth of our Lord. He indicates this in a homily of Matthew (Hom.V). He says: "And what goes before also establishes this interpretation. For he doth not merely say, 'Behold, the Virgin shall be with child,' but having first said, 'Behold, the Lord Himself shall give you a sign,' then he subjoins, 'Behold, the Virgin shall be with child.' Whereas, if she that was to give birth was not a virgin, what sort of a sign would the event be? For that which is a sign must, of course, be beyond the course of common events, it must be strange and extraordinary; else how could it be a sign?"¹⁷

In a homily on St. John, (Hom. LXXXVII) Chrysostom gives us a statement concerning Christ's local mode of presence in the state of glorification. He says that it was a condescension, but that is neither here nor there. It interests us at any rate that Chrysostom thought along these lines. "It is worth inquiring, how an incorruptible body showed the prints of the nails, and was tangible by the mortal hand. But be not thou disturbed; what took place was a matter of condescension. For

17. Schaff, op. cit., X, p.32

that which was so subtle and light as to enter in when the doors were closed, was free from all density; but this marvel was shown, that the Resurrection might be believed, and that men might know that it was the Crucified One Himself, and that not another rose in His stead....As therefore when we see Him walking on the waves before the Crucifixion, we do not say that the body is of a different nature, but of our own; so after the Resurrection, when we see Him with the prints of the nails, we will no more say, that He is therefore corruptible."¹⁸

When we consider Chrysostom's stand on the work of Christ we meet a disappointment. He was not quite clear on the universal character of the atonement. He makes a distinction without a difference. He says that Christ died for all, but that He did not bear the sins of all. He says: (Hom.XVII) on Hebrews, "Ver. 28. 'Christ was once offered.' By whom offered? evidently by Himself. Here He says that He is not the Priest only, but the Victim also, and what is sacrificed, On this account are (the words) 'was offered.' 'Was once offered' (he says) 'to bear the sins of many.' Why 'of many' and not 'of all'? Because not all believed. For He indeed died for all, that is His part: for that death was the counterbalance against the destruction of all men. But He did not bear the sins of all men, because they were not willing."¹⁹

We stated above that Chrysostom did not have a clear conception of the universal character of the work of Christ. In relation to this error Chrysostom comes out with a statement that sounds very much like the "Common grace" of the Calvinists.

18. Schaff, op. cit., XIV, p. 328

19. Schaff, op. cit., XIV, p. 447

We find this remark in his XVII Homily on Romans: "For he shows here that it is the worthy that God useth to save, even if the promise be made to the whole nation."²⁰

In a homily on the Acts, Chrysostom shows that he had the right conception of the place of the atonement of Christ in regard to the means of grace and the Christian life. Taken out of its context the quotation does not say much. Chrysostom is commenting on Peter's Pentecostal sermon. He says that Peter did not wish to antagonize the Jews and therefore in calling them to repentance and faith and in urging them to be baptized, he qualified his exhortation to be baptized not "in the Cross of Jesus," but "in the name of Jesus." We give the quotation as it occurs: "And (Hom. VIII) he said not, In the Cross, but, In the name of Jesus, let every one of you be baptized."²¹ A few lines lower he has a quotation that is striking and usable also today and that shows he had an adequate idea as to what the forgiveness of sins: "And yet quite other is the law of this world's tribunals: but in the case of the gospel proclamation; when the delinquent had confessed, then is he saved."²²

In a homily on St. John (Hom. XVII) we have a statement which might be considered under the doctrine of Christ. Chrysostom has a peculiar statement here by which he seems to indicate that the powerful workings of Christ's miraculous powers were more effective than the more descent of the Holy Spirit. I would have been a statement closer to the truth to say that also through Christ's miracles the Holy Spirit exerted His influence. "For if

20. Schaff, op. cit., XI, p. 483

21. Schaff, op. cit., XI, p. 46

22. Ibid.

when they saw Him working wonders, touching with His own hands the sick and the dead, and so bringing them back to life and health, they were so drunk with malice as to declare the contrary of what they saw; how could they shake off their unbelief by the descent of the Spirit only?"²³

VI Conversion, or The Bestowal of Faith

The early church in general neglected the doctrine of justification by faith. The church during this early period of its history was more concerned about the doctrine of the person of Christ, particularly His godhead. This doctrine was particularly under controversy in the early era. The result was that the doctrine of justification by faith was neglected. Not only because Chrysostom was a child of his day did he follow this tendency, but also because he so much in his own life and for his own person emphasized sanctification did he mix the doctrine of sanctification into that of conversion and justification by faith.

In our discussion of Chrysostom's attitude toward the doctrine of conversion we will begin by giving a good statement of grace by Chrysostom. If he had only remained in harmony with this statement his whole theology would have been entirely evangelical. This statement is found in a homily on St. John (H^{om}.XIV): "After having said, 'Of His fullness have all we received,' he adds, 'and grace for grace.' For by grace the Jews were saved: 'I chose you' saith God, 'not because you were many in number, but because of your fathers.' (Deut. 7,7-LXX) Now if they were chosen by God not for their own good deeds,

23. Schaff, op. cit., XIV, p. 61

it is manifest that by grace they obtained this honor. And we too all are saved by grace, but not in like manner; not for the same objects, but for objects much greater and higher. The grace that is then with us is not like theirs. For not only was pardon of sins given us, (since we have this in common with them, for all have sinned) but righteousness also, and sanctification, and sonship, and the gift of the Spirit far more glorious and more abundant. By this grace we have become the Beloved of God, no longer servants, but as sons and friends."²⁴

In the first negative statement we make about Chrysostom's attitude toward conversion we say that Chrysostom did not have the right idea about the essence of conversion. Chrysostom represents conversions as turning away from evil and toward good. Instead of considering conversion as contrition over sin and faith in Jesus Christ as the Savior from sin and with the resultant fruits of a hatred of evil and a love of good, he represents conversion as that which is a fruit of it rather than its essence, namely a turning away from evil and turning to good. We quote a statement of his in a homily on St. Matthew (Hom.XI): "But by repentance I mean, not only to forsake our former evils deeds, but also to show forth good deeds greater than those."²⁵

In a homily on Acts Chrysostom makes a statement concerning Cornelius that God took great pains to bring the Gospel to him because of his piety. This is related to the doctrine of conversion in this way that if Chrysostom's verdict here were true then in answer to the question, "Why does the Holy Spirit convert a man?" we would in each occasion have to give the answer that

24. Schaff, op. cit., XIV, p. 49

25. Schaff, op. cit., X, p. 66

it was because of a greater degree of piety that one person received the gift while another did not receive it. We quote now Chrysostom's words in the homily of Acts (Hom. XXII, XI, 141): "This man (namely Cornelius) is not a Jew, nor of those under the Law, but he had already forestalled our manner of life. Observe, thus far, two persons, both of high rank receiving the faith, the eunuch at Gaza, and this man; and the pains taken on behalf of these men. But do not imagine that this was because of their high rank: God forbid! it was because of their piety. For Scripture mentions their dignified station, is to show the greatness of their piety."²⁶ It is true what Chrysostom says here, that Scripture mentions the piety of Cornelius and the fact that his prayers and his alms had come up a memorial before God. But the author's mentioning of the virtues of Cornelius did not have the purpose of proving that the Holy Spirit brought him the Gospel because of his eminent piety, but that his piety and prayer-life is an evidence of his faith and of his being a child of God and that God as He does in many other cases⁵ in His great mercy answered Cornelius' prayer for more spiritual enlightenment. Cornelius was a proselyte of the gate, a heathen convert to the true religion of the Old Testament and God merely answered the prayer of a child of His. He did not reward a man's piety by bringing the Gospel to him. If piety were required before faith and if virtue had to precede our receiving the Gospel as a reward, then many sinners would be in a hopeless condition.

Now we have considered what Chrysostom regards as a pre-

26. Schaff, op. cit., XI, p. 141

ceding prerequisite of conversion, namely a good character, or as he puts it in another homily of his, "a noble soul." Let us then consider what part according to Chrysostom's synergism man must contribute in the actual moment to conversion. Chrysostom tells us that man's choice and free-will must be operative in the moment of regeneration. We quote a homily on St. John (Hom. XLV): "(Matt. 16,17) What he here intimateth is something of this kind, that 'faith in me is no ordinary thing, but needeth an impulse from above': and this He establisheth here throughout His discourse, showing that this faith requires a noble sort of a soul, and one drawn on by GodBut perhaps someone will say, 'If all that the Father giveth, and whomsoever He shall draw cometh unto Thee, if none can come unto Thee except it be given him from above, then those whom the Father giveth are not free from any blame or charges.' These are mere words and pretenses. For we require our deliberate choice also, ~~because~~ whether we will believe. And in this place, by the 'which the Father giveth Me,' He declareth nothing else than that 'the believing on Me is no ordinary thing, nor one that cometh of human reasonings, but needeth a revelation from above, and a well-ordered soul to receive that revelation."²⁷ In another homily on Hebrews (Hom. XIV, 446) Chrysostom in a similar vein gives us a statement concerning the activity of our free will in the moment of conversion. The Lutherans on the basis of Scripture say that everything in conversion is the work of the loving and effective power of the Holy Spirit through the Word. But then the questions naturally arise: "Why does God

27. Schaff, op. cit., XIV, p. 162

in His Word exhort us to believe? Why does He urge us to repentance? Why does He demand the impossible of us?" Luther in his *De Servo Arbitrio* answers this question by saying that God demands the impossible from us that we may learn our impotency and that we may come to Him for strength. There is also another Scriptural answer to this question. It is this that God in demanding the seemingly impossible of us at the same time and through the same word in which He requires faith of us and repentance towards God gives us the power to obey by the same word through which He commands. Now in the above referred to homily of Chrysostom, he gives us another answer to the question. He says that man is capable of obeying the word which exhorts to contrition and faith and that God cannot demand the impossible of us. We quote: "But easier than all these, if we have the will, is virtue, and the going up into Heaven. For here it is only necessary to ^{have} ~~thve~~ the will, and all the rest follows. For we may not say, I am unable, nor accuse the Creator. For if He made us unable and then commands, it is an accusation against Himself. How is it then (someone says) that many are not able? How is it then that many are not willing? For, if they be willing, all will be able. Therefore also Paul says, 'I would that all men were even as myself,' (I Cor. 7,7) since he knew that all were able to be as himself. For he would not have said this, if it had been impossible. Dost thou wish to become such? Only lay hold on the beginning."²⁸ The quotation of I Cor. 7, 7 and its implied exegesis is an example of Chrysostom's some times horrible interpretations of a text.

28. Schaff, op. cit., XIV, 446

10

Saint Paul here speaks of marriage and he wishes, speaking by the permission of God, that all men were as he was, unmarried.

In a homily on Romans (Hom. IV) Chrysostom speaks of faith as our contribution and of the grace of God as His contribution, whereby He forces us from error. We here have, therefore, a statement both of synergism in conversion and of God's grace which irresistably brings us from error by force. We quote: "If then He hath brought us near to Himself, when we were far off, much more will He keep us now that we are near. And let me beg of you to consider how He everywhere sets down these two points: His part and our part. On His part, however, there be things varied and numerous and diverse. For He died for us and further reconciled us, and brought us to Himself, and gave us grace unspeakable. But we brought faith only as our contribution. And so he says, 'by faith, unto this grace.' What grace is this? Tell me. It is the being counted worthy of the knowledge of God; the being forced from error, the coming of a knowledge of the Truth, the obtaining of all blessings that come through Baptism."²⁹

We will consider one more statement of Chrysostom on conversion. Before this we have established that Chrysostom was definitely synergistic in his views. Here we encounter a judgment of Chrysostom's that says conversion is of God and that the sanctification which follows it is of man and is that part which man must contribute in order to deserve his reward. When we try to establish just what Chrysostom did teach, we always come to this conclusion, that Chrysostom was an orator and that he often introduced doctrinal distinctions merely to appeal to

29. Schaff. op. cit., XI, p. 396

the intellect and to create the illusion of movement and development of thought. We quote from Chrysostom's second homily on First Corinthians (Hom. II): "What then saith the Christian? 'It were meet to have implanted in us the knowledge itself of virtue' He hath implanted it; for if He had not done so, whence should we have known what things are to be done, what left undone? Whence are the laws and the tribunals? But 'God should have imparted not (merely) knowledge, but also the very doing of it (virtue). For what then wouldst thou have to be rewarded if the whole were of God?"³⁰ This statement is a direct contradiction of Phil. 2,13, where St. Paul declares: "It is God which worketh in you both to will and to do of His good pleasure." Later on in the same homily Chrysostom repeats this sentiment: "It is quite clear that we also have it in our power to do well: why do we, the most part deceive ourselves in vain with heartless pretexts and excuses, bringing not only no pardon, but even punishment intolerable?"³¹

VII Justification by Faith

Now we will consider Chrysostom's stand on the central article of Christian faith--the doctrine of justification by faith. We will first begin with two good statements of Chrysostom and then we will show how he contradicted them with others entirely unscriptural and the last consideration will be this that Chrysostom in his teaching on justification, even if he had some statements that were admirable, by the preponderance of emphasis vitiated them with many more than are unacceptable.

30. Schaff, op. cit., XII, p. 8

31. Schaff, ibid.

If one observes the context in which the good statements are made, it is found that they are usually uttered where he is treating or quoting a passage that almost compells him by its clearness and authority to come out with a statement of evangelical truth.

Our first quotation of Chrysostom in regard to this doctrine is a good one, but its wording puts us in mind of his syergistic ideas on conversion. He says on Romans (Hom. IX) on page 395: "And after speaking of our faith, he also mentions God's unspeakable love toward man, which he ever presents on all sides, bringing the Cross before us. And this he now makes plain by saying, Ver. 25. 'Who was delivered for our offenses, and was raised again for our justification.'"³² Our second quotation (Hom. on Acts, XLV) gives a good statement of justification by faith by implication rather than by direct expression, by showing the salutary effects of God's grace to man. "It is grace (Hom. on Acts, XLV) that saveth. He constantly puts them in mind of grace, to make them more earnest as being debtors, and to persuade them to have confidence."³³ We submit a third statement of Chrysostom in which he in the same homily on Romans (Hom. IX) apparently contradicts himself. In the first part of his homily he speaks of faith as our part in the work of sanctification. In the same homily in the last part he says that the Apostle Paul has "ascribed everything not to our well-doings, but to God's love."³⁴ He evidently does not think of faith as a good work, although he demands it as our contribution. We quote the latter statement in which he says that sanctification is all the work of

32. Schaff, op. cit., XI

33. Schaff, op. cit., XI, p. 272

34. Schaff, XI, p. 396

God. "For this why he himself by saying, 'hope maketh not ashamed,' has ascribed everything not to our well-doing, but to God's love. But after mentioning the gift of the Spirit, he again passes to the Cross, speaking as follows: Ver. 6-8. 'For while we were yet without strength, Christ in due time died for the ungodly. For scarcely a righteous man will one die; yet peradventure for a good man some dare to die. But God commendeth His love towards us.'³⁵ If we were to take these two passages and comparing them deduce Chrysostom's doctrine, we should come to the conclusion that Chrysostom was guilty of a mild form of synergism, but when we examine many other passages of his, we come to the conclusion that he was synergistically inclined not only in a practical way through the manner in which he appealed to people, but that he also recognized the principle of synergism in his statements on the theory of the doctrine.

We first bring an example that shows that he was inclined to the synergistic manner of preaching. In our selection of homilies read we chose those texts which Chrysostom treated which contain good statements of sola gratia, sola fide, or solus Christus. Almost invariably we were disappointed. In this homily which we wish to consider Chrysostom shows that he knows just what the forgiveness of sins is in theory. The statement in the homily on Matthew (Hom. XXIX), "Who can forgive sins, but God only?", he paraphrases as "To bind sins pertains to God only."³⁶ In this homily Chrysostom had a marvelous opportunity to preach Christ crucified as the basis, as the causa meritoria of forgiveness of sins, but he spends most of the time in proving the Godhead of Jesus. This is a very worth while purpose and

35. Schaff, *ibid.*

36. Schaff, *X*, p. 195

it was demanded by the doctrinal needs of his day (we know that the doctrine of Christ's deity was the one which the early Christian Church had to spend the most time defending), but what a wonderful opportunity this text offers for showing the relation between Christ's work and the forgiveness of sins, between the Lord's redemption and the sinner's justification. Perhaps this tendency in Chrysostom led Luther to call him, "not the golden, but the gilden."

In a homily on St. John (Hom. XXI) Chrysostom mixes up grace and works and then says that this composite is necessary to salvation. He says: "We must place our hope of salvation in nothing else, but only in our righteous deeds (done) after the grace of God."³⁷

In a homily on Hebrews (Hom. VII) he says that both faith and good works are necessary to salvation. This error was ironed out in the Majoristic controversy. He states: "Faith is indeed great and bringeth salvation, and without it, it is not possible ever to be saved. It suffices not however of itself to accomplish this, but there is a need of right conversation also. So that on this account Paul exhorts those who had already been counted worthy of the mysteries, saying, 'Let us labor to enter into that rest.' 'Let us labor,' (he says) Faith not sufficing, the life also ought to be added thereto, and our earnestness to be great; for truly there is much need of earnestness too, in order to go up into Heaven."³⁸

In a homily on St. John (Hom. LXVI) Chrysostom gives us another statement that good works are necessary to salvation.

37. Schaff, op. cit., XIV, p. 75
 38. Schaff, op. cit., XIV, p. 348

He is led into this extreme statement here by his oratory which sometimes forced him into confusing if not into entirely false antitheses. He says: "Let us then flee them (he says referring to the false teachers), beloved, for a pure life profits nothing when doctrines are corrupt; as on the other hand neither do sound doctrines, if the life be corrupt."³⁹

In a homily on Romans (Hom. XVIII) Chrysostom makes a statement that sounds very much like the Roman Catholic penance. "Weighing then all these things to Him Who alone is Lord to blot out the bill against thee and to quench that flame, to Him make prayer and supplication, and propitiate Him, by now feeding and clothing Him continually."⁴⁰

Our final statement as to Chrysostom's stand against justification by faith alone is found in a homily on Matthew (Hom. LV). He has a flagrant statement of work-righteousness, teaching that after baptism the giving of alms is another means of securing the forgiveness of sins. We quote: "Consider of what prayer it were a worthy object, to be able to find after baptism a way to do away with one's sins. If He had not said this, Give alms, how many would have said, Would it were possible to give money, and so be freed from the ills to come! But since this hath become possible, again are they become supine."⁴¹

VIII The Doctrine of Sanctification and Good Works

A man's theology is often colored by the man. It is so difficult to be objective in matters pertaining to faith. And even among all those that are orthodox in their religious views

39. Schaff, op. cit., XIV, p. 246

40. Schaff, op. cit., XI, p. 486

41. Schaff, op. cit., X, p. 467

we find a difference of emphasis and a variation in approach. Such variations in the field of religion are not entirely without their value. In fact, according to Romans 12, they find a place in the economy of God. Therefore also with a man such as Chrysostom, a man of a strong and unique character, you will find a theology colored by the personality. Chrysostom in his own personal life as has been noted before was inclined toward asceticism. He was a man of great earnestness and of intense piety. Put such a man into a city like Antioch, a city loving pleasure and vice, and quite naturally he will overemphasize sanctification of life. It is well to keep this in mind when considering Chrysostom's doctrine of sanctification and good works.

A homily of Chrysostom's on Romans (Hom. IX) suggests to us some of the hair-raising sin of which the people were guilty. We quote: "And this one may see happening in victuals as well as in forms of government, in emulous aims of life too, and in the enjoyment of pleasures, and in wives, and in houses, and in slaves, and in lands, and in the cases of all other things. For what is more pleasurable pray, cohabiting with women or with males? with women or with mules? Yet still we shall find many that shall pass over women, and cohabit with creatures void of reason, and abuse the bodies of males. Yet natural pleasures are greater than unnatural ones. But still many there are that follow after things ridiculous and joyless, and are accompanied with a penalty, as if pleasurable."⁴²

It is not strange therefore that we find him condemning luxury in a homily on Matthew (Hom. XI). He says: "Let us

42. Schaff, op. cit., XI, p. 399

then forsake this soft and effeminate way of living. For it is not, it is not possible at once both to do penance and to live in luxury. And this let John (the Baptist) teach you by his raiment, by his food, by his abode. What then? dost thou require us, you may say, to practice such self-restraint as this? I do not require it, but I advise and recommend it."⁴³

In a homily on Acts (Hom. XLIX) Chrysostom in his enthusiasm to inculcate the ascetic life, discourages extravagance in families so that in case of death the bereaved be not tempted to remarry. He says: "Not only do you bring yourself into a disreputable position; you also disgrace your children by leaving them poor, if it chance that you depart this life before the wife; and you give her incomparable more occasions for connecting herself with a second bride-groom. Or do you not see that many women make this the excuse for a second marriage--that they may not be despised; that they want to have some man to take the management of their property?"⁴⁴

In fact, Chrysostom became so ardent in his battle against ungodly living that he adopted as his own philosophy the policy that it is even justifiable to deceive people if it is for their own good. He actually carried out this principle in the case of Basil. Allin his survey of Chrysostom's theology says that Chrysostom was "firmly persuaded that to deceive men for their good is a duty."⁴⁵ So we find the great preacher lashing out fiercely against all ungodliness uninhibited even by a sense of complete honesty.

In a homily on Romans (Hom. XX) Chrysostom gives a good

43. Schaff, op. cit., X, p. 66

44. Schaff, op. cit., XI, p. 296

45. Allin, "The Augustinian Revolution in Theology," p. 85

statement as to what was his ideal in a life of religious asceticism. "What then are the things which God willeth? to live in poverty, in lowliness of mind, in contempt of glory; in continency, not in self-indulgence; in tribulation, not in ease; in sorrow, not in dissipation and laughter; in all the other points wherein He hath given us laws."⁴⁶

Chrysestom, of course, is not always thoroughly consistent. At one time he goes to an extreme by saying that there was a difference in the Old Testament and the New in respect to their attitude on wealth. This he does in a homily on the Hebrews. He says: (Hom. XVIII) "And again, if riches and poverty are from the Lord, how can either poverty or riches be an evil? Why then were these things said? They were said under the Old Covenant, where the one was a curse and the other a blessing. But now it is no longer so. But wilt thou hear the praises of poverty? Christ sought after it and saith, 'But the Son of Man hath not where to lay His head.' (Matt. 7,20) And again He said to His disciples, 'Provide neither gold, nor silver, nor two coats.'"⁴⁷

In contrast to the above extreme view Chrysestom has a statement in which he shows a proper view toward riches. He brings this out in a homily on Acts (Hom. VIII) where he says: "For the fellowship was not only in prayers, nor in doctrine alone, but also in social relations. (This, he says, speaking of the Apostolic Church.) 'And sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men, as every man had need.' See what fear was wrought in them! 'And they parted them,' he says showing the wise management: 'As every man had need.' Not

46. Schaff, op. cit., XI, p. 498

47. Schaff, op. cit., XIV, p. 452

recklessly like some philosophers among the Greeks, of whom some gave up their land, others cast into the sea great quantities of money; but this was no contempt of riches, but only folly and madness. For universally the devil had made it his endeavour to disparage the creatures of God, as if it were impossible to make good use of riches."⁴⁸

IX The Law and The Gospel

Chrysostom in a homily of his on II Corinthians (Hom. VII) has an excellent statement of the distinction between the Law and the Gospel. He, however, did not always observe this distinction with all exactness in practice, confusing the Law and the Gospel in the doctrine of conversion and the Christian life of sanctification. "And other testimonies far more numerous than these may be adduced out of the Old Testament, showing how the Law is done away by Christ. So that when thou shalt have forsaken the Law, thou shalt then see the Law clearly; but so long as thou holdest by it and believest not Christ, thou knowest not even the Law itself."⁴⁹

X The Doctrine of Holy Baptism

The tenth doctrine to be considered is the doctrine of Baptism. In a homily on Romans (Hom. XVI) Chrysostom indicates that he believes in the regenerating power of Baptism. "Thus we are also gendered by the words of God. Since in the pool of water it is the words of God which generate and fashion us. For it is by being baptized into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost that we are gendered. And this birth

48. Schaff, op. cit., XI, p. 45

49. Schaff, op. cit., XII, p. 312

is not of nature but of the promises of God?⁵⁰ A few lines down he says: "You see then that it is not the children of the flesh that are the children of God, but that even in nature itself the regeneration by means of baptism from above was sketched out beforehand."⁵¹ Then we have another statement as to baptism that is adduced by the Baptists to indicate that the patristic mode of baptism was immersion. This may be true that many of the church fathers practised immersion, but that does not according to our Christian liberty compel us on scriptural grounds to make this method the one rightful one. That would have to be proved from Scripture itself. At any rate, this statement occurs in a homily of St. John (Hom. XXV) "In baptism are fulfilled the pledges of our covenant with God, burial and death; resurrection and life; and these take place all at once. For when we immerse our heads in the water, (It can also be noted here that we read the homilies in a translation made by the Baptist Schaff) the old man is buried as in a tomb below, and wholly sunk forever; then as we raise them again, the new rises in its stead. As it is easy for us to dip and lift our heads again, so it is easy for God to bury the old man, and to show forth the new."⁵²

In a homily on Acts (Hom. VII) Chrysostom shows that he had a proper conception of the Biblical teaching of the means of grace. When one examines this text and considers the marvelous opportunity that Chrysostom had for treating conversion and the justification of the sinner before God and how he nonetheless

50. Schaff, op. cit., XI, p. 463

51. S Ibid.

52. Schaff, op. cit., XIV, p. 84

- 23 -

with greater emphasis and in a greater portion of his sermon treats the practical matter of Christian life, we see that in the center of Chrysostom's theology we do not have the doctrine of justification, but the doctrine of sanctification. This statement is worth while because it shows that Chrysostom understood Baptism to ^{be a} means whereby God conveyed remission to the sinner. His statement is: "If you are to receive a gift, if baptism conveys remission, why delay?"⁵³

XI The Doctrine of The Lord's Supper

On most doctrines on which Chrysostom expressed himself we can determine with a fair degree of accuracy just what his stand was, whether he was in accord with Biblical doctrine, whether he was led astray from it or whether he held contradictory views on the same matter both for and against the truth of Scripture, but there is one doctrine where it is difficult even to determine where Chrysostom stood. We do not know in regard to this doctrine whether he spoke literally or figuratively, whether he had clear conceptions in his own mind concerning it or not. This is the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. The simplest way out of the predicament would be to present those various passages in which Chrysostom seems to have the clearest declarations and let the reader judge for himself. We agree with Schaff in his judgment of Chrysostom in regard to the Lord's Supper. "It would be unjust to press his devotional and rhetorical language into the service of transubstantiation, or consubstantiation, to the Roman view of the mass."⁵⁴ We now quote Schaff's quotation from a homily of Chrysostom on Hebrews IX, 26,

53. Schaff, op. cit., XI, p. 45

54. Schaff, op. cit., IX, p. 21

on the sacrificial aspect of the eucharist. "Christ is our High Priest, who offered the sacrifice that cleanses us. That sacrifice we offer also now, which was then offered, which cannot be exhausted. This is done in remembrance of what was then done. For, saith He, 'Do this in remembrance of Me.' It is not another sacrifice we make, as the High Priest of old, but always the same, or rather we perform the remembrance of a sacrifice."⁵⁵ When we examine this passage, we come to the conclusion that Chrysostom favored the memorial rather than the sacrificial character of the Lord's Supper. We quote another of Schaff's quotations from *De Sacerd.* III, 4. "When you behold (*ibid.*) the Lord slain and lying there, and the priest standing over the sacrifice and praying, and all stained with that precious blood, do you then suppose you are among men, and standing upon earth? Are you not immediately transported to Heaven?"⁵⁶ And in another place: "Christ lies slain upon the altar." And yet the people were so indifferent that Chrysostom speaking of their neglect of the Lord's Supper and of their contempt for the sacrament laments: "In vain is the daily sacrifice, in vain stand we at the altar; there is no one to take part."⁵⁷ In one place Chrysostom speaks of the sacrament as being a symbol and then again he speaks of the real and true presence. In a homily on Matthew (*Hom. LXXXII*) he speaks of the sacrament as a symbol. "As then in the case of the Jews, so here also He hath the memorial of the benefit with the mystery, by this again stopping the mouths of the heretics. For when they say, Whence is it manifest that Christ was sacrificed? together

55. Schaff, *ibid.*, quoting Chrysostom.

56. Schaff, *ibid.*, quoting *De Sacerd.* III, 4 of Chrysostom

57. Schaff, *ibid.*, quoting Chrysostom.

with the other arguments we stop their mouths from the mysteries also. For if Jesus did not die, of what then are the rites the symbols?"⁵⁸ So the Reformed could quote this passage as saying that Chrysostom did not teach the real presence. But in this instance Chrysostom is more interested in proving the atonement than in making a dogmatic statement as to the real presence. In a latter portion of this same homily Chrysostom indicates that the participants in the Lord's Supper receive a benefit from it, the same benefit that they receive from Baptism. "For His Word cannot deceive, but our senses are easily beguiled. That hath never failed, but this in most things goeth wrong. Since then the word saith, 'This is my body,' let us both be persuaded and believe, and look at it with eyes of the mind. For Christ hath given nothing sensible, but though in minds sensible yet all to be perceived by the mind. So also in baptism the gift, the gift is bestowed by a sensible thing, that is, by water; but that which is done is perceived by the mind, the birth, I mean, and the renewal. For if thou hadst been incorporeal, He would have delivered thee the incorporeal gifts bare; but because the soul hath been locked up in a body, He delivers thee the things that the mind perceives, in things sensible."⁵⁹

But we have in this same homily a statement that indicates that Chrysostom believes in the true presence. "What shepherd feeds his sheep with his own limbs? And why do I say shepherd? There are often mothers after the travail of birth send out their children to other women as nurses; but He endureth not to do this, but Himself feeds us with His own blood, and by all means entwines us with Himself."⁶⁰

58. Schaff, op. cit., X, p. 492

59. Schaff, ibid., p. 494

60. Schaff, ibid., p. 495

In this same homily we may note a very desirable characteristic in Chrysostom, his strict practice in regard to the celebration of the Lord's Supper. Dr. Fritz quotes this statement in his Pastoral Theology. "I would give up my life rather than impart of the Lord's blood to the unworthy; and will shed my blood rather than impart of such awful blood contrary to what is meet."⁶¹

In a homily on I Corinthians (XII) Chrysostom indicates his synergistic and Pelagainistic views in their full force. While on one side he emphasizes the fact that the Lord's Supper confers grace, on the other hand he indicates according to his synergism that man must prepare himself for the proper reception for this offered grace and that this effort on man's part brings the grace to him and earns it. We quote: "But thou, before thou hast partaken, fastest, that in a certain way thou mayest appear worthy of the Communion: but when thou hast partaken, and thou oughtest to increase thy temperance thou undoest all. And yet surely it is not the same to fast before this and after it. Since although it is our duty to be temperate at both times, yet most particularly after we have received the Bridegroom. Before, that thou mayest become worthy of receiving: after, that thou mayest not be found unworthy of what thou hast received...Purify thy right hand, thy tongue, thy lips, which have become a threshold for Christ to tread upon. Consider the time in which thou didst draw near and set forth a material table, raise thy mind to that Table, to the Supper of the Lord, to the vigil of the disciples, in that night, that holy night...For a festival is therefore appointed, not that we may behave ourselves unseemly, not that

61. Homily LXXXII, quoted by Dr. Fritz in his "Pastoral Theology."

we may accumulate sins, but that we may blot out those which exist."⁶²

In general, it might be said that Chrysostom was not interested in doctrinal distinctions. It was enough for Him that our Lord had commanded us to celebrate Communion. There is virtue and strengthening effect merely in following out his command. He had no clear conception of the materia and the forma of the Sacrament, but he dramatized its significance in order to get the people to celebrate this memorial and thus put themselves in remembrance of Christ's death.

XII The Doctrine of The Christian Church

Under the head doctrine of the Church we will bring into focus Chrysostom's attitude toward the primacy of Peter, the position of Mary in the church, and the supplication on saints. Schaff in his Prolegomena sums Chrysostom's attitude toward Peter in the words: "As to the question of the papacy he considered the bishop of Rome as the successor of Peter, the prince of the Apostles, and appealed to him in his exile against the unjust condemnation of the Council of Oak. But his Epistle to Innocent was addressed also to the bishops of Milan and Aquileia, and fall short of the language of submission to an infallible authority....He calls the bishop of Antioch (Ignatius and Flavian) likewise a successor of Peter, who labored there according to the express testimony of Paul. In commenting on Gal. 1, 18, he represents Paul as an equal in dignity to Peter."⁶³ In a homily by Chrysostom on St. John (Hom. XXI) he has an interesting interpretation of the words of Matthew 16, "Thou art

62. Schaff, op. cit., XII, p. 162

63. Schaff, op. cit., XI, Prolegomena, p. XXI.

Peter, etc." He interprets the word 'rock' as being the confession of Peter. "And what I shall say is clear, not from this only, but also from what follows. For Christ added nothing more to Peter, but as though his faith were perfect, said, that upon this confession of his He would build the Church; but in other cases He did nothing like this, but the contrary."⁶⁴ In another homily on St. John Chrysostom indicates his belief that Peter was the head of the Apostles by divine right. When we bear in mind that Chrysostom has the tendency to exaggerate and that when he refutes a claim of an historical, practical, or doctrinal nature, he is apt to do to the other extreme, we can to an extent account for this statement. We quote two statements: (Hom. LXXXVIII) "And at the same time to show him that he must now be of good cheer, since the denial was done away, Jesus putteth into his hands the chief authority among the brethren."⁶⁵ And again: "Here again He alludeth to his tender carefulness, and to his being very closely attached to Himself. And if any should say, 'How then did James receive the chair at Jerusalem?' I would make this reply, that He appointed Peter teacher, not of the chair but of the world."⁶⁶

Now let us consider Chrysostom's attitude toward Mary's position in the church. Here we note that Chrysostom was not infected by even a tendency toward Mariolatry. First we consider this fact that Mary gave birth to Jesus. He has two statements on this in a homily on St. Matthew (Hom. XLIV) "Even to have borne Christ in the womb, and to have brought forth that marvelous

64. Schaff, op. cit., XIV, p. 73

65. Schaff, ibid., p. 331

66. Schaff, ibid., p. 332

birth, hath no profit, if there be not virtue."⁶⁷

And on page 279: "And with what profit He reprov'd, that it was not with intent to drive them to perplexity, but to deliver them from the most tyrannical passion and to lead them on by little and little to the right idea concerning Himself, and to convince her that He was not her Son only, but also her Lord."⁶⁸

In a homily on St. John (Hom. XXI) he speaks in a similar vein. "And He therefore answered thus in this place, and again elsewhere, 'Who is my mother, and who are my brethren?' (Matt. 12,48), because they did not yet think rightly of Him; and she, because she had borne Him, claimed, according to the custom of other mothers, to direct Him in all things, when she ought to have revered and worshipped Him."⁶⁹ "Think of this then, and when you hear a certain woman saying, 'Blessed be the womb that bare Thee, and the paps which Thou hast sucked,' and Him answering, 'Rather blessed are they that do the will of my Father' suppose that those other words were also said with the same intention. For the answer was ^{not} that one of rejecting His mother, but of One who would show her having borne Him would have availed her nothing had she not been good and faithful."⁷⁰

What was Chrysostom's attitude toward the saints? He believed in supplicating them. It seems that supplicating the saints was a common practice among his people. In his homily on St. Matthew where he brings this idea out (Hom.V) he first develops the scriptural idea that it is of no avail that the saints and

67. Schaff, op. cit., X, p. 278

68. Schaff, ibid., p. 279

69. Schaff, op. cit., IX, pp. 74-75

70. Schaff, ibid., p. 75

the greatest of patriarchs pray for us, but then he brings in the false antithesis that we should depend on our own virtue. What interests us here is the suggestion concerning the supplication of the saints. "Let us not then be looking open-mouthed towards others. For it is true, the prayers of the saints have the greatest powers; on condition however of our repentance and amendment."⁷¹ And again, "And this I say, not that we may omit supplication^{of} the saints, but to hinder our being careless, and trusting our concerns to others only, while we fall back and slumber ourselves."⁷²

XIII The Doctrine of Eternal Election

When one errs in the doctrine of conversion, it is obvious that he will also, if he proves to be consistent, err in the doctrine of election. As Chrysostom contradicts himself in the doctrine of conversion, so he contradicts himself also in the doctrine of election. If we were to judge Chrysostom and come to the conclusion whether he is a monergist or a synergist, we could with justice judge him a synergist. In this homily on Romans (Hom. XVII) he brings out the doctrine of election. "As then Pharaoh became a vessel of wrath by his own lawlessness, so did these become vessels of mercy by their own readiness to obey. For though the more part is of God, still they also have contributed themselves some little. Whence he does not say either, vessels of well-doing or vessels of boldness, but 'vessels of mercy', to show that the whole is of God."⁷³ On this same page, in the next column he strengthens the first idea of his, "Whence

71. Schaff, *ibid.*, p. 34

72. Schaff, *ibid.*, p. 35

73. Schaff, *op. cit.*, XI, p. 469

then are some vessels of wrath, and some of mercy? Of their own free choice. God, however, being very good, shows the same kindness to both."⁷⁴ Further on he says: "Do you see that he too does not say that all are to be saved, but that those that are worthy shall? For I regard not the multitude, he means, nor does a race so far diffused distress me, but those only do I save that yield themselves worthy of it."⁷⁵

XIV The Doctrine of The Last Things

On the doctrine of the last things we could find only three statements in Chrysostom's homilies which have a direct bearing. This smallness in number of quotations referring to the last things shows that Chrysostom's preaching emphasized morals more than the hope of eternity, that his preaching at least, if not his religion, was more "diessaits" than "jenseits." We have one quotation in a homily on Acts (Hom. XXXIX) that speaks of the resurrection from the dead. "And when they heard', what great and lofty doctrines, they did not even attend, but jeered at the Resurrection! 'For the natural man,' it saith, 'receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God.'"⁷⁶

In a homily on Romans (Hom. XVI) Chrysostom has a very good statement indicating that it is the fault of the damned themselves that they are not saved. "Now if all have sinned, how come some to be saved, and some to perish? It is because all were not minded to come to Him, since for His part all were saved, for all were called."⁷⁷

74. Schaff, *ibid.*

75. Schaff, *ibid.*, p. 470

76. Schaff, *ibid.*, p. 241

77. Schaff, *ibid.*, p. 464

Finally, in a homily on Hebrews (Hom. XXI) Chrysostom shows that he has the same idea that we have, "As many then as do not believe in Hell, let them call these things to mind: as many as think to sin without being punished, let them take account of these things."⁷⁸

CHRYSOSTOM AND HIS SERMON METHOD

Since Chrysostom was one of the greatest preachers of all time, it becomes quite interesting to us as to just what was his sermon method. A very superficial acquaintance with Chrysostom's works informs us of the fact that his sermons are called homilies. First of all then we will try to develop the idea of a homily and then determine just what the nature of Chrysostom's homilies are. We will give some pertinent statements from some of the important writers of histories of preaching. We quote first from Broadus, *The History of Preaching*. He says: "The preaching of the time was in general quite informal. The preacher did not make logous discourses, but only homilies, homilies, that is conversations, talks. Even in the fourth century (i.e. during Chrysostom's floruit), there was still retained, by some out of the way congregations, the practice of asking the preacher many questions, and answering questions asked by him, so as to make the homily to some extent a conversation. And in this period it was always a mere familiar talk, which of course might rise into dignity and swell into passion, but only in an informal way. The general feeling appears also to have been that the dependence of the promised blessing of the Paraclete forbade elaborate preparation of discourses. And this feeling would prevent many from writing out their discourses

78. Schaff, *op. cit.*, XIV, p. 507

after they were spoken." 79

Dargan, in his "A History of Preaching" (pp. 41-42) says: "In form, the sermons of the earlier times were unpretentious addresses as their name 'Homilies'--conversations, talks--- sufficiently indicates. They were without much logical order, and give little if any indication of a previously prepared outline. The character of the audience would determine whether the talk should be chiefly didactic or evangelistic, and the circumstances of the preacher would decide whether it should be principally doctrinal, expository, or hortatory; or how far any of these elements might be combined in one discourse. There was progress both toward a more orderly structure and a more expository character, and these tendencies were powerfully furthered by the example and teaching of Origen toward the end of the third century (before Chrysostom). Before his time Scripture was used in the homilies, but rather by way of quotation and application than as furnishing a text for exposition. But in his hands continuous exposition with hortatory application became the rule. 80

Hoppin in his "Homiletics" quotes Vinet. He says: "'If the homily is not as greatly different from the ordinary sermon as we commonly suppose, it has yet a character of its own. This character belongs to it not only from its having to do most frequently with recitals, or from any familiarity peculiar to this kind of discourse, but rather from this, that its chief business, its principal object, is to set in relief the successive parts of an extended text, subordinating them to its contents, its accidents, its chances, if we may so speak, more than

79. Broadus, op. cit., pp. 46-47
 80. Dargan, op. cit., pp. 41-42

may be done in the sermon, properly so called...Nothing distinguished essentially the homily from the sermon, except the comparative predominance of analysis, in other terms, the prevalence of explanation over system." This last sentence of Vinet characterizes the nature of the homily more clearly and definitely than all the previous statements. "the prevalence of explanation over system."

Now that we have considered the nature of the homily let us take two of Chrysostom's homilies and that we may give ^{him} the benefit in judgment take two of his more orderly discourses and analyze them.

We believe that a homily found in Kleiser's, "The World's Great Sermons" is representative of Chrysostom at his best. The homily is labeled, "Excessive Grief At The Death Of Friends" and it is a development of I Thess. 4,13. "But I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not." Chrysostom begins the homily as he often does by mentioning what he had been discoursing on in his previous homilies. He mentions that they had been considering the story of the poor man Lazarus and then he brings in the analogy that as Lazarus was covered with sores in his body but that his spirit beneath was precious so also in regard to other treasures that are hidden in the earth--on the surface there is rough ground and thorns and briers but underneath an abundance of wealth. This is a characteristic of Chrysostom to bring figures of speech of this nature into his homilies and it is definitely a very strong characteristic of his. Chrysostom then goes over to his text by saying that the Thessalonians passage is the apostolic counterpart to the evangelical story of Lazarus.

This is a very orderly introduction on Chrysostom's part. Frequently his introductions are not so orderly and are almost too brief. His first comments in the body of the sermon are directed to the word "sleep" in the text and he contrasts this with the word "death", bringing out this fact that wherever Christ's death is mentioned it is always referred to as "death" while on the other hand the death of the Christian is often referred to as a "sleep."

Then under the figure of a broken down house and of a mutilated statue Chrysostom brings home the idea that the body must be destroyed so that it may be raised better and more glorious. That is the second comfort he holds out to those that have been or might be bereaved. He is delivering this discourse not on the occasion of someone's death but in preparation for all those that might be bereaved. This is an example of his pastoral wisdom. The comparison is then introduced that just as a person goes into a far away country and we rejoice even though he be away if he be prosperous there, so we should not lament excessively at the death of a loved one. There is a just limit to sorrow which it is not proper to pass.

We now adduce an example of Chrysostom's vividness of style and his manner of direct appeal. We quote: "Believe me, I am ashamed and blush to see unbecoming groups of women pass along the mart, tearing their hair, cutting their arms and cheeks--- and all this under the eyes of the Greeks. For what will they not say? What will they not declare concerning us? Are these the men who reason about the resurrection? Indeed! How poorly their actions agree with their opinions! In words, they reason about a resurrection: but they act just like those who do not

acknowledge a resurrection."⁸¹

Chrysostom now brings out the idea that we differ from the unbelievers and then leads over to the thought how we should differ from them in our estimate of death. One of these lines of distinction that Chrysostom mentions is the attitude toward wealth. This quotation is interesting because it brings out Chrysostom's ascetic philosophy. We quote: "He looks on wealth, and longs for it with earnest desire; I look on wealth, and condemn it. He sees poverty, and laments; I see poverty, and rejoice. I see things in one light; he in another."⁸²

By many scriptural allusions and quotations Chrysostom then develops the thought of our distinctness from the ungodly. He then says that there are people over whom we can more rightfully mourn than over the dead, that is, over those that have sinned and have not repented.

Then Chrysostom goes on to give us many scriptural examples of people who suffered great bereavements and yet thanked the Lord and were grateful to Him under trials. The first Biblical character that Chrysostom mentions is Job. He mentions him on many other occasions. He seems to have developed quite a fondness for quoting Job as an example.

We will bring in one statement from Chrysostom in regard to Job to which we must take exception. We quote: "That Job's children were virtuous, appears from the fact that their father was particularly solicitous in regard to them, and rising up offered up sacrifices in their behalf, fearing lest they might have committed secret sins; and no consideration was more important

81. Kleiser, "The World's Great Sermons," Vol. I, p. 31

82. Kleiser, *ibid.*, p. 33

in his esteem than this."⁸³ This is an example of faulty exegesis and false doctrine. Chrysostom gives the impression that Job sacrificed for his children who had died and thus tried to atone for some unforgiven sins. Instead of the word, "sacrificed" the Hebrew Bible uses the word for, "worshipped."^P In this instance Chrysostom could not have been misled by the LXX--the only version of the Old Testament to which he had access and which he could use, for the LXX also in this instance translates correctly. This is also an example of poor logic. How could the fact that Job sacrificed for his children after their death prove their peity?^Q

Chrysostom goes on to elaborate on Job's calamity and mentions various factors that made it so difficult. Then he brings in one of the striking examples of his vividness of speech. This example borders on the bizarre and the melodramatic. It is characterized by Oriental intensity and vividness of imagination and we can see what effect it had on his audience, as he himself tells us. We quote: "For their father did not see them expire on a bed, but they are all overwhelmed by the falling habitation. Consider then; a man was digging in that pile of ruins, and now he threw up a stone, and now a limb of a deceased one; he saw a hand still holding a cup, and another right hand placed on the table, and the mutilated form of a body, the nose torn away, the head crushed, the eyes put out, the brain scattered, the whole frame marred, and the variety of wounds not permitting the father to recognize the beloved countenances. You suffer emotions and shed tears at merely hearing of these things: what must he have endured at the sight of them?"⁸⁴

83. Kleiser, *ibid.*, p. 38

84. Kleiser, *ibid.*, pp. 39-40

Chrysostom brings the final illustration of Abraham, as an example under severely trying and troubling circumstances. Then Chrysostom compares the heroic faith of Abraham and Job with the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees. We believe that the comparison is improper. The righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees was no righteousness, while that of Abraham and Job was. We quote: "And let no one say that these were wonderful and great men. True, they were wonderful and great men. But we are required to have more wisdom than they, and than all who lived under the Old Testament. For 'except your righteousness exceed that of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven.'"⁸⁵

The sermon method of Chrysostom as deduced from this sermon might be stated in the following manner. The text was not difficult and we can say that Chrysostom understood it fully and correctly. He does not have a formal outline. He just takes the thoughts as they present themselves to him and develops them one by one, stringing them together in a loose manner. The sermon, however, does not lose any of its effectiveness on this account. He develops the thought of the text quite fully. He uses illustrations from the Bible and from the life of the common people. He believes in the resurrection of the body and he believes that the souls will be glorified in the world to come. The sermon as such is very good. It is not extraordinary for its contents. The only conclusion we can then arrive at is this that its effectiveness must have lain largely in his manner of delivery, in his serious earnestness, in his unmarred sincerity, and in his holy idealism.

85. Kleiser, *ibid.*, p. 45

We now take another of Chrysostom's homilies, his first homily concerning the statues, in which he discourses on the words of I Tim. 5, 23, "Drink a little wine for thy stomach's sake, and thy often infirmities." This homily does not properly belong to the twenty-one homilies concerning the statues, because it does not deal with the situation nor any of the circumstances in which the people of Antioch found themselves after their revolt. He perhaps delivered this homily just immediately before this occurrence and so it is included with the others in this grouping.

In his introductory remarks Chrysostom says that he chose this part of the words of the apostle for their consideration in order to show that in a text so simple and obvious as this one there was still much spiritual food. Chrysostom compares scripture with a bed of flowers and then again he likens the epistle of Paul to a mine of gold in which every portion of it is precious and worthy of attention. Chrysostom considers some objections made by the enemies of the Scriptures, namely why God permitted Timothy to be sick, a man who was ^oclose to Himself, who was working in His vineyard, and who could have been healed by Paul or himself. Then he goes on to show that Timothy was sick because of his severe austerities of self-denial. He reads this into the account of Timothy that he was ill because he was an ascetic. We know from Chrysostom's life that he himself became ill because of his extreme asceticism and that he was an advocate of self-discipline and self-torture and earnestly felt that Scripture encouraged this. Chrysostom then develops the point that this text does not give licence to drunkards. We have in this context another striking example of his Oriental

vividness. We quote (IX, Hom. 1, 335): "For what is more wretched than drunkenness! The drunken man in a living corpse. Drunkenness is a demon self-chosen, disease without excuse, an overthrow that admits of no apology; a common shame to our kind. The drunken is not only useless in our assemblies; not only in private and public affairs; but the bare sight of him is the most disgusting of all things, his breath being stench. The belchings, and gapings, and speech of the intoxicated, are at once unpleasant and offensive, and are utterly abhorrent to those who see and converse with them; and the crown of these evils is, that this disease makes heaven inaccessible to drunkards, and does not suffer them to win eternal blessedness: for besides the shame attending those who labour under this disease here, a grievous punishment is also awaiting them there!"⁸⁶

Then Chrysostom answers the objections of those who ask why God permits His saints to be afflicted with infirmities. He elaborates particularly on the point that God permits weakness to exist in His instruments in order to show His strength through their weakness, that He permits His beloved to suffer so that the ungodly when they see their prosperity might not say that they serve the Lord because of the benefit of earthly possessions they obtain thereby. He develops the idea with illustrations from the lives of the apostles and prophets, from Job, Lazarus, Abel, and others.

Toward the end of the homily Chrysostom thunders against blasphemy and gives some rather doubtful advice as to how to combat it. He says: "But now since our discourse has turned to

86. Schaff, op. cit., IX, p. 335--Homily I

the subject of blasphemy, I desire to ask one favor of you all, in return for this my address, and speaking with you; which is, that you will correct on my behalf the blasphemers of the city. And should you hear anyone in the public thoroughfare, or in the midst of the forum, blaspheming God; go up to him and rebuke him; and should it be necessary to inflict blows, spare not to do so. Smite him on the face; strike his mouth; sanctify thy hand with the blow, and if any should accuse thee, and drag thee to the place of justice, follow them thither; and when the judge on the bench calls thee to account, say boldly that the man blasphemed the King of angels!"⁸⁷

When we consider this homily, with rather few exceptions it follows a well-defined plan. Chrysostom, of course, announces no theme, but it is really surprising how excellent the logic of this discourse is. It is one of Chrysostom's best homilies and it could be read with great profit by all. It is textual and it has many striking Biblical examples which bring great spiritual truths home with force and clarity.

Now that we have considered Chrysostom's sermon methods as they were observed in two sermons in particular, we will gather a few pertinent statements from critics of preaching and preachers which we feel are a true judgment and an exact evaluation of Chrysostom's sermon method in general. Edward Ulbach has two statements which indicate Chrysostom's sermon method. "Every sermon concludes with a reproof of some vice, and an exhortation to some virtue."⁸⁸ This statement is borne out when one reads a good number of Chrysostom's homilies. The other statement

87. Schaff, *ibid.*, p. 343

88. Ulbach, Edward, *op. cit.*, p. 332.

treats of Chrysostom's manner of illustration. "His illustrations were often similar to the following: 'As wheresoever bad odors are, there will swine flock; but wheresoever sweet odors and incense are, there will bees resort. In like manner, wheresoever ungodly songs are sung, there will be devils gathered together; and wheresoever spiritual songs are sung, there will the grace of the Spirit fly to sanctify both mouth and soul.' His taste would be fastidious whom this would offend, and his comprehension dull who could not understand; and though a man forget all the rest of the sermon, the swine, the devils, and the bees with the lesson they inculcated, could not fail to stick."⁸⁹

Ker points out some of Chrysostom's faults as a sermonizer: "He takes a portion of the Bible, says something about it, and leaves it for digressions, though interesting and eloquent, which fail to bring out the depth and power of the Word of God in its bearing on the heart and conscience. This, again, was the fault of the time and school (Diodorus), rather than of the man. As Origen was led astray by philosophy, Chrysostom was led astray by art."⁹⁰ Riddle in his "Introductory Essay, St. Chrysostom As An Exegete," brings out Chrysostom's faults in his sermon methods, while discussing his greatness as an exegete. "Marks of carelessness, especially in citation, abound; the habits of the 'practical preacher' often lead to long digressions, to elaboration of matters that at best hold only the relation of a tangent to the truth of a text. Yet less than most pulpit orators does Chrysostom warp the interpretation to suit his homiletical purpose.

⁸⁹. Ulbach, Edward, *ibid.*, p. 340

⁹⁰. Ker, *op. cit.*, p. 69

Occasionally vehement invective occurs when an exegetical difficulty is encountered, and it is easy to suppose that unconsciously the former has been used to cover up the latter. But there are few evidences of lack of candor in the treatment of such difficulties."⁹¹

Chrysostom and His Preaching

While Chrysostom's life is interesting and sheds much light on a tragic and unsettled age and while his theology is still today exerting an influence on a great sector of Christendom, namely on the Greek Orthodox Church, Chrysostom's preeminent claim to immortality comes largely through his preaching. Studying his theology and trying to evolve his sermon methods are interesting and absorbing, but Chrysostom's greatest appeal also in the twentieth century comes to us when our imagination is inflamed in reliving and in the attempt at recreating his tremendous eloquence and silver-tonguedness.

Basic to good preaching is good character. If one were to examine the lives of the great preachers, one would almost invariably find that they were men of pure character. A man can hardly feign that intense moral earnestness and that unmixd sincerity that is required not only in preaching but in any speaking situation. Even the rhetoricians and the teachers of oratory of all ages have recognized this fact. We cannot escape the verdict of history that Chrysostom was a great preacher and if we examine his life, we cannot miss the fact that he was a noble character. Riddle in his "Introductory Essay, St. Chrysostom as an Exegete" has some very pertinent remarks on both. He says: "The preeminence of Chrysostom remains undisputed, despite the

91. Schaff, op. cit., Essay by Riddle, MB, D.D. XVIII-XVII (pp.)

many reversals of judgement that have resulted from modern historical investigations; no voice has been raised against the popular verdict, repeated in every age, that awards to him the first place among pulpit orators in the Eastern Church....Nor has there been any serious difference of opinion in regard to his personal character. His intense moral earnestness has always been recognized, and the man has been honored because it was distinctly felt that the man gave power to the oration. 'Golden mouth avails little, unless it belongs to a golden man'⁹² Ker in his "Lectures on the History of Preaching" makes this judgment as to Chrysostom's character: "He was a man, as we have said, of great honesty and zeal, admired and beloved by the people, feared by princes, envied by many of his fellows on account of his popularity, and disliked by them because of his secluded life and reserved manner."⁹³ Ulbach in his work on Chrysostom makes two significant remarks: "He was capable of the warmest friendship as is shown by his intimacy with Basil....His age needed him, but was unworthy of him,"⁹⁴

Mackay in his "Life and Death of Chrysostom" quotes Newman as saying in regard to Chrysostom's temperament and disposition: "John was the personification for a day in spring, showery, sunny, and glistening through its rain. It was his love for each that made John's sermons so exciting."⁹⁵ And Ker in his "Lectures on the History of Preaching" brings out the sterner side of his character. He says: "He was evidently a preacher who had in him the spirit of Stephen and Paul and was willing to make the men

93. Ker, op. cit., p. 76

94. Ulbach, Edward, "John Chrysostom, Preacher," p. 341

95. Mackay, "Followers in the Way," p. 81

enemies by daring to tell them the truth. It was his first and highest praise that, with such power and popularity, he thought so little of them, compared with fidelity to his Master."⁹⁶

This then was the character of the man.

Let us now direct a few words to describing the natures of the people whom he served and the situations under which he served. For one thing the professing Christians in those days had the same tendency that Christians in our day do. They were anxious to effect a convenient working compromise between the Church and the world. They were given to luxury and dissipation. They left the church to attend the theatre and the circus. They took part in bacchanalian orgies and they made a point of getting drunk on the first day of the year, under the belief that it would be unlucky for them to begin it sober. They thronged to hear the splendid oratory which awoke their admiration even when it did not touch their hearts, but they absented themselves from prayers and systematically turned their backs upon Communion. They listened so intently that pickpockets were able to ply a busy trade among them--and Chrysostom at times warned them of the presence of thieves in their midst, but they forgot the practical application of what they heard. They broke out into tumults of applause, but what they admired was the rhetoric, not the spiritual truth, it intended to convey. This was the occasion on a very memorable situation. It was the time that Chrysostom preached the second of the series of orations after the riot of the statues. Edward Ulbach describes the whole situation very graphically in his work, "John Chrysostom, Preacher" (p.332-333) "In the second year of his ministry, in the week before Lent,

96. Ker, op. cit., p. 68

A.D. 387, the inhabitants might have been seen hurrying in great crowds to their preacher. It is certain that the golden-mouthed John, during that season of Lent, never preached without the church being crowded to suffocation. It was rarely otherwise at any other time, although he sometimes congratulated himself on the select character of his audience, when it happened to be thin, and denounced those who had forsaken the church to attend the circus or the theatre. On this occasion he has for hearers all of the one hundred Christian inhabitants of Antioch that could crowd into the large Basilica. He holds them all spell-bound. You can see the changing emotions of their minds expressing themselves successively on their countenances, as the preacher makes chord after chord vibrate in their bosoms. Every eye is fixed on that emaciated face, lighted with glow of earnestness and enthusiasm; every ear drinks in the melodious flow of speech that rolls through the sanctuary in tones now deep and solemn, and now thrilling with passion; every time he strikes his left palm with his right forefinger--as he did when excited--some heart surrenders to the irresistible force of his eloquence; not a posture is changed, not a breath drawn, not a whisper heard among the listeners, until at last their emotion expresses itself in one simultaneous burst of applause, and the church reechoes with a tumultuous and deafening clapping of hands. The flush of triumph at first visible on the preacher's face is speedily followed by a deep shade of disappointment and sorrow, and when the silence is restored he chides them for filling the house of God with the noise and clamor of a theatre, telling them that these plaudits for a moment fall him with sinful pride, but afterwards produce the deepest sorrow, as they are only proofs that

he had moved their admiration without reaching their consciences. The tumultuous applause on the present occasion, however, is only the result of an inveterate habit, and not the sign of levity. For terror is depicted on every countenance; all seem panic-struck, and we only have to listen as the homily proceeds, to learn the cause of their alarm."⁹⁷

We will now adduce a passage from the second homily which illustrates the preacher's manner. We quote from Dergan, "A History of Preaching": "The gay and noisy city, where once the people hummed like bees around their hive, was petrified by fear into the most dismal silence and desolation; the wealthier inhabitants had fled into the country, those who remained shut themselves up in their houses, as if the town had been in a state of seige. If anyone ventured into the market-place, where once the multitude poured along like the streams of a mighty river, the pitiable sight of two or three cowering dejected creatures in the midst of the solitude soon drove them home again. The sun itself seemed to veil its rays if as in mourning. The words of the prophet were fulfilled. 'Their sun shall go down at noon, and their earth shall be darkened in a clear day.' (Amos 8,9). Now they might cry, 'Send to the mourning women, and let them come, and send for the cunning women that they may come.' (Jer,9,17) Ye hills and mountains! take up a wailing; let us invite all creatures to commiserate our woes, for this great city, this capital of Eastern cities is in danger of being destroyed out of the midst of the earth, and there is no man to help her, for the emperor, who has no equal among men, has been insulted; therefore let us take refuge with the King who is above, and summon Him to our aid."

97. Ulbach, Edward, op. cit., pp. 332-333

Pattison in his "History of Christian Preaching" perhaps better than any other history of preaching catches the spirit of Chrysostom's audiences and of his manner of preaching. We quote him at length: "We see the deacons place themselves around the pulpit and cry 'Silence! Silence! when the sermon is about to begin. The noisy throng fills the church--a flock, says the preacher, he cannot call it, for there is not a sheep among them, a stable, rather, for oxen, asses, and camels. They will not be quiet during the preliminary worship, they are talking about pleasure and about business, they are making bargains, they are breaking out in unseemly laughter. 'We can pray at home,' they say, 'but we can only hear preaching at church.' 'And what will the sermon profit you?' he retorts, 'If it not joined with prayer? First prayer, then the word, said the apostles.' A venerable bishop occupied his pulpit on one occasion, and those who often winced under Chrysostom's preaching now went off whimpering over his substitute like whipped boys; they cried out when he hit them, and yet they are the same children who return to their mother's side, catch hold of her dress, and are dragged along after her with sobs and tears. He preaches on repentance, and he notes that a crowd of soldiers and mechanics, as well as of those who have no business keeping them elsewhere, flock to hear him. Or, it is a wet day, and now a thin congregation chills the ardor of the few who attend. The plea for the poor is accompanied by a reference to the front row in the church filled with beggars. A sudden lighting up of church diverting the attention of his hearers gives point to his remonstrance because they turn so readily from Christ the light of the world to those poor earthly lamps: 'At the very time when

I am setting forth before you the scriptures, you are turning your eyes away from me, and fixing them upon the lamps, and upon the man who is lighting the lamps. Oh! of what a sluggish soul is this the mark, to leave the preacher and turn to him, I too am kindling a fire of the scriptures; and upon my tongue there is burning a taper, the taper of sound doctrine. Greater is this light and better, than the light that is yonder. For, unlike that man, it is no wick steeped in oil that I am lighting up. I am rather inflaming souls, moistened with piety, by the desire of the heavenly discourse.' We still seem to catch the perfume from the fashionable pews, to recover the sparkle of the gems, and to hear the great preacher as he surprises the gourmands with a sermon especially designed for those who before coming to church have dined not wisely but too well. He was emphatically a preacher for the hour. Listen to him at time of national panic when the people of Antioch have incurred the displeasure of the emperor by riot. See how he turns the panic to account in pressing the claims of God on those who are forgetful of his bounty: 'A man has been insulted, and we are all in fear and trembling, both those of us who have been guilty of this insult, and those of us who are conscious of innocence. But God is insulted every day. Why should I say every day? Rather should I say every hour; by rich and by poor. by those who are at ease and those who are in trouble, by those who calumniate and those who are calumniated; and yet there is never a word of this; therefore God has permitted our fellow-servant to be insulted, that thou mayest know the lovingkindness of the Lord. In this present outrage, the culprits have been apprehended, thrown into prison, and punished; and yet we are in fear. He who has been

insulted has not heard what has been done, or pronounced sentence; and we are all trembling. But God fears day by day the insults offered to him, and no one ^{trans} to him, although God is so kind and loving. With him it is enough to acknowledge the sin, and the guilt is absolved...do you not thence conclude how unspeakable is the love of God; how boundless, how it surpasses all description?"⁹⁸

It was this series of sermons, the "Sermons on the Statues" which according to Mackay (The Life and Death of St. John Chrysostom) "completed his (John's) conquest of Antioch."⁹⁹ Dargan makes the following comment on this series of sermons: "The homilies, however, were not only eloquent, but most timely and effective, so that thousands by their means were brought to better thoughts. The preacher bore down upon the vices and sins which marred the city; he complained that the people feared the wrath of the emperor more than the wrath of God, and dreaded death more than sin. Altogether these homilies are one of the most remarkable series of discourses in the literature of the pulpit. With them Chrysostom's fame and power reach their height in the city of his birth."¹⁰⁰

These homilies of Chrysostom's, the "Sermons on the Statues" are also noteworthy for their timeliness. They are, as the Germans put it, 'zeitgemaesslich.' But Chrysostom capitalized on other stirring occasions in his ministry. Eutropius, the eunuch prime minister of Theodosius had succeeded in obtaining Chrysostom for the position of archbishop and leading preacher

98. Pattison, op. cit., pp. 67-68

99. Mackay, op. cit., p. 82

100. Dargan, op. cit., p. 89

in Constantinople. But it was not long before John had incurred the displeasure of this same man and had made himself an enemy of this influential politician. But as the fate of politician's often is, when they lose their influence, that they are reduced to almost nothing, today as far as the security of power and influence is concerned, then as far as even the security of their lives were concerned, so Eutropius had fallen from favor with the emperor and was in the very danger of losing his life. But the magnanimous Chrysostom takes the part not only of one who had become an enemy, but one who was universally despised and could not expect to find mercy anywhere. Pattison in his "The History of Christian Preaching" describes the situation. "Eutropius, the fallen favorite of the emperor, is discovered clinging to the altar, while his foes, crowding about him, vow that the sanctity of the church shall no longer protect him, Between the abject wretch and the howling mob Chrysostom stands and preaches a sermon on vanity, pointing as he speaks to the culprit on whose face he sees the paleness of death, while his teeth chatter, his whole frame is convulsed, and his tongue stammers forth incoherent words. Behold the majesty of the Gospel which can afford even to a man so base as he an asylum! Then he holds the bloodthirsty throng back while he bids them remember the Savior's prayer for His enemies on the cross, not does he desist until they actually join with him in a plea for mercy to be shown Eutropius by the emperor."¹⁰¹ When one thinks of this scene in particular, one almost feels that the writer who said that there was an element of the bravado in Chrysostom was analyzing him correctly.

101. Pattison, op. cit., p. 69

We will consider one more occasion in which Chrysestem's nature shows itself up in a strong light. Chrysestem was banished by the queen Euzodia and he bid farewell to his flock. Pattison quotes the very words that recapture the pathos of the situation. We quote: "What can I fear? Will it be death? But you know that Christ is my life and I shall gain by death. Will it be the loss of wealth? But we brought nothing into the world and we can carry nothing out. Thus all the terrors of the world are contemptible in my eyes and I smile at all its good things. Poverty I do not fear. Riches I do not sigh for. Death I do not shrink from and life I do not desire save for the progress of your souls. But you know, my friends, the true cause of my fall. It is that I have not lined my house with rich tapestry. It is that I have not clothed me in robes of silk. It is that I have not flattered the effeminacy and the sensuality of certain men nor lay gold and silver at their feet. But why need I say more? Jezebel is raising her persecution and Elijah must fly; Herodias is taking her pleasure and John must be bound with chains; the Egyptian wife tells her lies, and Joseph must be thrust into prison. And so, if they banish me, I shall be like Elijah; if they throw me in the mire, like Jeremiah; if they plunge me into the sea, like the prophet Jonah; if into the pit, like Daniel; if they stone me, it is Stephen I resemble; John the forerunner if they cut off my head; Paul if they beat me with stripes; Isaiah if they saw me asunder."¹⁰² When his persecutors not daring to resist the indignant protest of the people of Constantinople recalled him, his restoration was celebrated by the inevitable sermon: "Blessed be God who allowed me to go forth; blessed again and again in that He has called me

102. Pattison, op. cit., p. 60

back to you. Blessed be God, who unchains the tempest, blessed be God who stills it and has made a calm....Through all the diversity of time the temper of the soul is the same, and the pilot's courage has been neither relaxed by the calm nor overwhelmed by the tempest...See what the snares of my enemies have done. They have increased affection and kindled regret for me and have won me six hundred admirers. At other times it is our own body alone who love me. Today the very Jews do me honor... It is not the enemies that I thank for their change of mind, but God, who has turned their injustice to my honour. The Jews crucified the Lord and the world is saved, yet it is not the Jews I thank but the Crucified. May they see which God sees; the peace, the glory that their snares have been worth to me. At other times the church alone used to be filled. Now the public square is become the church. All heads are as immovable as if they were one. All are silent, though no one orders silence. All are contrite too, There are games in the circus today, but no one assists at them. All flew to the temple like a torrent. The torrent is your multitude. The river's murmur is your voices, that rise up to heaven and tell the love that you bear to the Father. Your prayers are to me a brighter crown than all the diadems of earth."¹⁰³

Now that we have considered some of the representative situations in which Chrysostom had the opportunity to show himself up in his individual characteristics as a preacher, let us proceed to an evaluation of him as a preacher both from the

103. Pattison, *ibid.*, p. 70

positive and the negative view-points. As an introductory remark we say that Chrysostom did not at first have a great desire to get into the work of preaching. Like Luther and many of the other great preachers he shrank from this task for a long time. When we consider that he had many opportunities of entering the work of a preacher and that he began his career when he had already reached the age of forty years, we find much justification into Broadus's remark: "Chrysostom long shrank from the work of preaching, and the office of priest, the difficulties and responsibilities of which he had so impressibly stated in his little work on the priesthood."¹⁰⁴ And after he had become the chief preacher at the great church in Antioch he did not as is proverbially stated today 'shake the sermons out of his sleeve.' Wherever a man rises high in any art or any work he must be continually and consciously careful of his efforts and fearful that on some occasion he does not sink into an insipid mediocrity. Chrysostom throughout his ministry was a careful and painstaking worker. Farrar in his "Lives of the Fathers" tells us: "He rarely trusted to the inspiration of the moment, nor did he ever flatter himself that he could do without careful preparation. Sometimes, perhaps, he read his sermons."¹⁰⁵

We showed in the introductory remarks of this thesis that the almost universal judgment of critics of preaching and writers of its history give to Chrysostom one of the highest places in the history of preaching. Dargan says: "Some indeed give him, all things considered, the very first place after the Apostles."¹⁰⁶

104. Broadus, op. cit., pp. 75-76

105. Farrar, "Lives of The Fathers," p. 664

106. Dargan, op. cit., p. 91

In our discussion of Chrysostom's life we brought out many of the elements that made for his success. First of all he had great gifts. A great intellect and a noble heart. Then he had great opportunities for their cultivation. He had the devoted and intelligent care of a good mother. His liberal education and early work at the profession of the law gave him a knowledge of the world. His retired life of prayer and study strengthened his spiritual life and made him a master of the Scriptures. His work in the inferior offices of the clergy at Antioch brought him in close contact with the common people and acquainted him with the routines and the details of a pastor's life. When he therefore became the chief preacher he had a rich and varied experience and training and he had much time to develop himself fully. And the final consideration that brought the strength of his genius into full flower was his great opportunities. He had great places to fill and inspiring audiences to preach to both at Antioch and at Constantinople. He had at his command the language that the great Demosthenes used as his vehicle.

All these things together contribute to the greatness of the orator, but without that God-given instinct for speaking, for enlisting the feelings of the people and exciting their imagination, for holding them spell-bound and controlling their emotions and their intellects at will, Chrysostom would not have been the man nor the success that he was. He knew what to say and he knew how to say it. He could turn the occasion of the moment to his advantage. He has a command of language, wealth of material, and abundance and fitness of illustration, fine powers of imagination and description. Add to this a deep knowledge of

the Bible, a thorough understanding of human nature, a love for one and an intimate sympathy for the other and you have a picture of the golden-tongued St. John Chrysostom of Antioch.

But Chrysostom's strength was the source of his failing, perhaps even more correctly put, his strength was at the same time his weakness. His great drive and his overwhelming zeal often betrayed him into a false glitter, a forced antithesis, and occasionally into a hollow and affected pomp. "His best work," as Dargan puts it, "was marred by the Oriental intensity and exaggeration, in feeling, in thought, in language. The overmuch was his snare." But when we consider Chrysostom, I wonder whether modern preaching does not have many a lesson to learn from him. My opinion is that we never become effective because we are too timid, that in our fear of failure we lack the courage to rise above mediocrity, that as modern slang has it "we are afraid to stick our necks out" so that we might bring the message of Christ to the world with all its force and all its authority. The fault of our day is not a lack of gifts but it is a lack of that full-hearted trust in the assistance of our Lord to crown our sincere and conscientious efforts with His divine blessing.

Chrysostom's Life

A most interesting and a most profitable study for a Christian would be that of God's place and active part in the history of men. It certainly would bring many startling findings. It has been said that when God has work to do, He does not have men spring up from the soil, alive and fully matured, to perform His purposes, but He determines that a small child is to be born, gives it pious and faithful parents, a good Christian training and education, a godly environment, a sufficient amount of hardship

to purify the character and a sufficient amount of temptation to strengthen it, and then sets before the man the work which He determined to be done. Thus if we study the life of Luther and his reformation of the church under God we will find many evidences of God's providential working. So also in the life of Chrysostom. If we examine his life just from the viewpoint of God's providential working in the lives of men we will find many startling manifestations of the divine intervention. It seems that so many things conspired to give the church in the near East a man that she sorely needed and that was well qualified to meet the needs.

(In 347 Chrysostom was born in a wealthy and distinguished family in Antioch, the capital of Syria, and the home of the mother church of Gentile Christianity, where the disciples of Jesus were first called Christians.) (His father, Secundus, one of the eight Field Marshals of the Imperial army, died while he was yet a little child. His mother, the lady Anthusa, was thus widowed at the age of twenty years. His mother was an unusual woman. She was young, attractive, cultured, having a good family background, and being a woman of means. Suitors were many pressing and it is hinted that the emperor wished her to be married to one of his officers. She refused all offers of marriage and devoted herself to the upbringing of her boy particularly and to his older sister. At home she taught John the religious life. She selected the best teachers for his mental culture. The great teacher Libanius had returned to his native Antioch and so Anthusa enrolled her son in his school of rhetoric and it was not long till Libanius found in Chrysostom his favorite pupil.) In fact, Libanius wanted to have Chrysostom

as his successor.) On his deathbed he is said to have complained that Chrysostom would have been his worthiest successor, if the Christians had not carried him off. Libanius is also reported to have remarked, when he heard of Anthusa's devotion to John, "What women these Christians have!" John also attended lectures of Platonic philosophy under Andragathus. So John was thoroughly educated for law, and actually began the practice of it. A great career seemed to open up before him, but for the pure and earnest young man the corruptions of that profession and the worldly life about him were too bad to be endured. Then too he was perhaps influenced by his mother to give up rhetoric when she realized all the implication and requirements of the life of a lawyer. Chrysostom had a great friend in Basil, who like him also had studied under Libanius and who was determined to enter the monastery. He perhaps also persuaded Chrysostom to leave his profession and come into monastic life with him. But here his mother Anthusa stepped in. She pleaded that she would be lonely without him and so her son was persuaded to stay at home. But his stay was merely a compromise, for although he did not go to some monastery he turned his home into one and lived an ascetic life with all its austerities. He met Meletius in 367, entered his class of catechumens, and was baptized by Meletius in his twenty-third year. From this time on says Palladius, "He neither swore, nor defamed anyone, nor spoke falsely, nor curse, nor even tolerated facetious jokes."¹⁰⁷ Meletius foresaw the future greatness of the young lawyer and wished to secure him for the active service of the church and ordained him to the subordinate office of lector.) He now kept an almost un-

107. Schaff, op. cit., IX, Prolegomena, p. 6, quoting Palladius.

broken silence to prevent a relapse into the habit of slander. His former associates at the bar called him unsociable and morose. (Then presumably after his mother's death Chrysostom retired to a monastery near Antioch with two of his fellow-pupils under Libanius, Maximus (afterwards bishop of Seleucia) and Theodore of Mopsuetia. There they studied Scripture under Diodorus (afterwards a bishop of Tarsas). After a period under Diodorus he retired to the mountains to an aged hermit, a Syrian monk, with whom he lived for four years. Two years more he spent in a solitary cave, practicing during this period the most ^{severe} austerities and studying Scripture at the same time. The severities that he practiced undermined his health and he had to return to Antioch.)

(With his return to Antioch Chrysostom began an important part of his life. He was ordained deacon by Meletius in 380 or 381 and a few years later he was ordained presbyter by Flavian in 386. It was perhaps in the following year 387 when he had been made the chief preacher of the leading church in Antioch which was named St. Sophia) when that revolt occurred that gave Chrysostom a wonderful opportunity to use his ability as a preacher. (When we view Chrysostom's life, we must say that he had many wonderful opportunities for obtaining recognition, but they occurred in a comparatively short space of time and they were offered to him only when he was already forty years in age and when he had spent long and arduous years in preparation for them.) At this time Theodosius was the emperor of the Eastern Empire. As was usual for the emperors he had to give his army periodic gifts in order to maintain their favor. In order to avoid the claim of two gifts from the army he resolved to combine

the celebration of the fifth year of the nominal reign of his son Arcadius with that of his own tenth year on the throne. But to raise the necessary sum of money he had to levy an subsidy from the wealthiest cities of the East--especially from Alexandria and Antioch. Both cities were violently opposed to the claim. At Antioch the emperor's edict was proclaimed on Feb. 26, 387, and the sullen silence with which it was listened to was soon broken by the wail of the women who declared that the city would be ruined. As the bishop Flavian was absent from his home, the mob, finding themselves unable to plead for his intercession with the Emperor, surrounded the praetorium of the governor and then at the instigation of the lower element they rushed to the great public baths and aimlessly wrecked them. They also mutilated the statues of the emperor, the empress, and their sons. Although Theodosius was a Christian, he had a fierce temper which sometimes broke all bounds and the people of Antioch on reflection knew that they had much to fear from the emperor's wrath. They sent a deputation headed by the aged bishop Flavian to Constantinople to apologize for the affront and to sue for imperial clemency. Before apprizing Theodosius of the riot, the prefects of the city had proceeded to severe measures. The subsequent arrival of Hellebichus and Caesarius, the imperial commissioners, would have realized their worst fears, but for the intervention of the monks. The baths were closed, the senate imprisoned, Antioch degraded from its rank, and the last severities were being resorted to, when the monks pouring in from the surrounding country besieged the ears of their sovereign's representatives with prayers. At last they were induced to pause in the execution of vengeance till they heard from the emperor. In this interval

of popular suspense Chrysostom delivered the famous series of twenty-one homilies "On the Statues."

Ten years were passed in Antioch and the ten years confirmed the Government in its high opinion of Chrysostom's power over the people. Nectarius, the wealthy, genial, and easy-going Bishop of Constantinople died and there was a scramble of eager aspirants for the place. Among these was Theophilis, the unscrupulous and intriguing archbishop of Alexandria. At this time the weak emperor of Arcadius, the unworthy successor in the East of his great father Theodosius, was under the influence of one of the meanest of his ministers, the infamous Eutropius. Eutropius determined to disappoint all the schemers and bring from Antioch the eloquent John and make him archbishop at the capital. Knowing that both John and the people would resist this move, Eutropius resorted to stratagem and force to accomplish his purpose. The preacher was, innocently on his part, persuaded to come outside the city walls for the ostensible purpose of worshipping at some shrine. (He was seized by a band of soldiers in waiting and hurried off to Constantinople, where, with the requisite formalities, he was made archbishop and leading preacher at the great Church of the Apostles!)--an office which Gregory Naziansen had peevishly resigned before this time. He was consecrated Feb. 26, 398, by this enemy Theophilis, patriarch of Alexandria, who reluctantly yielded to the command of the emperor Arcadius or rather his prime minister, the eunuch Eutropius. (John now was at the height of his power). Constantinople took rank next after Rome as an episcopal see and one can see that it was growing in power from the fact that it by the middle of the next century, supported by a decree of the Council of Chalcedon and the efforts of the Greek emperors, claimed the same

ecclesiastical honors and prerogatives as the capital of the West. But John was also at this time at the height of danger and at the point where much disappointment and conflict awaited him. / Let us before we mention some of the conflicts that lay before Chrysostom discuss some of the constructive programs that he carried out. Consistent with his past, Chrysostom now lived the life of an ascetic, using the large revenues of his office in alms and other pious works. He, for example, built an infirmary. He extended the limits of his diocese; prosecuted a home mission among the Goths, the Arians in Constantinople; and exerted himself to spread the Gospel among the barbarous nations and to reclaim heretics. / But he was also as strict in his discipline as he was generous in his benevolences, and this led to his disappointments and conflicts, which finally culminated in his exile and death. He disciplined the venal and corrupt lower clergy with an unsparing hand. He rebuked without fear or favor all classes and conditions of men. His plainness of speech gave offense to the beautiful and imperious Euxodia, the wordly consort of Arcadius. Finally, after some time, the various elements of opposition that Chrysostom antagonized crystallized against him, Mackay in his "The Life and Death of St. John Chrysostom" summarized the various hostile forces in one striking sentence: "John had the World to fight in his patron Eutropius, the Flesh in the beautiful Empress Euxodia, a Byzantine Catherine of Russia, and the Devil in his spiritual superior, Theophilis, the Patriarch of Alexandria." 109 John had disappointed Eutropius who became his first enemy, When Eutropius fell from power John tried to get justice and mercy for

him, but Eutropius was killed and Euzodia became the power behind the throne. A magnificent pagan in Christian clothes, Euzodia was for a time captivated by John, and led the adoring crowds who surrounded his pulpit, but after a while she felt that John was reading the secrets of her heart, and her admiration became resentment. This flamed into hatred when John denounced the pagan festivities at the unveiling of the silver statue set up before the cathedral. An offended woman makes a bad enemy for a priest; an affronted empress makes a worse enemy for a bishop, and Euzodia, knowing that John was trying to reform the morals of the clergy conspired with Theophilis, the patriarch of Alexandria, whom we remember for being forced to consecrate John into his office. It took them three years to get John removed. A synod was called hastily at The Oak, a suburb of Chalcedon across the strait, to consider the charges against the archbishop. A formidable list of charges was made out--forty-six in number. Many of them were trivial, most of them utterly false, some with just enough show of truth to make them pass--with exaggerations and perversions--for the truth. Under such circumstance Chrysostom's condemnation was a foregone conclusion. He was deposed by a regularly convened and therefore a legal synod of the church, and was turned over to the government for punishment. The empress saw to that, and (an imperial decree of banishment was forthwith served on the bishops by the military arm of the government. He was escorted across the strait and his enemies seemed successful. But the news of his deposition and hasty banishment flew through the city--the people were roused--they gathered in crowds--they shouted, "Give us back our bishop," "We will have our bishop." "Better let the sun cease to

shine than stop that golden mouth!" In the midst of the popular uproar an earthquake came. The terrified empress quailed, the emperor gave way, Theophilis took to flight, and orders were given to bring the beloved preacher back. But this could not last. The sentence was not revoked, nor the enmity appeased, Finally, rather than be a source of schism in the church and of tumult in the empire, the good and wise man decided to accept voluntarily his condemnation with an appeal to a future general council. This council was never called. In order to avoid popular disturbance he left his mules hitched in the usual place near the church, and gave himself up privately through the back way to the guard, who secretly conveyed him across the Bosphorus.

Mackay in his "Life and Death of St. John Chrysostom" gives us a very graphic account of his exile and death. We take the liberty to quote at length: "In John's day the world was a flat plane with a brilliantly-lighted centre, from which you could apparently be taken right off the map into unknown desolation. Knowing John's sensitiveness Euxodia ordered him as far away as possible off the map. The idea was to carry him across Asia Minor towards the Caucasus till he died." For years John's health had been terribly bad; he appears to have suffered from almost chronic colitis and violent attacks of recurring fever. He could not eat ordinary food, and any extreme of heat or cold brought on an illness. The worst climate procurable was the of Armenia, and John could not bear any rough movements because of his colitis, so the plan was to carry him thither on a palanquin slung between two mules under a guard ordered to keep him moving as much as possible. His enemies were greatly aided in their plans for him by the Isaurian bandits, the predecessors of the

Kurds, who, in the same regions and in our own day, have extirpated under Turkish auspices the Christian Armenians. John and his party were delivered from the monotony of travel by having to spend weeks and months playing hide and seek with the Isaurian bandits. (The bishops through whose diseases he passed were ordered to hurry him on. Once when he was very dangerously ill a good lady took him into her country house. In the middle of the night a neighboring priest aroused him in great excitement and told him that the Isaurians were coming and would massacre the party. He was gotten out of bed, put into the carrying chair, and ordered forward up a mountain pass. No torches were allowed. Then one of the mules stumbled in the darkness, overturned the lectica, and flung the bishop into the road. The priest dragged him to his feet and urged him forward, and he staggered on for hours up a stony track in pitch darkness. It is most pathetic that in the letters he wrote to his best friends he made the best he possible could of his condition. His situation was always 'greatly improved,' his health which had been so bad was 'now reestablished'; to correspondents who would not grieve so much he sketched the other side of the picture. But John was tougher than his enemies hoped, and in the third winter of his exile his health grew better. So it was determined to bring matters to a close. A fresh guard was chosen and told to take him by forced marches to the eastern shores of the Black Sea. (He stood three months of this increased torture, then collapsed and died near a place called Comana in Pontus.)

And this is how he died. He was near death when they came to Comana, and he asked the guards to halt there, but they dragged him some miles farther to a place called Arabissus, where the

night was passed. Again next day he asked the guards to halt since his illness was so severe, but they would not, and marched on some miles past the chapel of the martyr Basiliscus, which stood outside the village. Then one of them looked into the carrying chair, and saw the shrunken face of Chrysostom, that at last the change had come, and that the end was at hand. It was useless to go on with a dead body, so they carried him back to the martyr's chapel.

Into the empty building the guards carried the Bishop's chair, pulled out the poles, and left him alone with two or three attendants. The Bishop made a little gesture toward his heart, and an attendant pulled back the many wrappings in which he was traveling and took out a small silver phial. He dusted the stone slab and set the phial down. It contained the Most Holy Viaticum. Then the Bishop pointed toward a little valise which always traveled with him. They unwrapped it and uncovered a pile of pure white linen - they were John's baptismal robes. Made for a young man of twenty, they were rather large for him now. The Bishop pointed to his traveling clothes. 'Divide these among yourselves,' he whispered, and they took off all his clothes, washed his body with water, and robed him from head to foot in the pure white linen. Then one brought him the silver phial, and he received his last communion. They knelt behind him, keeping silence, and left him sitting alone before the altar, robed in white. After a while he moved and spoke, 'Glory be to God for all things', said the Bishop."¹¹⁰

(Thirty-one years afterwards his body was brought back and buried amid the tears of the multitude. Edward Ulbach in his

110. Maskay, op. cit., pp. 85-88.

"John Chrysostom, Preacher" concludes his remarks on Chrysostom with the words: "He had not lived long; but he had lived with all his might."¹¹¹ And if I may make my own judgment, the life of Chrysostom is an excellent commentary on the words of John, the Baptist: "He must increase, but I must decrease."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allin, Thomas, D.D.--"The Augustinian Revolution In Theology"--
Edited by J.J. Lias, M.A. pp. 88-99.
London, James Clarke & Co. 13 & 14 Fleet Street. 1911
- Breadus, John A., D.D., LL.D.--"Lectures on the History of Preaching"
pp/ 46-47: 73-79
New York, A.C. Armstrong & Son. 1896
- Dargan, Edwin Charles, D.D. LL.D.--"A History of Preaching"
Volume I, pp. 86-93
Hodder and Stoughton, NY. George H. Doran Co. 1905.
- Farrar, Frederic W., D.D., F.R.S., "History of Interpretation"
pp. 220-222: New York: E.P. Dutton and Company,
Publishers and Importers, 31 W. 23rd St., 1886.
- Farrar, Frederic W., D.D., F.R.S., "Lives of the Fathers," pp.615-706
Edinburgh: Adam and Charles Black, 1889.
- Hoppin, James M., "Homiletics" pp. 6-9
N.Y.: Funk and Wagnall, Publishers, 18 & 20 Astor Place, 1883.
- Ker, Rev. John, D.D., "Lectures on the History of Preaching." pp. 65-69
Hodder and Stoughton, N.Y., George H. Doran Co. 1889.
- Kleiser, Grenville, "The World's Great Sermons," Vol. I, pp. 24-46
Funk & Wagnalls Co., New York and London, 1908.
- Mackay, H.F.B., "Followers In The Way." pp. 76-88
The Macmillan Company, New York, 1934.
- Pattison, T. Harwood, "The History of Christian Preaching." pp.63-72
The American Baptist Publication Society, 1701-1703
Chestnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa. 1903
- Schaff, P., D.D., LL.D., "The Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers."
New York, The Christian Literature Co., 1889 Vol. IX-XIV
- Ulback, Edward, "John Chrysostom, Preacher" in
Bibliotheca Sacra. pp. 322-342
Hicks Printing Company, 3901-31 Swill Avenue
Dallas, Texas, 1938.
- Baring, Gould, Rev. S., "The Lives of the Saints," Vol. I, pp. 400-413
Edinburgh: John Grant, 31 George IV Bridge, 1914
Printed by Ballantyne, Hanson & Co. at the Ballantyne
Press, Edinburgh.