

WRITINGS FROM THE GRECO-ROMAN WORLD



John Chrysostom on Paul

Praises and Problem Passages

Introduction, translation, and notes by
Margaret M. Mitchell

WRITINGS FROM THE GRECO-ROMAN WORLD

General Editors

John T. Fitzgerald and Clare K. Rothschild

Editorial Board

Theodore de Bruyn
Andrew Cain
Margaret M. Mitchell
Teresa Morgan
David T. Runia
Karin Schlapbach

Number 48
Volume Editor
Judith L. Kovacs

JOHN CHRYSOSTOM ON PAUL

Praises and Problem Passages

Introduction, translation, and notes by

Margaret M. Mitchell



ΧΡΥΣΟΣΤΟΜΟΥ
ΕΙΣ ΔΙΑΦΟΡΟΥΣ ΤΩΝ
ΑΓΙΩΝ ΓΡΑΦΩΝ ΠΕΡΙΚΟΠΑΣ
λόγοι γνήσιοι.

CONTENTS

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

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

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

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

The Authenticity of the Eighteen “Occasional Homilies”

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

151. See Mf 3:830–31.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

161. Aldama, *Repertorium Pseudochrysostomicum*.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Several aspects of the Sinai codex point in this direction. First, the title of *Hom. Tit. 2:11–12* contains a quasi-redundant *αὐτοῦ* (“by the same”) preceding the proper name and epithets (*τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἁγίου Ἰωάννου τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου*), which serves within this codex to link this homily with the previous, *CPG 4882*.¹⁹⁰ (Wenger had simply deleted the *αὐτοῦ* without comment from the text of his title in his edition, presumably because he regarded it as secondary.) The immediately preceding homily uses the

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

193. I have written out the four *nomina sacra* here plene (πρς, ἰω, θῦ, σῤῥος). Note that this title also lacks αὐτοῦ.

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

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

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

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

195. See especially §§9, 14, 19–24.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Hom. Tit. 2:11-12
(*In illud: apparuit gratia dei omnibus hominibus*)
CPG 4456 (AW as emended by Mitchell)¹

τοῦ ἐν ἀγίοις πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἰωάννου ἀρχιεπισκόπου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως τοῦ Χρυσσοστόμου λόγος εἰς τὸ «Ἐπεφάνη ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ σωτήριος παιδεύουσα ἡμᾶς.»

2 τοῦ ἐν ἀγίοις πατρὸς ἡμῶν Ἰωάννου ἀρχιεπισκόπου Κωνσταντινουπόλεως τοῦ Χρυσσοστόμου P] τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἀγίου Ἰωάννου τοῦ Χρυσσοστόμου S | τοῦ ἀγίου Ἰωάννου τοῦ Χρυσσοστόμου AW 3 λόγος εἰς τὸ P] ὁμιλία εἰς τὸ S || ἐπεφάνη ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ ἡ σωτήριος παιδεύουσα ἡμᾶς P] ἐπέφανη ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ εἰς τὰ Θεοφάνια S, AW

1. Provenance: AW 117 identifies this as only the second extant genuine homily by Chrysostom on the Feast of the Epiphany, January 6. The other festal homily for Epiphany, *De baptismo Christi et de epiphania* (CPG 4335; PG 49:363–72), is generally placed early in Chrysostom's ministry at Antioch because it seems to follow *In diem natalem Christi* (CPG 4334; PG 49:351–62), thought to have been preached at Antioch. But note that Mayer, *Provenance*, 436, 480, judging *De baptismo Christi* itself in terms of its detailed reference to Olympic games, judges it no more than possibly assignable to Antioch. In any case, the date and place of this other Epiphany sermon provide no clues either way about this homily's possible provenance, even as it is not clear that this homily was originally preached on the feast, as argued in the introduction. Nor does there seem to be any evidence in the text that allows us to locate it geographically. See also the introduction (pp. 51–58) for debate and arguments about the authenticity of this homily. The notes in the present translation point out some conspicuous points of correspondence between this homily and other Chrysostomic works as an aid to that ongoing discussion.

Text: Wenger text (AW) as emended by Mitchell. AW transcribed this homily from Sinai, gr. 491 (uncial, VIII–IX), fols. 116^r–129^r, as collated with Paris, gr. 700 (minuscule, IX–X), fols. 136^r–166^v (*sic*, AW 123; it should be 163^r–166^v). On the relation between the two manuscripts, Wenger stated: “Le manuscrit de Paris présente un texte identique à celui de *Sinaiticus* à l'exception de quelques variantes minimales et d'une finale plus développée, que le *Sinaiticus* semble avoir écourtée” (AW 120). Comparison of Wenger's edition with photographs of the Sinai manuscript made available

A homily by our father among the saints, John Chrysostom, archbishop of Constantinople, on the statement, “*The saving grace of God has been brought to light, giving us paideia*” (Titus 2:11).²

by Fr. Justin and digital images of Paris, gr. 700, available online (<https://gallica.bnf.fr>), has revealed significantly more variance between the readings of the two manuscripts than this assessment allows. Furthermore, AW's published text and apparatus of variant readings contain numerous inaccuracies and some notations that are misleading. The text printed here includes my corrections of some thirty or more errors in AW's text (as indicated) as well as places where I have adopted different readings from AW; all my emendations are explained in the notes accompanying the text. The two manuscripts are listed as S and P, respectively, and Wenger's text as AW. Pinakes lists one more manuscript that contains this homily, Mone Iberon 255 (= Lambros 4375 [XIV]), fols. 237–240 (I), for a total of three known witnesses. I have not had access to a full set of images of the Iberon codex, but I incorporate one reading from that manuscript in the final benediction from Aubineau, “Soixante-six textes, attribués à Jean Chrysostome,” as indicated on §27. Variant readings listed exclude itacisms, alternate spellings, presence or absence of *v*-movement, etc.

2. Minus γάρ after ἐπεφάνη, as throughout this homily. Note that this title reads ἡ before σωτήριος (with \mathfrak{M}), as consistently when the lemma is cited in the homily in P (but not so in S). I adopt the reading of P (plus ἡ) throughout, which is how Chrysostom always cites Titus 2:11—e.g., *Hom. Tit.* 5.1 (PG 62:688); *Hom. Matt.* 57.1 (PG 58:557); *Bapt.* §2 (PG 49:365); *Adv. Jud.* 5.12 (PG 48:903); *Exp. Ps.* Ψ 117 §6 (PG 55:337). For an explanation of this translation of παιδεύουσα, see p. 676 n. 38 below. I adopt the reading of P for the title. Wenger (AW 123) had adopted that of S, but without discussion chose to remove from his text the somewhat redundant reading αὐτοῦ, “a homily by the same John Chrysostom [τοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰωάννου χρυσσοστόμου],” though this reading was indicated in his apparatus. Note that the title in P does not identify this as a homily on the feast of the Epiphany; the ellipsis supplied by AW 123 in his *app. crit.*, “λόγος εἰς τὸ . . . P” has obscured this significant difference in reading (as well as in the citation of the lemma, including ἡ σωτήριος . . . παιδεύουσα ἡμᾶς).

1 1. [116^r] Πρώην ὑμῖν περὶ σωφροσύνης διελέχθημεν καθάπερ μέμνησθε καὶ
 οἷον δὲ νόμον ἀνέγνωμεν οὕτως ἔχοντα· Πᾶς ὁ ἐμβλέψας γυναικί πρὸς τὸ
 ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτὴν ἤδη ἐμοίχευσε αὐτὴν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ. Φοβερὸν τὸ
 ῥῆμα, καὶ γὰρ ἀναίσχυντον τὸ πάθος· δεινὴ ἡ ἀπόφασις, καὶ γὰρ χαλεπὴ ἡ
 5 ἐπιθυμία.

2. Καθάπερ οὖν κύνα τις ἔχων ἄγριον καὶ τοῖς παριοῦσιν ἐπιπηδῶντα
 πᾶσιν, οὐκ ἀνέχεται λελυμένον εἶναι καὶ ἄφετον, ἀλλὰ σιδηρᾷ ἀλύσει δῆσας
 αὐτὸν παραδίδωσιν ταῖς χερσὶν [116^v] τῶν οἰκετῶν μετὰ ἀσφαλείας κατέχειν,
 οὕτως καὶ ὁ Θεὸς τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τοὺς ἡμετέρους, κυνῶν ἀναιδέστερον
 10 ἐπιπηδῶντας τοῖς λαμπροῖς τῶν σωμάτων, οὐκ ἀφήσιν εἶναι λελυμένους,
 ἀλλ' ὡσπερ σιδηρᾷ ἀλύσει τῷ φόβῳ τῆς νομοθεσίας ἀποδήσας αὐτούς,
 παρέδωκεν μετὰ ἀσφαλείας κατέχειν τῷ λογισμῷ, προειπῶν καὶ ἀπειλήσας,

1 Folio references are to S (as in AW) 2 δέ S, P*] δὴ P^{corr} || γυναικί S] γυναῖκα
 P 3 ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτὴν S] ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτῆς P 6 καθάπερ οὖν S] καθάπερ P || ἄγριον
 S] ἄτιμον P 7 ἀνέχεται S] ἂν ἔχοιτο P || λελυμένον S] λελομένον (sc. λελειμμένον?)
 P 9 κυνῶν S] κυνάς P 11 ἀλλ' S] om. P

3. πρώην, as often in Chrysostom's homilies to refer to the previous occasion as, e.g., *Hom. 1 Cor. 7:39–40* §1 (PG 51:217); *Hom. 2 Cor. 4:13* Γ §1 (PG 51:291); *Hom. Gen. 25.1* (PG 53:218); *Anna 3.1* (PG 54:652); *Hom. Col. 9.1* (PG 62:359); *Adv. Jud. 1.1* (PG 48:843); *Laz. 2.1* (PG 48:981); and *Hom. Jo. 14.1* (PG 59:91), where it is also the first word of the homily.

4. σωφροσύνη is used for modesty or moderation in general (where it is one of the cardinal virtues of Platonic thought and Hellenistic ethics broadly) or, in early Christian texts, specifically for sexual self-control (PGL B).

5. AW 119 said that despite much effort he was not able to locate within Chrysostom's extant works the homily that is referred to here. I propose that it is likely *De paenitentia* hom. 6, which, though it bears the title, Ὁμιλία λεχθεῖσα περὶ νηστείας, from §2 forward (especially in §§2–5) is not about fasting but contains a sustained discussion of Matt 5:28, in which the verse is quoted fully eight times in John's exposition on it and the nature of improper desire four times in §2 (PG 49:316–17), three times in §4 (PG 49:319), and once in §5 (PG 49:321). Moreover, Matt 5:28 is explicitly cited in §2 (PG 49:316) as a divine law—ἀλλὰ θεῖον ὑμῖν ἀναγνώσσομαι νόμον, as stated here retrospectively (οἷον δὲ νόμον ἀνέγνωμεν οὕτως ἔχοντα). However, it is the case that, despite the homiletical treatment about the need for purity of vision and concern about ἐπιθυμία as ἡ τῆς μοιχείας μήτηρ in §2 (PG 49:316), the term σωφροσύνη itself is not used in *Paenit.* hom. 6 (cf. περὶ σωφροσύνης διελέχθημεν in the present homily), though we can note that, aside from the retrospective mentions, that term is found only once in the present argument, in §4, ὁ θησαυρὸς τῆς σωφροσύνης. Paragraphs 2–4, which follow in the present sermon, do pick up on and develop in a new direction and with a new analogy

1. Last time,³ as you remember, we spoke to you about self-control,⁴ and the passage of the law we read⁵ is as follows: “Everyone who looks at a woman with lustful desire for her has already committed adultery with her in his heart” (Matt 5:28).⁶ The statement is frightening, as indeed the passion is shameful; the declaration is dire, as indeed the lust is vicious.

2. A man who has a ferocious⁷ dog that leaps out at all who pass by certainly doesn't allow it to be untethered and run free. Instead, binding it with an iron chain, he hands it over to the care of his household slaves, to hold it securely in check. In the very same way, God doesn't allow our eyes, which leap out at beautiful bodies more shamelessly than dogs, to be untethered. Instead, having bound them by fear of his law⁸ as though with an iron chain,⁹ God has handed them over to the faculty of reason to hold them securely in check.¹⁰ In this way, God forewarned and threatened

the theme discussed on the earlier occasion, as the preacher himself states clearly in the transition at §5, ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν περὶ σωφροσύνης ἱκανῶς εἴρηται καὶ τότε καὶ νῦν τοῖς προσέχουσιν, which seems to fit this identification of the previous sermon.

6. With ἐμβλέψας γυναικί (with S) as against βλέπων γυναῖκα (P). This is in line with how Chrysostom reads the participle ἐμβλέψας throughout his oeuvre—see e.g. *Hom. Matt. 17.1* (PG 57:255), where he cites the lemma as such. He is, however, inconsistent in whether he reads γυναικί—as here, and *Hom. Matt. 17.1*—or γυναῖκα—as in *Hom. Matt. 7.7* (PG 57:81); *Anom. 10.3* (PG 48:789); *Paenit. 6.2–4* (PG 49:316–17, 319, 321).

7. P reads ἄτιμον, “dishonorable,” or perhaps a dog “bought on the cheap.” Its relative difficulty is perhaps an argument in its favor, but the reading of S, ἄγριον, is preferable in context (“wild,” “ferocious,” or “savage”).

8. A quite similar argument is found in *Paenit. 6.2* (PG 49:316), which is possibly the precursor sermon to this one (see p. 668 n. 5 above in this homily): ὀφθαλμία χαλεπὴ μοιχεία· τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν ἐστὶ τὸ νόσημα, οὐ τῶν τοῦ σώματος. ἀλλὰ πρότερον τῶν τῆς ψυχῆς· διὰ τοῦτο ἐκέϊθεν ἀνέστειλε τὸ ῥεῦμα τῆς ἀκολασίας τῷ φόβῳ τοῦ νόμου· διὰ τοῦτο οὐχὶ μοιχείαν μόνον ἐκόλασεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπιθυμίαν ἐτιμωρήσατο (“Adultery is a vicious eye-disease. It is an illness of the eyes—yet not the eyes of the body, but even more, those of the soul. That's why with this statement [sc. Matt 5:28] Christ stops up the discharge of debauchery by means of fear of the law. That's why he not only chastises adultery, but he even punishes desire”).

9. A comparable plea about the fear of God acting as a chain is made by John in *Hom. Eph. 8.7* (PG 62:66): Ταύτη τῇ ἀλύσει δῆσωμεν ἐκ τούτου· ἀντὶ σιδηρίου γενέσθω ἡμῖν ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ φόβος (“Let's bind ourselves with this chain; let the fear of God be for us like an iron chain”).

10. Although this exact image of the eyes as wild dogs is not to my knowledge found elsewhere in John's oeuvre, it is fully consistent with other appeals, such as *Ep. Olymp. 8.6d* (SC 13^{bis}:182, ed. Malingrey) where Chrysostom describes virgins as

εἰ διαφύγοιεν καὶ τινος τῶν παριόντων ἐπιλάβοιτο, τὴν τῶν μοιχῶν αὐτὸν ἀπαιτήσῃ τιμωρίαν. Πᾶς γὰρ ὁ ἐμβλέψας γυναικὶ πρὸς τὸ ἐπιθυμῆσαι αὐτὴν ἤδη ἐμοίχευσεν αὐτὴν ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτοῦ.

3. Τοῦτο δὲ ἠπειλήσεν [117^r] τῶν ὀρώντων κηδόμενος. Ἐπὶ μὲν γὰρ
 5 τῶν κυνῶν καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, οὐχ οἱ δάκνοντες κύνες, ἀλλ' οἱ δακνόμενοι
 ἀνθρωποὶ τὰ ἔλκη λαμβάνουσιν· ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν ἀσελγῶς ὀρώντων ὀφθαλμῶν καὶ
 τῶν ὀρωμένων γυναικῶν, οὐχ αἱ ὀρώμεναι γυναῖκες, ἀλλ' οἱ ὀρώντες ἀνθρωποὶ
 τὰ τραύματα δέχονται. Ἐκεῖ ὁ δηχθεὶς ἐπλήγη, ἐνταῦθα ὁ δάκνων τὸν ἰὸν
 10 ἔλαβεν.
 4. Διὰ τοῦτο αὐτοὺς ἀσφαλίζεται, διὰ τοῦτο βλέφαρα καὶ βλεφαρίδας
 τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς περιέθηκεν, ἵνα μὴ διὰ παντὸς ἀνεωγμένας ἔχῃς τὰς θυρίδας.
 Ὅταν γὰρ θύραι διὰ παντὸς ὥσιν ἀνεωγμέναι, μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς εὐκολίας
 ὁ ληστής ἐπεισέρχεται, μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς ἐξουσίας τὸν θησαυρὸν [117^v] τῆς
 σωφροσύνης συλᾷ. Διὰ τοῦτο κόραι καλοῦνται τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν αἱ βολαί, ἵνα
 15 μάθῃς ὅτι αἰσχύνεσθαι χρή καὶ ἐρυθριᾶν· καθάπερ γὰρ αἱ κόραι αἱ ἀπειρόγαμοι
 καὶ θαλαμευόμεναι οὐκ ἀνέχονται οὐδὲ πρὸς τοὺς οἰκείους μετὰ ἀναιδείας

1 ἐπιλάβοιτο τὴν S] ἐπιλάβοιτο αὐτὴν P 2 ἀπαιτήσῃ S] ἀπαιτήσιεν P (sic) | ἀπαιτήσιεν AW || γυναικὶ S] γυναῖκα P 10 αὐτοὺς S] τούτους P 11 ἀνεωγμένας ἔχῃς τὰς θυρίδας. Ὅταν γὰρ θύραι διὰ παντὸς ὥσιν S] om. P 13 ὁ ληστής ... τῆς ἐξουσίας S] om. P (h.t. εὐκολίας/ἐξουσίας) 14 συλᾷ S] ἀποσυλᾷ P 15 χρή S] δεῖ χρή P || αἱ κόραι αἱ ἀπειρόγαμοι S, P] αἱ ἀπειρόγαμοι AW 16 οὐκ ἀνέχονται S] οὐκ ἀναισχυντοὶ P || τοὺς P] τοῦ S

καθάπερ λυττῶντα κύνα καὶ συνεχῶς ἐπιπηδῶντα τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν διακρούμενοι (“driving off desire as though it were a dog that was raging and continually leaping out to assault”). See also *Dav.* 3.1 (PG 54:695): Καὶ ποίαν ἑτέραν ταύτης ζητεῖς μείζονα ἁμαρτίαν, ὅταν μοιχοὺς ἑαυτοὺς ἀπληροῦσμένους ποιήσαντες, ἀναιδῶς, καθάπερ κύνες λυττῶντες, ἐπιπηδῶσι τῇ ἱερᾷ ταύτῃ τραπέζῃ; (“And what kind of sin are you looking for that is worse than this, when making themselves consummate adulterers, without shame they leap forward like raging dogs upon this holy table of the Eucharist?”). Right after this Chrysostom describes ὁ τρόπος τῆς μοιχείας by citing Matt 5:28; in the fuller argument he makes some of the same associations as in our passage above.

11. On theories of intromission and extramission in vision in relation to this Matthean text, see Paul Brooks Duff, “Vision and Violence: Theories of Vision and Matthew 5:27–28,” in *Antiquity and Humanity: Essays on Ancient Religion and Philosophy Presented to Hans Dieter Betz on His 70th Birthday*, ed. Adela Yarbro Collins and Margaret M. Mitchell (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 63–75.

12. John shows himself blind to the possibility that women could be harmed by being the object of such leering looks.

13. Here taking the aorists as gnomic. For the latter, LSJ notes that *lós* can refer

that if the eyes should escape and pounce on any of the passersby, he will demand that their owner suffer the punishment that belongs to adulterers. For, “Everyone who looks at a woman with lustful desire for her has already committed adultery with her in his heart” (Matt 5:28).¹¹

3. He issued this threat out of concern for those doing the looking. Now, in the case of dogs and people, it’s not the dogs who bite who receive the wounds, but the people who are bitten. However, in the case of eyes that look lecherously and of women who are the objects of those looks, it’s not the women looked upon who receive the injury, but the men who are doing the looking.¹² In the former case, it’s the one who’s bitten who’s stricken, but in the latter, it’s the one who does the biting who’s poisoned.¹³

4. That’s why God rendered the eyes secure. That’s why he placed eyelids and eyelashes around them, lest you have doorways that are always open.¹⁴ For when doors are always open, a robber easily enters in and with full impunity absconds with your treasure—that is, your sexual self-control.¹⁵ This is why the flashing parts of the eyes are called *korai* (“pupils”),¹⁶ so you might learn that there is need for a proper sense of shame and embarrassment. Indeed, the *korai* (“virgins”), who have no experience of marriage and are sequestered in the women’s quarters, wouldn’t even dare to take a

to the “venom of a mad dog” (citing Rufus, frag. 118), so the sense may be more “who contracts rabies.”

14. Although Chrysostom elsewhere in his oeuvre uses the eyelashes as an example of God’s minute care and forethought in creation, for instance, likening them to the protection the outer stalks give to tender ears of corn in *Stat.* 11.4 (PG 49:123), this exact analogy is not found.

15. *σωφροσύνη*. As the previous sentences show, John’s concern here (as in the Matthean text that is his inspiration) is with *men’s* sexual self-control, which, he insists, by means of *λογισμός* (through the agency of fear of divine punishment) puts the *ὀφθαλμοί* on a short leash.

16. This argument is based upon a wordplay on *κόρη*, which means “virgin,” “doll,” and “pupil” of the eye (LSJ I, II, III), presumably because of the reflection in the pupil that looks like a miniature person (hence, a doll). The derivation of English “pupil” for this part of the eye is dependent upon the same etymological move in Latin (from *pupilla*). This is a conventional pun in Greek thought and literature, as, e.g., in the Hermetic work, *Korē Kosmou*, in reference to Isis as a “virgin” or to the “pupil” of the universe. See Corp. herm. frag. 23 (ed. and trans. Nock and Festugière, 4:1–22); see also M. David Litwa, *Hermetica II: The Excerpts of Stobaeus, Papyrus Fragments, and Ancient Testimonies in an English Translation with Notes and Introduction* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018), 100–129, esp 101–2 on the meanings and referents of *κόρη*.

- 1 ἰδεῖν, οὕτω καὶ τὰς κόρας τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν χρή, καθάπερ κόρας ἀπειρογάμους
 ἐν θαλάμῳ, τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ καθημένας, μὴ ἀναισχύντως ἀπάσαις ἐπαφίεναι
 ταῖς ὄψεσιν ἑαυτάς, ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἂν εἶεν κόραι λοιπόν, ἀλλὰ κύνες ἀναισχυντοί.
 5 Ἄλλα τὰ μὲν περὶ σωφροσύνης ἱκανῶς εἴρηται [118^F] καὶ τότε καὶ νῦν
 τοῖς προσέχουσιν· τὸ δὲ ζητούμενον, οὐχ ἵνα συνεχῆς ἢ παρ' ἡμῶν διδασκαλία
 γένηται καὶ συνεχῆς ἢ παρ' ὑμῶν ἀκρόασις, ἀλλ' ἵνα τι καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς ἡμετέρας
 διδασκαλίας καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς ὑμετέρας ἀκρόασεως γένηται πλέον εἰς λόγον ζωῆς
 τῆς ὑμετέρας, εἰς καύχημα ἡμέτερον, εἰς δόξαν καὶ ἔπαινον Θεοῦ, ἵνα δυναθῶ
 10 ἐγὼ κατὰ τὴν ἡμέραν ἐκείνην καυχᾶσθαι ἐκ τῶν κατορθωμάτων ὑμῶν καὶ
 εἰπεῖν· Ἴδου ἐγὼ καὶ τὰ παιδία ἃ μοι ἔδωκεν ὁ Θεός.
 6. Γενέσθω τὰ ῥήματα τὰ ἡμέτερα πράγματα δι' ὑμῶν. Καὶ γὰρ ἐπὶ τῶν
 γεηπόνων οὐ τοῦτο ἐστὶν τὸ ζητούμενον ζεῦξαι βοῦς ἀροτήρας καὶ βαθεῖαν
 αὐλαχα [118^V] τεμεῖν καὶ καταβαλεῖν τὰ σπέρματα, ἀλλὰ δεῖξει κομώντα
 τὰ λῆια καὶ τὴν ἄλωνα τῶν δραγμάτων πεπληρωμένην, ἵνα, ὅταν ἔλθῃ ὁ
 15 διακαθαίρων αὐτήν, οὗ τὸ πτύον ἐν τῇ χειρὶ αὐτοῦ, μηδαμοῦ τῆς ἄλwanος
 ἄχυρον εὔρη, ἀλλὰ πανταχοῦ σῖτον, πανταχοῦ καρπὸν ὠριμον εἰς βασιλικὰς
 ἀποθήκας ἀπενεχθῆναι δυνάμενον. Ἡξει γάρ, ἥξει πάντως ἐκεῖνος ὁ βαπτίζων
 ὑμᾶς ἐν πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ πυρὶ· καὶ τὸν μὲν σῖτον συνάξει εἰς τὰς ἀποθήκας,
 τὸ δὲ ἄχυρον κατακαύσει πυρὶ ἀσβέστῳ. Μεγάλη ἢ τιμωρία, ἀλλ' ἐὰν
 20 θέλωμεν, οὐ λημψόμεθα τὴν τιμωρίαν οὐδὲ ἐσόμεθα ἄχυρα.

2 ἐν θαλάμῳ τῷ ὀφθαλμῷ καθημένας S] ἐν θαλάμῳ καθημένας P || ἀπάσαις S] αὐτάς ἀπάσαις P || ἀναισχύντως ἀπάσαις ἐπαφίεναι ταῖς ὄψεσιν ἑαυτάς S] ἀναισχύντως αὐτάς ἀπάσαις ἐπαφίεναι ἀντὶ ταῖς ὄψεσιν P 3 εἶεν S, P] om. AW 5 τοῖς προσέχουσιν· τὸ δὲ ζητούμενον S] τοῖς προσέχουσιν τὸ ζητούμενον P || συνεχῆς S] συνεχῶς P 6 ἢ παρ' ὑμῶν ἀκρόασις P] παρ' ὑμῶν ἢ ἀκρόασις S | ἢ παρ' ὑμῶν ἢ ἀκρόασις AW 8 ἔπαινον S] αἶνον P || Italics added to AW (quotation of Phil 1:11) 9 ὑμῶν S] om. P 10 ἃ μοι S, P] ἃ ἐμοί AW 11 γάρ S] γὰρ ἂν P 13 AW placed folio break after τεμεῖν || τὰ σπέρματα S] σπέρματα P 17 ἀπενεχθῆναι S] ἀπελθεῖν P 18 Italics added to AW (quotation of Matt 3:11//Luke 3:16) || μὲν S] om. P || τὰς ἀποθήκας S] ἀποθήκας P 20 τὴν τιμωρίαν S] πείραν τῆς τιμωρίας P

17. To capture the paronomasia of ἐν θαλάμῳ, τῷ ὀφ-θαλμῷ καθημένας.
 18. τὸ ζητούμενον here more literally as “what is sought,” rather than as a “problem to be solved,” or “disputed question” (but see §19 below).
 19. Cf. Phil 2:16: λόγον ζωῆς ἐπέχοντες.
 20. Cf. Phil 2:16: εἰς καύχημα ἐμοί.
 21. Cf. Eph 1:6, 12.

shameless glance at the men of their own household. So also, those *korai* (“pupils”) of the eyes, although they’re embedded in the eye,¹⁷ like the *korai* (“virgins”) who have no experience of the bridal bed, mustn’t shamelessly let themselves loose to glance at anything and everything. Because then they wouldn’t be *korai* (“virgins”), but shameless dogs.

5. But what’s been said about sexual self-control both on the earlier occasion and today is enough for those who are paying attention. Yet the goal we aspire to¹⁸ isn’t for us to teach continually or for you to listen continually. It’s that from both our teaching and your listening you might gain some advantage for the account of your life,¹⁹ “for our boast”²⁰ and “for the glory and praise of God” (Phil 1:11),²¹ so that on that day I, too, might be able to boast of your virtuous deeds²² and say, “Here am I and the children whom God has given to me” (Heb 2:13; Isa 8:18).²³

6. Let our words become deeds by what you do. After all, for those who till the soil, the goal isn’t the yoking of the oxen for plowing and the cutting of deep furrows in the earth and the sowing of seeds,²⁴ but showing forth the crops in full bloom and the threshing floor full of sheaves. And thus when the one who cleans out the threshing floor comes, “whose winnowing wand is in his hand” (Matt 3:12 // Luke 3:17),²⁵ he won’t find chaff anywhere on the threshing floor, but everywhere grain, everywhere a ripe harvest that can be carted off into the royal silos. For the one who baptizes you “in the Holy Spirit and fire” (Luke 3:16) will surely come! And the grain he will gather into the silos,²⁶ “but the chaff he will burn with an unquenchable fire” (Matt 3:12 // Luke 3:17). The punishment is heavy, but if it is our wish, we shall not receive the punishment, nor shall we be chaff.

22. Phil 2:16; cf. 2 Cor 1:14.

23. Compare the similar argument in *Hom. Rom. 12:20* §1 (PG 51:173), with reference to 2 Cor 5:10 as the supporting Pauline text for the idea that Christian leaders must give an account at the final judgment for those who are under their charge.

24. See p. 625 n. 125 above on Chrysostom’s fondness for rehearsing the steps involved in agriculture.

25. AW 124 identifies the quote as Luke 3:16–17, but it is not clear which of the two Gospel parallels is being cited (and the quotation refers only to Luke 3:17).

26. Chrysostom has rephrased the first half of the verse to balance out the clauses in a μέν ... δέ construction (as is done by D Θ f¹³ in Luke 3:17, which have plus μέν); with transposition of τὸν σῖτον to before συνάξει, as also in *Exp. Ps. Ψ 7* §11 (PG 55:98); with εἰς τὰς ἀποθήκας for εἰς τὴν ἀποθήκην; minus αὐτοῦ after σῖτον in Matt 3:12 or after ἀποθήκην/ἀποθήκας in Luke 3:17.

1 7. [119^F] Τοιοῦτον γὰρ ἡ ἁμαρτία· καθάπερ τὰ ἄχυρα τῶν ἀλόγων
ζώων ἐστὶν τροφή και πυρὸς δαπάνη, οὕτως και ἡ ἁμαρτία τοῦ μέλλοντος
πυρὸς ἐστὶν δαπάνη. Βούλη μαθεῖν πῶς ἐστὶν πυρὸς δαπάνη ἡ ἁμαρτία; Εἴ
5 τις ἐποικοδομεῖ—φῆσιν—ἐπὶ τὸν θεμέλιον τοῦτον, χρυσόν, ἄργυρον, λίθους
τιμίους, ξύλα, χόρτον, καλάμην, ἐκάστου τὸ ἔργον φανερόν γενήσεται· ἡ γὰρ
ἡμέρα δηλώσει, ὅτι ἐν πυρὶ ἀποκαλύπτεται. Εἴ τις τὸ ἔργον κατακαήσεται,
ζημιωθήσεται. Ἴδου πυρὸς δαπάνη ἡ ἁμαρτία. 8. Ἄκουσον πῶς και ἀφροσύνη
ἐστὶν και ἀλόγων τροφή παθῶν· ἄκουσον τοῦ Δαυὶδ λέγοντος· [119^V] Αἱ
ἀνομίαι μου ὑπερήραν τὴν κεφαλὴν μου· ὡσεὶ φορτίον βαρὺ ἐβαρύνθησαν
10 ἐπ’ ἐμέ· προσώξεσαν και ἐσάπησαν οἱ μῶλωπές μου ἀπὸ προσώπου τῆς
ἀφροσύνης μου. Τὸ ἄχυρον πάλιν κοῦφόν ἐστὶν και εὐρίπιστον και μικρᾶ
ἀνέμου προσβολῆ ταχέως μετεωρίζεται και πανταχοῦ περιφέρεται. [120^F]
Τοιοῦτοὶ εἰσιν τῶν ἀνθρώπων οἱ ῥαδίως ὑπὸ ὀργῆς ἐξαπτόμενοι, οἱ ταχέως ὑπὸ
ἀνοίας φυσώμενοι. Διὰ τοῦτο παραινεῖ τις λέγων· Μὴ λίχμα παντὶ ἀνέμῳ—
15 ἵνα μὴ μείνης ἄχυρον—ἀλλ’ ἴσθι ἐστηριγμένος ἐπὶ τῇ πέτρᾳ.

9. Διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ ἦλθεν ὁ Χριστός, οὐχ ἵνα τὰ παλαιὰ ἁμαρτήματα
καταλύσῃ μόνον, ἀλλ’ ἵνα και πρὸς τὰ μέλλοντα ἡμᾶς διορθώσῃται. Τοῦτο
και Παῦλος, δεικνύς ὅτι οὐ διὰ τὰ παλαιὰ μόνον ἦλθεν ἁμαρτήματα, ἀλλὰ
και διὰ τὰ μέλλοντα κατορθώματα, ἐβόα τήμερον· Ἐπεφάνη ἡ χάρις τοῦ
20 Θεοῦ ἡ σωτήριος, παιδεύουσα ἡμᾶς. Ἀλλὰ διανάστητε· πάλιν γὰρ τοὺς

1 τοιοῦτον γὰρ ἡ ἁμαρτία S] om. P || ἄχυρα τῶν ἀλόγων ζώων ἐστὶν τροφή S] ἄχυρα
τροφή τῶν ἀλόγων ζώων ἐστὶν P 2 πυρὸς δαπάνη, οὕτως και ἡ ἁμαρτία τοῦ μέλλοντος
πυρὸς ἐστὶν δαπάνη S] πυρὸς δαπάνη τοῦ μέλλοντος P 4 χρυσόν, ἄργυρον P] χρυσόν,
ἀργύριον S, AW 6 κατακαήσεται S] κατακαῆ P 7 πῶς S] και πῶς P || ἀφροσύνη S]
ἀφροσύνης τέκνον P 8 δαδ n.s. S, P] Δαβίδ AW; plene form Δαυὶδ (1,231x in Chry-
sostom v. 25x Δαβίδ, per TLG texts) 12 ἀνέμου S] ἀνέμων P 15 ἄχυρον S] ἄχυρον
ἄν P 16 διὰ τοῦτο γὰρ S] διὰ γὰρ τοῦτο P || τὰ παλαιὰ ἁμαρτήματα S] τὰ παλαιὰ
ἁμαρτήματα P 17 και S] και τὰ P 18 διὰ τὰ παλαιὰ μόνον ἦλθεν ἁμαρτήματα S] διὰ τὰ
παλαιὰ ἁμαρτήματα ἦλθεν μόνον P 19 κατορθώματα S] ἀμαρτήματα P 20 ἡ σωτήριος
P] om. S, AW

27. The interrogative phrase βούλη μαθεῖν (here and in §21) is found over a hundred and twenty times in Chrysostom’s oeuvre, as a part of his interactive preaching style. By contrast, Gregory of Nyssa uses it five times, Libanius (either John’s teacher, or at least his contemporary at Antioch), five.

28. I.e., the eschatological day of the Lord, the time of judgment.

29. Minus δέ before τις. I adopt the reading of P, χρυσόν, ἄργυρον, not χρυσόν, ἀργύριον (the reading of S, accepted by AW). The former is read by ℣ at 1 Cor 3:12 and found elsewhere in Chrysostom’s oeuvre in *Hom. 1 Cor.* 9.2 (PG 61:78); *Hom. Heb.* 9.1 (PG 63:77); *Exp. Ps.* Ψ 44 §12 (PG 55:201); ellipsis of και ἐκάστου τὸ ἔργον ὁποῖόν ἐστιν ... λήμψεται, as marked in the translation.

7. This is what sin is like. In the same way as chaff is fodder for irrational beasts and fuel for fire, so also is sin fuel for the fire to come. Do you want to learn²⁷ how sin is fuel for fire? “If anyone builds,” he says, “upon this foundation—gold, silver, precious stones, wood, grass, hay—the work of each will become manifest. For the day²⁸ will disclose it, because it is revealed by fire.... If someone’s work will be burned up, they will suffer loss (1 Cor 3:12–13, 15).²⁹ See how sin is fuel for fire. 8. Hear how it is also foolishness³⁰ and fodder for irrational passions. Hear David saying, “My lawless deeds have risen higher than my head. Like a heavy load they have weighed down upon me. My welts stink and rot in the face of my foolishness” (Ps 37:5–6). Again, chaff is light and easily fanned into flames, quickly cast in the air by a little volley of wind and everywhere whirled about. Such are those people who are readily enflamed by anger, who are swiftly puffed up³¹ by folly. The reason a speaker gives this advice, “Don’t winnow in every wind” (Sir 5:9),³² is so you might not remain chaff.³³ Instead, be firmly fixed upon rock!³⁴

9. The reason Christ came wasn’t only so he might abolish the old sins,³⁵ but also so he might offer us correction for the future. So also Paul, in demonstrating that Christ didn’t come only for the sake of the old sins but also for virtuous deeds in the future, has this very day cried out,³⁶ “the saving grace of God has been brought to light³⁷ ... giving us paideia” (Titus

30. P reads ἀφροσύνης τέκνον, “a child of foolishness.”

31. Possibly Chrysostom has in mind Paul’s use of the term φυσιοῦσθαι in this broader section of 1 Corinthians (4:6, 18, 19).

32. Minus ἐν before παντί.

33. For the same sentiment, see, e.g., *Hom. Matt.* 11.6 (PG 57:199): Μηδεὶς τοίνυν γινέσθω ἄχυρον, μηδεὶς εὐρίπιστος ἔστω, μηδὲ ταῖς πονηραῖς ἐπιθυμίαις προκεισθω, πανταχοῦ ῥαδίως ὑπ’ αὐτῶν ἀναρριπιζόμενος. Ἄν μὲν γὰρ μείνης σίτος, κἂν πειρασμὸς ἐπενεχθῆ, οὐδὲν πείση θεινόν (“So then, let no one be chaff, let no one be easily fanned into flames, nor be disposed to evil desires, everywhere easily swept away by them. For if you remain grain, even if temptation threatens, you’ll suffer no terrible harm”).

34. Cf. Matt 7:25.

35. There are verbal resonances with Matt 5:17 (Μὴ νομίσητε ὅτι ἦλθον καταλύσαι) but perhaps also to the distinction between the παλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος and the καινὸς ἄνθρωπος of Eph 4:20–24.

36. I.e., in the lectionary passage read by the ἀναγνώστης. See pp. 52–53 in the introduction for discussion of this as a mark of authenticity.

37. The verb ἐπιφαίνειν can have transitive or intransitive meanings in active, middle, and passive voices. Hence ἐπεφάνη can be translated “appeared” (as it is in most all major translations) or “has been made to appear” or “was manifested.” John will play on the passive voice and also on the literal sense of the compound ἐπι-φαίνειν,

1 θησαυρούς διανοίγομεν, πάλιν τοὺς [120^V] μαργαρίτας δείκνυμεν· μηδεὶς τοίνυν διαδράμη τῶν εἰρημένων τὸ κάλλος· Ἐπεφάνη ἡ χάρις.

10 Διὰ τί οὐκ εἶπεν· ἐδόθη ἡ χάρις, ἀλλ' Ἐπεφάνη ἡ χάρις; Ἴνα μάθῃς ὅτι, πρὸ τοῦ φανῆναι τὴν χάριν, ἐν σκότει τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἡ φύσις ἐκάθητο.
5 τοῖς γὰρ ἐν σκότει καθήμενοις ὁ Χριστὸς φαίνει, ὅπερ οὖν καὶ ὁ προφήτης προαναφωνῶν ἔλεγεν· Ὁ λαὸς ὁ καθήμενος ἐν σκότει εἶδεν φῶς μέγα. Ἐπεφάνη ἡ χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡ σωτήριος. Εἶδες ἀποστόλων καὶ προφητῶν συμφωνίαν; Ὁ λαὸς ὁ καθήμενος ἐν σκότει· τοιαύτη γὰρ ἡ φύσις τοῦ σκότους· ὅπουπερ ἂν καταλάβῃ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, [121^I] εὐθέως καθίζει αὐτοὺς καὶ οὐκ
10 ἀφήσιν προβῆναι περαιτέρω, ἢ βάδισις σφαλέρα καὶ ἐπικίνδυνος γίνεται. Ὁδηγῶν τοίνυν καὶ τὸ ἀπρακτον τῆς φύσεως ἡμῶν πρὸς ἀρετὴν, ἔλεγεν· Ὁ λαὸς ὁ καθήμενος ἐν σκότει εἶδεν φῶς μέγα.

11 Οὐ τοῦτο δὲ μόνον ἐνδείκνυται ἡμῖν τὸ ἀποστολικὸν ῥῆμα τὸ Ἐπεφάνη, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἕτερον πρὸς τούτοις. Ποῖον δὲ τοῦτο; Ὅτι οὐχ ἡμεῖς ζητήσαντες
15 εὔραμεν τὸ φῶς, ἀλλὰ αὐτὸ ἡμῖν ἐπεφάνη· οὐχ ἡμεῖς ἀπήλθαμεν πρὸς αὐτόν, ἀλλ' αὐτὸς παρεγένετο πρὸς ἡμᾶς. Καὶ τοῦτο δηλῶν ὁ Χριστὸς ἔλεγεν· Οὐχ

1 θησαυρούς διανοίγομεν, πάλιν S] θησαυρούς ἀπλανῆ P 2 διαδράμη τῶν εἰρημένων S] παραδράμη τῶν ὀρωμένων P 3 ἐδόθη S] κατεπέμφθη P || ἀλλ' ἐπεφάνη ἡ χάρις S, P] om. AW 4 τῶν ἀνθρώπων ... ἐν σκότει S] om. P (h.t. ἐν σκότει) 7 ἐπεφάνη S] καὶ ἐπεφάνη P || ἡ σωτήριος P] σωτήριος S, AW 8 συμφωνίαν S] ὁμοφωνίαν P 9 καθίζει αὐτοὺς S] αὐτοὺς καθίζει P 10 καί P] ἐπὶ καί S 15 εὔραμεν S, P] εὔρομεν AW || αὐτό S] αὐτόματον P, τοῦτο AW 16 παρεγένετο S, P] προσεγένετο AW || δηλῶν ὁ Χριστὸς ἔλεγεν S] αὐτὸ ἔλεγεν ὁ Χριστὸς P

“shine upon” (cf. BDAG, 2) in his larger argument yet to come. To capture both senses, I translate *ἐπεφάνη* consistently as “has been brought to light” (cf. LSJ s.v. *ἐπιφανής* A: “coming to light, coming suddenly into view, appearing”). Due to the lexical and substantive connection, the Titus text was an appropriate lection for the Feast of the “Epiphany” (τὰ θεοφάνια or ἡ ἐπιφάνεια). For discussion of whether this homily was in fact originally delivered on Epiphany, see introduction, pp. 51–58.

38. Ellipsis of *ἡ σωτήριος πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις*, as marked. Below in this homily, especially in §§19–24, John will take up the definitional question of which of the different senses of *παιδεία/παιδεύειν* Paul has in view in this passage. The words can mean both “teaching” and “punishment” or something in between, like “chastisement” or “discipline” (see PGL). So the reader can see that argument unfold, I am rendering the participle as a verbal clause with the transliterated noun as its object. Each time *paideia* appears in the translation, one should keep all of these senses in view and see how John is emphasizing, distinguishing, or accenting one or the other.

39. See the very similar statement in *Sanct. Anast.* §2 (PG 63:496): *Μαργαρίτης γὰρ ἔστιν ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ λόγος...* Ἄλλὰ διανόστητε, καὶ ὄψεσθε πόσον ἡμῖν θησαυρὸν αὕτη

2:11–12).³⁸ Now, stay awake! Because once again we’re opening treasures, once again we’re displaying pearls.³⁹ So let no one run past the beauty that’s contained in these words:⁴⁰ “*Grace has been brought to light*” (Titus 2:11).

10. Why didn’t he say, “*grace has been given*”⁴¹ (cf. Eph 4:7),⁴² but instead, “*Grace has been brought to light*” (Titus 2:11)? So you might learn that before grace shone forth⁴³ human nature was sitting in darkness. For Christ shines upon those sitting in darkness, exactly as the prophet foretold when he said, “*The people sitting in darkness have seen a great light*” (Isa 9:1).⁴⁴ “*The saving grace of God has been brought to light*” (Titus 2:11). Have you seen the harmony⁴⁵ between the apostles and the prophets? “*The people sitting in darkness.*” For such is the nature of darkness: wherever it might apprehend⁴⁶ people, immediately it makes them sit down and doesn’t allow them to advance any further; walking becomes precarious and dangerous. So then, in order to lead even our intractable nature toward virtue, he said, “*The people sitting in darkness have seen a great light*” (Isa 9:1).

11. The apostle’s statement, “*has been brought to light*” (Titus 2:11), shows us not only this, but also something else in addition to these things. What might that be? That we didn’t find the light by seeking it, but it “*has been brought to light*”⁴⁷ (Titus 2:11) for us. It wasn’t we who went off after him, but he who came to us.⁴⁸ And Christ showed this when he said, “*You*

τῆς λέξεως ἡ δύναμις ἀνακαλύπτει (“For the word of God is a pearl... But stay awake and you’ll see what a sizable treasure this powerful statement reveals”).

40. For *διαδράμη τῶν εἰρημένων τὸ κάλλος* (so S), P reads *παραδράμη τῶν ὀρωμένων τὸ κάλλος*: “let no one run past the beauty of the things that are seen” (on this reading, pointing to the previous sentence rather than to the quotation that follows).

41. P reads *κατεπέμφθη*, “has been sent down.”

42. ἐνὶ δὲ ἐκάστῳ ἡμῶν ἐδόθη ἡ χάρις.

43. φαίνειν (see p. 675 n. 37 on the lexical linkages to the lemma and theme of the homily).

44. Reading *καθήμενος* with LXX A (against B, *πορευόμενος*; cf. Luke 1:79); with εἶδεν with ^c L C (against B A, ἴδετε). (Correcting the citation of Isa 9:2 on AW 126.)

45. I adopt *συμφωνίαν* with S; P reads the synonym *ὁμοφωνίαν*. John’s point is that Isaiah and Paul reinforce one another by their agreement on this point—cf. *Exp. Ps.* Ψ 109 §3 (PG 55:268); see also the similar argument about the *συμφωνία* of the two Testaments in *Hom. 2 Cor. 4:13 B* §§2, 6 (PG 51:282, 286); cf. *Hom. 2 Cor. 4:13 I* §2 (PG 51:291) in this volume.

46. Cf. John 1:5: καὶ τὸ φῶς ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ φαίνει, καὶ ἡ σκοτία αὐτὸ οὐ κατέλαβεν.

47. John seems to be emphasizing the passive voice of the verb. The reading of P, with *αὐτόματον* instead of *αὐτό*, might push less on the passive sense: “on its own initiative ‘it has come to light’ for us.”

48. Reading *παρεγένετο* with S and P, against AW: *προσεγένετο*.

1 ὑμεῖς με ἐξελέξασθε, ἀλλ' ἐγὼ ὑμᾶς ἐξελεξάμην. [121^V] Καὶ ὁ ἀπόστολος
 δὲ πάλιν, συνωδὰ τούτοις βοῶν, ἔλεγεν· Τότε δὲ ἐπιγνώσομαι καθὼς καὶ
 ἐπεγνώσθην· νῦν δὲ οὐκ ἐπέγνων, ἀλλ' ἐπεγνώσθην. Καὶ πρὸς Φιλιππησίου
 δὲ γράφων ἔλεγεν· Διώκω δὲ εἰ καὶ καταλάβω ἐφ' ᾧ καὶ κατελήμφθην,
 5 διὰ πάντων δηλῶν ὅτι οὐχ ἡμέτερον κατόρθωμα γέγονεν ἡμῶν ἢ σωτηρία,
 ἀλλὰ θεία χάριτι πάντες ἐσώθημεν· ὅπερ οὖν καὶ ἐνταῦθα αἰνίττεται λέγων·
 Ἐπεφάνη ἡ χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ.

12. Ποῖα χάρις; Καὶ γὰρ [122^I] καὶ τῆς παλαιᾶς χάρις ἔστιν καὶ ὁ Ἰωάννης
 ἐβόα λέγων· Χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος ἐλάβομεν. Καὶ γὰρ ὄντως χάρις καὶ ἡ τῆς
 10 παλαιᾶς, ἀπαλλάξασα αὐτούς τῆς δουλείας τῆς ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ μυρίων κακῶν
 ἐτέρων· ἀλλὰ μείζων αὕτη ἡ χάρις. Τότε μὲν γὰρ τῶν Αἰγυπτίων ἀπήλλαξεν,
 νῦν δὲ τῆς τῶν δαιμόνων ἠλευθέρωσεν τυραννίδος· τότε ἀπήλλαξεν τῆς μανίας
 Φαραῶ, νυνὶ δὲ τῆς κατοχῆς τοῦ διαβόλου· τότε διὰ Μωϋσέως, νυνὶ δὲ διὰ
 τοῦ Μονογενοῦς· τότε διὰ ῥάβδου, νυνὶ δὲ διὰ σταυροῦ· τότε διὰ θαλάσσης
 15 ἐρυθρᾶς, νυνὶ δὲ διὰ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας· τότε ἀπὸ πηλοῦ καὶ πλινθείας
 ἐξήγαγεν, [122^V] νῦν ἀπὸ θανάτου καὶ ἁμαρτίας· τότε εἰς γῆν ῥέουσιν γάλα
 καὶ μέλι, νῦν εἰς βασιλείαν οὐρανῶν εἰσήγαγεν.

2 τούτοις βοῶν S] βοῶν τούτοις P 3 Italics removed from AW (not a quotation) || νῦν
 δὲ ... ἐπεγνώσθην S] om. P (h.t. ἐπεγνώσθην) 4 ἔλεγεν S] om. P || καταλάβω S]
 καταλάβω φησὶν P 5 ἡμῶν S] ἡμῖν P 8 καὶ γὰρ καὶ S] καὶ γὰρ ἢ P 12 νῦν δὲ τῆς
 τῶν δαιμόνων ... τυραννίδος· τότε S] om. P (h.t. ἀπήλλαξεν) 13 Φαραῶ S] τοῦ Φαραῶ
 P || νυνὶ 4x S] νῦν P, AW 14 τοῦ Μονογενοῦς S] Μονογενοῦς P 15 Italics added to
 AW (quotation of Titus 3:5) 16 νῦν S, P] νῦν δὲ AW || Italics added to AW (quota-
 tion of Exod 3:7, 17; 33:3) 17 οὐρανῶν εἰσήγαγεν S] εἰσήγαγεν οὐρανῶν P

49. With transposition of ἐξελεξάμην and ὑμᾶς.

50. Possibly John has Gal 4:9 in mind with this contrast marked νῦν δὲ and having to do with knowledge of and by God.

51. Although the text of the Johannine Prologue is ambiguous about where the speech of John the Baptist that begins in John 1:15 ends, Chrysostom in *Hom. Jo.* 14.1 (PG 59:92) stipulates that the voice of 1:16–17 is John the evangelist (whom he calls μαθητῆς), so we assume that identity of the speaker in the translation above, even though the text of this homily just says Ἰωάννης.

52. Despite being more of a paraphrase, this is introduced as a quotation, and hence it is marked as such in the translation. The reading has a transposition of ἐλάβομεν and χάριν ἀντὶ χάριτος; minus καὶ before χάριν. The ἀντὶ is multivalent and could mean “(one grace) in place of” another; “grace after grace,” or “grace upon grace” (BDAG 1 and 2). I translate the quotation (“grace for grace”) in a way that tries not to force a single interpretation. The exposition that follows will play out one version of

didn't choose me, but I chose you” (John 15:16).⁴⁹ And once again, the apostle also sings in harmony with these sentiments, saying: “*Then I shall know, just as also I have been known*” (1 Cor 13:12). But now⁵⁰ I have not known, but “*I have been known*” (1 Cor 13:12). And also, when writing to the Philippians, he said, “*I press forward to see if I might apprehend, inasmuch as I also have been apprehended*” (Phil 3:12). In all these statements Paul was showing clearly that the cause of salvation wasn't our virtuous action, but it was by divine grace that we were all saved (cf. Eph 2:5, 8). This is exactly what he's pointing to here, too, when he says, “*The grace of God has been brought to light*” (Titus 2:11).

12. What sort of grace? Well to be sure, there's the grace of the old covenant. And the disciple John⁵¹ cried out, saying, “*We received*” “*grace for grace*” (John 1:16).⁵² For the grace that belonged to the old covenant truly was grace, too, given that it delivered them from slavery in Egypt and from countless other terrible things. But this grace⁵³ is greater. Back then it gave deliverance from the Egyptians, but now it has granted freedom from the tyranny of demons. Then it gave deliverance from the madness of Pharaoh, but now⁵⁴ from the possessive grip of the devil. Then it came through Moses, but now through the Monogenes⁵⁵ (cf. John 1:17–18). Then it came through a staff (cf. Exod 14:16), but now through a cross (cf. Eph 2:16).⁵⁶ Then through a sea of red (cf. Exod 15:22), now “*through the water of regeneration*” (Titus 3:5). Then it brought people out from mud and brickmaking (cf. Exod 1:14), but now from death and sin (cf. Rom 8:2). Then it brought people “*into a land flowing with milk and honey*” (Exod 3:7, 17; 33:3), now into the kingdom of heaven (cf. Matt 3:2, etc.).

this, showing both continuity of the two and what the preacher regards as the superiority of the χάρις in the new. Note that one thing the preacher does not do here in relating the “old” and the “new” forms of χάρις is say that the first contains τύποι of the second, which contains the ἀλήθεια—but see *Hom. Jo.* 14.1–2 (PG 59:92–93).

53. I.e., that of which the apostle speaks in Titus 2:11. For Chrysostom, this is the grace that belongs to the καινὴ διαθήκη. Although χάρις is not found in 2 Cor 3:4–18, the contrast of the two covenants (παλαιά, καινή) from there is influencing John's argument here.

54. In the four comparisons that follow, each time S reads νυνὶ, but P the synonym (perhaps slightly less vivid), νῦν.

55. “The only begotten” of John 1:18 (retained here as a title to capture the anti-theological play with Moses).

56. A similar but not identical comparison between Moses's staff and Christ's cross is made in *Exp. Ps.* Ψ 109 §3 (PG 55:269).

- 1 13. Ὡντως ἐπεφάνη ἡ χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡ σωτήριος. Ἀλλὰ τίνος ἔνεκεν, ὦ μακάριε Παῦλε, τοσαῦτα κατορθώματα παρέδραμες ἐνὶ ῥήματι; Ἀνακάλυψόν μοι τὴν χάριν, εἶπέ μοι τὸ πέλαγος τῶν δωρεῶν. Ἀρκεῖ πάντα παραστῆσαι, φησίν, ἡ τοῦ δεδωκότος φιλανθρωπία. ὅταν γὰρ Θεοῦ χάρις ᾖ, οὐκ ἔχει
- 5 μέτρον ἡ χάρις. Ἐπεφάνη ἡ χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὁ Θεὸς ἄνθρωπος ἐγένετο, διὰ σὲ μορφήν δούλου ἔλαβεν, ἵνα ἐλεύθερον ποιήσῃ τὸν δούλον. [123^F] Καὶ καθάπερ δεσπότης, σφόδρα φιλῶν οἰκέτην, τὸ ἱμάτιον αὐτοῦ περιβάλλεται, οὕτω καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς, φιλῶν τὴν φύσιν τὴν ἡμετέραν, τὸ ἱμάτιον αὐτῆς περιεβάλετο. Ἄνθρώπου μὲν ἔλεος ἐπὶ τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ, τοῦ δὲ Θεοῦ τὸ ἔλεος ἐπὶ πᾶσαν
- 10 σάρκα. Εἶδες πῶς καὶ τὸ μέγεθος ἔδειξεν τῆς χάριτος καὶ τὸ καθολικὸν τῆς δωρεᾶς, τὸν δεδωκότα εἰπὼν;
14. Ἀλλὰ τί ἐστὶν σωτήριος ἴδωμεν. Αἱ χάριτες ἀπὸ τῶν διδόντων τὰ ὀνόματα λαμβάνουσιν, οἷον ὅταν ἄρχων δῶ χάριν, ἀρχοντικὴ καλεῖται ἡ χάρις, ὅταν βασιλεὺς δῶ χάριν, βασιλικὴ καλεῖται ἡ χάρις. ἐπεὶ οὖν καὶ ἐνταῦθα ὁ
- 15 Σωτὴρ ἔδωκεν τὴν χάριν, σωτήριος ἡ χάρις λέγεται. [123^V] Διὰ τοῦτο γάρ

1 ἡ σωτήριος P] σωτήριος S, AW 2 παρέδραμες S] παρέδραμεν P 3 μοι S] om. P 4 οὐκ ἔχει μέτρον ἡ χάρις S] οὐκ ἔχει μέτρον P 5 ἐπεφάνη S] ἐφάνη P 6 μορφήν δούλου S] δούλου μορφήν P 9 ἀνθρώπου μὲν S] ἀνθρώπου μὲν οὖν P 12 τί S, P] τίς AW 13 ἡ χάρις P] χάρις S, AW 14 ἡ χάρις S, P] χάρις AW 15 διὰ τοῦτο γάρ φησιν S] διὰ τοῦτο καλέσεις γάρ P

57. I.e., χάρις (“gift,” “grace”) which Chrysostom regards as a kind of Pauline shorthand for the totality of divine benisons.

58. Chrysostom often refers to the treasures in the Scriptures as an ocean, elsewhere as an ocean not of gifts (τὸ πέλαγος τῶν δωρεῶν) but of meanings or senses (τῶν νοημάτων), as in *Hom. Rom. 16:3 A* §1 (PG 51:187); *Hom. Rom. 28.3* (PG 60:654); *Hom. Gen. 10.3, 7* (PG 53:84, 89); etc.

59. The homilist addresses Paul directly here (as is so often done by Chrysostom). For AW 121, this homily provides a “solution” to the “problem” of Chrysostom’s reputation for coming too close to Pelagianism (“Ce passage [Titus 2:11] est très intéressant car il permet de corriger ce que l’on a souvent appelé le pélagianisme de Chrysostome). While this may be the case in terms of the reception of Chrysostom, the homily itself does not call out particular theological opponents. The theme of the relationship between human virtue and divine grace, well exhibited here, is a constant one in Chrysostom’s writings, and often those on Paul (see *HT* 135–99, with discussion and references).

60. χάρις, of course, means both grace and gift; John does not see these as separate or distinct, though he can put more emphasis on one aspect at any given time as it suits his argument and context.

13. Truly, “*The saving grace of God has been brought to light*” (Titus 2:11). “But why, blessed Paul, did you run past so many marvelous deeds by using this single word?⁵⁷ Reveal this grace to me; tell me the ocean⁵⁸ of its gifts!”⁵⁹ “The generous love of the one who gives is sufficient to represent it all,” he says. For when the gift of grace⁶⁰ comes from God, it is a gift beyond measure. “*The grace of God has been brought to light*” (Titus 2:11), that is, God became human,⁶¹ for your sake he took “*the form of a slave*” (Phil 2:7), so he might make the slave free. As a master who very much loves a household slave wraps himself in his garment,⁶² so also Christ out of love for our nature wrapped himself in it as a garment.⁶³ “*Human mercy is upon one’s neighbor, but God’s mercy is upon all flesh*” (Sir 18:13).⁶⁴ Have you seen how Paul, by declaring who the giver is,⁶⁵ demonstrated both the magnitude of grace and the universality of the gift?

14. But let’s see what “*saving*” (Titus 2:11) means. Gifts take their names from those who give them. For example, when a leader gives a gift, it’s called a “leadership gift”; when an emperor gives a gift, it’s called an “imperial gift.” Consequently, since here it’s the Savior who gave the gift, it’s

61. Cf. Phil 2:7.

62. This does not appear to be a reference to a known cultural convention (e.g., of a manumission ceremony, which does not contain such clothes swapping by the master), but is instead meant by John to be a surprising, even shocking, act of paternalistic love of a master for his slave. Chrysostom is not the first to use the image of a superior donning the clothes of his slave for the incarnation; see, e.g., Origen, *Comm. Rom. 5.10.11–12* (PG 14:1051–52). (I thank Chris L. de Wet for this reference and for valuable discussion on this point via email, September 18, 2016.) See also de Wet, *Preaching Bondage: John Chrysostom and the Discourse of Slavery in Early Christianity* 141, 204 on “paternalism.”

63. For this customary metaphor for the incarnation using the verb περιβάλλω, see *PGL B.2*, with references spanning from Clement to Theodoret. Although *PGL* includes no examples from Chrysostom, one can add, e.g., *Hom. Jo. 6.1; 11.2* (PG 59:61, 80), τὴν σάρκα τὴν ἡμετέραν περιεβάλετο; 63.2 (PG 59:350), τὴν φύσιν τὴν ἡμετέραν περιεβάλετο.

64. John has helped along the contrast by adding μὲν to the first clause, and in both clauses pulling the genitive forward for emphasis (ἀνθρώπου, Θεοῦ); he also reads Θεοῦ for κυρίου. (The citation corrects AW’s Eccl 18:12.)

65. A reference back to Titus 2:11 and the dependent genitive τοῦ Θεοῦ that Paul (indisputably the author of Titus for Chrysostom, of course) added to χάρις to tell who gave that gift.

1 φησιν· Καὶ καλέσεις ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν, ὅτι αὐτὸς σώσει τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν.

15 Καὶ πῶς, φησίν, εἰ καθολικὴ χάρις ἐστὶν καὶ εἰς τὴν οἰκουμένην ἐξέχεεν τὴν δωρεάν, τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ μόνον σώζειν ἐπηγγείλατο; Ὁ γὰρ 5 Ἰουδαϊκὸς μόνος οὗτος ἐχρημάτιζεν δῆμος ἔμπροσθεν, ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἔμεινεν μόνος οὗτος χρηματίζων· ἀλλ’ ἐπειδὴ μετὰ ταῦτα ἀνάξιοι τῆς τιμῆς εὐρέθησαν, μετέβη ἢ προσηγορία εἰς τὴν οἰκουμένην πᾶσαν.

16. Ὅτι γὰρ λαὸς αὐτοῦ ἡμεῖς, ἄκουσον σαφῶς τοῦ Ὡσηὲ λέγοντος καὶ τοῦ Παύλου ἐρμηνεύοντος· [124^f] Καλέσω τὸν οὐ λαὸν μου λαὸν μου. Καὶ 10 ὅτι περὶ ἡμῶν εἴρηται δῆλον ἐκεῖθεν· ἡμεῖς ἐσμεν οἱ οὐ λαός, ἡμεῖς ἐγενόμεθα λαός. Καὶ ἕτερον δὲ τούτου σαφέστερον ἄκουσον· Καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῷ τόπῳ οὗ ἐρρέθη αὐτοῖς οὐ λαός μου, ὑμεῖς ἐκεῖ κληθήσεσθε υἱοὶ Θεοῦ ζῶντος. Ποίω τόπῳ; Ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ φησίν· ἐκεῖ γὰρ οἱ προφῆται ἔλεγον οὐ λαός μου, καὶ 15 ἐκεῖ τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἔλεγεν ὁ Χριστός· Εἰς ὁδὸν ἐθνῶν μὴ εἰσέλθητε, ἀλλ’ ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ πάλιν εἶπεν· Πορευθέντες μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη.

1 καλέσεις S, P] λέγεις AW || Ἰησοῦν, ὅτι S] τὸν Ἰησοῦν, φησίν, ὅτι P 2 ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν S] om. P 4 Italics added to AW (quotation of Matt 1:21) 5 Ἰουδαϊκὸς μόνος οὗτος S] Ἰουδαϊκὸς νόμος οὕτως P || δῆμος S] om. P 7 μετέβη S, P] μετέβην AW || ἢ προσηγορία S, P] προσηγορία AW || πᾶσαν S] ἅπασαν P 11 οὗ ἐρέθη S (sic)] οὗ ἂν ῥήθη P, οὗ ἐρρήθη AW || κληθήσεσθε S] κληθήσονται P

66. Or, “the Savior’s gift.”

67. With ὅτι αὐτὸς σώσει for αὐτὸς γὰρ σώσει.

68. As often, a hypothetical interlocutor introduces a potential “problem.” In *Hom. Rom.* 17.9 (PG 60:561) Chrysostom also regards the Hosea-Paul duet in Rom 9:25–26 as confirming the solution to these problems of peoplehood and theodicy: Ἀποδοὺς τοίνυν τὴν λύσιν τῷ ζητήματι τὴν διὰ τῶν πραγμάτων, ὥστε καὶ ἐτέρωθεν ἀξιόπιστον ποιῆσαι τὸν λόγον, καὶ τοὺς προφῆτας ἐπεισάγει τὰ αὐτὰ προαναφωνούντας (“So, having given the solution to the problem, one that is grounded in the events, in order to make the argument credible in another way, he then adds the prophets who foretold the very same things”).

69. Cf. Acts 10:45: καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ ἔθνη ἢ δωρεὰ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐκκέχεται.

70. If the text of S is reliable, the preacher is using λαός and δῆμος interchangeably here. Chrysostom can refer to ὁ τῶν Ἰουδαίων δῆμος as, e.g., in *Adv. Jud.* 1.2; 4.6 (PG 48:846, 880); *Laed.* §13 (SC 103:118, ed. Malingrey); *Scand.* 14.12 (SC 79, ed. Malingrey). The reading of P is significantly different, and likely corrupt (by metathesis, μόνος/νόμος): Ἰουδαϊκὸς νόμος οὕτως ἐχρημάτιζεν ἔμπροσθεν, ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἔμεινεν μόνος οὕτω χρηματίζων (“the Jewish law conferred this designation previously, but they didn’t remain the only people thus designated”).

called a “saving gift.”⁶⁶ That is why it says, “And you will call his name Jesus, because he will save his people from their sins” (Matt 1:21).⁶⁷

15. “And how is it,” one might say,⁶⁸ “that if grace is universal and God has poured out this gift into the whole world,⁶⁹ he promised to save only ‘his people’?” (Matt 1:21). For before this the Jewish people were the only ones to bear this designation of his “people”;⁷⁰ however, they didn’t remain the only ones designated as this. But because later they were found unworthy of the honor,⁷¹ the title⁷² passed to the whole world.

16. Now, to show that we are his people, listen to Hosea clearly stating it and Paul giving the interpretation:⁷³ “I shall call the not-my-people, my people” (Rom 9:25; cf. Hos 2:25).⁷⁴ From this passage it’s clear this was said about us. We’re the “not-people”; we’ve become “the people.”⁷⁵ Listen to still another passage even clearer than this one: “And it shall come to pass that in the very place it was said to them, ‘not-my-people’, there you shall be called sons of the living God” (Rom 9:26; Hos 2:1).⁷⁶ In what place? “In the land of Judea,” he says. For it was there that the prophets said, “not-my-people” (Hos 2:1), and it was there that Christ said to his disciples, “Don’t go into the way of the gentiles” (Matt 10:5).⁷⁷ And yet it was in the very land of Judea⁷⁸ that he said once more, “Go forth and make disciples of all the

71. Cf. Acts 13:46–48.

72. I.e., of being ὁ λαὸς αὐτοῦ.

73. For John this is another instance of the harmony of apostles and prophets (as stated in §10).

74. ἐρῶ τῷ Οὐ-λαῶ-μου Λαός μου εἶ σύ.

75. Cf. 1 Pet 2:10: οἱ ποτε οὐ λαός, νῦν δὲ λαὸς θεοῦ. In *Hom. Rom.* 17.9 (PG 60:561) Chrysostom identifies the “not-my-people” as τὰ ἔθνη, but not as ἡμεῖς specifically.

76. Here Paul had quoted Hos 2:1 LXX exactly. AW has put the comma after μου and before ὑμεῖς, regarding Chrysostom as having construed the pronoun to fit his change of the verb to the second person plural (κληθήσεσθε for κληθήσονται). This receives some confirmation from the second citation of the verse in this paragraph (see n. 81 below). That means Chrysostom has altered the syntax from both Paul and Hosea, in both of which ὑμεῖς belongs in the prior clause. The shift in the person of the verb is found only here; John cites the lemma as κληθήσονται in *Hom. Rom.* 16.9 (PG 60:562) and also in the third person, ἐκλήθησαν, in the citation that will follow in this paragraph (though there with a shift of tense).

77. With εἰσέλθητε for ἀπέλθητε.

78. Actually, this was in the Galilee, according to Matt 28:16. John is generalizing about the region as being the territory of the Jewish people.

Εἶδες πῶς ἐν τῷ τόπῳ οὗ ἐρρέθη αὐτοῖς οὐ λαός μου, ἐκεῖ ἐκλήθησαν υἱοὶ Θεοῦ ζῶντος; Διὰ τοῦτο φησιν· Αὐτὸς σώσει τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ [125^F] ἀπὸ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν αὐτῶν.

17. Μεγάλη σωτηρία ὄντως· οὐδὲ γὰρ οὕτω μέγα ἀπαλλαγῆναι θανάτου
 5 ὡς μέγα ἀπαλλαγῆναι ἁμαρτίας· διὰ γὰρ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν ὁ θάνατος, οὐ διὰ τὸν
 θάνατον ἢ ἁμαρτία. Καὶ ἵνα μάθῃς ὅτι αὕτη μείζων ἢ ἀπαλλαγὴ καὶ, ταύτης
 ἀνηρημένης, οὐκ ἔστιν φοβερὸς ὁ θάνατος, ἀπ’ αὐτοῦ σκοπεῖ τοῦτο τοῦ
 σώματος τοῦ δεσποτικοῦ. 18. Τὸ γὰρ σῶμα ἐκεῖνο ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν,
 καὶ ἐμπεσὼν εἰς τὸν θάνατον ὠδῖνας αὐτῷ πικρὰς ἤγειρεν καὶ διέρρηξεν
 10 αὐτοῦ τὴν γαστέρα· καὶ οὐ μόνον οὐ κατεπόθη, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἠφάνισεν αὐτὸν εἰς
 τέλος. Καὶ καθάπερ ὁ Δανιήλ, μάζαν εἰς τὸ στόμα τοῦ δράκοντος ἐμβαλὼν,
 διέφθειρεν [125^V] τὸ θηρίον, οὕτω καὶ ὁ Χριστός, τὴν σάρκα τὴν ἑαυτοῦ εἰς
 τὸ στόμα τοῦ θανάτου ῥίψας, διέσχισεν αὐτοῦ τὴν γαστέρα· καὶ γὰρ κέντρον

1 ἐρρέθη S, P] ἐρρήθη AW || Italics added to AW (quotation of Rom 9:26) 2 λαὸν
 αὐτοῦ P] λαόν S, AW || Correcting AW’s “124v.” Fol. 124v has no text inscribed
 (presumably because of considerable run through of ink from the recto). The text
 continues on 125r, where indicated above. 3 αὐτῶν S] αὐτοῦ P 4 ὄντως S] ὅμως
 P || οὐδέ S] οὐδέν P || ἀπαλλαγῆναι S] ἀπαλλαγῆς P 5 Italics removed from AW (not
 a quotation) || τὸν θάνατον S, P] τοῦ θανάτου AW 6 καὶ ἵνα P] ἵνα S 7 τοῦ σώματος
 S, P] om. AW 10 Italics added to AW (quotation of 1 Cor 15:54; cf. that of 15:56
 following) 11 μάζαν S] om. P 12 εἰς τὸ στόμα τοῦ θανάτου ῥίψας S] εἰς τὸ στόμα τοῦ
 δράκοντος ἐμβαλὼν ῥίψας P 13 αὐτοῦ τὴν γαστέρα S] τὴν τοῦ θανάτου γαστέρα P

79. Or “all the nations,” but Chrysostom is clearly construing it as a reference to the movement of the status of peoplehood from Jews to the gentiles.

80. Correcting the citation from AW’s Matt 29:28.

81. An exact quotation, except with ἐκλήθησαν for κληθήσονται to mark the fulfillment of the prophecy (and minus ὑμεῖς accordingly).

82. As in §14, S has minus γὰρ but also (surprisingly, given the point Chrysostom is making) minus αὐτοῦ after λαόν. It is, however, on a page break in S, which is followed by a blank, damaged page (fol. 124^v; the text continues on fol. 125^r). αὐτοῦ is read in P (fol. 165^r) and adopted here.

83. Surely an allusion to Rom 5:12–21 but not a quotation, and so it should not be in italics, as in AW.

84. I.e., the one from sin.

85. Cf. Heb 2:14–15.

86. Cf. Acts 2:24.

87. Death for Chrysostom, as in places for Paul (such as one of the passages in view here, 1 Cor 15:54–56), is a hypostatized entity. I begin capitalizing from here because of the combat scene envisioned (see next, and subsequent notes). But one could have done so earlier in this paragraph and the previous (§17), according to the full train of thought and set of presuppositions at work about Death as personified entity.

gentiles⁷⁹” (Matt 28:19).⁸⁰ Have you seen how “in the very place it was said to them, ‘not-my-people’, there you shall be called sons of the living God” (Rom 9:26; Hos 2:1)?⁸¹ That’s why it says, “He will save his people from their sins” (Matt 1:21).⁸²

17. Salvation is truly magnificent; because not even deliverance from death is as significant as deliverance from sin. For death came on account of sin,⁸³ not sin on account of death. And, so you might learn that this deliverance⁸⁴ is the greater one, and that once sin has been annihilated, death isn’t to be feared;⁸⁵ observe what took place in the case of the Lord’s own body. 18. For that body “did not commit sin” (1 Pet 2:22), and once he’d fallen into death, he inflicted bitter pains⁸⁶ on Death⁸⁷ and split his belly in two.⁸⁸ Not only was the Lord not “swallowed up”⁸⁹ (1 Cor 15:54; cf. Isa 25:8), but in the end he even obliterated Death.⁹⁰ Just as Daniel, by tossing cake into the mouth of the dragon, destroyed the beast,⁹¹ so also Christ, by hurling his own flesh into the mouth of Death, split his belly apart.⁹² For

88. This vivid imagery of Death/Hades, with a belly swollen full of the righteous dead, vivisected by Christ, who vanquishes him and frees them, is found, with some of the same language, in Chrysostom’s older contemporary, Ephrem Syrus, in his *Sermo in pretiosam et vivificam crucem*: ἐν τούτῳ τῷ ἁγίῳ ὄπλῳ (sc. ὁ σταυρός) διέρρηξε Χριστὸς τὴν παμφάγον τοῦ ἕδου γαστέρα καὶ τὸ πολυμήχανον τοῦ Διαβόλου ἐνέφραξε στόμα. Τοῦτον ἰδὼν ὁ θάνατος, τρομάξας καὶ φρίξας, πάντας οὓς εἶχεν ἀπὸ τοῦ πρωτοπλάστου ἀπέλυσε (ed. Phrantzoles, 4:135; my translation: “By means of this holy weapon [i.e., the cross] Christ split the omnivorous belly of Hades in two and he shut the conniving mouth of the Devil. On seeing this cross, Death, shivering and shaking with fear, released all those whom he had held fast, starting with the first-formed man [Adam]”). See the excellent treatment of this scene in texts and Byzantine art by Margaret English Frazer, “Hades Stabbed by the Cross of Christ,” *Metropolitan Museum Journal* 9 (1974): 153–61, who cites this Ephrem text (pp. 157–58) and others up through Romanos Melodos, including one Ps-Chrysostomic text. One difference is that the preacher in *Hom. Tit. 2:11–12* focuses not on the cross but on the very σῶμα of Christ as having torn Death/Satan/Hades apart, though this is likely due to the comparison he is trying to make with Bel (Add Dan). (See also n. 92 below for another instance in Chrysostom’s writings that makes this same analogy.)

89. I.e., Christ did not suffer the fate Paul said Death did.

90. The language is different, but cf. 2 Tim 1:10.

91. Cf. Bel. (Add Dan) 23–27. The language is very close: καὶ ἐποίησε μάζαν καὶ ἐνέβαλεν εἰς τὸ στόμα τοῦ δράκοντος, καὶ φαγῶν διεράγη (Bel 27).

92. The same argument comparing Christ’s body attacking Death with Daniel’s assault on the dragon, with much identical language, is made by Chrysostom in *Hom. 1 Cor. 24.4* (PG 61:204): Οὐδεμία γὰρ γυνὴ παιδίον κύουσα οὕτως ὠδίνει, ὡς ἐκεῖνος, τὸ σῶμα ἔχων τὸ Δεσποτικόν, διεκόπτετο διασπώμενος. Καὶ ὕπερ ἐπὶ τοῦ δράκοντος γέγονε

1 τοῦ θανάτου ἢ ἁμαρτία. Ἀνελὼν τοίνυν τὸ κέντρον, εἶασεν λοιπὸν τὸ θηρίον ἀνενέργητον.

19. Ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ ζητούμενον ἐκεῖνό ἐστιν· τί δηποτοῦν εἰπὼν ἐπεφάνη ἢ χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ ἢ σωτήριος, ἐπήγαγεν παιδεύουσα ἡμᾶς. Ἡ γὰρ χάρις οὐ παιδεύει, ἀλλὰ δημηγορεῖ· ἢ χάρις οὐ παιδεύει, ἀλλὰ ἀφήσιν ἁμαρτήματα. 5 συγγνώμην δίδωσιν, οὐ παιδείαν ἐπάγει. Ἀλλὰ μὴ φοβηθῆς τὸ ὄνομα τῆς παιδείας. [126^f] ἔστιν γὰρ παιδεία κόλασις καὶ ἔστιν παιδεία διδασκαλία. “Ὁν γὰρ ἀγαπᾷ Κύριος παιδεύει—φησὶν—μαστιγοῖ δὲ πάντα υἱὸν ὃν 10 παραδέχεται. Ἐνταῦθα παιδεία ἢ κόλασις ἐστιν. Ἄκουσον ἀλλαχοῦ πῶς ἢ παιδεία διδασκαλός ἐστιν. Μακάριος ἄνθρωπος ὃν ἂν παιδεύσης, Κύριε, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ νόμου σου διδάξῃς αὐτόν. Κατὰ τοῦτο τοίνυν ἐπεφάνη ἢ χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ ἢ σωτήριος, παιδεύουσα ἡμᾶς, τοῦτ’ ἐστὶν διδάσκουσα ἡμᾶς.

1 τοῦ S, P] om. AW || εἶασεν λοιπὸν τὸ θηρίον ἀνενέργητον S] νεκρὸν εἶασεν τὸ θηρίον λοιπὸν P 3 καὶ S] om. P || ἐκεῖνο S] τοῦτο P 4 ἢ σωτήριος P] σωτήριος S, AW 5 ἀλλὰ δημηγορεῖ· ἢ χάρις οὐ παιδεύει P] om. S (h.t. οὐ παιδεύει), AW 7 ἔστιν γὰρ P] ἔστιν S, AW 8 φησὶν S] om. P || υἱὸν S] ἄνθρωπον P 9 παιδεία ἢ κόλασις S] ἢ παιδεία κόλασις P 9 ἄκουσον ἀλλαχοῦ πῶς ἢ παιδεία διδασκαλός ἐστιν P] om. S (h.t. ἐστὶν) 10 παιδεύσης κύριε καὶ ἐκ S] παιδεύση κύριος κύριε καὶ ἐκ P 11 διδάξῃς P] διδάξεις S (itac.?), AW 1 τοίνυν S] οὖν P 12 ἢ σωτήριος P] σωτήριος S, AW 1 τοῦτ’ ἐστὶν διδάσκουσα ἡμᾶς P] om. S (h.t. ἡμᾶς), AW

τοῦ Βαβυλωνίου, ὅτε λαβὼν τὴν τροφὴν διερράγη μέσος, τοῦτο καὶ ἐπὶ τούτου. Οὐ γὰρ διὰ τοῦ στόματος ἄλλιν ἐξῆλθεν ὁ Χριστὸς τοῦ θανάτου, ἀλλ’ αὐτὴν μέσῃ διαρρήξας τὴν γαστέρα τοῦ δράκοντος καὶ ἀνατεμών, οὕτως ἀπὸ τῶν ἀδύτων προῆει μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς λαμπρότητος (“For no woman giving birth to a child suffers as much pain as Death did when, having the Lord’s own body inside, he was vivisected and torn in two. And precisely what happened in the case of the Babylonian dragon, when it took the food and was split down the middle, happened also in the case of the Lord. Yet Christ didn’t come out again through the mouth of Death, but after he had split the belly of the dragon right down the middle and cut him open, he walked right out of the hidden chamber in full splendor”). In that context also Chrysostom refers to 1 Cor 15:54–56 for the triumph over death, as here. In both cases, it is a reference to a tradition such as that contained in the *Decensus Christi ad inferos* (inspired by 1 Pet 3:18–19, etc.), as appended to the *Acta Pilati*, in which Christ journeys to hell and releases the righteous dead. See further Frazer, “Hades Stabbed by the Cross of Christ.”

93. P reads νεκρὸν εἶασεν τὸ θηρίον λοιπὸν (“he left the beast finally dead”).

94. τὸ ζητούμενον.

95. Chrysostom does not mention the intervening words, πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις, which is a bit surprising given the argument about universality above (§§15–16); he appears to have presumed, but not quoted, that part.

indeed, “*the sting of death is sin*” (1 Cor 15:56). And then, after snatching away its sting, he left the beast in the end completely powerless.⁹³

19. But there’s still that vexing question⁹⁴ to be investigated: “Why then was it that after saying, ‘*The saving grace of God has been brought to light,*’ Paul added, ‘*giving us paideia*’ (Titus 2:11–12)?⁹⁵ For grace doesn’t teach privately, but it speaks publicly; grace doesn’t chastise,⁹⁶ but it forgives sins. It grants pardon, it doesn’t bring punishment.”⁹⁷ Now don’t be afraid of the word *paideia*.⁹⁸ Because *paideia* means “chastisement” and *paideia* means “instruction.”⁹⁹ “*For the Lord chastises¹⁰⁰ the one he loves,*” it says, “*and he applies the whip to every son whom he accepts*” (Heb 12:6; Prov 3:12).¹⁰¹ In that statement *paideia* means “chastisement.” But hear how elsewhere *paideia* means “the role of instruction”: “*Blessed is the person whom you instruct, O Lord, and whom you teach from your law*” (Ps 93:12).¹⁰² Accordingly, then, “*the saving grace of God has been brought to light, giving us paideia*” (Titus 2:11–12) means “teaching us.”¹⁰³

96. ἀλλὰ δημηγορεῖ· ἢ χάρις οὐ παιδεύει is restored from P (lacking in S, likely a parablepsis error). In setting up these three antitheses, John is playing off different senses of παιδεύειν/παιδεία, as “instruction,” “chastisement,” and “punishment” (hence the varieties in translating οὐ παιδεύει above, to fit the three contrasts).

97. I take the interlocutor’s question to extend to here. Then what follows is John’s solution, or λύσις, initially addressing the interlocutor in the second person (and, by extension, his audience at the *synaxis* as well).

98. In responding to the ζητούμενον, Chrysostom first treats it as a lexical problem.

99. John’s gloss is upheld in a modern lexicon like *PGL* (see above, n. 38).

100. Although most English translations choose “discipline” here (including NETS), in the next sentence, John identifies this as κόλασις, “chastisement, correction” (LSJ 2), or “punishment” (*PGL* 1).

101. It is not possible to tell whether John is quoting from one or the other, since Hebrews has quoted the Proverbs LXX text exactly (and φησὶν is ambiguous). The quotation in this exact form is found in *Laz.* 1.12 (PG 48:980); *Exp. Ps.* Ψ 7 §8 (PG 55:92); *Hom. Jo.* 35.3 (PG 59:202); *Hom. Heb.* 29.1 (PG 63:204); and, without γὰρ, in *Adv. Jud.* 8.7 (PG 48:939); *Stat.* 1.9 (PG 49:28); *Exp. Ps.* Ψ 110 §3 (PG 55:284).

102. Minus σύ before παιδεύσης with LXX A; I adopt the reading διδάξῃς (from P), rather than διδάξεις (S). The macarism is quoted by Chrysostom in this form also in *Stat.* 18.3 (PG 49:185); *Hom. Jo.* 47.5 (PG 59:322); *Hom. Phil.* 15.5 (PG 62:294).

103. Having set up the alternative solutions to the lexical quandary, the preacher argues for the single meaning of παιδεύουσα here as giving “instruction.” But that leads to the next questions, how and what does grace teach?

- 1 20. Καὶ πῶς διδάσκει ἡ χάρις; Ἡ γὰρ χάρις ἀμαρτήματα ἀφήσιν, ἀλλ' αὕτη ἡ ἄφεσις τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν διδασκαλία κατορθωμάτων ἐστίν· καὶ γὰρ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων τῶν νοῦν ἐχόντων οὐχ οὕτω μάστιγες καὶ πληγαὶ παιδεύουσιν πολλοὺς ὡς ἀμαρτημάτων συγχώρησις. Ὅταν γοῦν ἴδῃ τὴν φιλανθρωπίαν τοῦ συγχωρήσαντος, [126^V] ὁ ἡμαρτηκῶς ἑαυτὸν ἀκριβέστερον ποιεῖ πρὸς τὰ μέλλοντα κατορθώματα. Καὶ οὕτως αὐτὸν παιδεύει ἡ χάρις, μαστίγων μᾶλλον κατανύττουσα· ἐρυθριᾷ γὰρ καὶ αἰσχύνεται πάλιν τοῖς αὐτοῖς περιπεσεῖν, δυσωπεῖται τὸ μέγεθος τῆς δωρεᾶς τοῦ εὐεργετήσαντος καὶ γίνεται παιδευσις ἡ χάρις.
- 10 21. Βούλει μαθεῖν καὶ ἐτέρωθεν πῶς καὶ χάρις ἐστίν καὶ παιδευσις, πῶς καὶ ἐχαρίσατο καὶ ἐπαίδευσεν ὁ Χριστός; Εἶδεν τὸν παραλελυμένον, συνέπηξεν αὐτοῦ τὰ νεῦρα, διωρθώσατο τῆς φύσεως αὐτοῦ τὴν ἀσθένειαν, ἐπανήγαγεν πρὸς τὴν προτέραν ὑγίαν τὸ σῶμα, εἶτα ὑστερον ἰδὼν αὐτὸν ἔλεγεν· Ἴδου ὑγιῆς γέγονας [127^I]—τοῦτο χάριτος· μηκέτι ἀμάρτανε—
- 15 τοῦτο παιδείας καὶ διδασκαλίας. Καὶ τοῖς μαθηταῖς ἀμφότερα ἐνεχείρισεν· εἰπὼν μὲν γὰρ πορευθέντες βαπτίζετε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη εἰς τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, τὴν χάριν ἐδήλωσεν, τὴν ἄφεσιν τῶν παραπτωμάτων· ἐπαγαγὼν δὲ διδάσκοντες αὐτοὺς τηρεῖν πάντα ὅσα ἐνετειλάμην ὑμῖν, τὴν παιδείαν ἐνέφηεν. Ἄ δὴ καὶ ὁ Παῦλος δηλῶν ἔλεγεν·
- 20 Ἐπεφάνη ἡ χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ, παιδεύουσα ἡμᾶς.

1 γὰρ S] om. P 3 τῶν νοῦν S, P] τὸν νοῦν AW || πληγαὶ S] πληγαῖς P 4 πολλοὺς S] om. P || τὴν P] τὴν τὴν S (sic) 5 ἑαυτὸν ἀκριβέστερον S] ἀκριβέστερον ἑαυτὸν P 7 κατανύττουσα P] κατανοίγουσα S | κατανουγείσα AW conj. || γὰρ καὶ S] καὶ P 10 πῶς καὶ S] πῶς P 11 πῶς S] πάλιν P 12 διωρθώσατο S] διόρθωσεν P || φύσεως αὐτοῦ S] φύσεως P 13 ἐπανήγαγεν S] ἐπήγαγεν P 14 χάριτος P] χάρις S, AW || ἀμάρτανε S, P] ἀμαρτάνει (sic) AW 15 Altering AW's punctuation to establish consistency in the two parallel clauses 17 τὴν ἄφεσιν S] καὶ τὴν ἄφεσιν P 18 παραπτωμάτων S] ἀμαρτήματα P || δέ S] om. P 19 ἄ δὴ καὶ S] ἄ καὶ P 20 τοῦ θεοῦ P] τοῦ θεοῦ σωτήριος S, AW

104. This part of the argument (especially §§20–21) bears resemblance to the much briefer treatment of the verse in Chrysostom, *Hom. Tit.* 5.1 (PG 62:689), with the same emphasis on how χάρις brings about συγχώρησις and how it acts both to deal with past and future sins and to provide ἀσφάλεια for the future: Ἀλλὰ μὴ νομίσης, ὅτι ἡ χάρις μέχρι τῆς τῶν προτέρων συγχωρήσεως ἴσταται, ἀλλὰ καὶ εἰς τὸ μέλλον ἡμᾶς ἀσφαλίζεται· καὶ γὰρ καὶ τοῦτο χάριτος (“But don’t suppose that grace stops with forgiving our former sins, but it even secures us for the future. Indeed, this is precisely the role of grace”).

105. P omits πολλοὺς and also reads πληγαῖς for πληγαί (“Indeed, the whips that offer *paideia* even by means of beatings”).

20. So how does grace teach? Well, grace forgives sins, but this act of forgiving sins constitutes a teaching about virtuous actions.¹⁰⁴ Indeed, the whips and beatings that offer *paideia* to the masses¹⁰⁵ aren’t as effective for intelligent people as is the pardoning of their sins. Because when those who’ve sinned¹⁰⁶ see the merciful love of the one who has pardoned them, they make themselves all the more attentive to do acts of virtue in the future. This is how grace gives them *paideia*, spurring them on¹⁰⁷ even better than whips do, since out of embarrassment they’re ashamed to fall into the same actions again. They’re abashed at the magnitude of their benefactor’s gift, and so grace becomes a process of *paideia*.

21. Do you want to learn from yet another source how it is both grace and a process of *paideia*, how Christ both gave a gift of grace and offered *paideia*? He saw the man who was paralyzed, he strengthened his tendons, he corrected the weakness of his nature, he brought his body back to its former health (cf. John 5:2–9). Then later, when Christ saw him, he said, “Look, you’ve become healthy!” (John 5:14)¹⁰⁸—this is an act of grace.¹⁰⁹ And, he said, “No longer sin” (John 5:14)—this is an act of *paideia* and instruction. Both these tasks were what Christ entrusted to his disciples. For by saying, “Go forth and ... baptize all the nations in the name of the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit” (Matt 28:19),¹¹⁰ he was clearly showing grace, that is, the forgiveness of transgressions. But by adding, “teaching them to observe all the things I commanded you” (Matt 28:20), he was pointing to *paideia*. And indeed, this is precisely what Paul showed so clearly when he said, “The saving grace of God has been brought to light ... giving us *paideia*” (Titus 2:11–12).

106. The translation chooses the plural here to avoid gender-exclusive language, but the Greek is singular.

107. AW rightly adopts κατανύττουσα, the reading of P, here (as translated above). S has κατανοίγουσα (a rare intensive of ἀνοίγω nowhere else used by Chrysostom), about which AP offers the following hesitant conjecture: “*num κατανουγείσα?*” (presumably the hesitation is due to the ill-suited passive voice). Chrysostom likes the verb κατανύττειν; see, e.g., *Hom. Rom.* 16:3 B §6 (PG 51:206); *Exp. Ps.* Ψ 110 §5 (PG 55:287); *Hom. Matt.* 87.4 (PG 58:774); *Hom. Jo.* 48.3 (PG 59:272); *Hom. Rom.* 30.4 (PG 60:666); *Hom. Act.* 9:1 3.3 (PG 51:140) in addition to the citations listed in PGL 1.b.

108. ἰδού for ἴδε (correcting AW’s citation of John 15:14).

109. I adopt χάριτος, the reading of P, instead of χάρις (that of S, adopted by AW).

110. A paraphrase at the start: πορευθέντες βαπτίζετε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη for πορευθέντες μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη βαπτίζοντες.

1 22. Ὑπὲρ δὲ τούτων ἀπάντων εὐχαριστήσωμεν τῷ Θεῷ καὶ διὰ παντὸς
ἔχωμεν διὰ μνήμης τὴν χάριν αὐτήν. [127^V] καὶ τετυφωμένος ἦς καὶ
ἀπονενογημένος, καὶ εὐθυμῆς, παιδεύσει σε ἡ χάρις μετριάζειν. Ὅταν γὰρ
ἐννοήσης ὅτι ὁ τῶν ἀγγέλων δεσπότης, Θεὸς ὁ σύνθρονος τοῦ πατρός, δούλου
5 μορφὴν ἔλαβεν, οὐ δυνήσῃ ποτὲ ὀργῆς ἢ ἀπονοίας πάθος κατασχεῖν ἐν τῇ
ψυχῇ.

23. Οὕτω γοῦν καὶ Παῦλος παιδεύει ἐν ταπεινοφροσύνῃ ἡμᾶς, δεικνύς
ὅτι τοῦτο αὐτὸ χάρις ἐστὶν καὶ διδασκαλία· διὸ καὶ τῆς χάριτος ἀναμιμνήσκει
πρότερον. Καὶ ποῦ τοῦτο ποιεῖ; Φιλιππησίοις γράφων καὶ βουλόμενος αὐτοὺς
10 πείσαι παραχωρεῖν ἀλλήλοις τῶν πρωτείων, οὕτως συνεβούλευσεν. Τῇ
ταπεινοφροσύνῃ ἀλλήλους προηγούμενοι ὑπερέχοντας ἑαυτῶν. [128^F] Εἶτα
τὴν διδασκαλίαν ἀπὸ τῆς χάριτος ἐπήγαγεν εἰπών· Τοῦτο γὰρ—φησὶν—
φρονεῖσθω ἐν ὑμῖν ὁ καὶ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, ὃς ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχων οὐχ
ἀρπαγμὸν ἠγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ, ἀλλ' ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν, μορφὴν δούλου
15 λαβών· καὶ σχήματι εὔρεθεις ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἐταπείνωσεν ἑαυτὸν.

24. Εἶδες πῶς τὴν χάριν εἰς μέσον ἀγαγὼν διδασκαλίαν τὸ πρᾶγμα
ἐποίησεν; Οὕτω, καὶ ὅταν εἰς ἀγάπην προτρέπηται, ποιεῖ, τῆς χάριτος
ἀναμιμνήσκων καὶ λέγων· Καθὼς ὁ Χριστὸς ἠγάπησεν ἡμᾶς καὶ παρέδωκεν
ἑαυτὸν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν, οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀγαπάτε ἀλλήλους. Παιδευθῶμεν τοίνυν

1 δέ S] δὴ P || ἀπάντων S, P] ἀπάτων (sic) AW 2 καὶ ἀπονενογημένος S, P] om.
AW 3 Ὅταν γὰρ ... ἔλαβεν S] om. P 5 ὀργῆς ἢ S] ἀγαθῶν οὐδέ P 7 ἐν ταπεινοφροσύνῃ
S] εἰς ταπεινοφροσύνην P 8 τοῦτο αὐτὸ χάρις S] τὸ αὐτὸ καὶ χάρις P 9 ποιεῖ S] φησὶν
P 10 τῇ ταπεινοφροσύνῃ P] ἐν τῇ ταπεινοφροσύνῃ S 11 προηγούμενοι S] ἡγούμενοι
P (with M) || ὑπερέχοντας S, P] ὑπέρετας AW 12 εἰπών S] om. P 15 εὔρεθεις S, P]
εὔρηθεις (sic) AW 17 ἐποίησεν P] ἐκάλεσεν S, AW 1 προτρέπηται S] om. P 18 καθὼς
S] οὕτως P 19 ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν S] om. P

111. Cf. 1 Thess 1:2.

112. καὶ ἀπονενογημένος is read by both manuscripts (AW *app. crit.* incorrectly says only P adds it).

113. I.e., “give you the *paideia*.”

114. With transposition of μορφὴν and δούλου.

115. Ὅταν γὰρ ἐννοήσης ... ἔλαβεν is the reading of S. P has dropped the line, resuming (after μετριάζειν in the previous line) with οὐ δυνήσῃ, and reads ἀγαθῶν οὐδέ for ὀργῆς ἢ. That textual reading appears corrupt but would be something like, “You’ll never be able to harbor the emotions for good or arrogance in your soul.”

116. I.e., *paideia*.

117. John is seeking to show that in Titus 2:11 and other places, like John 5:14 and Matt 28:19–20, χάρις precedes παιδεία.

22. So, on behalf of all these things, let’s give thanks to God, and let’s remember this grace at all times.¹¹¹ And if you’re conceited and haughty,¹¹² if you’re high-spirited, grace will instruct you¹¹³ in moderating your behavior. For when you consider that the Lord of the angels—the God who shares the throne with the Father—took “*the form of a slave*” (Phil 2:7),¹¹⁴ you’ll never be able to harbor the emotion of wrath or of arrogance in your soul.¹¹⁵

23. This is how Paul offers us instruction¹¹⁶ in humility, by showing that it’s the very thing that constitutes grace and teaching. That’s why he mentions grace first.¹¹⁷ And where does he do¹¹⁸ this? When writing to the Philippians and wishing to persuade them to cede to one another the positions of preeminence, he puts his counsel this way: “*In humility consider one another better than yourselves*” (Phil 2:3).¹¹⁹ Then he added the teaching that comes from grace, saying, “*For,*” he says, “*let your mindset be that which was in Christ Jesus, who, although he was in the form of God, did not consider being equal to God something to be grasped at, but he emptied himself, taking the form of a slave ... and being found in human form, he humbled himself*” (Phil 2:5–8).¹²⁰

24. Have you seen how by bringing grace to the forefront Paul made the matter a form of instruction?¹²¹ He does this also when he is giving a protreptic appeal¹²² to love, by bringing grace to mind and saying, “*Just as Christ loved us and handed himself over on our behalf*” (Eph 5:2),¹²³ thus

118. ποιεῖ (S); P reads φησὶν (“And where does he say this?”).

119. S reads προηγούμενοι (with μ^{46} D*^c I K 075. 0278. 1175. 1505; cf. Rom 12:10 on the sense of the verb) for ἡγούμενοι (so M and other witnesses). In one other place in his oeuvre, John cites Phil 2:3 with προηγούμενοι, in *Scand.* 17.5 (SC 79, ed. Malin-gre), but when citing the lemma in *Hom. Phil.* 6.3 (PG 62:222), he has ἡγούμενοι. John conflates Phil 2:3 and Rom 12:10 (τῇ τιμῇ ἀλλήλους προηγούμενοι ὑπερέχοντας ἑαυτῶν) also in *Hom. Gen.* 4.7; 33.5 (PG 53:47, 312). AW’s ὑπέρετας for ὑπερέχοντας (the reading of both manuscripts) is an outright mistake.

120. With φρονεῖσθω for φρονεῖτε, and ellipsis in Phil. 2:7 (ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος), as marked in the translation.

121. S reads ἐκάλεσεν (“how after bringing grace to the forefront Paul called the matter ‘instruction’”).

122. As AW notes, P omits προτρέπηται, though it is required for the ὅταν clause. John may or may not have a formal προτρεπτικός λόγος in mind, but he uses the term consistent with its rhetorical definition as a discourse of persuasion toward a particular course or way of life.

123. Minus καὶ before ὁ Χριστός; John may also have in mind Gal 2:20, where in the following verse (2:21), this act of Christ’s handing himself over in love is called χάρις.

1 ἀπό τῆς χάριτος καὶ εὐχαριστήσωμεν τῷ φιλανθρώπῳ Θεῷ καὶ διὰ τὴν
γενομένην [128^V] εἰς ἡμᾶς δωρεὰν καὶ διὰ τὴν ἐκ τῆς χάριτος διδασκαλίαν,
ὅτι καὶ τῶν προτέρων ἀμαρτημάτων ἀπηλλάγημεν καὶ πρὸς τὰ μέλλοντα
κατορθώματα μεγίστην ἔχομεν ἀσφάλειαν τῶν ἀμαρτημάτων τὴν ἄφεσιν.
5 25. Καὶ καθάπερ ἐν κατόπτρῳ, τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ τοῦ λόγου, τὸν βίον τὸν
ἡμέτερον κατανοῶμεν μετὰ ἀκριβείας καὶ ῥυθμιζώμεν τὰ ἡμελημένα τῶν
πράξεων. Καὶ ὅπερ ἐν τοῖς κουρείοις καθεζόμενοι ποιοῦσιν ἄνθρωποι μετὰ τὸ
τὴν τρίχα ἀποκείρασθαι τῆς κεφαλῆς, τὸ κάτοπτρον τῇ δεξιᾷ κατέχοντες,
περισκοπούμενοι [129^F] μήπου τι κατὰ τὴν κουρὰν ἀμάρτημα γέγονεν τῇ
10 κεφαλῇ, κατ' αὐτὸ καὶ σὺ ποίησον· καθάπερ κάτοπτρον τὴν διδασκαλίαν τοῦ
λόγου λαβὼν, ἀπ' αὐτῆς σου τὸν βίον θεώρει πάντα, κἂν ἴδῃς ἀμάρτημά τι
γεγεννημένον, εὐθέως διορθῶσαι καὶ σὺ.

15 26. Οὕτω καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες ποιοῦσιν· ἀπὸ γὰρ τῆς εὐνῆς εὐθέως
διανιστάμεναι, τὴν τε ὄψιν ἀποσμήχουσιν καὶ τὴν τῶν τριχῶν κόμην
διατιθέασιν, καὶ πρὸς τὸ κάτοπτρον βλέπουσαι, τοῦ κάλλους τῆς ὄψεως οὕτω
τὴν δοκιμασίαν ποιοῦνται, ὥστε μηδὲν ἡμελημένον παραδραμεῖν. Καὶ σὺ
3 ἀπηλλάγημεν καὶ πρὸς τὰ μέλλοντα κατορθώματα μεγίστην ἔχομεν ἀσφάλειαν S]
ἀπηλλάγημεν ἀπολογίαν τῶν ἀμαρτημάτων τὴν ἄφεσιν P 7 κουρείοις, regularizing the
orthography] κουρίοις S, P, AW (itac.) || ποιοῦσιν ἄνθρωποι S] ἄνθρωποι P 8 τῇ δεξιᾷ
S] ἐν τῇ δεξιᾷ P 9 περισκοπούμενοι μήπου τι S] περισκοποῦσιν μήπου P 10 κατ' αὐτό
P] κατὰ τούτων S, AW 11 τὸν βίον θεώρει πάντα S] θεώρει πάντα τὸν βίον P || κἂν
S] καὶ εἰ P 12 διορθῶσαι καὶ σὺ S] διορθῶσαι P | διόρθωσαι (sic) AW 13 Οὕτω καὶ
αἱ γυναῖκες ... παραδραμεῖν P, AW in angle brackets] om. S 16 δοκιμασίαν AW]
δοκίμασιν P || Καὶ σὺ τοῖνον λαβὼν P, AW] τοῖνον λαβὼν S

124. Cf. Eph 5:1–2a, 25. Although the phrasing of the final clause in its four words (καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀγαπᾶτε ἀλλήλους) follows John 13:34, Chrysostom in context is offering this as an instance of *Pauline* love protreptic, which must mean he is thinking of the broader argument of Eph 5.

125. The text of P appears to have suffered some corruption here; for καὶ πρὸς τὰ μέλλοντα κατορθώματα ... ἀσφάλειαν, it reads ἀπολογίαν (and then resumes τῶν ἀμαρτημάτων τὴν ἄφεσιν). It lacks a verb of which ἀπολογίαν is the object.

126. The λόγος here naturally refers to the teaching of Scripture, specifically the lemma, Titus 2:11, but it may equally or jointly refer to the teaching of Scripture in the present λόγος, the homily. The phrase ἡ διδασκαλία τοῦ λόγου is used in this way repeatedly by Chrysostom—e.g., *Adv. Jud.* 8.4 (PG 48:932); *Terr. mot.* §1 (PG 50:713); *Hom. Gen.* 40.1 (PG 53:369); *Hom. Jo.* 5:19 §1 (PG 56:248). And it is grounded for him also in the missionary proclamation by Paul and the other apostles of the word of the gospel—e.g., *Hom. Rom.* 2.2 (PG 60:402); *Hom. Matt.* 6.5 (PG 57:68); *Exp. Ps.* Ψ 49 §6 (PG 55:250).

also you love one another.¹²⁴ Therefore, let's receive our *paideia* from grace, and let's give thanks to God who mercifully loves us—both because of the free gift that has come to us and because of the teaching that comes from the gift of grace, since we've been delivered from our former sins and, in addition, we have the forgiveness of sins as the most secure basis for our virtuous actions in the future.¹²⁵

25. Let's look closely at our own life in this teaching of Scripture¹²⁶ as though looking in a mirror,¹²⁷ and let's correct our careless misdeeds. Men who sit in the barbershop, after their full head of hair has been cut, hold the mirror in their right hand and check carefully all around, lest there's been an errant snip in the hair on their head.¹²⁸ You, too, should do the exact same thing.¹²⁹ Grasping this teaching of Scripture as though it were a mirror, take a close look at your entire life in it, and, if you see something amiss,¹³⁰ you, too, correct it immediately!

26. This is what women do, as well. For as soon as they get up from bed, they wash off their face and arrange their hairdo, and by looking at the mirror, they test¹³¹ the beauty of their appearance so they not overlook something that's carelessly askew.¹³² So now, you¹³³ too, grasping this teach-

127. Despite biblical passages that refer to mirrors (e.g., 1 Cor 13:12; 2 Cor 3:18; Jas 1:23–24), John does not appear to be making a direct allusion to them here so much as he is to everyday custom.

128. There is a very close parallel, using much the same language, in Chrysostom's *Hom. Matt.* 4.8 (PG 57:49): Ἄλλ' ἐν κουρείῳ μὲν καθήμενος, καὶ τὴν κόμην ἀποκείρων, τὸ κάτοπτρον λαβὼν περισκοπεῖς μετὰ ἀκριβείας τὴν τῶν τριχῶν σύνθεσιν ("But when you sit in the barbershop and get your hair cut, you take the mirror and check carefully and attentively the condition of your hair"). As in the present homily, this is in contrast to the lack of concentrated attention people give to the beauty or disfigurement (*ἀμορφία*) of their souls.

129. I adopt the reading of P, κατ' αὐτό, over that of S, κατὰ τούτων (as read by AW).

130. Of course, ἀμάρτημα means both sin and error.

131. P reads δοκίμασιν, which AW sensibly corrected to δοκιμασίαν.

132. This sentence, marked as an insertion via brackets in the text in AW, is found only in P. AW was confident that the monastic male community at Saint Catherine's in the Sinai may have felt the exemplum of the woman's toilette to be irrelevant to their context ("le *Sinaiticus* a certainement fait des coupures à l'intention sans doute d'un auditoire monastique" [p. 121]), and thus they had deleted it. This is an unlikely and unnecessary conjecture, because it does not reckon with the fact that the woman in this comparison as it continues (see n. 133 below) is not just any female but is an analogy for the church or perhaps the soul, as in *Catech. illum.* 1.4 (SC 50^{bis}:111, ed. Wenger), whose bridegroom—for whom she prisms—is Christ. The rendition in AW

1 τοίνυν λαβὼν τὸ κάτοπτρον τῆς διδασκαλίας, μόρφωσον καὶ τύπωσον τὸ
 κάλλος τῆς ψυχῆς· ἔχεις γὰρ ἄνδρα καὶ σὺ ὧ μὲλλεις ἀρέσκειν· ὥσπερ ἐκεῖναι
 οὐδὲν πρὸ τοῦ ἔργου τούτου ποιοῦνται, οὕτω καὶ σὺ μηδὲν ταύτης προτίμα
 τῆς σπουδῆς, ἀλλὰ κὰν ἅπασαν τὴν οἰκίαν ἡμελημένην ἴδοις, πρότερον
 5 ἄρεσον τῷ ἀνδρὶ, καὶ τότε τὰ ἄλλα διάθες καλῶς. “Ὅτι γὰρ ἔχεις ἄνδρα καὶ
 σὺ, ἀκουσον τοῦ Παύλου λέγοντος· Ἡρμοσάμην ὑμᾶς ἐνὶ ἀνδρὶ παρθένον
 παραστήσαι τῷ Χριστῷ. “Ὅσω δὲ μείζων τοῦ ἀνδρὸς τούτου ἡ ἀξία, τοσοῦτω
 μείζονα παρ’ ἡμῶν γενέσθαι χρὴ τὴν σπουδὴν· ὁ γὰρ εἰς κάλλος βλέπει ψυχῆς
 καὶ ταύτην βούλεται καλλωπίζεσθαι τὴν ὄψιν. Πᾶσα γὰρ ἡ δόξα τῆς θυγατρὸς
 10 τοῦ βασιλέως ἔσωθεν.

27. Ταύτην τοίνυν τὴν δόξαν καλλωπίζωμεν, ἵνα μετὰ ταύτης
 ἀπαντήσαντες τῷ βασιλεῖ τῆς δόξης τῆς αἰωνίου καὶ ἀθανάτου τύχωμεν τιμῆς·

2 ἔχεις γὰρ ἄνδρα καὶ σὺ ... ἔσωθεν P, AW in angle brackets] om. S 11 τοίνυν P] δέ
 S || μετὰ ταύτης ἀπαντήσαντες I (per Aubineau)] μετὰ ταύτης S | μετὰ ταύτης ἀπαντες
 τῷ βασιλεῖ τῆς δόξης P | μετὰ ταύτης ἀπαντες τῷ βασιλεῖ τῆς δόξης <παραστήσαντες>
 AW

121 (“la mimique de l’homme chez le coiffeur suffisait à la leçon, sans y ajouter celle de la femme devant son miroir”) has missed this key point in the development of the image. In any case, there is also a clear contrast between men’s coiffures in the public barbershop and women’s confinement at home. Beyond that, we can likely account for the minus in S by parablepsis (note that καὶ σὺ is repeated at least three times in the last four lines, differently placed by our two manuscripts). The scribe of S clearly understands καὶ σὺ in line 12 to follow διορθῶσαι, because τοινῦν λαβὼν begins on a new line; hence we have adopted that reading above and posit that καὶ σὺ was once more repeated by the preacher before τοινῦν λαβὼν (though it is lacking in P). For all these reasons, I adopt the reading of P and remove the brackets.

133. The gender of the participle λαβὼν indicates that the preacher moves from the example of the women to addressing everyone in the assembly generally.

134. I.e., Christ, as the argument will make clear. The language deliberately echoes 1 Cor 7:32–34.

135. Although John will cite 2 Cor 11:2, following the logic of his argument earlier (see above, n. 132), Eph 5:25–33 may have also been in his mind as he makes this transition into the marital imagery.

136. ἀκουσον τοῦ Παύλου λέγοντος, a phrasing Chrysostom favors and uses much more than any other ancient Christian author. See, in this volume, *Hom. 1 Cor. 7:2–4* §3 (PG 51:213); *Hom. 2 Cor 4:13 I* §10 (PG 51:299); *Hom. 2 Tim. 3:1* §§1, 2 (PG 56:271–72); and throughout his oeuvre as, e.g., in *Hom. Matt. 9.2*; 10.5 (PG 57:178, 190); *Hom. Gen. 2.2*; 4.2 (PG 54:589, 596); *Adv. Jud. 3.4* (PG 48:867); *Stat. 1.8*; 3.6 (PG 49:27, 57), among many examples.

137. Minus γὰρ after ἡρμοσάμην; minus ἀγνήν after παρθένον.

ing as a mirror, shape and mold the beauty of your soul. For you, too, have a husband whom you’re going to please.¹³⁴ Just as those women do nothing before this cosmetic work, you, too, should value nothing ahead of zealous care for your soul. But even if you see your entire house falling down from neglect, please your husband first, and then make sure the other things are in good order. After all, for the fact that you also have a husband,¹³⁵ listen to Paul saying,¹³⁶ “I have betrothed you to one husband, to present you as a virgin to Christ” (2 Cor 11:2).¹³⁷ Our measure of zeal must be all the greater to suit this husband’s extraordinary worthiness. For he looks at the beauty of our soul,¹³⁸ and he wishes it to be adorned in splendor. For “all the glory of the daughter of the king comes from the inside” (Ps 44:14).¹³⁹

27. So then, let’s put on this glory as our adornment, so that when with this glory we’ve approached the King of glory¹⁴⁰ we might attain an honor

138. The beauty of the soul (ψυχῆς κάλλος), though of course not unique to him, is a favored Chrysostomic theme—see, in this volume, *Hom. Rom. 12:20* §4 (PG 51:179); *Hom. Rom. 16:3 A* §4 (PG 51:193); also, e.g., *Hom. Gen. 47.2*; 48.2 (PG 54:431, 437); *Dav. 3.2* (PG 54:698); *Hom. Act. 27.2* (PG 60:207).

139. ἔχεις γὰρ ἄνδρα ... ἔσωθεν, adopting the reading of P (S omits; AW places in brackets). This passage clearly makes reference to the exemplum of the women’s morning routine in the previous passage adopted also from P but lacking in S. For the scriptural quote, plus γὰρ after πᾶσα (supplied by John to connect with the argument); reading τῆς θυγατρὸς τοῦ with LXX A, for αὐτῆς θυγατρὸς (κ B). This psalm verse is drawn upon rather frequently by Chrysostom as, e.g., in *Virginit. 6.2* (SC 125:110, ed. Musurillo); *Hom. princ. Act. 3.5* (PG 51:95); *Hom. Rom. 16:3 A* §4 (PG 51:193); *Hom. Heb. 28.5* (PG 63:199), with a similar appeal and language as here: οὐχ ὥστε τὸ σῶμα λευκὸν ποιῆσαι καὶ ἀποστίλβον, ἀλλ’ ὥστε τὴν ψυχὴν καλλωπίσαι· αὕτη γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ ἀγωνιζομένη ἐκεῖ καὶ ἀθλοῦσα. Πᾶσα ἡ δόξα τῆς θυγατρὸς τοῦ βασιλέως ἔσωθεν, φησί. Ταῦτα περιθουμυρίων γὰρ καὶ ἄλλων ἀπαλλάττεις σαυτὴν κακῶν, καὶ τὸν ἄνδρα μερίμνης, καὶ σαυτὴν φροντίδος. Οὕτω γὰρ αἰδέσιμος ἔση τῷ ἀνδρὶ, ὅταν μὴ πολλῶν δέη (“not in order to make your body bright and shiny, but to make your soul beautiful. This [your soul] is what contends and contests [in the theater of heaven]. ‘All the glory of the daughter of the king comes from the inside,’ he says. Clothe yourself in these things. For you are ridding yourself of countless other evils and ridding your husband of worry and yourself from anxious care. And so you will be respected by your husband when you don’t have need of many possessions”).

140. In §27 with AW I adopt the reading of P for the first part (to χάριτι), but I reject AW’s conjectural emendation to the text of P, παραστήσαντες (cf. 2 Cor 11:2, παραστήσαι τῷ Χριστῷ), which causes more problems than it resolves. For instance, the participle is active voice, and AW has translated it as though its object were ἀπαντας, “afin de nous presenter tous en cette tenue au roi de gloire,” rather than the manuscript reading, ἀπαντες. Beyond these internal considerations, we can confirm that P’s

1 χάριτι καὶ φιλανθρωπία τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, μεθ' οὗ τῷ Πατρὶ ἢ δόξα σὺν ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι, νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων. Ἀμήν.

1 καὶ φιλανθρωπία S] om. P || μεθ' οὗ τῷ Πατρὶ ἢ δόξα σὺν ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι, νῦν καὶ ἀεὶ καὶ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων S] ᾧ ἢ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας P

ungrammatical ἀπαντες (ἀπαντες τῷ βασιλεῖ τῆς δόξης τῆς αἰωνίου; “all ... to the King of eternal glory”) is a result of corruption of ἀπαντήσαντες, because it is the reading of this homily in the third witness, codex Mone Iberon 255, fol. 240 (per Aubineau, “Soixante-six textes, attribués à Jean Chrysostome,” 58). This reading is also consistent with Chrysostom’s usage elsewhere, as in *Diab.* 2.5 (PG 49:264): ἵνα ... καὶ μετὰ πολλῆς δόξης ἀπαντήσωμεν τῷ βασιλεῖ τῆς δόξης Χριστῷ (“so that ... with great glory we might approach Christ, the King of glory”). For a similar closing benedictory formula, see *Catech. ult.* 3.10, ἵνα μετὰ πολλῆς τῆς δόξης ἀπαντήσωμεν τῷ βασιλεῖ τῶν οὐρανῶν (SC 366:242, ed. Piédagnel and Doutreleau).

that is eternal and unending, by the grace and loving-kindness of our Lord Jesus Christ, with whom be glory to the Father, together with the Holy Spirit, now and always, forever and ever.¹⁴¹ Amen.¹⁴²

141. AW returns in the benediction to accepting the reading of S, which he regards as a key sign of an authentic Chrysostomic homily: “Nous oserions presque dire qu’une homélie qui comporte cette conclusion a toute chance d’être authentique” (AW 121). Earlier he had noted that P has a different doxology: χάριτι τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰ. Χ., ᾧ ἢ δόξα καὶ τὸ κράτος εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας· ἀμήν. (“by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, to whom be glory and power forever and ever. Amen.”). Even though AW regards P as reliable for two other significant readings in the final paragraphs of this homily, in this case he resorts to a claim about the fatigue of the scribe: “Cependant, tout à fait à la fin l’attention du copiste qui ne reproduit pas exactement la doxologie coutumière de l’orateur paraît s’être relâchée: cette variante ne nous semble pas compromettre l’authenticité de l’ensemble” (AW 121). At any rate, it bears attention that AW thought the scribes of both S and P had introduced changes into the text in the concluding sections.

142. S has the *subscriptio* τοῦ Χρυσοστόμου εἰς τὰ Θεοφάνια (“a sermon of Chrysostom’s on the Feast of the Epiphany”). For discussion, see introduction, pp. 53–57.