

John Chrysostom
On Almsgiving and the Therapy of the Soul

Submitted by
Junghun Bae, B.A., M.Div., Th.M.

A thesis submitted in total fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Institute for Religion and Critical Inquiry
Faculty of Theology and Philosophy

Australian Catholic University
Graduate Research Office

Date of Submission: 22 February 2018

STATEMENT OF SOURCES

Word Account: 88,102

This thesis contains no material published elsewhere or extracted in whole or in part from a thesis by which I have qualified for or been awarded another degree or diploma.

No parts of this thesis have been submitted towards the award of any other degree or diploma in any other tertiary institution.

No other person's work has been used without due acknowledgment in the main text of the thesis.

Name: Junghun Bae

Date: 22 February 2018

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title Page	
Statement of Sources.....	i
Table of Contents.....	ii
Abstract.....	iii
Abbreviations.....	iv
Introduction. John Chrysostom, Almsgiving, and the Therapy of the Soul.....	1
Chapter 1. Passion and Therapeutic Almsgiving.....	54
Chapter 2. Rhetoric of Hope and Fear: The Psychagogical Approach to Reward and Punishment.....	103
Chapter 3. Almsgiving, the Cure of the Soul, and Salvation: The Hermeneutics of Christianized Philosophical Therapy.....	154
Conclusion. Almsgiving: For Your Soul.....	211
Bibliography.....	217

ABSTRACT

In recent years, a significant scholarly focus has been on John Chrysostom's appropriation of ancient psychagogy, demonstrating that he was a skilled Christian physician of the soul who sought to promote the somatic and psychological health of his congregation by proposing preaching and various ascetic disciplines as medical treatments. In these studies, however, relatively little attention has been devoted to his use of philosophical therapy in relation to almsgiving. To address this, my project aims to take a closer look at Chrysostom's view of almsgiving and soul therapy within the context of ancient philosophical therapy. Ancient philosophers identified passions (πάθη), desires, and distorted thought as the diseases of the soul and developed various kinds of cognitive and behavioural remedies. This thesis attempts to seek interdisciplinary research between Greco-Roman philosophy and social ethics in early Christianity, particularly in the tradition of the Greek fathers, and to pursue a givers-centered analysis which has largely been ignored in the previous receivers-oriented approach.

Following an introductory chapter, the thesis is divided into three chapters. Chapter 1 looks at how almsgiving heals the diseases of the soul, demonstrating that it cures the sick soul and keeps its health. Chapter 2 analyses the psychagogical role of eschatology within Chrysostom's discourse of psychic-therapeutic almsgiving. As gentle and harsh therapy speeches reward and punishment arouse both hope and fear, which results in regaining the peace of the mind in harmonious combination with almsgiving. The last chapter explores Chrysostom's idea of Christianized psychic-therapeutic almsgiving. The integrated horizon of Christian therapy gives a broader vision of salvation from the accomplishment of happiness to participation to a divine life.

On the basis of findings from the close analysis of Chrysostom's homiletic series on Matthew and John, this thesis argues that for Chrysostom almsgiving is one of the most powerful remedies for healing the sick souls, and the concept of Christianized soul therapy is a new key framework for understanding his approach to almsgiving and his homilies on it holistically and systematically. These findings suggest that the Christianized therapy of the soul will be a vital interpretive methodology which has the potential to offer a new reading of discourse on almsgiving in late antiquity. Chrysostom still gives the same message to modern audiences as he did in the past: 'give alms and your soul will be healed.'

ABBREVIATIONS

Ancient Authors and Works

Anonymous Author(s)

Did. *Didache*

Aristotle (Arist.)

Rh. *Rhetorica*

Cicero (Cic.)

Off. *De Officiis*

Tusc. *Tusculan disputations*

Clement of Alexandria (Clem.)

Paed. *Paedagogus*

Q.D.S. *Quis dives salvetur*

Cyprian (Cypr.)

Eleem. *De opere et eleemosynis*

Dio Chrysostom (D. Chr.)

Or. *Orationes*

Epictetus (Epict.)

Diss. *Dissertationes ab Arriano digestae*

Epicurus (Epicur.)

Ep. Men . *Letter to Menoeceus*

Fr. *Fragmenta*

Gregory of Nazianzus (Gr. Naz.)

Or. 1-26, 32-45 *Orationes*

Gregory of Nyssa (Gr. Nyss.)

Paup. *De pauperibus amandis*

John Chrysostom (Chrys.)

Eleem. *De eleemosyna*

Hom. 1-12 in Col. *In epistulam ad Colossenses homiliae 1-12*

Hom. 1-24 in Eph. *In epistulam ad Ephesios homiliae 1-24*

Hom. 1-88 in Jo. *In Johannem homiliae 1-88*

Hom. 1-90 in Mt. *In Matthaeum homiliae 1-90*

Hom. 1-5 in 2 Thess. *In epistulam ii ad Thessalonicenses homiliae 1-5*

Hom. 1-6 in Tit. *In epistulam ad Titum homiliae 1-6*

Laz. 1-7 *De Lazaro homiliae 1-7*

Paen. hom. 1-9 *De paenitentia homiliae 1-9*

Sac. 1-6 *De sacerdotio 1-6*

Scand. *Ad eos qui scandalizati sunt*

Theatr *Contra ludos et theatra*

Musonius Rufus (Muson.)

Diss. *Dissertationum a Lucio digestarum reliquiae*

Philodemus (Phld.)

Lib. *De libertate dicendi*

Plato (Pl.)

Phdr. *Phaedrus*

Sph. *Sophista*

Plutarch (Plu.)

Garr. *De garrulitate*

Llib. educ. *De liberis educandis*

Quo. adu. *Quomodo aducator ab amico internoscatur*

Virt. mor. *De virtute morali*

Porphyry (Porph.)

Marc. *Ad Marcellam*

Quintilian (Quint.)

Inst. *Institutio oratoria*

Seneca (Sen.)

Ep. *Ad Lucilium epistulae morales*

Ira *De Ira*

Sextus Empiricus (Sext. Emp.)

Pyrr. *Πυρρώνειοι ὑποτυπώσεις*

Series, Journals and Other Source Materials

AthR *Anglican Theological Review*

CPG Clavis Patrum Graecorum. Edited by M. Geerard. 5 vols. Turnhout: Brepols, 1974-87.

CPG Suppl. Clavis Patrum Graecorum Supplementum. Edited by M. Geerard and J. Noret. Turnhout: Brepols, 1998.

CQ *Classical Quarterly*

CSEL Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum. Vienna: C. Geroldi, et al., 1865-.

FC Fathers of the Church. Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1947-.

GOTR *Greek Orthodox Theological Review*

HTR *Harvard Theological Review*

JECS *Journal of Early Christian Studies*

JLA *Journal of Late Antiquity*

JSNTSup Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series

LCL Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1911-.

LSJ Liddell, H. G., R. Scott, and H. S. Jones. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. 9th ed. with revised supplement. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.

NETS New English Translation of the Septuagint

NIV New International Version

NRSV New Revised Standard Version

NPNF 1 A Select Library of Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers of Christian Church. Series

	1. New York: Scribner. 1886-.
PG	Patrologia graeca. Edited by J.-P. Migne. 162 vols. Paris, 1857-86.
PGL	<i>Patristic Greek Lexicon</i> . Edited by G. H. W. Lampe. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.
RevScRel	<i>Revue des sciences religieuses</i>
RHPR	<i>Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses</i>
SC	Sources chrétiennes. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1943-.
SCH	<i>Studies in Church History</i>
SE	<i>Sacris Eridiri</i>
SP	<i>Studia Patristica</i>
TS	<i>Theological Studies</i>
VC	<i>Vigiliae Christianae</i>
ZAC	<i>Zeitschrift für Antikes Christentum/Journal of Ancient Christianity</i>
ZKTh	<i>Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie</i>

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My dissertation owes to the grace of a great number of people. First of all, I wish to express my deep gratitude to Prof. Pauline Allen for encouraging me and offering constant useful comments and assistance while this thesis was being written. I am deeply grateful to Wendy Mayer for introducing a new wave of Chrysostom studies and guiding me. Her feedbacks, suggestions, and warm encouragement were invaluable. I benefitted greatly from her vast knowledge. I wish to record my thanks to Raymond Laird and Ormond Rush for kind support and help. I thank Geoffrey D. Dunn for proof reading this manuscript. I am especially grateful to ACU, which have provided generous scholarship. Without this financial support, I would not have finished my work successfully. Dongsan church has contributions to this study in a variety of ways.

My most profound debt is to my family. As always, my family have been there, providing all sorts of tangible and intangible support. My parents and mother-in-law have provided care, physical, emotional, and spiritual. Most of all, my gratitude goes to my wife, Jinnie, who has assisted me in innumerable ways during my studies in foreign countries, USA and Australia. Whatever I might say here cannot do full justice to the extent and the value of her contribution. Our children, Peter and Esther, have motivated to pursue continually this task. This thesis is dedicated to my lovely family.

INTRODUCTION: JOHN CHRYSOSTOM, ALMSGIVING, AND THE THERAPY OF THE SOUL

1. Aim

In recent years, significant scholarly focus has been on the topic of John Chrysostom (c.349-407 C.E.)’s appropriation of ancient psychagogy, that is, the guidance of the soul.¹ David Rylaarsdam investigates Chrysostom’s use of adaptation (συγκατάβασις) which was one of the essential psychagogical techniques in the ancient philosophical-oratorical tradition. Ancient philosophers argued that the physicians of the soul should suitably adapt their therapeutic methods for each state of the soul. Rylaarsdam demonstrates that this psychagogical principle consistently occurs in Chrysostom’s theology and his homiletical methods.² Wendy Mayer argues that Chrysostom was a holistic therapist, and his homilies were a key therapeutic tool.³ She also identifies the genre of a number of Chrysostom’s works, such as *Ad eos qui scandalizati sunt* and *Quod nemo laeditur nisi a se ipso*, as Christianized philosophical-medical treatises and therapy.⁴ In her examination of Chrysostom’s correspondence with Olympias, Livia Neureiter points out that topics such as health, sickness, and healing are recurrent in these letters. She indicates that the letters were a medicine (φάρμακον) prescribed for the despondency

¹ A detailed exploration of ancient psychagogy will be presented in section 3.

² David Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy: The Coherence of His Theology and Preaching*, Oxford Early Christian Studies (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014). A fuller treatment of recent scholarship on Chrysostom’s adaption of ancient psychagogy will be provided 3. 3.

³ Wendy Mayer, “Medicine in Transition: Christian Adaptation in the Later Fourth-Century East,” in *Shifting Genres in Late Antiquity*, ed. G. Greatrex and H. Elton, with the assistance of L. McMahon (Farnham: Ashgate 2015), 11-26.

⁴ Wendy Mayer, “The Persistence in Late Antiquity of Medico-Philosophical Psychic Therapy,” *JLA* 8 (2015): 337-51. See her other articles, Wendy Mayer, “Shaping the Sick Soul: Reshaping the Identity of John Chrysostom,” in *Christian Shaping Identity from the Roman Empire to Byzantium: Studies Inspired by Pauline Allen*, ed. Geoffrey D. Dunn and Wendy Mayer, Supplements to *Vigiliae Christianae* 132 (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 140-64; and ead., “A Son of Hellenism: Viewing John Chrysostom’s Anti-Intellectualism through the Lens of Antiochene *Paideia*,” in *Intellektueller Austausch und religiöse Diversität in Antiochien 350-450*, ed. Silke-Petra Bergjan and Susanna Elm (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, forthcoming).

(ἀθυμία) of Olympias.⁵

In these recent studies, however, relatively little attention has been devoted to Chrysostom's use of philosophical therapy in relation to almsgiving, that is, charitable giving to the poor. Only Mayer makes mentions of the therapeutic function of voluntary poverty which is linked with almsgiving and that only briefly:

The health of both individual and city lies in everyone ideally consuming only what they need to survive – that is, living in voluntary poverty – and distributing their excess to those in society who do not have enough resources to be self-sufficient, the indigent poor.⁶

Given the fact that Chrysostom repeatedly returns to the topic of almsgiving in his corpus, which led to the title of 'champion of the poor,' it is essential to explore how

⁵ Livia Neureiter, "Health and Healing as Recurrent Topics of John Chrysostom's Correspondence with Olympias," *SP* 47 (2010): 267-72. For Chrysostom's treatment of Stagirus' depression, see Jessica Wright, "Between Despondency and the Demon: Diagnosing and Treating Spiritual Disorders in John Chrysostom's Letter to Stageirios," *JLA* 8 (2015): 352-67.

⁶ Mayer, "Medicine in Transition," 16. Some recent studies just mention almsgiving as medical treatment in early Christianity, but here Chrysostom is excluded: Christopher M. Hays, "By Almsgiving and Faith Sins Are Purged? The Theological Underpinnings of Early Christian Care for the Poor," in *Engaging Economics: New Testament Scenarios and Early Christian Reception*, ed. Bruce W. Longenecker and Kelly D. Liebengood (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2009), 265-66; Michael Dörnemann, "Einer ist Arzt, Christus: Medizinale Verstandnis von Erlösung in der Theologie der griechischen Kirchenvater des zweiten bis vierten Jahrhunderts," *ZAC* 17 (2013): 102-24, this article advance his earlier monography on this topic; id., *Krankheit und Heilung in der Theologie der frühen Kirchenväter*, Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 20 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003); and Gregor Emmenegger, *Wie die Jungfrau zum Kind kam: zum Einfluss antiker medizinischer und naturphilosophischer Theorien auf die Entwicklung des christlichen Dogmas*, Paradosis 56 (Fribourg: Academic Press Fribourg, 2014), 43. This phenomenon is similarly found in several analyses of the influence of ancient philosophical therapy on the ideas of patristic writers. Even when they focus on the eastern Christian tradition, they hardly deals with Chrysostom, mainly investigating Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and the Cappadocians: Pierre Hadot, *Philosophy as a Way of Life: Spiritual Exercises from Socrates to Foucault*, ed. Arnold I. Davidson, trans. Michael Chases (New York: Blackwell 1995); Richard Sorabji, *Emotion and Peace of Mind: From Stoic Agitation to Christian Temptation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000); Simo Knuutila, *Emotions in Ancient and Medieval Philosophy* (Oxford: Clarendon, 2004); and John T. Fitzgerald, ed., *Passions and Moral Progress in Greco-Roman Thought* (London: Routledge, 2007).

almsgiving, in his thought, is related to the cure of the soul.

The purpose of this thesis is to take a closer look at Chrysostom's view of almsgiving and soul therapy within the context of ancient philosophical therapy.⁷ As the recent studies mentioned above indicate, Chrysostom saw himself as a philosophical-medical therapist and his pastoral care was primarily concerned with the care of the soul. This dissertation investigates how ancient philosophical therapy fits within Chrysostom's approach to almsgiving. In this sense, it attempts to offer interdisciplinary research between Greco-Roman philosophy and social ethics in early Christianity, in particular in the tradition of the Greek fathers. In this thesis, Chrysostom's strategy associated with the cure of the soul is defined as '(psychic)-therapeutic almsgiving' which is distinguished from redemptive almsgiving in the Jewish-Christian tradition in a narrow sense.⁸ The goal of therapeutic almsgiving is to heal or remove passions or desires as a disease of the soul, as we will show, in terms of philosophical therapy and it leads to the recovery of the peace of mind, which is broken by passions.⁹ Situating Chrysostom's approach to poverty,

⁷ There are various kinds of terminologies in relation to philosophical therapy in Greco-Roman thought. Martha C. Nussbaum, *The Therapy of Desire: Theory and Practice in Hellenistic Ethics*, Martin Classical Lectures, n.s., 2 (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994), uses a variety of terms such as "the therapy of desire or emotions," "therapeutic arguments" and "Hellenistic philosophy or moral philosophy." Christopher Gill, "Philosophical Therapy as Preventive Psychological Medicine," in *Mental Disorders in the Classical World*, ed. William V. Harris, Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition 38 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 339-60, refers to the therapy of emotions as "philosophical therapy." Mayer, "The Persistence in Late Antiquity," 337-51; ead., "Shaping the Sick Soul," 140-64; and ead., "A Son of Hellenism," forthcoming, uses the term, "medico-philosophical therapy or medico-ethical philosophy." 'The therapy of the soul' and 'philosophical therapy' are used mainly in this thesis to refer to Chrysostom's psychic-therapeutic ideas, but other terms mentioned above are also used interchangeably.

⁸ Dealing with Chrysostom's curative method of almsgiving, this thesis employs the terms of 'a narrow sense' and 'a broad sense.' The narrow approach is mainly related to the cure of passions (chapters 1 and 2), and the other term refers to Chrysostom's integrated version of therapeutic almsgiving, which counteracts passions and divine judgement (chapter 3).

⁹ Some scholars confuse a philosophical therapeutic almsgiving with a redemptive one. For instance, Eric Costanzo, *Harbor for the Poor: A Missiological Analysis of Almsgiving in the View and Practice of John Chrysostom* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publication, 2013), 105, considers Chrysostom's strategy of almsgiving, which functions as a salve of spiritual wounds such as pride, jealousy, and anger as subsumed within the Jewish-Christian tradition of redemptive almsgiving.

wealth, and almsgiving in the context of philosophical therapy, this thesis focuses on how his psychic-therapeutic ideas influenced the formation and development of his view of almsgiving. These questions are addressed: What is the disease of the soul? How does almsgiving cure the sick soul? What kinds of psychological diseases does it heal? How much does charity as a remedy cost? What are directions for the use of the treatment? What is a relationship between psychic therapeutic almsgiving in the tradition of ancient philosophical therapy and redemptive almsgiving in the Jewish-Christian tradition?

2. Literature Review on Chrysostom and Almsgiving

Since this dissertation deals with Chrysostom's approach to therapeutic almsgiving, we need to analyse previous Chrysostom studies on almsgiving, which is one of the most frequently recurring themes in his corpus. He often rebuked sharply the unlimited greed of the wealthy and urged them to give generously alms to the poor. This repeated plea for the poor has drawn naturally much attention from scholars in the area of late-antique poverty studies. Previous scholars have analysed Chrysostom's thought on almsgiving through roughly four different approaches: theological, ascetical, socio-scientific, and philosophical.¹⁰ The categories used here are not definitely discrete and do overlap to some degree, particularly in relation to the theological and ascetical approaches. Some studies do not fit exactly into these categories and belong to more than one category. However, this categorization is useful for understanding the overall trend of previous research and for assessing its pros and cons. Initially, individual studies are summarized critically according to the classification. Then, the results of the analysis are synthesized comparing categories with each other, and we deal with how this dissertation bridges the

¹⁰ The framework of my analysis is indebted to the thesis by Matthew Ingalls, "Golden Mouth, Empty Pockets: An Investigation of the Motivations and Aims behind John Chrysostom's Theology of Wealth and Poverty" (MA thesis, George Fox University, 2013). Though Ingalls analyzes a variety of previous studies on Chrysostom's thought on poverty and wealth, he does not deal with a philosophical approach to him. Thus, the philosophical approach is added to Ingall's categorization. Further, a socio-scientific approach is modified into a socio-cultural approach. The characteristics of the categories are refined in the course of the following review.

research gaps of previous scholarship.¹¹

2. 1. Theological Approach

Those who take a theological approach focus on Chrysostom's theology, analysing how this shapes his view of poverty, wealth, and almsgiving. Emmanuel Clapsis shows the typical characteristics of the theological approach, which supports the traditional position that Chrysostom was a defender of the poor. Quoting a variety of his homilies, Clapsis argues that Chrysostom made the poor visible by describing their misery in detail and defended them against people's false prejudice.¹² Clapsis also insists that Chrysostom gave dignity to the poor by identifying them with Christ.¹³ He maintains that these ideas of Chrysostom are based on his theological anthropology: he asserts that baptized Christians are equal regardless of status, age, sex, and nationality.¹⁴ According to Clapsis, his ascetical ideas had a huge impact on this egalitarian thought.¹⁵ He insists that almsgiving is the supreme virtue in Chrysostom because it is related to others' benefit. The common good determines the hierarchy of virtues in Chrysostom.¹⁶ Clapsis argues that Chrysostom encouraged his congregation to give alms unconditionally to all the poor regardless of their religion.¹⁷

¹¹ In this literature review, a significant number of unpublished dissertations are included because if we access only published studies, this biases the reading of almsgiving in Chrysostom's thought.

¹² Emmanuel Clapsis, "The Dignity of the Poor and Almsgiving in St. John Chrysostom," *GOTR* 56 (2011): 64-65. In his dissertation, Michael J. DeVinne, "The Advocacy of Empty Bellies: Episcopal Representation of the Poor in the Late Roman Empire" (PhD diss., Stanford University, 1995), 5-8, first points out that late-antique bishops made the poor visible by describing their misery in detail.

¹³ Clapsis, "The Dignity of the Poor," 66 and 71-73.

¹⁴ Clapsis, "The Dignity of the Poor," 57-59. This anthropology is not the only primary source of Chrysostom's view of poverty and almsgiving despite its importance. Clapsis identifies Chrysostom's anthropology as the only source of his view of almsgiving, but his analysis of Chrysostom's ascetic ideas implies that the common good in his thought also underlies his view of almsgiving. Cf. Clapsis, "The Dignity of the Poor," 60-61, 79-80.

¹⁵ Clapsis, "The Dignity of the Poor," 60-61.

¹⁶ Clapsis, "The Dignity of the Poor," 79-80.

¹⁷ Clapsis, "The Dignity of the Poor," 79. Similar points are noted by Georges Florovsky, "St. John Chrysostom: the Prophet of Charity," *St Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly* 3 (1955): 37-42; and Peter Klasvogt,

Clapsis clearly shows the humanitarian aspects of Chrysostom in comparison with other theological studies, but does not take account of any influence of Greco-Roman thought on his view on almsgiving. He maintains that Chrysostom's opinion about the neutrality of both poverty and wealth came from his theology,¹⁸ but these ideas are related closely to 'the Stoic idea of indifferents,' an idea that the value of a thing is attributed to its use.¹⁹ He also tends to fail to discern Chrysostom's interest in the givers' benefit in almsgiving that was influenced by pagan euergetism.²⁰

In his analysis of Chrysostom's care of the poor, Rudolf Brändle also demonstrates that Chrysostom elevated the dignity of the poor by identifying them with Christ on the basis of his interpretation of Matthew 25:31-46. According to Brändle, Chrysostom argues that Christ in the poor continues to work for our salvation just as he did on the cross.²¹ Brändle maintains that Chrysostom made a place for the poor in the Roman world by

Leben zur Verherrlichung Gottes: Botschaft des Johannes Chrysostomos: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Pastoral, Hereditas 7 (Bonn: Borengässer, 1992), 55-216.

¹⁸ Clapsis, "The Dignity of the Poor," 61-62 and 73.

¹⁹ Recent studies indicate that the nature of poverty and wealth in Chrysostom's thought is similar to the Stoic idea of 'indifferents'; Francine Cardman, "Poverty and Wealth as Theater: John Chrysostom's Homilies on Lazarus and the Rich Man," in *Wealth and Poverty in Early Church and Society*, ed. Susan R. Holman, Holy Cross Studies in Patristic Theology and History (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2008), 166-67; and Wendy Mayer, "The Audience(s) for Patristic Social Teaching. A Case Study," in *Reading Patristic Texts on Social Ethics: Issues and Challenges for Twenty-First-Century Christian Social Thought*, ed. Johan Leemans, Brian J. Matz and Johan Verstraeten, CUA Studies in Early Christianity (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 2011), 87-88.

²⁰ Peter Van Nuffelen, "Social Ethics and Moral Discourse in Late Antiquity," in *Reading Patristic Texts on Social Ethics*, 48.

²¹ Rudolf Brändle, "This Sweetest Passage: Matthew 25:31-46 and Assistance to the Poor in the Homilies of John Chrysostom," in *Wealth and Poverty in Early Church*, 133-37. He advances his earlier study on this same topic, see id., *Matthäus 25:31-46 im Werk des Johannes Chrysostomos: Ein Beitrag zur Auslegungsgeschichte und zur Erforschung der Ethik der griechischen Kirche um die Wende vom 4. Zum 5. Jahrhundert*, Beiträge zur Geschichte der biblischen Exegese 22 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1979). Catherine Broc-Schmezer, "De l'aumône faite au pauvre à l'aumône du pauvre: Pauvreté et spiritualité chez Jean Chrysostome," in *Les pères de l'Église et la voix des pauvres: Actes du IIe Colloque de la Rochelle, 2-4 septembre 2005*, ed. Pascal Delage (La Rochelle: Histoire et Culture, 2006), 131-48, aligns herself with Brändle, a poor person becomes sacramentalised through his/her identification with Christ.

asserting the salvific power of the poor, indicating that the identification of the poor with Christ underlies Chrysostom's concept of the dignity of the poor and his emphasis on almsgiving. Like Clapsis, Brändle clearly demonstrates Chrysostom's concern for the poor, but tend to ignore the fact that in many discourses on almsgiving, Chrysostom's main interest tends to be weighted toward the therapy of the givers' souls, rather than the welfare of the receivers. Although Brändle's approach is limited in his restricted focus on theology, it is noteworthy that he shifts firmly towards understanding Chrysostom's approach to almsgiving within the sanctification of believers.²²

Some works focus on how Chrysostom approached the issue of wealth. Kleanthis X. Kourtoubelides investigates Chrysostom's view on the use of wealth. He argues that for Chrysostom, wealth is not evil in itself, and the use of wealth determines its moral value. He insists that the proper use of wealth is almsgiving, and its misuse is indulgence in selfish luxury and usury for Chrysostom.²³ According to Kourtoubelides, this idea is related closely to his view of absolute ownership by God and human ownership as stewardship. Chrysostom maintains that God is the ultimate owner of all things that people have, and our possessions are God's gifts for serving the poor.²⁴ In his thesis, Kourtoubelides shows that Chrysostom's theology was a motivating factor in his emphasis on almsgiving. Almsgiving as the proper use of wealth is to realize God's original plan. However, he shows no awareness of the influence of Greco-Roman thought on Chrysostom's view of the nature of wealth and affirms without detailed examination that his ideas are 'biblical' in that they originated from his biblical exegesis.²⁵

²² Brändle, "This Sweetest Passage," 137-38. He is likely to deny the concept of redemptive almsgiving in Chrysostom's thought, explaining it within the framework of faith and work. This will be treated in detail in 1. 2 in chapter 3.

²³ Kleanthis X. Kourtoubelides, "The Use and Misuse of Wealth according to St. John Chrysostom" (MA thesis, Durham University, 1995), 57-73 and 95-109.

²⁴ Kourtoubelides, "The Use and Misuse of Wealth," 40-53. He also argues on 113-19 that Chrysostom's approach to wealth is situated within his larger picture of eternal punishment and reward at the Last Judgment. Russell E. Willoughby, "The Use and Misuse of Wealth in Selected Homilies of John Chrysostom," in *Church Divinity, 1987: National Student Essay Competition in Divinity*, Church Divinity Monograph Series 7, ed. John H. Morgan (Bristol, Ind: Wyndham Hall, 1987), 1-19, takes the same approach as Kourtoubelides.

²⁵ Kourtoubelides, "The Use and Misuse of Wealth," 34. See. n. 18.

While Kourtoubelides argues for the value neutrality of wealth in Chrysostom's thought, some scholars do not agree with this point. Barry Gordon deals with the problem of scarcity and its solution in Chrysostom's thought, noting that for him private ownership itself is one of the main reasons for scarcity as social injustice. Since a few people monopolized wealth, many people lived in absolute poverty. In the beginning, all resources were plentiful, but greed destroyed this peaceful state.²⁶ Gordon argues that almsgiving was Chrysostom's solution to scarcity, and he urged the rich indiscriminately to give their money to the poor. Chrysostom supported the total abandonment of possession except for basic needs, but the standard of 'basic needs' was ambiguous.²⁷ Interestingly, Gordon maintains that Chrysostom preferred communal ownership to charity in his treatment of poverty: Chrysostom considered the Christian community in Jerusalem and monastic communities in his time as the ideal model.²⁸

Margaret M. Mitchell examines Chrysostom's approach to possessions and the performative effectiveness of his rhetoric about wealth. Her analysis of Chrysostom's view of wealth is similar to that of Gordon: private ownership is the origin of all evils, and possessions are not good, and what is really good is a spiritual thing. Chrysostom's idea of goods is based on the doctrine of creation. God is the ultimate owner of all resources and equally distributed them to human beings.²⁹ Mitchell also notes that death and divine punishment play an important role in Chrysostom's understanding of goods.³⁰ In Chrysostom's solution to the problem of wealth, however, she shows a conflicting opinion to Gordon. Unlike Gordon, she argues that Chrysostom attempted to transform the inner

²⁶ Barry Gordon, "The Problem of Scarcity and the Christian Fathers: John Chrysostom and Some Contemporaries," *SP* 22 (1989): 112-14.

²⁷ Gordon, "The Problem of Scarcity," 115-16.

²⁸ Gordon, "The Problem of Scarcity," 117-18.

²⁹ Margaret M. Mitchell, "Silver Chamber Pots and Other Goods Which Are Not Good: John Chrysostom's Discourse against Wealth and Possessions," in *Having: Property and Possession in Religious and Social Life*, ed. William Schweiker and Charles Mathews (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2004), 91-98. In addition to Gordon and Mitchell, Chrysostom's stark criticism of wealth is also stressed by Dolores Greeley, "St. John Chrysostom: Prophet of Social Justice," *SP* 17 (1982): 1163-68; and George S. Bebis, "Saint John Chrysostom: On Materialism and Christian Virtue," *GOTR* 32 (1987): 227-37.

³⁰ Mitchell, "Silver Chamber Pots and Other Goods," 109-10.

disposition in addressing the problem of wealth, rather than fundamentally to change the social system: his main strategy was almsgiving.³¹ Mitchell maintains that while it is difficult to estimate how Chrysostom's homilies on wealth and poverty impacted on the daily life of his congregation, one thing is clear: the discourse made a difference.³²

Several scholarly works analyse Chrysostom's theological ideas of poverty, wealth, and charity within a specific hermeneutical lens. They provide useful various viewpoints that help us to understand Chrysostom's theology of wealth. Claire. E. Salem gives a way in which we explore Chrysostom's approach to almsgiving through the perspective of his anthropology. She demonstrates that the care of others, in particular the poor, is a vital element Chrysostom's anthropology, which covers a wide range from sanity to insanity and from super-humanity to demonic. The upper-limit case is the person who loves God and his/her neighbour and pursues heavenly things. The lower-limit case is the person who ignores God and his/her neighbour and is enamored of earthly things, especially wealth.³³ Chrysostom maintains that covetous persons neglecting the poor are inhuman, sub-bestial, and even demonic.

Dealing with Chrysostom's homilies on the gospels and the Pauline letters, Eric Costanzo explores Chrysostom's idea and practice of almsgiving from a missiological standpoint. According to him, for Chrysostom, almsgiving was the most essential form of the mission to the poor in Antioch in the fourth century. This is because it brought the good news of the gospel to the poor materially and spiritually, resulting in the Christianization of the city.³⁴ Through his missiological analysis, Costanzo offers a fresh contribution to poverty studies on Chrysostom. However, he too does not go beyond the limits of the theological approach. He argues that pagan philanthropy impacted on Christian charity, and Chrysostom used the language of Greco-Roman virtue ethics to encourage his congregation to participate in the ministry to the poor. He also points out that Chrysostom also compared almsgiving with a salve for a wound. Almsgiving as a salve heals selfish

³¹ Mitchell, "Silver Chamber Pots and Other Goods," 108 and 111-19.

³² Mitchell, "Silver Chamber Pots and Other Goods," 121.

³³ Claire E. Salem, "Sanity, Insanity, and Man's Being as Understood by St. John Chrysostom" (PhD diss., University of Durham, 2010), 8-20, esp. chapters 3-4.

³⁴ Costanzo, *Harbor for the Poor*.

avarice. This therapeutic language has originated in Greco-Roman philosophy.³⁵ Ironically, however, like Kourtoubelides he concludes that Chrysostom's concept of almsgiving is the most biblical among the church fathers.³⁶ His preoccupation with the theological nature of Chrysostom's view on almsgiving leads him to underestimate the obvious traces of Greek philosophy in Chrysostom's thought.³⁷

Costanzo's investigation of the forms of poverty and almsgiving in Chrysostom is noteworthy in that many previous scholars have not paid much attention to these issues. He divides the types of poverty in Chrysostom's work into conjunctural and structural poverty on the basis of contemporary sociological categories, but does not examine his own terms for the poor.³⁸ Regarding the forms of almsgiving, he insists that Chrysostom's focus was on the indirect almsgiving by the church, rather than direct alms to the poor.³⁹ However, his analysis intends to overlook Chrysostom's frequent emphasis on direct almsgiving to the poor in his homilies.

Among theological studies, some scholars attempt to discover the implications of Chrysostom's view on poverty and almsgiving for contemporary society. Jung Suk Yang's dissertation deals with the application of Chrysostom's theology of wealth and poverty to South Korea.⁴⁰ His study is motivated by the issue of the continual decrease of Christians in Korea. He argues that the main reason for this is the poor morality of pastors in relation

³⁵ Costanzo, *Harbor for the Poor*, 105 and 126-28.

³⁶ Costanzo, *Harbor for the Poor*, 64. See. n. 23.

³⁷ Another limit is that he, *Harbor for the Poor*, 37-48, does not give the critical analysis of Peter Brown's thesis of the primary role of the Christian bishop in the promotion of almsgiving and of the stark opposition between pagan euergetism and Christian almsgiving. See Peter Brown, *Poverty and Leadership in the Later Roman Empire*, The Menahem Stern Jerusalem lectures (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 2002). This book will be analyzed in the part of a socio-scientific approach.

³⁸ Costanzo, *Harbor for the Poor*, 29-37.

³⁹ Costanzo, *Harbor for the Poor*, 110-36.

⁴⁰ Jung Suk Yang, "Five Key Recommendations for a Korean Protestant Pastor concerning Understanding and Applying Biblical Ethics in Finances: John Chrysostom as a Model for Ministry" (DMin diss., Liberty Baptist Theological Seminary, 2011). As well as missiological investigation, Costanzo, *Harbor for the Poor*, 1-8, also pays attention to how contemporary churches in evangelical Christianity in the USA may recover biblical almsgiving and thus may fulfil effectively their responsibility for ministry to the poor on the basis of his analysis of Chrysostom's views and practice of almsgiving.

to money, and they should learn the biblical view of the economy from Chrysostom and practise it in order to solve this problem.⁴¹ On the basis of his analysis, Yang gives useful recommendations for pastors in Korea. He argues that in particular, simplicity and almsgiving are vital biblical virtues for Christians in Korea in indicating their Christian identity in society.⁴² Given a lack of interest in patristic studies in Korea, this dissertation is valuable in bridging the research gap in patristics by offering the analysis of Chrysostom's theology of wealth and poverty and in trying to apply it to the Korean context. However, Yang's analysis does not provide a deep examination of Chrysostom's theology of wealth in most parts of his thesis. Moreover, he presupposes that Chrysostom's view on wealth and poverty is biblical, like Kourtoubelides and Costanzo. He embarks on his study on the basis of this premise without questioning it.⁴³ He argues for the unique nature of Chrysostom's thought in contrast with its pagan surroundings.

While these studies examined above focus mainly on Chrysostom's interest in the poor, Maria Verhoeff leads us to see another side of Chrysostom who supported the benefits to the wealthy in almsgiving.⁴⁴ She explores the notion of God as a debtor in Chrysostom's view of almsgiving. On the basis of Proverbs 19:17, Chrysostom argues that almsgiving makes God a debtor, and God will repay the donor.⁴⁵ Criticizing the previous claim that regarded the concept of God as debtor as redemptive almsgiving, she insists that this concept is related to friendship with God in Chrysostom's thought: benefactors make friendship with God by giving their money to the poor, which makes them become like God (deification). Further, she insists that the concept of friendship with God is 'the

⁴¹ Yang, "Five Key Recommendations," 1-3.

⁴² Yang, "Five Key Recommendations," 98-125.

⁴³ Yang, "Five Key Recommendations," 4.

⁴⁴ This position was presented earlier by Otto Plassmann, *Das Almosen bei Johannes Chrysostomus* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1961), 14-47 and 74-79, who claims that Chrysostom had a greater interest in the spiritual benefits of the donors, the rich, and almsgiving is a means of eliminating individual covetousness and promoting a virtuous life. On 11-12, he points out that Chrysostom employed *πένης*, *πτωχός*, *ἐπαίτης*, and *δεόμενος* to refer to a poor person, but does not explain how these words fall into any category of poverty.

⁴⁵ Maria Verhoeff, "A Genuine Friend Wishes to be a Debtor: John Chrysostom's Discourse on Almsgiving Reinterpreted," *SE* 52 (2013): 49. Proverbs 19:17 says that "he who shows mercy to the poor man lends to the Lord."

framework of Chrysostom's idea of almsgiving.⁴⁶ According to Verhoeff, Chrysostom's view of God as a debtor is linked closely to the Jewish-Christian tradition, rather than Greco-Roman thought. She presents a similar connection between God as a debtor and friendship in Clement of Alexandria's *Quis dives salvetur?* She argues that while there are two references about the friend wanting to be a debtor in Seneca's *De beneficiis*, it is hard to prove whether Chrysostom had read Seneca.⁴⁷ Her analysis demonstrates that Chrysostom's focus was on almsgivers, especially their self-interest and that we need to recontextualise Chrysostom's idea of redemptive almsgiving through his doctrine of deification, which implicitly suggested by Brändle.⁴⁸

2. 2. Ascetical Approach

This group of scholars approaches Chrysostom's view of almsgiving by focusing on the influence of his ascetic ideas on it. In her study on poverty and almsgiving in Chrysostom's times, Mayer argues that it is necessary to add an 'ascetic model' to the civil model of Evelyne Patlagean and Brown.⁴⁹ She puts forth two types of evidence. One thing is that Chrysostom tried to redirect public almsgiving from the voluntary poor toward the economic poor. She claims that people in his times tended to put higher value on voluntary poverty than economic poverty. She notes that the superiority of voluntary poverty was influenced partly by Stoic philosophy. According to Stoics, the moral value of voluntary poverty is higher than that of involuntary poverty due to its link with a philosophical life. People regarded the involuntary poverty as a social evil and refused to give their alms to

⁴⁶ Verhoeff, "A Genuine Friend Wishes to be a Debtor," 48-50 and 60-65; and ead., "More Desirable than Light Itself: Friendship Discourse in John Chrysostom's Soteriology" (PhD diss., Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, 2016), 162-93. Her argument that friendship with God is the framework of Chrysostom's concept of almsgiving seems to be controversial. Her thesis is based on Michael Sherwin, "Friends at the Table of the Lord: Friendship with God and the Transformation of Patronage in the Thought of John Chrysostom," *New Blackfriars* 85 (2004): 387-98.

⁴⁷ Verhoeff, "A Genuine Friend Wishes to be a Debtor," 55-60. For the detailed explanation of friendship and soteriology in Chrysostom's thought, see ead., "Friendship Discourse."

⁴⁸ See n. 22 above.

⁴⁹ Mayer, "Poverty and Generosity toward the Poor in the Time of John Chrysostom," in *Wealth and Poverty in Early Church*, 141-42. See Evelyne Patlagean, *Pauvreté économique et Pauvreté sociale à Byzance, 4e-7e siècles*, Civilisations et Sociétés (Paris: Mouton, 1977); and Brown, *Poverty and Leadership*.

them.⁵⁰ Mayer explains the fundamental reason for this tendency by using the concept of limited good. According to this theory, reciprocity is a vital concept because people believe that goods are limited in society. Thus, those who are not able to repay donors are considered as threatening seriously the structure of society. On the basis of this theory, Mayer maintains that people in Chrysostom's times preferred to give their alms to the voluntary poor. This is because that they thought that monks give spiritual benefit to them for their alms. According to Mayer, this concept also explains why the rich gave their alms to the poor who entertained them, and Chrysostom referred frequently to the benefit of givers in his sermons on almsgiving.⁵¹ The other evidence of an ascetic model is that ascetics played a significant role in redistributing wealth. In Syrian civil community in the late fourth to early fifth century, there were ascetics who redistributed goods gained from people to the poor. Mayer claims that ascetics such as Isaac at Constantinople played this role as the channel for redistributing wealth.⁵² However, it is uncertain how this model is relevant to Antioch because she does not deal with ascetics in Antioch. She demonstrates that ascetics played a vital role in the promotion of Christian almsgiving, undermining Brown's thesis of the prominent role of bishops in this process.

Addressing Chrysostom's social vision, Adolf M. Ritter argues that Chrysostom had a utopian idea and was a proto-communist on the basis of the fact that he pursued a community of goods. His thesis is similar to Gordon's claim that Chrysostom supported the absolute abandonment of private ownership.⁵³ According to Ritter, Chrysostom heavily criticized private possession from the beginning of his ministry in Antioch and demanded that the rich renounce all their property and distribute it to the poor.⁵⁴ Ritter maintains that Chrysostom tried to realize his utopian idea of the community of goods at least three times

⁵⁰ Mayer, "Poverty and Generosity," 147-54.

⁵¹ Mayer, "Poverty and Generosity," 153-54.

⁵² Mayer, "Poverty and Generosity," 157-58.

⁵³ For Gordon's position, see n. 28 above.

⁵⁴ Adolf M. Ritter, "Between 'Theocracy' and 'Simple Life': Dio Chrysostom, John Chrysostom and the Problem of Humanizing Society," *SP* 22 (1989): 173. In this review, his English version and his updated German article are explored together; id., *Studia Chrysostomica: Aufsätze zu Weg, Werk und Wirkung des Johannes Chrysostomos (Ca. 349-407)*, Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 71 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 34-67.

in Antioch and Constantinople.⁵⁵ For Chrysostom poverty was regarded as a social injustice that should be overcome. In this sense, he was a forerunner of social justice.⁵⁶

Ritter points out that Chrysostom's view of asceticism is the fundamental factor in shaping his utopian idea.⁵⁷ He states that "... as I firmly am convinced, only on this basis (his ascetical views), by positioning Chrysostom in exactly this framework, do his teachings on the issues, discussed in what follows, make sense. These topics are: Chrysostom's critical judgement as to private possession. . ."⁵⁸ This is because the key to his ascetic theology lies in the pursuit of the welfare of the community.⁵⁹ As Ritter argues, Chrysostom's ascetical thought is vital for understanding his idea of poverty and wealth. However, his overemphasis on Chrysostom's view of monasticism is problematic. Other various elements such as his theology and Greco-Roman thought are important in understanding his idea of poverty and wealth.

On the basis of Chrysostom's ascetical theology, Ritter compares John Chrysostom with Dio Chrysostom (c.40-c.115 C.E.) who was a Greek philosopher and orator. He concludes that although there are many similarities between them in relation to their idea of poverty and wealth, John differs fundamentally from Dio.⁶⁰ In particular, Ritter sharply criticizes Mayer who argues that Chrysostom's approach to poverty is almost similar to the Stoic position, maintaining that Chrysostom is distinct from Greco-Roman philosophy⁶¹

⁵⁵ Ritter, "Between 'Theocracy' and 'Simple Life,'" 176.

⁵⁶ Ritter, "Between 'Theocracy' and 'Simple Life,'" 171 and 173. Ritter, *Studia Chrysostomica*, 64. n. 136.

⁵⁷ Ritter, "Between 'Theocracy' and 'Simple Life,'" 174-77, also suggests several minor factors that led Chrysostom to developed radical attitude to possessions. One thing is Chrysostom's idea of Christian perfection accomplished by total abandonment of one's private property. Another thing is his view of the absolute ownership by God. The third factor is the influence of Platonic utopian ideas of the equality of rights on him. Lastly, he realized the limit of individual almsgiving in solving poverty during his episcopal period in Constantinople.

⁵⁸ Ritter, *Studia Chrysostomica*, 66. Clapsis, "The Dignity of the Poor," 57-61, makes the same point of the importance of asceticism in Chrysostom's view of almsgiving.

⁵⁹ Ritter, "Between 'Theocracy' and 'Simple Life,'" 171-72.

⁶⁰ Ritter, "Between 'Theocracy' and 'Simple Life,'" 179-80; Ritter, *Studia Chrysostomica*, 56-59.

⁶¹ Ritter, *Studia Chrysostomica*, 64-65. See Wendy Mayer, "John Chrysostom on Poverty," in *Preaching Poverty in Late Antiquity: Perceptions and Realities*, ed. Pauline Allen, Bronwen Neil, and Wendy Mayer, *Arbeiten zur Kirchen-und Theologiegeschichte* 28 (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2009), 69-111. The

which aims at individual happiness in contrast with Chrysostom's interest in the common good.⁶² However, this dichotomy seems to be unconvincing, and more detailed study is needed in relation to Chrysostom's view of Christian life.

Ritter's work demonstrates how the concept of the common good played an essential role in shaping Chrysostom's view of asceticism, poverty, and almsgiving. However, his revolutionary position in relation to Chrysostom is controversial. Elizabeth A. Clark argues that Chrysostom radical approach to wealth had been gradually moderated in the course of his ministry in Antioch and Constantinople. Though the common ownership in monastic community was considered as the ideal social vision, this was limited to monasticism, and Chrysostom did not seek to realize this utopia in the city. Instead, his idea of the common good serves more as a theological principle for his emphasis on almsgiving. Chrysostom's primary solution to poverty was individual charity.⁶³

Aideen M. Hartney also is in opposition to the approach that sees Chrysostom's social vision as revolutionary. She argues that his aim was to transform the city by establishing each Christian family as a monastery, a social strategy based on the Aristotelian model that a city consists of each household (*oikos*).⁶⁴ The key to this vision lies in the Christianized hierarchy of sexes and generosity to the poor. The primary role of the man is to take responsibility for the faith of his wife and children, and the woman obeys her husband and cares for domestic affairs. All family members pursue a simple life, serving the poor. These Christian households are the strong tools for inverting secular

critical review of this work will be given in a section of socio-scientific approach.

⁶² Ritter, "Between 'Theocracy' and 'Simple Life,'" 179.

⁶³ Ritter, *Studia Chrysostomica*, 83-87. Mitchell, "Silver Chamber Pots and Other Goods," 108 and 111-19, offers the same argument.

⁶⁴ Aideen M. Hartney, "Men, Woman, and Money: John Chrysostom and the Transformation of the City," *SP* 37 (2001): 528-29. Her contention about the centrality of a household is also advocated by Chris L. de Wet, *Preaching Bondage: John Chrysostom and the Discourse of Slavery in Early Christianity* (Oakland, CA: University of California Press, 2015), 82-126. In some homilies, Chrysostom also identifies the church as the alternate community. For investigation regarding the church as an alternative community, see Arnold Stötzel, *Kirche als 'neue Gesellschaft': die humanisierende Wirkung des Christentums nach Johannes Chrysostomos*, *Münsterische Beiträge zur Theologie* 51 (Münster: Aschendorff, 1984).

values and culture. Chrysostom's strategies of social transformation demonstrate that his social vision is not to destroy a traditional structure, but to cover it with Christian values.⁶⁵ Hartney indicates that the redistribution of wealth by almsgiving is an essential factor in Chrysostom's social vision, and individual Christians heal society by practising voluntary poverty.⁶⁶

2. 3. Socio-Cultural Approach

The socio-cultural approach explores Chrysostom's discourses on almsgiving within his social, economic, and cultural settings. In some cases, this group examines social and cultural concepts and phenomenon in Chrysostom's attitude to poverty and wealth by using modern sociological theories. Brown investigates Christian almsgiving in late antiquity, arguing that social perceptions of the poor and care for them were shifted fundamentally by the development of Christianity from the fourth century onwards.⁶⁷ He maintains that it was Christian bishops who brought about this change in the social imagination by making the poor visible and the necessity of caring for them prominent through their sermons. They redirected pagan benefaction to civil members toward almsgiving to the poor by using their growing authority. As a result, they became the patrons of the poor, and Christian almsgiving became a civic virtue.⁶⁸ Brown maintains

⁶⁵ Hartney, "Men, Woman, and Money," 528-34. The main target of her criticism on 529 is Peter Brown, *The Body and Society: Men, Women and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity*, 2nd edn, Columbia Classics in Religion (New York: Columbia University Press, 2008), 311-12.

⁶⁶ For the fuller treatment of Chrysostom's social vision, see Aideen M. Hartney, *John Chrysostom and the Transformation of the city* (London: Duckworth, 2004), 67-182; Andrea Sterk, *Renouncing the World yet Leading the Church: the Monk-Bishop in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004), 141-62; and Jutta Tloka, *Griechische Christen. Christliche Griechen. Plausibilisierungsstrategien des antiken Christentums bei Origenes und Johannes Chrysostomos*, Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 30 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 176-204.

⁶⁷ Brown, *Poverty and Leadership*, 1-11. Brown takes Patlagean, *Pauvreté économique*, a step further. It was Patlagean who had argued for the fundamental shift in the fourth to sixth centuries and that Christianity was responsible for it.

⁶⁸ Brown, *Poverty and Leadership*, 26-44, 54-72, and 80. A major feature of this group is that it explores late-antique homilies on poverty through the system of patronage which was a socio-cultural infrastructure in Rome. Chrysostom's acceptance of the system was briefly addressed by A. Natali, "Eglise et évergétisme à

that this shift depended partly on the identification of the poor with Christ, which destroyed the gap between the rich and the poor.⁶⁹ Brown's work changed the paradigm of late-antique poverty studies, but there are several problems in it. His comprehensive approach glosses over any differences in poverty relief in late antiquity. Overemphasis on the opposition between pagan and Christian almsgiving and on the role of bishops is also problematic.⁷⁰

Antioche à fin du siècle d'après Jean Chrysostome," *SP* 17 (1982): 1177-78. For the treatment of the connection between patronage and pastoral care in Chrysostom, see Wendy Mayer, "Patronage, Pastoral Care and the Role of the Bishop at Antioch," *VC* 55 (2001): 58-70; and Sherwin, "Friends at the Table of the Lord," 387-98.

⁶⁹ Brown, *Poverty and Leadership*, 78-82. On 15, he divides the types of late antique poverty into shallow and deep poverty.

⁷⁰ For more detailed estimation of Brown's thesis, see Bronwen Neil, "Conclusions," in *Preaching Poverty in Late Antiquity*, 209-28. Though Richard D. Finn, *Almsgiving in the Later Roman Empire: Christian Promotion and Practice (313-450)*, Oxford Classical Monographs (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 34-115, does not deal with Chrysostom directly, it is noteworthy here given its importance in critical response to Brown's thesis about the primary role of bishops in late-antique poverty relief. He investigates the practice and the meaning of Christian almsgiving in the later Roman Empire in a critical conversation with Brown, claiming that the almsgiving of monks, lay Christians and the imperial family played a significant role in the promotion of Christian charity, though episcopal almsgiving was prominent in late antiquity. On 205-19, he also maintains that Christian almsgiving did not replace pagan benefaction. Regarding the meaning of almsgiving, he focuses on the theological aspects of Christian almsgiving, arguing that almsgiving as an exchange of gifts turns passive recipients into active agents of giving spiritual benefit to the donors (176-203). On 170-73 and 214-18, he deals briefly with the influence of Greco-Roman thought on the ideas of Christian almsgiving.

Finn has a significant contribution to poverty studies in late antiquity, given the fact that he brings together historical and theological approaches in poverty studies which are separate in other works. In this sense, his work is useful for both historians of late antiquity and patristic scholars who are interested in poverty and almsgiving in late antiquity. He also proposes impressively a large picture of Christian almsgiving which is a good starting point for further studies on poverty and almsgiving in late antiquity. However, he does not take fully into account individual, geographical and chronological differences in late-antique Christian almsgiving due to the expansive range of his research, and his arguments cannot fit exactly into all churches' charitable activities in late antiquity. For example, Chrysostom emphasized direct and indiscriminate giving of alms to the poor, which suggests an exception to Finn's position regarding the priority of indirect almsgiving by the church. In this respect, Finn's work needs to be re-assessed by the detailed analyses of individual authors and their works.

In his study on Chrysostom's 40th homily on 1 Corinthians, Chris L. de Wet investigates his strong criticism against the wealthy, supporting Brown's thesis. De Wet demonstrates that to perform this task effectively, Chrysostom presented Paul as his agent of criticism. Chrysostom's hermeneutic of resuscitation makes his congregation think as if Paul is alive and is talking to them.⁷¹ Through Paul's voice, Chrysostom severely rebukes the rich people's various vices such as greed, pride, and envy, claiming that they are mad.⁷² De Wet insists that Chrysostom urged the wealthy to care for the poor, by attempting to change their conventional idea about the limited good. In the Greco-Roman world, being rich meant the exclusion of giving because giving was regarded as diminution. Challenging this economic concept, Chrysostom notes that spiritual economics overturns the conventional notion. Almsgiving makes one wealthy, and no one can become wealthy without giving.⁷³

Silke Sitzler demonstrates how Chrysostom promoted almsgiving by borrowing the patronage system which was a fundamental social structure in late antiquity, insisting that Chrysostom is characterized by the compassionate advocator of the poor. Applying the theory of identity to Chrysostom's homilies on almsgiving and poverty, she maintains that these discourses are related mainly to the re-establishment of the identity of the rich as the patrons of the poor. She attempts to prove her thesis through four characteristics in his homilies on almsgiving: the image of the poor, the treatment of the poor, the benefits provided by the poor, and the virtue of almsgiving.⁷⁴ Transforming the identity of the wealthy also involves the essential redefinition of the identity of the poor as valuable clients,⁷⁵ this aspect explored in more detail by investigating Chrysostom's 35th homily on

⁷¹ Chris L. de Wet, "Vilification of the Rich in John Chrysostom's Homily 40 *On First Corinthians*," *Acta Patristica et Byzantina* 21 (2010): 86-87.

⁷² De Wet, "Vilification of the Rich," 89-91.

⁷³ De Wet, "Vilification of the Rich," 88. The approach to wealth and poverty in Chrysostom through the concept of the limited good was adopted firstly by Mayer, "Poverty and Generosity," 153-54. See n. 2. 2 above.

⁷⁴ Silke Sitzler, "Identity: The Indigent and the Wealthy in the Homilies of John Chrysostom," *VC* 63 (2009): 470.

⁷⁵ Sitzler, "Identity," 474-76 and 478-79. She also ignores Chrysostom's emphasis on the health of the soul in his homilies on almsgiving, just as does an approach with focus on his humanitarian aspects. See n. 20

Matthew and 11th homily on Hebrews. Sitzler argues that in late antiquity the poor, especially the able-bodied ones, were regarded as totally unworthy of receiving alms because people thought that they were idle, tricky, and even criminal. She explains this identity of the poor by using the modern sociological term of ‘social deviance.’⁷⁶ Her analysis of these two homilies indicates that Chrysostom challenged this deep-rooted perception and attempted to reposition the status of the poor from social deviants to valuable clients.⁷⁷

Similarly, Blake Leyerle deals with Chrysostom’s view of wealth in terms of economic exchange. She argues that he criticized heavily the *philotimia* system by which the wealthy sought only honour through their civil donation, ignoring the poor.⁷⁸ Leyerle shows that Chrysostom demanded strongly that wealthy elites relieve the plight of the poor and tried to promote almsgiving by using the language of investment, maintaining that the rich can accumulate their wealth in heaven through their almsgiving. Since the poor as mediators transfer the rich person’s wealth to heaven and secure his salvation, they become valuable clients in this system of gift and counter gift.⁷⁹ Leyerle asserts that the ultimate purpose of Chrysostom’s use of exchange language was to form mutuality: he tried to solve the conflict between the rich and the poor, and to build a Christian community.⁸⁰ She indicates the significance of solidarity in his view of almsgiving, but overlooks the fact that the focus of almsgiving as the practice of exchange is on the givers’ benefit in Chrysostom’s work.

Geert Roskam investigates the historical validity of Chrysostom’s attack against

above.

⁷⁶ Silke Sitzler, “Deviance and Destitution: Social Poverty in the Homilies of John Chrysostom,” *SP* 47 (2010): 261-63.

⁷⁷ Sitzler, “Deviance and Destitution,” 263-66.

⁷⁸ Blake Leyerle, “John Chrysostom on Almsgiving and the Use of Money,” *HTR* 87 (1994): 32-34.

⁷⁹ Leyerle, “John Chrysostom on Almsgiving,” 37-40 and 43. Chrysostom’s description of charitable giving in terms of economic transaction has received much attention from patristic scholars, see Eberhard F. Bruck, *Kirchenväter und soziales Erbrecht: Wanderungen religiöser Ideen durch die Rechte der östlichen und westlichen Welt* (Berlin: Springer, 1956), 26-28; and A. Sifoniou, “Les fondements juridiques de l’aumône et de la charité chez Jean Chrysostome,” *Revue de Droit Canonique* 14 (1964): 250.

⁸⁰ Leyerle, “John Chrysostom on Almsgiving,” 29, 40-43, and 46.

pagan euergetism in the first part of *De inani gloria et de educandis liberis* (paragraphs 1-15), which had previously been ignored in poverty studies, by estimating how this criticism is 'objective' in the context of Greco-Roman sources, particularly Plutarch. He argues that Chrysostom's attack is unfair in that he ignores the positive sides of pagan euergetism which are presented in pagan sources.⁸¹ He maintains that this biased assessment should be understood within Chrysostom's agenda in the first part of *De inani gloria*: the aim of this part is to show the nature and the evils of vainglory, and Chrysostom uses pagan euergetism for this purpose.⁸² He indicates that it is necessary to approach Chrysostom's position of wealth and poverty carefully because he was not fully free from his own bias.

Francine Cardman looks at the language and devices of theatre in *De Lazaro conciones*. She demonstrates that Chrysostom urged the wealthy to see the misery of the poor and to feel pity for them by visualizing the life of Lazarus.⁸³ According to her, however, his ultimate focus in these homilies is on the salvation of his congregation, especially the wealthy. Using the language of exchange, he maintains that Lazarus is in heaven due to his virtuous life in this world, but the rich man receives eternal punishment due to his lack of almsgiving.⁸⁴ Against Leyerle, Cardman points out rightly that this language of investment aims at the redemption of the soul.⁸⁵ She also argues that Chrysostom's discourse on real wealth and poverty lessens his rhetorical force of care for the poor, because adapting the revelatory model of the theatre he claims that wealth and poverty in this world are false, but the real wealth and poverty will be revealed at the Last Judgment.⁸⁶ Though her research is limited to Chrysostom's homilies on the rich man and

⁸¹ Geert Roskam, "John Chrysostom on Pagan Euergetism: A Reading of the First Part of *De inani gloria et de educandis liberis*," *SE* 53 (2014): 155-61.

⁸² Roskam, "John Chrysostom on Pagan Euergetism," 164-65. On 167 n. 58-59, Roskam observes that Chrysostom asserts that almsgiving cures vainglory.

⁸³ Cardman, "Poverty and Wealth as Theater," 164-66 and 173. For the further studies on Chrysostom's use of theatrical techniques, see Blake Leyerle, *Theatrical Shows and Ascetic Lives: John Chrysostom's Attack on Spiritual Marriage* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001); Christoph Jacob, *Das geistige Theater: Ästhetik und Moral bei Johannes Chrysostomus* (Münster: Aschendorff 2010).

⁸⁴ Cardman, "Poverty and Wealth as Theater," 170-71.

⁸⁵ Cardman, "Poverty and Wealth as Theater," 170 n. 47.

⁸⁶ Cardman, "Poverty and Wealth as Theater," 166-67 n. 30. This idea is similar to Stoic philosophy, especially Seneca and Epictetus.

Lazarus, it challenges the traditional position that understands Chrysostom as a champion of the poor.

Mayer challenges directly the reassessment of the traditional position on several grounds. She argues that care of the poor is secondary to one's salvation in Chrysostom's view of almsgiving, and poverty is God's providence and plays a vital role in maintaining social order in his thought.⁸⁷ In addition, she points out that his description of the poor is exaggerated and ambiguous.⁸⁸ In this study, she classifies the types of poverty found in Chrysostom's work under three large groups, such as socio-economic, spiritual, and voluntary poverty; socio-economic poverty is divided into endemic, episodic, and epidemic.⁸⁹ She analyses the types of poverty in detail, but her work tends to remain in the application of sociological categories of poverty, like Costanzo.⁹⁰

2. 4. Philosophical Approach

This approach explores how the tradition of Greco-Roman philosophy affected the development of Chrysostom's attitude to wealth and almsgiving. G. Viansino shows that Chrysostom's thought on poverty, wealth, and almsgiving has many traces of Greco-Roman philosophy.⁹¹ Though his research succinctly analyses the philosophical underpinnings of Chrysostom's teachings about charitable giving, it indicates that the teachings were developed in dynamic conversation with the heritage of ancient philosophical insights.

Demetrios E. Tonias demonstrates that Chrysostom presented Abraham as the exemplar of virtue by adopting Stoic virtue ethics and sophistic rhetoric.⁹² Using Abraham

⁸⁷ Mayer, "John Chrysostom on Poverty," 100-101 and 110. According to her (97 and 102), Chrysostom emphasized direct almsgiving and considered almsgiving as the supreme virtue due to its benefit for others.

⁸⁸ Mayer, "John Chrysostom on Poverty," 104-9.

⁸⁹ Mayer, "John Chrysostom on Poverty," 83-95.

⁹⁰ See n. 38 above.

⁹¹ G. Viansino, "Aspetti dell'opera di Giovanni Crisostomo," *Koinonia* 25 (2001): 137-202, esp. 189-202.

⁹² Demetrios E. Tonias, *Abraham in the Works of John Chrysostom* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2014), 13-24. On 27-36 and 47-49, he maintains that Paul's perspective of Abraham was essential in Chrysostom's description of Abraham's virtues. Associating the characteristics of Abraham with classical and Pauline virtue, Chrysostom reinterpreted classical virtues through Pauline virtues. Given this influence of Paul on

as the model of philanthropy, Chrysostom encouraged his congregation to give generously their alms to the poor. In particular, he emphasized that Abraham is a perfect model for the wealthy since although Abraham was married and rich, he not only rejected wealth by the pursuit of a simple life, but also distributed his wealth to those in need.⁹³ Tonia's work deserves consideration in poverty studies, given the fact that he indicates that Chrysostom used biblical figures as exemplars to promote almsgiving, a pedagogical tool rooted in Stoic virtue ethics, which previous scholarship, particularly the theological approach has ignored.⁹⁴ However, the main focus of his treatment is not on the impact of philosophical thought on Chrysostom's attitude to almsgiving, like Viansino.

2. 5. Synthesis

So far, previous studies on poverty, wealth, and almsgiving in Chrysostom's thought been analysed. In this section the results of my analysis are synthesized on the basis of several limitations in previous poverty studies on Chrysostom that this dissertation attempt to solve.⁹⁵ First, there has been little analysis of where Chrysostom's view on

Chrysostom, it is necessary to look at the effect of Paul on his view of almsgiving.

⁹³ Tonia, *Abraham*, 96-100.

⁹⁴ Yang, "Five Key Recommendations," 56-57, overlooks this appropriation of Greco-Roman thought in Chrysostom's homilies on the rich man and Lazarus in which he presents Lazarus and the rich man as the exemplar of a life of virtue and a life of vice respectively. For another elaborated studies on virtue exemplars in Chrysostom's work, see Margaret M. Mitchell, *The Heavenly Trumpet: John Chrysostom and the Art of Pauline Interpretation*, Hermeneutische Untersuchungen zur Theologie 40 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000); Pak Wah Lai, "John Chrysostom and the Hermeneutics of Exemplar Portraits" (PhD diss., Durham University, 2010).

⁹⁵ Following matters are not addressed in this dissertation, but worthy of further investigation. First, there has been little study of the types of poverty and the forms of almsgiving. Although a few scholars such as Costanzo and Mayer have tried to define the categories of the poor in Chrysostom's homilies by applying sociological concepts of poverty, no one has explored his own categorization concerning poverty in detail except Plassmann's concise treatment. Studies on the forms of almsgiving have been scattered and partial. Previous scholarship has investigated chiefly institutional almsgiving by Chrysostom, and has paid little attention to important issues such as the range of recipients and his emphasis on personal almsgiving. Second, it is necessary to approach Chrysostom's discourses on almsgiving in a holistic and consistent way. Some scholars have proposed a certain concept as the framework of his view of almsgiving. Clapsis and Brändle deal mainly with his thought about the dignity of the poor and the motivation of almsgiving on the

almsgiving situates itself within Greco-Roman thought. Previous studies have mainly explored the theological, ascetical, socio-economic, and rhetorical factors in Chrysostom's discourses on almsgiving. Although some studies noted the philosophical foundations of his view of almsgiving, little research in any monograph or thesis has been devoted to an analytic and detailed examination of them.⁹⁶ In general, the theological and ascetical approaches have tended to isolate Chrysostom from his social, economic, and intellectual backgrounds, resulting in stressing only his uniqueness. However, the socio-scientific and philosophical approaches demonstrate that he adopted the thought, language and images of the Greco-Roman world in accordance with his purpose, and that the development of his theology of wealth and poverty was a dynamic process of interaction between him and his contexts. In this sense, these approaches make up for the shortcomings of the theological and ascetical approaches. This shows that it is necessary to contextualize his social ideas within his own historical backgrounds. This dissertation indicates these dynamics more clearly by reconsidering his attitude to charity through a new perspective of philosophical soul therapy which was an essential axis in the formation of his ideas of poverty and wealth, but has been neglected in previous scholarship.

Second, scholars have rarely paused in their studies to consider the benefits to the donors in Chrysostom's thought. The assessment of the identity of Chrysostom as 'the lover of the poor' has been prominent in previous scholarship, and the huge majority of studies have emphasized that Chrysostom had spoken actively for the outcasts of society and fought against poverty as social injustice. In some cases, the radical portrait of Chrysostom who advocates common ownership has also been highlighted.⁹⁷ A few

basis of his anthropology and his exegesis of Matt 25:31-46 respectively. Ritter analyses primarily his utopian idea on the grounds of his view of the common good, and Verhoeff attempts to understand his ideas of almsgiving through the concept of fellowship with God. These studies present the constitutive elements of Chrysostom's thought, but fail to provide a satisfactory answer to the conflicting standpoints of previous scholarship on his attitude toward poverty, wealth, and almsgiving.

⁹⁶ See 2. 4 above.

⁹⁷ In his homily on almsgiving, Chrysostom, *Elem.* 1 (PG 51:261.4-20), describes himself as 'an ambassador of the poor': "today, I stand before you to make a just, useful, and suitable advocacy. I come from no one else; only the beggars who live in our city elected me for this purpose, not with words, votes, and the resolve of a common council, but rather with their pitiful and most bitter spectacles. In other words,

scholars such as Plassmann and Mayer explicitly dispute this traditional position, pointing out briefly that the givers' benefit was a more vital element in Chrysostom's concept of almsgiving.

As Michell rightly pointed out, the passionate advocacy of the poor and the interest in the spiritual benefits of the rich coexist in Chrysostom's homilies on poverty.⁹⁸ This is supported by Peter Van Nuffelen's investigation of late antique panegyrics on imperial munificence: he demonstrates that the ideas of *liberalitas* and *caritas* were interconnected closely with each other, and that these two ideas coexisted in patristic sermons on poverty and almsgiving.⁹⁹ In many cases, however, we find the fact that Chrysostom's focus seems to tend to lean toward the benefits to the givers, and he deals with vices and their therapy.¹⁰⁰ Expounding Christ's commands (Matt 10:40-42), he pays attention to the reason why Christ mentions the various types of reward. He promised a number of rewards according to the different kinds of good works (a prophet's reward and

just as I was passing through the marketplace and the narrow lanes, hastening to your assembly, I saw in the middle of the streets many outcasts, some with severed hands, others with gouged-out eyes, others filled with festering ulcers and incurable wounds, especially exposing those body parts that, because of their stored-up rotteness, they should be concealing. I thought it the worst inhumanity not to appeal to your love on their behalf, especially now that the season forces us to return to this topic." Translation from *On Repentance and Almsgiving*, trans. Gus G. Christo, FC 96 (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1998), 131, modified. Translations in this thesis are mine unless noted otherwise.

⁹⁸ Mitchell, "Silver Chamber Pots and Other Goods," 99. "Chrysostom's various treatments of possessions are rooted in the two different directions of his paranesis which always meet in the middle. He is very troubled by the concrete impact of economic injustice on the poor but is equally worried about the eschatological fate of the rich in his congregation. Thus his approaches to the use and abuse of possessions often vacillate between these two perspectives and purposes, which are not identical." These aspects raise the following important questions: for Chrysostom, what is the primary purpose of almsgiving? Is it the donors' benefit (the therapy of their soul) or care for the poor? Was Chrysostom really concerned with the poor and their rights? How did he think about poverty? Is it social injustice or a natural element in society? May we call him a champion of the poor? It is necessary to re-evaluate this traditional position.

⁹⁹ Van Nuffelen, "Social Ethics," 48-53 and 58-62. In general, *liberalitas* is the old pagan (Greco-Roman) concept with its focus on the givers' benefit, and *caritas* is the new and Christian idea with its focus on the poor's needs (48).

¹⁰⁰ Even in some homilies which indicate Chrysostom's defence of the poor, this support is situated within the larger context of the therapy of the soul, see Chrys. *Hom. 35 in Mt.* (PG 57:405-12).

a righteous man's reward), and there is reward for even a cup of cold water. According to Chrysostom, Christ sets many rewards to emphasize that good work (almsgiving) exists for the benefit of those who do it.

Yet nevertheless he proffers also another reward, indicating that here he gives heed to those who provide hospitality for strangers (ξενοδοχούντων) more than the strangers who are guests (ξενιζομένων). He confers the first honour, saying, "He who receives you receives me, and he who receives me receives him who sent me (Matt 10.40)." What is equal to the fact that one receives the Father and the Son? But he promises also another reward along with this. "He," Christ says, "who receives a prophet in the name of a prophet will receive the reward of a prophet, and he who receives a righteous man in the name of a righteous man will receive the reward of a righteous man" (Matt 10.41). . . . Then, he says lest anyone should give an excuse of poverty, "Or if he who gives to drink to one of these little ones a cup of cold water only in the name of a disciple, I say to you truly, he shall not lose his reward (Matt 10.42). Even though you give a cup of cold and do not make any effort over it, your reward will be stored up even for this. For I do all things for the sake of you the receivers (διὰ ὑμᾶς δεχομέους)." ¹⁰¹

In *In Matthaëum hom.* 20, Chrysostom also insists that Christ commended voluntary poverty for the sake of the givers. The distribution of possessions to the poor is for the health of the givers' soul.

He teaches the contempt of riches itself by itself, showing that he makes these laws not so much for their sake who receive mercy (διὰ τοὺς ἐλεουμένους) as for the sake of the giver (διὰ τὸν δίδόντα). In other words, he did it so that we may despise our possessions, giving them to those in need, though no one injures us and drags us into court. ¹⁰²

Although it is not the purpose of this dissertation to consider the hierarchy between the donors and recipients in Chrysostom's mind, the point to be made here is that

¹⁰¹ Chrys. *Hom.* 35.2 *in Mt.* (PG 57:408.15-24 and 36-42; NPNF 1.10, 234, modified).

¹⁰² Chrys. *Hom.* 20.2 *in Mt.* (PG 57:289.25-30; NPNF 1.10, 142, modified). In *In Matthaëum hom.* 49, he, *Hom.* 49.4 (PG 58:500.59-501.2), concisely and plainly declares this point: "let us consider what the aim (τέλος) of almsgiving is. Then, what is its aim? Heaven and the good things in it."

the state of the donor's soul and the presentation of its treatment feature much more prominently in his discourses on poverty than many scholars have understood. Thus, we undertake to look systematically at his approach to the donors' benefits in terms of the cure of the soul. This dissertation seeks a givers-centered analysis, which has been ignored in previous receivers-oriented approach.

3. Ancient Philosophical Therapy

As mentioned before, we try to deal with Chrysostom's thought on almsgiving within the tradition of Greek-Roman philosophy, especially the therapy of emotions. What does the cure of the soul mean in ancient philosophy? What is a disease of the soul, why does it occur, and how is it treated? Is the metaphor of sickness and healing limited to a philosopher or philosophical school? How did early Christian writers, including Chrysostom, react to this ancient philosophical tradition? Addressing these questions, this section undertakes to provide the philosophical background of Chrysostom's view on almsgiving. We offer an overview of the definition of ancient philosophical therapy, the origin and development of therapeutic arguments in Greco-Roman tradition, and Christian adaption. We also examine how recent studies approach to Chrysostom within philosophical therapy.

3. 1. Identifying Philosophical Therapy: Disease of the Soul and Therapeutic Strategies

Ancient philosophers commonly argued that the task of philosophy is to heal the soul of a human being, just as the art of medicine is to treat the illness of the body: a philosopher is a doctor of the soul, and philosophy without treating our needs is defective. Indeed, as Pierre Hadot argues, ancient philosophy was a way of life and was fundamentally related to how we achieve happiness (εὐδαιμονία).¹⁰³ Simply put,

¹⁰³ Hadot, *Philosophy as a Way of Life*, 82-83. Gill, "Philosophical Therapy," 349, argues that according to ancient philosophy happiness is the natural target of human beings and was not just a feeling, but an objective state that all human beings are able to reach by their own efforts. Hellenistic philosophical schools differently defined the state of happiness. The Epicureans identified the ultimate purpose of life as ἀταραξία,

philosophical act in ancient times was essentially practical, which results in the transformation of the self.¹⁰⁴ Comparing a philosopher's school with a doctor's surgery, Epictetus (c.50-135 C.E.), a Greek Stoic philosopher, maintains that a philosopher should cure the dislocated shoulder, abscess, and headache of the souls of his students. Students should not leave the school without the treatment of their psychological diseases.¹⁰⁵ According to Cicero (106-43 B.C.E.), who was a Roman politician and philosopher, philosophy is an art of medicine for the soul, and individuals must become a doctor for their own souls with the aid of philosophy.¹⁰⁶ Epicurus (341-c.270 B.C.E.), who was an ancient Greek philosopher and was known as the founder of the Epicurean school, insists that just as the nature of medicine depends on the healing of bodily illness, so too philosophy is useless unless it copes with the suffering of the soul.¹⁰⁷

freedom from all anxieties, cares and pains including physical pains (Nussbaum, *The Therapy of Desire*, 107-11). The Stoics pursued ἀπάθεια, freedom from all emotions such as fear, distress, pity, hope, anger, jealousy, love, and joy (Nussbaum, *The Therapy of Desire*, 398-400). According to the Sceptics, beliefs are problematic themselves and should be fully removed from us (Nussbaum, *The Therapy of Desire*, 280-313). In addition to these schools, Cynicism considered ἐλευθερία as the ideal way of life, which is an anti-cultural and anti-social notion and means freedom from all things in relation to our life, such as desire, clothes, food, marriage, tradition, law, and even society (David E. Aune, "The Problem of the Passions in Cynicism," in *Passions and Moral Progress in Greco-Roman Thought*, ed. John T. Fitzgerald [London: Routledge, 2007], 50). Despite of their differences, what they argued commonly lies in the fact that the happiness is related to the health of the soul (the peace of mind), and virtuous life is achieved by retaining the tranquility of the soul. Cf., Nancy Sherman, "Ancient Conceptions of Happiness," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 55 (1995): 913-19; Jon Miller, "A Distinction Regarding Happiness in Ancient Philosophy," *Social Research* 77 (2010): 595-624; and Oyvind Rabbas, Eyjolfur K. Emilsson, Hallvard Fossheim, and Miira Tuominen, *The Quest for the Good Life: Ancient Philosophers on Happiness* (Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2015).

¹⁰⁴ Hadot, *Philosophy as a Way of Life*, 83: "The philosophical act is not situated merely on the cognitive level, but on that of the self and of being. It is a progress which causes us to be more fully, and makes us better. It is a conversion which turns our entire life upside down, changing the life of the person who goes through it. It raises the individual from an inauthentic condition of life, darkened by unconsciousness and harassed by worry, to an authentic state of life, in which he attains self-consciousness, an exact vision of the world, inner peace, and freedom."

¹⁰⁵ Epict. *Disc.* 3.23.30 (LCL 218:180-81).

¹⁰⁶ Cic. *Tusc.* 3.6 (LCL 141:230-31).

¹⁰⁷ Epicur. *Fr.* 221 = Porph. *Marc.* 31 (A.A. Long and D.N. Sedley, *The Hellenistic Philosophers*, vol. 2: Greek and Latin Texts with Notes and Bibliography [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987], 160).

Greco-Roman thinkers considered passions, desires, and false beliefs as psychological illnesses that cause unhappiness, pain, and disturbance, and their main attention was directed to the emotions or passions (πάθη)¹⁰⁸ such as love, anger, pity, gratitude, fear, and grief.¹⁰⁹ It was generally agreed among ancient moral philosophers that emotions are based on a set of certain beliefs and judgements about objects that we regard as valuable, such as loved ones and wealth. Aristotle (384-22 B.C.E.) asserts that we are angry on account of undeserved slight to ourselves or our family members and friends.¹¹⁰ He also defines fear as pain or disturbance engendered by our impression of an imminent evil that is destructive or painful.¹¹¹ Passions can be evaluated on the basis of the characteristics of beliefs and can be altered by the transformation of beliefs. Within this framework, if emotions are based on false beliefs, they disturb the soul and break its calmness, and this state is the soul's illness.¹¹² Cicero insists that the diseases and sickness of the soul emerges as a consequence of corrupted opinions.¹¹³

¹⁰⁸ Πάθη is the plural form of πάθος. Πάθος originates from παθεῖν (to suffer). In most cases, πάθος connotes negative meaning in the Greco-Roman world. It is very difficult to translate exactly what πάθος means. Πάθη has been translated mainly as 'emotions,' or 'passions,' or 'affections' in the English-speaking world, and 'emotions' and 'passions' have been used frequently. These two translations are used in this thesis unless otherwise noted. (John T. Fitzgerald, "The Passions and Moral Progress: An Introduction," in *Passions and Moral Progress*, 2-5).

¹⁰⁹ Cf. Nussbaum, *The Therapy of Desire*, 36-37 and 78. Hadot, *Philosophy as a Way of Life*, 83, argues that "in the view of all philosophical schools, mankind's principal cause of suffering, disorder, and unconsciousness were the passions: that is, unregulated desires and exaggerated fear. People are prevented from truly living, it was taught, because they are dominated by worries. Philosophy thus appears, in the first place, as a therapeutic of the passions."

¹¹⁰ Arist. *Rh.* 2.2.1 (LCL 193:172-73).

¹¹¹ Arist. *Rh.* 2.5.1 (LCL 193:200-201).

¹¹² Nussbaum, *Therapy of Desire*, 80-81, 105-15, and 316-53; Richard Sorabji, *Emotion and Peace of Mind: From Stoic Agitation to Christian Temptation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 19-28; L. Michael White, "Moral Pathology: Passions, Progress, and Protreptic in Clement of Alexandria," in *Passions and Moral Progress*, 292-93; and Susanna Elm, *Sons of Hellenism, Fathers of the Church: Emperor Julian, Gregory of Nazianzus, and the Vision of Rome*, Transformation of the Classical Heritage 49 (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2012), 172. Nussbaum, *Therapy of Desire*, 80-81, argues that for Hellenistic philosophers, most emotions are bad because they are influenced by false opinions and beliefs in society.

¹¹³ Cic. *Tusc.* 4.29 (LCL 141:356-57).

Speech or writing (λόγος) was a key tool in treating the sick soul. In *Phaedrus*, Plato's (c.427-347 B.C.E.) Socrates presents the definition of rhetoric: "As a whole, the rhetorical art (ἡ ῥητορικὴ τέχνη) is a kind of psychagogy by means of words (ψυχαγωγία τις διὰ λόγων)." ¹¹⁴ Plato argues that an orator should lead his listeners to truth, not what seems to be true. In this regard, the speaker must know truth about all subjects of which he speaks. Unless the orator pays proper attention to philosophy, he cannot accomplish the therapeutic goal of speech. ¹¹⁵ The analogy between *logos* and medicine goes back to Homer. In earlier times, the notion of *logos* was comprehensive, including religious writings, poems, advice, and philosophical arguments. In the late fifth century B.C.E., the application of *logos* to philosophical arguments became prominent. After that period, that is, from Plato and Aristotle to the Hellenistic philosophers, therapeutic *logos* mainly meant philosophical orations and writings that were often likened to a drug or surgery for the sickness of the soul. ¹¹⁶

Changing false beliefs was a concrete strategy for the therapy of the soul. According to ancient philosophical therapy, false beliefs were regarded as the main cause of psychological illness, rather than external factors. Passions caused by an incorrect value system were able to be moderated or removed by transforming the value systems, and this process results in the therapy of the soul. ¹¹⁷ In his letter to Menoeceus, Epictetus points out that disturbance results from perverted opinions regarding gods, death, and desires. After addressing his teachings about these issues, he urges Menoeceus to contemplate them day and night for the peace of his soul. ¹¹⁸ In this sense, the ancient therapy of passions was cognitive therapy, that is, its objective was a change of attitude to pain. This cognitive shift depends on personal responsibility. In philosophical therapy,

¹¹⁴ Pl. *Phdr.* 261a (LCL 36:516-19).

¹¹⁵ Pl. *Phdr.* 259e-261a and 277b (LCL 36:512-19 and 570-71).

¹¹⁶ Nussbaum, *Therapy of Desire*, 49-53.

¹¹⁷ Gill, "Philosophical Therapy," 341 and 348. On 341, he points out that philosophical therapy "develops emotional resilience, that is, the ability to cope with personal disasters or problems without loss of emotional stability or inner calm." Hadot, *Philosophy as a Way of Life*, 83, also notes that "each school had its own therapeutic method, but all of them linked their therapeutics to a profound transformation of the individual's mode of seeing and being. The object of spiritual exercises is precisely to bring about this transformation."

¹¹⁸ Epicur. *Ep. Men.* DL 10.123-35 (LCL 185:649-59).

personal agency was emphasized in that we are able to accomplish moral development and happiness by our own effort.¹¹⁹

The writings on the therapy of emotions analyse one's state of psychic disease and suggested advice to establish a new value system.¹²⁰ In this process of therapy philosophical analysis plays a vital role, providing motivation of soul therapy and guiding the whole therapeutic process. Specific suggestions are based on the principal doctrines of each school.¹²¹ Gill maintains that protreptic, therapy, and advice were interconnected in antiquity. Protreptic encourages a person to undertake therapy, therapy removes false beliefs, and advice replaces false beliefs with true ones: these three elements constitute the crucial parts of the therapeutic process as a whole.¹²² Therapeutic writings offered both reactive treatment and the program of long-time management to prevent the soul's illness.¹²³

3. 2. Origin, Development, and Christian Adaption

The origin of ancient psychagogy is ascribed to Homer's *Odyssey*, where the

¹¹⁹ Gill, "Philosophical Therapy," 348-51. One of the core strategies in therapeutic discourses is to regard a psychic-patient as "a responsible agent, capable in principle of understanding the causes of her own current distress and of relieving this by a deliberate programme of actions or thoughts." (Gill, "Philosophical Therapy," 339-40).

¹²⁰ Gill, "Philosophical Therapy," 351. These are the third and fourth in the core strategies of philosophical therapy identified by Gill. "The third element in the process is the formulation of the central message of the therapeutic process in a form that engages effectively with the concerns of the person involved and his or her state of mind at the start of the therapy. . . . The fourth element in the strategy is offering advice to the other person of a kind that is designed to enable him to rebuild his belief-set in a way that provides a secure basis for development away from the framework of beliefs that generates psychological sickness and towards well-being and happiness."

¹²¹ Sorabji, *Emotion and Peace of Mind*, 212.

¹²² Gill, "Philosophical Therapy," 342-43.

¹²³ Elm, *Sons of Hellenism*, 174; and Gill, "Philosophical Therapy," 341-42 and 346-47. Gill argues that the function of ancient philosophical therapy is close to preventive medicine, which was a significant branch of ancient medicine. Regimen (δίαίτα) as preventive medicine manages life-style such as diet, exercise, and environment to prevent disease. Gill asserts that ancient works on the therapy of the soul focus mainly on a long program of caring for the soul. He maintains that philosophers framed their teachings as psychological medicine due to the importance of regimen in Greek medicine.

goddess Athena disguised as Mentos provided guidance to the young Telemachos.¹²⁴ The form of classical therapy was developed by Plato. The analogy between philosophers and physicians appears prominently in his works.¹²⁵ The psychology of Plato is a tripartite theory that indicates that the soul consists of the reasoning, spirited, and appetitive parts. When the reason controls the other two lower parts, this is the ideal state of the soul, which is mainly accomplished by philosophy.¹²⁶ Criticizing the sophists, Plato claimed that the aim of rhetoric is to nourish the soul. Orators are required to have the knowledge of truth and of the various types of the souls, and their speech needs to be adapted to the different conditions of the souls of listeners, just as a doctor differently treats patients according to the types of their illness.¹²⁷ Plato also acknowledged the importance of non-cognitive methods such as music, sport, and diet for the cure of impulsive desires and emotions.¹²⁸ Aristotle played a vital role in the development of classical psychic therapy. Like other Greek thinkers, he claimed that emotions are related closely to beliefs and opinion, and they are changed by cognitive alteration.¹²⁹ He conceded the sympathetic relationship between body and soul, asserting that bodily change gives rise to emotions.¹³⁰ Aristotle asserted that emotions are natural and in particular essential elements in understanding truth. However, it is necessary to control them in a moderate way when they are too strong or they are incorrectly developed by false beliefs. According to Aristotle, we need to learn how to respond properly to a variety of situations through

¹²⁴ Paul R. Kolbet, *Augustine and the Cure of Souls: Revising a Classical Ideal* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2009), 25-26. Further studies on philosophical therapy in Greco-Roman philosophy and its Christian adaption, see Hadot, *Philosophy as a Way of Life*; Sorabji, *Emotion and Peace of Mind*; Knuuttila, *Emotions in Ancient and Medieval Philosophy*; Fitzgerald, ed., *Passions and Moral Progress in Greco-Roman Thought*; and Gill, "Philosophical Therapy," 339-60.

¹²⁵ Kolbet, *Augustine and the Cure of Souls*, 26; and Gill, "Philosophical Therapy," 343. For detailed description of the main works on psychological therapy, see Gill, "Philosophical Therapy," 342-45; and Fitzgerald, "The Passions and Moral Progress," 5-12.

¹²⁶ Knuuttila, *Emotions in Ancient and Medieval Philosophy*, 7-10.

¹²⁷ Kolbet, *Augustine and the Cure of Souls*, 31.

¹²⁸ Knuuttila, *Emotions in Ancient and Medieval Philosophy*, 18.

¹²⁹ Nussbaum, *The Therapy of Desire*, 78, 81-93; and William W. Fortenbaugh, "Aristotle and Theophrastus on the Emotions," in *Passions and Moral Progress*, 31-41.

¹³⁰ Fortenbaugh, "Aristotle and Theophrastus on the Emotions," 37-39.

education. He emphasized the significance of the education of emotions for childhood and youth.¹³¹

It was the Hellenistic schools, especially Epicureans, Stoics, and Sceptics that systematically developed the concept of the therapy of the soul and a variety of therapeutic methods on the basis of classical therapy.¹³² According to Epicurus, human beings naturally seek pleasure and avoid pain, and the satisfaction of natural desires is a crucial part of happiness. However, desires stimulated by false beliefs bring about psychological disturbance such as anxiety and care. Epicurus considered perverted notions about pleasure, gods and soul as the main reasons for unhappiness.¹³³ *Logoi* heal the illness of the soul by changing these false beliefs, which cause vain and excessive desires. Epicurus urged his followers to memorize his teachings, presenting them as medicines.¹³⁴ Directing attention from suffering to the good memories of the past was a key tool of Epicurean therapy.¹³⁵ According to Philodemus (c.110-c.30 B.C.E.), who was an ancient Epicurean philosopher, a good therapeutic *logos* is a balanced mix of gentle and harsh speech on the basis of the condition of patients' souls. He maintained that harsh and directive speech should be publicly delivered to those whose false beliefs are rooted

¹³¹ Nussbaum, *The Therapy of Desire*, 78, 93-95, and 97; Fortenbaugh, "Aristotle and Theophrastus on the Emotions," 43; and Knuuttila, *Emotions in Ancient and Medieval Philosophy*, 25-26.

¹³² In her book, *The Therapy of Desire*, 16-22, 33, and 24-26, Nussbaum compares Hellenistic philosophers to the Platonic approach and the ordinary-belief approach which has been ascribed to Aristotle. Unlike the Platonic approach with its focus on the truth outside us, the Hellenistic approach focuses on our needs and wishes. The norms for happiness are value-laden. Among the aspects of life, some aspects are estimated by philosophers as more valuable and important than the others. In this sense, the norms involve human interference. It is not surprising that Hellenistic moral philosophers emphasize a variety of methods to achieve happiness given the practical hallmark of their philosophy. In the ordinary-belief approach, the role of ethics lies in collecting and recording traditional beliefs in society. The task of ethics is to present the systematic explanation of truths that people already have. However, the Hellenistic approach analyzes ordinary beliefs critically on the basis of the presupposition that they are distorted by society. Therefore, the Hellenistic approach makes up for the shortcomings of both the Platonic and ordinary-belief approaches.

¹³³ Knuuttila, *Emotions in Ancient and Medieval Philosophy*, 81-82; and Nussbaum, *The Therapy of Desire*, 105-15.

¹³⁴ Knuuttila, *Emotions in Ancient and Medieval Philosophy*, 82-84; and Nussbaum, *The Therapy of Desire*, 132-33.

¹³⁵ Sorabji, *Emotion and Peace of Mind*, 165 and 233.

firmly in their inner being. This harsh speech was likened to a purgative and surgery.¹³⁶ Mutual criticism and confession also functioned as vital therapeutic tools.¹³⁷

For the Stoics too, false beliefs were regarded as the problematic elements of mental health and should be removed. They maintained that individuals should become a master of their souls to keep them healthy.¹³⁸ A Greek Stoic philosopher Chrysippus (c.279-c.206 B.C.E.) represents the Stoic intellectual theory of emotions, maintaining that emotions are judgement about an event (good or bad) and the appropriateness of emotional response. Because they identified emotions with false beliefs, the Stoics offered the radical remedy of extirpating them. They criticized the Aristotelian view of moderation, arguing that the claim that emotions can be moderated by education is naïve.¹³⁹ In the Stoic therapy, the memorization of principal doctrines was also important, and the Stoics emphasized the repeated practice of applying their teaching to various potential circumstances.¹⁴⁰ Interestingly, Epictetus insisted that we need to try to detach ourselves from loved ones to handle troubles in the future.¹⁴¹ Narratives and exemplars, which were critical elements in therapeutic *logoi*, were frequently used to overcome the shortcoming of non-oral literatures.¹⁴²

The Sceptics insisted that a set of beliefs is problematic in itself. If one person with a certain system of beliefs encounters the opposite system, much bigger disturbance will happen than before. The Sceptics asserted that it is better to accept pain than to struggle to achieve cognitive change in reaching the calm state of the soul.¹⁴³ Though Cynicism was not a Hellenistic school, it is noteworthy given its importance in the

¹³⁶ Nussbaum, *The Therapy of Desire*, 122-26.

¹³⁷ Knuuttila, *Emotions in Ancient and Medieval Philosophy*, 84-85; and Sorabji, *Emotion and Peace of Mind*, 218.

¹³⁸ Nussbaum, *The Therapy of Desire*, 316-53.

¹³⁹ Nussbaum, *The Therapy of Desire*, 366-81 and 389-98; David E. Aune, "The Problem of the Passions in Cynicism," in *Passions and Moral Progress*, 54-55; and Knuuttila, *Emotions in Ancient and Medieval Philosophy*, 77.

¹⁴⁰ Knuuttila, *Emotions in Ancient and Medieval Philosophy*, 78.

¹⁴¹ Sorabji, *Emotion and Peace of Mind*, 215.

¹⁴² Nussbaum, *The Therapy of Desire*, 337-41.

¹⁴³ Nussbaum, *The Therapy of Desire*, 280-313.

development of therapeutic arguments in the Greco-Roman world. The Cynics maintained that we should live according to nature and avoid all artificial things around us. For them, pleasure was the main obstacle to achieve happiness. Cynicism was considered by the ancients as a life-style, not as a systematic set of teachings.¹⁴⁴

On the side of medicine, there was interesting debate on the therapy of emotions. Because exploring the history of psychic therapy in ancient medicine is beyond the scope of this thesis, this part focuses on a representative physician, Galen (129-c.200 C.E.). He argued that emotions depend on the blend of hot, cold, fluid, and dry in the body (the theory of humours) and described the imbalance of this bodily blend as disease. This imbalance is caused by either external stimuli or the consumption of food and drink. For Galen, even the soul is a bodily blend (the materiality of the soul), and external factors directly affect the soul. Consequently, physical training, eating habits, and environment are vital for the health of the soul. On the basis of his physical approach to emotions and psychological health, Galen proposed non-cognitive therapy.¹⁴⁵

Early Christians adapted the idea of the therapy of the soul in Greco-Roman thought. A Hellenistic Jewish philosopher, Philo of Alexandria (20 B.C.E.- c.50 C.E.), had a positive attitude to emotions and adapted both moderation and eradication of emotions as ideals for different people. We find the constant influence of Philo on the Greek fathers, especially the Cappadocians (Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nyssa, and Gregory of Nazianzus).¹⁴⁶ Justin Martyr (100-65 C.E.), an early Christian apologist, described Christ as the true philosopher whose philosophy is superior to all other philosophers in the Greco-Roman world.¹⁴⁷ In Clement of Alexandria (c.150-c.215 C.E.) we see the therapy of the soul directly related to the Christian approach to wealth. In *Quis dives*

¹⁴⁴ Aune, "The Problem of the Passions in Cynicism," 50-52 and 57-63.

¹⁴⁵ Sorabji, *Emotion and Peace of Mind*, 253-56; and White, "Moral Pathology," 294-95. Cf. Elm, *Sons of Hellenism*, 172-73. Musonius Rufus (c.30-c.100 C.E.), a Roman Stoic philosopher, also argued that a meal should be thin, light and dry. Meat is forbidden because it dulls mental activity. Further, one should possess only what is necessary to survive. Self-restraint is a key to both somatic and psychic health. (White, "Moral Pathology," 299-300). For the explanation of a variety of behavioural therapies for emotions, see Sorabji, *Emotion and Peace of Mind*, 271-72.

¹⁴⁶ Sorabji, *Emotion and Peace of Mind*, 385-86.

¹⁴⁷ Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*, 33.

salvetur, Clement's aim is to heal the sick souls of the wealthy, arguing that wealth is not bad in itself, but that passions such as avarice and conceit are real problems to be solved.¹⁴⁸ In *Paedagogus*, Clement shows a holistic approach to psychic health, maintaining that food and drink affect the condition of the soul.¹⁴⁹ Origen (c.184-c.254 C.E.) likened Christ to a doctor who cures the sickness of a sinner, and he adopted the Stoic ideal of ἀπάθεια, which is achieved by God's grace.¹⁵⁰ Susanna Elm's recent analysis of Gregory of Nazianzus' (c.329-90 C.E.) *Orationes* 2 indicates that psychic-therapeutic ideas also were adapted by late-antique Christians, particularly in the East.¹⁵¹ In this oration, Gregory's description of ideal Christian leadership falls within the lines of the medico-ethical tradition. A Christian leader is a doctor of the soul. Gregory maintains that the types of speech should be adapted to the individual soul and an opportune time is most important in healing the soul.¹⁵² Gregory too accepted the idea of the interrelationship between the body and the soul.¹⁵³ In *De pauperibus amandis*, Gregory of Nyssa (c.335-c.395 C.E.) approaches almsgiving to lepers from the psychic-therapeutic perspective. Lepers were isolated from society due to people's fear of contagion.¹⁵⁴ Refuting this opinion, which spread widely in his congregation, Gregory insists that direct contact with lepers through almsgiving cures the sickness of the souls of givers, that is, greed, and the spiritual holiness of lepers is transmitted to the psychic patients.¹⁵⁵

Our description of the therapy of the soul in both Greco-Roman thought and the early church indicates that medico-philosophical therapy had a long trajectory of tradition across philosophy, rhetoric, and medicine, and the idea of soul therapy was a main

¹⁴⁸ Clem. *Q.D.S.* 3.3-6 and 11.2 quoted in White, "Moral Pathology," 290-91. Cf. Judith Kovacs, "Divine Pedagogy and the Gnostic Teacher according to Clement of Alexandria," *J ECS* 9 (2001): 3-25.

¹⁴⁹ Clem. *Paed.* 2.2 quoted in White, "Moral Pathology," 300. Cf. Dawn Lavalle, "Divine Breastfeeding: Milk, Blood, and *Pneuma* in Clement of Alexandria's *Paedagogus*," *JLA* 8 (2015): 322-36.

¹⁵⁰ Elm, *Sons of Hellenism*, 171 n. 84; and Sorabji, *Emotion and Peace of Mind*, 387.

¹⁵¹ Kolbet, *Augustine and the Cure of Souls*, shows that philosophical therapy also influenced late-antique Christians in the West such as Augustine.

¹⁵² Gr. Naz. *Or.* 2.30-33 referenced in Elm, *Sons of Hellenism*, 170, 174-75.

¹⁵³ Gr. Naz. *Or.* 2.18 referenced in Elm, *Sons of Hellenism*, 173.

¹⁵⁴ Susan R. Holman, *The Hungry are Dying: Beggars and Bishops in Roman Cappadocia*, Oxford Studies in Historical Theology (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), 153-58.

¹⁵⁵ Gr. Naz. *Paup.* 1-2 referenced in Holman, *The Hungry are Dying*, 153-63.

Zeitgeist in the Greco-Roman world.

3. 3. Sickness, Health, and Remedy in Chrysostom¹⁵⁶

Recent studies on Chrysostom's conceptual framework of madness demonstrate how sins or passions or desires are equated with psychic disorders in his thought. Salem indicates that sin is described as mental illness, and individuals are responsible for their moral error in Chrysostom's thought.¹⁵⁷ Salem's thesis is also supported by Mayer who argues that for Chrysostom moral error is referred as madness, and no one avoids the culpability of one's behaviour because this psychic insanity voluntarily occurs.¹⁵⁸ She examines the aetiology of psychological madness, claiming that the sickness is caused by the imbalance of the soul: when passions are not controlled by reason, the balance of the soul is broken down, bringing about physical and psychological symptoms.¹⁵⁹ Investigating the locus of the mindset (γνώμη)¹⁶⁰ in Chrysostom's anthropology, Raymond Laird maintains that the disorder of the mindset is responsible for the sick soul

¹⁵⁶ For other critical review of recent scholarship on Chrysostom and the cure of the soul, see Wendy Mayer, "John Chrysostom: Moral Philosopher and Physician of the Soul," in *John Chrysostom: Past, Present, Future*, ed. Doru Costache and Mario Baghos (Sydney: AIOCS Press, 2017), 193-216.

¹⁵⁷ Salem, "Sanity, Insanity, and Man's Being," 8-71.

¹⁵⁸ Wendy Mayer, "Madness in the Works of John Chrysostom: A Snapshot from Late Antiquity," in *Concept of Madness from Homer to Byzantium: Manifestations and Aspects of Mental Illness and Disorder*, ed. Hélène Perdicoyianni-Paléologou, Byzantinische Forschungen 32 (Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 2016), 349-61.

¹⁵⁹ Mayer, "Madness in the Works of John Chrysostom," 353-56. As Gill, "Philosophical Therapy," 350-51, points out, psychic physiology is linked closely to ethical development in philosophical therapy.

¹⁶⁰ Γνώμη has many meanings such as mind, thought, will, disposition, judgement, opinion, purpose, intent, and decision. (*LSJ*, 354; *PGL*, 317-18). Raymond Laird, *Mindset, Moral Choice, and Sin in the Anthropology of John Chrysostom*, Early Christian Studies 15 (Strathfield, NSW: St. Pauls Publications, 2012), translates γνώμη as "mindset." Peter Moore, "Chrysostom's Concept of γνώμη: How 'Chosen Life's Orientation' Undergirds Chrysostom's Strategy in Preaching," *SP* 54 (2013): 352-55, suggests "chosen life's orientation" as a proper translation of γνώμη. In this thesis, 'the mindset' is employed as a main translation of the Greek term. For the detailed works about Chrysostom's view of γνώμη in his anthropology, see Laird, *Mindset Moral Choice, and Sin*; Moore, "Chrysostom's Concept of γνώμη," 351-58; and Samantha Miller, "No Sympathy for the Devil: The Significance of Demons in John Chrysostom's Soteriology" (PhD diss., Marquette University, 2016), 169-221.

since the mindset is the critical faculty of the soul and controls both the body and the soul. The health of the soul depends on shaping the correct mindset.¹⁶¹ Peter Moore further develops Laird's thesis that the mindset is the critical faculty in Chrysostom's anthropology, asserting that transforming the mindset was a fundamental principle in Chrysostom's entire homiletic methods.¹⁶²

For Chrysostom, religious deviation is identified as the sickness of the soul as well. Laird's analysis of Chrysostom's series of homilies, *De incomprehensibili dei natura*, indicates that he diagnoses the souls of the Anomoeans as diseased with festering sores. Their serious madness of pride is based on their perverted mindset, a false idea that the nature of God is fully comprehensible.¹⁶³ Courtney W. VanVeller looks closely at how Chrysostom constructed the identity of non-Jewish Christian orthodoxy in terms of sickness and health by using the model of Paul. She construes Paul's conversion from Judaism to Christianity as the healing of his sick soul. Paul's consistent contact with the Jews after his conversion is also described as his highly strategic adaptability for leading Jewish people out of Judaism.¹⁶⁴ She notes that Chrysostom's description of Paul as a physician of the soul is based firmly on his premise of the sickness of Jewish souls. On the basis of Paul's statement in Romans 9-11, Chrysostom also constructs the racialized

¹⁶¹ Laird, *Mindset, Moral Choice and Sin*, 26-112, 114-34, and 239-56. On 135-91, he insists that this priority of the mindset in Chrysostom's anthropology is rooted firmly in and is shaped by Greek thought from Thucydides, Demosthenes and Aristotle to Libanius.

¹⁶² Moore, "Chrysostom's Concept of γνώμη," 352-55. According to Moore, 356-58, Chrysostom frequently tended to reconstruct the mindset of biblical figures such as Paul in a concrete way, presenting them as the models of a virtuous life to be imitated. This is because he believed the disordered mindset is transformed by consistent exposure to a model of the well-established and healthy mindset. For the fuller studies on Chrysostom's pastoral care for shaping the healthy mindset, see id., "Gold without Dross: An Assessment of the Debt to John Chrysostom in John Calvin's Oratory" (PhD diss., Macquarie University, 2013).

¹⁶³ Raymond Laird, "John Chrysostom and the Anomoeans: Shaping an Antiochene Perspective on Christology," in *Religious Conflict from Early Christianity to the Rise of Islam*, ed. Wendy Mayer and Bronwen Neil, *Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte* 121 (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2013), 135-38. Preaching, prayer, love, and friendship are presented as remedies for their sickness which restore the arrogant mindset to a humble one (138-39).

¹⁶⁴ Courtney W. VanVeller, "Paul's Therapy of the Soul: A New Approach to John Chrysostom and Anti-Judaism" (PhD diss., Boston University, 2015), 51-63.

mindset of Jews, collectively diagnosing the disordered Jewish mindset as indifferent and contentious. He insists that this sickness of Jewish souls has been so hardened that the condition of the Jewish mindset became almost incurable. Jews are considered as a potential and constant threat to healthy Christians due to the risk of contagion from their sick mindset.¹⁶⁵

Numerous scholars have pointed out that Chrysostom's sermons and writings were used as a core remedy to heal the sick soul.¹⁶⁶ Mayer insists that for Chrysostom, the church is a hospital, and the priest whose main therapeutic tool is the homily is a physician of the soul. She defines the genre of Chrysostom's works, such as *Ad eos qui scandalizati sunt*, *Quod nemo laeditur nisi a se ipso*, and his letters to Olympias as Christianized medical treatises and therapy in that they focus mainly on correct mindset and personal responsibility.¹⁶⁷ She takes one step further, suggesting that in Chrysostom's homilies, the exegetical parts cannot be separated from the ethical parts, and both constitute a united therapeutic *logos* as a whole. She suggests that it was likely that his

¹⁶⁵ VanVeller, "Paul's Therapy of the Soul" 133-60; and ead., "John Chrysostom and the Troubling Jewishness of Paul," in *Revisioning John Chrysostom*, forthcoming. The pathological approach to heresies was a common literary *topos* in early church writers. See Jennifer Barry, "Diagnosing Heresy: Ps.-Martyrius's Funerary Speech for John Chrysostom," *J ECS* 24 (2016): 395-418; and Thomas J. Whitley, "Poison in the Panarion: Beasts, Heretics, and Sexual Deviants," *VC* 70 (2016): 237-258. See also n. 7 in chapter 1.

¹⁶⁶ In *De sacerdotio* 4.3, SC 272:248.5-250.20, Chrysostom states that the preaching of a priest is the only remedy to cure a disease of the soul: "doctors who treat the human body have discovered a multiplicity of drugs, various designs of instruments, and appropriate forms of diet for the sick, and the character of the climate is often sufficient by itself to restore the patient's health. Sometimes a timely bout of sleep relieves the doctor of all trouble. In this case, however, there is nothing like this to rely on. When all is said and done, there is only one means and only one method of treatment available, and this is teaching by means of word. This is the best instrument, the best diet, and the best climate. It takes the place of medicine, cautery, and surgery. When we need to cauterize or cut, we must use this. All things are useless without it. By it we rouse the lethargy of the soul, reduce its inflammation, remove excrescences, and supply defects, in short, do everything which contributes to its health" (Translation from *Six Books on the Priesthood*, trans. Graham Neville [Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1984], 114-15, modified). Although, as we will demonstrate, Chrysostom's rhetoric is exaggerated, it is evident that preaching is a very important treatment.

¹⁶⁷ Mayer, "Medicine in Transition," 11-26.

hermeneutics of therapy depended on Hellenistic medical-philosophical tradition.¹⁶⁸ Neureiter also claims that subjects such as health, illness, and healing are key topics in Chrysostom's correspondence with Olympias. These letters are referred as remedy for the therapy of Olympias' despondency.¹⁶⁹ Jessica Wright's examination of Chrysostom's letter to Stagirus demonstrates that this letter is fundamentally therapeutic: Chrysostom notes that Stagirus' depression is caused by his concerns about his own and his family's honour, not a demon, and he believes that the monk will return to normal if he shakes off his preoccupation with the fame of his family.¹⁷⁰ Samantha Miller clearly shows that for Chrysostom salvation (the health of the soul) depends on our choice and responsibility, not the power of devil.¹⁷¹

Analysing Chrysostom's appropriation of pedagogical adaption in ancient philosophical-rhetorical tradition, Rylaarsdam notes that the concept of the accommodation to individual needs thoroughly permeates Chrysostom's theology and his homiletical methods. According to Rylaarsdam, Chrysostom characterizes God as the true philosopher who guides the sick souls toward the world of truth by means of various pedagogical strategies that were rooted in Greek *paideia*.¹⁷² For Chrysostom Paul is not only an imitator of divine pedagogy, but also an exemplar of a psychic-therapist. On the basis of the model of Paul, he defines the primary role of a priest as a guider of the soul, and the priest heals the sick soul with a variety of therapeutic methods such as gentle or harsh speech. Rylaarsdam's treatment of Chrysostom's homiletical methods indicates that Chrysostom too saw himself as a healer of the soul and did not refuse to use the heritage of his education, in particular under Libanius, a prominent Antiochene rhetorician.¹⁷³

¹⁶⁸ Mayer, "Shaping the Sick Soul," 157.

¹⁶⁹ Neureiter, "Health and Healing," *SP* 47 (2010): 267-72. Cf. Ulrich Volp, "'That Unclean Spirit Has Assaulted You from the Very Beginning': John Chrysostom and Suicide," *SP* 47 (2010): 273-86.

¹⁷⁰ Wright, "Between Despondency and the Demon," 352-67.

¹⁷¹ Miller, "No Sympathy for the Devil."

¹⁷² Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*, 13-99.

¹⁷³ Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*, 157-282. Rylaarsdam generates a paradigm shift in Chrysostom studies, arguing that Chrysostom was a systematic and consistent theologian, and we need to reexamine the assumed inconsistency in his thought within its historical-intellectual context. Vanveller, "Paul's Therapy of the Soul," 75-93 and 94-130, shows that Chrysostom explains Paul's cure of ailing Jewish

Several scholars note that scriptural figures and monks are frequently adduced as virtue exemplars to be imitated in his therapeutic discourse.¹⁷⁴ Some scholars approach Chrysostom's therapeutic arguments through a lens of the Judeo-Christian soteriology and eschatology. James Cook, for example, claims that although Chrysostom borrowed the concept of philosophical therapy, his ultimate goal of therapy is to escape sin and God's judgement. He pays attention to the pedagogical role of Christian eschatology in Chrysostom, insisting that the warning of the final judgement functions as a therapeutic tool that arouses fear and motivates a virtuous life. This protreptic use of afterlife differentiates Chrysostom from ancient moral philosophers.¹⁷⁵

We also encounter the trace of the correlation between virtue and the health of the soul in Chrysostom's ascetic ideas.¹⁷⁶ Anne-Marie Malingrey analyses the concept of

souls in terms of the mixed methods of gentle and harsh speech. Paul employed the language of kinship and Jewish privileges such as their election as a gentle speech to make weak Jewish souls receptive to harsh speech. Chrysostom maintains that this gentle speech secretly condemned Jews and their faith and practices. In this sense, Paul's Jewishness does not mean his fidelity to Judaism, but is his deceptive pedagogy.

¹⁷⁴ Laurence Brottier, "‘Et la fournaise devint source’: l'épisode des trois jeunes gens dans la fournaise (Dan 3) lu par Jean Chrysostome," *RHPR* 71 (1991): 309-27; Mitchell, *The Heavenly Trumpet*; Catherine Broc-Schmezer, *Les figures féminines du Nouveau Testament dans L'œuvre de Jean Chrysostome: Exégèse et pastorale*, Collection des Études Augustiniennes, Série Antiquité 185 (Paris: Institut d'études Augustiniennes, 2010); Lai, "John Chrysostom and the Hermeneutics of Exemplar Portraits"; id., "The Monk as Christian Saint and Exemplar in St. John Chrysostom's Writings," *SCH* 47 (2011): 19-28; Andreas Heiser, *Die paulusinszenierung des Johannes Chrysostomus: Epitheta und ihre Vorgeschichte*, Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 70 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012); Samantha Miller, "Chrysostom's Monks as Living Exhortations to Poverty and the Rich Life," *GOTR* 58 (2013): 79-98; Raymond Laird, "It's All in the Mindset: John Chrysostom and the Great Moments of Personal Destiny," in *Men and Women in the Early Christian Centuries*, ed. Wendy Mayer and Ian J. Elmer, Early Christian studies 18 (Strathfield, NSW.: St Pauls Publications, 2014), 194-210; Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*, 157-93 and 261-69; and Tonia, *Abraham*.

¹⁷⁵ James Cook, "Preaching and Christianization: Reading the Sermons of John Chrysostom" (PhD diss., Oxford University, 2016), 143-63; id., "'Hear and Shudder!': John Chrysostom's Therapy of the Soul," in *Revisioning John Chrysostom*, forthcoming.

¹⁷⁶ For a more extensive treatment of the correlation between early Christian ascetic discourse and ancient medical and philosophical knowledge, see Timothy S. Miller, *The Birth of the Hospital in the Byzantine Empire* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997); Teresa M. Shaw, *The Burden of the Flesh: Fasting and Sexuality in Early Christianity* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1998); Anne E. Merideth,

philosophy (φιλοσοφία) in Chrysostom's works, indicating that philosophy is not simply restricted to intelligent activity such as logical reasoning and thinking, but a way of life. Chrysostom refers to the practice of Christian virtues associated with the benefit of the soul, especially monastic disciplines, as philosophy.¹⁷⁷ Jan R. Stenger aligns with Malingrey in arguing for Chrysostom's emphasis on the practical orientation of Christian philosophy. Chrysostom contrasts monks' *vita activa* with philosophers' *vita contemplativa*, noting that Christian monks embody the true ideal of a philosophical life. While philosophers fail to set an example of a virtuous life, monks lead people to the truth of Christ through their labor and piety.¹⁷⁸ In his study on the close link between gender, virtue, and psychagogy in late antiquity, De Wet focuses on Chrysostom's view of asceticism, a concept that ascetic disciplines make the soul young and healthy by suppressing the flesh's desires and passions. Based on this ascetic idea, Chrysostom presents a new standard for the geriatrics of the soul. Although the elderly lose masculinity as they grow older, they can overcome this loss by practicing ascetic discipline. De Wet argues that Chrysostom's discourse of gerotranscendence made a significant contribution to the conceptual reconstruction of masculinity in late antiquity.¹⁷⁹

"Illness and Healing in the Early Christian East" (PhD diss., Princeton University, 1999); Andrew T. Crislip, *From Monastery to Hospital: Christian Monasticism and the Transformation of Health Care in Late Antiquity* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2005); id., *Thorns in the Flesh: Illness and Sanctity in Late Ancient Christianity* (Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013); and Gary B. Ferngren, *Medicine and Health Care in Early Christianity* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009). For the critical consideration of scholarship on religion and medicine, see Heidi Marx-Wolf and Kristi Upson-Saia, "The State of the Question: Religion, Medicine, Disability, and Health in Late Antiquity," *JLA* 8 (2015): 257–72.

¹⁷⁷ Anne-Marie Malingrey, *Philosophia; étude d'un groupe de mots dans la littérature grecque des présocratiques au IVe siècle après J. C.*, *Études et Commentaires* 40 (Paris: C. Klincksieck, 1961), 270-86. Jean-Louis Quantin, "A propos de la traduction de 'philosophia' dans l'Adversus oppugnatores vitae monasticae de Saint Jean Chrysostome," *RevScRel* 61 (1987):187-97; and Margaret A. Schatkin, *John Chrysostom as Apologist: With Special Reference to De incomprehensibili, Quod nemo laeditur, Ad eos qui scandalizati sunt, and Adversus oppugnatores vitae monasticae*, *Analekta Vlatadōn* 50 (Thessalonikē: Patriarchikon Hidryma Paterikōn Meletōn, 1987), 230-72, make the same point.

¹⁷⁸ Jan R. Stenger, "Where to Find Christian Philosophy?: Spatiality in John Chrysostom's Counter to Greek Paideia," *J ECS* 24 (2016): 187-90.

¹⁷⁹ Chris L. de Wet, "Grumpy Old Men?: Gender, Gerontology, and the Geriatrics of the Soul in John

Mayer addresses Chrysostom's approach to asceticism and individual and social health. Chrysostom's emphasis on moderate asceticism (voluntary poverty) is linked closely with both somatic and psychic health. This view is related to his social vision. The health of society depends on individuals who pursue a simple life and give their excess to the poor. Mayer demonstrates that almsgiving is related to the therapy of the soul in Chrysostom's thought.¹⁸⁰

These recent studies look closely at Chrysostom through the eyes of ancient philosophical therapy, indicating that his intellectual activities were performed within the lengthy trajectory of medico-philosophical tradition. They clearly demonstrate that the therapy of the soul is a key concept for understanding Chrysostom's thought and more importantly, give a new perspective from which to approach his response to poverty, wealth, and almsgiving within his own theoretical background.

4. Sources

4. 1. Identifying the Scope of Analysis

A systematic analysis of Chrysostom's view of psychic-therapeutic almsgiving is made in this project, seeking a coherent understanding of his view of almsgiving under the concept of the therapy of soul. Unfortunately, however, Chrysostom did not leave any writing focusing on almsgiving that can be matched with a thesis or book as modern academic piece of writing. Since he was a priest who nurtured Christians spiritually, most of his remarks about almsgiving are fragmentarily scattered throughout his voluminous

Chrysostom," *J ECS* 24 (2016): 507-20.

¹⁸⁰ Mayer, "Medicine in Transition," 11-26; and ead., "Madness in the Works of John Chrysostom," 353-56. She leaves open the question about the relationship between the health of the soul and redemption in his therapeutic vision of almsgiving. Mayer, "Solving Poverty by Treating the Soul: Connecting Philanthropy, Medicine and Moral Philosophy" (Shifting Frontiers in Late Antiquity XI, Iowa, March 26-29, 2015), also points out that psychic-therapeutic ideas underlie Chrysostom's views of poverty. Poverty or wealth is not a problem, but the correct mind is important. Within this framework, poverty is natural and even necessary in society. Mayer argues that Chrysostom understands the solution of poverty as a byproduct of curing the sick soul because almsgiving is primarily concerned with the therapy of the soul.

corpus.¹⁸¹ This necessitates narrowing the scope of his work in such a way that those that are essential for the topic of almsgiving are addressed. This has been done by conducting a search on relevant terminology (e.g. ἐλεημοσύνη) utilizing the TLG (Thesaurus Linguae Graecae) database. As a result of the searches conducted, it is clear that Chrysostom's homilies are the most significant sources for the project: *De Lazaro, De paenitentia, De eleemosyna, In illud: Habentes eundem spiritum, In Genesim (homiliae 1-67), In Matthaeum, In Joannem, In Acta apostolorum, In epistulam ad Romanos, In epistulam i ad Corinthios, In epistulam ii ad Corinthios, In epistulam ad Philippenses, In epistulam ii ad Timotheum, In epistulam ad Titum, and In epistulam ad Hebraeos*. Works attributed to Chrysostom which are of suspect authorship are excluded according to CPG's classification.¹⁸²

It is only in recent decades that early Christian sermons¹⁸³ have begun to be recognized as an important historical resource for understanding thought, culture, society, and economy in early Christianity.¹⁸⁴ There are several reasons for the delay in recognition

¹⁸¹ The total number of Chrysostom's genuine works which survive is more than 1,000. For the detailed list of these works, see CPG 4305-4495 and CPG Suppl. 4305-4495.

¹⁸² See CPG 4500-5079 and CPG Suppl. 4500-5099. There is still controversy over the authenticity of some works, such as *Comparatio regis et monachi*. See CPG 4500 and David G Hunter, *A Comparison between a King and a Monk: Against the Opponents of the Monastic Life* (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen, 1988), 25.

¹⁸³ It is difficult to precisely define what constitutes a sermon. Wendy Mayer, "Homiletics," in *the Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Studies*, ed. Susan A. Harvey and David G Hunter (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 570, notes this problem: "at the most basic level, then, all that we can claim is that a homily is something that conforms to a few essential conditions, but whose shape is elastic and changes with regional cultural conditions and with time." According to Mary B. Cunningham and Pauline Allen, "Introduction," in *Preacher and Audience: Studies in Early Christian and Byzantine Homiletics*, ed. Mary B Cunningham and Pauline Allen, *New History of the Sermon 1* (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 1-2, the term 'homily' is defined as "works prepared beforehand or delivered impromptu at ceremonies which had some kind of liturgical content, but which were not always held in a church building." It is argued that 'homily' (ὁμιλία) is distinguished from 'sermon' (λόγος or ἐγκώμιον) from the seventh century (C.E.) onwards. 'Sermon' which is more formal and structured than 'homily' was often used to refer to the later festal homilies. The validity of the distinction between these two genres requires more detailed discussion. In this dissertation, both terms are employed interchangeably.

¹⁸⁴ Mayer, "Homiletics," 566-67; and Jessica Wright, "Brain and Soul in Late Antiquity" (PhD diss., Princeton University, 2016), 195-96.

of the value of homilies. First, sermons were regarded as “popular,” and therefore “trivial,” as a large part of them were delivered to the ordinary masses as well as the intellectually highly trained elites by the classical education.¹⁸⁵ Second, even if a homily has a certain structure, it is not systematic compared with a theological treatise. The impromptu remarks of a preacher and the needs and interests of audience interfere with the logical flow of preaching, and it is also often ended suddenly without any conclusions due to the limit of time.¹⁸⁶ Lastly, numerous problems surrounding sermons lead to undervalue their impact on hearers. For instance, the attendance of the congregation was fluctuating. Sermons were mostly delivered in the church. While the church was crowded at the major festivals of the liturgical year, such as Lent and Christmas and at the ceremonies of martyrs, attendance was reduced at other times.¹⁸⁷ An audience also could not clearly listen to a preacher: “on occasion the preacher’s words were either drowned out by the hubbub in church or failed to carry to the aisles where the faithful crowded for lack of space.”¹⁸⁸ Despite the limits in relation to the nature of preaching, its centrality in the early Christian pastoral ministry cannot be underestimated: a homily was one of the most important ways of teaching people Christian doctrines and moral exhortations.¹⁸⁹ Early Christian preachers used this tool to address various themes, such as poverty, wealth, almsgiving, marriage, education, virginity, and authority.¹⁹⁰ It was argued that a homily was “the only vehicle for instructing the many who were wholly or partially illiterate, and so had no access to letters, treatises, and written *Lives*.”¹⁹¹

¹⁸⁵ Mayer, “Homiletics,” 567.

¹⁸⁶ Wright, “Brain and Soul in Late Antiquity” 198.

¹⁸⁷ Finn, *Almsgiving in the Later Roman Empire*, 139-40.

¹⁸⁸ Finn, *Almsgiving in the Later Roman Empire*, 143. For the fuller challenges to the impact of late antique homilies, see Finn, *Almsgiving in the Later Roman Empire*, 137-46 (Re Chrysostom, 139-40 and 142-43); and Cunningham and Allen, “Introduction,” 2-19.

¹⁸⁹ Finn, *Almsgiving in the Later Roman Empire*, 137-40; Mayer, “Homiletics,” 567-68; and Wright, “Brain and Soul in Late Antiquity” 197-98.

¹⁹⁰ Mayer, “Homiletics,” 568.

¹⁹¹ Finn, *Almsgiving in the Later Roman Empire*, 140. Jaclyn L. Maxwell, *Christianization and Communication in Late Antiquity: John Chrysostom and His Congregation in Antioch* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 1, also argues: “sermons were popular in Late Antiquity – a number of priest and bishops became famous their rhetorical skill and charisma as speakers. The importance of rhetoric

Similarly, a sermon was an essential educational method in Chrysostom's pastoral care. Christian sermons had its golden age in terms of both their quality and quantity in Chrysostom's era, and these homilies were used as textbooks by later generations.¹⁹² Chrysostom frequently likens the church to a school. A priest is a school master, and a sermon is a handbook for a believer as a student in a spiritual school.¹⁹³ More importantly, as the search conducted by TLG shows, Chrysostom's sermons are the most important sources to understand his view of poverty, wealth, and almsgiving.¹⁹⁴ His treatises deal mainly with voluntary poverty, and his letters give only partial information regarding his poverty relief in Constantinople. Palladius' hagiography of Chrysostom also does not provide detailed data on his ideas and practice of almsgiving.¹⁹⁵

Among the homilies selected, this dissertation places Chrysostom's homiletic series on Matthew and John (*In Matthaëum hom.* 1-90: CPG 4424, *In Joannem hom.* 1-88: CPG 4425) at its analytic centre. These homilies constitute the longest homiletic series of his that have survived and are representative resources for grasping his thought. Approximately, 55 sermons in 90 Matthew homilies and 20 sermons in 88 John homilies are related to the topic of charitable giving. In the homilies, Chrysostom addresses almsgiving as a main topic or as one of several themes. In addition, he often expounds biblical passages unrelated to charity throughout his preaching and suddenly transitions to

in ancient higher education meant that many of the men who took on leadership roles in the clergy, especially after the conversion of Constantine, were trained for public speaking. On the same note, frequent rhetorical displays in cities taught the crowds to be listeners, and these people made up the urban Christian congregation. Communication across social and economic boundaries and the widespread appeal of rhetorical eloquence had long been an important part of urban life, and this played a part in the spread of Christianity and the formation of orthodoxy in Late Antiquity.”

¹⁹² Maxwell, *Christianization and Communication in Late Antiquity*, 2.

¹⁹³ Cook, “Preaching and Christianization,” 70-71; and Maxwell, *Christianization and Communication in Late Antiquity*, 88-90. For the fuller treatment of Chrysostom's pedagogy, see Cook, “Preaching and Christianization,” 67-110; Maxwell, *Christianization and Communication in Late Antiquity*, 88-117; and Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*.

¹⁹⁴ Similarly, Finn, *Almsgiving in the Later Roman Empire*, 137, makes this same point: “sermons were the most important way in which promoters of almsgiving advanced their cause.”

¹⁹⁵ Pauline Allen, Bronwen Neil, and Wendy Mayer, “Reading the Texts: A Methodology of Approach to Genre,” in *Preaching Poverty in Late Antiquity*, 48 and 62.

discourse on it at the last part of the sermon.¹⁹⁶ As mentioned before, Chrysostom's discourse on almsgiving focuses far more on what benefits it confers on the givers than previously asserted. Given the fact that this discourse, as will be shown, speaks primarily of the givers' passions, their cure, and salvation, the Matthean and Johannine homilies provide sufficient sources for the case-study of Chrysostom's psychotherapeutic use of almsgiving. Since, in particular, more than half of the Matthean homilies are concerned directly with almsgiving, poverty, and wealth, the homilies have been regarded as crucial in understanding Chrysostom's approach to almsgiving.¹⁹⁷ Despite the difference in the total number of homilies on almsgiving according to their criteria of analysis, scholars generally agree that this issue is covered in almost half of the sermons. C. Bauer notes: "in ninety sermons on the Gospel of St Matthew, Chrysostom spoke forty times on almsgiving alone; he spoke some thirteen times on poverty, more than thirty times on avarice, and about twenty times against wrongly acquired and wrongly used wealth."¹⁹⁸ Finn suggests the result similar to mine:

Of the ninety homilies in this series, over half, at least forty-eight, and perhaps as many as fifty-one, may be said to promote almsgiving: one (*Homily 63*) is a homily on poverty and wealth; almsgiving features as one important topic among others in nineteen (*Homilies 15*,

¹⁹⁶ Cf. Finn, *Almsgiving in the Later Roman Empire*, 152. On 146, he categorizes late antique homilies on almsgiving into five types: "(1) sermons devoted essentially to the promotion of almsgiving; (2) sermons on wealth and poverty in which almsgiving is a major theme, but in which the preacher also tackles related issues of avarice and pride; (3) other sermons in which almsgiving is one of several important topics; (4) sermons in which almsgiving is promoted in conclusion to a sermon on some other topic, such as the need for repentance; and (5) sermons in which almsgiving is briefly promoted, as it were, in passing."

¹⁹⁷ Rudolf Brändle, "Jean Chrysostome: l'importance de Matth 25:31-46 pour son éthique," *VC* 31 (1977): 47-52; id., *Matthäus 25:31-46 im Werk des Johannes Chrysostomus*, 299-310; Sergio Zincone, "Essere simili a Dio: l'esegesi crisostomiana di Mt 5:45," *SP* 18 (1986): 353-58; Margaret M. Mitchell, "John Chrysostom," in *The Sermon on the Mount through the Centuries*, ed. Jeffrey P. Greenman, Timothy Larsen, and Stephen R. Spencer (Grand Rapids, MI: Brazos Press, 2007), 19-42; Brändle, "This Sweetest Passage," 127-39; Luc Dubrulle, "Entre archétype et scandale, la mise en place théologique de la catégorie morale du pauvre," *Transversalités* 111 (2009): 23-33; and Costanzo, *Harbor for the Poor*, 64-80. For another list of studies, see Wendy Mayer, "John Chrysostom's Use of Luke 16:19-31," *Scrinium* 4 (2008): 47-48, n.8.

¹⁹⁸ C. Bauer, *John Chrysostom and His Time*, trans. M. Gonzaga, vol. 1 (London: Sands, 1959), 217.

19, 20, 21, 31, 35, 48, 50, 52, 64, 66, 71, 77, 78, 79, 80, 85, 88, 89); there are ten homilies in which almsgiving is promoted in conclusion to a sermon on another topic (*Homilies* 4, 5, 33, 39, 41, 45, 46, 54, 74, 83); and some twenty-one in which almsgiving is briefly promoted (*Homilies* 3, 7, 8, 16, 18, 22, 23, 26, 27, 30, 37, 40, 47, 49, 51, 57, 61, 65, 68, 72, 73).¹⁹⁹

My count is almost comparable to the total number of sermons on almsgiving (about 59) found in Chrysostom's homilies on Pauline letters, such as homilies on 1 and 2 Corinthians, homilies on Philippians, and homilies on Hebrews, which have played a prominent role in Chrysostom studies.²⁰⁰ Even though the quantity of information does not guarantee its quality, nonetheless the importance of the Matthean homilies in Chrysostomic poverty studies cannot be easily overlooked. This thesis will explore these two series homilies in depth.

4. 2. Date, Provenance, and Audience

Most scholars argue that Chrysostom's homiletic series on Matthew and John were delivered at Antioch in early 390s. From the preacher's remark in the seventh sermon on Matthew ("our city is the first to be credited with the name 'Christian'"), J. Quasten reasons that Chrysostom presented this series at Antioch in 390. It is also presumed that the other series was preached in the same place in 391.²⁰¹ Like Quasten, J.N.D. Kelly situates the homilies on Matthew and John in Antioch in 390 and 391, respectively. He mentions that there is internal evidence for his claim, but the specifics are not given.²⁰² All of homilies on Matthew and John have been assumed to be delivered at Antioch in 388 to the end of 393 and in the late 388 to 395 respectively.²⁰³

In her groundbreaking study, Mayer challenges the traditional classification of the

¹⁹⁹ Finn, *Almsgiving in the Later Roman Empire*, 152.

²⁰⁰ Finn, *Almsgiving in the Later Roman Empire*, 153-54.

²⁰¹ J. Quasten, *Patorology*, vol. 3 (1950; repr., Westminster: Christian Classics, 1986), 437 and 439.

²⁰² J.N.D. Kelly, *Golden Mouth: the Story of John Chrysostom – Ascetic, Preacher, Bishop* (New York: Cornell University Press, 1995), 90.

²⁰³ Wendy Mayer, *The Homilies of St John Chrysostom – Provenance: Reshaping the Foundations*, *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 273 (Roma: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 2005), 258 and 267.

past four centuries regarding the provenance and date of Chrysostom's homilies, insisting that even a series of homilies contains homilies which were delivered at different times and in different locations. According to her, when and where Chrysostom preached has been generally determined by the following process: among a series of homilies, the date (provenance) of some homilies is first identified on the basis of internal evidence. These settled sermons constitute the reference point, and the rest in the series distributed to the same date. In addition, the period of Chrysostom's ministry has played a decisive role in determining the provenance of preaching. If a sermon is deemed to be delivered in 386 to 397, it automatically belongs to Antioch, while the provenance of a homily that seems to be addressed in 398 to 404 is Constantinople. Mayer points out that a fundamental problem of these tendencies is that they neglect the possibility of intentional edition by later generations surrounding the composition and ordering of the existing texts.²⁰⁴ Indeed, she attests the validity of her arguments through variety of detailed case studies as well as her monograph. For instance, it is persuasively shown that a series of homilies on Colossians was preached at both Antioch and Constantinople.²⁰⁵

After Mayer's challenge, the issue about where and when Chrysostom preached his homilies on Matthew and John still have rarely been treated. Reshaping the date and provenance of these homilies is a highly complex task that requires detailed consideration of various elements, and it is beyond the scope of the investigation of this thesis that it looks closely at this issue. For one thing the chronology and origin of the whole of these

²⁰⁴ Mayer, *The Homilies of St John Chrysostom*, 22-23. For the summary survey of her findings, see ead., "Les Homélie de Jean Chrysostome: Problèmes concernant la provenance, l'ordre et la datation," *Revue d'Etudes Augustiniennes et Patristiques* 52 (2006): 329-53.

²⁰⁵ Pauline Allen and Wendy Mayer, "Chrysostom and the Preaching of Homilies in Series: A New Approach to the Twelve Homilies *In epistulam ad Colossenses* (CPG 4433)," *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 60 (1994): 21-39. For other related studies, see ead., "Chrysostom and the Preaching of Homilies in Series: A Re-Examination of the Fifteen Homilies *In Epistulam ad Philippenses* (CPG 4432)," *VC* 49 (1995): 270-89; ead., "The Thirty-Four Homilies on Hebrews: The Last Series Delivered by Chrysostom in Constantinople?," *Byzantion* 65 (1995): 309-48; Wendy Mayer, "'Les homélie de s. Jean Chrysostome en juillet 399': A Second Look at Pargoire's Sequence and the Chronology of the *Novae homiliae* (CPG 4441)," *Byzantinoslavica* 60 (1999): 273-303; and ead., "The Sequence and Provenance of John Chrysostom's Homilies *In illud: si esurierit Inimicus* (CPG 4375), *De mutatione nominum* (CPG 4372) and *In principium actorum* (CPG 4371)," *Augustinianum* 46 (2006): 169-86.

series have been determined on the basis of a small number of sermons, like other homiletic series.²⁰⁶ It is assumed in this thesis that a certain number of homilies in these series were first presented in Antioch in the early 390s, opening up several possibilities as to what extent they were preached there at the same period. It was suggested that some of the Matthean homilies (17, 40, 82, and 85) might have been delivered in Constantinople.²⁰⁷

As Chrysostom might have addressed these homiletic series in both Antioch and Constantinople, his congregation might have consisted of people in both areas, which demonstrates that constructing the original audiences is also significantly complicated.²⁰⁸ Rather than providing an alternate suggestion for the composition of Chrysostom's audience, this thesis focuses on presenting the findings of previous scholarship. Ramsay MacMullen argues that the upper elite predominated in the congregation of Chrysostom.²⁰⁹ Several scholars dispute this claim, maintaining that people from diverse social and economic backgrounds would have heard his preaching.²¹⁰ It is also suggested that in some cases, the range of the audience(s) in his homilies expands to a secondary audience(s) through the model behaviour of the original hearer(s) or reader(s).²¹¹ This thesis expects that Chrysostom's homilies on Matthew and John were exposed to a greater range of people in social and economic background, gender, and educational levels.

²⁰⁶ Mayer, *The Homilies of St John Chrysostom*, 470-71.

²⁰⁷ Mayer, *The Homilies of St John Chrysostom*, 38 and 470-71.

²⁰⁸ Finn, *Almsgiving in the Later Roman Empire*, 137-43; Wendy Mayer, "John Chrysostom: Extraordinary Preacher, Ordinary Audience," in *Preacher and Audience*, 105-37.

²⁰⁹ Ramsay MacMullen, "The Preacher's Audience (AD 350-400)," *JTS* n.s. 40 (1989): 503-11.

²¹⁰ Wendy Mayer, "John Chrysostom and His Audiences: Distinguishing Different Congregations at Antioch and Constantinople," *SP* 31 (1997): 70-75; Pauline Allen, "John Chrysostom's Homilies on I and II Thessalonians: the Preacher and His Audience," *SP* 31 (1997): 3-21; Wendy Mayer, "Constantinopolitan Women in Chrysostom's Circle," *VC* 53 (1999): 265-88; ead., "Female Participation and the Late Fourth-Century Preacher's Audience," *Augustinianum* 39 (1999): 139-47; ead., "Who came to hear John Chrysostom preach?: Recovering a Late Fourth-Century Preacher's Audience," *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 76 (2000): 73-87; and Maxwell, *Christianization and Communication in Late Antiquity*, 67-86.

²¹¹ Mayer, "The Audience(s)," 89-96.

5. Methodology

Several things are considered in analysing these late-antique homilies. Initially, a homily that is related to the topic is studied within its literary context. The literary context plays an important role in determining the meaning of a word, sentence and paragraph.²¹² Taking note of specific context in each homily, we try to read Chrysostom's discourse on almsgiving closely. Of course, we do not exclude the possibility that the text handed over to us is different from what Chrysostom originally said. Chrysostom's homilies were likely to be altered from both the transformation from oral delivery to written text and the transmission of manuscripts.²¹³ In this thesis, the PG text is used unless otherwise mentioned. In addition, we need to take into account the audience of homilies because each homily has a particular setting(s). There has been debate about whether his sermons are dialogues or mass media, but it is certain that it is a series of communication between the preacher and large audiences.²¹⁴ Indeed, frequent references to interlocutors who refuse to Christian belief and lifestyle are found in Chrysostom's homilies. Once Chrysostom is viewed as a healer of the soul, the importance of his audience cannot be overlooked. That is because the psychological sickness of the audience is a main object which he should deal with. As Rylaarsdam shown, Chrysostom's preaching is in most cases tailored to the needs and problems of the congregation.²¹⁵ Given that his agenda, community, and various audiences influenced the formation of his social message, it is necessary to consider these

²¹² For detailed examination of the various contexts of Chrysostom's homilies, see Laird, *Mindset, Moral Choice, and Sin*, 3-20.

²¹³ Cook, "Preaching and Christianization," 31-65; and Allen, "Reading the Texts," 37-39. For the text condition of Chrysostom's homilies on Matthew and John, see Herbert Musurillo, "John Chrysostom's *Homilies on Matthew* and the Version of Annianus," in *Kyriakon: Festschrift Johannes Quasten*, ed Johannes Quasten, Patrick Granfield, and Josef A. Jungmann (Münster: Aschendorff, 1970), 452-60; Justin Taylor, "The Text of St. John Chrysostom's *Homilies on John*," *SP 25* (1993): 172-75; and Jeff W. Childers, *The Syriac Version of John Chrysostom's Commentary on John: I. Mêmre 1-43*, *Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium 652* (Leuven: Peeters, 2013), vii-xi.

²¹⁴ Maxwell, *Christianization and Communication in Late Antiquity*, 1-7; and Isabella Sandwell, "Preaching and Christianisation: Communication, Cognition and Audience Reception," in *Revisioning John Chrysostom*, forthcoming.

²¹⁵ Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*.

factors. However, there is need to treat carefully these external factors in understanding his view of therapeutic almsgiving, since it is difficult to reconstruct completely the original settings and audiences of his homilies as shown before. Finally, it is necessary to be wary of Chrysostom's rhetoric. It is demonstrated that in his description of the poor, he used extreme examples or gave scenes reinterpreted for his special purpose.²¹⁶

6. Structure

Following this introductory chapter, the thesis is divided into three chapters. The introduction has presented the aims, literature review, the definition of philosophical therapy, methodology, and structure. Chapter 1 looks at how almsgiving cures the diseases of the soul. For Chrysostom, passions are a spiritual sickness that breaks peace of mind and ultimately destroys the soul. He uses the medical terms of bodily and mental illnesses to psychic disorder. The sickness of the soul is caused by the loss of control of the reason over passions. When the mind cannot control desires, spiritual equilibrium is broken. Therefore, it is recommended that Christians diligently take care of their mind for their spiritual health. Almsgiving is a spiritual remedy that heals sick souls. The function of psychic-therapeutic almsgiving reflects the tradition of behavioural therapy in ancient psychagogy, and almsgiving is so affordable that all can take its treatment. As behavioural therapy almsgiving has two kinds of functions: reactive and preventive treatments. In the case of reactive therapy, almsgiving mitigates or removes passions when they have arisen. Chrysostom prescribes it for all kinds of psychic diseases: it cures not only each passion, but also a variety of passions at the same time. As a result, givers regain their peace of mind. Chrysostom's therapeutic discourse consists of diagnosis and prescription, and in some cases the cognitive shift of therapeutic *logoi* is suggested to facilitate the curative process of the soul. In addition to reactive treatment, almsgiving also prevents spiritual illness by strengthening the soul. As benefactors become wise with their assistance to the poor, they can avoid passions and sins. Chrysostom compares the preventive efficacy of charity with the fruit of the olive which was regarded as health-giving food in the Roman empire. The benevolent acts towards the poor keep the health of the soul by providing

²¹⁶ Allen, "Reading the Texts," 40-44.

adequate nutrition to the soul and strengthening its immune system. The givers should be humble and not give alms from injustice to enjoy the fruitful results of their charitable giving.

Chapter 2 aims to analyse the psychagogical role of eschatology within Chrysostom's care for the soul through almsgiving. To address this purpose, this chapter focuses on the mixed use of praise and blame which was an essential technique in ancient psychagogy. Ancient moral philosophers and orators supported this balanced method to avoid both despair and laziness. In general, praise or gentle exhortation was applied to good deeds or simple errors. It motivates people to do good things, while excessive praise engenders insolence and complacency. Harsh speech corrects repetitive or serious faults, but indiscriminate criticism destroys voluntariness, and at worst, makes the weak soul abandon the pursuit of a philosophical life. To overcome these weak points of praise and rebuke, these two methods of pedagogy should be properly mixed. As a doctor of the soul Chrysostom reinterpreted Christian doctrine of eschatology through the angle of this ancient strategy of philosophical therapy. Reward as gentle speech motivates the sick soul to progress towards a virtuous life, by arousing the hope of future blessings. It is particularly useful for the therapy of the weak soul, helping it easily receive the divine commandment and strengthening tenacity in the face of various trials and sufferings in addition to the hope of future blessings. However, Chrysostom offered the fearful place of hell as harsh speech to awaken the lazy soul and correct its moral errors through fear. He often used deliberate means to strengthen the sense of hope and fear. Chrysostom has been considered as a strict teacher, but his fundamental strategy was the balanced use of praise and blame. The prevalence of harshness might be construed as Chrysostom's inevitable pedagogical method for recalcitrant hearers. Almsgiving, reward, and punishment harmonize with each other for the cure of the soul: Chrysostom not only comforts his congregation with the encouragement of reward, but also wields the whip of divine punishment. He leads his congregation to the health of the soul through almsgiving within the framework of both hope and fear.

Chapter 3 looks at Chrysostom's idea of Christianized psychic-therapeutic almsgiving. For Chrysostom Christian giving is also understood as an important means of cleansing sin and avoiding God's eternal punishment. This chapter closely investigate how two concepts, namely the Christian doctrine of redemptive almsgiving and the theory of

psychic therapeutic almsgiving in terms of philosophical, especially psychagogical tradition operated in his mind. The doctrine of redemptive almsgiving has been long developed by the Bible, apocrypha, and early church authors, and Chrysostom was firmly rooted in this Judeo-Christian thought. He believed that the post-baptismal sins of believers are forgiven through almsgiving. However, this position does not support salvation by work. Chrysostom makes it clear that salvation can be gained only through the redemptive deeds of Jesus Christ. Almsgiving results from voluntary obedience to seek to imitate God in response to grace. On the basis of Chrysostom's doctrine of soteriology, especially the exegesis of biblical passage which formed the basis of the formation of redemptive almsgiving (LXX Dan 4:27; Prov 15:27; and Luke 11:41), both Christian and philosophical traditions are holistically unified into a new kind of theoretical system of therapy in his thought. There we find that the concepts of philosophical sickness and its consequences are absorbed and altered within the framework of Christian ideas of sin and punishment. For Chrysostom sin is not only a disordering of passions or distorted thought which destroys psychological calmness, but also the terrible state which provokes the judgement of God and damnation due to disobedience to God's words. Almsgiving solves this spiritual crisis. In short, it removes vices and promotes virtues, so that the soul becomes healthy, and heaven will be for the givers, and ultimately God's image is restored. Far from rejecting the Greco-Roman concept of philosophical therapy, Chrysostom transformed its scope and objective according to his pastoral concerns, and formed Christian discourse of therapeutic almsgiving.

The conclusion summarizes the results of the analysis conducted in previous chapters. On the basis of these results, this part suggests some implications in scholarship on Chrysostom, almsgiving, and his approach to ancient philosophy.

CHAPTER 1. PASSION AND THERAPEUTIC ALMSGIVING¹

Introduction

Recently, as noted above, a new direction in Chrysostom scholarship indicates that Chrysostom stood within a long trajectory of philosophical therapy, and medical concepts and therapeutic strategies permeate his corpus. Studies from this perspective show that the idea of the therapy of the soul is vital in understanding Chrysostom's thought. Despite the prevalence of *topoi* such as sickness, cure, and medicine in Chrysostom's works, however, scholarly works have paid little attention to his approach to almsgiving in relation to the cure of the soul.

This chapter closely investigates Chrysostom's view of curative almsgiving through the lens of the therapy of emotions in ancient philosophy. In our discussion, we first consider the question of a disease of the soul. In connection with this issue, we investigate Chrysostom's view of the nature of psychic sickness, focusing on his medical conceptualization of passions. Then, his remarks about the aetiology of psychic illness are addressed. After dealing with the nature of the sickness of the soul, we move to the examination of the role of almsgiving as a spiritual remedy. First, almsgiving is situated in behavioural therapy, and we explore some directions for almsgiving treatment. Then, we analyse what types of diseases almsgiving cures and how it heals them within the categories of both a reactive and preventive treatment.

1. Disease of the Soul

1. 1. Passion (πάθος) as the Disease of the Soul²

¹ An earlier version of this chapter will be published in *Augustinianum*. See Junghun Bae, "Almsgiving and the Therapy of the Soul in John Chrysostom's Homilies on Matthew," *Augustinianum* 58 (2018), forthcoming.

² Since therapeutic methods are principally based on symptoms, the symptoms of psychic illness will be addressed fully later.

Chrysostom identifies passions as the disease of the soul by employing the language of bodily disease. We see this approach to passions in ancient philosophers. Seneca states that avarice and ambition are caused by long-standing and hardened false judgements, and these vices are the sickness of the soul (*morbus animi*).³ Calling into question the existing social notion that the expression of anger contributes to the greatness of the soul, he also argues that anger is just a swelling (*tumor*) of the soul.⁴ Chrysostom refers to greed (φιλαργυρία), vainglory (κενοδοξία), and usury as the diseases (νόσημα) of the soul which seriously threaten spiritual health.⁵ Greed which causes spiritual blindness is also equivalent to an evil humour (πονηρὸς χυμός) that makes physical eyes blind.⁶ In addition to an evil humour, the desire of money (ἐπιθυμία χρημάτων) is compared with fever (πυρετός) as well. Those who suffer from this spiritual fever continually desire to acquire more wealth even though it aggravates the illness of the soul, like those who suffer a fever crave more cold water, knowing its negative impact on health.⁷

³ Sen. *Ep.* 75.11-12 (LCL 76:142-43).

⁴ Sen. *Ira* 1.20 (LCL 214:160-61). Plato and Cicero also considered passions and desires as spiritual diseases (Cook, "Preaching and Christianization," 120; and Knuuttila, *Emotions in Ancient and Medieval Philosophy*, 72).

⁵ Chrys. *Hom.* 20.2 and 4 *in Mt.* (PG 57:288.60-289.1 and 291.22-24); and *Hom.* 56.5 *in Mt.* (PG 58:556.27-29).

⁶ Chrys. *Hom.* 20.5 *in Mt.* (PG 57:293.9-11). Chrysostom accepted humoristic theory in ancient medicine. According to ancient medicine, bodily diseases originate from the imbalance of four humours (blood, yellow bile, phlegm, and black bile). Chrysostom's knowledge of medicine is much indebted to Galen, a doctor in the late second century C.E. (Blake Leyerle, "The Etiology of Sorrow and its Therapeutic Benefits in the Preaching of John Chrysostom," *JLA* 8 (2015): 369 and 371-73; and Mayer, "Madness in the Works of John Chrysostom," 354-55). For the other explanation of Chrysostom's acquaintance with medicine, Chris L. de Wet, "The Preacher's Diet: Gluttony, Regimen, and Psycho-Somatic Health in the Thought of John Chrysostom," in *Revisioning John Chrysostom*, forthcoming; Jessica Wright, "Brain, Nerves, and Ecclesial Membership in John Chrysostom," in *Revisioning John Chrysostom*, forthcoming; ead., "Between Despondency and the Demon," 352-67; ead., "Brain and Soul in Late Antiquity," 193-252; and ead., "John Chrysostom and the Rhetoric of Cerebral Vulnerability," *SP* 81 (2017): 109-26.

⁷ Chrys. *Hom.* 63.3 *in Mt.* (PG 58:606.47-55); and *Hom.* 51.6 *in Mt.* (PG 58:518.7-12). Wright, "Brain and Soul in Late Antiquity," 280-311, demonstrates that Augustine of Hippo (354-430 C.E.) criticizes his opponents, such as Donatists and Pelagians by using the chief pathological symptoms of phrenitis (brain fever) which is thought to be caused by swelling around the brain. As patients suffering from phrenitis do not

Pride (ὕπερηφανία) is called sickness (νόσος) and tumour (ὄγκος).⁸ Diagnosing the inner state of a man in power in *In Matthaëum hom.* 23, Chrysostom notes that while this man flaunts his splendid look with luxurious clothes and a great company of attendants, his soul is miserable: the soul swells like an inflated bladder (φύση σπωμένη) and is filled with plenty of dropsy (ὑδερρον) and inflammation (φλεγμονήν).⁹ Luxury (τρυφή), pleasure (ἡδονή), vanity (τῦφος), envy (φθόνος), anxiety (φροντίς) and fornication (πορνεία), rancour (μνησικακία) and anger (ὀργή) are also the sickness (νόσος) of the soul.¹⁰ Extortion (ἀρπαγή) is regarded as a serious sore (ἔλκος) of the soul.¹¹ In *In Matthaëum hom.* 41, we see a long list of vices described in terms of somatic illness. This list includes adultery (μοιχεία), secret plotting (λαθραίος ἐπιβουλή), false accusation (συκοφαντία), slander (κακηγορία), swearing oaths (ὄμνυμι), perjury (ἐπιορκία), enslavement to money (δουλεύω τῷ μαμωνᾷ), lust (ἀκόλαστος ὀφθαλμός), insolence (ὑβρις), and arrogance (ἀπόνουα). Chrysostom calls all these sins wounds (τραύματα), which seriously damage the soul.¹² What is noticeable on this list is that it contains a great deal of evil words, such as malicious slander and perjury that harm the reputation of others.

In addition to the terms of somatic diseases, Chrysostom describes sin as the psychic disease by using the language of mental illness as well. In their recent studies, Claire E. Salem and Mayer demonstrate that Chrysostom considered passions as madness (μανία).¹³ Similar approach is found in Greco-Roman philosophers. Cicero identifies

recognize their own illness, they stubbornly refuse the treatments of doctors and even offer violence. Augustine argues that heretics like the mentally ill, are ignorant of their spiritual state and reject the teachings of orthodox Christianity. According to Wright, “Physicians of Orthodoxy” (Annual Meeting of Society of Biblical Literature, San Antonio, TX, November 19-22, 2016), this psychiatric diagnosis of religious deviation reflects the tradition of philosophical therapy and was employed by earlier Christian writers such as Irenaeus of Lyons (130-c.202 C.E.) and Epiphanius of Salamis (c.310-403 C.E.) in their heresiological works.

⁸ Chrys. *Hom.* 89.3 in *Mt.* (PG 58:785.24-25); *Hom.* 16.4 in *Jo.* (PG 59:106.19-45); and *Hom.* 9.2 in *Jo.* (PG 59:72.45-55).

⁹ Chrys. *Hom.* 23.10 in *Mt.* (PG 57:320.11-24).

¹⁰ Chrys. *Hom.* 89.3-4 in *Mt.* (PG 58:785.1-788.20); and *Hom.* 19.5 in *Mt.* (PG 57:284.20-285.9).

¹¹ Chrys. *Hom.* 63.4 in *Mt.* (PG 58:608.3-13).

¹² Chrys. *Hom.* 41.4 in *Mt.* (PG 57:450.27-452.5).

¹³ Salem, “Sanity, Insanity, and Man’s Being,” 35-71; and Mayer, “Madness in the Works of John

passions as the agitated state of the soul, calling this state madness (*insania*). He argues that the wise should be free of this madness.¹⁴ Plutarch argues that drunkenness is culpable madness (μανία) that we should avoid.¹⁵ According to Chrysostom, a jealous person (βασκανία) suffers from insanity (μανία).¹⁶ Excessive luxury is also referred to as a serious madness of the soul.¹⁷ Criticizing those enslaved to their bellies, Chrysostom calls gluttony folly (ἄνοια).¹⁸ The images of slavery frequently appear in Chrysostom's discourse on psychological sickness and its healing.¹⁹ Spiritual diseases articulate the servitude of passions.

A person who seeks vainglory is similar to a raving lunatic (λύσσα/μανία). Vainglory is the most tyrannical passion of all because it destroys the benefit of good works such as fasting, prayer and almsgiving.²⁰ In *In Matthaeum hom.* 58, Chrysostom deals with the characteristics of an arrogant man (ἀπονενοημένος) who sees himself surpassing all and thinks it shameful to live with them. Chrysostom states that this man is

Chrysostom,” 356-57. For Chrysostom mental illnesses, such as madness (μανία), phrenitis (φρενίτις), and epilepsy (ἐπιληψία) are indistinguishable in a strict way. In general, madness seems to refer to all of these mental illnesses. According to a humorist theory in ancient medicine, clinical insanity (μανία) results from an excess of yellow or black bile (Salem, “Sanity, Insanity, and Man’s Being,” 12-15; and Mayer, “Madness in the Works of John Chrysostom,” 353-54, 362-63).

¹⁴ Cic. *Tusc.* 3.8-9 (LCL 141:232-34).

¹⁵ Plu. *Garr.* 503e (LCL 337:404-5).

¹⁶ Chrys. *Hom.* 40.3 in *Mt.* (PG 57:442.13-33). Chris L. de Wet, “John Chrysostom on Envy,” *SP* 47 (2010): 255-60, addresses Chrysostom’s views on envy, insisting that envy is a recurrent motif in Chrysostom’s works. Interestingly, Chrysostom states that the person who envies is incapable of attaining virtue since envy is so firmly rooted in the deep part of being that it is almost impossible to cure it.

¹⁷ Chrys. *Hom.* 49.5-6 in *Mt.* (PG 58:502.32-503.9); and *Hom.* 7.4-5 in *Col.* (PG 62:349.21-350.26).

¹⁸ Chrys. *Hom.* 13.5 in *Mt.* (PG 57:214.32-45). For the fuller treatments of gluttony in Chrysostom’s approach to somatic and psychic health, see De Wet, “The Preacher’s Diet,” forthcoming; and Shaw, *The Burden of the Flesh*, 131-38.

¹⁹ De Wet, *Preaching Bondage*, 64-80; and Mitchell, “Silver Chamber Pots and Other Goods,” 103-4. De Wet, *Preaching Bondage*, 70, argues that for Chrysostom the metaphor of spiritual slavery played an important role in perpetuating the institutional slavery. If a slave is free from his/her passions, the enslaved state is indifferent.

²⁰ Chrys. *Hom.* 19.1 in *Mt.* (PG 57:273.11-30 ab imo); and Roskam, “John Chrysostom on Pagan Euergetism,” 166-68.

in the state of derangement (μανία or παράνοια). He is like a person who believes that being three cubits (about 135cm), he/she is taller than the mountains.²¹ Pride (φύσημα) resulting from good works is also detrimental to the health of the soul. In *In Matthaeum hom.* 4, Chrysostom criticizes the arrogance of his congregation, pointing out that they minutely remember the least amount of their alms, flattering themselves because of their good works, but forgetting their great sins that are committed every day. He insists that this arrogance shows the most insane state (ἐσχάτη ἄνοια) of their souls.²²

Frequently comparing sinful persons with the mentally-ill and the possessed, Chrysostom maintains that moral insanity is worse than mental disease and demonic possession.²³ Recent studies commonly note that fundamental differences between moral insanity, and mental illness, and demonic possession are volition and culpability. The insane in the moral sense are blamed for their sin due to the volitional nature of their wicked works, while the mentally ill and the possessed are not responsible for their behaviour, since their deeds are involuntary.²⁴ In this comparison, Chrysostom clearly maintains that passions are voluntary madness. According to *In Matthaeum hom.* 18, the enraged (θυμούμενοι) are more wretched than the possessed because their anger is a volitional frenzy (παραπληξία).²⁵ Comparing a man living in luxury to the possessed, he claims that since the sin of luxury is a self-chosen madness (αὐθαίρετον μανίαν), this sinful man is the object of our aversion, but we should pity the possessed.²⁶ In a comparison between a covetous man (φιλάργυρος) and a mad person, Chrysostom insists that the madness (μανία) of greed is much worse than the mental illness of the mad person.

²¹ Chrys. *Hom.* 58.3 in *Mt.* (PG 58:570.9-19).

²² Chrys. *Hom.* 3.5 in *Mt.* (PG 57:37.9-20).

²³ Analysing the wide range of usage of μανία in Chrysostom's homilies on Matthew, Salem, "Sanity Insanity, and Man's Being," 7-71, maintains sin, mental illness and demonic possession are understood as madness (μανία) in Chrysostom's thought. However, Mayer, "Madness in the Works of John Chrysostom, 358-61," insists that demon possession and mental illness are distinguished in late antique medicine, and Chrysostom also rejected the demonic aetiology of madness.

²⁴ Salem, "Sanity Insanity, and Man's Being," 17-18 and 67; Mayer, "Madness in the Works of John Chrysostom," 356-57; and Wright, "Brain and Soul in Late Antiquity," 257-66.

²⁵ Chrys. *Hom.* 18.4 in *Mt.* (PG 57:270.23-31).

²⁶ Chrys. *Hom.* 57.4 in *Mt.* (PG 58:564.10-13). The Stoics also argued that the pursuit of wealth is foolish (Mitchell, "Silver Chamber Pots and Other Goods," 103).

Although the person who suffers from mental illness often injures himself with a sword, this is not serious as he is able to be cured.²⁷ Here, this sermon does not explain how this mental patient is treated. The disease may be episodic or he may recover to a normal state due to medical intervention.²⁸ On the other hand, the covetous man cannot be freed from the madness of greed. Rather, wealth aggravates his illness by inflicting numberless wounds on the soul.²⁹ Judas represents this case. According to Chrysostom, the madness of the greed of Judas is more serious than the madness of the mentally ill and the possessed, and finally greed devastates both his body and soul.³⁰

1. 2. Psychological Aetiology

In *In Matthaeum hom.* 20, Chrysostom analyses pathologically greed. In the exegesis of Matthew 6:22-23,³¹ he presents the aetiology of the sickness of the soul, emphasizing the role of the mind or rational faculty (νοῦς/διάνοια/λογισμός). Before moving forward with our analysis, we need to explore Chrysostom's anthropology. There has been debate on what psychic faculty is the most essential in his anthropology. Laird challenges the previous view regarding choice/will (προαίρεσις) as the locus of moral responsibility, insisting that for Chrysostom mindset (γνώμη) is the ruling power of the soul which controls attitudes, desire, will, and choice, and is responsible for sin.³² He traces Chrysostom's emphasis on the centrality of mindset, demonstrating that it reflects

²⁷ Chrys. *Hom.* 51.6 in *Mt.* (PG 58:518.12-21).

²⁸ Mayer, "Madness in the Works of John Chrysostom," 359 and 363.

²⁹ Chrys. *Hom.* 51.6 in *Mt.* (PG 58:518.21-26); and Salem, "Sanity, Insanity, and Man's Being," 13.

³⁰ Chrys. *Hom.* 81.3 in *Mt.* (PG 58:734.29-19).

³¹ Matt 6:22-23 states that "22. The eye is the lamp of the body. If your eyes are healthy, your whole body will be full of light. 23. But if your eyes are unhealthy, your whole body will be full of darkness. If then the light within you is darkness, how great is that darkness!" (NIV is used in this thesis unless noted otherwise).

³² Laird, *Mindset, Moral Choice and Sin*, 26-51 and 221-56. He mainly criticizes Edward Nowak, *Le chrétien devant la souffrance; étude sur la pensée de Jean Chrysostome*, Théologie Historique 19 (Paris: Beauchesne, 1972); Christopher A. Hall, "John Chrysostom's *On Providence*: A Translation and Theological Interpretation" (PhD diss., Drew University, 1991); and Demetrius Trakatellis, "Being Transformed: Chrysostom's Exegesis of the Epistle to the Romans," *GOTR* 36 (1991): 211-29. The centrality of the mindset in Chrysostom's therapy of the soul is also advocated by Vanveller, "Paul's Therapy of the Soul," 136-59.

the Greco-Roman intellectual tradition from Thucydides, Aristotle, and Demosthenes to Libanius.³³ Recently, Samantha Miller takes a central position, suggesting that Chrysostom synonymously mobilizes προαίρεσις and γνώμη. Even though it is stated that mindset underlies the exercise of free will, these two are closely linked. She points out that this is also found in Demosthenes, Aristotle, and Gregory of Nyssa.³⁴

Laird's work adds important nuance to our understanding of Chrysostom's anthropology, but it does not alter my argument here. Even if the γνώμη is the source of the προαίρεσις, they together serve as the locus of moral responsibility, for if προαίρεσις is the expression of the γνώμη, they are still bound together. . . . Functionally, Chrysostom uses προαίρεσις and γνώμη more or less synonymously. It does not appear that he has any system for using one over the other, and often in his homilies he uses both together as synonyms.³⁵

We take Miller's thesis a step further, asserting that although Chrysostom emphasizes a specific faculty of the soul according to circumstances, νοῦς, προαίρεσις, and γνώμη are generally equal in importance. First, we note that, as will be mentioned later, centrality of reason in the health of the soul is frequently explored in his homilies. In *In Johannem hom. 3*, Chrysostom encourages those who are in despair to come to the church as a place of healing and to listen to the law of God and to engrave it in their mind (διάνοια).³⁶ He states that the soul that is strengthened by the repetitive meditation of Chrysostom's preaching will not be attacked by the devil and always will enjoy peace and joy. It is stressed that overcoming despair ultimately depends on the mind.³⁷ More

³³ Laird, *Mindset, Moral Choice and Sin*, 135-91.

³⁴ Miller, "No Sympathy for the Devil," 169-82.

³⁵ Miller, "No Sympathy for the Devil," 176 and 178.

³⁶ Chrys. *Hom. 3.1-2 in Jo.* (PG 59:38.28-32). For the extensive studies on Chrysostom's view of sorrow/depression, see Volp, "That Unclean Spirit Has Assaulted You," 273-86; Leyerle, "The Etiology of Sorrow," 368-85; Wright, "Between Despondency and the Demon," 352-67; Andrew Mellas, "Tears of Compunction in John Chrysostom's *On Eutropius*," *SP* 83 (2017): 159-72; Jesse S. Arlen, "'Let Us Mourn Continuously': John Chrysostom and the Early Christian Transformation of Mourning," *SP* 83 (2017): 289-312; and Margaret B. Freddoso, "The Value of Job's Grief in John Chrysostom's Commentary on Job: How John Blesses with Job's Tears," *SP* 83 (2017): 271-88.

³⁷ Chrys. *Hom. 3.1-2 in Jo.* (PG 59:38.9-31 ab imo). In Chrysostom's demonology, νοῦς is also a key term in

importantly, for Chrysostom νοῦς, προαίρεσις, and γνώμη are treated as synonymous. In *In Matthaëum hom.* 19, he interprets Matthew 6:1 (“Be careful not to practice your righteousness in front of others to be seen by them. If you do, you will have no reward from your father in heaven”), stating that what Christ forbids here is not concerned with an outward act, but with an inner disposition. That is because nobody can always give alms secretly. Speaking of intention or mind in relation to charity, Chrysostom interchangeably uses these three words:

It is not merely an action, but intent (γνώμην) that he both punishes and rewards. Unless such exactness (ἀκρίβεια) was employed, this would make many more backward about the giving of alms, because it is not on every occasion altogether possible to do it secretly. For this reason, setting you free from this restraint, he defines both penalty and reward not by the result of the action, but by the intention (προαίρεσι) of the doer. In order for you not to say, “What happen to me, should others see?,” he says, “I am not seeking this, but your mind (διάνουαν) and disposition (τρόπον) of the action.” For his will is to shape our soul and to deliver it from all diseases.³⁸

Returning to our exploration of *In Matthaëum hom.* 20, Christ, Chrysostom maintains, describes the sickness of the soul according to the level of his disciples (συγκατάβασις), equating what the mind is to the soul with what eyes are to the body. As they cannot understand the invisible spiritual truth, Christ helps them toward its easy comprehension by presenting a phenomenon in the physical world.³⁹ Here, he is depicted

addition to προαίρεσις, cf. Miller, “No Sympathy for the Devil,” 170.

³⁸ Chrys. *Hom.* 19.1 in *Mt.* (PG 57:274.8-20 ab imo; NPNF 1.10, 131, modified). For Chrysostom precision (ἀκρίβεια) is a vital characteristic of the nature of Scripture. He believed that since God as the divine author of the Bible is precise, its teachings are accurate, clear, and intentional. This theological principle led Chrysostom to highlight that the interpreters of the Bible should pay close attention to its details, even to particles (Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*, 113-15). See also Robert C. Hill, “Akribeia: A Principle of Chrysostom’s Exegesis,” *Colloquium* 14 (1981): 32-36.

³⁹ Chrys. *Hom.* 20.3 in *Mt.* (PG 57:290.23-31 and 50-58). “Since this was too high for the mind (διανοίας) of his hearers, and neither was the damage of the mind within easy view of the generality, nor the gain evident, but there was need of a spirit (γνώμης) of more self-command to understand each of these; first, he has put it after those other topics, which are obvious, saying, ‘Where a person’s treasure is, there is his/her heart also

as an ancient psychagogue employing the skill of teaching invisible reality through visible things, which was a key method of philosophers for the guidance of the soul.⁴⁰

Interpreting these passages, Chrysostom insists that just as when eyes are blinded, most parts of the body lose their function, so when the mind is corrupted, the soul suffers huge damage:

Just as when the eyes are blinded, the bulk of the function of the rest of the parts goes away, and their light is quenched, so when the mind (δῆλον) is corrupted, your life will be filled with countless evils. . . . For just as he who destroys the spring dries up the river too, so he who has marred his mind (νοῦν) confounds all his doings in this life. Therefore, he says, “If then the light within you is darkness, how great is that darkness (Matt 6.23)?” . . . If you set your treasure near you, corrupting your mind (νοῦν) which can weaken your passions (πάθη), you not only benefit nothing, but also inflict the greatest damage on your whole soul and disable it.⁴¹

(Matt 6:21),’ and next he makes it clearer again, by leading his discourse from the intellectual to the sensible, and saying, ‘The light of the body is the eye (Matt 6:22).’ . . . He leads his discourse to the things which are more within the reach of our senses. Since he had spoken of the mind (νοῦν) as enslaved and brought into captivity, and there were not many who could easily discern this, he transfers his teaching to external things, lying before men’s eyes, so that from these people also might understand his teaching. ‘If you do not know,’ says he, ‘what a thing it is to be injured in mind (νοῦν), learn it from the things of the body; for as what the eye is to the body, the same is the mind (νοῦν) to the soul’” (NPNF 1.10, 143, modified).

⁴⁰ Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*, 55-75.

⁴¹ Chrys. *Hom. 20.3-4 in Mt.* (PG 57:291.3-6, 10-13, and 40-43; NPNF 1.10, 143-44, modified). Idleness is one of the main reasons for weakness of the mind (Panayiotis Papageorgiou, “A Theological Analysis of Selected Themes in the Homilies of St. John Chrysostom on the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans” PhD diss., The Catholic University of America, 1995, 53; and Cook, “Preaching and Christianization,” 132-33). According to Chrysostom, *Hom. 80.3 in Mt.* (PG 58:728.5-14), the illness of greed is not natural in that natural things are common to all. Chrysostom notes that the greedy do not regard other people and even themselves, and their attention is directed only to money, which is contrary to humanity. He argues that the desire originates from laziness (ῥαθυμία). Chrysostom, *Hom. 88.4 in Mt.* (PG 58:779.50-780.6), also maintains that his congregation loses a spiritual battle due to their remissness (ὀλιγοψία).

For Chrysostom a psychological disease is born out of the loss of control of the mind over passions: the cause of our trouble lies in the weakness of the mind, not external things. He claims:

It is not the nature of things that causes disturbance to rise within us, but the weakness of our mind (δυναμία). If the cause of our trouble lies in the things that happen to us, all people must be disturbed by them.⁴²

As Gill points out, the diagnosis of internal disorder as a major reason for psychic illness was a hallmark feature of philosophical therapy.⁴³ Moral philosophers commonly argued that false beliefs, which are caused by the malfunction of reason, lead to the sickness of the soul.⁴⁴ In Chrysostom's anthropology, the mind not only leads us to remove ignorance and to make right judgement, but also keeps down wicked desires. The very mind is the weapon of the soul for psychic health.⁴⁵ If, however, the mind is weakened, it cannot take control of passions, which causes psychic tranquillity to break. The corrupted mind damages other faculties of the soul, such as mindset (γνώμη), judgement (κρισιεῖς), and choice (προαίρεσις).⁴⁶

As Constantine Bosinis demonstrates, Chrysostom often explains this aetiology of psychic disease by using the Platonic metaphor of the chariot of the soul, which appears in Plato's *Phaedrus*.⁴⁷ Here, Plato's psychological anatomy is presented: he divides the soul

⁴² Chrys. *Hom.* 3.2 in *Jo.* (PG 59:38.9-12 ab imo). Translation from *Commentary on Saint John the Apostle and Evangelist: Homilies 1-47*, trans. Thomas A. Goggin, FC 33 (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1956), 30 (modified).

⁴³ Gill, "Philosophical Therapy," 348-51.

⁴⁴ Antigone Samellas, *Death in the Eastern Mediterranean (50-600 A.D): The Christianization of the East: An Interpretation*, Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 12 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002), 93-108. The same point is made by many scholars: Hadot, *Philosophy as a Way of Life*, 82-125; Nussbaum, *The Therapy of Desire*; Sorabji, *Emotion and Peace of Mind*, 17-340; Knuuttila, *Emotions in Ancient and Medieval Philosophy*, 5-110; John T. Fitzgerald, eds., *Passions and Moral Progress*, 27-198; and Cook, "Preaching and Christianization," 117-26.

⁴⁵ Chrys. *Hom.* 20.4 in *Mt.* (PG 57:291.27-31).

⁴⁶ Laird, *Mindset, Moral Choice and Sin*, 250-51.

⁴⁷ Constantine Bosinis, "Two Platonic Images in the Rhetoric of John Chrysostom: 'The Wings of Love' and

into three parts, such as the rational (νοῦς), spirited (θυμός), and appetitive (ἐπιθυμία).⁴⁸ The rational, spirited, and appetitive parts are related mainly to rational faculty, emotional responses, and essential biological instincts respectively.⁴⁹ Plato likens the whole soul to a chariot, reason to a charioteer, and the rest of the parts to the two horses, arguing that reason as the charioteer should hold fast the reins of the other two parts as horses. In particular, the horse of the appetitive part is problematic. Unlike the other horse which is beautiful and obedient to the driver, it is ugly and stubborn. Plato maintains that since it is quite rebellious, the driver should hold fast its rein to such an extent as to drench its jaw with blood to tame it.⁵⁰ This indicates that for Plato, the health of the soul depends ultimately on the control of desires. Appropriating this Platonic metaphor, Chrysostom also argued for the control of the other two parts of the soul by the rational part. If the rational part controls both the spirited and appetitive parts, the soul is healthy. If, however, these two parts are not controlled by the mind (passions are out of control), the soul is diseased.⁵¹ In this sense, the physiological imbalance of the soul brings about psychic diseases.⁵² Severely criticizing those going to hippodromes, Chrysostom diagnoses this imbalance of their sick souls as follows:

If you wanted to see the race of animals, why didn't you yoke the irrational passions within you, temper (θυμόν) and desire (ἐπιθυμίαν), and put on them the yoke of philosophy which is useful and light, and set over them right reason (λογισμόν)?⁵³

⁴⁸ 'The Charioteer of the Soul,' *SP* 41 (2006): 436-38.

⁴⁸ Pl. *Phdr.* 246a.8-b.4 (LCL 36:470-71).

⁴⁹ Bosinis, "Two Platonic Images," 436.

⁵⁰ Pl. *Phdr.* 253d.1-254d.10 (LCL 36:494-97)

⁵¹ Chrys. *Hom.* 17.3 in *Eph.* (PG 62:120.41-122.2); and *Theatr.* 1.1 (PG 56:264.18-265.28). Bosinis, "Two Platonic Images," 436-37, maintains that Chrysostom transformed this Platonic metaphor by presenting the work of the Holy Spirit for the control of the spirited and appetitive parts. The Spirit is ultimately responsible for psychic health.

⁵² Ferngren, *Medicine and Health Care*, 29; and Mayer, "Madness in the Works of John Chrysostom," 354-55.

⁵³ Chrys. *Theatr.* 1.1 (PG 56:265.23-26), Translation from *John Chrysostom*, trans. Wendy Mayer and Pauline Allen, *The Early Church Fathers* (New York: Routledge, 2000), 120 (modified). In *epistulam ad Ephesios Hom.* 17, which deals with the control of anger, ends as follows: "Training these two faculties of

Chrysostom maintains that the mind plays a leading role in maintaining the healthy state of the soul. *In Johannem hom. 3* elaborates this point by employing the metaphor of sailing. According to Chrysostom, we all sail the same sea where waves and storms always happen. It is impossible to avoid all the waves and storms, but if we are detached from them with a strong mind, they cannot disturb the soul. The healthy mind causes us to remain in tranquillity (γαλήνη) regardless of the joys and sorrows of life.⁵⁴ The Stoics and Galen argued that happiness is determined only by virtue, not external conditions, such as wealth, honour, and health. Galen gives an account of his experience of loss, claiming that as he had this mindset, he was able to keep his mind calm despite the huge loss of his wealth.⁵⁵ Comparing the mind with the general and the pilot, Chrysostom insists that if the general is captured, even a mighty army cannot win the war, and if the pilot is dead while underway, any well-equipped ship is useless.⁵⁶ As a result, he urges his congregation to take care diligently of their minds for their mental health: “just as therefore we aim at this in the body, namely, to keep eyes sound, so we keep the mind (νοῦν) sound in the soul.”⁵⁷

1. 3. Is medical language merely metaphorical?

Anne Merideth and Gary B. Ferngren maintain that medical language found in the works of early Christian writers is metaphorical: the language of sickness and healing was a rhetorical device for readers or hearers to easily understand the invisible concepts in relation to moral and religious deviance and correction. According to early Christian authors, sin is psychic illness, and Jesus (*Christus medicus*) is the great physician. A priest and his tasks are also described in medical terms.⁵⁸ After dealing with the notion of

the soul, that is, desire (ἐπιθυμίαν) and temper (θυμόν) and putting them like well-broken horses under the yoke of reason (λογισμῶ), let us set over them the mind (νοῦν) as charioteer” (Chrys. *Hom. 17.3 in Eph.* [PG 62:120.52-55]; NPNF 1.13, 132, modified).

⁵⁴ Chrys. *Hom. 3.2 in Jo.* (PG 59:38.12-1 ab imo).

⁵⁵ Sophia Xenophontos, “Psychotherapy and Moralising Rhetoric in Galen’s Newly Discovered *Avoiding Distress (Peri Alypias)*,” *Medical History* 58 (2014): 588-96.

⁵⁶ Chrys. *Hom. 20.3 in Mt.* (PG 57:291.13-16).

⁵⁷ Chrys. *Hom. 20.3 in Mt.* (PG 57:291.6-8).

⁵⁸ Merideth, “Illness and Healing,” 153-70; and Ferngren, *Medicine and Health Care*, 29-31.

Christus medicus in early Christianity, Ferngeren concludes that “it is primarily in its metaphorical sense, and rarely in its literal meaning.”⁵⁹

Even though it is hard to deny completely the possibility of the figurative use of medical language in some cases, the analogy between medicine and Christianity employed by Chrysostom is primarily more than metaphorical.⁶⁰ This needs to be closely explored in his historical-intellectual-cultural background. First, ancient philosophy as a way of life was essentially therapeutic, and the medical function was the fundamental ground for assessing the essence of philosophy. As a result, each of the Hellenistic schools competitively developed their methods of healing, arguing for their supremacy.⁶¹ Chrysostom also engaged in this contest of philosophical therapy by presenting Christianity as the superior way of life.⁶² If medical language were merely metaphorical in this situation, the rhetorical power of the preacher would have been dramatically reduced. That is because his preaching would be considered simply a flowery speech, which was not relevant to the daily life of his congregation.

In addition, the integration of philosophy and medicine in ancient times supports the literal use of medical concepts. Philip J. van der Eijk demonstrates that the exact boundary between these two disciplines was obscure in the Greco-Roman world.⁶³ For example, a physician like Galen treated the soul and its passions. This ambiguity presupposes the interrelationship between the body and soul in both ancient medicine and

⁵⁹ Ferngren, *Medicine and Health Care*, 30. For a similar approach, see Dörnemann, “Einer ist Arzt, Christus,” 102-24; id., *Krankheit und Heilung*, 80-280; and Emmenegger, *Wie die Jungfrau zum Kind kam*, 42-65.

⁶⁰ This position is also presented by following scholars: Wright, “Between Despondency and the Demon,” 366; De Wet, “Grumpy Old Men?” 516; Kristi Upson-Saia, “Wounded by Divine Love,” in *Melania: Early Christianity through the Life of One Family*, ed. Catherine M. Chin and Caroline T. Schroeder, Christianity in Late Antiquity 2 (Oakland, CA: University of California Press, 2016), 87-89; and Mayer, “John Chrysostom: Moral Philosopher,” 214.

⁶¹ Hadot, *Philosophy as a Way of Life*, 82-125; Nussbaum, *The Therapy of Desire*; Sorabji, *Emotion and Peace of Mind*, 17-340; Knuuttila, *Emotions in Ancient and Medieval Philosophy*, 5-110; John T. Fitzgerald, eds., *Passions and Moral Progress*, 27-198; and Gill, “Philosophical Therapy,” 339-60.

⁶² Malingrey, *Philosophia*, 270-86; Quantin, “A propos de la traduction de ‘philosophia,’” 187-97; Schatkin, *John Chrysostom as Apologist*, 230-72; and Stenger, “Where to Find Christian Philosophy?” 173-98.

⁶³ Philip J. van der Eijk, *Medicine and Philosophy in Classical Antiquity: Doctors and Philosophers on Nature, Soul, Health and Disease* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 1-42.

philosophy. Brooke Holmes argues that the idea that a somatic disorder might have a negative impact on psychic functions was prominent in Greek medicine in the later fifth century B.C.E, and the language of sympathy between the body and the soul gained a technical sense in the Hellenistic period.⁶⁴ According to L. Michael White, the Stoics argued for the corporeality of the soul and the close interconnectedness between the soul and body. Most philosophers in the line of medico-moral philosophy adopted this essentially Stoic anthropology.⁶⁵ It is noted that this phenomenon continued in the late antiquity.⁶⁶ Mayer indicates that both late antique philosophers and physicians used the common language of “moderation or self-control (σωφροσύνη, ἐγκράτεια), balance (μέτρια) and intemperance or imbalance (ἀκρασία, ἀμέτρια).”⁶⁷ Given this concept of the sympathetic relationship between the body and soul, it can be argued that for ancients somatic illness was regarded as psychic disease and vice versa. Recent studies show that Chrysostom also adopted this sympathetic approach in the Greco-Roman medico-philosophical tradition, which signifies that medical metaphor found in his corpus refers to “a genuine naturalistic illness.”⁶⁸

2. Almsgiving as a Spiritual Remedy

We have demonstrated that for Chrysostom passions are the diseases of the soul. They are described in the medical terms of both somatic and psychic sickness. Speaking of the unsatisfying appetite of desire, Chrysostom argues that while a lion stops eating when

⁶⁴ Brooke Holmes, “Disturbing Connections: Sympathetic Affections, Mental Disorder, and the Elusive Soul in Galen,” in *Mental Disorders in the Classical World*, ed. William V. Harris, Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition 38 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 151-55.

⁶⁵ White, “Moral Pathology,” 292.

⁶⁶ Elm, *Sons of Hellenism*, 172-73; and Mayer, “Medicine in Transition,” 12-14.

⁶⁷ Mayer, “Medicine in Transition,” 14.

⁶⁸ Mayer, “Medicine in Transition,” 12; ead., “Madness in the Works of John Chrysostom,” 351-56; Neureiter, “Health and Healing as Recurrent Topics,” 267-72; Leyerle, “The Etiology of Sorrow,” 372-73 n. 21; De Wet, “The Preacher’s Diet,” forthcoming; Wright, “Brain and Soul in Late Antiquity,” 193-252; ead., “the Rhetoric of Cerebral Vulnerability,” 109-26; and ead., “Brain, Nerves, and Ecclesial Membership,” forthcoming. See also n. 63 above.

it is full, sin is never satisfied until the soul is destroyed.⁶⁹ Then, how do we cure passions? Chrysostom's answer is almsgiving (ἐλεημοσύνη). Assistance to the poor is presented as a psychic remedy (θεραπεία/φάρμακον) for curing the sick soul.⁷⁰ Chrysostom states that almsgiving is “the foundation of health, the abundance of light and the origin of joyfulness (Καὶ γὰρ ὑγιείας ἐστὶν ὑπόθεσις, καὶ φωτὸς χορηγία, καὶ φαιδρότητος ἀφορμή).”⁷¹

2. 1. Medical Expenses: Definition of Almsgiving

In Matthaeum hom. 74 explores the psychological sickness of the wealthy, referring to the treatment cost of almsgiving. Chrysostom laments their indifference to the souls. He states that when their slaves are ill with fever, they diligently care for them: they instantly call a doctor and set up a separate room for their recovery and appoint even a watchperson to make sure that their slaves follow the instructions of the doctor. To heal the sickness of their slaves, the rich accept all the demands of the physician and spare no expense.⁷² With these remarks, it seems that those addressed possess considerable wealth. In late antiquity, the uppermost class hired skilled private doctors and provided all the medical equipment in their palaces.⁷³ The household was a chief source of health care, but slaves were often left at the Tiber Island in Rome when they were too old or too sick.⁷⁴ However, Chrysostom insists that masters should be responsible for both the psychic and somatic health of their slaves.⁷⁵ According to Chrysostom in this homily, the wealthy neglect their own souls, which suffer from the fever (πυρετός) of greed though their souls are much more valuable than the bodies of their slaves. They treat their souls as if they do robbers or enemies. Chrysostom notes that if they paid attentions to their souls at least as

⁶⁹ Chrys. *Hom.* 4.9 in *Mt.* (PG 57:50.42-55).

⁷⁰ Chrys. *Hom.* 63.4 in *Mt.* (PG 58:608.3); and *Hom.* 41.4 in *Mt.* (PG 57:451.7).

⁷¹ Chrys. *Hom.* 64.5 in *Mt.* (PG 58:615.48-49).

⁷² Chrys. *Hom.* 74.3-4 in *Mt.* (PG 58:683.41-684.15).

⁷³ Miller, *The Birth of the Hospital*, 149.

⁷⁴ Ferngren, *Medicine and Health Care*, 132.

⁷⁵ De Wet, *Preaching Bondage*, 78.

much as the bodies of their slaves, their souls would have been well. He urges them to send for physicians and to spend money for curing their psychic sickness.⁷⁶

The doctors whose help rich people should seek are the authors of the Scripture. Presenting the authors as the doctors of the soul, Chrysostom encourages the patients to take their prescriptions. What is particularly noteworthy here is that he mentions the cost of spiritual medical practice. Unlike the doctors of the body, the doctors of the soul do not receive healthcare cost except for almsgiving:

Someone says, “How should we do?” Show your soul to Paul when it is ill; call in Matthew; let John sit beside you. Listen to what we ought to do from them as your soul is ill, they will surely tell and will not conceal. For they are not dead, but live and speak. However, does the soul take no heed to them, being weighed down by the fever? Compel it and awaken its reasoning power. Call in prophets. We do not need to pay money (χρήματα) to these physicians; neither do they demand hire (μισθόν) for themselves, nor for the medicines (φαρμάκων) which they prepare and drive you to the necessity of expense (δαπάνης), except for almsgiving (ἐλεημοσύνης).⁷⁷

Only charity is charged. In this sermon, a specific amount of therapeutic almsgiving is not given, but we can infer this in relation to the definition of almsgiving. Since Chrysostom’s discourse on almsgiving is largely located within soteriology (the healing of the soul), this inference is legitimate.⁷⁸ In ancient times, the survival of the family was sometimes threatened by excessive medical expenditure.⁷⁹ Then, how much did psychic-therapeutic almsgiving cost? For Chrysostom, a word associated with charity is ἐλεημοσύνη, which means benevolent emotion for those in distress (pity and mercy) and the specific actions from this mindset (charity, alms, and almsgiving).⁸⁰ The lexical

⁷⁶ Chrys. *Hom.* 74.3-4 in *Mt.* (PG 58:683.41-684.15).

⁷⁷ Chrys. *Hom.* 74.4 in *Mt.* (PG 58:684.15-26; NPNF 1.10, 448, modified).

⁷⁸ Philosophy and theology were integrated in Chrysostom’s mind. His approach to the interrelationship between philosophical therapy and redemptive almsgiving will be fully investigated in chapter 3.

⁷⁹ Ferngren, *Medicine and Health Care*, 132.

⁸⁰ *LSJ*, 531; *PGL*, 447-48; Plassmann, *Das Almosen*, 9-10; Brändle, “This Sweetest Passage,” 131; and Costanzo, *Harbor for the Poor*, 12. For the detailed examination of Chrysostom’s theology of ἐλεημοσύνη, see Thomas R. Karmann, “Barmherzigkeit als Thema spätantiker Großstadtpastoral: Eine Spurensuche im

meanings of ἐλεημοσύνη provide basic clues to grasp Chrysostom's understanding of almsgiving, but what is more important is its contextual meaning. In his sermons, we hardly find his own definition of this word. Instead, the indirect mention of the types of charity is represented in a part of moral exhortation in a homily that promotes almsgiving. As a result, we need to pay attention to the context in his homilies. Almsgiving is generally defined as financial or material help for the poor, but for Chrysostom it has a more comprehensive meaning, including all behaviours that derive from a pitiful mind toward one's neighbours, especially the poor and marginalized. Brändle correctly pointed this out:

Ἐλεημοσύνη includes far more for John than alms. For him it is a behaviour of loving openness to fellow humans and can be expressed in varying acts of compassion. It may include the kind word just as much as material help.⁸¹

Chrysostom's repeated list of charity is as follows: word, food, water, clothing, money, hospitality, and visiting the sick people and prisoners.⁸² Tears and sighs for those who are badly treated are often represented as charity.⁸³ In fact, Chrysostom refers to all emotional and material responses to those in distress as almsgiving.⁸⁴ As pointed

oeuvre des Johannes Chrysostomus," *ZKTh* 138 (2016): 348-67. In addition, for a broader context of Christian discourse on mercy/compassion, see Demetrios J. Constantelos, "The Hellenic Background and Nature of Patristic Philanthropy in the Early Byzantine Era," in *Wealth and Poverty in Early Church*, 187-208; and Susan Wessel, *Passion and Compassion in Early Christianity* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2016), 1-15.

⁸¹ Brändle, "This Sweetest Passage," 131.

⁸² Chrys. *Hom.* 45.2-3 *in Mt.* (PG 58:473.57-475.13); *Hom.* 79.1 *in Mt.* (PG 58:717.3 ab imo-718.9 ab imo); *Hom.* 59.4 *in Jo.* (PG 59:327.34-328.37); and Costanzo, *Harbor for the Poor*, 16-17. In late antiquity, the provision of health care functioned as a main charitable activity of monasticism and church (Crislip, *From Monastery to Hospital*, 39-67).

⁸³ Chrys. *Hom.* 15.10 *in Mt.* (PG 57:15-24). Chrysostom states that "if we see someone who is badly treated and beaten in the market-place, if we can pay down money, let us do that: or if we may separate them by words, let us not hesitate. For there is a reward even for a word even a word, and there is a great reward for sighs. The blessed Job said this; 'I wept for every helpless one, and I sighed when I saw a person in distress (Job 30:25).' If there be a reward for tears and sighs, when words, effort, and many other things besides are added, consider how great the recompense becomes." (NPNF 1.10, 100-1, modified).

⁸⁴ The same point is also made by Costanzo, *Harbor for the Poor*, 16-17, who argues that "at the turn of the

elsewhere, Matthew 25:31-46 plays a crucial role in the formation of this list.⁸⁵ This passage is a parable that delineates the final judgement, and Jesus tells those chosen the reason for their salvation:

For I was hungry and you gave me something to eat, I was thirsty and you gave me something to drink, I was a stranger and you invited me in, I needed clothes and you clothed me, I was sick and you looked after me, I was in prison and you came to visit me (Matt 25:35-36).

In particular, Chrysostom emphasizes the importance of words, arguing that we can give alms with words (ἔστι γὰρ καὶ διὰ ῥημάτων ἐλεημοσύνην ποιεῖν).⁸⁶ The words of meekness, humility, and blessing are viewed as almsgiving.⁸⁷ According to Chrysostom, praise, support, encouragement, and comfort are also characteristics of Christ's tongue. Christians imitate Christ by speaking gently and kindly. Chrysostom maintains that even if we are humiliated, we should warmly advise people for their edification. A mild word is far more valuable than gold and precious stones.⁸⁸ Consequently, Chrysostom urges his audience, especially the rich, to comfort the poor with gentle words, rather than reject them as the poor approach them. It is argued that these words and actions can heal the depressed mind of the poor.⁸⁹ The poor, who have no ability to pay back, were often judged as a group threatening the social order and were not recognized as the recipients of merciful giving in Chrysostom's times when belief on limited goods was dominant.⁹⁰ Chrysostom

fifth century, John Chrysostom and Augustine represented the most comprehensive writing on the subject. Both viewed almsgiving as more than just the redistribution or appropriation of material wealth. On the contrary, both taught almsgiving was best understood as a collective term encompassing the provision of material goods and resources, physical or emotional care, spiritual guidance or other general forms of help for those in need.”

⁸⁵ Brändle, “This Sweetest Passage,” 136; and id., *Matthäus 25:31-46 im Werk des Johannes Chrysostomus*, 284-342.

⁸⁶ Chrys. *Hom. 51.5 in Mt.* (PG 58:517.5-6).

⁸⁷ Chrys. *Hom. 51.5 in Mt.* (PG 58:516.55-517.7).

⁸⁸ Chrys. *Hom. 78.3 in Mt.* (PG 58:715.3-716.5).

⁸⁹ Chrys. *Hom. 35.5 in Mt.* (PG 57:412.20-58).

⁹⁰ Mayer, “Poverty and Generosity,” 140-48; and Sitzler, “Deviance and Destitution,” 261-66. For the fuller

also states that people who are reluctant to visit prison because of poverty need only a mouth to encourage and comfort prisoners.⁹¹

The inclusive nature of almsgiving is closely related to the varying circumstances and abilities of the givers. Chrysostom urges his congregation to help the poor according to their own situation. He comments on the parable of talents (Matthew 25:14-30) in *In Matthaem hom.* 78, claiming that talents signify individual abilities and gifts. These gifts are individually diverse, encompassing words, teaching, protection, wealth, and so on. According to Chrysostom, God gave us mouths, hands, feet, strength, intellect, and understanding, all of which should be ultimately used for the benefit of our neighbours.⁹² All talents are the same in value, and importantly, they need to be used for the common good. The concept of common good, as Ritter rightly remarks, was vital in shaping Chrysostom's attitude to almsgiving.⁹³

In this regard, Chrysostom insists that the poor cannot be excluded from the duty of giving alms. In his exegesis of Matthew 10:40-42, he focuses on the fact that Christ prepared various kinds of rewards for the givers, and there is a reward for a cup of cold water, noting that the poor should also be merciful givers. That is because even if impoverished, they could afford to give a cup of cold water.⁹⁴ Here, we need to deliberately consider the use of Chrysostom's term for the poor. It has been argued that for him the identity of the poor is quite ambiguous. In some cases, he names as poor those who have a certain amount of wealth, but are in relative poverty.⁹⁵ It is also unclear whether those in absolute poverty constituted Chrysostom's congregation.⁹⁶ When, however, we take into account Chrysostom's exhortation that a basic emotional response and the

exploration of social-economic-cultural background behind this rejection and Chrysostom's coping strategies, see Mayer, "Poverty and Generosity," 140-48; and Sitzler, "Deviance and Destitution," 261-66.

⁹¹ Chrys. *Hom.* 60.6 in *Jo.* (PG 59:336.18-27).

⁹² Chrys. *Hom.* 78.2-3 in *Mt.* (PG 58:713.26-715.3).

⁹³ Ritter, "Between 'Theocracy' and 'Simple Life,'" 171-72.

⁹⁴ Chrys. *Hom.* 35.2 in *Mt.* (PG 57:408.15-24, 36-42).

⁹⁵ MacMullen, "The Preacher's Audience," 504-6; and Mayer, "Who Came to Hear John Chrysostom Preach?" 83.

⁹⁶ Mayer, "Who Came to Hear John Chrysostom Preach?" 83. For the detailed discussion on the composition of Chrysostom's hearers, see 4. 2 in introduction above.

minimum amount of material are required in the case of the charity of the poor, it can be insisted that he was likely to have an ideal position that even beggars also should join in charitable giving. To those who claim that the poor will not be able to give alms due to a lack of gold or high quality clothes, he responds:

“What concern are these words to the poor (πένητας) ?” you will ask. “They certainly have no gold or such garments as these.” Nevertheless, they have bread and cold water; they have two oboli and feet, so that they may visit the sick; they have a tongue and speech, so as to offer consolation to the afflicted; they have a house and roof, so that they may make the stranger welcome to their home. Indeed, we do not require such and such a number of talents of gold from the poor (πενήτων), but we expect these from the rich. If a person be poor (πένης) and come to the doors of the other poor people, our Lord is not ashamed to accept an obol, but will even say that he has received something greater from him/her than from those who have cast in much (Mark 12:41-44).⁹⁷

To support this argument, the examples of the widow, Peter, and John are presented. They were poor and unlearned (Acts 4:13), but they used what they had for their neighbours.⁹⁸ Chrysostom asserts that God will much more greatly recompense the poor than the rich when both engage in merciful assistance to the poor.⁹⁹

⁹⁷ Chrys. *Hom.* 59.4 in *Jo.* (PG 59:327.34-328.11). Translation from *Commentary on Saint John the Apostle and Evangelist: Homilies 48-88*, trans. Thomas A. Goggin, FC 41 (Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1959), 132 (modified). Elsewhere, Chrysostom, *Hom.* 79.1 in *Mt.* (PG 58:717.3 ab imo-718.9 ab imo; and *Hom.* 45.2-3 in *Mt.* (PG 58:473.57-475.13), states that almsgiving is not a grandiose act, pointing out that Christ commands easy things (Matt 25:35-40): he demands a piece of bread and clothing, a glass of cold water, and a visit. He merely requests to visit him, not to release him from prison and not to heal him. He does not want expensive meals, but wants necessary foods for survival. Plain clothes are enough, not fancy clothes. Chrysostom maintains that as Christ requires a task within our power and below it in some cases, poverty cannot be an excuse for being unmerciful; see Broc-Schmezer, “Pauvreté et spiritualité,” 139-48.

⁹⁸ Chrys. *Hom.* 78.3 in *Mt.* (PG 58:714.50-58). We will investigate Chrysostom’s use of virtue exemplars in guiding his listeners towards a virtuous life. See n. 202.

⁹⁹ Chrys. *Hom.* 64.5 in *Mt.* (PG 58:615.49-618.3). For the psychagogical roles of reward in Chrysostom discourse on almsgiving, see 3. 1. 1-2 in chapter 2.

Little attention was paid to Chrysostom's emphasis on γνώμη (the mindset) in scholarly debate on the definition of almsgiving. The mindset figures in his thought, especially in anthropology, to such an extent as to justify calling him a theologian of the mindset,¹⁰⁰ and it is also essential to determine the value of almsgiving. According to Chrysostom, γνώμη is important in almsgiving, not external factors. In *In Matthaëum hom.* 52, he demonstrates that almsgiving is a perfect skill (τέχνη), arguing that in the case of agriculture, grain cannot be produced without of the skills of smiths, carpenters, carriers, builders, and bakers, but almsgiving needs the only one condition, that is, γνώμη. He breaks down people's prejudice regarding almsgiving by indicating the biblical example of the widow. While people judge its value by external forms and amount (money, clothes, house, shoes, and so on), if it is practised with integrity, like the widow who gave two mites, it is valuable.¹⁰¹ Chrysostom notes as follows: "our alms are not judged by the measure of our gifts, but by the largeness of our mind (γνώμησ)."¹⁰² Since for him we can give alms according to our abilities and circumstances, and what is the most crucial in almsgiving is the disposition of the benefactors, it can be suggested that almsgiving is affordable.

2. 2. Directions for Receiving Almsgiving Treatment

When we are treated, the instructions of physicians and the dosage of the medicine need to be observed for the effectiveness of the therapy. In the case of therapeutic almsgiving, the mindset is closely linked with the guidelines that the givers must bear in mind. Chrysostom states that as good works tend to make us arrogant and proud, we need to be alert to pride (ἀπόνοια/φύσημα/ὑπερηφανία).¹⁰³ He claims that pride is the

¹⁰⁰ Laird, *Mindset, Moral Choice and Sin*, 25-51.

¹⁰¹ Chrys. *Hom.* 52.3-4 in *Mt.* (PG 58:523.3-30). For treatment of Chrysostom's description of almsgiving as a skill within Greco-Roman context, see Susanna Barsella, "Ars and Theology: Work, Salvation, and Social Doctrine in the Early Church Fathers," *Annali d'Italianistica* 32 (2014): 53-72.

¹⁰² Chrys. *Hom.* 52.3 in *Mt.* (PG 58:522.27-28; NPNF 1.10, 324, modified).

¹⁰³ In the directions of almsgiving, vainglory and pride are interconnected and sometimes are used as a synonym. Strictly speaking, vainglory and pride are concerned with the motive of almsgiving and attitude after it respectively. Chrysostom argues that these two vices destroy its benefits, namely the cure of the soul and heavenly reward. His view of vainglory in charity will be addressed in detail later (3. 1. 3 in chapter 2).

stronghold (ἀκρόπολις), root (ρίζα), mother (μήτηρ), and foundation (πηγή) of all evils. Arrogance brought other evils into the world, and the whole world fell into chaos. It is also a sin of the devil and Adam. They lost their blessed status as they attempted to become like God. Above all, Chrysostom strongly warns that pride neutralizes the efficacy of good works. The healing function of almsgiving disappears, and even though we have all virtues, such as chastity, virginity, fasting, prayer, almsgiving, and moderation, this is useless without humility. Chrysostom explains the story of the Pharisee found in Luke 18:9-14, stating that he reached the summit of a virtuous life, but lost everything when he was arrogant.¹⁰⁴

Humility (ταπεινοφροσύνη) is the essential element in making therapeutic almsgiving effective. Commenting on Matthew 5:3 which is the starting point of eight blessings in the Sermon on the Mount (“Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven”), Chrysostom demonstrates some of the key characteristics of true humility. First, humility is voluntary. He argues that ‘spirit’ means ‘choice’ (προαίρεσις). While many people are reluctantly humble, what Jesus teaches here is that genuine modesty comes from the heart by choice. Chrysostom claims that this humility is commendable.¹⁰⁵ It is maintained that for him only action by choice deserves to be rewarded and judged.¹⁰⁶ Miller notes that Chrysostom’s emphasis on free choice is similar to Stoic accounts of virtue and vice.¹⁰⁷ Second, humility is essentially awe of God’s words. Chrysostom analyses why Christ refers to ‘poor’ instead of ‘humble,’ assuming that humility is the fear and trembling of God’s commands beyond the lowering of the mind (Isa 66:2). Third, modesty is considered as the state of a broken heart. According to Chrysostom, true humility is not moderately lowliness, but the totally lowered mind, which is also the sacrifice pleasing to God (Ps 51:17).¹⁰⁸ To sum up, for Chrysostom humility is the totally broken mind by choice in front of divine words.

¹⁰⁴ Chrys. *Hom.* 3.4 in *Mt.* (PG 57:36.24-29); *Hom.* 15.2 in *Mt.* (PG 57:224.39-225.9); *Hom.* 9.2 in *Jo.* (PG 59:72.24-60); and *Hom.* 16.4 in *Jo.* (PG 59:106.19-43).

¹⁰⁵ Chrys. *Hom.* 15.1 in *Mt.* (PG 57:224.12-20).

¹⁰⁶ Miller, “No Sympathy for the Devil,” 171 n. 3; Salem, “Sanity Insanity, and Man’s Being,” 17-18 and 67; and Mayer, “Madness in the Works of John Chrysostom,” 356-57.

¹⁰⁷ Miller, “No Sympathy for the Devil,” 154-221.

¹⁰⁸ Chrys. *Hom.* 15.1-2 in *Mt.* (PG 57:224.20-39).

Chrysostom mentions that humility is the source of all virtue. Just as pride is the root of all evil, so humility is the mother and principle of virtue. Chrysostom uses the analogy of architecture, insisting that foundation work is vital in construction, and humility is the foundation for the construction of the solid building of virtues.¹⁰⁹ He interprets the Sermon on the Mount from the perspective of ancient philosophical therapy. Christ is treated as a physician of the soul, and the eight blessings are explored as remedies for healing the sick soul. The one thing that interests us in particular is that the blessings are described as the stages of virtue. Chrysostom calls this the golden cord of virtue, and each virtue becomes a preliminary stepping stone to a next step. As mentioned before, humility is the fundamental virtue.¹¹⁰ Other fathers, such as Gregory of Nyssa, Ambrose of Milan (c.340-397 C.E.), and Augustine of Hippo (354-430 C.E.) read the Sermon on the Mount in terms of the progress of virtue, like Chrysostom.¹¹¹

Chrysostom urges his congregations to forget that they helped the poor. They should not have a high opinion of their good works, but rather think that they have conducted nothing. While if they boast of good deeds, all their labour will be in vain, if they hide them, humbly giving thanks to God, not only their souls will be healed, but also

¹⁰⁹ Chrys. *Hom.* 15.2 *in Mt.* (PG 57:224.39-225.2).

¹¹⁰ Chrys. *Hom.* 15.1-11 *in Mt.* (PG 57:223.8-238.60). After his exposition on the last blessing of a persecuted life (“Blessed are those who are persecuted because of righteousness, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven,” Matt 5:10), Chrysostom, *hom.* 15.6 *in Mt.* (PG 57:230.50-231.5), remarks: “Observe too that after how many commandments he has put this. For he surely did this not without reason, but to show that it is impossible for a person who is not equipped and trained with all those other virtues to go forth to these conflicts. Always paving, as you see, the way for the following precept from the former one in each instance, he has woven a sort of golden cord for us. For a person who is ‘humble’ will surely also ‘mourn’ for his/her own sins; the person who ‘mourn’ will be ‘meek,’ ‘righteous,’ and ‘merciful;’ the person who is ‘merciful,’ ‘righteous,’ and ‘contrite’ will be surely also ‘pure in heart;’ and such a one will be ‘a peacemaker’ too; the person who has attained unto all these will be moreover arrayed against dangers and will not be troubled when evil is spoken of him/her and he/she will endure innumerable trials.” (NPNF 1.10, 96, modified). For related studies, see Mitchell, “John Chrysostom,” 19-42; and Peter Moore, “Deploying Emotional Intelligence: John Chrysostom’s Relational Emotional Vocabulary in his Beatitude Homilies,” *SP* 83 (2017): 131-38.

¹¹¹ Liviu Barbu, “The ‘Poor in Spirit’ and Our Life in Christ: An Eastern Orthodox Perspective on Christian Discipleship,” *Studies in Christian Ethics* 22 (2009): 264-66.

heavenly glory, praise, and reward will be bestowed. According to Chrysostom, humility is the safe storehouse of good works and makes them much greater.¹¹² He mentions as follows:

Let us not lift up ourselves, but let us declare ourselves unprofitable that we may become profitable. For if you call yourself approved, you become unprofitable, though you were approved; but if you call yourself useless, you become profitable, even though you were reprobate. Therefore it is necessary to forget our good deeds. . . . Let us beware of saying anything about ourselves, for this renders us both odious with people and abominable to God. For this reason, the greater the good works we do, the less let us say of ourselves; this is a way to reap the greatest glory both with people and God. Or rather, not only glory from God, but also a reward, in that, a great recompense.¹¹³

2. 3. Almsgiving and the Cure of the Soul

2. 3. 1. Behavioural Therapy

Chrysostom's therapeutic strategy of almsgiving belongs to the tradition of behavioural therapy in ancient psychagogy. In philosophical therapy, behavioural therapy was one of the most common types of therapy along with cognitive therapy. Richard Sorabji provides a variety of examples of behavioural therapy introduced and practised by ancient philosophers. Socrates attempted to lower his voice, smile and soften his gaze whenever he got irritated with his friends. Seneca advised to look at oneself in a mirror to control anger. Plato recommended parents create inspirational aesthetic environments such as painting, weaving, embroidery, architecture, and furniture for their children's emotional development. A sparse and vegetarian diet was regarded as a vital practice in promoting health and virtue in the Pythagorean tradition. Porphyry, a neo-Platonist (c.234-c.305 C.E.) rejected meat to forestall lust. Posidonius (c.135-c.51 B.C.E.) who was a Greek Stoic

¹¹² Chrys. *Hom.* 3.4-5 in *Mt.* (PG 57:36.24-38.1). See also Chrys. *Hom.* 33.3 in *Jo.* (PG 59:191.41-192.65).

¹¹³ Chrys. *Hom.* 3.5 in *Mt.* (PG 57:37.5-10 and 37.48-38.1; NPNF 1.10, 18, modified). For the treatment of the functions of reward and punishment in Chrysostom's homilies on almsgiving, see chapter 2 later.

philosopher and Galen offered a whole regimen of diet, rest, sleep, exercise, and wordless music to maintain psychological health.¹¹⁴

2. 3. 2. Reactive Treatment

As a remedy almsgiving has two kinds of functions: reactive and preventive treatments. Like medicine, ancient philosophical therapy had these two functions.¹¹⁵ We first look at reactive treatment, which aims to recover health by treating existing illness. Ancient doctors used various kinds of medical methods, such as diet, sleep, drugs, cautery, and surgery. Drugs were commonly prescribed, while cautery and surgery were administered more sparingly.¹¹⁶ In the case of psychological therapy, reactive treatment is concerned with mitigating or removing passions and wrong beliefs when they arise. As a result, a patient regains peace of mind.¹¹⁷ We analyse a wide range of examples in Chrysostom's homilies, exploring how charity heals the sick souls.

2. 3. 2. 1. Anger

In *In Matthaeeum hom. 4*, Chrysostom deals with the cure of anger (θυμός). First, he closely examines the inner state of an angry person. According to ancient philosophical therapy, therapeutic process began with the diagnosis of psychic illness.¹¹⁸ In *De ira*, Seneca gives detailed account of how anger greatly damages the soul before dealing with its treatment.¹¹⁹ The psychology of ancient philosophers was mainly based on their

¹¹⁴ Sorabji, *Emotion and Peace of Mind*, 270-72.

¹¹⁵ Sen. *Ira* 2.18 (LCL 214:202-3); Sorabji, *Emotion and Peace of Mind*, 212; and Ferngren, *Medicine and Health Care*, 20. For the detailed examples of various reactive and preventive treatments in ancient psychagogy, see Sorabji, *Emotion and Peace of Mind*, 212-27.

¹¹⁶ Ferngren, *Medicine and Health Care*, 20. Healing resources were slender in ancient medicine: "it (ancient medicine) could mend broken bones, reduce dislocations, cauterize wounds, perform various kinds of surgical operations, engage in venesection or phlebotomy, administer traditional drugs and remedies, and prescribe rest and a regimen that involved change of diet, exercise, and baths."

¹¹⁷ Sen. *Ira* 2.18 (LCL 214:202-3); Sorabji, *Emotion and Peace of Mind*, 212; and Hadot, *Philosophy as a Way of Life*, 83.

¹¹⁸ Gill, "Philosophical Therapy," 351.

¹¹⁹ Sen. *Ira* 1.1-2.17 (LCL 214:106-203); Knuuttila, *Emotions in Ancient and Medieval Philosophy*, 86; and Gill, "Philosophical Therapy," 351.

philosophical doctrines: they analysed the soul and developed therapeutic methods according to essential teachings in each philosophical school.¹²⁰ It is found from Chrysostom's diagnosis that an angry person contracts the psychic disease of the internal organs. Comparing anger with a parasite (σκώληξ) and serpent (ὄφις), Chrysostom claims that it penetrates the entrails of the soul and makes the soul useless by devastating it.¹²¹ Just as a patient whose internal organs are totally destroyed by parasites hardly can breathe, the person with this spiritual sickness cannot perform any acts of virtue. Chrysostom states:

If a person nourishing worms in his/her entrails, shall not be able to breathe because all his/her internal organs are destroyed, how shall we having so large a serpent (it is wrath I mean) eating up our all viscera, be able to produce anything noble?¹²²

Almsgiving heals the sick entrails of the soul by killing the worm and serpent of anger. Of special interest here is that Chrysostom prescribes almsgiving as a liquid anthelmintic medicine: in this homily, the therapeutic function of almsgiving is described in pharmaceutical terms. John D. Penniman's analysis of Cyprian *Ep.* 63 demonstrates that Cyprian (c.200-258 C.E.) formulated the function of the eucharistic cup within the pharmacology of Roman medicine. Penniman maintains that criticizing water-drinkers, Cyprian advocated the use of wine in the eucharist on the basis of its psychic curative effect. Adopting the tradition of wine as a drug in Roman medicine, Cyprian argues that the wine of the eucharist has the pharmacological power of healing the sick soul diseased by the old self.¹²³ Chrysostom insists that the patient whose psychic organs have

¹²⁰ Sorabji, *Emotion and Peace of Mind*, 159-62.

¹²¹ Chrys. *Hom.* 4.9 in *Mt.* (PG 57:50.8-27).

¹²² Chrys. *Hom.* 4.9 in *Mt.* (PG 57:50.27-31; NPNF 1.10, 27, modified). In his treatment of the public demonstration of anger, Chrysostom argues that if a free adult male cannot control his anger in public places, his social identity will be effaced, and he will be ashamed. See Lee Blackburn, "‘Let the Men be Ashamed’: Public Insults, Angry Words, and Figures of Shame in Chrysostom's *Homilies on Acts*," *SP* 47 (2010): 295-300. For other studies on Chrysostom's view of anger, see M. G. de Durand, "La colère chez S Jean Chrysostome," *RevScRel* 67 (1993): 61-77; and Brian Dunkle, "John Chrysostom's Community of Anger Management," *SP* 83 (2017): 217-30.

¹²³ John D. Penniman, "‘The Health-Giving Cup’": Cyprian's *Ep.* 63 and the Medicinal Power of Eucharistic

malfunctioned through anger needs to drink the liquid spiritual parasiticide to remove the parasite. The blood of Christ and preaching are also presented as spiritual parasiticides that complement almsgiving.¹²⁴ In Chrysostom's discourse of therapeutic almsgiving, many different kinds of psychic remedies are often provided at the same time. On the basis of examination, the suitable methods of therapy are prescribed for each disease, and the combination of various therapies maximizes the curative effect. Chrysostom is a skilled doctor of the soul who knows how to handle various treatments.

Then how will we be freed from this outrage (λύμης)? If we drink a potion (ποτόν) which can kill (νεκρῶσαι) worms and serpents within us. Someone may ask, "What is this potion which has such power?" These are the precious blood of Christ (τὸ τίμιον αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ) if it is received with assurance (for it can extinguish all diseases), careful listening to the divine Scriptures (τῶν θείων Γραφῶν ἢ μετ' ἀκριβείας ἀκρόασις) and almsgiving added to listening. For passions which ruin our souls can be killed by all these potions. Only then will we live.¹²⁵

2. 3. 2. 2. Greed

In epistulam ad Colossenses hom. 7 harshly criticizes the excessive greed (φιλαργυρία) of wealthy women who make silver chamber-pots. They seem to think that lavatory facilities should be also suitable for their status, but most people used much inferior chamber-pots. In addition, there were private and public latrines in the Roman empire. While some public facilities were well equipped with stone chairs and water channels, ordinary toilets were made of simple pits. Sewer workers regularly cleaned these latrines and flushed away excrement.¹²⁶ As luxury springs in large part from greed, for Chrysostom distinction between these two vices is often unclear. In several homilies, he

Wine," *J ECS* 23 (2015): 189-211. See also Barry M. Craig, "Potency, not Preciousness: Cyprian's Cup and a Modern Controversy," *Worship* 81 (2007): 290-313.

¹²⁴ Chrys. *Hom. 4.9 in Mt.* (PG 57:50.31-41).

¹²⁵ Chrys. *Hom. 4.9 in Mt.* (PG 57:50.31-41; NPNF 1.10, 27-28, modified). The description of various therapeutic methods is also related to Christian tradition of penitent practices. This will be explored in 2. 2 in chapter 3.

¹²⁶ Blake Leyerle, "Refuse, Filth, and Excrement in the Homilies of John Chrysostom," *JLA* 2 (2009): 338-39.

rebukes the luxurious lifestyle of women in the upper class, and the tone of this homily is much harsher than *In Matthaeum hom.* 89, to be mentioned later, focusing only on the madness (μανία) of excessive desire.

Chrysostom's diagnosis of the female patients indicates that they seem to have a spiritual brain fever.¹²⁷ According to ancient doctors, phrenitis (φρενίτις) is mainly caused by inflammation and swelling around the brain, accompanied by acute fever and delirium.¹²⁸ It is suggested that the ancient medical classification of mental illness is not generally applied to Chrysostom's comments on it, and here a word for phrenitis is not explicitly referred.¹²⁹ However, we can see that his account of their inner state bear a striking likeness to the major symptoms of clinical brain fever. The greedy patients do not discern their sickness: even though the souls are inflamed all over with fevers (πυρετοῖς)

¹²⁷ Greed is also compared with cold (fever) and blindness. In several homilies on Matthew, Chrysostom plainly shows how the inner state of wealthy people is miserable. According to *In Matthaeum hom.* 63, their souls are not only dark (σκοτεινός), desolate (ἔρημος), base (αἰσχρός), and ugly (εἰδής), but also are full of cobwebs (ἀράχνην) and dust (κόνιν), even though their brilliant appearance attracts a large crowd (Chrys. *Hom.* 63.4 in *Mt.* [PG 58:608.3-16]). They are in the same condition as the body which freezes (πεπηγυῖαν) and becomes numb (ναρκῶσαν) in wintry storm and frost (Chrys. *Hom.* 57.4 in *Mt.* [PG 58:564.13-19]). In *In Matthaeum hom.* 27, Chrysostom, *hom.* 27.4 in *Mt.* (PG 57:348.51-349.24), also gives a detailed analysis of the decayed soul of a rich man, asserting that the state of the soul is the same as that of the dead or rather is worse than them. That is because the dead are free from sin, but the rich man is enslaved to his passions (παθῶν). The soul is corrupted by countless wounds and even is torn into pieces. Chrysostom urges his congregation to see the rotten soul of the rich man which stinks. This rhetoric was intended to invert the traditional view of wealth by making wealth become the object of revulsion (Leyerle, "Refuse, Filth, and Excrement," 346-49 and 352-53; and Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*, 255-57). Chrysostom, *hom.* 27.4 in *Mt.* PG 57:349.10-15 and 19-24, states that "Do not you see his body in a state of decay? And what is this? Since before his body, his soul is corrupted (διέφθαρται) and destroyed (ἀπόλωλε), and undergoes greater rottenness (σηπεδόνα). For the other stinks for just ten days, but this man exhales bad odor (δυσωδίας) for his whole life, having a mouth more foul than sewers. . . . But is he carried on a horse? And what is this? For the other is on a bed. It is hard to loosen him, and no one sees his rotten body, but he has a coffin as a cover. However, this man is going about everywhere with bad odor (οδωδῶς), carrying about his dead soul in his body just as in a tomb (NPNF 1.10, 188, modified).

¹²⁸ Wright, "Brain and Soul in Late Antiquity," 255-63.

¹²⁹ Salem, "Sanity, Insanity, and Man's Being," 12-15; and Mayer, "Madness in the Works of John Chrysostom," 353-54 and 362-63. see also n. 13 above.

and inflammations (φλεγμοναῖς), the patients think that they are healthy, confusing illness and health and persistently refusing the treatment of a doctor.¹³⁰

The souls, Chrysostom notes, are seriously diseased by the psychological madness. Exemplifying stories in pagan myths, he maintains that wealth often makes people mad by provoking desire, and they invent bizarre things to satisfy their desire. The hippocentaur made a golden plane tree and heaven, and Scylla threw human beings into a wooden bull.¹³¹ According to Chrysostom, the degree of madness of the women who revere their excrement in silver pots surpasses even the inhumane display of wealth conducted by these wicked beings:

Do you see how great wealth makes people mad? How it inflames them? I think that wealth does not even recognize the sea, and perhaps wishes to walk on it. Is this not a Chimera? Is it not a hippocentaur? But even today there are people who do not distance themselves from it, but are much sillier. How, tell me, do those who make silver pots and vessels and flasks differ in silliness from the golden plane tree? How do the women differ (I am embarrassed, but have to say it) who make silver chamber-pots? . . . In truth wealth makes people silly and mad. If they had such abundance, they would wish for the earth to be gold, and walls to be of gold, perhaps even heaven and air to be of gold. What madness is this, what transgression of decency, what fever? Another person, made in the image of God, is dying of cold, while you are equipping yourself with such things? What arrogance! What more would a mad person do? Do you so revere excrement that you would receive it in silver? . . . This is intemperance and cruelty and inhumanity and brutality and insolence. What kind of Scylla would do this, what kind of Chimera, What kind of dragon – or I should say, what kind of demon, what kind of devil?¹³²

Chrysostom laments that if the women are not healed, their diseases are likely to develop into the worst state to such an extent that they desire golden hair, lips and eyebrows and even anoint their whole bodies with liquid gold, like monsters. Chrysostom

¹³⁰ Chrys. *hom. 7.4 in Col.* (PG 62:348.12-48); Wright, “Brain and Soul in Late Antiquity,” 282-311; and Mayer, “Madness in the Works of John Chrysostom,” 362-63.

¹³¹ Chrys. *Hom. 7.4 in Col.* (PG 62:348.49-349.21).

¹³² Chrys. *Hom. 7.4-5 in Col.* (PG 62:349.21-31, 31-52, and 54-58; Mayer and Allen, *John Chrysostom*, 81-82).

states that he is not joking given that a Persian king has a golden beard.¹³³ He adamantly declares that if the women are continually seized with the mental illness of luxury, he will excommunicate them.¹³⁴

How is the psychological phrenitis of the women cured? Almsgiving is prescribed as a strong treatment. Chrysostom urges the patients as follows: “Look, I’m advising and enjoining you to smash facial adornments and containers such as these and to give to the poor and no longer suffer this madness (μὴ οὕτω μεμηνέναι).”¹³⁵

2. 3. 2. 3. Extortion

In *In Matthaeum hom. 52*, Chrysostom explores the therapeutic effect of almsgiving on extortion (ἀρπαγή) which originates from covetousness (πλεονεξία).

¹³³ Chrys. *Hom. 7.5 in Col.* (PG 62:350.6-26). The madness of greed is an insatiable desire. Elsewhere, Chrysostom, *hom. 63.3 in Mt.* (PG 58: 607.12-20), also gives the detailed description of this insatiable madness: “a person who despises wealth quiets the desire. However, a person who desires to be rich has inflamed it much more and does not stay. Even though he/she has gotten ten thousand talents, he/she desires more than them. Even though he/she gains them, again he/she aims at twice as much more. He/she continues to desire mountains, the earth and the sea, and even prays that all become gold for him, being mad (μαινόμενος) with a kind of new and fearful madness (μανίαν) which can never be extinguished (NPNF 1.10, 389-90, modified).

¹³⁴ Chrys. *Hom. 7.5 in Col.* (PG 62:350.27-47). “Look, I am making a public statement, I am no longer advising, but commanding and giving orders. Let the one who wants to, hear; let the one who does not, disobey. If you continue to do this, I will not put up with you, nor shall I accept you or allow you to cross this threshold. What use do I have for a crowd sick people? What use if in educating you I do not stand in the way of excesses? Indeed, Paul stood in the way of both gold and pearls. We are laugh at by the Greeks, and our belief seems to be myths. And to the men I give the following advice: Have you come to school to be instructed in spiritual philosophy? Do away your arrogance. The following advice I give both to men and women, and even if someone does otherwise, I will not put up with (that excess) any more. . . . If we flatter all the time, when shall we revive? When shall we benefit you?” (Chrys. *Hom. 7.5 in Col.* [PG 62:350.27-39 and 41-43]; Mayer and Allen, *John Chrysostom*, 82-83, modified). In this sermon, Chrysostom frequently warns that God will severely judge these women. Along with the threat of divine judgement, this declaration of excommunication can be viewed as a harsh speech that intends to correct moral errors through fear. See 3. 2 in chapter 2.

¹³⁵ Chrys. *Hom. 7.5 in Col.* (PG 62:350.48-50; Mayer and Allen, *John Chrysostom*, 83).

Extortion is referred as the serious wound (ἔλκος) of the soul.¹³⁶ Wounds, as found in ancient literature, are not mere cuts or bruises, but are a serious condition accompanied by pus and inflammation, which escalate into life-threatening necrotic illnesses.¹³⁷

Chrysostom argues that it is worse than murder (φόνος) in that it consumes its victims little by little.¹³⁸

Almsgiving is provided as a remedy for the wound of extortion. Here, Chrysostom presents two instructions that patients should observe. These two instructions are intended to criticize the wrong ways of the charity of extortioners. First, the alms of extortioners should be given to those whom they extorted. In a therapeutic treatment of extortioners, Chrysostom sets the specific recipients of almsgiving. Extortioners would give their alms to other people. Regarding this, Chrysostom states that they heal those whom they did not wound. The objects of their healing should be the victims of their sins whose bodies and souls are injured by their extortion with insult and violence.¹³⁹

Second, alms should exceed the amount of money or goods extorted. This is an interesting argument: the disease of extortion can be healed by charity, but in this case, significant payment is required for the spiritual patients. According to Chrysostom, this is not mercy, but injustice even if the sinners give everything they took.¹⁴⁰ To construct this point, the commandment of the Old Testament about the recompense of theft and the example of Zacchaeus are noted. Exodus 22:1 states that a thief should pay back four times, and Zacchaeus observed this commandment (Luke 19:8). He exemplifies the therapy of robbery through his declaration.¹⁴¹ Chrysostom makes a slight change to Luke

¹³⁶ Chrys. *Hom. 52.5 in Mt.* (PG 58:525.5-9). Extortion is also called defilement (μιάσμα) which seriously pollutes the soul (Chrys. *Hom. 52.5 in Mt.* [PG 58:526.15]).

¹³⁷ Upson-Saia, "Wounded by Divine Love," 89-92.

¹³⁸ Chrys. *Hom. 52.5 in Mt.* (PG 58:526.14-15).

¹³⁹ Chrys. *Hom. 52.5 in Mt.* (PG 58:524.56-525.5).

¹⁴⁰ Chrys. *Hom. 85.3 in Mt.* (PG 58:761.29-40).

¹⁴¹ Chrys. *Hom. 52.5 in Mt.* (PG 58:525.14-17); *Hom. 73.3 in Jo.* (PG 59:398.45-53); and *Hom. 88.3 in Jo.* (PG 59:482.25-28). Exod 22:1 states: "Whoever steals an ox or a sheep and slaughters it or sells it must pay back five head of cattle for the ox and four sheep for the sheep." According to Luke 19:8, Zacchaeus says to Jesus that "Look, Lord! Here and now I give half of my possessions to the poor, and if I have cheated anybody out of anything, I will pay back four times the amount."

19:8 to stress compensation for healing psychological sickness of Zacchaeus: the original passage is in the order of almsgiving and compensation, but in his homily this order is reversed.¹⁴² Chrysostom contends that if a thief pays fourfold, an extortioner should give alms at least more than tenfold. The reason for the huge gap of recompense between theft and extortion may spring in large part from Chrysostom's conviction that extortion causes enormous damage and insult to victims, incomparable to theft. In addition, the commandment about theft was announced under the law, while now it is the era of grace.¹⁴³

It is not possible to cure (θεραπεῦσαι) the evil which comes from covetousness with the same measure of almsgiving (τῷ αὐτῷ μέτρῳ τῆς ἐλεημοσύνης). For if you defraud an obol, you need to give in return as alms a talent, not an obol to remove the wound which comes from greed. Therefore a thief who has committed theft pays fourfold, but an extortioner (ἀρπάζων) is worse than a thief. If the former should repay fourfold what he/she stole, the extortioner should pay tenfold and much more (δεκαπλασίονα καὶ πολλῶ πλέον). For the injustice is expiated in this way. For even then he will not receive the fruit of almsgiving.¹⁴⁴

This second instruction is intended to denounce the easy-going attitude of extortioners toward their sin. After taking all the possessions of other people, they gave a little bit as alms to the poor. The notion that a small amount of alms is enough to cover the evils of extortion underlay their almsgiving. Falling under this self-deception, they thought of extortion lightly.¹⁴⁵ Chrysostom declares that possessions from injustice could never be a psychic treatment. As mentioned earlier, pride and vanity are related to the attitudes of the givers, and unjust wealth falls into the problem of a remedy itself.¹⁴⁶ Chrysostom makes it clear that all charitable activities are in vain unless this disease is first treated:

¹⁴² Chrys. *Hom. 52.5 in Mt.* (PG 58:525.14-17); and Ronald H. van der Bergh, "Chrysostom's Reception of Luke 19:8b (the Declaration of Zacchaeus)," *Hervormde Teologiese Studies* 70 (2014): 3.

¹⁴³ Chrys. *Hom. 52.5 in Mt.* (PG 58:525.17-20); and *Hom. 85.3 in Mt.* (PG 58:761.40-56).

¹⁴⁴ Chrys. *Hom. 52.5 in Mt.* (PG 58:525.5-14; NPNF 1.10, 325-26, modified).

¹⁴⁵ Chrys. *Hom. 52.5 in Mt.* (PG 58:525.21-526.6); and *Hom. 85.3 in Mt.* (PG 58:761.17-22).

¹⁴⁶ See 2. 2 above.

Just as in the case of tumours (οιδημάτων) and ulcers (συρίγγων), if one does not first stop the fluid that is oozing out and aggravating the wound (τραῦμα), whatever remedies he/she applies, his/her efforts are all in vain, since the root of the evil has not been checked. So, if we also do not restrain our hand from greed and prevent this evil inflow of riches, even if we give alms, we do it all in vain. Covetousness, overtaking what has been cured by this means, sweeps it away and destroys it, and makes the evil worse than before. Let us, then, stop defrauding, and let it thus that we give alms.¹⁴⁷

Giving the exploited money to the poor is more abominable than sacrificing a dead ass to God. Chrysostom argues that it is better not to give alms.¹⁴⁸ Criticizing the charity of extortioners, Chrysostom maintains that even a hundredfold almsgiving is not sufficient to heal the disease of extortion.¹⁴⁹ Of course, this argument is Chrysostom's exaggerative rhetoric, but emphasizes that extortion is a serious sin in that its therapeutic process demands a very high price from extortioners to such an extent as to inflict great financial losses on them. The psychic illness of extortion is one of the hardest kinds of diseases to treat.

2. 3. 2. 4. Luxury and Its Complications

In *In Matthaëum hom.* 89, Chrysostom looks at the treatment of luxury (τρυφή) and its complications. In this homily, he severely criticizes wealthy aristocratic women seized by obsession with fancy clothing. The criticism of the female aristocrats' flamboyant lifestyle was characterized by a male discourse. The public appearance was an effective means of demonstrating class and identity, in particular related to an elite group.¹⁵⁰ In the late Roman empire, people generally wore a tunic and a mantle or coat, but these wealthy women indulged in golden ornaments and clothes decorated with gold.¹⁵¹ Chrysostom diagnoses the souls of the women, maintaining that they suffer from the severe sickness of luxury. They find one ornament more valuable than the miserable soul of the

¹⁴⁷ Chrys. *Hom.* 88.3 in *Jo.* (PG 59:482.28-38; Goggin, *Commentary on Saint John*, FC 41, 478, modified).

¹⁴⁸ Chrys. *Hom.* 85.3 in *Mt.* (PG 58:761.22-56); and *Hom.* 73.3 in *Jo.* (PG 59:398.53-399.11).

¹⁴⁹ Chrys. *Hom.* 52.5 in *Mt.* (PG 58:525.20-21).

¹⁵⁰ De Wet, *Preaching Bondage*, 121-22.

¹⁵¹ Costanzo, *Harbor for the Poor*, 79.

poor, enjoying wearing high-priced jewels (ten thousand talents: μυρίων ταλάντων), but are unwilling to give even a piece of bread to the poor Christ.¹⁵² The sharp contrasting depiction between the rich and the poor is a recurring literary *topos* in Chrysostom's discourses on almsgiving. This criticism is somewhat exaggerated, but plays a role in arousing pity for the poor through guilt.¹⁵³ Examining the souls of greedy women, Chrysostom discovers numerous complications of luxury in their souls. Their souls are enslaved to pleasure (ἡδονή). What is worse than this state of spiritual slavery is that they do not want to escape from this state. Just as a prisoner who has been jailed for many years accustom themselves to a prison and rejects to be set free, the women are enjoying the prison of pleasure. Their souls are also swollen by vanity (τῦφος), arrogance (ἀπόνοια), and vainglory (κενή δόξα). They boast of their splendid clothes and jewels, and look down on other people. Behind their glossy appearance, however, they are afflicted with anxiety (φροντίς) about the loss of their beauty.¹⁵⁴

How does Chrysostom as a physician of the soul treat these spiritual diseases? In this case, two cognitive therapies and almsgiving as behavioural therapy are presented all together. Cognitive therapy was a main psychotherapeutic method in ancient philosophical therapy and sought to alter wrong beliefs and judgement. Ancient philosophers considered false beliefs as the fundamental cause of psychological illness and attempted to transform these beliefs.¹⁵⁵ First, Chrysostom calls into question the women's judgement about the value of their golden ornaments, insisting that the ornaments are worthless. The women place a high value on their ornaments, but those are just earth (γῆ) and ashes (σποδός), and

¹⁵² Chrys. *Hom.* 89.4 in *Mt.* (PG 58:787.2-6 and 787.18-788.4). For Chrysostom's view of the identification of Christ with the poor, see Brändle, *Matthäus 25:31-46 im Werk des Johannes Chrysostomus*; and idem, "This Sweetest Passage," 127-37.

¹⁵³ Costanzo, *Harbor for the Poor*, 79; and De Wet, "Vilification of the Rich," 85-86.

¹⁵⁴ Chrys. *Hom.* 89.3 in *Mt.* (PG 58:785.5-31). In *In Matthaëum hom.* 49, rich young people are diagnosed with the same diseases. Dealing with their luxury of costly sandals, Chrysostom claims that they are taken captive by the frantic desire (μανία) of luxury. Their madness brings about various complications such as anxiety, grief, arrogance, the love of money and vainglory. In this homily, Chrysostom suggests paternal discipline and corporate prayer as the cognitive medicines of choice (Chrys. *hom.* 49.4-6 in *Mt.* [PG 58:501.50-504.44]).

¹⁵⁵ Gill, "Philosophical Therapy," 341 and 348.

turn into clay (πηλός) when mixed with water. In this sense, it is shameful for the women to serve clay as their master.¹⁵⁶ Chrysostom's discourse frequently returns to the topics of honour and shame. Hendrik F. Stander notes that this value system was an integral part in Chrysostom's ministry, arguing that he overturned the established value of honour: boasting fancy dresses is shameful, not honourable.¹⁵⁷

Then, Chrysostom challenges the women's existing notion of the advantage of luxury. He repeatedly asks the women: what is the advantage of wearing expensive ornaments to them? They think that they benefit from luxury, but rather luxury harms them, in particular their souls. Chrysostom claims that the women are widely accused for their luxurious life. They think that people envy them, but in fact they are blamed and reviled. When the poor see the women decorated with expensive ornaments on the street, they do not admire them, but mock them, thinking that they are greedy and boastful. As the women enter into the church in expensive clothes and jewels, most of the congregation backbites, whispering that they turn the church as the symbol of spiritual humility into the place of worldly splendour, such as a pompous procession and ridiculous theatre. Quoting Isaiah 3:16-17, 24 and 1 Timothy 2:9, Chrysostom states that even scriptural figures such as Isaiah and Paul condemn the women for their luxury.¹⁵⁸ More seriously, the luxurious life of the women damages their souls. Chrysostom points out that their souls become slaves to pleasure, and are saturated with vainglory, vanity, arrogance, and anxiety:

¹⁵⁶ Chrys. *Hom.* 89.4 in *Mt.* (PG 58:786.43-46).

¹⁵⁷ Hendrik F. Stander, "The Concept of Honour/Shame in Chrysostom's Commentary on Matthew," *SP* 41 (2006): 469 and 473-74; and De Wet, *Preaching Bondage*, 75-76. See also Stander's other related studies, id., "Eer en skaamte as sleutelkonsepte in Chrysostomos se eksegesi van 1 Korintiërs," *NedGeref Teologiese Tydskrif* 44 (2003): 518-26; id., "Honour and Shame as Key Concepts in Chrysostom's Exegesis of the Gospel of John," *Hervormde Teologiese Tydskrif* 58 (2003): 899-913; and id., "The Role of Honour and Shame in Chrysostom's Commentaries on the Pauline Epistles," *Ekklesiastikos Pharos* 86 (2004): 136-45.

¹⁵⁸ Chrys. *Hom.* 89.3-4 in *Mt.* (PG 58:785.43-786.18 and 45-55). Isa 3:16-17 and 24: "16. The lord says, "The women of Zion are haughty, walking along with outstretched necks, flirting with their eyes, strutting along with swaying hips, with ornaments jingling on their ankles. 17. Therefore the Lord will bring sores on the heads of the women of Zion; the Lord will make their scalps bald." 24. Instead of fragrance there will be a stench; instead of a sash, a rope; instead of well-dressed hair, baldness; instead of fine clothing, sackcloth; instead of beauty, branding." 1 Tim 2:9: "I also want the women to dress modestly, with decency and propriety, adorning themselves, not with elaborate hairstyles or gold or pearls or expensive clothes."

Tell me what is the advantage (ὄφελος) of these costly stones and of gold-spangled clothes? Someone says, “My soul is glad with these things and rejoices.” I asked you profit (κέρδος), but you told me hurt. For nothing is worse than being taken up with these things, and delighting in them, and being riveted to them. . . . Tell me what then is the profit (κέρδος) of this ornament and this stupidity? Someone says, “I am pleased with them.” Again you have told of the harm and ruin. “But I enjoy also,” someone says, “much honour from the beholders.” And what is this? This is another occasion of destruction, when you are puffed up with vanity and arrogance. . . . What kind of profit (πρόσοδος) arises from a house? What is the advantage (ὄφελος) of a luxurious garment for a woman who wears it? There is no advantage (ὄφελος), but rather great disorder and accusation from all quarters.¹⁵⁹

Chrysostom plainly indicates how the souls of the women are damaged, by using the Platonic metaphor of the wings of the soul. He argues that the women lose their wings due to their submission to passions. According to *Phaedrus*, the winged soul intends naturally to fly to the world of gods in heaven, and the wings are grown by seeing the heavenly reality. If, however, the soul is captured by desires, the wings waste away and even are destroyed, and the soul is in misery.¹⁶⁰ Chrysostom maintains that the loss of wings degrades the women into a dog (κύων) or swine (χοῖρος) from an eagle (ἀετός). They voluntarily give up looking up to heaven and flying there. Like swine, they are interested only in mines and holes as they are riveted to the earth.¹⁶¹ Chrysostom believes that indulgence in desires results in debasing humanity, and the covetous who neglect the poor are sub-bestial.¹⁶² In Chrysostom’s discourse of virtue promotion, those who commit

¹⁵⁹ Chrys. *Hom.* 89.3-4 in *Mt.* (PG 58:785.5-10, 20-25, and 786.32-35; NPNF 1.10, 528-29, modified). In *In Matthaëum hom* 63, both cognitive and behavioural therapy are used together in the same way. Firstly, Chrysostom attempts to change false belief about wealth, arguing that that greed is not removed if we have wealth because wealth aggravates the illness of greed. After the transformation of incorrect belief about wealth, greed is cured by almsgiving (Chrys. *hom.* 63.1-4 in *Mt.* [PG 58:604.7 ab imo-610.5]).

¹⁶⁰ Pl. *Phdr.* 246c-248c (LCL 36:472-79); and Bosinis, “Two Platonic Images,” 433-34.

¹⁶¹ Chrys. *Hom.* 89.3 in *Mt.* (PG 58:785.35-43).

¹⁶² Salem, “Sanity, Insanity, and Man’s Being,” 27.

wrongdoing are sometimes regarded as a dog, swine, ass, monster, snake, worm, and so on. This analogy encourages them to live a virtuous life by giving them a sense of shame.¹⁶³

Chrysostom's psychotherapeutic speech that converts the women's belief in the advantage of luxury leads to the presentation of the remedy of almsgiving. After criticizing the vanity of extravagance, Chrysostom states that almsgiving greatly benefits the women: "How much better (πόσῳ βέλτιον) it is to feed hungry souls than to bore through the lobes of ears and to hang the food of the countless poor heedlessly and in vain (εἰκῆ καὶ μάτην)!"¹⁶⁴ That is, almsgiving leads to recover their psychic health by curing all of their diseases such as luxury, pleasure, conceit, arrogance, vainglory, and anxiety. It also gives them true honour, praise, and pleasure. Consequently, Chrysostom urges them to clothe themselves in almsgiving instead of clothes decked with gold. If they refrain from the absurd pursuit of glamour to help the poor, they can hear Christ ("All hail") and touch feet like Mary Magdalene and the other Mary (Matt 28:1-10, esp. 9).¹⁶⁵

2. 3. 2. 5. Various Vices

In *In Matthaëum hom.* 88, Chrysostom demonstrates that almsgiving removes greed (φιλαργυρία), licentiousness (ἀσελγεία), adultery (μοιχεία), fornication (πορνεία), gluttony (γαστριμαργία), drunkenness (μέθη), quick anger (ἄκροχολία), railing (λοιδορία) and blasphemy (βλασφημία). Before diagnosing the psychic illness of his congregation, he emphasizes the therapeutic nature of almsgiving through dialogue with an imaginary interlocutor, who complains that he/she is greatly sick of repeated sermons about almsgiving and does not want to listen to them anymore. Chrysostom replies to this complaint, stating that he must continue to teach about almsgiving because his congregation still does not learn it. They are likened to children who do not acquaint themselves with the letter alpha (α), accusing a teacher of repetitive pedagogy. According

¹⁶³ Blake Leyerle, "Locating Animals in John Chrysostom's Thought," in *Revisioning John Chrysostom*, forthcoming. See also ead., "Animal Passions: Chrysostom's Use of Animal Imagery," *SP* 83 (2017): 185-202.

¹⁶⁴ Chrys. *Hom.* 89.4 in *Mt.* (PG 58:786.11-14; NPNF 1.10, 528, modified); and Roskam, "John Chrysostom on Pagan Euergetism," 166-68.

¹⁶⁵ Chrys. *Hom.* 89.3 in *Mt.* (PG 58:784.33-785.4).

to Chrysostom, his congregation should ask him not to cease to teach charity instead.¹⁶⁶ In his homilies, child-rearing is frequently mentioned in relation to adult moral formation. The memory of short lessons formed the very beginning in ancient education curriculum, and here the comparison between almsgiving and the first alphabet of Greek indicates how charity is essential in spiritual growth.¹⁶⁷ Chrysostom then uses medical metaphors to explain why he continues to preach almsgiving:

If someone suffered from eye disease, and I was a physician (ιατρὸς), and then having covered his/her eye up and anointed it and applied other treatment, I did not benefit much from them and so desisted, coming to the doors of my surgery, would he/she not have cried out against me, accusing me of great remissness, “I withdrew myself, while the disease (νόσου) remained?” But if, being blamed, I replied to these things, “I covered it up and anointed it,” would he/she have endured? By no means, but rather he/she would immediately have said, “What is the advantage, if I still suffer pain?” Consider about your soul (ψυχῆς) in this way. If after having often fomented a numb and shrunk hand, I did not soften it, what would happen? Would I not have heard the same thing? Now we wash the shrunk and withered hand all around. For this reason, we will not desist until we perfectly straighten it.¹⁶⁸

¹⁶⁶ Chrys. *Hom.* 88.3 in *Mt.* (PG 58:779.14-32). “Someone will perhaps say, “You are discoursing on almsgiving and humanity (φιλανθρωπίας) to us every day.” I will not cease to speak of this. For even though you had attained to it, I should not desist in order not to make you more remiss; yet had you attained, I might have relaxed a little; but if you have not arrived even at the half, say these things to yourselves, not to me. For indeed you do the same in blaming me, as if a little child, hearing often of the letter alpha, but not learning it, were to blame his/her teacher, because he/she is continually and for ever reminding him/her about it. For who has become more forward in almsgiving from these discourses? Who has thrown away his/her possessions? Who has given the half of his/her substance? Who has given the third part? No one has practised such things. Then how is it absurd that you bid us to desist from teaching even though you do not learn? You should do the contrary. If we were minded to desist, you should hold us back and say, “We did not yet learn these things, but how did you desist from mentioning them?” (NPNF 1.10, 523, modified).

¹⁶⁷ Raffaella Criatore, *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001), 50-53 and 160-84; and Blake Leyerle, “Appealing to Children,” *JECS* 5 (1997): 254-55.

¹⁶⁸ Chrys. *Hom.* 88.3 in *Mt.* (PG 58:779.32-45; NPNF 1.10, 523, modified).

Comparing his congregation with soldiers, Chrysostom asserts that the various parts of their souls (eyes, mouth, hands, belly, and feet) suffer from serious wounds (τραύματα), gashes (ώτειλάς), and sores (έλκη). In the late Roman empire, the upper classes' refusal of *vita militaris* resulted in the crisis of traditional masculinity. Christian ecclesiastical leaders addressed this crisis by formulating a new kind of discourse, describing Christian devotional life in terms of spiritual warfare: Christians are spiritual soldiers who are involved in the war between virtue and vice. For Chrysostom, fighting against the devil and passions are interrelated to each other.¹⁶⁹ In this homily, his vivid description of the sickness of the souls demonstrates the aetiology of the various diseases of the soul. For some people their eyes are blinded due to lust, and they cannot see the face of the enemy and use their spears and darts. For others their mouth festers with quick anger, railing, and blasphemy, and they cannot shout in the battle. For others their greed leads to the shrinkage and withering of their hands, and they are not able to brandish swords. For others their belly suffers dropsy due to gluttony and drunkenness, and they are not able even to walk. For others their licentiousness causes crippling to their feet, and they cannot stand in the war.¹⁷⁰ Due to their weakness, they cannot fight in a spiritual war:

¹⁶⁹ Chris L. de Wet, "Virtue and the (Un-) Making of Men in the Thought of John Chrysostom," in *Men and Women*, 231 and 234.

¹⁷⁰ Chrys. *Hom.* 88.4 in *Mt.* (PG 58:779.50-780.32). Chrysostom, *hom.* 88.4 in *Mt.* (PG 58:780.12-32), states that "one person's hand is diseased, and shrunk by disliking almsgiving. How then should such a one hold a shield, and thrust it, and avoid being wounded by the jeers of cruelty? Others limp by going up to the theatres and to the resorts of prostitutes. How shall these then be able to stand in the battle, and not to be wounded with the accusation of wantonness? Another suffers and is maimed in his eyes, by not looking straight, but being full of licentiousness (άσελγείας), and assailing the chastity (σωφροσύνη) of women, and overthrowing marriages. How then should this man be able to look in the face of the enemy, and brandish a spear, and throw this dart, being goaded on all sides with jeers? We see also many suffering with their bellies not less than the dropsical (ύδεριώντων), whenever they are possessed by gluttony (γαστριμαργίας) and drunkenness (μέθης). How then shall I be able to lead forth these drunken men to war? Another's mouth is rotten; such are the passionate (άκρόχολοι), and revilers (λοίδοροι), and blasphemers (βλάσφημοι). How then shall this man ever shout in battle, and achieve anything great and noble, he too being drunk with other drunkenness, and affording much laughter to the enemy?" (NPNF 1.10, 523-24, modified). The similar image appears in Chrys. *hom.* 32.8 in *Mt.* (PG 57:388.16-24): lust, satanical songs, greed and the evils of theatres damage the eyes, mouth, hands and feet of the soul respectively. This embodied description of the diseases of the soul also appears in Chrysostom's harsh criticism of those who indulge in a luxurious life. According to Chrysostom,

When you are not yet healthy (μηδέπω υγιαίνοντας), how does anyone arm you? When you still have wounds (τραύματα) and gashes (ώτειλάς), how does he lead you to a battle? Since if indeed I clearly saw you sound (υγιαίνοντας), I would have led you to that battle, and you would have seen innumerable enemies falling down dead by the grace of Christ and their heads heaped one upon another. . . . However, we cannot thoroughly celebrate a victory in such a way due to the remissness of the multitude. For whenever we innumerable conquer them in doctrines, they reproach us with the life of the bulk of the members of our community, namely our wounds and diseases (νοσήματα) in our souls.¹⁷¹

The congregation needs urgent treatment. Almsgiving restores all of the sick parts of the soul to health. Going about all over the camps of his congregation, Chrysostom as a spiritual military physician deliver sermons about almsgiving as a remedy and treats their diseases and wounds. Almsgiving restores all of the sick parts of spiritual soldiers to health, and they become an invincible army.

Then how shall we confidently show you in the battle when you rather dishonour us, being straightway wounded by our enemies and made a mock of? . . . Therefore I go about this camp every day, healing (θεραπεύων) your wounds and curing (διορθούμενος) your sores (ἔλκη). If you recover and become fit even to wound others, I will both teach you this art of war and instruct you how to handle these weapons; rather your works themselves will be weapons to you, and all people will immediately submit, if you would become merciful, if forbearing, if mind and patient, if you would show forth all other virtues.¹⁷²

all of the organs in their head are closed off by the wrappers and grave-clothes of drunkenness. Their hands are bound up by the bands of covetousness, and feet are fastened about with cares. The devil as an embalmer ties up the soul with its passions, and the soul is crippled. Chrysostom's diagnosis shows luxury is fatal to the health of all the organs of the soul (Chrys. *hom.* 27.4 in *Mt.* [PG 57:349.40-350.20]).

¹⁷¹ Chrys. *Hom.* 88.4 in *Mt.* (PG 58:779.54-580.3 and 580.4-9; NPNF 1.10, 523, modified). For an investigation of Chrysostom's description of an ancient battle scene, see J. K. Newman, "Lucan and John Chrysostom: A Parallel of Imagination," *Illinois Classical Studies* 38 (2013): 245-54.

¹⁷² Chrys. *Hom.* 88.4 in *Mt.* (PG 58:780.9-12 and 32-40; NPNF 1.10, 523-24, modified). It is likely that the military infirmaries in the Roman Empire failed to provide high-quality medical care. In addition, the number of large military hospitals rapidly decreased in the third century. Therefore, soldiers who were seriously ill were advised to retire and convalesce with their family (Miller, *The Birth of the Hospital*, 38; and Vivian Nutton, *Ancient Medicine, Sciences of Antiquity* [London: Routledge, 2004], 186).

2. 3. 2. 6. Almsgiving as a Panacea

Interestingly, Chrysostom argues that almsgiving is a panacea. In *In Johannem hom.* 23, almsgiving is referred to as a common remedy (κοινὸν φάρμακον). Chrysostom states that because each one of his congregation has different diseases, he cannot deal with only one illness in his sermons. Instead, he diagnoses a variety of spiritual illness, such as greed, luxury and licentiousness and prescribes almsgiving as suited to every sickness. The listeners have responsibility for taking this medicine according to the types of their diseases.¹⁷³

My preaching is addressed to all, and a common remedy (κοινὸν φάρμακον) is provided for those who need one, but it is the duty of each one of my listeners to take what is proper for his/her disease (νοσήματι). I do not know who are the sick, who the healthy. Therefore, I discuss every sort of subjects and a medicine suited to all passions, now criticizing greed and luxury later, and at another time attacking licentiousness, then praising and encouraging almsgiving.¹⁷⁴

In *In Johannem hom.* 81, almsgiving is identified as the best medicine. According to Chrysostom, our souls are wounded with the disease of lust, anger, sloth, railing, revenge, envy and so on.¹⁷⁵ Almsgiving cures all these psychic illness:

The soul receives many wounds (τραύματα) every day from lust, anger, sloth, profanity, revenge, envy. Well, then, we must apply remedies (θάρμακα) to it. Now, the remedy of almsgiving is no trifling matter, since it can be applied to every wound. Indeed, “Give alms,” Scripture says, “and all things will be clean to you (Luke 11.41).” — Alms, not rapine, for what is given out of rapine does not remain, even if you give it to the needy. It is almsgiving which is free from all injustice that makes all things clean.¹⁷⁶

¹⁷³ Chrys. *Hom.* 23.1 in *Jo.* (PG 59:138.2-24 ab imo).

¹⁷⁴ Chrys. *Hom.* 23.1 in *Jo.* (PG 59:138.24-16; Goggin, *Commentary on Saint John*, FC 33, 222, modified). Gratitude is also identified as a panacea for passions. See Justus T. Ghormley, “Gratitude: A Panacea for the Passions in John Chrysostom’s Commentary on the *Psalms*,” *SP* 83 (2017): 203-16.

¹⁷⁵ Chrys. *Hom.* 81.3 in *Jo.* (PG 59:441.20-442.4).

¹⁷⁶ Chrys. *Hom.* 81.3 in *Jo.* (PG 59:442.2-11; Goggin, *Commentary on Saint John*, FC 41, 385, modified).

For Chrysostom’s biblical exegesis in the discourse of therapeutic almsgiving, see 2. 2 in chapter 3.

2. 3. 3. Preventive Treatment

In addition to reactive treatment, almsgiving also prevents spiritual illness by strengthening the soul. Preventive medicine (δίαιτα) was a major branch of ancient medicine, and its main object lies in preventing illness by suggesting the long-term management of lifestyle in relation to diet, sleep, exercise, sexual activity, and environment, such as climate and a living place.¹⁷⁷ The preventive effect of almsgiving signifies that as benefactors become wise, they can avoid passions and keep psychological youth, vigour, and health.¹⁷⁸ Chrysostom frequently refers to the practice of virtue and the cultivation of habit, which is closely linked with the protection of the soul.¹⁷⁹

In relation to the preventive function of almsgiving, Chrysostom compares it with the fruit of the olive (ὁ τῆς ἐλαίας καρπός). His mention of olives shows that in late antiquity, olives were considered as a health food for maintaining a healthy body, and the Romans often pressed oil from olives to eat them. Since olives are highly nutritious, athletes enjoyed eating them. Wrestlers consumed them to preserve physical strength and to improve muscular power.¹⁸⁰ Chrysostom maintains the soul needs daily nourishment (καθημερινή τροφή) much more than the body. Unless it is well nourished, it will become weaker and even perish. The olive of almsgiving provides enough nourishment for the soul, and makes it healthy and strong.¹⁸¹ Chrysostom states that “the olive enlightens the

¹⁷⁷ Ferngren, *Medicine and Health Care*, 20; and Gill, “Philosophical Therapy,” 340-41 and 345-47.

¹⁷⁸ Chrys. *Hom. 52.5 in Mt.* (PG 58:524.42-44); Sen. *Ira* 2.18 (LCL 214:202-3); Sorabji, *Emotion and Peace of Mind*, 212; and De Wet, “Grumpy Old Men?” 514-20.

¹⁷⁹ Papageorgiou, “A Theological Analysis of Selected Themes,” 194-224; Maxwell, *Christianization and Communication in Late Antiquity*, 144-54; and Cook, “Preaching and Christianization,” 129-30.

¹⁸⁰ Chrys. *Hom. 81.3 in Jo.* (PG 59:442.4-11); *Hom. 24.3 in Jo.* (PG 59:148.21-24); *Hom. 64.5 in Mt.* (PG 58:615.42-49); and Maria Lisa Clodoveo, Salvatore Camposeo, Bernardo De Gennaro, Simone Pascuzzi, and Luigi Roselli, “In the Ancient World, Virgin Olive Oil was Called ‘Liquid Gold’ by Homer and ‘the Great Healer’ by Hippocrates. Why has this Mythic Image been Forgotten?” *Food Research International* 62 (2014): 1062. For a fuller studies on the medical function of olive in antiquity, see Innocenzo Mazzini, “Use of Olive Oil in Medicine in the Ancient World,” *Medizinhistorisches Journal* 35 (2000): 105-26.

¹⁸¹ Chrys. *Hom. 81.3 in Jo.* (PG 59:441.28-442.11).

soul and enriches it and makes it noble and beautiful.”¹⁸² Of special interest is that the sinews (νεῦρα) of the soul are strengthened by almsgiving.¹⁸³

Givers do not suffer from any psychological illness due to the effect of health-giving almsgiving. If someone keeps eating this spiritual food, the immune system is strengthened, and the soul will stay healthy.

A person who practises showing pity to the needy will stand quickly away from covetousness. A person who perseveres in giving to the poor will stand quickly away from anger and will never be puffed up by pride. For, just as when a physician is continually caring for the wounded he/she readily girds himself/herself, as he/she observes human nature in the misfortunes of others, so also if we engage in giving assistance to the poor we shall readily become truly wise and thus shall not admire wealth and shall not consider any possessions of this life important, but will despise them all.¹⁸⁴

Chrysostom argues that seeing the misfortunes of others offers an opportunity to look at oneself. This self-reflection causes to control the passions of the soul, such as greed, anger, and pride. A similar comment is also discovered in Chrysostom’s advice on a visit to a prison. Visitors determine to live a virtuous life after seeing pitiful prisoners.¹⁸⁵ Here, another reason for the preventive effect of care for offenders: prison reminds people of God’s judgement. Chrysostom argues that the social system of punishment inherently

¹⁸² Chrys. *Hom.* 81.3 in *Jo.* (PG 59:442.13-14).

¹⁸³ Chrys. *Hom.* 24.3 in *Jo.* (PG 59:148.25-28).

¹⁸⁴ Chrys. *Hom.* 81.3 in *Jo.* (PG 59:442.17-26; Goggin, *Commentary on Saint John*, FC 41, 386, modified).

¹⁸⁵ Chrys. *Hom.* 60.4 in *Jo.* (PG 59:333.21-33). “You will see some in fetters, others squalid; some with unkempt hair and clad in rags, others wasting away with hunger and running to your feet like dogs; some with their sides torn by lashes, others just returning, bound, from the market-place. Though they have begged all day, they have obtained not even the food they need; yet in the evening what they have collected painfully and toilsomely is demanded of them by their guards. Even if you be of stone, you will be surely more merciful; even if you are living a soft and slack life, you will surely be wiser, because of having seen the condition of humankind in the light of the misfortunes of others.” (Goggin, *Commentary on Saint John*, FC 41, 144, modified).

originates from God, and this system predicts divine wrath. This fear of future judgement acts as a brake on sin.¹⁸⁶

You will be strongly reminded of that fearful day and its various punishments. As you mediate and ponder over these things, you will completely discard anger, carnal pleasure, and the love of things of this world, and will make your soul more tranquil than the smoothest of harbors. . . . If you wisely reflect upon these matters, you will be more readily inclined to show mercy and will enjoy great pleasure.¹⁸⁷

What is quite interesting in Chrysostom's description of the preventive treatment of almsgiving is that adultery or fornication will be shunned. He compares theater and prison. As mentioned above, he emphasizes the importance of sight in the moral progress of Christians. His harsh criticism of the theater is informed in a large part by the negative visual effect of the theater.¹⁸⁸ Male spectators are excited and confused by a constant remainder of the faces, makeup, words, gestures, and clothes of actresses.¹⁸⁹ On the other hand, those who visit the prison do not succumb to the temptation of prostitutes due to their strong level of immunity:

Those who come from a visit to the prison will not succumb to such desire, but will enjoy much tranquility (γαλήνην) and calmness (ἀταραξίαν). For the compunction which results from the sight of the prisoners quenches that other fire altogether. Even if a licentious prostitute should meet a man as he is on his way from visiting the prison, this would do not harm him. For as one who has finally become immune (ἀπλαστος), he will not thus be caught in the snare of that sight, since the fear of the judgement is at that moment before his eyes, rather than that wanton face. That is the reason why he who had

¹⁸⁶ Chrys. *Hom.* 60.4-5 in *Jo.* (PG 59:333.33-48). For the role of fear through the threat of divine punishment, see 3. 2 in chapter 2.

¹⁸⁷ Chrys. *Hom.* 60.4-5 in *Jo.* (PG 59:333.33-38 and 46-48; Goggin, *Commentary on Saint John*, FC 41, 144-45, modified).

¹⁸⁸ Blake Leyerle, "John Chrysostom on the Gaze," *J ECS* 1 (1993): 163-65. For an extensive explanation of Chrysostom's approach to the ancient theatre, see ead., *Theatrical Shows and Ascetic Lives: John Chrysostom's Attack on Spiritual Marriage* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001).

¹⁸⁹ Chrys. *Hom.* 60.5 in *Jo.* (PG 59:333.49-57).

experienced every kind of carnal pleasure declared: “it is better to go to the house of mourning than to the house of laughter” (Eccl 7:2).¹⁹⁰

Chrysostom argues that married women’s cultivation of virtues plays a major role in ensuring the spiritual health of all members of her household, especially her husband’s. This idea is shown in Chrysostom’s treatment of the luxurious life of the wealthy women. Chrysostom indicates that their luxury devastates the souls of all of the members in their household. Their indifference to their children’s souls causes them to fall into the dirty mire of wickedness.¹⁹¹ Their luxurious adornment is a cause of their husbands’ fornication (πορνεία). Husbands are easily snared by prostitutes because their wives deck themselves out like prostitutes.¹⁹² The greed of the women shatters the souls of their slaves. Slaves are beaten or are sent to prison or even are executed because of just the loss of the ornaments of their female owners.¹⁹³ This loss also generates distrust between husbands, wives, and their friends, to the point where they charge each other with theft. Their souls suffer substantial damage with accusations, abuses, and curses.¹⁹⁴ Beyond the household, the extravagance of the rich women has a huge negative impact on the congregation of the church. Some women return to their house with the sickness of envy after seeing the expensive garments and jewels of noble women in the church. Describing the cost and size of these ornaments, they lament their misfortune and quarrel with their husbands who

¹⁹⁰ Chrys. *Hom.* 60.5 in *Jo.* (PG 59:333.57-334.2; Goggin, *Commentary on Saint John*, FC 41, 145-46, modified).

¹⁹¹ Chrys. *Hom.* 89.4 in *Mt.* (PG 58:787.6-18). Chrysostom, *Hom.* 49.6 in *Mt.* (PG 58:503.14-16), also points out that a munificent father worsens the illness of luxury in his children.

¹⁹² Chrys. *Hom.* 89.4 in *Mt.* (PG 58:788.4-8).

¹⁹³ Chrys. *Hom.* 89.4 in *Mt.* (PG 58:786.23-26). In the Roman world, the punishment of slaves was common, and various methods were used, including “the deprivation of food, house arrest, sale, binding with chains, whipping, sexual humiliation” and even execution. While Chrysostom objected to unjust and excessive punishment, he approved of punitive punishment for the correction of bad behaviour of slaves. He argued that strict regulation and punishment are necessary to discipline slaves (De Wet, *Preaching Bondage*, 203-17).

¹⁹⁴ Chrys. *Hom.* 89.4 in *Mt.* (PG 58:786.26-29).

cannot satisfy their desires. This complaint estranges their husbands from the virtue of almsgiving.¹⁹⁵

Chrysostom suggests the moderation of women as a solution for removing the detrimental evils which come from their greed. The healthy souls of women which are established by almsgiving deliver their husbands from the desire of lust:

If you taught him to look down upon these things and to take delight in moderation (σωφροσύνη), piety (εὐλαβεία), and humility (ταπεινοφροσύνη), he would not have been easily taken by the wings of fornication. For a prostitute is able to adorn herself to a greater degree than you, but never to do so with these other ornaments. Therefore, accustom him to take delight in this ornament which he cannot see in the prostitute. Then how will you bring him into this habit? If you take off your ornament and put on other adornment. Then your husband will be in safety, and you will be in honour, and God will be gracious to both of you, and all people will admire you, and you will attain the good things to come.¹⁹⁶

Chrysostom notes that when wives wear the ornaments of charity, husbands also abstain from superfluous consumption, which leads to the control of greed and interest in giving alms:

Apply this adornment within yourself and place these necklaces around your soul. . . . If you act in this way, you will not only make yourself beautiful, but also your husband. For, if husbands see their wives foregoing this worldly adornment, they will not be forced to undertake great expense. If they do not have expense, they will refrain from all covetousness and will be better disposed to give alms.¹⁹⁷

Here, Chrysostom mentions only the preventive therapy of husbands through the merciful works of their wives, but we can infer from his view of covetous women's negative influence on others that women's self-control has also a therapeutic impact on

¹⁹⁵ Chrys. *Hom.* 89.4 in *Mt.* (PG 58:786.55-787.2).

¹⁹⁶ Chrys. *Hom.* 89.4 in *Mt.* (PG 58:788.8-18; NPNF 1.10, 529, modified).

¹⁹⁷ Chrys. *Hom.* 69.3 in *Jo.* (PG 59:380.43-45 and 54-60; Goggin, *Commentary on Saint John*, FC 41, 249).

their children and slaves (the household), and other women who are diseased by envy. The therapy of the greed of a woman results in the therapy of her household.¹⁹⁸

Job exemplifies the preventive function of almsgiving. According to Chrysostom, Job maintained the equilibrium of the soul due to his diligent practice of virtues when he underwent various hardships. He states that athletes train very hard every day to be successful at the Olympics. If they neglect training, they cannot expect to be champions. Chrysostom gives a concrete example of pentathletes training: they repeatedly lift and lower a bag full of sand or compete against each other. These exercises make them strong.¹⁹⁹ Like an excellent athlete, Job tried to despise wealth though he was rich: he put his hope in God and did not become a slave to his wealth. He did not take others' possessions to satisfy his greed, but rather generously distributed his wealth to the poor.

¹⁹⁸ Indeed, this idea shapes Chrysostom's social vision. Exploring Chrysostom's strategies for the transformation of the city, Hartney demonstrates that establishing a Christian household as monastery was an essential factor in his vision of transformation. This social strategy is based on the Aristotelian model that a city consists of each household (οἶκος). The key to the pastoralization of the household lay in the Christianized hierarchical roles of the sexes and generosity to the poor. According to Chrysostom, the man as the *paterfamilias* needs to manage his whole household (Hartney, "Men, Woman, and Money," 530 and 532). In particular, he should care more for his family members' spiritual welfare than his social career and honour, since he is a priest of his household (Hartney, "Men, Woman, and Money," 532; and Chris L. de Wet, "Between the Domestic and Agoric Somatoscape: John Chrysostom on the Appearance of Female Roman Aristocrats in the Marketplace," *Religion & Theology* 20 (2013): 206-7). The woman as a surrogate of her husband is responsible for dealing with domestic affairs including the control of her children and slaves (Hartney, "Men, Woman, and Money," 531; and De Wet, "Between the Domestic and Agoric Somatoscape," 207). In this well-ordered household, all family members pursue together a simple life and distribute their wealth to the poor. This body of Christian households embodying Christian virtues comes together and forms a potent tool for inverting secular values and culture (Hartney, "Men, Woman, and Money," 534. For the detailed treatment of Chrysostom's social transformative strategies, see eadem, *John Chrysostom*, 67-182; and De Wet, *Preaching Bondage*, 82-126). As a result, these transformed households cure society, which is deprived by greed. For Chrysostom the transformation of the appearance of women, in particular aristocratic women, was one of the most crucial elements in promoting the establishment of the culture of simplicity (De Wet, "Between the Domestic and Agoric Somatoscape," 208-15; and id., *Preaching Bondage*, 122-23). Chrysostom's vision of psychic-therapeutic almsgiving is extended to the therapy of society beyond the boundary of the cure of the individual soul.

¹⁹⁹ Chrys. *Hom.* 33.6 in *Mt.* (PG 57:395.18-29).

Thus, he could avoid sorrow even though all his possessions disappeared.²⁰⁰ Just as right diet and exercise keep the body from contracting illness, almsgiving improves his psychological immune system.

Job also was rich, but he did not serve mammon and he possessed wealth, but ruled over it and he was not a slave, but a master. Just as he was a steward of another person's possessions, so he possessed all those things, not only not extorting from others, but giving his own wealth to those in need. More importantly, he did not rejoice in his wealth when he had it. If you want to listen to what he said, "If I rejoice in great wealth which I gained (Job 31.25)." Therefore he did not grieve (ἠλγησεν) when it departed from him.²⁰¹

Chrysostom urges his congregation to imitate Job. Stoics presented a virtuous person as a model to be imitated in order to promote virtues. Appropriating this method, Chrysostom frequently praises the virtues of the great figures found in the scriptures, such as Abraham, Moses, Noah, Job, and Paul, and encouraged his congregation to follow their ways of life.²⁰² In particular, Job is depicted as a prominent virtue exemplar for the rich. Chrysostom asserts that even though Job was rich, he considered his great wealth indifferent and used it rightly by practising munificent almsgiving. He was skilled in the art (ἐπιστήμη/τέχνη) of charity which is essential to the wealthy.²⁰³

²⁰⁰ Chrys. *Hom.* 21.1 in *Mt.* (PG 57:295.50-296.1); and *Hom.* 33.6 in *Mt.* (PG 57:395.41-47).

²⁰¹ Chrys. *Hom.* 21.1 in *Mt.* (PG 57:295.53-296.1; NPNF 1.10, 147, modified).

²⁰² Tonia, *Abraham*, 13-17; Lai, "John Chrysostom and the Hermeneutics of Exemplar Portraits," 72-92; and Sorabji, *Emotion and Peace of Mind*, 223-24. Tonia, *Abraham*, 10-45, argues that Chrysostom's hermeneutic of virtue exemplars was formed within his Hellenistic and Christian backgrounds, in particular such as Stoicism, the second sophistic rhetoric and the Antiochene theological tradition. Exploring the development of Chrysostom's exemplar portraits, however, Lai, "John Chrysostom and the Hermeneutics of Exemplar Portraits," 15-92, gives more weight to the heritage of Hellenistic philosophy and rhetoric than the Christian tradition.

²⁰³ Chrys. *Hom.* 49.3 in *Mt.* (PG 58:500.39-50). Abraham is also portrayed as a model for the wealthy to emulated. See Tonia, *Abraham*, 92-100; and id., "The Iconic Abraham as John Chrysostom's High Priest of Philanthropy," in *Revisioning John Chrysostom*, forthcoming.

Conclusion

Up to now we have investigated the roles of almsgiving in Chrysostom's care of the soul within the context of philosophical therapy. His therapeutic ideas and strategies are rooted firmly in the Greco-Roman philosophical and medical tradition. Appropriating the idea of the therapy of desires in ancient philosophy, he applied this idea to Christian almsgiving which manifests God's love for the poor. For Chrysostom passions are a psychic disorder which seriously harms the health of the soul. He identifies passions and sins as diseases, wounds, tumours, madness, and so on by deploying the terminology of both bodily and mental illness. Passions are not only psychological diseases, wounds and tumours, but also madness. Like bodily sickness, psychic disorder has various complications and spreads easily. Passions and desires break peace of mind and destroy the soul in the end. Spiritual illness is born out of the malfunction of the mind, and thus, the mind is the pivot in the health of the soul.

Almsgiving is a remarkable remedy in healing the sickness of the soul. In most cases, Chrysostom's therapeutic discourse is structured around diagnosis and prescription, and almsgiving is prescribed as affordable behavioral treatment. It cures all kinds of psychic diseases: it cures not only each passion, but also a variety of complications at the same time. On the basis of the examination of spiritual patients, Chrysostom often suggests various remedies along with almsgiving and uses cognitive treatment to correct misconceptions that causes spiritual sickness, if necessary. The soul can also win the battle against any sin with the aid of merciful acts which improve its immune system. No passion can remove the efficacy of almsgiving unless wealth from injustice is given, and the givers become arrogant. Almsgiving functions as both reactive and preventive treatment and keeps the soul healthy.

CHAPTER 2. RHETORIC OF HOPE AND FEAR: THE PSYCHAGOGICAL APPROACH TO REWARD AND PUNISHMENT

Introduction

In the previous chapter about Chrysostom on almsgiving and the cure of the soul, we demonstrated that he suggests almsgiving as a spiritual remedy for the sickness of the soul caused by sins and passions and how this in turn situates itself within the ancient tradition of philosophical therapy. According to Chrysostom, almsgiving, we discovered, not only heals all kinds of passions, but also prevents psychological illness by improving the immune system of the soul. There we saw how Chrysostom's medicalized discourse on almsgiving reflects a certain therapeutic pattern which ancient philosophers, rhetoricians, and physicians developed over a long period of time. In a large frame, his discourse mainly consists of the diagnosis of illness and the treatment of almsgiving as behavioural treatment. In some cases, cognitive intervention is added to make the curative process easy by breaking mental barriers that impede cure.

In this therapeutic structure, there is a recurrent element that we did not cover in the previous exploration: the eschatological horizon of divine reward (μισθός) and judgement (κόλασις).¹ Christian eschatology was a crucial axis that cannot be ignored in the development of the patristic attitudes to wealth and poverty. Helen Rhee argues that “as the patristic writers responded to the issues surrounding attitudes toward wealth, they consistently resorted to eschatological language and paradigm.”² As Brian E. Daley rightly notes, “Chrysostom was intensely concerned to focus his hearers’ attention on what

¹ For Chrysostom it is difficult to identify future reward accurately, while the definition of eschatological judgement is largely uncontroversial, an idea which denotes divine punishment after death and the Last Judgment. In the light of Chrysostom's comments, reward is likely to be the blessings accrued by merciful works in heaven in a narrow sense, but it is unclear whether this is spiritual or material. Sometimes, salvation is presented as reward. This chapter tries to focus on the narrow sense of reward.

² Helen Rhee, *Loving the Poor, Saving the Rich: Wealth, Poverty, and Early Christian Formation* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2012), 49.

awaited them at the end of their histories.”³ This leads us to question of how reward and punishment function in Chrysostom’s logic of therapeutic almsgiving.

This chapter aims to investigate how Chrysostom deals with eschatological reward and punishment in his discourse on psychic-therapeutic almsgiving and how the Christian doctrine of eschatology combines with other elements to achieve the ultimate goal of soul health. In examining these issues, we pay attention to the mixed method of praise and blame which was discussed in ancient psychagogy. This chapter tries to treat the limitations of recent scholarship. Some studies have addressed Chrysostom’s appropriation of these healing speeches in the background of ancient philosophy and medicine. In relation to eschatology, however, only Rylaarsdam gives a very brief description, and there has been little study on Chrysostom’s psychagogical use of eschatological language in his discourse on almsgiving.⁴ To solve this problem, various therapeutic roles of reward and judgement will be fully analysed. In this respect, this study is also clearly distinguished from Cook’s approach. Apart from making no mention of Chrysostom’s emphasis on reward, he does not pay sufficient attention to the psychagogical effect of eschatological judgement in Chrysostom’s Christian therapy.⁵ We will show that Chrysostom reinterpreted even the Christian doctrine of eschatology in terms of philosophical therapy.

Firstly, philosophical debate surrounding the alternate use of gentle and harsh speech is examined. Since the mixed use of blame and praise was a method of adaptable pedagogy, we briefly look at this principle, and then indicate why praise and blame were considered vital in the guidance of the soul in the context of Greco-Roman philosophy. After that, we analyse how this philosophical aspect influenced Chrysostom’s use of reward and punishment in his homilies on almsgiving. We examine how Chrysostom identifies reward and punishment as gentleness and harshness, focusing on his portrait of Christ and his disciples as a doctor of the soul. Then Chrysostom’s views of the therapeutic

³ Brian E. Daley, *The Hope of the Early Church: A Handbook of Patristic Eschatology* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 105.

⁴ Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*, 77-80 and 273-74; Vanveller, “Paul’s Therapy of the Soul,” 94-132; and Upson-Saia, “Wounded by Divine Love,” 94-95.

⁵ Cook, “Preaching and Christianization,” 143-63; and id., ““Hear and Shudder!”” forthcoming. In a similar way, Cyrille Crépey, “La récompense, un thème majeur dans le discours pastoral de Jean Chrysostome,” *RevScRel* 83 (2009): 97-113, focuses on Chrysostom’s theological view of reward.

roles of eschatology are presented, indicating that reward and punishment as the rhetoric of hope and fear complement each other. Within this section, we also treat what strategies Chrysostom employed to strengthen the rhetorical power of hope and fear. Lastly, we attempt to show the whole picture of almsgiving and the mixed method in Chrysostom's curative vision of almsgiving. This demonstrates how almsgiving and the therapy speech of reward and punishment lead the sick soul to recover its strength in a harmonized way.

1. The Mixed Use of Gentle and Harsh Instruction in Ancient Psychagogy

1. 1. Adaptability

Ancient philosophers and rhetoricians claimed that to accomplish effectively his task of guiding the soul, a doctor of the soul should use methods proper to the condition of each soul.⁶ We find this adaptable principle in Plato (c.427-347 B.C.E.)'s *Phaedrus*. Answering Phaedrus' question about how we persuasively lead our listeners to truth, Plato offers several instructions. First, an orator must know the various forms of soul. Comparing the art of medicine to that of rhetoric, Plato claims that in the former case we analyse the body to prescribe the proper ways of treatment, and in the latter case, we analyse the soul to cure it. The practitioner of the art of speech should be taught whether the soul is simple or not, what characteristics each soul has and how it is influenced by a certain situation. Then the orator must learn the various kinds of speech and adapt them to each state of the soul. Plato points out that one kind of soul can be easily persuaded by a certain kind of speech, but another kind of soul cannot be persuaded by the same sort of speech.⁷ Thus, the orator should "offer elaborate and harmonious discourses to the complex soul, and simple talks to the simple soul."⁸ Quintilian (c.35-c.100 C.E.), a Roman rhetorician, also advises the teachers of rhetoric to guide children according to their intellectual ability and nature.

⁶ Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*, 18-22; and Jason S. Sturdevant, *The Adaptable Jesus of the Fourth Gospel: The Pedagogy of the Logos, Culture and History of the Ancient Near East* 78 (Leiden: Brill, 2015), 13-30.

⁷ Pl. *Phdr.* 269d.1-272b.6 (LCL 36:544-55).

⁸ Pl. *Phdr.* 277c.2-4 (LCL 36:570-71).

Some are idle unless you press them; others are impatient of discipline. Fear restrains some and paralyses others. Some need continuous effort to knock them into shape; with others, the sudden attack is more effective. Give me a boy who is encouraged by praise, pleased by success, and who cries when he has lost. He is the one who will be nourished by ambition, hurt by reproof, and excited by honour. In him I shall never have to fear laziness.⁹

Musonius Rufus (c.30-c.100 C.E.), a Roman Stoic philosopher, insists that a good philosopher should have different approaches to their students, considering their level of intellect and growing environment. He gives examples of two types of students. One is dull and is raised in luxury, and the other is clever and trained in moderation. In the case of the former, the philosopher needs to offer numerous proofs and to pay much attention to this pupil in order to persuade him. However, a few simple and lucid proofs are appropriate for the latter. Comparing the teaching of the philosopher with medical treatment, Musonius states that the more serious the illness is, the longer treatment.¹⁰ This adaptable method was also found in Epicurus (341-c.270 B.C.E.) who was an ancient Greek philosopher and was known as the founder of the Epicurean school. He divided his students into three categories and suggested pedagogical techniques proper to each category. The first category is those who make progress to virtue by themselves and do not need a teacher's assistance. The second category is those whose disposition is good, but cannot progress without proper guidance. The teacher needs to lead them to a desired goal. Since their disposition is good, they faithfully follow their teacher's lessons. The last group is those whose disposition is recalcitrant. They are required to observe strict discipline.¹¹

1. 2. The Mixture of Gentle and Harsh Exhortation

The alternating use of praise and blame was one of the many different kinds of methods of adaptation.¹² Moral philosophers and orators argued that a psychagogue must

⁹ Quint. *Inst.* 1.3.6-7 (LCL 124:98-99).

¹⁰ Muson. *Diss.* 1 (Otto Hense, ed., *C. Musonii Rufi reliquiae* [Leipzig: Teubner, 1905], 1-6).

¹¹ Sen. *Ep.* 52.3-4 (LCL 75:344-47).

¹² Clarence E. Glad, *Paul and Philodemus: Adaptability in Epicurean and Early Christian Psychagogy*, Supplements to Novum Testamentum 81 (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 69-89; Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on*

guide people “between the two extremes, using now the curb, now the spur.”¹³ In general, praise or gentle exhortation was applied to good deeds or simple errors, and blame to repetitive or serious faults. The more serious a sickness was, the harsher a remedy was.¹⁴ Sextus Empiricus (c.160-c.210 C.E.), a Pyrrhonian Sceptic, urges the adherents of the Sceptics to follow the model of their teachers: just as doctors accommodate therapeutic intensity to patients, so the Sceptics, in the treatment of the insolence of dogmatists, severely rebuke those whose psychic disease is serious, but gently advise those whose sickness is easy to cure.¹⁵ Plutarch (c.45-120 C.E.), who was a Platonist philosopher, argues that praise and blame are the pedagogical tools of wise fathers. He asserts that like nurses who breastfeed babies after making them cry, fathers should use praise and rebuke alternately and in various ways.¹⁶ He recommends fathers not to be utterly strict and austere, but to endure the misdeeds of their children and occasionally to pretend not to know them.¹⁷ According to Seneca (c.1 B.C.E-65 C.E.), a Stoic philosopher, the balanced use of gentle and harsh measures is a trait of good rulers. He states that physicians first prescribe a dietary therapy or drugs to cure a disease. When, however, this mild measure does not work, surgery or cautery is used. Seneca maintains that rulers too must vary the intensity of therapeutic methods from persuasion and reproof and punishment to extreme punishment according to the level of faults.¹⁸

The reason for emphasis on the mixed method springs in large part from the complementarity of praise and blame.¹⁹ Praise motivates people to do good things, while

Divine Pedagogy, 55-56, 77-78; and Sturdevant, *The Adaptable Jesus of the Fourth Gospel*, 17 and 39-40. For a fuller description of various means of adaptation, see Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*, 56-99; and Sturdevant, *The Adaptable Jesus of the Fourth Gospel*, 30-44.

¹³ Sen. *Ira* 2.21.4 (LCL 214:210-11).

¹⁴ Glad, *Paul and Philodemus*, 71.

¹⁵ Sext. Emp. *Pyrr.* 3.32.280-281 (LCL 273:512-13). Describing an ideal philosopher, Dio Chrysostom (c.40-c.115 C.E.), *Or.* 77/78.38.4 (LCL 385:294-9), also states that the philosopher leads all people to virtue and sobriety, “partly by persuading and exhorting, partly by abusing and reproaching.”

¹⁶ Plu. *Lib. educ.* 9a.4-7 (CLC 197:40-41); and *Virt. mor.* 452c.6-d.9 (LCL 337:84-87). Plato, *Sph.* 229c.5-230a.3 (LCL 123:310-13), too refers to the mixed method as a paternal pedagogical tool.

¹⁷ Plu. *Lib. educ.* 13d.1-f.3 (CLC 197:62-65).

¹⁸ Sen. *Ira* 1.6.2-4 (LCL 214:120-23).

¹⁹ Glad, *Paul and Philodemus*, 69-89; Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*, 77-78; and

excessive praise engenders insolence and complacency.²⁰ It also spoils the disposition. Those who have never been denied are quick-tempered when they are criticized. Seneca points out that we see this case in the only child, and the rich and the noble who are surrounded with flatterers.²¹ Blame resolves these shortcomings of praise. Similarly, Plutarch notes that “when children are full of confidence, [a father should] put them to shame by rebuke.”²²

Harsh speech corrects the faults of the soul.²³ Frank speech (παρρησία) was originally a political term referring to the speech of a free-born man and came to connote a proper speech style for correcting the soul.²⁴ Philosophers maintained that frank speech differentiates a true friend from a flatterer.²⁵ Although frank criticism involves pain, it is essential in the guidance of the soul.²⁶ Dio Chrysostom (c.40-c.115 C.E.) who was a Greek philosopher and orator insists that “a bad philosopher is marked by lack of severity.”²⁷ A doctor of the soul is required not to refrain from censuring even those who were the closest to him,²⁸ and to continue to denounce psychic patients until they correct their errors.²⁹

Sturdevant, *The Adaptable Jesus of the Fourth Gospel*, 39-40.

²⁰ Plu. *Lib. educ.* 9a.2 and 7-8 (LCL 197:40-41); *Virt. mor.* 452c.6 (LCL 337:84-85); and Quint. *Inst.* 2.2.6-7 (LCL 124:270-71).

²¹ Sen. *Ira* 2.21.6-7 (LCL 214:210-11).

²² Plu. *Lib. educ.* 9a.5 (LCL 197:40-41).

²³ Phld. *Lib. fr.* 6.1-3, 7.1-10, and 10.1-11 (David Konstan, Diskin Clay, Clarence E. Glad, Johan C. Thom, and Jame Ware, *Philodemus: On Frank Criticism: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*, Texts and Translations 43, Graeco-Roman 13 [Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1998], 30-31 and 32-33); Plu. *Lib. educ.* 9a.3 (LCL 197:40-41); and *Virt. mor.* 452c.6-9 (LCL 337:84-85).

²⁴ VanVeller, “Paul’s Therapy of the Soul,” 95.

²⁵ VanVeller, “Paul’s Therapy of the Soul,” 95; and Glad, *Paul and Philodemus*, 23-43, 69). For a fuller elaboration of frank speech, see John T. Fitzgerald, ed., *Friendship, Flattery, and Frankness of Speech: Studies on Friendship in the New Testament World*, Supplements to Novum Testamentum 82 (Leiden: Brill, 1996).

²⁶ Epict. *Diss.* 3.23.30 (LCL 218:180-81).

²⁷ D. Chr. *Or.* 32.18.7 (LCL 358:188-89).

²⁸ D. Chr. *Or.* 77/78.42-44 (LCL 385:298-99). Here, Dio, *Or.* 77/78.43-44 (LCL 385:298-99), Chrysostom gives an example of a physician, mentioning that the physician does not use a duller knife or milder fire when he treats his family, but employs the most potent and vigorous treatment possible.

²⁹ Phld. *Lib. fr.* 11.6-10 and 16.1-9 (Konstan et al., 32-33 and 36-37).

However, indiscriminate criticism destroys voluntariness, because people are reluctant to practise virtuous acts to avoid blame.³⁰ Immoderate harshness also hinders moral progress. Objecting to blows or ill-treatment, Plutarch insists that “children grow numb and shudder at their tasks, partly from the pain of the blows, partly from the degradation.”³¹ Quintilian also argues that dry teachers lead their students to “fall into the fault of being without virtues.”³² At worst, harshness makes the weak soul abandon the pursuit of a philosophical life. Moral philosophers categorized their students on the basis of their disposition and characterized immature and insecure ones as ‘weak,’ arguing that the weak soul is especially vulnerable to harsh rebuke, which has the potential risk of destruction.³³ Quintilian mentions that tender leaves are afraid of a pruning knife and cannot bear scars.³⁴ Consequently, rebuke should be mixed with mildness so as not to throw a person into despair. Plutarch argues that just as physicians combine bitter drugs with sweet syrups, so fathers should tighten the reins at one time and slightly loosen them at others, allowing their children to do what they want.³⁵

Due to the destructive nature of frank speech, several directions were required when rebuke was given as well as the mixture of harsh and gentle modes of exhortation. First, the decision about whether we criticize or not should be carefully made. Cicero (106-43 B.C.E.), a Roman politician and philosopher, insists that we need to choose reproof

³⁰ Sen. *Ira* 2.21.4 (LCL 214:210-11).

³¹ Plu. *Lib. educ.* 8f.3-9a.1 (LCL 197:40-41). Since corporal punishment was considered proper only for slaves, some philosophers opposed it in the education of children (Plu. *Lib. educ.* 8f.3-5 [LCL 197:40-41]; and Quint. *Inst.* 1.3.14-15 [LCL 124:100-1]).

³² Quint. *Inst.* 2.4.9 (LCL 124:284-85).

³³ Glad, *Paul and Philodemus*, 78-79.

³⁴ Quint. *Inst.* 2.2.7-8 and 2.4.10-11 (LCL 124:270-71 and 284-85).

³⁵ Plu. *De lib. educ.* 13d.1-f.3 (LCL 197:62-65). Quintilian, *Inst.* 2.4.12-14 (LCL 124:284-87), urges a rhetorician to treat quite kindly a young beginner so that severe remedies can be gently applied: “The teacher must praise some things, tolerate others, suggest changes (always also giving reasons for them), and brighten up passages by putting in something of his own. He will sometimes also find it useful to dictate whole themes himself for the boy to imitate and sometimes love as if they were his own. If, however, the written work is so careless that it cannot be corrected, I have found that it helped if I treated the same theme again myself and made my pupil write it out afresh, telling him he could do even better.”

“when it is unavoidable and no other remedy can be discovered.”³⁶ Second, anger should be avoided. Seneca maintains that since anger is an error of the soul (*delictum animi*), it is not right to correct a fault by doing wrong.³⁷ Aggressive remarks might trigger hatred.³⁸ Thus, a psychagogue needs to refrain from offensive and abusive language, and instead, he must wholeheartedly rebuke people for their own sake.³⁹ When he provides guidance for the balanced use of praise and blame, Quintilian advises teachers to adopt a parental attitude toward their students.⁴⁰ Lastly, blame should be delivered on timely occasions. It is inopportune to reproach someone when he is noisy from laughter or drink.⁴¹

2. Reward and Judgement as Gentle and Harsh Speech

2. 1. The Reality of Reward and Punishment

For Chrysostom reward and punishment are not just rhetorical devices, but real events that will happen in the afterlife. He maintains that we will receive reward or punishment according to our deeds.

. . . After our departure there, we will stand at the fearful judgment-seat and give account of all that we have done, and will receive punishment and submit to sentence, if we remain in our sin, and will enjoy crowns and unutterable good things, if we are willing to give a little heed to ourselves.⁴²

In his treatment of Chrysostom’s view of divine providence, Christopher Hall mentions as follows: “Chrysostom does more than simply linking epistemology to

³⁶ Cic. *Off.* 1.137.1 (LCL 30:138-39). Quintilian, *Inst.* 2.2.5 (LCL 124:270-71), tells teachers that they often advise their students and rarely rebuke them.

³⁷ Sen. *Ira* 1.16.1 (LCL 214:144-45). Seneca, *Ira* 1.15.1 (LCL 214:142-43), also points out that a physician does not show anger toward a patient.

³⁸ Quint. *Inst.* 2.2.7 (LCL 124:270-71).

³⁹ Cic. *Off.* 1.137 (LCL 30:138-39); Quint. *Inst.* 2.2.5-8 (LCL 124:270-71); Sen. *Ira* 1.15.1-3 (LCL 214:142-45); and Phld. *Lib. fr.* 12.6-10 (Konstan et al., 34-35).

⁴⁰ Quint. *Inst.* 2.2.4 (LCL 124:270-71).

⁴¹ Plu. *Quo. adu.* 68d.1-13 (LCL 197:362-63).

⁴² Chrys. *Hom.* 13.5 in *Mt.* (PG 57:218.5-8; NPNF 1.10, 86, modified).

eschatology. He is utterly convinced of the reality of future rewards and punishment, and freely incorporates the actuality of heaven and hell into his understanding of providence.”⁴³

Due to the invisible nature of reward and judgement, however, some among Chrysostom’s congregation denied their reality. Since no one has been to heaven and hell, they cannot believe in reward and punishment.⁴⁴ Refuting this argument, Chrysostom defends the reality of the two future events, maintaining that we cannot see these spiritual realities, but can infer them through analogy. Chrysostom argues that if our reasoning power (λογισμός) is performed under the guidance of the divine scriptures, it becomes a more accurate tool than our eyes in understanding realities.⁴⁵ Regarding punishment, he points out that human punishment reflects the actuality of God’s punishment, which is related to God’s providence for our salvation: we all will be lost due to immoderation if there was no punishment.⁴⁶ Like a father who beats their children or destroys their toys on account of their negligence, the wicked will be judged by God.⁴⁷ Also, just as criminals are imprisoned, so hell is prepared for sinners.⁴⁸ According to Chrysostom, if God punishes sinners little by little in their life, their future penalty will be light. As, however, their punishment is delayed, they will be greatly judged in God’s court. In support of this point, Chrysostom adduces the story of the rich man who had not suffered any harm in his life, but was not allowed to alleviate his suffering through a drop of cold water in the next life.⁴⁹

Similarly, Chrysostom compares human reward with God’s reward: just as we reward someone for his or her efforts, so God rewards us for our good works. A master requites a faithful slave with freedom and a gift of money when he is near death;⁵⁰ an

⁴³ Hall, “John Chrysostom’s *On Providence*,” 103.

⁴⁴ Chrys. *Hom.* 13.5 in *Mt.* (PG 57:215.16-18).

⁴⁵ Chrys. *Hom.* 13.5 in *Mt.* (PG 57:215.23-34).

⁴⁶ Daley, *The Hope of the Early Church*, 107-8. For a detailed examination of Chrysostom’s view of the relationship between God’s providence and reward and punishment, see Hall, “John Chrysostom’s *On Providence*,” 98-111.

⁴⁷ Chrys. *Hom.* 23.9 in *Mt.* (PG 57:319.23-35).

⁴⁸ Chrys. *Hom.* 60.4 in *Jo.* (PG 59:333.38-43).

⁴⁹ Chrys. *Hom.* 13.5 in *Mt.* (PG 57:214.32-45). See also Chrys. *De Laz.* 3 (PG 48:996.49-997.50).

⁵⁰ Chrys. *Hom.* 13.5 in *Mt.* (PG 57:215.46-54). Chrysostom asserts that if masters fail to reward slaves,

emperor gives crowns, prizes and garments to victors at horse races.⁵¹ Chrysostom claims that like this master and emperor, God will offer abundant reward to those who struggle to obey the divine laws, and this heavenly reward will be incomparable.⁵²

Chrysostom also mentions God's providential care and encourages his congregation to think about God's providence. God continues to work for them. Chrysostom argues that this is the absolute evidence of the reality of future reward. If God cares for them through all creation in this world, God will also never ignore their good works in heaven.

Now you see him for your sake stretching out the sky, kindling the sun, founding the earth, pouring forth the sea, expanding the air, appointing courses for the moon, setting unchangeable laws for the seasons of years, and leading all other things to exactly performing their own courses with his order. . . . Seeing therefore so great order (though we have not mentioned so much as the least portion), dare you say that he who accomplishes so many great things for you, will overlook you in a critical time and permit you to lie with asses and swine after you pass away, and that having honoured you with so great a gift, that of godliness, whereby he has even equalled you with angels, he will overlook you after your countless labours and toils? How can this be reasonable?⁵³

2. 2. Chrysostom's Identification of Eschatology as the Mixed Exhortation

For Chrysostom a priest is a doctor who is appointed to ensure the health of Christ's body, the church.⁵⁴ He should protect the body from spot or wrinkle or a disease that mars its health and beauty, since the body must retain its pure form to be worthy of its head, Christ. However, this task is not easy. Chrysostom notes that the illnesses of the soul are various, and its recovery needs much time and effort.⁵⁵ In this sense, the priest must closely examine the state of the soul "from every angle with a thousand eyes" and apply

slaves' heavenly reward will be increased (De Wet, *Preaching Bondage*, 208).

⁵¹ Chrys. *Hom.* 54.6 in *Mt.* (PG 58:539.35-39).

⁵² Chrys. *Hom.* 13.5 in *Mt.* (PG 57:215.54-216.1-20); and *Hom.* 54.6 in *Mt.* (PG 58:539.39-48).

⁵³ Chrys. *Hom.* 13.5 in *Mt.* (PG 57:216.56-217.1 and 217.11-218.1; NPNF 1.10, 86, modified).

⁵⁴ VanVeller, "Paul's Therapy of the Soul," 45-50; and Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*, 194-227.

⁵⁵ Chrys. *Sac.* 4.2-3 (SC 272:246.96-248.5).

the proper method for the sick soul.⁵⁶ Chrysostom considers the mixed use of praise and blame as a trait of a good Christian psychagogue, asserting that if the doctor leniently treats a patient suffering from serious wounds, the illness becomes worse.⁵⁷

Since the priest must mix with men who have married and are bringing up children, keep servants, own great possessions, take part in public life, and hold high office, he must be many-sided (ποικίλον). I say many-sided—not a charlatan, a flatterer, or a hypocrite; but absolutely open and frank of speech (ἐλευθερίας καὶ παρρησίας), knowing how to accommodate (συγκατιέναι) to good purpose, when the situation requires, and to be alike kindly and severe (χρηστόν καὶ αὐστηρόν). It is impossible to treat all his people in one way, any more than it would be right for the doctors to deal with all their patients alike or a helmsman to know only one way of battling with the winds. This ship of ours is beset with continual storms; and these storms not only attack from outside, but are engendered within. Great adaptation and great strictness (συγκαταβάσεως καὶ ἀκριβείας) are both needed. And all these different methods look to one object: the glory of God and the edification of the church.⁵⁸

In *In Matthaëum hom.* 20 and 21, Chrysostom identifies Christ's promise of reward and his threat of punishment as the mixed healing skill in ancient philosophical therapy, that is, gentle and harsh speech.⁵⁹ Here, he depicts Christ as an ancient psychagogue: like a skilful doctor who "points out both a disease which arises from negligence, and health which results from obedience," Christ varies his tones by suggesting both benefit and harm to effectively cure greed.⁶⁰ A similar description also is found in Chrysostom's doctrine of God.⁶¹ Commenting on Matthew 6:19-20,⁶² Chrysostom

⁵⁶ Chrys. *Sac.* 2.4 (SC 272:114.29-30 and 116.36-39).

⁵⁷ Chrys. *Sac.* 2.4 (SC 272:112.1-6 and 114.31-116.36).

⁵⁸ Chrys. *Sac.* 6.4 (SC 272:318.72-320.88; Neville, *Six Books on the Priesthood*, 142, modified).

⁵⁹ Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*, 80, exemplifies *In Johannem hom.* 39, 44, and 45.

⁶⁰ Chrys. *Hom.* 21.1 in *Mt.* (PG 57:295.5-9).

⁶¹ Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*, 79.

⁶² Matt 6:19-20 states: "19. Do not store up for yourselves treasures on earth, where moths and vermin destroy, and where thieves break in and steal. 20. But store up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where moths and vermin do not destroy, and where thieves do not break in and steal."

approaches Christ's promise of great reward from the perspective of a gentle advice to lead his hearers who listen to the Sermon on the Mount toward almsgiving: like a good adviser, he argues that Christ gently addresses greed by presenting heavenly reward. Christ promises that if people give their money to the poor, he will not only safely keep their goods, but also greatly increase them with heavenly things.

And neither here has he spoken the whole things about voluntary poverty, but even in this place he gently (ἡρέμα) has spoken about it, although he had shown his extreme vehemence in relation to these things in the wilderness. However, he does not speak about this in the same way, nor bring it forward; for it was not yet time to reveal it; but for a while he closely examines reasons, maintaining the place of an adviser (σύμβουλος) rather than a lawgiver (νομοθέτης), in his sayings on this subject. For after he had said, "Lay not up treasures upon the earth," he added, "where moth and rust destroy, and where thieves break through and steal (Matt 6:19)." For the present he signifies the hurtfulness of the treasure here, and the profit of what is there, both from the place, and from the things which mar it. And neither at this point does he stop, but adds also another argument. And first, what things they most fear, from these he urges them. For "what do you fear?" said he: "lest your goods should be spent, if you give alms? No, give alms, and then they will not be spent; and more importantly, so far from being spent, your goods will receive a greater increase; for the things in heaven are added unto them."⁶³

Christ is described as a wise counselor who modulates the levels of teaching and softens his tone, taking into account the understanding of the audience.⁶⁴ Focusing on the level of his audience's eyes, Christ begins his lessons about charity with what they want most, so as not to make his commendments onerous. In fact, almsgiving is the way of achieving their desire to keep and increase their possessions. These teachings are related to therapeutic methods for the therapy of greed, as will be explained in detail later.⁶⁵

Christ does not only gently deal with the psychological disease of the greedy. Chrysostom also presents Christ's warning of judgement as severe criticism. Christ

⁶³ Chrys. *Hom.* 20.2 in *Mt.* (PG 57:289.30-48; NPNF 1.10, 142, modified).

⁶⁴ See n. 39-40 in chapter 1 above.

⁶⁵ See also Chrys. *Hom.* 60.1-2 in *Mt.* (PG 58:604.7 ab imo-605.20).

threatens the greedy with future punishment to awaken the dull mind of spiritual patients. If they refuse to care for the poor, they will receive terrible judgement from God. The message of Christ contains encouragement on the one hand and warning on the other. After exegeting Christ's promise of reward, Chrysostom says:

For the present, what had most power to persuade them, that he brings forward, namely, that their treasure would remain impregnable. And on either hand he attracts them. For he not only said that if you give alms, it is preserved, but also threatened (ἠπειλίησεν) the opposite thing, that if you do not give, it perishes.⁶⁶

Here, the concept of God's judgement broadly consists of the loss of wealth, the sickness of the soul and damnation, and hell is the most serious among them. If, according to Chrysostom, the greedy store up their wealth on earth, not only moths, rust, and thieves steal it, but also they are enslaved by it, and thus they will be punished after they leave this world.⁶⁷ He insists that although in some cases the greedy prosper in this world, they will not avoid psychic illness and future judgement as a result.⁶⁸

In *In Matthaëum hom. 74*, Chrysostom asserts that the apostles as the doctors of the soul too are not in the extreme, skilfully oscillating between the harshness of punishment and the mildness of reward to heal the sick souls of the greedy, like their teacher Christ. In this homily, Chrysostom firstly diagnoses the psychological disorder of the greedy, who suffer spiritual fever (πυρετός). Like a fevered patient who craves more cold water in spite of its harmful impact on health, they desire to acquire more wealth even though wealth worsens their spiritual state.⁶⁹ After examining the souls, Chrysostom prescribes the apostles' mixed method for curing the disease. First, Chrysostom states that, as a prominent doctor of the soul, Paul whom Chrysostom respected the most among the apostles follows the model of Christ. Recent studies demonstrate that Chrysostom read Paul according to the pedagogical principle of philosophers who adapted their teachings to

⁶⁶ Chrys. *Hom. 20.2-3 in Mt.* (PG 57:289.48-55; NPNF 1.10, 142, modified).

⁶⁷ Chrys. *Hom. 20.3 and 6 in Mt.* (PG 57:289.55-290.23 and 294.20-42); and *Hom. 21.2 in Mt.* (PG 57:296.17-54).

⁶⁸ Chrys. *Hom. 20.3 in Mt.* (PG 58:289.55-290.23).

⁶⁹ Chrys. *Hom. 74.4 in Mt.* (PG 58:684.32-33).

the conditions and needs of students, but do not explore Chrysostom's treatment of Paul's eschatological judgement and reward language as mixed speech.⁷⁰ Paul bluntly rebukes the greedy, asserting that they will receive God's judgement. According to ancient medical writings, decisiveness and determination are characteristic of good doctors.⁷¹ Just as a doctor strictly warn a fevered patient that if he continues to drink cold water, he may lose his life, so Paul states that greed eventually leads to destruction: "Those who want to get rich fall into temptation and a trap and into many foolish and harmful desires that plunge people into ruin and destruction" (1 Tim 6:9). He also mentions that Christ is near (Heb 10:37; Phil 4:5), and thus, this world will pass away soon (1 Cor 7.31). Chrysostom mentions that like the doctor who cautions the patient about the harmful effect of cold drinks on his teeth, nerves, and bones, he briefly and powerfully warns about the danger of greed: "The love of money is a root of all kinds of evil" (1 Tim 6:10).⁷² However, Paul is a wise physician who properly manipulates his treatments: he is not just an austere doctor of the soul, but also tenderly heals the greedy with reward. "Like a doctor, Paul not only commands (ἐπιτάττει)," Chrysostom argues, "but also soothes (παραμυθεῖται)."⁷³ Just as the doctor devises other things in the place of cold beverages, Paul urges the greedy to be rich in good works and to store up their treasure in heaven, for if they become rich in good works, their wealth will be increased. Paul also points out that contentment is a great gain (1 Tim 6:6).⁷⁴

Second, Matthew is presented. He also severely reprimands the greedy, asserting that they will be punished by God. Here, Chrysostom asserts that Matthew relays Christ's messages, stating that storing up wealth on earth causes the loss of salvation as well as the loss of wealth (Matt 6:19).

See another entering in again, and saying severe things (χαλεπά) concerning this disease, or rather it is the master by him; "For you cannot serve both God and money (Matt 6.24)."

⁷⁰ VanVeller, "Paul's Therapy of the Soul," 94-131; Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*, 157-93; and Mitchell, *The Heavenly Trumpet*, 34-68.

⁷¹ Upson-Saia, "Wounded by Divine Love," 90.

⁷² Chrys. *Hom. 74.4 in Mt.* (PG 58:684.34-43 and 48-53).

⁷³ Chrys. *Hom. 74.4 in Mt.* (PG 58:684.43-44).

⁷⁴ Chrys. *Hom. 74.4 in Mt.* (PG 58:684.44-48).

Yea, he says. How will these things be? How will we cease from the desire? Hence may we learn this also. How will we know? Hear him saying this too: “Do not store up for yourselves treasures on earth, where moths and rust destroy, and where thieves break in and steal (Matt 6:19).” Do you see how by the place and by the things that destroy there, he draws people off from this desire that is here, and rivets them to heaven, where all things are impregnable? For if you transfer your wealth there where neither moth nor rust destroys, nor thieves break in and steal, you will both remove this disease, and establish your soul in the greatest abundance.⁷⁵

To demonstrate this point clearly, he gives the example of the young rich man (Matt 19:16-30), who strove to gain eternal life, but could not attain it due to his greed, and left Jesus without getting anything and lost salvation. Chrysostom notes that Luke also relates the rich man’s great suffering in hell (Luke 19:23-25). Though this man had enjoyed his wealth during his life, he faced the extreme punishment of hell after his death due to his mercilessness. He earnestly asked Abraham to give a drop of water, but even this request was rejected.⁷⁶ Like Paul, Matthew does not use only a harsh remedy in his treatment of greed, but also gently addresses the sickness of greed by promising an abundant reward. Chrysostom mentions that “as he is adaptable (συγκαταβατικός), Matthew does not drive even the rich to despair (ἀπογινώσκειν).”⁷⁷ Matthew states that “whoever has forsaken father or mother or lands or house, shall receive one hundredfold” (Matt 19:29).⁷⁸

⁷⁵ Chrys. *Hom. 74.5 in Mt.* (PG 58:685.11-27; NPNF 1.10, 449, modified). Cf. Chrysostom’s exegesis of Matthew 6:19-21 above.

⁷⁶ Chrys. *Hom. 74.5 in Mt.* (PG 58:685.27-35).

⁷⁷ Chrys. *Hom. 74.5 in Mt.* (PG 58:685.37-38).

⁷⁸ Chrys. *Hom. 74.5 in Mt.* (PG 58:686.18-23). Chrysostom, *hom. 74.5 in Mt.* (PG 58:685.38-686.18), suggests Matthew’s other method of gentle advice. Interestingly, here Chrysostom reconstructs the text of Matthew by integrating parallels between Matthew and Luke. Matthew comforts the greedy, especially the rich, stating that their psychological fever can be easily cured because God is their doctor. No matter what their condition, God is able to recover their health. Matthew states that “what is impossible with man is possible with God.” (Luke 18:27, cf. Matt 19:26). To emphasize this point, he offers several therapeutic cases: Levi, who was a tax collector, was seriously sick with the same disease, but was quickly cured when he followed Jesus (Luke 5:27, cf. Matt 9:9); when Zacchaeus received Jesus, he also easily became free from

3. The Psychagogic Role of Eschatology

3. 1. The Promise of Reward as Gentle Encouragement

3. 1. 1. The Rhetoric of Hope

As Cyrille Crépey maintains, reward played an important role in Chrysostom's pastoral ministry.⁷⁹ According to Chrysostom, the promise of heavenly reward as gentle advice raises hope.⁸⁰ When people hear of great reward, they are buoyed up by the hope of future blessings.⁸¹ This rhetoric of hope has several functions in Chrysostom's discourse on almsgiving. First of all, it motivates people to give alms to the poor. In rhetorical performance, emotions played a crucial role in transforming hearers' thought and behaviour, and among them hope was one of the most important.⁸² In his handbook of rhetorical education, Quintilian notes that "nothing makes for happy work as much as hope."⁸³ Chrysostom's emphasis on self-interest can be read as his adaptive strategy for a weak soul. In her analysis of rabbinic literature and Leo the Great's homilies, Bronwen Neil suggests that "both the rabbinic and Christian acceptance of self-interest as a valid motivation for charitable giving can be read as a pragmatic response to human moral limitations."⁸⁴ We find that Chrysostom frequently uses reward as an impetus for almsgiving. In *In Johannem hom.* 60, the promise of great reward is presented in relation to visiting prison. In this homily, Chrysostom advises his congregation suffering passions, in particular greed, to visit prison, insisting that God will give great treasure even to those who comfort prisoners with just kind words.

Well, then, since we are aware of the treasure that lies available in prison, let us visit there

the illness (Luke 19:1-10).

⁷⁹ Crépey, "La récompense," 97-113.

⁸⁰ Chrys. *Hom.* 40.4 in *Jo.* (PG 59:234.43-45).

⁸¹ Chrys. *Hom.* 88.3 in *Jo.* (PG 59:481.43-482.2).

⁸² Yannis Papadogiannakis, "Homiletics and the History of Emotions: The Case of John Chrysostom," in *Revisioning John Chrysostom*, forthcoming.

⁸³ Quint. *Inst.* 2.4.14 (LCL 124:286-87).

⁸⁴ Bronwen Neil, "Models of Gift Giving in the Preaching of Leo the Great," *JECS* 18 (2010): 244.

continually; let us busy ourselves there; and let us turn in that direction our enthusiasm for the theater. Even though you have nothing to bring there, bring the good cheer of your words. God rewards not only him who feeds the hungry but also him who visits those in prison. Indeed, when you go in and hearten the trembling and fearful soul, by offering encouragement, lending assistance, promising to defend, causing it to seek after true wisdom, you will receive no small reward for this, also.⁸⁵

In *In Matthaëum hom.* 12, Chrysostom speaks of the reward of almsgiving to guide the rich to almsgiving: they are immersed in only building luxurious houses and buying fields and decorating gardens and baths. He argues that even though they can protect their wealth, using keys, doors, bars, and numerous guards, they never escape death, which will deprive them of all their possessions, and often hand their wealth over to their enemies. If, however, they transfer their wealth to heaven by giving alms to the poor, nothing destroys it, because it will be not only safely kept, but also increase.⁸⁶ Chrysostom declares that ignoring such advantages of almsgiving is utterly foolish.

How then is it not of the utmost folly, where destruction and corruption is the lot of all that is stored, there to heap up all, but where things abide untouched and increase, and we are to live there forever, there not to store up even the least portion?⁸⁷

Urging his congregation to give alms in *In Matthaëum hom.* 54, Chrysostom emphasizes that the reward will be great. Citing Isaiah 58:6-9⁸⁸, he asserts that it is God's will that we care for the poor and remove unjust contracts. Comparing emperors' reward

⁸⁵ Chrys. *Hom.* 60.6 in *Jo.* (PG 59:336.18-27; Goggin, *Commentary on Saint John*, FC 41, 150).

⁸⁶ Chrys. *Hom.* 12.4-5 in *Mt.* (PG 57:207.31-208.5).

⁸⁷ Chrys. *Hom.* 12.5 in *Mt.* (PG 57:207.47-51; NPNF 1.10, 79, modified).

⁸⁸ According to Isa 58:6-9, "6. "Is not this the kind of fasting I have chosen: to loose the chains of injustice and untie the cords of the yoke, to set the oppressed free and break every yoke? 7. Is it not to share your food with the hungry and to provide the poor wanderer with shelter— when you see the naked, to clothe them, and not to turn away from your own flesh and blood? 8. Then your light will break forth like the dawn, and your healing will quickly appear; then your righteousness will go before you, and the glory of the LORD will be your rear guard. 9. Then you will call, and the LORD will answer; you will cry for help, and he will say: Here am I. . ."

for horse racers and Christ's reward for the racers of almsgiving, he insists that heavenly reward will be unimaginably great. Emperors make their reward look great to boast about their wealth, but in reality it is small. However, Christ's reward is so great that a winner cannot hold it.⁸⁹ To support this point, Chrysostom gives the detailed analysis of a part of Isaiah 58:8 associated with the promise of reward ("Then your light will break forth like the dawn. . . ."), pointing out that this gift is not one thing, but many things, including crowns, prizes, and other rewards. The passage is divided into three parts. First, Chrysostom interprets 'break forth,' a verb which means the abundance and quickness of reward, claiming that God employs 'break forth,' not 'appear' to declare these characteristics of reward. The second part, 'like the dawn,' also means that reward will be quickly given.⁹⁰ Lastly, Chrysostom analyzes 'light,' which denotes the glorious and splendid world of heaven and all good things in there.

Of what manner of light is he speaking, and what is this light? This is not sensible; but another far better, which shows us heaven, the angels, the archangels, the cherubim, the seraphim, the thrones, the dominions, the authorities, the powers, the whole army, the royal palaces, the tabernacles. . . . You will depart, "where sorrow and woe are fled away (Isa 35:10)," where great is the joy, and the peace, and the love, and the pleasure, and the mirth; where is eternal life, and unspeakable glory, and inexpressible beauty; where are eternal tabernacles, and the untold glory of the King, and those good things, "which eye has not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man (1 Cor 2:9);" where is the spiritual bridechamber, and the apartments of the heavens, and the virgins who bear the bright lamps, and those who have the marriage garment; where many are the possessions of our Lord, and the storehouses of the king.⁹¹

After his full description of great reward in heaven, Chrysostom advises his congregation to strive to help the poor in the hope of this reward.

Do you see how great the rewards are, and how many did he set forth by one passage (Isa

⁸⁹ Chrys. *Hom. 54.5-6 in Mt.* (PG 58:539.6-48).

⁹⁰ Chrys. *Hom. 54.6 in Mt.* (PG 58:539.49-540.16).

⁹¹ Chrys. *Hom. 54.6 in Mt.* (PG 58:540.16-22 and 28-39; NPNF 1.10, 338, modified).

58:8), and how did he bring all together? So also by unfolding each of the passages that follow, we will find our abundance great, and the ocean immense. Shall we then still delay, I beg you; and hesitate to show mercy on those that are in need?⁹²

Second, reward helps weak souls easily receive the command of almsgiving by reducing the psychological burden. VanVeller insists that Chrysostom considered gentle speech as a vital tool in guiding weak souls and strategically used it to make them receptive to his admonition. According to Chrysostom, Paul attempted to encourage the Jews and to lead them to Christian faith by using Jewish kinship language and referring to their salvation, choice, and privilege.⁹³ In the case of almsgiving, as Rylaarsdam notes, he persuaded the weak souls to show mercy to the poor by employing the gentle encouragement of reward, rather than direct criticism.⁹⁴ In *In Johannem hom. 77*, Chrysostom admits that though almsgiving is related to the health of the soul, it is still burdensome and hard for weak souls to put it into practice. To dispel this burden, Chrysostom recommends transferring their attention to heavenly blessings reserved for givers from the act of almsgiving.

Well, then, when we are going to suffer anything unpleasant, we ought to think, not of the hardships involved, but of the crowns to come. Just as traders consider not merely the seas, but also the profits they will obtain, so we also ought to reflect on heaven and confidence in God. . . . Again, if it is burdensome to give to the poor, do not concentrate your thoughts on the cost, but at once transfer your attention to the harvest from the sowing. . . . Virtue is difficult to acquire. But let us modify our view of it by the greatness of the promise of future rewards. Virtuous men, to be sure, even without these, regard virtue as beautiful of itself, and therefore they seek it and practice it because it is pleasing to God, and not for the sake of a reward. They hold chastity in great esteem, not because they will escape punishment if they do so, but because God has commanded it. However, if a man be somewhat weak, let him keep the rewards in view. Let us act in this way also with regard to almsgiving, and let us take pity on our fellow people; let us not neglect

⁹² Chrys. *Hom. 54.6 in Mt.* (PG 58:540.39-44; NPNF 1.10, 338, modified).

⁹³ VanVeller, "Paul's Therapy of the Soul," 110-14 and 121-30.

⁹⁴ Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*, 279.

those wasted by hunger.⁹⁵

According to in *In Matthaëum hom.* 54, Chrysostom's hearers are reluctant to help the poor as they find the task of almsgiving difficult. To solve this problem, Chrysostom offers two kinds of gentle exhortations. First, he intentionally repeats that almsgiving is an easy task to encourage his congregation, asserting that they can accomplish more than God demands because this demand is very easy. God orders them to give their bread to the poor and break unjust contracts, not to cross mountains and seas, and to dig in the ground and live there without food and wrap themselves in sackcloth.⁹⁶ Despite this teaching, however, the hearers' attitude to almsgiving remains unchanged. Consequently recommending them to see the reward of almsgiving, Chrysostom states that if they think about reward, their resistance will be disarmed.

And who is able to do all this? It may be asked. No, who is unable? Tell me. For which is difficult of things I have mentioned? Which is laborious? Which not easy? . . . What is there at all even hard in these sayings? For neither did he say, "Pass over the mountain, go across the sea, dig through so many acres of land, abide without food, wrap yourself in sackcloth;" but, "Impart to the poor, impart of your bread, cancel the contracts unjustly made (Isa 58:6-7)." What is easier than this? Tell me. If, however, you consider it difficult, look, I pray you, at the rewards also, and it shall be easy to you.⁹⁷

In Matthaëum hom. 16, two gentle pieces of advice are similarly presented to assist a weak person to lead a virtuous life. Paying attention to heavenly reward, Chrysostom argues that while labour and sweat are temporary, profit and pleasure are immortal. Here, he emphasizes that the reward of virtue is exceedingly great in comparison

⁹⁵ Chrys. *Hom.* 77.4 in *Jo.* (PG 59:418.25-29, 31-34, and 39-48; Goggin, *Commentary on Saint John*, FC 41, 333-34).

⁹⁶ Chrys. *Hom.* 54.5-6 in *Mt.* (PG 58:539.18-33). Chrysostom's position on almsgiving appears inconsistent. Here, he claims that almsgiving is easy, but in *In Johannem hom.* 77, which is treated before, he speaks about its difficulty (see n. 95). As Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*, 279, n.312, maintains, Chrysostom's goal—to heal the sick soul—is the same in each case, but he approach to each case differently in order to achieve this goal.

⁹⁷ Chrys. *Hom.* 54.5-6 in *Mt.* (PG 58:539.18-21 and 28-35; NPNF 1.10, 337, modified).

with effort. Moreover, Chrysostom points out that God will help us. If we are willing, God will immediately come to us and do everything for us.⁹⁸ According to Chrysostom, these two gentle speeches make virtue easy.

Do not then allege to me labours and sweat; for not by the hope only of the things to come, but in another way also, God has made virtue easy, laying hold of our hands everywhere, and assisting us. And if you will only contribute a little zeal, everything else follows. . . . In order then that we also may escape the hell that is there, by extinguishing all the furnace of disordered pleasure here, let these each day be our counsels, our cares, and our practice, drawing towards us the favour of God, both by our full purpose concerning good works, and by our frequent prayers. For thus even those things which appear insupportable now, will be easy, and light, and lovely.⁹⁹

Third, the hope of reward builds patience. Although a person is weak, he does not give up his task if he has a clear purpose. Chrysostom maintains that just as an athlete endures hard training, expecting a glorious crown, we can easily overcome desire for wealth if we are seized by the noblest intoxication of heavenly things.¹⁰⁰ Chrysostom says through the voice of Matthew.

You are on fire with exceeding desire for riches. Have the possessions of all people instead of your own. For indeed I give you, he says, more than you seek, in opening to you the houses of the wealthy throughout the world. “For whoever has forsaken father or mother, or lands, or house, shall receive an hundredfold (Matt 19.29).” Thus you will not only enjoy more abundant possessions, but also even remove this grievous thirst altogether, and will endure all things easily, so far from desiring more, not seeking often even necessary things.¹⁰¹

Thus, he advises his congregation to think about everlasting blessings when they intend to abandon a virtuous life in the face of the attack of greed. Of particular interest is

⁹⁸ Chrys. *Hom.* 16.11 *in Mt.* (PG 57:254.1-35).

⁹⁹ Chrys. *Hom.* 16.11 *in Mt.* (PG 57:254.14-18 and 34-41; NPNF 1.10, 115, modified).

¹⁰⁰ Chrys. *Hom.* 74.5 *in Mt.* (PG 58:686.28-35).

¹⁰¹ Chrys. *Hom.* 74.5 *in Mt.* (PG 58:686.18-27; NPNF 1.10, 450, modified).

that Chrysostom urges them to control their way of thinking by looking forward to reward: “I am fine because I will receive great reward soon.” This exercise of thinking strengthens the soul even though the external situation still remains unchanged, and was also a significant exercise of asceticism in the care for self.¹⁰²

When therefore the custom of evil things and the desire of wealth keep on bewitching you; do you war against them with that mode of thinking which tells us, “Great is the reward we shall receive, and despise the pleasure which is but for a season;” and say to your soul; “Are you quite dejected because I defraud you of pleasure? No, be of good cheer, for I am introducing you into heaven. You do it not for people, but for God. Be patient therefore a little while, and you shalt see how great the gain is. Endure for the present life, and you shall receive an unspeakable confidence.” For if we would thus discourse with our own soul, and not only consider that which is burdensome in virtue, but take account also of the crown that comes from it, we shall quickly withdraw our soul from all wickedness.¹⁰³

Through a model of Lazarus, Chrysostom encourages Christians, especially the poor and disadvantaged, to endure suffering. According to Chrysostom, patience was the key virtue of Lazarus: he did not complain to God about his extreme poverty and starvation, but simply endured them, giving thanks to God. As a result, Lazarus now lives with Abraham in heaven, which will offer great motivation to continue to practise a noble life for people.¹⁰⁴

3. 1. 2. Economic Language: Visualizing invisible Reward

Here, we need to pay attention to Chrysostom’s use of economic language in relation to these therapeutical and pedagogical roles of the rhetoric of reward. Economic language often appears in Chrysostom’s discourse on almsgiving. As Maria Verhoeff notes, Chrysostom’s discourse on almsgiving is “surrounded by commercial language of

¹⁰² Chrys. *Hom. 16.11 in Mt.* (PG 57:253.50-254.1); and Sorabji, *Emotion and Peace of Mind*, 357-71.

¹⁰³ Chrys. *Hom. 16.11 in Mt.* (PG 57:253.50-254.1; NPNF 1.10, 114, modified).

¹⁰⁴ Cardman, “Poverty and Wealth as Theater,” 166-74; and Mayer, “John Chrysostom’s Use of Luke 16:19-31,” 45-59.

investment, reciprocity, inheritance and merchandise.”¹⁰⁵ These commercial metaphors have been traditionally interpreted as redemptive almsgiving in the Jewish-Christian tradition. According to Gary A. Anderson, the rabbinic tradition viewed sin as debt and almsgiving as merit or credit. If a person gives his money to the poor, his treasury in heaven will be funded, and this deposit will pay down his sin as debts at the final judgement. Anderson insists that this linkage between almsgiving and economic concepts was already implicit in the logic of Daniel’s advice to king Nebuchadnezzar in Daniel 4:27: “Renounce your sins by doing what is right, and your wickedness by being kind to the oppressed.” This Jewish approach to almsgiving was adopted by early Christian writers, and almsgiving became one of the most important means of atoning for sin in early Christianity.¹⁰⁶ Since for Chrysostom reward is a comprehensive idea embracing salvation, it is not surprising that we find the frequent occurrence of economic language in his description of heavenly reward in a narrow sense. However, it is Chrysostom’s pedagogical use of Jewish-Christian heritage in the framework of Greek rhetoric that attracts our attention. Previously, as seen above, scholars have pointed out rightly that Chrysostom frequently used economic language in his discourse on almsgiving, but have ignored the larger context of his interest in the therapy of the soul.¹⁰⁷ In other words, Chrysostom describes heavenly reward by using economic images to make invisible spiritual reward visible before his hearers’ eyes.

This technique of visualization (*ekphrasis*, ἔκφρασις) was a crucial element in

¹⁰⁵ Verhoeff, “Friendship Discourse,” 94.

¹⁰⁶ Gary A. Anderson, “Redeem Your Sins by the Giving of Alms: Sin, Debt, and the ‘Treasury of Merit’ in Early Jewish and Christian Tradition,” *Letter & Spirit* 3 (2007): 39-57. For a further study on alms, reward, and salvation in early Christian discourse of almsgiving, see David J. Downs, *Alms: Charity, Reward, and Atonement in Early Christianity* (Waco, TX : Baylor University Press 2016). The fuller treatment of redemptive almsgiving in early Christianity and Chrysostom will be presented in the next chapter.

¹⁰⁷ Leyerle, John Chrysostom on Almsgiving,” 29, 40-43, and 46; Costanzo, *Harbor for the Poor*, 75-79; and Sitzler, “Identity,” 475-76. They argue that Chrysostom’s use of investment language plays a vital role in building unity between the rich and the poor in the Christian community. Recently, Verhoeff, “Genuine Friend Wishes to be a Debtor,” 48-50 and 60-65, has challenged this previous scholarship, asserting that the cultivation of friendship with God is a driving force in Chrysostom’s use of economic language. Against Leyerle, Cardman, “Poverty and Wealth as Theater,” 170. n. 47, also insists that the language of investment aims at the redemption of the soul.

orations in the Greco-Roman world. *Ekphrasis* is defined as “a descriptive discourse which almost makes the things depicted visible to the sight.”¹⁰⁸ Ancient philosophers and rhetoricians emphasized the use of visual images formed by detailed description in order to imprint messages on a reader or hearer’s mind, arguing that the human mind easily absorbs visual impressions, like soft wax that receives a sealing stone’s impression.¹⁰⁹ Quintilian states that vivid description leaves the image of absent things in the mind “in such a way that we seem actually to see them with our eyes.”¹¹⁰ Thus, he insists that a good orator should present all the circumstances before people’s eyes through a strategic use of mental images, and his task should not so much narrate as exhibit.¹¹¹ According to orators, such visibility plays an important role in guiding people’s way of life, since listeners come to receive a new world view by seeing a speaker’s intended message and actively engaging in it. Turning hearers into spectators through vivid description, a speaker takes control of their mind and emotion and transforms their character.¹¹²

Given Chrysostom’s education in Greek *paideia*, it is no wonder that he frequently employed the rhetorical device of images. Rylaarsdam speaks of this point.

Chrysostom’s preaching is a factory of images, some are biblical images and scenes which crowd out false mental images, others are images from daily life which are re-presented through the lens and values of biblical narrative.¹¹³

As Stenger also notes, “Chrysostom’s preaching is a matter of demonstration, not reason alone.”¹¹⁴ Though he acknowledged the negative aspect of images, the preacher did not fully reject their strategic use as he and his congregation were exposed to various images in their daily life. Instead, he argued for the proper use of images according to his

¹⁰⁸ Mitchell, *The Heavenly Trumpet*, 101.

¹⁰⁹ Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*, 231-32.

¹¹⁰ Quint. *Inst.* 6.2.30 (LCL 126:60-61).

¹¹¹ Quint. *Inst.* 6.2.31-32 (LCL 126:60-61).

¹¹² Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*, 233-34; and Mitchell, *The Heavenly Trumpet*, 103.

¹¹³ Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*, 239.

¹¹⁴ Jan R. Stenger, “Text Worlds and Imagination in Chrysostom’s Pedagogy,” in *Revisioning John Chrysostom*, forthcoming.

purpose.¹¹⁵ In the case of economic images regarding reward, he visualized invisible reward and made his hearers see it through these images. Such pedagogical use of economic images would maximize the functions of reward. The imaginary rhetoric of economic language stimulates the memory stored in the listener's mind, and this leads one to picture the mental representation of reward in it.¹¹⁶ By seeing heavenly reward through their eyes, the hearers received the exhortation of almsgiving with great hope. Here, we find Chrysostom's wise adaptation to ordinary people. He would know that they could not easily agree with his representation of spiritual reward in that this reward is invisible, and he did not hesitate to compare it with economic transaction for his congregation. Stenger points out that as Chrysostom was well aware of his congregation's difficulty in understanding spiritual realities, he made an effort to harness images and metaphors provided by everyday life such as the theatre, baths, and the agora to make biblical teachings accessible to them. These images were not simply "a naïve reworking of life," but "a deliberate didactic method."¹¹⁷

In *In Matthaeum hom.* 15, Chrysostom presents reward as debts that God should pay to givers. He points out that benefactors practise heavenly usury with God through the poor to whom they give financial aid. If people lend money to God through the poor, God becomes a "co-signer," and is responsible for repayment.¹¹⁸ This metaphor of reward as debts originates from Proverbs 19:17: "He who shows mercy to the poor man lends to the Lord." Along with Proverbs 19:17, the concept of the identification of Christ with recipients, in particular the poor, is also essential in the idea of God as a debtor. If benefactors give their money to the poor, they also give to Christ.¹¹⁹ In this homily, Chrysostom deals with the fights of the poor in public places such as a marketplace.

¹¹⁵ Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*, 236-37.

¹¹⁶ Stenger, "Text Worlds and Imagination," forthcoming.

¹¹⁷ Stenger, "Text Worlds and Imagination," forthcoming.

¹¹⁸ Verhoeff, "Friendship Discourse," 95. Anderson, "Redeem Your Sins by the Giving of Alms," 49, notes that the poor person is like "some sort of ancient automatic teller machine through which one could make a deposit directly to one's heavenly account. Just as an altar was a direct conduit of sacrifices to the heavenly realm, so the hand of the impoverished soul seeking charity."

¹¹⁹ Verhoeff, "Friendship Discourse," 95; Brändle, "This Sweetest Passage," 136; id., *Matthäus 25:31-46 im Werk des Johannes Chrysostomus*, 284-342; and Broc-Schmezer, "Pauvreté et spiritualité," 139-48.

Enmity and anger, which come from greed, seem to be the main reason for the fights. Interestingly, Chrysostom insists that a fight belongs to the rich as wealth naturally has many elements of conflict, and he wonders why, though they are poor, the poor have the same evils regarding wealth as the rich.¹²⁰

In addition to fighting, curious spectators are also problematic. Chrysostom bemoans the fact that people enjoy watching fighting, rather than stopping it. Their brothers or friends revile and hit each other, but they do not separate them and instead form a devilish amphitheatre. Chrysostom highlights the fact that fighters are not beasts, serpents or bears, but human beings who have the same substance as the spectators. Because the souls of fighters are in a serious state, they need urgent and immediate help. To declare this seriousness, he employs the metaphors of a shipwreck and fire. Their ships are wrecked and sink, and they are surrounded by roaring fire. If no one helps them, they will fall into hell in the end; consequently, people should rescue them from the shipwreck and fire. Reminding his congregation of Christ's command that we should help even our enemy's donkey, which falls down under its load (Exod 23:5), Chrysostom claims that if we should raise the ass, we should do much more in the case of the soul that falls into the fire of hell. People often get hit when they break up a fight, and this is martyrdom since they suffer on God's behalf.¹²¹

Chrysostom suggests several ways of stopping the fight: money, words, tears, and sighs, adding the promise of heavenly reward as motivation. Each good behaviour has a corresponding reward to it, and if these good works are performed at once, recompense will greatly increase.¹²² Here the metaphor of God as a debtor is indicated. According to Chrysostom, his audience becomes God's creditor by pulling quarrelling persons apart.¹²³

Let us consider how Chrysostom's rhetoric of heavenly usury affects his congregation. First, the image of God as a debtor eliminates the doubt of the congregation

¹²⁰ Chrys. *Hom.* 15.11 in *Mt.* (PG 57:237.49-238.7).

¹²¹ Chrys. *Hom.* 15.10 in *Mt.* (PG 57:236.27-237.30).

¹²² Chrys. *Hom.* 15.10 in *Mt.* (PG 57:236.13-24).

¹²³ Chrysostom, *Hom.* 15.11 in *Mt.* (PG 57:238.7-60), refers to forgiveness as a deed that makes God indebted to us. For Chrysostom this concept is applied not only to almsgiving, but also to "praying, obedience, displaying gratitude for received benefits and being thankful for bad things (suffering, sickness and being falsely accused)" (Verhoeff, "Friendship Discourse," 95-96).

about reward. As future reward is invisible, people do not believe in its reality. Therefore, Chrysostom gives an account of reward by adapting the system of mortgage or guarantor in moneylending, pointing out that no one lends money without mortgages or pawns or guarantees.¹²⁴ In ancient Greece, poor peasants' wives and children were used as security against their loans, and if debtors could not repay their loans, their entire families were sold into slavery. To eradicate this abuse of usury, Solon, archon of Athens in 594 B.C.E, strongly prohibited "loans on the person."¹²⁵ Because the economic system of security was familiar to Chrysostom's congregation, they could easily imagine a scene where God pays them back instead of the poor. Chrysostom highlights this point: God makes a contract with givers and already gives them an earnest with both spiritual and material things in this life.¹²⁶ Since God who has boundless wealth is a guarantor of the poor and guarantees huge interest as well as their principal, lenders do not need to worry about losing their money.

Therefore, when God realized that the poor man is endangered by his indigence, and indeed that the rich man is endangered by his inhumanity, he himself entered in between

¹²⁴ Chrys. *Paen. hom. 7.7* (PG 49:333.44-49). The authenticity of *Homilia 7* has been called into question in previous scholarship, and it has been regarded as the work of Severian of Gabala (CPG 4333, cf. 4186; J.A. De Aldama, *Repertorium Pseudochrysostomicum*, Documents, études et répertoires publiés par l'Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes 10 [Paris: Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1965], 395). However, Christo, *On Repentance and Almsgiving*, xv-xvi, argues that it belongs to Chrysostom on the basis of its reflection of Chrysostom's ecclesiology. This thesis addresses this homily as one of Chrysostom's corpus, but our conclusion leaves the door open to further investigation.

¹²⁵ Brenda L. Ihssen, *They Who Give from Evil: The Response of the Eastern Church to Moneylending in the Early Christian Era* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2012), 17-19. See also, Holman, *The Hungry are Dying*, 115; and Antigone Samellas, "The Anti-Usury Arguments of the Church Fathers of the East in Their Historical Context and the Accommodation of the Church to the Prevailing 'Credit Economy' in Late Antiquity," *Journal of Ancient History* 5 (2017): 134-78.

¹²⁶ Chrys. *Hom. 66.5 in Mt.* (PG 58:632.7-11). Chrysostom, *hom. 66.5 in Mt.* (PG 58:632.13-19), presents God's security in detail: "For what you have received are these: He himself made you the body, he himself put in you the soul, he honoured with speech you alone of the things on the earth, he gave you the use of all the things that are seen, he bestowed on you the knowledge of himself, he gave up his son for you, he gave you a baptism that is full of so many good things, he gave you a holy table, he promised a kingdom, and the good things that cannot be told (NPNF 1.10, 408, modified)."

them, like a security (ἐγγύριον) to the poor man and as a pledge (ἐνέχυρον) to the lender. “You disbelieve him,” he says, “due to his poverty, believe in me for my abundance.” He saw the poor man and had mercy upon him. He saw the poor man and did not disregard him; rather, he gave himself as a pledge (ἐνέχυρον) to the one who had nothing, and he stood next to the needy and helpless out of his abundant goodness; and the blessed David verifies this philanthropy, saying: “For, he stood on the right hand of the poor (Ps 108:31).” “He who has mercy on a poor man lends to God (Prov 19:17).” “Have courage,” he says, “lend to me.”¹²⁷

Second, in his discourses on almsgiving Chrysostom frequently emphasizes that reward will be great, but his hearers cannot understand how it will be really great due to its invisibility. In this case, we need to pay attention to Chrysostom’s comments on the interest that accrues in spiritual transaction. The explanation of reward through interest helps the audience realize how their future reward will be abundant. Chrysostom asks his congregation why God says that givers ‘lend’ to him, not ‘give’ to him (Prov 19:17). Basically, to give means loss, but to lend means gain, because the principal of the lenders continues to increase with interest. On the basis of this economic idea, Chrysostom explains the amount of reward: like interest, reward will continually increase as time goes on.¹²⁸ He summarizes his arguments regarding why God uses an expression, ‘to lend.’

This is why it did not say simply, “Whoever has mercy upon the poor gives to God,” so you may not think that the recompense will be customary (ἀπλήν); rather, it said, “Whoever has mercy upon the poor lends to God.”¹²⁹

Then, what is the interest rate of almsgiving as divine debts? In the late Roman Empire, the standard interest rate approximately ranged between five and twelve percent.

¹²⁷ Chrys. *Paen. hom.* 7.7 (PG 49:333.55-334.5; Christo, *On Repentance and Almsgiving*, 106). Elsewhere comparing God as a debtor to a king as debtor, Chrysostom, *hom.* 16.11 *in Mt.* (PG 57:254.9 -14), speaks of this confidence. “For if one having a king his debtor (ὀφειλέτης), thinks he has sufficient security for all his life; consider how great will he be, who has made benevolent and everlasting God a debtor (χρεώστης) to himself, for good deeds both small and great (NPNF 1.10, 114, modified).”

¹²⁸ Chrys. *Paen. hom.* 7.6 (PG 49:333.27-34).

¹²⁹ Chrys. *Paen. hom.* 7.6 (PG 49:333.34-37; Christo, *On Repentance and Almsgiving*, 105).

In the case of twelve, one percent interest rate was charged per month and twelve percent per year. In practice, however, the rate was higher, and in some cases, the rate increased up to fifty percent.¹³⁰ The interest rate on a heavenly loan is much higher than this standard rate, and Chrysostom maintains that almsgiving is the most lucrative investment in that God repays principal even a hundred times (Matt 19:29).

When you lend to others, what do you gain? What do you wish for from them in interest (πλεονασμός)? Do you not ask for the hundredth part in order to strive to be within the law? If you intensified your insatiable desire, you would reap double and triple the fruits of injustice. I, however, defeat your greediness. I surpass your insatiable appetite. I cover your excessiveness with my abundance. You ask for a hundredth; I, however, give you a hundred times more.¹³¹

Therefore, Chrysostom urges his congregation not to miss an opportunity to receive their loans with abundant interest, while criticizing their stinginess. In the voice of Paul, he declares that one who sows sparingly will also reap sparingly (2 Cor 9:6). If they have fertile ground for planting crops, they may borrow seeds from others to make a larger profit. In the case of almsgiving, which ensures high-rate profits, however, they hesitate to invest their money in this spiritual transaction.¹³² According to Chrysostom, they should “lend to God who gives an interest (τόκος) greater than the principal (κεφάλαιον).”¹³³ While earthly moneylending yields the return of death, the heavenly one gives a lender heaven and its good things.¹³⁴

Lastly, Chrysostom notes the fact that the spiritual loan dramatically changes the status of givers in regard to their relationship with God. In a loan system, a creditor does not need to avoid his borrower. He always demands his money back with confidence. Likewise, in the heavenly transaction, givers have the right to boldly request their money

¹³⁰ Holman, *The Hungry are Dying*, 115; and Ihssen, *The Response of the Eastern Church to Moneylending*, 33.

¹³¹ Chrys. *Paen. hom. 7.7* (PG 49:334.9-16; Christo, *On Repentance and Almsgiving*, 106, modified).

¹³² Chrys. *Hom. 5.5 in Mt.* (PG 57:60.53-61.11).

¹³³ Chrys. *Hom. 5.5 in Mt.* (PG 57:61.17-18).

¹³⁴ Chrys. *Hom. 5.5 in Mt.* (PG 57:61.22-62.9).

from God. As mentioned above, in the society of late antiquity a lender had powerful authority to such an extent as to sell a debtor's children into slavery when the debtor could not repay his debts.¹³⁵ Chrysostom maintains that God as a debtor is ashamed before givers as his lenders, and the lenders should claim their money from God, not both the poor and him.¹³⁶ He emphasizes this point multiple times: to those who request praise from him, he responds.

But sometimes you show mercy to the poor. I too know that. But even in this again great is the mischief. For you do this either in pride or in vainglory, so as not to profit even by your good deeds. What can be more wretched than this, to be making your shipwreck in the very harbor? To prevent this, when you have done any good action, seek not thanks from me, that you may have God your debtor (ὀφειλέτης). For, "Lend", says he, "to them from whom you do not expect to receive (Luke 6.35)." You have your debtor (χρεώστης); why do you leave him, and require it of me, a poor and miserable mortal? What? Is not your debtor (χρεώστης) displeased, when the debt is required of him? What? Is not he poor? Is not he unwilling to pay? Do not you see his unspeakable treasures? Do not you see his indescribable munificence? Lay hold then on him, and make your demand; for he is pleased when one thus demands the debt of him. Because, if he sees another required to pay for what he himself owes, he will feel as though he were insulted. And he repays you no more and justly reproaches, saying, "Why, of what ingratitude have you convicted me? What poverty do you know to be in me, that you pass by me, and resort to others? You have lent to one, and do you demand the debt of another?" For although man received it, it was God that commanded you to bestow; and his will is to be the archetypal debtor (πρωτότυπος ὀφειλέτης) and surety (ἐγγυητής), affording you ten thousand occasion to demand the debt of him from every quarter. Do not then let go so great facility and abundance, and seek to receive of me who have nothing.¹³⁷

The passage above indicates that givers can request their money from God in their

¹³⁵ See n. 125 above.

¹³⁶ Chrys. *Paen. hom.* 7.6 (PG 49:333.39). He, *Paen. hom.* 7.6 (PG 49:333.37-40), states that "since God borrows from us, then, he is our debtor. How do you want to have him, as a judge or debtor? The debtor is ashamed before his lender; the judge does not put to shame the one who borrows."

¹³⁷ Chrys. *Hom.* 15.9 in *Mt.* (PG 57:235.41-236.3; NPNF 1.10, 100, modified).

present life, but it is in heaven that they ultimately exercise their right. God repays only part of his debts here, and the rest of them will be given in heaven.¹³⁸

3. 1. 3. Caution: Avoiding Vainglory¹³⁹

For Chrysostom, almsgiving is a quite profitable investment, but there is a vice associated with the loss of this profitability, namely vainglory (κενοδοξία) which is related to the motivation of charity and should be avoided. Chrysostom calls vainglory a many-headed beast (πολυκέφαλον θηρίον) because it is connected with many different kinds of deeds. It becomes a main underlying factor in seeking power, wealth and luxurious life, and more seriously, often wears the mask of virtues, such as almsgiving, fasting and prayer. Chrysostom argues that in all cases vainglory is terrible, and it is the cruellest and the most inhumane when it is linked with almsgiving, as givers seek to enhance their own reputation at the cost of the misery of the poor. They are not concerned with the poor condition of those in need and are only eager to gain others' praise.¹⁴⁰ According to Chrysostom, ascetics and monks are particularly vulnerable to vainglory, as seen in Stageirios.¹⁴¹

Chrysostom argues that those seeking glory from people will lose all their reward in heaven as well as eternal life, hearing Christ's voice: "you lose all your reward (Matt 6:1)."¹⁴² They are quite wretched, like those whose ship is wrecked in the very harbour.¹⁴³ Chrysostom notes that ironically, they destroy treasure themselves that no one can steal. Comparing vainglory with a moth and thief, he makes the following remark;

Do you desire to be called merciful from people? And what is the gain? The gain is nothing, but the loss infinite. For these very persons, whom you call to be witnesses,

¹³⁸ Chrys. *Hom.* 15.9 in *Mt.* (PG 57:236.7-12); and *hom.* 5.5 in *Mt.* (PG 57:62.9-34).

¹³⁹ See Chrysostom's similar argument of arrogance in 2. 2 in chapter 1 above.

¹⁴⁰ Chrys. *Hom.* 71.2-3 in *Mt.* (PG 58:664.35-55 and 665.41-46); and *hom.* 19.1 in *Mt.* (PG 57:273.30-28 ab imo and 275.10-16).

¹⁴¹ Wright, "Between Despondency and the Demon," 363-66; and ead., "Brain and Soul in Late Antiquity," 266-80.

¹⁴² Chrys. *Hom.* 71.3 in *Mt.* (PG 58:665.35-41).

¹⁴³ Chrys. *Hom.* 15.9 in *Mt.* (PG 57:235.44-45).

become robbers of your treasures that are in heaven; or rather not these, but ourselves, who spoil our own possessions, and scatter what we have laid up above. O new calamity and this strange passion! Where moth does not corrupt, nor thief break through, vainglory scatters. This is the moth of those treasures there; this is the thief of our wealth in heaven; this ruins the riches that cannot be spoiled; this mars and corrupts all. For because the devil saw that the place is impregnable to thieves and to the worm, and the other plots against them, he by vainglory ruins the wealth.¹⁴⁴

Chrysostom urges his congregation to learn the skill of almsgiving from God to prevent this misfortune, arguing that God is a craftsman who knows best about the skill of almsgiving and how to teach it. Chrysostom states that if someone wants to learn some art, he needs to go to its expert. For example if he wants to be a wrestler or fighter or orator, he must visit the school of a trainer or boxer or rhetorician respectively. It is absurd for someone who tries to learn wrestling to seek its techniques from a fish seller or vegetable dealer.¹⁴⁵ God as the master of philanthropy requires his people to give alms secretly to the poor. Interestingly, here Chrysostom identifies almsgiving as a sacrament (μυστήριον) and maintains that whoever pursues vainglory in almsgiving profanes God's holy mystery.¹⁴⁶ A poor person is regarded as a temple of God and an altar on which believers offer up their gifts to God because of their identification with Christ.¹⁴⁷ The remarkable description of almsgiving as mystery is based on Chrysostom's definition of sacrament: "Christian mysteries are nothing less than God's mercy and loving kindness (Καὶ γὰρ τὰ μυστήρια τὰ ἡμέτερα τοῦτο μάλιστα ἐστίν, ἐλεημοσύνη καὶ φιλανθρωπία Θεοῦ)."¹⁴⁸ To support his proposition, he provides concrete examples of intercession in the eucharist, arguing that these intercessory prayers are heavily charged with mercy. At the beginning of the eucharist, the series of three intercessory prayers are offered for the possessed, penitents, and participants in this sacrament respectively. Chrysostom notes that in the case of the believers, their children pray for them, and because children are humble, their prayer

¹⁴⁴ Chrys. *Hom. 71.3 in Mt.* (PG 58:666.9-23; NPNF 1.10, 434, modified).

¹⁴⁵ Chrys. *Hom. 71.3 in Mt.* (PG 58:665.46-666.4).

¹⁴⁶ Chrys. *Hom. 71.4 in Mt.* (PG 58:666.30-32).

¹⁴⁷ Broc-Schmezer, "Pauvreté et spiritualité," 139-48; and Brändle, "This Sweetest Passage," 133-35.

¹⁴⁸ Chrys. *Hom. 71.4 in Mt.* (PG 58:666.32-34).

is accepted. He declares that the participants know how the mystery is full of mercy, in fact it is mercy in itself. On the basis of his definition of mystery, he states that as a self-appointed priest a benefactor should shut doors to keep the mystery of almsgiving holy.¹⁴⁹ Of course, for Chrysostom secret almsgiving is primarily a matter of the intention (γνώμη), not of the action. This point is emphasized because no one can always and absolutely help the poor in secret. Interpreting Christ's command in Matthew 6:1-4 (give alms secretly), Chrysostom points out that God rewards and punishes according to the intention of givers.¹⁵⁰ Even though givers hide their charity from others' eyes, if they pursue praise and credit in their unseen mind, this charity loses its value. As Laird argues, the mindset is the object of God's evaluation.¹⁵¹

According to Chrysostom, the renunciation of earthly praise ensures heavenly praise in abundance. While people condemn or dishonour the vainglorious, maintaining that their interest is only in their fame, almsgivers who performed their charity in secret will receive honour in heaven beyond their imagination.¹⁵² Chrysostom depicts this honour by adapting the pagan euergetic system in which the rich elite spent a huge amount of money to construct a public building or to organize festivals, and in exchange for their contribution, they received public acclamations, and in some cases, their statues or inscription was built and honorary decrees were issued.¹⁵³ Picturing an imaginary theatre in heaven, Chrysostom insists that benefactors will be gloriously honoured by the whole universe as well as God.

Setting for him a great and august theatre (θέατρον) and bestowing on him the very thing that he desire in great abundance, "For what," says he, "do you wish? Is it not to have

¹⁴⁹ Chrys. *Hom. 71.4 in Mt.* (PG 58:666.35-52); Bryan D. Spinks, "The Growth of Liturgy and the Church Year," in *Constantine to c. 600*, ed. Augustine Casiday and Frederick W. Norris, *The Cambridge History of Christianity* vol. 2 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007), 605; and Mayer, "Madness in the Works of John Chrysostom," 363-64.

¹⁵⁰ Chrys. *Hom. 19.1 in Mt.* (PG 57:274.9-20 ab imo). See also VanVeller, "Paul's Therapy of the Soul," 136-59.

¹⁵¹ Laird, *Mindset, Moral Choice, and Sin*, 41-46.

¹⁵² Chrys. *Hom. 71.4 in Mt.* (PG 58:666.53-668.2).

¹⁵³ Roskam, "John Chrysostom on Pagan Euergetism," 150.

some to be spectators of what is going on? Behold then, you have some; not angels, nor archangels, but the God of all.” And if you desire to have people also as spectators, neither of this desire does he deprive you at the fitting season, but rather in greater abundance affords it to you. For, if you should now make a display, you will be able to make it to ten only, or twenty, or (we will say) a hundred persons: but if you take pains to lie hid now, God himself will then proclaim you in the presence of the whole universe. Therefore above all, if you will have people who see your good deeds, hide them now, that then all may look on them with the more honour, as God makes them manifest, and extolls them, and proclaims them before all. . . . And let me add, even were there no penalty, it was not fitting for him who desires glory, to let go this theatre (θέατρον), and take in exchange that of people. For who is there so wretched, as that when the king was hastening to come and see his achievements, he would let him go, and make up his theatre (θέατρον) of the poor and beggars?¹⁵⁴

3. 2. The Threat of Judgement as Harsh Criticism

3. 2. 1. The Rhetoric of Fear

While reward as gentle speech is useful for encouraging the weak soul to take up therapeutic almsgiving, gentle exhortation has its limit in curing the soul. Despite Chrysostom’s repetitive teachings about mercy, the majority of his congregation was still indifferent to how the poor lived. He expresses his dissatisfaction with the necessity for preaching almsgiving repeatedly. Indeed, what he would like to do is to speak on spiritual wars against the Jews, pagans, and heretics, but he needs to confine himself to the issue of almsgiving due to his congregation’s state.¹⁵⁵ Chrysostom points out that under this circumstance, the unbalanced use of praise tends to result in negligence, and to correct such laziness there is need of strong condemnation.¹⁵⁶ He was not always a gentle teacher.

Kindness and gentleness are not helpful on all occasions, but there is a time when the

¹⁵⁴ Chrys. *Hom.* 19.2 in *Mt.* (PG 57:275.41-58 and 276.7-13; NPNF 1.10, 131-32, modified).

¹⁵⁵ Chrys. *Hom.* 88.3-4 in *Mt.* (PG 58:779.14-24 and 50-53).

¹⁵⁶ Chrys. *Sac.* 2.4 (SC 272:116.33-36). “There are others who, because they do not pay a proportionate penalty for their sins, are misled into negligence and become far worse, and are led on to commit greater sins (Neville, *Six Books on the Priesthood*, 58).”

teacher has need of greater severity. When the pupil is lazy and foolish, it is necessary to use a goad to prod such great sluggishness. This even the son of God has done time and again.¹⁵⁷

Chrysostom construes future divine judgement as harsh speech to make up for the shortcomings of gentleness on the basis of the tradition of ancient moral philosophers and rhetoricians who underscored the role of reprimand and punishment in education. According to a popular pedagogical maxim attributed to Isocrates (436-338 B.C.E.) who was an ancient Greek orator, “the root of education is bitter; its fruit sweet.”¹⁵⁸ Epictetus (c.50-135 C.E.), a Greek Stoic philosopher, argues that a philosopher’s school is one of pain in essence: “All of you, a philosopher’s school is a doctor’s surgery. You should not leave it in pleasure, but in pain.”¹⁵⁹ Addressing the identity of a philosopher, Plutarch too questions as follows: “What is there so august about one who has spent so much time talking philosophy, yet has never caused anyone pain?”¹⁶⁰ In the education of the Greco-Roman world, corporal punishment was a standard technique in teaching methods.¹⁶¹ Henri I. Marrou notes that “‘to hold out the hand for the cane’ (*manum ferulae subducere*) was an elegant Latin way of saying ‘to study.’”¹⁶²

According to Chrysostom, the threat of divine punishment leads the sick soul to turn away from wicked deeds by engendering fear.¹⁶³ Hell has a pedagogical role due to

¹⁵⁷ Chrys. *Hom.* 44.1 in *Jo.* (PG 59:247.16-21 ab imo; Goggin, *Commentary on Saint John*, FC 33, 442, modified).

¹⁵⁸ Malcolm Heath, *Hermogenes on Issues: Strategies of Argument in Later Greek Rhetoric* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), 13-14, quoted in Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*, 277.

¹⁵⁹ Epict. *Diss.* 3.23.30 (LCL 218:180-81, modified).

¹⁶⁰ Plu. *Virt. mor.* 452d.2-3 (LCL 337:84-85).

¹⁶¹ Cook, “Preaching and Christianization,” 88-90. For the fuller treatment of corporal punishment in ancient education, see Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind*, 65-73. For the objection to this punishment in ancient educators, see Henri I. Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity*, trans. George Lamb (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1956), 272. Cf. n. 31.

¹⁶² Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity*, 272.

¹⁶³ Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*, 79; and Knuuttila, *Emotions in Ancient and Medieval Philosophy*, 136. See also Meghan Henning, *Educating Early Christians through the Rhetoric of Hell: “Weeping and Gnashing of Teeth” as Paideia in Matthew and the Early Church*, Wissenschaftliche

the fear produced by hell itself. Although fear of the afterlife was denied by ancient philosophers, another fear, namely that of punishment imposed by laws and regulations, was a common tool for promoting virtues in the Roman empire.¹⁶⁴ For Chrysostom the warning of hell is like “an electric shock” to the ill soul that awakens it and leads it to God’s mercy.¹⁶⁵ He states that “If you think of the future life after you commit sin, you become very fearful (περιδεής) and tremulous (ἔντρομος), even if no one punishes you. . . . God is angry with us, hell (γέεννα) is reaching out to receive us, and our thoughts give us no rest.”¹⁶⁶ Fear is an absolutely essential element in the guidance of the soul: “If the fear (φόβος) of the judgment did not exist, all would be lost, since, even though such great punishments do threaten, many people are deserters to the side of evil.”¹⁶⁷

Even though condemnation is useful for correcting faults, it leaves the hearers’ minds in pain and sorrow. As the healing process inevitably involves suffering, harshness leads to a serious problem when it is not controlled. Chrysostom knew this well. He states that if a doctor makes an incision without mercy, a patient becomes frightened by jumping to conclusions and gives up the treatment, which makes his condition worse.¹⁶⁸ He advises priests to gently and gradually blame their flock’s sins.

You should not simply exact a penalty by the measure of the sins; some guess must be made about the disposition of the sinners, for fear that when you want to stitch up what is torn, you should make the tear worse, and in your eagerness to help up the fallen you should cause a worse fall. For those who are weak and loose-minded and generally in bondage to worldly luxury—even more if they can pride themselves on their birth and rank—may be freed partially, if not perfectly, from the evils which master them, by being converted slightly and gradually from the sins they commit. But if anyone applies a sudden restraint, he deprives them even of this small improvement. For once a soul is

Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe 382 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014), 218-20; and J. David Woodington, “Fear and Love: The Emotions of the Household in Chrysostom,” *SP* 83 (2017): 19-36.

¹⁶⁴ Cook, “Preaching and Christianization,” 149; id., “Hear and Shudder,” forthcoming; and Knuuttila, *Emotions in Ancient and Medieval philosophy*, 76.

¹⁶⁵ Cook, “Preaching and Christianization,” 161-63.

¹⁶⁶ Chrys. *Hom.* 88.3 in *Jo.* (PG 59:482.9-11, 16-18; Goggin, *Commentary on Saint John*, FC 41, 477).

¹⁶⁷ Chrys. *Hom.* 60.5 in *Jo.* (PG 59:333.44-46; Goggin, *Commentary on Saint John*, FC 41, 145).

¹⁶⁸ Chrys. *Sac.* 2.4 (SC 272:112.6-114.11).

forced to be brazen, it becomes callous and thereafter neither responds to gentle words nor is checked by threats nor is persuaded by kindness, but becomes much worse than the city which the prophet reviled, saying, “You had a whore’s forehead; you refused to be ashamed before all (Jer 3:3).”¹⁶⁹

As we have seen above, ancient philosophers advised that stringent rebuke should come from love, not anger. Chrysostom often described himself as a father or mother in his relationship with his congregation.¹⁷⁰ Although occasionally his voice was overwhelmingly strict, he intended to spur his children’s progress to maturity with his loving remedy of harshness.¹⁷¹

Moreover, Chrysostom believes that the guidance of the soul reaches fruition through patience. As the passage above shows, the patient’s progress is slow. Chrysostom notes that when people wander away from the right faith, a priest needs to persistently persuade them to return to the body of Christ because force is not a right path. He compares a shepherd with a priest: the shepherd can compel a sick sheep to receive his treatment by binding the sheep by force when he needs to use cautery or knife. But it is not the case with the priest: his coercion has no efficacy and rather produces a contrary result because the decision to receive the remedy lies with the patient.¹⁷²

We shall look at several examples of Chrysostom’s use of judgment as harsh exhortation. In *In Johannem hom.* 50, Chrysostom harshly criticizes his congregation’s vices, in particular their insatiable greed. Regarding their inhumanity, injustice and theft, he does not beat around the bush: they are not able to enter heaven. They are compared with the foolish virgins (Matt 25:1-13) who could not join the bridegroom’s wedding ceremony due to lack of oil in their lamps. Similarly, the greedy people’s lamps become gradually dim, but they do not fill them with oil, and rather attempt to extinguish them. Chrysostom insists that avarice is the strongest wind and the coldest water to quickly quench fire. In the end, the lamps will be extinguished, and the greedy will depart, bringing

¹⁶⁹ Chrys. *Sac.* 2.4 (SC 272:114.11-29; Neville. *Six Books on the Priesthood*, 57-58, modified).

¹⁷⁰ Cook, “Preaching and Christianization,” 91-93.

¹⁷¹ Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*, 273.

¹⁷² Chrys. *Sac.* 2.3-4 (SC 272:108.32-112.66 and 116.40-55).

with them just dust, ashes, and plenty of smoke.¹⁷³ Chrysostom warns that if his congregation does not turn away from their wickedness, they will hear Christ's terrible words: "where I am, you cannot come (John 7:34)," and "I do not know you (Matt 7:23)."

We ought to fear lest he might have occasions to address them to us, because we cannot go where he is on account of our sinful lives. With reference to the disciples he said: "I will that where I am, they also may be with me (John 17:24)." But with regard to us, I fear lest he may say the opposite: "Where I am, you cannot come." When we do the opposite to his commands, how can we go there? . . . May it not be our lot to hear this voice: "I do not know you." But when may we hear them more clearly than when on seeing a poor man we act as if we did not see him? When we do not recognize the hungry Christ, he also will not recognize us who did not show mercy, and rightly so. Indeed, if a person ignores a person in distress and does not give him what he has, how will he seek to receive in his turn what is not his?¹⁷⁴

The pedagogical role of hell is also found in *In Johannem hom.* 34, where Chrysostom chastises the spiritual insensibility of his hearers. To heal this insensibility, he gives a variety of lessons about terrible judgement. These several strategies indicate the patients' serious condition. Firstly, Chrysostom notes that God knows everything. While people are afraid of a ruler, they ignore God who is the ultimate judge. Chrysostom warns that their sins cannot be hidden from God, and he will judge everyone according to their deeds. They believe that no one sees their bad behaviour, but these evils will be clearly manifest before all people's eyes in the final judgement, which will disgrace them.¹⁷⁵ Chrysostom urges them to fear God: ". . . Let us fear God as we ought, who both sees what is happening now and punishes hereafter those who do not repent now."¹⁷⁶

Moreover, the last day is near. Chrysostom claims that it approaches more quickly than we expect, asking the question that if Paul identified his time as "the fullness of time

¹⁷³ Chrys. *Hom.* 50.3 in *Jo.* (PG 59:282.26-54).

¹⁷⁴ Chrys. *Hom.* 50.3 in *Jo.* (PG 59:282.16-21 and 54-61; Goggin, *Commentary on Saint John*, FC 41, 32-33, modified).

¹⁷⁵ Chrys. *Hom.* 34.3 in *Jo.* (PG 59:196.39-197.3).

¹⁷⁶ Chrys. *Hom.* 34.3 in *Jo.* (PG 59:196.37-39; Goggin, *Commentary on Saint John*, FC 33, 338, modified).

(Gal 4:4) four hundred years ago,” how should we speak of our time? His congregation still looks upon divine judgment as a remote event, but it is just around the corner. He adduces evidence for impending punishment: wars, famine, and earthquakes occur all over the world. Just as when a house is on the verge of collapse, its roof or wall crashes down, so numerous disasters signify the impending end of the world.¹⁷⁷ Chrysostom asserts that each one reacts in different ways to the threat of God’s imminent wrath, which gives a virtuous person confidence and joy, but fear and anxiety to a vicious person.

For the time of punishment is close at hand, and indeed, is close at hand. That is why Paul also said: “The Lord is near. Have no anxiety (Phil 4:5-6).” But perhaps the opposite ought to be said to us: “the Lord is near. Be careful.” They who were in the midst of affliction and toils and trials might well hear: “Have no anxiety”; but those who are living in the midst of rapine and in luxury, and who have a difficult reckoning to give, would with reason hear not the latter, but that other; “The Lord is near. Be careful.”¹⁷⁸

Lastly, Chrysostom maintains that judgement will come unexpectedly, stating that nothing makes us nervous as much as unpredictability and reminding his congregation of Paul: like birth pangs, destruction will suddenly come (1 Thess 5:3). Birth pangs are a typical example of unpredictability. Since Chrysostom’s listeners do not know when judgement will come, they have only one option: they should accomplish their salvation with fear and trembling. Unless they are ready for divine punishment, there is no way of avoiding it.¹⁷⁹

Let us, then, gird up our loins; let us delight in the fear of God. . . . Therefore, since our situation is something like this, let us be always ready. We shall not be hearing this warning forever; we shall not forever possess the power to heed it. “For in the underworld who praises you (Ps 6:5)?” says Scripture.¹⁸⁰

¹⁷⁷ Chrys. *Hom. 34.3 in Jo.* (PG 59:197.38-198.19).

¹⁷⁸ Chrys. *Hom. 34.3 in Jo.* (PG 59:197.30-38; Goggin, *Commentary on Saint John*, FC 33, 340, modified).

¹⁷⁹ Chrys. *Hom. 34.3 in Jo.* (PG 59:198.20-33).

¹⁸⁰ Chrys. *Hom. 34.3 in Jo.* (PG 59:198.19-20 and 33-37; Goggin, *Commentary on Saint John*, FC 33, 341).

We see Chrysostom's serious advice of judgement in relation to rich people's luxurious wedding ceremony in *In Matthaëum hom.* 48. In a comparison between Herod's banquet (Matt 14:1-12) and the wedding celebration, the celebration is reproached. In the Roman empire, a wedding ceremony lasted two days in various stages, and many friends and clients gathered together to celebrate a new couple, while singers and dancers were hired for entertainment.¹⁸¹ The wealthy in Chrysostom's congregation followed the traditional customs, and magnificent wedding banquets were provided, and a large sum of money was spent on entertainment. He laments the fact that the lofty ceremony is reduced to the conspicuous display of wealth and strongly criticizes the inhumanity of the wealthy: while they enjoy plenty of quality food and wines for themselves, they do not give the poor even dry bread or a cup of cold water.¹⁸² Their mind is darkened by desire for the selfish boast of their wealth and cannot see the pain of the poor. Chrysostom reminds them of their stewardship: their wealth is not theirs and should be used for helping the poor and if they vainly squander God's possessions entrusted to them, they will face immeasurable punishment.

If you were a guardian to a child, and having taken possession of his goods, neglect him in extremities, you would have ten thousand accusers, and would suffer punishment appointed by the laws; and now having taken possession of the goods of Christ, and thus consuming them for no purpose, do you not think that you will have to give account? . . . For how, tell me, will you escape accusation and blame, while your parasite is stuffed full, and the dog that stands by you, but Christ's worth appears to you even not equal to theirs? . . . Do you shudder at being told it? Shudder then at the realities. Cast out the parasites, and make Christ to sit down with you. If he partakes of your salt, and of your table, he will be mild in judging you; he knows how to respect your table.¹⁸³

¹⁸¹ Allison Glazebrook and Kelly Olson, "Greek and Roman Marriage," in *A Companion to Greek and Roman Sexualities*, ed. Thomas K. Hubbard, Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World (Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, 2013), 77; and Chrys. *Hom.* 48.5 in *Mt.* (PG 58:493.32-47).

¹⁸² Chrys. *Hom.* 48.5-6 in *Mt.* (PG 58:494.32-494.8); and Maxwell, *Christianization and Communication in Late Antiquity*, 158-59.

¹⁸³ Chrys. *Hom.* 48.6 in *Mt.* (PG 58:494.11-15, 24-27, and 32-36).

3. 2. 2. The Hierarchy of Punishment

Chrysostom often mentions the degree of severity in judgement, which causes greater fear. He claims that those who deprive others of their possessions will receive more severe punishment than the greedy. If the rich man could not drink even a drop of water, and those who did not give a piece of bread to the poor were rejected by Christ, extortioners should not expect any mercy from God.¹⁸⁴ Moreover, according to Chrysostom the easier a command, the greater the punishment is. He mentions that Christ's commands are easy and simple and orders his disciples to visit the sick, not to heal them and to console prisoners, not to deliver them, but those who do not obey such commands cannot make any excuse.¹⁸⁵ Chrysostom also insists that those who enjoy God's grace substantially will be judged more seriously. According to him, his congregation received the best and perfect gifts from God, namely that they became God's children and inherited the heavenly kingdom. Thus they should seek heavenly things according to their new identities. However, Chrysostom notes that their mind is still filled with desire for earthly wealth, and they are like a poor person who is adopted by a king, but wants to live in his shabby house, renouncing a majestic palace. He argues that if Adam was expelled from the Garden of Eden due to his sin of breaking just one command, no one can imagine what a great punishment his congregation will receive.¹⁸⁶

For no longer are you punished merely as a person, but as a son of God who has sinned; and the greatness of your honour becomes a mean of bringing a sorer punishment on you. For we too punish not equally slaves who do wrong, and sons committing the same offense; and most of all when they have received some great kindness from us. . . . For he who is not made better even by so great privilege, would justly suffer the most extreme, and a yet more grievous punishment.¹⁸⁷

¹⁸⁴ Chrys. *Hom.* 40.4 in *Jo.* (PG 59:234.15-29).

¹⁸⁵ Chrys. *Hom.* 60.4 in *Jo.* (PG 59:333.3-21).

¹⁸⁶ Chrys. *Hom.* 12.4 in *Mt.* (PG 57:206.35-207.25).

¹⁸⁷ Chrys. *Hom.* 12.4 in *Mt.* (PG 57:207.8-13 and 23-25; NPNF 1.10, 78, modified).

4. Eschatology, Almsgiving and the Cure of the Soul

We have explored Chrysostom's approach to judgement and reward in the ancient context of the alternate use of praise and blame for guiding the soul. In this section, we attempt to provide two examples of how Chrysostom alternately uses reward and punishment as gentle and harsh speech in his homilies on almsgiving with the aim of curing the soul.

4. 1. *In Matthaëum hom. 20: Greed*

This homily shows that almsgiving removes greed (*φιλαργυρία*). Castigating the greedy, Chrysostom asserts that greed is an evil humour (*πονηρὸς χυμός*) that makes their spiritual eyes blind.¹⁸⁸ There are several symptoms of this spiritual blindness. First, Chrysostom describes its symptoms as the slavery of the mind (*νοῦς*) to greed on the basis of his interpretation of Matthew 6:21 (“for where your treasure is, there your heart will be also.”). The greedy are too enslaved by earthly things such as money, usury and gains to see heavenly things. The metaphor of slavery is used in describing the symptom of spiritual blindness.¹⁸⁹ Chrysostom argues that the patients' condition is worse than that of any slaves since they voluntarily give up their nobility and liberty, which are the essential characteristics of humanity, and serve the most grievous tyranny, that is greed.¹⁹⁰ Chrysostom also compares psychological slavery to a guard dog at a grave: like the dog bound to the tomb, the greedy bark at those coming near to them to keep what they own.¹⁹¹

¹⁸⁸ Chrys. *Hom. 20.4-5 in Mt.* (PG 57: 292.9-13 and 293.9-11).

¹⁸⁹ Chrys. *Hom. 20.3 in Mt.* (PG 57: 290.7-13).

¹⁹⁰ Chrys. *Hom. 20.3 in Mt.* (PG 57: 290.13-19). He, *Hom. 20.4 in Mt.* (PG 57: 291.17-27), maintains that the enslaved state of the mind is more serious than its external results, such as plots, strifes and suits because the latter happens less frequently than the former. Christ speaks of the latter first (“your adversary may hand you over to the judge, and the judge may hand you over to the officer, and you may be thrown into prison.” Matt 5:25), and this is considered as Christ's psychagogical strategy which gradually presents symptoms according to the degree of severity. Chrysostom states: “thus then, omitting now to speak of the plots to which wealth gives occasion, the strife and the suits (these indeed he had intimated above, saying, “The adversary shall deliver you to the judge, and the judge to the officer” Matt 5.20) and setting down what is more grievous than all these, as sure to occur, he so withdraws us from the wicked desire (17-24).”

¹⁹¹ Chrys. *Hom. 20.3 in Mt.* (PG 57: 290.19-23). For Chrysostom's rhetoric of honour and shame, see n. 157

This canine analogy was intended to humiliate the greedy.¹⁹² Second, the greedy are excessively afraid of losing even a small amount of their wealth, a symptom related to the complications of greed, such as fear, anxiety, and sorrow. Chrysostom insists that in particular the wealthy are vulnerable to these complications.¹⁹³ He elucidates the symptom by using a characteristic of the blind who fear what those who have sight do not fear due to their sight disability. Just as they are scared of a small rope, supposing that it is a snake, so the rich fear the loss of their wealth and, some people even commit suicide, not enduring this ill fortune.¹⁹⁴ Lastly, the greedy do not spend their money on what they should. Chrysostom's diagnosis of greed leads to his harsh castigation of the wealthy: they are most effeminate. The greedy are compared with theatre actors or actresses, who perform dangerous circus acts such as walking on a rope on the stage, but do nothing when their courage should be displayed. In the same way, the greedy lavish their money on pleasure, whereas they are stingy in caring for the poor. According to Chrysostom, showing no self-discipline at the necessary moment is the most shameful.¹⁹⁵

Almsgiving leads to the recovery of spiritual sight by removing greed as an evil humour. In a curative process, Christ's promise of reward motivates the patients to take almsgiving as their spiritual remedy, a promise based on Matthew 6:20: "Store up for yourselves treasures in heaven." Chrysostom claims that the lesson of Christ as a physician of the soul is a bright beam that scatters dark clouds in the sick soul.¹⁹⁶ He stresses that almsgiving is the very way of fully satisfying our desire: if the greedy store up their wealth in heaven through charity instead of storing it on earth, their wealth not only will be kept in safety, but also will be greatly increased.¹⁹⁷

According to Chrysostom, this gentle promise of reward involves Christ's two kinds of therapeutic methods, which can be applied to every case where reward is presented in Chrysostom's discourse on almsgiving. First, Christ breaks down a cognitive

in chapter 1 above.

¹⁹² Leyerle, "Locating Animals," forthcoming.

¹⁹³ Leyerle, "The Etiology of Sorrow," 370.

¹⁹⁴ Chrys. *Hom.* 20.4 in *Mt.* (PG 57: 292.13-25).

¹⁹⁵ Chrys. *Hom.* 20.4-5 in *Mt.* (PG 57:292.13-51).

¹⁹⁶ Chrys, *Hom.* 20.5 in *Mt.* (PG 57:293.11-15).

¹⁹⁷ Chrys. *Hom.* 20.2 and 4 in *Mt.* (PG 57:289.42-48 and 291.44-292.9).

barrier associated with almsgiving. Because Chrysostom's congregation regarded almsgiving as financial loss, they were reluctant to help the poor. Mayer delineates this phenomenon by using the economic concept of limited good in late antiquity, according to which, reciprocity was essential in the society where goods were considered limited. Under a social-economic system of this kind, the poor who were not able to repay donors were naturally excluded from the list of valuable recipients.¹⁹⁸ Christ inverts this economic custom, insisting that almsgiving does not inflict a loss, but rather offers great gain, because instead of the poor God will abundantly repay donors.¹⁹⁹ Second, Christ cures the human desire for wealth by using the very craving that the greedy value most. Ironically, the greedy are cured by satisfying their wish, not by restraining it: almsgiving is a way to satisfy their desires. Chrysostom asks his congregation why they seek wealth and keep it, whereas if they store up their riches in heaven by giving alms, they can achieve their goal, that is, they will not only enjoy luxury, but also keep their wealth in safety, and Christ will give them the chance of enjoying these benefits more abundantly.²⁰⁰

In addition to the gentle advice of reward, the startling admonition of judgement is given to correct slackness, and the intensity of threat increases gradually. Chrysostom warns that if the wealthy store up their wealth on earth, it will be lost, and this calamity may not come to an individual, but he cannot avoid the illness of the soul and divine punishment as its result.²⁰¹ Everyone should stand before God's court. Chrysostom asserts that the Second Advent of Christ is imminent, and the fearful and terrible tribunal may arrive in his generation. The last day comes suddenly: like God's judgement in the time of

¹⁹⁸ Mayer, "Poverty and Generosity," 153-54.

¹⁹⁹ Chrys. *Hom.* 20.2 in *Mt.* (PG 57:289.42-48); and De Wet, "Vilification of the Rich," 88.

²⁰⁰ Chrys. *Hom.* 20.4 in *Mt.* (PG 57:291.44-292.9). "Do you see how he leads people especially from absolute wickedness and brings them back to virtue through those very things which they desire most? For "why do you desire riches?" He says, "Is this not that you may enjoy pleasure and luxury?" . . . "Why do you bury your wealth in the earth? Is this that it may be kept safely?" . . . In this way, he has captured a covetous person (φιλάργυρον) by means of those very things which he had desired most. For "what do you want?" He says, "Do you want to have your wealth kept and to enjoy pleasure? I will afford you both things in great abundance if you lay up your gold in the place where I bid you." (PG 57:291.44-48, 291.52-53, and 292.5-9; NPNF 1.10, 144, modified).

²⁰¹ Chrys. *Hom.* 20.3 in *Mt.* (PG 57:289.55-290.23).

Noah and Sodom, it comes unexpectedly when people relax their attention. Chrysostom mentions that even if judgement does not come in his time, we will face our own end, in that death, after which we cannot obtain any favour from God even though Abraham or Noah or Job or Daniel entreats for us.²⁰²

Greed is often not cured in a single therapeutic session, and to deal with this case Chrysostom offers two kinds of effective treatments that echo the mixed method. We see Chrysostom prescribing various remedies according to the level of severity of the disease. First, the greedy should continue to listen to Christ who urged us to store up our wealth in heaven.²⁰³ The repetitive memorization of principal doctrines was a common strategy for the therapy of the soul in the Hellenistic schools.²⁰⁴ For example, after addressing his teachings about a god, death and desires, Epicurus encourages Menoeceus, his interlocutor, to contemplate them day and night for the peace of his soul.²⁰⁵ The Stoics required their students to memorize Stoic doctrines and to practise their application in many different kinds of imaginary bad situations in the future.²⁰⁶ These practices are related to the Stoic concept of attention (*προσοχή*). According to the Stoics, it is vital for their followers to have clear and concise doctrines at hand through the repetitive contemplation of them for the tranquillity of their souls.²⁰⁷ Continual contemplation of Christ's teaching reminds the rich of how greed is harmful for their psychic health and of how almsgiving is greatly beneficial for it. Second, if the patients are still under the control of greed despite this repeated meditation, the devaluation of greed itself is needed.²⁰⁸ The vituperation of passions was a part of Stoic therapy.²⁰⁹ Chrysostom asks an imaginary interlocutor if greed deserves to be named as desire, because it leads to the swamp of destruction by blinding the soul to a sense of real truth and filling it with fear and care. It does not deserve

²⁰² Chrys. *Hom. 20.6 in Mt.* (PG 57:294.20-42).

²⁰³ Chrys. *Hom. 20.5 in Mt.* (PG 57:293.15-18).

²⁰⁴ Knuuttila, *Emotions in Ancient and Medieval Philosophy*, 84; and Hadot, *Philosophy as a Way of Life*, 87-89. Mitchell, "John Chrysostom," 40-41, compares Chrysostom and Plato.

²⁰⁵ Epicur. *Ep. Men.* DL 10.135 (LCL 185:658-659).

²⁰⁶ Knuuttila, *Emotions in Ancient and Medieval Philosophy*, 78-79.

²⁰⁷ Hadot, *Philosophy as a Way of Life*, 85.

²⁰⁸ Chrys. *Hom. 20.5 in Mt.* (PG 57:293.18-20).

²⁰⁹ Knuuttila, *Emotions in Ancient and Medieval Philosophy*, 78.

to be called a passion due to its rather inferior nature. Chrysostom reminds the wealthy of Christ's reward again: if they store up their wealth on earth, they are never free from anxiety even though their security is manifold. However, if their possession is stored up in heaven, they are able to be free from anxiety because no one steals their money stored up in heaven. Heaven is not only the safest security, but also the most profitable bank. Chrysostom confidently declares that it is God who promises this and rebukes the rich for their distrust of God.²¹⁰

4. 2. *In Johannem hom. 79: Adultery or Fornication*

Here Chrysostom explains the therapeutic effect of almsgiving in relation to the illness of adultery (μοιχεία) or fornication (πορνεία). In the curative process, judgement and reward are alternately applied in several times. Chrysostom criticizes those who seek a sexual relationship with a prostitute, showing that their sickness is serious. To gain her heart, they do all they can and forsake even their family and wealth. However, when the preacher urges them to care for the poor, they resort to all kinds of excuses: 'I am poor and also have a wife and children whom I have to support.' They ignore a hungry and naked person in the street and do not say even a warm word, while they converse with the sex worker's maid for a long time in the middle of a market place.²¹¹ Chrysostom gives a strong warning about God's fearful judgement: "Is it not with good reason that there is a hell? Is it not with good reason that there are punishments without number in store?"²¹²

Chrysostom suggests the reward of almsgiving immediately after the warning of punishment to assuage the patients. Comparing the evils of adultery and God's blessings, he emphasizes that heavenly reward is quite great. Adultery causes dishonour, shame, blame, and enmity, but God promises heaven and its good things. Unlike adultery, which brings about the waste of possessions, ineffable blessing will be given though almsgiving.²¹³

²¹⁰ Chrys. *Hom. 20.5 in Mt.* (PG 57:293.20-46).

²¹¹ Chrys. *Hom. 79.5 in Jo.* (PG 59:431.52-432.8 and 432.17-21).

²¹² Chrys. *Hom. 79.5 in Jo.* (PG 59:432.8-9; Goggin, *Commentary on Saint John*, FC 41, 364).

²¹³ Chrys. *Hom. 79.4-5 in Jo.* (PG 59:431.34-52, 432.21-29).

So, if you please, let us continue the discussion, even if what we say is very vulgar to hear. The beloved woman promises nothing of worth to her lovers but dishonour, and shame, and opprobrium. For the fact of consorting with a harlot causes this relationship to be ridiculous, shameful, and dishonourable. God, on the contrary, promises heaven and the blessings of heaven, and makes us his sons, and brothers of the only begotten son. . . .Then, too, that harlot forces them to squander all their possessions for their ruin and destruction, while God bids us to sow for heaven and gives the hundredfold and life everlasting. Again, she uses her lover as a slave, giving orders more harsh than those of any tyrant, while God says: “No longer do I call you servants, but friends (John 15:15).” Do you see the excessive evils in the one instance, and the blessings in the other?²¹⁴

Despite heavenly blessings, however, people still expect wellbeing that they can experience in their present life. In response to this, Chrysostom claims that givers will enjoy pleasure, joy, and peace, and that people will admire them.²¹⁵

The threat of hell is presented again. According to Chrysostom, if the patients refuse to receive the divine remedy of almsgiving despite the blessings promised to them in the present and the afterlife, they cannot avoid the fire of hell. He warns them not to throw themselves into the furnace of burning fire. Lastly, he gently encourages them to choose the way of virtue, which heals them, by presenting the story of the prodigal son (Luke 15:11-32). The condition of the prodigal of son was more serious than their sickness, but he recovered his former honour when he returned to his father and was esteemed more than his brother.²¹⁶ The repetition of reward and punishment leads to the recovery of the sick souls. “I,” Chrysostom says, “beseech those who are suffering from this disease to retrieve themselves and restore themselves to health and not permit themselves to fall into despair.”²¹⁷

²¹⁴ Chrys. *Hom.* 79.4-5 in *Jo.* (PG 59:431.34-40 and 44-52; Goggin, *Commentary on Saint John*, FC 41, 363-64, modified).

²¹⁵ Chrys. *Hom.* 79.5 in *Jo.* (PG 59:432.29-50). See n. 157 in chapter 1 above.

²¹⁶ Chrys. *Hom.* 79.5 in *Jo.* (PG 59:432.50-54 and 56-60).

²¹⁷ Chrys. *Hom.* 79.5 in *Jo.* (PG 59:432.54-56; Goggin, *Commentary on Saint John*, FC 41, 366).

4. 3. *In Johannem hom.* 16: Pride

In some cases, only the promise of recompense (or the threat of punishment) is presented for treating the sick soul. *In Johannem hom.* 16 deals with the issue of pride (ὕπερηφανία), which in particular arises from wealth. According to Chrysostom, pride is the most serious disease of the soul (χαλεπωτάτη νόσος). This point is highlighted by repetition. After diagnosis, Chrysostom gives the general description of pride, rather than deeply analysing the sickness of the rich. First, his congregation is reminded that pride caused the devil to become the devil, whose arrogance deprived him of original honorable status. As a result, the devil fell into hell and became the source of all evils. Second, pride is compared to other vices and virtues. Chrysostom argues that pride defiles the soul more than adultery and fornication. This claim is not convincing at first glance, and Chrysostom suggests the following reasons: while lust can be used as an excuse for fornication, but nothing can justify arrogance.²¹⁸ Even though the medicines of virtues such as almsgiving, prayer, and fasting are strong, pride also entirely destroys their therapeutic effects. Lastly, it is remarked that the insanity (μανία or παραπληξία) of the Eunomians and Anomoeans comes from their pride based on their false belief in the full comprehensibility of God.²¹⁹ Chrysostom lists a wide range of the sickness of pride, insisting the arrogant are the most senseless.²²⁰

To heal the illness of pride, Chrysostom offers two therapy speeches before the prescription of almsgiving. Possessions are nothing: they are passing like a shadow (σκιά) and the flowers of the field (ἄνθος τοῦ χόρτου). Chrysostom states that the rich are equated with the poor who suffer from hunger, but take pride in a dream one night.²²¹ Further, he treats his patients, claiming that their wealth, such as a number of talents of gold and slaves, is not theirs. He asks them to examine the examples of their predecessors. If, however, they do not learn from these examples due to their corrupted mind, they will experience soon what Chrysostom speaks: when they are on the verge of death, they will

²¹⁸ Chrys. *Hom.* 16.4 in *Jo.* (PG 59:106.26-30 and 35-43).

²¹⁹ Chrys. *Hom.* 16.4 in *Jo.* (PG 59:106.19-26 and 30-34); and Laird, “John Chrysostom and the Anomoeans,” 135-38.

²²⁰ Chrys. *Hom.* 16.4 in *Jo.* (PG 59:106.43-47).

²²¹ Chrys. *Hom.* 16.4 in *Jo.* (PG 59:106.47-56).

see that their possessions are given unexpectedly over to other people, in some cases to their enemies. Because death suddenly visits them, they are not allowed to enjoy their wealth.²²²

How can the rich enjoy their possessions forever? The key is almsgiving. In the echo of Matthew 6:19-20, almsgiving as a remedy and reward as impetus are presented simultaneously. Chrysostom urges the rich to store up their wealth in heaven through their charity. There, no one can deprive them of it.

In order that we may not endure such suffering, let us here, while we are still vigorous and in good health, give over these possessions to our own city. In this way only shall we be able to enjoy them; but otherwise, not at all. In this way we shall lay them up in a secure and safe place. In that place there is not, there is not a single thing with the power to deprive us of them: death is not there, or wills, or succession of heirs, or sycophants, or schemes. But he/she who departs thither, carrying with him/her many possessions, can there enjoy the fruits thereof forever. Who, then, is so wretched as not to wish to revel in riches which will be irrevocably his/hers? Well, then, let us give over our wealth, and let us store it up there.²²³

In almsgiving, the costs of transport are free. The poor transfer the riches of the wealthy to heaven. Chrysostom states as follows:

We shall not need asses, or camels, or carriages, or ships for such transfer (μετάθεσιν); for God has freed us of this difficulty. However, we need only the poor (πενήτων), the lame, the maimed and the sick. These have been commissioned with this transfer. These dispatch our wealth to heaven. These bring the possessors of such wealth to the inheritance of everlasting good things.²²⁴

²²² Chrys. *Hom.* 16.4 in *Jo.* (PG 59:106.56-107.8).

²²³ Chrys. *Hom.* 16.4 in *Jo.* (PG 59:107.8-108.2; Goggin, *Commentary on Saint John*, FC 33, 160, modified).

²²⁴ Chrys. *Hom.* 16.4 in *Jo.* (PG 59:108. 4-12, Goggin, *Commentary on Saint John*, FC 33, 160, modified).

Conclusion

For ancient moral philosophers and orators, adaptable pedagogy was regarded as an essential element in guiding the soul. Since each has a different character, disposition and situation, the proper method for the state of each soul is needed. The alternate use of praise and blame resulted from this adaptable approach to the soul, and philosophers emphasized this mixed method to avoid both despair and laziness. As a doctor of the soul Chrysostom adapted the balanced use of praise and blame in caring for the soul, and in the case of therapeutic almsgiving, he reinterpreted the Christian doctrine of eschatology through the philosophical ideas of gentle and harsh speech. Reward as gentle speech motivates the sick soul to progress toward a virtuous life, by arousing the hope of future blessings. It is particularly useful for the weak soul, helping it easily receive the divine commandment and strengthening tenacity in the face of various trials and sufferings. In Chrysostom's psychagogical approach to heavenly reward, his vivid explanation of invisible reward through economic metaphors intensifies these functions of reward. However, he knew that excessive praise causes laziness and arrogance and used the fearful place of hell as harsh speech to correct the errors of the soul through fear. The description of the hierarchy of judgement leads the sick soul quickly to seek God's mercy, by reporting the seriousness of the state of its illness. Once Chrysostom's discourses on almsgiving are examined within the context of Greco-Roman philosophical tradition, which viewed the guidance of the soul as its ultimate goal, we find that they are systematically structured in the adaption of the techniques of philosophical therapy, rather than a collection of inconsistent contents.

Chrysostom has been considered as a strict teacher, but his fundamental strategy was the balanced use of praise and blame. Gentle advice of reward that has been ignored is as significant as harsh rebuke in his pastoral care of the sick soul, and even in the use of harshness, he emphasizes its gentle application. As Rylaarsdam points out, the prevalence of harshness might be construed as Chrysostom's inevitable pedagogical method for recalcitrant hearers.²²⁵ Almsgiving, reward, and punishment harmonize with each other for the cure of the soul: Chrysostom not only comforts his congregation with the

²²⁵ Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*, 274.

encouragement of reward, but also wields the whip of divine punishment. He leads his congregation to the health of the soul through almsgiving within the framework of both hope and fear.

CHAPTER 3. ALMSGIVING, THE CURE OF THE SOUL, AND SALVATION: THE HERMENEUTICS OF CHRISTIANIZED PHILOSOPHICAL THERAPY

Introduction

The previous chapters have examined how philosophical therapy affects the formation of Chrysostom's view of almsgiving. His discourse on almsgiving and the cure of the soul reflects a wide range of philosophers' therapeutic arguments and methods. It mainly consists of diagnosis and prescription. Chrysostom identifies passions as psychological sickness and offers almsgiving as a vital remedy for treating the ailing soul. It not only cures all spiritual illnesses, but also prevents them by strengthening the soul, like olive oil. To enhance the effectiveness of this treatment, cognitive therapy and eschatological reward and judgement as therapeutic speeches are often suggested in addition to almsgiving as behavioural therapy.

In Chrysostom's homilies on almsgiving, the tradition of redemptive almsgiving also is often repeated as well as philosophical therapy. Redemptive almsgiving is the Christian doctrine associated with charity and the forgiveness of sin. These two types of therapies generally form the major axes in his discourse on almsgiving. Then, what is the relationship between these two ideas in Chrysostom's view of almsgiving? Although this issue was not directly mentioned, it is pointed out that looking at how Chrysostom understood theology and philosophical soul-healing is important in future studies. As the interdisciplinary approach to Chrysostom and philosophical-medical therapy itself has only recently been attempted, however, these topics have not yet been addressed.¹ To bridge this research gap surrounding Chrysostom, almsgiving, and philosophical therapy, this last chapter seeks to explore closely how both therapeutic and redemptive almsgiving fit in his

¹ The critical literature review of recent scholarship will be fully presented in section 2 later. Interestingly Hays, "By Almsgiving and Faith Sins Are Purged?," 265-75, deals with the various theological underpinnings of establishing the theory and practice of early Christian charitable acts, distinguishing between psychic therapeutic almsgiving and redemptive almsgiving, but does not give an account of how the early Church writers approached these two concepts.

thought. We first analyse the Judeo-Christian idea of almsgiving and salvation. After dealing with the definition of redemptive almsgiving, we look at the formation and development of the early Christian doctrine of redemptive almsgiving and Chrysostom's approach to this tradition. Then, we investigate the theoretical place of Judeo-Christian and philosophical therapeutics in Chrysostom's thought. In this section, we address how Chrysostom deals with these traditions, and what principles play an essential role in this process. Before treating these issues, a brief discussion of the term 'Christianization' is needed. In fact, the previous chapters are concerned with Chrysostom's Christianized philosophical therapy. In this chapter, the term refers primarily to his integrated therapeutic vision, including the appropriation of philosophical therapy as previously mentioned.

1. Redemptive Almsgiving and Chrysostom

1. 1. Redemptive Almsgiving in the Jewish-Christian Tradition

1. 1. 1. Defining Redemptive Almsgiving

It is difficult to arrive at a clear identification of redemptive almsgiving that emerged and prospered in the Jewish-Christian theological tradition because salvation is essentially a multidimensional phenomenon that cannot be covered by one concept.² In previous scholarship, there has been much discussion about the definition of redemptive almsgiving. Roman Garrison argues that redemptive almsgiving is defined as a means of "providing a ransom for sin: almsgiving not only wins favour with God, earning the individual entrance into the kingdom of God, but even merits the forgiveness of sin."³ According to Alyssa M. Gray, redemptive almsgiving refers to "atonement for sin, prayer on behalf of the donor by the poor, or rescue from death in this world or from a severe divine decree and/or the assurance of felicity in the next world."⁴ David J. Downs argues exclusively for a definition

² Michael Slusser, "Salvation," in *Encyclopedia of Early Christianity*, ed. Everett Ferguson, Michael P. McHugh, Frederick W. Norris, and David M. Scholer, Garland Reference Library of the Humanities 846 (New York: Garland, 1990), 823-26.

³ Roman Garrison, *Redemptive Almsgiving in Early Christianity*, JSNTSup 77 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 10.

⁴ Alyssa M. Gray, "Redemptive Almsgiving and the Rabbis of Late Antiquity," *Jewish Studies Quarterly* 18

of redemptive almsgiving as ‘atoning almsgiving’ “framing charity as a means of canceling, cleansing, covering, extinguishing, lightening, or in some way atoning for human sin and/or its consequences” on the basis of his claim that redemption contains only one metaphoric image, that is atonement, excluding the other metaphors used to explain the forgiveness of sin. He challenges the previous definitions, maintaining that they conflate redemptive almsgiving and meritorious almsgiving, which promises the benefactor rewards for giving alms to the poor.⁵

Focusing on the salvific effect of almsgiving associated with reckoning with sin and its consequences, we define Judeo-Christian redemptive almsgiving as follows: it denotes the atonement of sins through charitable giving to the poor, which ultimately ensures salvation.⁶ It redeems sin and delivers from spiritual death, which results in opening the gates of heaven. The treatment of sins through almsgiving often is expressed differently through a wide variety of metaphors: the provision of material assistance to the poor purifies the stain of sin or pays its debt or lightens its burden.⁷

1. 1. 2. The Septuagint and the Apocrypha

It has been suggested that the concept of atoning almsgiving first emerged in the Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible, the so-called Septuagint (LXX) version, which explicitly articulated the meaning of the salvific efficacy of charitable giving.⁸ The LXX

(2011):147. It is questionable whether the prayers of the poor constitute the redemptive functions of almsgiving. Gray’s definition is also found in Hays, “By Almsgiving and Faith Sins Are Purged?” 266-73, adding the concept of alms as sacrifices in which the giver becomes a self-appointed priest, and the poor are construed as God’s altar.

⁵ Downs, *Alms: Charity, Reward, and Atonement* 6-9. Differentiating redemptive almsgiving from meritorious almsgiving is useful in understanding the nature of redemptive almsgiving, but Downs’ definition poses several issues that must be addressed. First since the concepts of both reward and salvation are considerably intertwined in patristic writings, it is difficult to differentiate precisely between the two kinds of almsgiving in them. Second, we need to clarify what kinds of acts of merciful giving cause the redemption of sin and why they result in it. In addition to these issues, Downs’ argument for the difference in meaning between atonement and redemption also needs to be reconsidered.

⁶ Neil, “Models of Gift Giving,” 225.

⁷ Downs, *Alms: Charity, Reward, and Atonement*, 4-9.

⁸ Garrison, *Redemptive Almsgiving*, 52 and 55; and Downs, *Alms: Charity, Reward, and Atonement*, 86. Our

version produced by Jewish scholars in Alexandria in the late third or early second century B.C.E. greatly influenced the development of the doctrine of redemptive almsgiving in the early church because this version was preferred in it.⁹ Daniel 4:27 (MT 4:24) is one of the most important texts. After warning of God’s judgement against Babylon’s king Nebuchadnezzar due to his pride, Daniel suggests a way of avoiding this punishment: “Therefore, O king, may my counsel be acceptable to you: atone for your sins with righteousness and your iniquities with mercy to the oppressed (יְצַדִּיקָהּ פְּלִק וְעוֹיְתָהּ בְּמִתְוֹן עֲגִיב), so that your prosperity may be prolonged (NRSV).” The exact translation of the Masoretic text involves several complex considerations, but it is evident that in the text itself, Nebuchadnezzar’s just and merciful deeds toward the disadvantaged are identified as an atoning mechanism.¹⁰ The redemptive efficacy of almsgiving is clearly articulated in the Greek translation of Daniel 4:27 (the Theodotian version) where this passage is translated as follows: “Therefore, O king, may my counsel be acceptable to you, and redeem your sins with almsgiving (τὰς ἀμαρτίας σου ἐν ἐλεημοσύναις λύτρωσαι) and your iniquities with compassion for the poor. Perhaps God will show forbearance for your transgressions (NETS,

primary concerns are given to important texts related to the origin and development of redemptive almsgiving in the Judeo-Christian tradition. For the fuller investigation of this topic, see Boniface Ramsey, “Almsgiving in the Latin Church: The Late Fourth and Early Fifth Centuries,” *TS* 43 (1982): 226-59; Garrison, *Redemptive Almsgiving*; Gray, “Redemptive Almsgiving and the Rabbis of Late Antiquity,” 144-84; Rhee, *Loving the Poor, Saving the Rich*, 73-102; Peter Brown, *The Ransom of the Soul: Afterlife and Wealth in Early Western Christianity* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2015); and Downs, *Alms: Charity, Reward, and Atonement*.

⁹ Timothy M. Law, *When God Spoke Greek: The Septuagint and the Making of the Christian Bible* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 35-36; and Garrison, *Redemptive Almsgiving*, 52.

¹⁰ Anderson, “Redeem Your Sins by the Giving of Alms,” 43-50, insists that ‘righteousness’ of the original text means ‘almsgiving’ on the ground of the parallel structure of the Daniel passage, and “this verse is something of a watershed in the history of biblical thought because here, we have a clear and unambiguous reference to almsgiving as a penitential act.” Downs, *Alms: Charity, Reward, and Atonement*, 50-55, opposes Anderson’s interpretation, arguing that the original reference to ‘righteousness’ demands that King Nebuchadnezzar rule in a righteous and just way, and the redemptive function of charity is revealed evidently by the LXX version of Daniel. Downs, *Alms: Charity, Reward, and Atonement*, 51 n. 55 and Garrison, *Redemptive Almsgiving*, 52, maintain that the Hebrew נְקִיָּץ becomes a technical term for ἐλεημοσύνη in rabbinic literature.

modified).”¹¹ Rendering ‘righteousness’ (הַצְדִּיקוּת) from the original text as ‘almsgiving’ (ἐλεημοσύνη), the LXX presents financial assistance to the poor as a means of redeeming sins. What we note here is that the translator of Daniel, as the Greek verb λυτρόω indicates, understands sin and its solution as debt and merit or credit from an economical perspective: the generous giving of Nebuchadnezzar is converted into heavenly currency to pay off his debt of sin.¹²

The doctrine of the forgiveness of sin by generous giving to the marginalized also develops in the Greek translation of Proverbs. While Proverbs 16:6 in the Masoretic text (MT) states that “by loyalty (הַאֱמֻנָה) and faithfulness iniquity is atoned for (NRSV),” the LXX 15:27a reads that “by acts of mercy and faithful deeds sins are purged (ἐλεημοσύναις καὶ πίστεσιν ἀποκαθαίρονται ἁμαρτίαι)”¹³ by interpreting ‘loyalty’ (הַאֱמֻנָה) as ‘almsgiving.’ Specifically, the LXX relates the efficacy of redemptive almsgiving to the elimination of the sin of bribery by adding a reference to it found in MT 15:27.¹⁴ Proverbs 10:2 from the LXX also claims that “righteousness shall deliver from death (δικαιοσύνη ῥύσεται ἐκ θανάτου, cf. Prov 11:4 in MT¹⁵).”¹⁶ There is ambiguity in stating that the LXX text itself constructs the concept of redemptive almsgiving because it renders הַצְדִּיקוּת with δικαιοσύνη, not ἐλεημοσύνη. However, later Christian writers who supported this idea used this verse as a proof text to teach the fact that almsgiving delivers a sinner from God’s eschatological judgment.¹⁷

Alongside the LXX, Greek translation of the Old Testament Apocrypha also plays an important role in promoting redemptive almsgiving. In Tobit 12:8-10, an angel Raphael

¹¹ This thesis consults NETS for the Septuagint unless otherwise noted.

¹² Anderson, “Redeem Your Sins by the Giving of Alms,” 39.

¹³ According to Hays, “By Almsgiving and Faith Sins Are Purged?” 269, the Septuagint’s translation of ‘faithfulness’ (הַאֱמֻנָה) as πίστεσιν indicates that “‘deeds [plural] of faithfulness’ cleanse an individual from sins, not simply faith in abreaction.”

¹⁴ Downs, *Alms: Charity, Reward, and Atonement*, 47-49. Proverbs 15:27 in the LXX states that “a receiver of bribes destroys himself, but he who hates the receiving of bribes is saved. By acts of mercy and faithful deeds sins are purged, but by the fear of the Lord everyone turns away from evil (NETS, modified).”

¹⁵ This passage is not found in the LXX.

¹⁶ Proverbs 10:2 in the MT states that “righteousness (הַצְדִּיקוּת) delivers from death.”

¹⁷ Downs, *Alms: Charity, Reward, and Atonement*, 42-44; Garrison, *Redemptive Almsgiving*, 54; Anderson, “Redeem Your Sins by the Giving of Alms,” 50-51; and Hays, “By Almsgiving and Faith Sins Are Purged?” 271.

tells Tobit and his son Tobias:

8. Prayer is good with fasting and almsgiving and righteousness (ἐλεημοσύνης καὶ δικαιοσύνης). A little with righteousness is better than much with injustice. It is better to give alms than to store up gold. 9. For almsgiving delivers from death, and it will purge away every sin (ἐλεημοσύνη γὰρ ἐκ θανάτου ῥύεται, καὶ αὐτὴ ἀποκαθαριεῖ πᾶσαν ἁμαρτίαν). Those who practice almsgiving and righteousness will be filled with life, 10. but those who sin are enemies of their own life (G 1, NETS, modified).

This text illustrates two effects of almsgiving in relation to salvation. First, almsgiving delivers from death (cf. Tob 4:10), which alludes to Proverbs 10:2 and 11:4. Within the literary context, the liberation from death seems to denote the avoidance of sudden and unexpected death and the enjoyment of longevity. Although Raphael's remark from Tobit 12:9 does not directly refer to liberation from eschatological judgment, as mentioned earlier, it provides an essential clue to the doctrinal development of redemptive almsgiving in the early church. Second, almsgiving cleanses every sin. While the LXX Daniel 4:27 and Proverbs 15:27a deal primarily with the issue of reckoning with pride and bribery respectively, Tobit further advances the redemptive power of almsgiving by extending its alleviating scope to all sins.

Sirach devotes a great deal of space to the issues of wealth, poverty, almsgiving, and righteousness.¹⁸ The noun ἐλεημοσύνη is used quite often in Sirach, and its translator identifies almsgiving with righteousness (πρῆξις) on several occasions (3:14, 30; 7:10; 12:3; and 40:17 and 24).¹⁹ Sirach 3:30 is a crucial passage in relation to redemptive almsgiving: “a blazing fire water will extinguish, and almsgiving will atone for (ἐξιλάσεται) sins (NETS, modified).” It indicates that like water almsgiving overwhelms at once the flame of sin that fiercely rushes toward sinners.

1. 1. 3. Early Christianity

We find the concept of redemptive almsgiving in the New Testament. Luke 11:37-

¹⁸ Downs, *Alms: Charity, Reward, and Atonement*, 71; and Garrison, *Redemptive Almsgiving*, 54-55

¹⁹ Downs, *Alms: Charity, Reward, and Atonement*, 71; and Garrison, *Redemptive Almsgiving*, 54-55.

41 records the scene of a meal between Jesus and a Pharisee. The Pharisee invited Jesus to dine. When he was amazed that Jesus did not wash before dinner, Jesus responds:

39. Now you Pharisees clean the outside of the cup and of the dish, but inside you are full of greed and wickedness. 40. You fools! Did not the one who made the outside make the inside also? 41. So give alms for those things that are within; and see, everything is clean for you (πλὴν τὰ ἐνόντα δότε ἐλεημοσύνην, καὶ ἰδοὺ πάντα καθαρὰ ὑμῖν ἐστίν, NRSV, modified).

There is some dissent concerning the translation of τὰ ἐνόντα, but it seems reasonable to regard it as an accusative of respect related to the phrase δότε ἐλεημοσύνην: “give alms with respect to the things within.”²⁰ This reading is also supported by the literary context. Criticizing the Pharisees whose attentions are only directed to external purity, Jesus points out that they should clean up their inner minds. Luke 11:41 suggests almsgiving as a tool for cleansing the stains of greed and wickedness of the Pharisee. Downs claims that this text most clearly witnesses the salvific ability of merciful giving to the poor in the New Testament.²¹ It is one of the most quoted passages from the New Testament as proof text in the discourse of redemptive almsgiving in the early church.²²

1 Peter 4:8 is another New Testament text that was frequently cited by patristic writers in support of atoning almsgiving along with Luke 11:41.²³ The author of 1 Peter encourages the recipients of this letter to maintain constant love for one another, warning about the imminence of the end (1 Peter 4:7-8). The basis of this exhortation lies in the atoning efficacy of love: “love covers a multitude of sins (ἀγάπη καλύπτει πλῆθος ἁμαρτιῶν, 1 Peter 4:8).” Here, as verse 9 notes (“offer hospitality to one another without grumbling”), ‘love’ designates a specific act of mercy toward one’s neighbours. The text states that this act covers a multitude of sins, but does not indicate explicitly whose sins are forgiven. Many early Christian authors understood the text as the affirmation that merciful action exempts

²⁰ Downs, *Alms: Charity, Reward, and Atonement*, 126.

²¹ Downs, *Alms: Charity, Reward, and Atonement*, 127.

²² Downs, *Alms: Charity, Reward, and Atonement*, 125; and Garrison, *Redemptive Almsgiving*, 66.

²³ Downs, *Alms: Charity, Reward, and Atonement*, 175-76; and Garrison, *Redemptive Almsgiving*, 73.

sin and God's eschatological judgment.²⁴

The salvific approach to charity that appears or is echoed in Jewish-Christian literature was further elaborated by early Christian authors. In general, almsgiving was recognized as a way of eliminating postbaptismal sins in the eastern and western churches. *Didache*, which has been dated as early as the first half of the first century C.E., is a representative document in the light of redemptive almsgiving among the earliest Christian writings.²⁵ In *Didache*, two ways, one of life and one of death, are compared, and merciful action toward the disadvantaged is suggested as a deed which guides those who practise almsgiving to the way of life.

5. Do not be one who stretches out the hands to receive but withdraws them when it comes to giving. 6. If you have something by working with your hands, you shall give a ransom (λύτρωσιν) for your sins. 7. You shall not hesitate to give, nor shall you grumble when giving, for you will know who is the good paymaster of the reward. 8. You shall not turn away from someone in need, but share everything with your brother or sister, and do not claim that anything is your own. For if you are sharers in what is imperishable, how much more so in perishable things.²⁶

Didache encourages recipients to give to the poor generously, especially those in the household of the same faith. This charity solidifies the unity of the Christian community. A notable passage regarding redemptive almsgiving is verse 6 which seems to reflect Daniel 4:27 in the LXX: generous almsgiving for a brother or sister of faith is to pay a ransom for the debt accrued by sin.²⁷ The phrase in 6a, "you have something by working with your

²⁴ Downs, *Alms: Charity, Reward, and Atonement*, 177. For a detailed study of the reception of 1 Peter 4.8 in the first three centuries of the Common Era, see *ibid.*, 180-201.

²⁵ Michael W. Holmes, ed. and trans., *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*, 3rd ed. (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2007), 337. It is difficult to exactly date *Didache* due to its composite nature, and it has a wide range of dates from 50 C.E to the third century. Holmes speculates that it may have been put into its present form as late as 150. For the detailed description of the date and redaction of *Didache*, see Alistair Stewart-Sykes, *The Apostolic Church Order: The Greek Text with Introduction, Translation and Annotation*, Early Christian Studies 10 (Strathfield, NSW: St. Pauls Publications, 2006), 1-86.

²⁶ *Did.* 4.5-8 (Holmes, *The Apostolic Fathers*, 350-51).

²⁷ Anderson, "Redeem Your Sins by the Giving of Alms," 57; and Downs, *Alms: Charity, Reward, and*

hands,” shows that all those with the least physical ability to work should strive for merciful deeds which result in the redemption of sins.

In *Quis dives salvetur*, Clement of Alexandria, a leader of the eastern church in the late second century, deals with the significant issue of the salvation of the rich. Commenting on the story of a rich man in Mark 10.17-31, he points out that an obstacle to the salvation of the wealthy is not wealth itself, but covetousness.²⁸ He states by employing Luke 16:9²⁹ as a ground for his advocacy of redemptive almsgiving that the rich will receive eternal heavenly dwellings in exchange for the distribution of their wealth to the poor.³⁰ He declares eloquently this heavenly trade:

What splendid trading! What divine business! You buy incorruption with money. You give the perishing things of the world and receive in exchange for them an eternal abode in heaven. Set sail, a rich person, for this market if you are wise. Compass the whole earth if need be. Spare not dangers or toils, that here you may buy a heavenly kingdom.³¹

Both the wealthy and the poor engage in a transaction. In other words, the rich satisfy the material needs of the poor, and the poor are responsible for the salvation of the rich. Interestingly, Clement urges the rich to seek after people and to sincerely ask them to receive their alms for the sake of their salvation. This reverses existing social expectations that the poor should depend on the wealthy for their survival.³²

Desire to live and reign in heaven with God. This kingdom a person, imitating God, shall

Atonement, 236-39.

²⁸ Rhee, *Loving the Poor, Saving the Rich*, 78-80; and White, “Moral Pathology,” 286-87.

²⁹ “I tell you, make friends for yourselves by means of dishonest wealth so that when it is gone, they may welcome you into the eternal homes (NRSV).” Downs, *Alms: Charity, Reward, and Atonement*, 131, suggests the possibility of reading the text as redemptive almsgiving in light of the subsequent parable of the rich man and Lazarus (19-31). The rich man was not welcomed into heaven which is represented by Abraham's bosom because he did not make Lazarus his friend with his wealth in his lifetime. Cf. Garrison, *Redemptive Almsgiving*, 64.

³⁰ Clem. *Q.D.S.* 31 (LCL 92:336-37).

³¹ Clem. *Q.D.S.* 32 (LCL 92:336-39, modified).

³² Finn, *Almsgiving in the Later Roman Empire*, 181.

give you. Having taken little from you here, he or she will make you through all the ages a fellow-inhabitant there. Beg him/her to take it. Hasten, strive earnestly, and fear lest he/she reject you. For he/she has not been commanded to take, but you to provide.³³

Moving to the western church in the mid-third century, we encounter Cyprian, bishop of Carthage, who featured prominently in the formation of atoning response to almsgiving. In *De opere et eleemosynis*, he wrestles with the issue of postbaptismal sins, and often uses the metaphors of sickness and healing to explain soteriology. For him salvation is not a one-time event, but a task that believers must continue to accomplish throughout their lives.³⁴ According to Cyprian, pre-baptismal sins are purified through the redemptive death of Christ, and postbaptismal sins are expunged in good works, that is almsgiving. This clear distinction is repeated several times:

The infirmity (*infirmitas*) of human frailty and weakness would have no resource nor accomplish anything, unless again divine mercy, coming once more in aid, should open a way to safeguard salvation by pointing out the works of justice and mercy, so that by almsgiving (*eleemosynis*) we may wash away whatever pollutions we later contract (Prov 16:6). The Holy Spirit speaks in the Scriptures, saying: “by alms and by faith sins are cleansed (Prov 16:6).” Surely not those sins which had been contracted before, for they are purged by the blood and sanctification of Christ. Likewise again he says: “as water quenches fire, so do alms quench sin (Sir 3:30).” Here also it is shown and proved that just as with laver of the waters of salvation the fire of Gehenna is extinguished, so by almsgiving and righteous works the flame of sins is quenched. And because the remission of sins is once granted in baptism, constant and continuous work acting in the manner of

³³ Clem. *Q.D.S.* 32 (LCL 92:338-39, modified).

³⁴ Cypr. *Eleem.* 1 (CSEL 3.1:371). “Many and great, most beloved brothers, are the divine blessings by which the abundant and copious clemency of God the Father and of Christ has both worked and is always working for our salvation. . . . These are the many and great gifts of divine mercy. But still further, what providence and what great clemency that is, that we are provided for by a plan of salvation so that more abundant care is taken for people’s salvation who has already been redeemed!” (Translation from *Saint Cyprian: Treatises*, trans. Roy J. Deferrari, FC 36, Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1958, 227, modified). On this treatise see Geoffrey D. Dunn, “Cyprian’s Care for the Poor: The Evidence of *De Opere et Eleemosynis*,” *SP* 42 (2006): 363-68.

baptism again bestows the indulgences of God.³⁵

God allows the means of salvation so that his people do not fall out of the way of salvific pilgrimage. We find in Cyprian that the cross of Christ as the unique basis of redemption and the forgiveness of sins through the good works of believers do not contradict each other under the concept of God's grace.

1. 2. Almsgiving and Salvation in Chrysostom³⁶

1. 2. 1. The Expurgation of Sins

Chrysostom stands firmly on this long-standing branch between almsgiving and salvation in Judeo-Christian thought. In *In Matthaëum hom. 71*, Chrysostom lays stress on almsgiving that predominantly functions as the remission of the sin of greed.³⁷ Chrysostom emphasizes the fact that the rich are the stewards of God's property. Even if they have gained their wealth through inheritance or honest labour, it is inherently God's, and also of the poor. God entrusted his possessions to the rich to help the poor. Chrysostom strongly criticizes wealthy people for using their wealth only for luxury and even for assaulting the poor, while abandoning the will of God. Comparing the rich with the deacons who are in charge of relief activities in the church, he claims that they should use their wealth appropriately. He points out that just as the deacons as the stewards of the church convey the donations of the wealthy to the poor, so the rich as the stewards of God also have an obligation to distribute God's wealth to them. The rich watch over the deacons to make sure that they perform their duties

³⁵ Cypr. *Eleem.* 1-2 (CSEL 3.1:371; Deferrari, *Saint Cyprian*, 227-28, modified).

³⁶ Investigation on the development of the early church doctrine of redemptive almsgiving has paid little attention to Chrysostom's approach to the salvific effect of almsgiving (see n. 8 above). Given the fact that charity was one of the most repeated topics in his preaching, this omission is somewhat difficult to account for. For significant studies on this topic, see Brändle, *Matthäus 25:31-46 im Werk des Johannes Chrysostomus*, 299-310; id., "This Sweetest Passage," 127-39; Costanzo, *Harbor for the Poor*, 98-108; Verhoeff, "Genuine Friend Wishes to be a Debtor," 47-66; and ead., "Friendship Discourse," 93-107.

³⁷ Costanzo's assertion, *Harbor for the Poor*, 98, that Chrysostom's thought on redemptive almsgiving is most prevalent in his homilies on the Gospel of John is not convincing. His references to this idea appear at least in his homilies on the Gospel of Matthew as much as or more than the homilies on John.

properly, and likewise God also keeps a close eye on the wealthy to see if they properly spend God's goods.³⁸ Finn indicates the historical background of Chrysostom's line of argumentation, arguing that the distribution of church alms in late antiquity was mainly administered by the deacons under the supervision of the bishops. A visit to the houses of the poor and a report to the bishops about it was one of the important official tasks of the deacons. The resources on which the episcopal almsgiving drew consisted of the donation of the rich, a collection, and ecclesiastical revenues. Church alms were distributed to widows, orphans, virgins, and sick people and the elderly who could not work, and the priority of alms was generally given to Christians.³⁹ Chrysostom asserts that the church in Antioch provided daily assistance to 3,000 widows and virgins, together with prisoners, sick people, travellers or pilgrims, cripples, those serving at the altar, and beggars.⁴⁰ The funds of ecclesiastical ministry to the poor in Antioch were likely to be largely covered by moneymaking business in the church. Chrysostom complains about the fact that priests must devote themselves chiefly to managing fields, property, and mules with their drivers in the church, neglecting their spiritual duties, such as prayer and Bible reading. This profit-making work of the church has created a fatal consequence that negates the spiritual obligations of priests.⁴¹

In the homily concerned, the direct alms of the rich to the poor seem to be encouraged, rather than the indirect almsgiving through the church. Chrysostom presents the redemptive effect of almsgiving as its driver. If the wealthy faithfully carry out their stewardship, their postbaptismal sin of greed will be forgiven. He sets the bounds of the salvific efficacy of almsgiving to post baptismal sins alone:

Consider of what prayer it was a worthy object, to be able to find a way to redeem (λύουσαν) one's postbaptismal sins. If he had not said this, "give alms," how many would have said, "would it were possible to give money, and so be freed from the ills to

³⁸ Chrys. *Hom.* 77.4-5 in *Mt.* (PG 58:707.27-708.27).

³⁹ Finn, *Almsgiving in the Later Roman Empire*, 35-77. Also, see Kelly, *Golden Mouth*, 38-40.

⁴⁰ Chrys. *Hom.* 66.3 in *Mt.* (PG 58:630.24-34).

⁴¹ Chrys. *Hom.* 85.3-4 in *Mt.* (PG 58:761.51-762.29). For the treatment of charitable work in Antioch, see Brändle, "This Sweetest Passage," 131; and Costanzo, *Harbor for the Poor*, 115-36.

come?” When, however, this has become possible, they become lazy again.⁴²

This text implies that Chrysostom too interprets sin and its forgiveness in light of the economic trade of debt and its liquidation.⁴³

In *In Matthaëum hom.* 51, Chrysostom indicates that almsgiving atones for various vices in relation to bad language by employing the metaphor of filth. He points out that his congregation wash their mouth or hands before prayer, but are not interested in their souls.⁴⁴ This sensitivity to bodily purity among Chrysostom’s congregation may reflect their interest in the Jewish purification rituals.⁴⁵ He insists that vices make the soul, especially the mouth of the soul, dirty, likening slander (κακηγορία), blasphemy (βλασφημία), railing (λοιδορία), insult (ὕβρις), angry words (ὀργίλα ρήματα/θυμός), filthy talking (αἰσχρολογία), laughter (γέλως), jesting (εὐτραπελία) to filth (ρύπος), dung (κόπρος), and mire (βόρβορος).⁴⁶ As Blake Leyerle aptly notes, sewers, latrines, and refuse of all kinds are “a visible and inescapable part of public life in the great urban centres of Late Antiquity” like Antioch, and the language of filth is mobilized to correct the vices by arousing the disgust of the vices in the hearers.⁴⁷ What the congregation really needs to clean is the filth and dung of their spiritual tongues, not their physical ones. Chrysostom states that just as if a beggar holds his legs with his hands filled with dung to entreat them, they kick him out, so God will not listen to their prayers if they pray with dirty mouths. Since the tongues of believers are the hands that hold God’s knees, God unpleasantly escapes the dirty hands.⁴⁸

The filth of vices also slows down the function of a psychic sense of hearing. In *In Matthaëum hom.* 37, Chrysostom warns that those who do not receive the poor will face greater punishment than the Sodomites (Matt 11:24). They close their ears (ᾠτα) not only to

⁴² Chrys. *Hom.* 77.5 in *Mt.* (PG 58:708.27-33; NPNF 1.10, 467, modified).

⁴³ Anderson, “Redeem Your Sins by the Giving of Alms,” 39-69; and id., *Sin: A History* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 3-14.

⁴⁴ Chrys. *Hom.* 51.4 in *Mt.* (PG 58:515.51-516.3).

⁴⁵ Leyerle, “Refuse, Filth, and Excrement,” 341-44.

⁴⁶ Chrys. *Hom.* 51.4 in *Mt.* (PG 58:516.3-5).

⁴⁷ Leyerle, “Refuse, Filth, and Excrement,” 337, 346-49, and 352-53; and Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*, 255-57.

⁴⁸ Chrys. *Hom.* 51.4-5. in *Mt.* (PG 58:516.3-15 and 21-28).

strangers, but also the apostles such as Paul and John. The fundamental problem is attributed to the malfunction of their spiritual ears. The filth and mud (πηλός) of the songs of harlots and talking about worldly news, debts, interest, and loans close the ears of their mind (διάνοια), and they cannot hear the desperate voice of the poor. Interestingly, it is said here that these secular songs and words pile up filth in the ears of hearers as well as in those of speakers or singers. The songs of actors and prostitutes are notoriously harmful to the spiritual sense of hearing. Unaware of such harmfulness, people rejoice at the songs and applaud the performance of actors.⁴⁹

Almsgiving is presented as a cleanser for the dirty soul: it wipes off filth in the mouth of the soul and brings the soul back to normal. Repentance, apology, and reconciliation function also as spiritual cleansers along with almsgiving:

Someone says, “Then what?” “Shouldn’t we pray?” We should pray, but should do it, without being filthy or having such mire. Someone says, “Then what, if I have been taken already?” Cleanse (κάθαρον) yourself. “How and in what way?” Weep (κλαῦσον), moan (στενάξον), give alms (δοῦς ἐλεημοσύνην), apologize (ἀπολόγησαι) to a person who was insulted, reconcile (κατάλλαξον) the person with yourself through your apology and wipe off your tongue so that you do not provoke God more grievously.⁵⁰

For Chrysostom almsgiving covers all sins. *De paenitentia homiliae* 3 clearly declares:

I mean almsgiving, the queen of the virtues, a virtue that quickly raises human beings to the heavenly vaults, and our best advocator (συνήγορος). Almsgiving is a great thing. For this reason Solomon exclaimed, “A human being is great, and a merciful person precious (Prov 20:6).” Its wings (πτερά) are great. It cleaves the air, surpasses the moon, goes beyond the rays of the sun, and rises up to the very vaults of the heavens. It does not stop there; rather, it surmounts heaven and overtakes the multitudes of angels, the choirs of archangels, and all the higher powers, and it stands next to the royal throne. And you were taught from this very Scripture that says, “Cornelius, your prayers and your alms have

⁴⁹ Chrys. *Hom.* 37.5. in *Mt.* (PG 57:425.16-426.18).

⁵⁰ Chrys. *Hom.* 51.5 in *Mt.* (PG 58:516.15-21; NPNF 1.10, 319, modified).

ascended before God (Acts 10:4).” “Before God” means that even if you have many sins, you should not be afraid if you possess almsgiving as your advocate (συνήγορος). For no higher power opposes it. . . . Therefore, regardless of how many other sins you have, your almsgiving counterbalances all of them.⁵¹

In resonance with the dynamics of an ancient courtroom, almsgiving is personified as a defence lawyer who advocates for the donors. A judge, a prosecutor, a lawyer, and a defendant constituted the court in the Greco-Roman world. Because both prosecutor and defender present the opposing assessment of the same case, forensic rhetoric is marked as dialectical in character.⁵² In the heavenly court, the judge is God, and personified almsgiving entreats God to forgive all sins of the benefactors on their behalf, assuming the stance of the defending lawyer. This judicial rhetoric is based on the interpretation of Acts 10:4 where it is suggested that Cornelius was brought into the household of God because of his generous merciful acts toward the poor.⁵³ Chrysostom approaches this verse in a remarkably allegorical way, using the Platonic metaphor of the winged soul. According to Plato, the soul wants to fly to the celestial world.⁵⁴ Chrysostom borrows this concept, noting that almsgiving flies to God beyond the natural and heavenly world to ameliorate the spiritual wellbeing of the donors. The conventional response to an issue surrounding patristic hermeneutics is to bring about a sharp contrast between Antiochene and Alexandrian exegesis. The Antiochenes pursued the literal meaning of the Scripture, but the Alexandrians sought the deeper spiritual meaning beyond the biblical text itself. Bradley Nassif critically reflects on the dichotomy of early Christian hermeneutics, arguing that the Antiochene Fathers including Chrysostom also interpreted the Bible according to the spirit. This spiritual and mysterious exegetical method is known as *theōria*.⁵⁵

⁵¹ Chrys. *Paen. hom.* 3.1 (PG 49:293.9-26 and 29-30; Christo, *On Repentance and Almsgiving*, 30-31, modified).

⁵² Demetrios S. Katos, “Socratic Dialogue or Courtroom Debate?: Judicial Rhetoric and Stasis Theory in the *Dialogue on the Life of St. John Chrysostom*,” *VC* 61 (2007): 49-50 n. 26.

⁵³ Garrison, *Redemptive Almsgiving*, 67.

⁵⁴ Plato, *Phdr.* 246c-48c (LCL 36:472-79); cf. Bosinis, “Two Platonic Images,” 435-36.

⁵⁵ Bradley Nassif, “The ‘Spiritual Exegesis’ of Scripture: The School of Antioch Revisited,” *ATHR* 75 (1993): 437-70. Nassif argues for *theōria* as the fundamental hermeneutical principle in the Antiochene biblical reading: “behind the Antiochene Fathers’ search for the literal meaning of Scripture lies a deceptively

1. 2. 2. Deliverance from Hell (γέεννα)

Chrysostom claims that sin conduces not only to death, but also to eternal divine judgment. Human beings are afflicted with pain and toil in their present life that are the consequences of sin, and even worse they will be damned after death, completely disconnected from fellowship with God.⁵⁶ This point is made in *In Matthaëum hom. 4* where Chrysostom treats the insatiable nature of the passions that devour the soul every day. Unlike a lion, which stops eating when it is full, passions are never satisfied until they draw us to the devil. In this sense, they not only cause the disease of the soul, but also kill the soul in the end. Chrysostom warns that unless we kill passions first here, they will kill us in the next life.⁵⁷ He describes hell as the sea of fire where there is no mercy or comfort, only pain for eternity.⁵⁸

Recently, it has been argued that Chrysostom rejected the notion of eternal damnation. Ilaria Ramelli treats the theory of universal restoration (ἀποκατάστασις) in the early church, “that is, of the return of all beings, or at least all rational beings or all humans to God in the end,” asserting that “this doctrine was abundantly received throughout the Patristic era, up to John Eriugena.”⁵⁹ She claims that for Chrysostom κόλασις αἰώνιος means “otherworldly punishment,” not “eternal punishment,” and that his threat of eternal punishment is a merely rhetorical expression for promoting the moral progress of his

simple hermeneutic which governed their efforts to bridge the spiritual and historical approaches to biblical interpretation. This “spiritual” hermeneutic, known as *theōria* (“vision, insight, contemplation”), lies at the center of the Antiochenes’ dual concern for a historical and yet christological reading of the Bible. It not only permitted, but required them to find “mystical” interpretations that were based upon and congruent with the literal sense of the text. In short, *theōria* specified the content and character of a distinctly Antiochene form of mystical exegesis (Ibid., 438).” The classic work on the so-called Antiochene School versus the so-called Alexandrian School is that of Christoph Schäublin, *Untersuchungen zu Methode und Herkunft der Antiochenischen Exegese*, Theophaneia 23 (Cologne and Bonn: Hanstein, 1974).

⁵⁶ Papageorgiou, “A Theological Analysis of Selected Themes,” 53-55; and Daley, *The Hope of the Early Church*, 107-8.

⁵⁷ Chrys. *Hom. 4.9 in Mt.* (PG 57:50.42-55).

⁵⁸ Chrys. *Hom. 43.4 in Mt.* (PG 57:461.52-462.21).

⁵⁹ Ilaria Ramelli, *The Christian Doctrine of Apokatastasis: A Critical Assessment from the New Testament to Eriugena*, Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae 120 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 1.

audiences.⁶⁰ Ramelli provides useful insights, but her arguments are not convincing. All of her arguments are not critically reflected here, but one point to be made clearly is that her preoccupation with certain words or sentences used by authors in support of the doctrine of universal restoration, such as Origen, leads her to misunderstand what texts themselves really say, though her comparative reading is regarded as a valuable attempt. She tends to interpret texts by projecting her pre-understanding regarding doctrine into them.⁶¹ For instance, let us consider her approach to *In epistulam ii ad Thessalonicenses hom. 3* where he states:

There are many people who have good hopes not by abstaining from their sins, but by thinking that hell is not so terrible as it is said to be, but rather milder than what is threatened, and temporary, not eternal (πρόσκαιρον, οὐκ αἰώνιον), and they often philosophize about this. I can prove from many reasons and infer from the very words of Scripture concerning hell, that it is not only not milder than what is threatened, but much more terrible. However, I do not now intend to treat these things. For simple words are sufficient for the fear, though we do not fully unfold their meaning. To realize that it is not temporary, listen to Paul now saying, concerning those who do not know God, and who do not believe in the Gospel, that “they shall suffer punishment, even eternal destruction (2 Thess 1:8-9).” How then is that which is everlasting temporary? “From the face of the Lord,” he says. What is this? What is there of mildness in these words?⁶²

Regarding this text, Ramelli argues:

Here John would seem to want hearers to take αἰώνιος as meaning “eternal,” although he is himself aware of the polysemy of this adjective. . . . John’s hortatory aim is clear: one should not place one’s hopes in the limitedness of future punishment, but should rather avoid doing evil. *This was also Origen’s argument: it is better for an immature person to believe that punishment will be eternal and to avoid sinning, than to believe that punishment will not be eternal and to sin* (italics is mine).⁶³

⁶⁰ Ramelli, *The Christian Doctrine of Apokatastasis*, 549-64.

⁶¹ Cf., Cook’s criticism against Ramelli, id., “Hear and Shudder,” forthcoming.

⁶² Chrys. *Hom. 3.1 in 2 Thess.* (PG 62:479.15-31 ab imo; NPNF 1.13, 386, modified).

⁶³ Ramelli, *The Christian Doctrine of Apokatastasis*, 555.

According to Ramelli, Chrysostom's harsh account of eternal punishment in hell is his pedagogical tool to teach immature Christians. To support this, she compares Chrysostom and Origen, but does not provide any textual evidence from Chrysostom's own voice. Strictly speaking, Ramelli sees Chrysostom through Origen. Unlike Origen, here Chrysostom strongly criticizes those who advocate the finitude of divine judgement, emphasizing that it is eternal.⁶⁴ Furthermore, it is shown that Chrysostom's main strategy of addressing the weak soul was gentle speech including the presentation of heavenly reward, which leads the immature soul to seek a virtuous life, rather than the threat of hell according to the pedagogical principle of accommodation (συγκατάβασις) in ancient philosophy.⁶⁵

Chrysostom claims that eternal damnation can be avoided by our merciful works. This is elaborated in his account of Daniel and his friends, namely Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego. According to Daniel 3, King Nebuchadnezzar made an image of gold and declared an edict ordering all his people to fall down and worship it. He warned that whoever rejects his command will immediately be thrown into a blazing furnace. Despite the royal edict, Daniel and his three friends refused to bow before the image, and they eventually were thrown into the furnace. Even though, however, the soldiers who threw them into the fire burned to death, the others walked out of the fire without any harm, and the king praised God who kept them safe. Chrysostom applies this story to charitable giving, urging the rich not to serve an idol of money but to enter the furnace of poverty. Like Daniel and his friends who are safe in the furnace, they do not need to fear the fire of hell if they participate in the suffering of the poor, because almsgiving is the dew that completely extinguishes the fire. Chrysostom states that if the wealthy worship the image of money, the fire of hell will eventually burn them down.⁶⁶ W. Dennis Tucker Jr. explores the *Wirkungsgeschichte* of Daniel 3, noting an interesting interpretive change. Christian writers before persecution driven by the Roman empire, such as Hippolytus (170-235 C.E.)

⁶⁴ Daley, *The Hope of the Early Church*, 107-8, also argues for Chrysostom's advocacy of eternal punishment.

⁶⁵ See Chapter 2 above, esp. 3.1.1-2.

⁶⁶ Chrys. *Hom.* 4.11-12 in *Mt.* (PG 57:53.13-54.54); and Hendrik F. Stander, "Chrysostom's Interpretation of the Narrative of the Three Confessors in the Fiery Furnace," *Acta Patristica et Byzantina* 16 (2005): 99-100 and 103.

and Origen (c.184-c.254 C.E.), primarily associated this story with martyrdom. Just as the youths did not forsake the worship of God in spite of the king's command, so early Christians should not yield to the unjust emperor, but keep their loyalty to Christ. After the conversion of Constantine, however, the interpretation shifted. When Chrysostom considers this story, he focuses on the virtues of the boys, rather than the relationship between the state and church. The furnace did not cause any harm to these virtuous boys.⁶⁷ Antiochene Christians do not need to be afraid of future judgment if they realize virtue (almsgiving).

Then, an angel went down with these children; now, let us go down with those who are in the furnace of poverty (καμίνῳ πενίας), make dew (δρόσον) through almsgiving, and extinguish flame that we also may be partakers of their crowns; that the voice of Christ may likewise scatter the flame of hell (φλόγα τῆς γέεννης), saying, "You saw me hungry and fed me." . . . Let us not therefore sit down outside the furnace, feeling no pity towards the poor, lest the same befall us as then befell these executioners. For if you go down to them and stand with the children, the fire will no longer harm you; but if you sit above and neglect them in the flame of their poverty, the flame will burn you up. Go down therefore into the fire, that you may not be burnt up by the fire; not sit down outside the fire, lest the flame catch hold of you. For if it finds you among the poor, it will depart from you; but if you are alienated from them, it will run upon you quickly and catch you. Do not therefore stand off from those who are cast in, but when the devil gives command to cast those who have not worshipped gold into the furnace of poverty, do not be of those who cast others in, but of those who are cast in in order that you may be of the members of the saved, and not of the burned. For indeed it is the most effectual dew (δρόσος) to be held in no subjection by desire of wealth and to be associated with the poor. These are wealthier than all, who have trampled under their foot the desire of riches.⁶⁸

⁶⁷ W. Dennis Tucker Jr., "The Early Wirkungsgeschichte of Daniel 3: Representative Examples," *Journal of Theological Interpretation* 6 (2012): 295-303. Also, see Stander, "Chrysostom's Interpretation of the Narrative of the Three Confessors," 91-105; and Brottier, "Et la fournaise devint source," 309-27.

⁶⁸ Chrys. *Hom. 4.12 in Mt.* (PG 57:53.51-54.4 and 54.26-45; NPNF 1.10, 30, modified).

In *In Matthaeum hom. 52*, Chrysostom demonstrates the salvific effect of almsgiving, employing the concept of an art (τέχνη). He defines an art in terms of usefulness (χρησις) and states that almsgiving is an art in that it significantly benefits us. Its workshop is in heaven, God is a teacher, and its tools are not made of iron or bronze, but of our will (γνώμη).⁶⁹ Chrysostom insists that since the essence of an art lies in its usefulness (χρησις), it will lose its status if it does not benefit us. Architecture, cooking, weaving, and embroidery are designed to meet the basic needs of our life, but if they damage our soul and body, they will no longer be called art. If these arts are used for ostentation or luxury, this is against their divine purpose.⁷⁰ In her study of early Christian theology of work, Susanna Barsella argues that Chrysostom transformed the philosophical definition of art. Aristotle saw art as belonging to a theoretical system that reveals truth, and Chrysostom extended the domain of art to its practical implication (*praxis*).⁷¹ In other words, the usefulness of art identifies what an art is. Chrysostom's emphasis on practicality is also supported by Stenger whose study of Chrysostom's apologetics of Christian philosophy indicates that he criticizes philosophers' *vita contemplativa*. Chrysostom claims that a genuine Christian philosophical life is *vita activa* represented by labour and unconditional commitment for the salvation of one's neighbours, not just ascetic disciplines only for one's own soul.⁷²

According to Chrysostom, almsgiving is the best art. The superiority of almsgiving is based on its usefulness. The essence of an art lies in its usefulness, and the advantages of almsgiving are incomparably greater than any other skill. He compares almsgiving with other skills to indicate how it is useful. First, it takes a great deal of time and effort to master other arts, but their benefit is not huge. In the case of almsgiving, however, it does not need labour and time except the will, but the gain is unspeakable. If we only have the will to practise it, this is sufficient for the acquisition of the art. External factors such as

⁶⁹ Chrys. *Hom. 52.3 in Mt.* (PG 58: 522.32-45); and *Hom. 49.4 in Mt.* (PG 58:500.51-57).

⁷⁰ Chrys. *Hom. 49.4 in Mt.* (PG 58:501.9-56).

⁷¹ Barsella, "Ars and Theology," 62, n. 3. Also, see Plassmann, *Das Almosen*, 14.

⁷² Stenger, "Where to Find Christian Philosophy?" 187-90. The same point has been made by several scholars: Malingrey, *Philosophia*, 270-86; Quantin, "A propos de la traduction de 'philosophia'," 187-97; and Schatkin, *John Chrysostom as Apologist*, 230-72.

age and health are not obstacles to learning almsgiving, if we are willing.⁷³ Second, other arts need to be assisted by a variety of arts to perform their function, but this is not the case with almsgiving: it alone is sufficient to benefit us. Chrysostom exemplifies agriculture, which provides us with food, but the assistance gained by carpenters, blacksmiths, builders, and bakers is essential for this function. Third, almsgiving gives a huge number of advantages, while others have one benefit. Agriculture is useful for feeding us, and weaving is used to make clothes. Unlike these skills, almsgiving not only gives us honour and praise in this life, but also stores up treasures in heaven, builds eternal houses, delivers us from death and hell, and secures eternal life in the afterlife. It keeps the body, the soul, and all of our possessions intact. Lastly, the usefulness of other arts ends with our present life and is temporary even in this life. However, almsgiving benefits us in both this and the next life, and even shines brighter in the next life. We can safely sail on the rough sea of life in the guidance of almsgiving as a harbour. Besides, almsgiving stands by the judgement seat of Christ and defends us, just as sophists and rhetoricians do in courts.⁷⁴ Here, the salvific effect of almsgiving is suggested as its main benefit. Chrysostom states:

Let us consider what the aim (τέλος) of almsgiving is. Then, what is its aim? Heaven and the good things in it: unspeakable glory, spiritual bridal chambers, bright lamps, abiding with the bridegroom; the other things, which no speech, nor even understanding, is able to set forth.⁷⁵

For Chrysostom salvation requires continuous obedience to God's will. As Brändle puts it rightly, "redemption for Chrysostom is not limited to what happened on the cross. Redemption is not something finished, but rather something that continues to happen in our everyday life."⁷⁶ In *In Johannem hom. 23*, Chrysostom notes that Jesus' disciples came to believe in his resurrection with the aim of the abundant grace of the Holy Spirit. If there had been no such grace, they who denied him and ran away in just one evening would not have believed in his resurrection. However, Chrysostom points out that the

⁷³ Chrys. *Hom. 52.4 in Mt.* (PG 58:523.53-524.4); and *Hom. 49.4 in Mt.* (PG 58:500.51-59).

⁷⁴ Chrys. *Hom. 52.3-4 in Mt.* (PG 58:522.45-524.25).

⁷⁵ Chrys. *Hom. 49.4 in Mt.* (PG 58:500.59-501.5; NPNF 1.10, 307, modified).

⁷⁶ Brändle, "This Sweetest Passage," 137.

maintenance of the grace of the Holy Spirit is predicated on their virtues: if they had not lived a virtuous life, they would never have entered heaven.⁷⁷ This understanding of soteriology is characterized by the concept of divine-human synergism (συνεργία): salvation is the cooperative work between God and us. Therefore, it is not a matter of choosing either divine grace or human choice in Chrysostom's doctrine of soteriology.⁷⁸ Panayiotis Papageorgiou gives a clear account of Chrysostom's position between grace and work:

According to Chrysostom, without the grace of God we cannot achieve any spiritual progress and reach salvation and perfection. Even our achievements are called gifts by St. Paul, because even in these we need a good deal of assistance from above. God's assistance, however, does not eliminate man's effort, for it is not given unless he sees our resolve to come to him, to be obedient to his commands, to simply want his sanctification. Then he grants his spirit to transform us so that we can cease to walk 'according to the flesh' and begin to walk 'according to the Spirit.' Chrysostom believes, that in spite of the fact that God has the first world and also the last in the process of man's redemption and ultimate perfection, man's cooperation is absolutely necessary for the process to be completed. Furthermore, neither God by himself nor man through his own efforts can reach the goal. Both have to work together and their contribution is equally necessary, though not of equal measure.⁷⁹

⁷⁷ Chrys. *hom.* 23.3 in *Jo.* (PG 59:142.43-68). In *In Matthaëum hom.* 15, Chrysostom, *hom.* 15.6 in *Mt.* (PG 57:231.31-42), similarly argues that it is Christ's work that restores the corrupted nature of a human being to a formal state, but we are responsible for maintaining this restored condition: "'you are the salt of the earth (Matt 5.13).' What then? Did they (spiritual patients) restore the decayed? By no means; for it is impossible to do any good to that which is already spoilt, by sprinkling it with salt. Therefore they did not this. However rather they salted those which have been renewed before, committed to their charge, and freed from foul smell, maintaining and preserving them in that freshness, which they had received from the Lord. For the fact that people should be set free from the rottenness of their sins was the good work of Christ; but not returning to it again any more was the object of their diligence and travail (NPNF 1.10, 97, modified)."

⁷⁸ Papageorgiou, "A Theological Analysis of Selected Themes," 87-91; and Miller, "No Sympathy for the Devil," 240-42.

⁷⁹ Papageorgiou, "A Theological Analysis of Selected Themes," 90-91.

Chrysostom emphasizes human actions in a salvific journey without overlooking the importance of divine grace. Lack of grace cannot be an excuse for laziness in spiritual progress, and non-activism caused by the biased idea of grace has nothing to do with the soteriology of Chrysostom.⁸⁰ He clearly points out that the concrete acts of his audience's consistent love for the poor will lead them to the gates of heaven:

Well, then, let us also imitate them (apostles), and let us not extinguish our lamps, but keep them bright by almsgiving. It is by this means that the brightness of this fire is preserved. Let us, then, put oil in our vessels as long as we are here. It is not possible to buy it when we have taken our departure hence, or to receive it from any source other than the hands of the poor. Let us, therefore, collect it from there in great abundance, that is, if we wish to enter in with the bridegroom; if we do not do this, we must remain outside the bridal chamber. *It is impossible, I repeat, even if we perform countless good works, to enter the portals of the kingdom without almsgiving* (Italics is mine).⁸¹

This passage reflects Chrysostom's interpretation of the parable of ten virgins founded in Matthew 25:1-13 where five foolish virgins appear and wait for the bridegroom with their lamps. When they go to a town to buy oil because it runs out, the bridegroom comes, and they cannot participate in the wedding banquet. Interestingly, Chrysostom derives the necessity of almsgiving from this text. Reading oil as almsgiving, he argues that the virgins were not able to be welcomed to the kingdom because they did not continue to practise charity. Based on this argument, he encourages his hearers to continually care for the poor to be saved. More importantly, he stresses that almsgiving is more important than virginity, and indeed, it is the best virtue in his thought. The virgins represent the ascetic discipline of virginity, and the fact that they were abandoned due to lack of oil delineates the superiority of merciful giving over virginity. Chrysostom

⁸⁰ Miller, "No Sympathy for the Devil," 222-59; Papageorgiou, "A Theological Analysis of Selected Themes," 77-131; Mel Lawrenz, *The Christology of John Chrysostom* (Lewiston, NY: Mellen University Press, 1996), 146-54; and Lloyd G. Pierson, "An Analysis of John Chrysostom's Underlying Theory of Christ's Redemption in the Letters of St. Paul" (PhD diss., Saint Louis University, 2004), 95-97 and 220-23.

⁸¹ Chrys. *Hom. 23.3 in Jo.* (PG 59:142.69-144.1; Goggin, *Commentary on Saint John*, FC 33, 231, modified).

seriously warns that even celibacy (virginity), which was considered one of the highest ascetic virtues, cannot secure individual salvation without merciful assistance to the disadvantaged. Almsgiving is the foundational virtue that all believers must fulfill if they want to reach spiritual perfection.

Chrysostom's bold claim about almsgiving (good works) has raised much controversy particularly among Protestant scholars who in the Reformation tradition argue for God's absolute sovereignty and total human incompetence in the process of salvation: in the words of Gary A. Anderson, "can human beings buy their way out of their sinful state? If so, man saves himself by his own good works."⁸² They argue that this is a theological regression that deviates from the original gospel.⁸³ Garrison argues that the doctrine of redemptive almsgiving distinctively emerged in the apostolic fathers. This doctrine was devised by the early church to solve social and theological problems arising from the huge financial gap between the rich and the poor. It was incompatible with Christ's death and resurrection as the unique expiating means for sins. Garrison maintains that its advocates attempted to make a theological compromise to address the problems they confronted, and as a result, the belief in the redemptive power of Christ weakened.⁸⁴ Under this circumstance, Chrysostom's excessive emphasis on almsgiving has been often stigmatized as a semi-Pelagian.⁸⁵ "The charge of moralism is raised again and again against the great preacher."⁸⁶

However, we should approach this issue with caution. Since not only Chrysostom, but also nearly every church father and writer commonly bore witness to the redemptive

⁸² Anderson, "Redeem Your Sins by the Giving of Alms," 57.

⁸³ Anderson, "Redeem Your Sins by the Giving of Alms," 57; Lai, "John Chrysostom and the Hermeneutics of Exemplar Portraits," 130-31; Papageorgiou, "A Theological Analysis of Selected Themes," 128-31; and Brändle, "This Sweetest Passage," 138.

⁸⁴ Garrison, *Redemptive Almsgiving*, 11, 60, 75.

⁸⁵ Lai, "John Chrysostom and the Hermeneutics of Exemplar Portraits" 130-31; Papageorgiou, "A Theological Analysis of Selected Themes," 128-31; and Brändle, "This Sweetest Passage," 138. It is argued that about twelve years after the death of Chrysostom, Julian of Eclanum was the first to adduce Chrysostom as his witness in support of his Pelagian position in the debate with Augustine (Laird, *Mindset, Moral Choice and Sin*, 1).

⁸⁶ Brändle, "This Sweetest Passage," 138.

power of almsgiving, the conclusion that this position was a deviation from the true gospel seems to deny a vital theoretical and practical tradition in early Christianity.⁸⁷ In addition, it is necessary to reconsider an argument for the nature of the gospel, namely Garrison's thesis that the forgiveness of sin and salvation through the atoning death of Christ is in conflict with redemptive almsgiving. It was argued that some teachings in the Bible can be interpreted to directly convey the redemptive effect of charity. In his investigation of the formation of atoning almsgiving from the New Testament to the third century C.E., Downs criticizes Garrison, asserting that these two concepts already operate in harmony in the biblical tradition and that early Christian promoters of redemptive almsgiving faithfully represented this teaching in the scriptures. In the biblical and patristic tradition, the close link between charity, reward, and forgiveness of the poor appear.⁸⁸ Therefore, we must properly take measure of Chrysostom's view of almsgiving and salvation.

For Chrysostom, as mentioned above, grace and work do not contradict each other. Moral progress is fundamentally a proper response to God's salvific work and grace.⁸⁹ Commenting on Matthew 19:26 ("with man this is impossible, but with God all things are possible"), Chrysostom underscores God's grace: no matter how great good works are, we should seek God and ask his assistance.⁹⁰ Most of Chrysostom's homilies end with a doxology, which clearly shows that grace and action are closely intertwined. In *In Matthaeum hom. 35*, Chrysostom encourages the members of his congregation, especially the rich, to generously help the poor who approach to them to seek their mercy, not to insult them. Their almsgiving will give them salvation as a great reward in return, which will be ultimately accomplished by the grace of God:

⁸⁷ Anderson, "Redeem Your Sins by the Giving of Alms," 58.

⁸⁸ Downs, *Alms: Charity, Reward, and Atonement*, 5-6.

⁸⁹ Ashish J. Naidu, *Transformed in Christ: Christology and the Christian Life in John Chrysostom*, Princeton Theological Monograph Series 188 (Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2012), 159, notes that for Chrysostom "almsgiving and charity to the poor are viewed as ways to demonstrate the love of God and as a reflection of the work of grace in the life of the Christian. Divine forgiveness follows human repentance and true generosity of the heart reflects that gift. God's *eleēmosynē* towards the Christian in turn demands the same attitude towards the needy." See also Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*, 100-51, esp. 144-51.

⁹⁰ Chrys. *Hom. 63.2 in Mt.* (PG 58:606.20-27).

Duly considering then all these things, let us both bridle our tongue and put away inhumanity, and let us stretch forth our hands to give alms, and not with money only, but with words also, let us relieve those in need; that we may both escape the punishment for reviling and may inherit the kingdom which is a reward for blessing and almsgiving, by the grace (χάρτι) and love (φιλανθρωπία) of our Lord Jesus Christ, to whom be glory and might forever and ever, Amen.⁹¹

As seen above, grace and deed are like both sides of a coin. These two work together without separation. In this sense, Chrysostom did not advocate ‘so-called salvation by works.’ Work is a key sign which demonstrates the true faith of a believer.⁹² Generous giving to the poor begins also with one’s faith in God’s promise to the abundant gifts of salvation and reward in return for it. Here, we see the infinite mercy of God, who receives some money through the hands of the poor and gives eternal life.⁹³ Brändle claims:

For John there is a close connection between soteriology and ethics. This connection allows for a new understanding of his statements about the relationship between grace and faith, and again between faith and works, which is normally interpreted as an uninspired synergism. Through his soteriological interpretation of Matt. 25:31-46 he assures the preeminence of grace. For it is out of grace that the risen Christ comes to us today in the poor, out of love to us that he suffers in and with them, and out of grace that he accepts what we give to suffering humans as given to him and promises us great reward for our small deeds. Works for John are not elements separable from faith, but they are far more: a concrete form of faith. Good deeds are a step in the direction of the experience of faith, signs of a true life already grasped.⁹⁴

⁹¹ Chrys. *Hom. 35.5 in Mt.* (PG 57:412.50-58; NPNF 1.10, 238, modified).

⁹² Naidu, *Transformed in Christ*, 159.

⁹³ Anderson, “Redeem Your Sins by the Giving of Alms,” 58-65.

⁹⁴ Brändle, “This Sweetest Passage,” 138. The same point is made by Costanzo, *Harbor for the Poor*, 103-9. Cyprian, Augustine, and Ephrem, a Syrian church father, are said to concur with this (Anderson, “Redeem Your Sins by the Giving of Alms,” 57-69; and Downs, *Alms: Charity, Reward, and Atonement*, 256-71). Regarding Ephrem, Anderson, “Redeem Your sins by the Giving of Alms,” 60-62, maintains: “for Ephrem,

Recently, some scholars lend a new direction to this issue, casting considerable doubt over the understanding of Chrysostom's doctrine of soteriology from the theological lens of faith and work. Because this view is mainly based on Augustine's reading of Christian faith, which was accepted and developed by Protestant scholars afterward, there is a limit to interpreting Chrysostom's thought within his own theological context.⁹⁵ Indeed, this issue was not an important matter during his ministry in both Antioch and Constantinople.⁹⁶ In his treatment of Chrysostom's hermeneutics of exemplar portraits, Pak-Wah Lai strongly criticizes the anachronistic approach to Chrysostom's soteriology, claiming that his doctrine of redemption should be interpreted as the discourse of deification, which was his historical and theological background.⁹⁷ Lai's thesis is also advocated by Verhoeff in her treatment of Chrysostom's discourse on friendship with God.⁹⁸ Although it is hard to clearly define what deification in Chrysostom is due to lack of its technical terms in his writings,⁹⁹ these recent studies demonstrate that Chrysostom's idea of divinization can generally be recapitulated as the restoration of the divine likeness by means of the mysterious union of a believer with Christ.¹⁰⁰ Through baptism,

the one who makes a loan to God through almsgiving is not simply doing a human work—he is making a public testimony to his faith. On this view, alms are not so much a human work as they are an index of one's underlying faith. . . . Yet for Ephrem, *only one who truly believes in God as the ultimate guarantor of his loan to the poor would have the temerity to demand its repayment*. Scripture, Ephrem reasons, has shown that it is precisely in the hands of the poor that God's promise of grace is to be found. *Timidity about the reward for such a loan reveals nothing other than a lack of faith*. At this point, we are well beyond the standard contours of a debate about the merits of human works (italics is mine)." Brändle, "This Sweetest Passage," 138, regrets that this tradition has disappeared: "with his bold interpretation of the Matthew passage, John Chrysostom has found a new approach to soteriology. Unfortunately for the church, this was not developed further by later writers, and even today is little taken into account. Instead, the charge of moralism is raised again and again against the great preacher."

⁹⁵ Lai, "John Chrysostom and the Hermeneutics of Exemplar Portraits," 130-32.

⁹⁶ Laird, *Mindset, Moral Choice and Sin*, 1.

⁹⁷ Lai, "John Chrysostom and the Hermeneutics of Exemplar Portraits," 130-32.

⁹⁸ Verhoeff, "Friendship Discourse," 162-93.

⁹⁹ Verhoeff, "Friendship Discourse," 165.

¹⁰⁰ In Chrysostom's arguments about a deified life, the concept of *Imago Dei* is important, see Pak-Wah Lai, "The Imago Dei and Salvation among the Antiochenes: A Comparison of John Chrysostom with Theodore of Mopsuestia," *SP* 67 (2013): 393-402.

Christians becomes God in terms of ontology. They realize a heavenly life in their present life by developing an intimate relationship with Christ through union with him. As a result, they transcend the limitations of human nature, and their oneness with God makes them superior to angels. Virtues also lead them to continually participate in the divine character.¹⁰¹

Within this framework of deification, almsgiving plays an essential role in the assimilation of the believer to God through moral progress. Chrysostom derives the principle of deifying almsgiving from his exegesis of Luke 6:36, “be merciful, just as your Father is merciful (γίνεσθε οἰκτίρμονες καθὼς ὁ πατήρ ὑμῶν οἰκτίρμων ἐστίν).”¹⁰²

¹⁰¹ Lai, “John Chrysostom and the Hermeneutics of Exemplar Portraits,” 132-52; id., “Exemplar Portraits and the Interpretation of John Chrysostom’s Doctrine of Recapitulation,” in *Revisioning John Chrysostom*, forthcoming; Verhoeff, “Friendship Discourse,” 172-83; and Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*, 144-51. Lai, “John Chrysostom and the Hermeneutics of Exemplar Portraits” 171, summarizes his arguments: “Chrysostom’s soteriology is firmly grounded upon, and to a large extent appropriates, the deification discourse of the Irenaean, Alexandrian and Cappadocian traditions. Specifically, Chrysostom conceives salvation as the re-creation of a Christian into the image of Christ who is both divine and human. Two primary ideas are involved here. The first is the recognition that a Christian, through union with Christ, can transcend the limitations of human nature. It is on this account that a Christian is called angelic or even a god. The second is the insistence that the Christian, while attaining divine like qualities, nevertheless, remains resolutely human. At the same time, spiritual progress also consists in his participation in Christ’s victorious recapitulation of the human life.” For Chrysostom celestial imagery is closely linked with the discourse of divinization. For the exploration on this image in Chrysostom’s writings, see Maria Verhoeff, “‘God on Earth, Man in Heaven:’ John Chrysostom’s Use of Celestial Imagery for the Christian Life,” in *Seeing through the Eyes of Faith: New Approaches to the Mystagogy of the Church Fathers*, ed. Paul van Geest, *Late Antique History and Religion* 11 (Leuven : Peeters, 2016), 251-68; and Lai, “John Chrysostom and the Hermeneutics of Exemplar Portraits,” 62-68.

¹⁰² Sergio Zincone, “Essere simili a Dio,” 353-58, shows that Matt 5:45 is also important in Chrysostom’s discourse on virtue and deification. Matt 5:44-45 states that “44. I tell you, love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you, 45 that you may be children of your Father in heaven” (ὅπως γένησθε υἱοὶ τοῦ πατρὸς ὑμῶν τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς). According to these passages, loving our enemies and praying for our persecutor make us the children of God. Chrysostom replaces ‘υἱοὶ’ with ‘ὅμοιοι,’ which means that for him these virtuous acts make believers God, not simply his children. According to Verhoeff, “Friendship Discourse,” 180 n. 109, this change seems to arise from Chrysostom’s recognition of the expression of oneness with God (ὅμοιοι), which best represents an intimate relationship between God and a human being. Barsella, “Ars and Theology,” 61, argues for the interpretive role of 2 Thess 3:10 (“The one who is unwilling

Because God is merciful in nature, we imitate this divine attribute if we help the poor. Chrysostom claims that a person who practises mercy is God: “this is God (τοῦτο Θεός). For be, he said, merciful as your father.”¹⁰³ He also becomes a true human being. A human being was created by God not only to make rational judgement, but also to feel mercy and pity. We have compassion for our family and those close to us, and we are indignant and mourn when something unfair or unfortunate happens to them. Compassion for the poor is to follow the principle of divine creation.¹⁰⁴ Chrysostom makes much of almsgiving as the best gift of God in the Christian journey of deification:

Let us not fall away into cruelty, but let us listen to Paul, saying “Be not weary in doing good;” let us listen to the Lord who said, “Give to everyone who asks you,” and “Be merciful as your father.” Though he had spoken of many things, he had used this expression nowhere, but only with regard to our deeds of mercy. For nothing so equals (ἴσους) us with God, as doing good.¹⁰⁵

Chrysostom repeatedly mentions redemptive almsgiving within the context of deification, which demonstrates that his discourse on it should be understood in line with this doctrine of salvation. As Verhoeff rightly mentions, “Chrysostom does not depict almsgiving as a redemptive activity in itself or ‘by its own nature,’ but shows that redemption is friendship with God” (divinization).¹⁰⁶ In *In Matthaeum hom.* 71, Chrysostom strongly criticizes people seeking vainglory when they give alms to the poor, stating that if the act of mercy is motivated by worldly glory and honour, the giver will suffer tremendous loss: “if you wrestle according to the opinion of the multitude, and not that of the teacher, the loss is in the wrestling; but here it is in eternal life. You become like (ὅμοιος) to God in giving alms; be like (ὅμοιος) him in not making a display.”¹⁰⁷ In *Matthaeum hom.* 77 makes the same point where Chrysostom explains the redemptive

to work shall not eat.”) in Chrysostom’s theology of almsgiving and *imitatio Dei*.

¹⁰³ Chrys. *Hom.* 52.5 in *Mt.* (PG 58:524.45-46).

¹⁰⁴ Chrys. *Hom.* 52.5 in *Mt.* (PG 58:523.26-44).

¹⁰⁵ Chrys. *Hom.* 35.4 in *Mt.* (PG 57:411.25-31; NPNF 1.10, 236-37, modified).

¹⁰⁶ Verhoeff, “A Genuine Friend Wishes to be a Debtor,” 48. See also ead., “Friendship Discourse,” 107.

¹⁰⁷ Chrys. *Hom.* 71.3 in *Mt.* (PG 58:666.4-8; NPNF 1.10, 434, modified).

function of almsgiving through the lens of the imitation of God, encouraging his congregation to give their alms generously: “let us hold this way, for this is especially the way that leads up to heaven, which renders people the imitators (μιμητός) of Christ, which makes them, as far as possible, like (ὁμοίους) God.”¹⁰⁸ Becoming God is the sum of all spiritual good things, including salvation. Chrysostom argues that all these benefits result in deification:

Let us receive this skill (ἐπιστήμην) and bring to perfection. For it is better to know this than to be a king and to wear a diadem. For it not only does not need other things, but also is able to accomplish a variety of objects, both many and of all kinds. For it builds houses which continue forever in heaven. It teaches those who have brought it to perfection how they escape the never-dying death; and gives you treasures that are never spent, but escape all harm from robbers, worms, moths, and time. If someone had only taught you about the preservation of wheat, what would you not have given to preserve your grain uncorrupted for many years? However, behold this teaches you concerning not only wheat, but also concerning all things, namely how your goods and soul and body remain unconsumed. Why should we rehearse particularly all the good effects of this art? For this teaches you how you become like (ὅμοιος) God, which is the sum (κεφάλαιον) of all good things. Did you see how its advantage is not one, but many? Without needing any other art, it builds houses, it weaves garments, it stores up impregnable treasures, it makes us overcome death, and prevail over the devil, and it renders us like (ὁμοίους) God.¹⁰⁹

2. The Christianization of Philosophical Therapy

2. 1. The Integration of Psychic Therapy and Salvation

We have examined Chrysostom’s understanding of the correlation between almsgiving and the forgiveness of sin within the tradition of Jewish-Christian redemptive almsgiving. For Chrysostom Christian giving was understood as an important means of cleansing sin and avoiding God’s eternal punishment. How did two concepts, namely the Christian doctrine of redemptive almsgiving and the theory of psychic therapeutic

¹⁰⁸ Chrys. *Hom. 77.5 in Mt.* (PG 58:708.52-55; NPNF 1.10, 468, modified).

¹⁰⁹ Chrys. *Hom. 52.4 in Mt.* (PG 58:523.30-50; NPNF 1.10, 324-25, modified).

almsgiving in terms of philosophical, especially psychagogical tradition operate in his mind? Recently a new attempt to reshape the identity of Chrysostom through the perspective of ancient philosophy and medicine provides valuable ground for addressing this issue, though it does not engage directly in the medical conceptualization of almsgiving in his thought. Mayer investigates Chrysostom's medico-philosophical approach to Christianity, arguing that his identity should be redefined within his contemporary intellectual environment. In particular, she calls into question an interpretive tendency from the viewpoint of modern systematic theology, where Chrysostom has been viewed as just a moralist or orator, not a thinker, with a lack of both theoretical consistency and deep insight into theology, biblical exegesis, and spirituality.¹¹⁰ She notes that Chrysostom was a psychagogue who was firmly rooted in a long-standing branch of medico-philosophical therapy in Greco-Roman society, and that it was the primary purpose of his pastoral care to correct the sick souls of his congregation caused by passions and false conceptions through preaching as a healing tool.¹¹¹

For John, I would argue, theology as a distinct intellectual exercise does not appear on his horizon. For his own (etic) point of view he is a psychagogue in the classical sense, a teacher of his own (albeit Christian) philosophical school. This best explains why John commonly uses the terms *didaskalos* and *logos* when he refers to the priest, himself include, in the role of preacher. Like philosophers in the psychagogic stream, his goal is the health of his students' souls and he is best viewed, as I will argue, not within the context of the emergence at the end of the fourth century of systematized discussion of Christian doctrine, but within the already lengthy trajectory of a particular strand of moral

¹¹⁰ Mayer, "Shaping the Sick Soul," 140-43; and Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*, 1-3.

¹¹¹ Mayer, "Shaping the Sick Soul," 143-64. Mayer, "Medicine in Transition," 13-16, also maintains that Chrysostom was a holistic physician who sought ultimately to improve the health of both the body and soul, which is explained in more detail by other scholars. De Wet, "The Preacher's Diet," forthcoming, explores Chrysostom's view of gluttony, showing that his considerable attention to modest diet is associated closely with the psycho-somatic health of his audience. He identifies Chrysostom as "a psychic iatrosophist." Wright, "Brain, Nerves, and Ecclesial Membership," forthcoming; and ead., "Brain and Soul in Late Antiquity," 193-252, also points out that Chrysostom criticizes excessive drinking because of the negative effect of wine on the brain, organs, and ultimately souls.

philosophy that became formalised within the Hellenistic and early Roman imperial periods as medico-philosophical psychic therapy.¹¹²

Mayer's insightful analysis suggests the necessity of reading Chrysostom within the philosophical tradition, so-called psychagogy, but overlooks the eschatological dimension in his therapy of the soul. Some scholars note this point. For example, Cook concedes Mayer's argument that Chrysostom betrays an allegiance to the intellectual framework formed and developed by moral philosophers, but claims that she overlooks the significant difference between him and them.¹¹³ According to Cook, Christian theology and the tradition of the scriptures differentiate fundamentally Chrysostom from pagan thinkers in the concept of psychic therapy. Unlike the tradition of philosophical therapy in which the disturbance of the soul is regarded as a psychic illness due to the control of passions over reason, for Christian theology the sickness of the soul is essentially disobedience to the commands of God, causing divine wrath and judgement. As a result, Christian therapy seeks to turn from sin and to return to God through repentance, which avoids the punishment of hell.¹¹⁴ Cook's analysis of Chrysostom's homilies on Titus and Philemon shows that he also follows this theological heritage. The clear trace of moral

¹¹² Mayer, "Shaping the Sick Soul," 145. For similar studies with focus on Chrysostom's adaption of ancient psychagogy (philosophy and medicine), see Neureiter, "Health and Healing as Recurrent Topics," *SP* 47 (2010): 267-72; Mayer, "Madness in the Works of John Chrysostom," 353-56; ead., "The Persistence in Late Antiquity," 337-51; ead., "Solving Poverty by Treating the Soul,"; ead., "A Son of Hellenism," forthcoming; VanVeller, "Paul's Therapy of the Soul,"; ead., "John Chrysostom and the Troubling Jewishness of Paul," in *Revisioning John Chrysostom*, forthcoming; Wright, "Between Despondency and the Demon," 352-67; De Wet, "Grumpy Old Men?" 507-20; and Stenger, "Text Worlds and Imagination." See also n. 110 above.

¹¹³ Cook, "Preaching and Christianization," 111 and 135; and id., "Hear and Shudder," forthcoming. The same point is suggested by Verhoeff, "Friendship Discourse," 162: "Chrysostom is not merely interested in the regulation of the soul of the individual as a goal in itself. In order to discover Chrysostom's perception of the divine-human relationship and the *telos* of the Christian life, it remains important to answer the question regarding the ultimate aim Chrysostom envisioned as psychagogue, a point not sufficiently captured by Mayer's approach." For other explorations of theological perspectives in Chrysostom's cure of soul, see Iain R. Torrance, "God the Physician: Ecclesiology, Sin, and Forgiveness in the Preaching of St. John Chrysostom," *GOTR* 44 (1999): 163-76; and Mellas, "Tears of Compunction," 159-72.

¹¹⁴ Cook, "Preaching and Christianization," 136-44; and id., "Hear and Shudder," forthcoming.

philosophy appears in Chrysostom's homilies, but for him the fundamental purpose of healing is to prepare his audience for the eschatological life through spiritual awakening emerging as a consequence of the serious advice of fearful judgement. In this regard, Cook argues that Chrysostom is closer to Christian theology, especially to the therapeutic tradition of prophets in the Old Testaments.¹¹⁵

Chrysostom's role as spiritual physician differs subtly but markedly from that of the classical philosophers. In many ways more similar to the Old Testament prophets, Chrysostom's preaching focused on a message of repentance and obedience to a God who would be his congregations' judge at the resurrection, but also stressed the necessity of seeking God's mercy and love through prayer and of participating in Christ's death and resurrection through the sacraments. Terrifying them with the threat of hell drove them to seek God's forgiveness, and awakened them out of the lethargy which prevented him from working a transformation in the believer's soul. At the same time, however, he was also preaching within a classical tradition, and thus saw the root cause of sin in the individual to be a disordered soul in which the reason was subject to the passions. A disordered soul was a disobedient soul. As a result, he worked towards his aim of bringing about repentance and obedience to God through urging his congregation to undertake many of the same spiritual exercises encouraged by the classical philosophers.¹¹⁶

Cook perceptively explains how Chrysostom's doctrine of Christian soteriology plays a role in distinguishing his approach to psychic therapy from that of pagan thinkers in the Greek-Roman world. However, as we will indicate, he does not fully take into

¹¹⁵ Cook, "Preaching and Christianization," 145-75; and id., "Hear and Shudder," forthcoming.

¹¹⁶ Cook, "Preaching and Christianization," 170. See also id., "Hear and Shudder," forthcoming. "In his therapy of the soul, Chrysostom was heir to both the classical philosophical tradition and that of the scriptures and early Christian writings. He was a blend of the classical 'medico-philosophical psychic therapist' and the Jewish/early Christian prophet. In seeing the root cause of sin in the individual to be a disordered soul in which the reason was subject to the passions, and by exhorting his congregation to undertake spiritual exercises that would restore order to the soul, he did indeed resemble a philosopher such as Galen or Epicurus. In the goal of his therapy, however, the very reason why uncontrolled passions needed to be corrected, he bore a far closer resemblance to a prophet such as Ezekiel, Jesus or his favorite apostle Paul. For a disordered soul was in need of healing not primarily because of the discontentment and unhappiness it caused, but rather because of the fires of hell that it threatened."

account the fact that these two kinds of therapeutic traditions are so closely connected that it is almost impossible to separate, if not deliberately distinguish, them from each other in Chrysostom's care of the sick soul. Though Cook insists on the integration of Chrysostom's theology with philosophy in terms of the concept of psychic sickness, he still stays with the dichotomy between theology and philosophy.¹¹⁷ Regarding this dichotomy, Rylaarsdam states: "Chrysostom saw himself as a Christian philosopher, a guide to a way of life in harmony with truth, a teacher of biblical theology who leads people to God; but 'philosophy' and 'theology' must be understood in historical context."¹¹⁸ If Chrysostom is viewed within his contemporary intellectual background, indeed his theology can be interpreted as Christian philosophy, which is an alternative way of the ideal philosophical life advocated by philosophers and orators.¹¹⁹ Chrysostom was not just "a blend of the classical 'medico-philosophical psychic therapist' and the Jewish/early Christian prophet."¹²⁰

In dealing with the relationship between both concepts of therapeutic and redemptive almsgiving, we take Mayer and Cook's findings a step further, maintaining that these two ideas are holistically unified into a new kind of theoretical system of therapy in Chrysostom's thought.¹²¹ Some recent scholarly works clearly demonstrate Chrysostom's amalgamation of the classical heritage into a Christian framework. Leyerle asserts that the philosophical-medical approach to sadness with some modifications is incorporated in his

¹¹⁷ Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*, 3.

¹¹⁸ Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*, 3.

¹¹⁹ Mayer, "Shaping the Sick Soul," 145; and Hadot, *Philosophy as a Way of Life*, 126-43.

¹²⁰ Cook, "Hear and Shudder," forthcoming.

¹²¹ In her critical survey of recent studies on Chrysostom's debt to both classical Greco-Roman moral philosophy with focus on soul health and Judeo-Christian theology, Mayer, "John Chrysostom: Moral Philosopher," 204-5, suggests a future task of this approach: "If viewing Chrysostom solely from the perspective of theology has in the past led to a decidedly negative view of his contribution to the development of Christian doctrine, while emphasis on his debt to his secular education and his local environment is opening up significant new vistas, the current challenge, they would argue, is to marry together the two—theology and his moral-philosophical soul-therapy. That is, obvious as it may be, Chrysostom owes a debt, too, to the Judeo-Christian tradition. Where the future lies is in assessing in what ways the two strands of influence—Graeco-Roman and Judeo-Christian—come into dialogue with each other in his thought and precisely how and to what degree the former is transformed by the latter."

ascetic theology that advocates the therapeutic tears of repentance.¹²² This phenomenon is well elaborated by Averil Cameron who calls the development of Christian rhetoric the process of ‘totalizing discourse.’ She points out that Christianity is essentially the religion of discourse. Christianity has established doctrines and norms about faith and life on the basis of the written texts, especially the scriptures.¹²³ She argues that Christian discourse provided a new worldview through which people understood their world by absorbing and transforming existing Greco-Roman discourses, which led it to capture the centre of power in the Roman empire.¹²⁴ The tradition of ancient psychagogy has been accumulated over a long period of time from Plato to the Hellenistic philosophical schools across philosophy, rhetoric, and medicine. During this development, philosophers, orators, and doctors created their own discourse of sickness and healing. They identified passions (πάθη), desires, and distorted thought as the diseases of the soul and developed various kinds of cognitive and

¹²² Leyerle, “The Etiology of Sorrow,” 368-85. For similar arguments, see, Bosinis, “Two Platonic Images,” 436-38; Lai, “John Chrysostom and the Hermeneutics of Exemplar Portraits”; id., “Exemplar Portraits and the Interpretation,” forthcoming; Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*; Tonia, *Abraham*; and id., “The Iconic Abraham,” forthcoming. Regarding Chrysostom’s portrait of Abraham as a virtue exemplar to be imitated, Tonia, *Abraham*, 78, maintains that “Chrysostom, through his mastery of the epideictic oratory, not only placed Abraham firmly within the classical context of virtue but used the patriarch’s classical virtue to help explain his fulfillment of Pauline virtue and to make what he regarded as a tenable claim upon Abraham’s paternity. In many ways, Chrysostom was not simply expanding the categories of virtues but synthesizing them.”

¹²³ Averil Cameron, *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire: The Development of Christian Discourse*, Sather Classical Lectures 55 (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1991), 19.

¹²⁴ Cameron, *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire*, 21 and 222. For another studies on the connection between rhetoric and power (Christianization), see Peter Brown, *Power and Persuasion in Late Antiquity: Towards a Christian Empire*, The Curti Lectures (Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1988); Lieve Van Hoof, “Performing Paideia: Greek Culture as an Instrument for Social Promotion in the Fourth Century A.D.,” *CQ* 63 (2013): 387-406; and Peter Van Nuffelen, “A War of Words: Sermons and Social Status in Constantinople under the Theodosian Dynasty,” in *Literature and Society in the Fourth Century AD Performing Paideia, Constructing the Present, Presenting the Self*, ed. Lieve Van. Hoof and Peter Van Nuffelen, Mnemosyne Supplements 373 (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 202-17. For the treatment of the historical background of philosophical speech in Antioch, see Maxwell, *Christianization and Communication in Late Antiquity*, 11-64.

behavioral treatments.¹²⁵ As a physician of the soul, Chrysostom adapted and transformed this Greco-Roman discourse of medicalization, forming his own version of Christian therapeutic almsgiving.

Let us look at some examples. *In Johannem hom.* 24 delineates this integration well. Towards its end, the indication of the nexus of psychic sickness, healing, salvation, and almsgiving is provided. The discourse begins with the diagnosis of illness. Chrysostom mentions that spiritual truth will not be simply gained by rational thinking (λογισμός). Human intellectual activity must be washed with the light of the Holy Spirit because it is covered with mud, which indicates that reason functions properly in understanding heavenly teachings under the illumination of the Spirit. Chrysostom argues that the illumination emerges as a consequence of virtue, but reason (διάνοια) is darkened by the passions (πάθη).¹²⁶ The imbalance of power between reason and the passions results in breaking the peace of mind.¹²⁷ Chrysostom gives an account of this psychic pathology by citing Paul:

This is also why Paul said to the Corinthians: “I fed you with milk, not with solid food, for you were not yet ready for it. Nor are you now ready for it, for you are still carnal. For since there are jealousy and strife among you, are you not carnal (1 Cor 3.2)?” And in the Epistle to the Hebrews, also, and in many places, too, one may see Paul saying that this is the cause of evil teaching, for the diseased soul (ἐμπαθῆ ψυχήν) cannot see anything great accurately, but, as if clouded by some rheum (λήμης), is subject to the most acute dim-sightedness.¹²⁸

Paul grieves that Christians in Corinth are unable to eat solid spiritual food due to the sickness of the soul caused by jealousy and quarrel. Chrysostom seriously notes that

¹²⁵ Hadot, *Philosophy as a Way of Life*; Nussbaum, *The Therapy of Desire*; Sorabji, *Emotion and Peace of Mind*; Knuuttila, *Emotions in Ancient and Medieval Philosophy*; and Gill, “Philosophical Therapy,” 339-60. For a brief survey of ancient philosophical therapy, see. 3. 1-2 in the introduction above.

¹²⁶ Chrys. *Hom.* 24.3 in *Jo.* (PG 59:147.23-33).

¹²⁷ Ferngren, *Medicine and Health Care*, 29; and Mayer, “Madness,” 354-55.

¹²⁸ Chrys. *Hom.* 24.3 in *Jo.* (PG 59:147.33-148.4; Goggin, *Commentary on Saint John*, FC 33, 240, modified).

passions take away the spiritual sight of seeing the heavenly things, which results in a person eventually to leave God.¹²⁹

Chrysostom uses the image of the field to present the depiction of the psychological diseases and their symptoms. There are the thorns (ἄκανθα) of anxiety and covetousness in the field of the mind. Thorns hurt farmers and make a field infertile. In addition, wild beasts, vipers, and scorpions hiding between thorns cause various troubles to the farmer and his field. Passions also devastate the soul in a similar way.¹³⁰ Then how do we solve these problems? Chrysostom prescribes almsgiving as the behaviour therapy that will enrich any deserted field of the soul:

Let us apply the fire of the Spirit that we may consume the thorns. Let us drive the wild beasts out of the field that we may provide cleared land for a farmer. After purifying it, let us water it with spiritual streams. Let us plant the fruitful olive (ἐλαίαν), the most easily cultivated tree, ever green, illuminating, nourishing, giver of health. Almsgiving has all these qualities just as a seal is on those who possess it. Not even death, as it approaches, dries up this plant, but it ever stands, enlightening the mind (διάνοιαν), nourishing the sinews (νεῦρα) of the soul, rendering its strength more powerful.¹³¹

Almsgiving burns all the thorns of passions and eliminates the desires and false opinions as wild animals related to them. The field of the mind is turned into fertile land with the supply of almsgiving as water, which will produce abundantly crops. In the field,

¹²⁹ For Chrysostom's extensive description of spiritual blindness, see Chrys. *Hom.* 20.3-5 in *Mt.* (PG 57: 290-93).

¹³⁰ Chrys. *Hom.* 24.3 in *Jo.* (PG 59:148.5-17). A similar description also appears in *In Johannem hom.* 88 where Chrysostom, 88.3 in *Jo.* (PG 59:481.43-47), maintains that "sin and concern for the interests of this world are indeed thorns: bearing no fruit, and very troublesome. And just as the thorn, when it is held, pierces him who is holding it, as also, in whatever way you hold to the things of this life, they will give you pain if you cling to them and cherish them (Goggin, *Commentary on Saint John*, FC 41, 477, modified). For the detailed exploration of Chrysostom's use of the metaphor of fields, see Blake Leyerle, "The Consolation of Nature: Fields and Gardens in the Preaching of John Chrysostom," in *Ascetic Culture: Essays in Honor of Philip Rousseau*, ed. Blake Leyerle and Robin D. Young (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2013), 269-92.

¹³¹ Chrys. *Hom.* 24.3 in *Jo.* (PG 59:148.17-28; Goggin, *Commentary on Saint John*, FC 33, 241, modified).

almsgiving also is planted as olive trees providing fruits that help to maintain psychic health. Here Chrysostom suggests both reactive and preventive effects of merciful giving. Not only are passions and desires removed by medicine or surgery, but also the soul becomes stronger due to health-giving food.¹³²

This part has been read as an advocacy for redemptive almsgiving.¹³³ Although Chrysostom emphasizes the role of the Holy Spirit and quotes the Bible, his remarks on the sickness of the soul and its remedy, however, are closer to the ancient philosophical tradition. That is because they focus mainly on the damage of the mind and its recovery. As Antigone Samellas points out correctly, the central role of reason in the health of souls was a key feature of ancient philosophical therapy.¹³⁴ Moral philosophers commonly argued that the disturbance of the soul originates from the loss of the control of reason over the passions. We cannot rightly judge something due to the weakness of the mind. Plato explains this psychological aetiology by employing the metaphor of a chariot. Psychic sickness occurs when the horse of the appetitive part rebels against the charioteer of the rational part.¹³⁵ Cicero summarizes philosophical debate on passions very concisely: “pity, envy, exultation, and joy, all these the Greeks term diseases (*morbos*), are the movements of the soul (*motus animi*) that are not obedient to reason.”¹³⁶ In *De ira*, Seneca claims that anger is sickness, suggesting two treatments for its therapy, both responsive and preventive approaches. While for Chrysostom almsgiving functions as these two efficacies of treatment, Seneca prescribes different methods for each case.

¹³² See 2. 3 in chapter 1 above.

¹³³ Costanzo, *Harbor for the Poor*, 106.

¹³⁴ Samellas, *Death in the Eastern Mediterranean (50-600 A.D.)*, 93-108. The same point is made by many scholars: Hadot, *Philosophy as a Way of Life*, 82-125; Nussbaum, *The Therapy of Desire*; Sorabji, *Emotion and Peace of Mind*; Knuutila, *Emotions in Ancient and Medieval Philosophy*; John T. Fitzgerald, eds., *Passions and Moral Progress*; Gill, “Philosophical Therapy,” 348-51; and Cook, “Preaching and Christianization,” 117-26.

¹³⁵ Pl. *Phdr.* 253d.1-254d.10 (LCL 36:494-97). Bosinis, “Two Platonic Images,” 436-37, argues that Chrysostom transformed the Platonic metaphor of the chariot of the soul by underscoring the role of the Holy Spirit in controlling desires. The Spirit ultimately makes the soul healthy. For Chrysostom’s appropriation of this metaphor, see 1. 2 in chapter 1 above.

¹³⁶ Cic. *Tusc.* 3.7 (LCL 141:232-33, modified).

Let us now pass to the consideration of its (anger) remedies. In my opinion, however, there are but two rules—not to fall into anger, and in anger to do no wrong. Just as in caring for the body certain rules are to be observed for guarding the health, others for restoring it, so we must use one means to repel anger, another to restrain it.¹³⁷

Education is a vital method for preventing anger. It was believed in ancient psychagogy that human beings can progress in moral development with the assistance of rational education.¹³⁸ According to Seneca, people should be taught the characteristics of anger and how it brings great harm to the soul.¹³⁹ Its diagnosis and symptoms described in his letter are contained in this education, which shows the analysis of the inner state of a spiritual patient itself also is engaged in therapy.¹⁴⁰ In reactive treatment, Seneca advises a behaviour therapy: looking into a mirror is useful for suppressing anger and regaining the equanimity of the soul.

Some people, as Sextius remarks, have been benefited by seeing themselves in a mirror while they are angry; the great change in their own appearance confused them; brought, as it were, into their own presence they did not recognize themselves. However, how little of the real ugliness did that image reflected in the mirror disclose? If the soul could be shown and made to appear through any substance, its black, mottled, inflamed, distorted and swollen appearance would confound us when we gazed upon it. Even as it is, though it can only come to the surface through bones, flesh, and so many obstacles, its hideousness is so great; what if it could be shown stark naked?¹⁴¹

Chrysostom and Seneca prescribe different methods for the treatment of the passions, but they aim commonly at the recovery of the right role of reason. However, the beneficial effects of Christian almsgiving extend beyond the eschatological dimension.

¹³⁷ Sen. *Ira* 1.7 and 2.18 (LCL 214:124-25 and 202-5).

¹³⁸ Gill, "Philosophical Therapy," 349-50.

¹³⁹ Sen. *Ira* 2.18 (LCL 214:204-5).

¹⁴⁰ Sen. *Ira* 1.1-2.17 (LCL 214:106-203); Knuuttila, *Emotions in Ancient and Medieval Philosophy*, 86; and Gill, "Philosophical Therapy," 351.

¹⁴¹ Sen. *Ira* 2.36 (LCL 214:248-49, modified).

After speaking of the psychotherapeutics of almsgiving from the viewpoint of philosophical therapy, Chrysostom states:

Almsgiving has all these qualities just as a seal is on those who possess it. Not even death, as it approaches, dries up this plant, but it ever stands, enlightening the mind, nourishing the sinews of the soul, rendering its strength more powerful. If we always possess this, we shall be able to behold the bridegroom with confidence and to enter the bridal chamber.¹⁴²

In an echo of the parable of foolish virgins, Chrysostom claims that almsgiving leads ultimately to the path of salvation. The givers will avoid the judgement of God and live with God in heaven forever. For Chrysostom, protection from future judgement through almsgiving is a Christian concept. Some philosophers acknowledged the afterlife, but did not claim that virtues (good works) in the present are ways to escape the future judgement.¹⁴³

Though therapeutic and redemptive almsgiving are deliberately distinguished to explain Chrysostom's theoretical flow, this homily clearly indicates the totalizing discourse of Christianized therapeutic almsgiving, showing that two discourses—Greco-Roman and Christian—are not just mixed, but made into one theory aiming at the cure of the soul by means of almsgiving. Within a holistic version of therapeutic almsgiving, Chrysostom's logic unfolds from philosophical-therapeutic almsgiving to Christian redemptive almsgiving in a natural way. There we find that the concepts of philosophical sickness and its consequences are absorbed and altered within the framework of Christian ideas of soteriology. It has been suggested that Chrysostom's view of sin situates itself between the Greco-Roman tradition and Christian theology.¹⁴⁴ However, for Chrysostom

¹⁴² Chrys. *Hom. 24.3 in Jo.* (PG 59:148.17-30; Goggin, *Commentary on Saint John*, FC 33, 241, modified).

¹⁴³ Cook, "Preaching and Christianization," 150; and Sorabji, *Emotion and Peace of Mind*, 235-38.

¹⁴⁴ Mayer, "John Chrysostom," 206. For related treatments, see Papageorgiou, "A Theological Analysis of Selected Themes," 34-55; id., "Chrysostom and Augustine on the Sin of Adam and Its Consequences," *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 39 (1995): 361-78; Salem, "Sanity, Insanity, and Man's Being," 8-71; Laird, *Mindset, Moral Choice and Sin*; id., "It's All in the Mindset," 195-210; id., "Mindset (γνώμη) in John Chrysostom," in *The Oxford Handbook of Maximus the Confessor*, ed. Pauline Allen and Bronwen Neil (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015), 194-211; VanVeller, "Paul's Therapy of the Soul," 133-61; and Mayer, "Madness in the Works of John Chrysostom," 349-61.

in general sin is not only a disordering of the passions or distorted thought that destroys psychological calmness, but also the terrible state that provokes the judgement of God and damnation due to disobedience to God's words.¹⁴⁵ Chrysostom was not the only thinker who Christianized the Hellenistic concept of the passions and desires. It is suggested that this phenomenon was common in early Christian writers, especially in the eastern church tradition from the Jewish Platonic philosopher Philo to the Cappadocians.¹⁴⁶ Almsgiving solves this spiritual crisis. In short, it removes vices and promotes virtues, so that the soul becomes healthy, and heaven will be open to the givers. Far from rejecting the philosophical-oratorical position in relation to sickness and treatment, Chrysostom transforms its scope and objective according to his pastoral concerns, which betrays "a culture takeover bid" undertaken by the preacher to form a Christian culture.¹⁴⁷

As a result, we must consider both the philosophical and Christian theological traditions in which Chrysostom stood to understand "his fully rounded picture" of therapeutic almsgiving.¹⁴⁸ In addition, we need to have a cautious attitude about concluding that he used the frame of philosophers, but the content is Christian when we assess his holistic therapy. That is because, as shown above, he and philosophers share the same thought in many cases.¹⁴⁹

¹⁴⁵ Cook, "Preaching and Christianization," 170; and id., "Hear and Shudder," forthcoming. In this chapter, the fuller discussion on philosophical and Christian understanding of sin is not provided. However, what I want to point out here at least is that passions (πάθη), sin (ἁμαρτία), desire (ἐπιθυμία), vice (κακία), and evil (κακά) are synonyms in the homilies explored in this thesis.

¹⁴⁶ Merideth, "Illness and Healing," 153-70; Sorabji, *Emotion and Peace of Mind*, 29-143, 343-52, and 386-94; Dörnemann, *Krankheit und Heilung*; Knuuttila, *Emotions in Ancient and Medieval Philosophy*, 48-143; Ferngren, *Medicine and Health Care*, 29-31; Dörnemann, "Einer ist Arzt, Christus," 102-24; and Emmenegger, *Wie die Jungfrau zum Kind kam*, 42-46.

¹⁴⁷ Rylaarsdam, *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy*, 5.

¹⁴⁸ In this regard, my thesis intends to challenge both Mayer (see n. 112 above) and Cook, "Preaching and Christianization," 111, who maintains that "the philosophical context will prove to be only a partial parallel; . . . a more fully rounded picture of his cure of souls can only be established when he is set against the background of the scriptures and Christian theology."

¹⁴⁹ Cf. Dörnemann, "Einer ist Arzt, Christus," 102. As for *Ad eos qui scandalizati sunt*, Mayer, "Shaping the Sick Soul," 153, proposes an interesting argument: "if we stripped out the copious scriptural exempla adduced throughout the treatise and substituted another concept of the divine for the Christian God, what we

In Johannem hom. 40 is also a representative example of an integrated picture of healing almsgiving. At its end, he speaks about how greed, in particular extortion is detrimental to the soul, insisting that it ruins its state. His examination of the sick soul begins with the exegesis of Matthew 6:24, showing that a greedy person is a slave of greed and leaves God, the master of all. Since the commands of these two masters are opposite to each other, he cannot simultaneously follow them. Interestingly, Chrysostom, as shown later, gives account of the philosophical concept of psychic disorder by commenting on biblical passages. It is noted that like pagan writers, he uses the slavery of passions as the form of invective to vilify the sins of his congregation.¹⁵⁰

It (greed) has led us away from Christ's most blessed servitude. "You cannot serve God and Mammon (Matt 6:24)," he says, for the latter gives commands the opposite of those of Christ. He says: "give to the needy." But the other: "plunder from those in need." Christ says: "forgive those who plot against and wrong you." He, on the contrary: "lay snares for those who have done you no wrong." Christ says: "be merciful and kind." He, contrariwise: "be cruel and heartless and think that the tears of the poor are of no account."¹⁵¹

Just as a harsh master damages the health of a slave, so the master of greed devastates the soul. Chrysostom contrasts Christ with greed to highlight that Christ is the true master who guides people onto a path of virtue.¹⁵²

Chrysostom's diagnosis of the psychic ailment reaches an eschatological perspective. In this homily, the eschatological consequence of the desire that is implied in the preceding sermon is remarkable. He mentions that the greedy person is not only enslaved with his passion, but also will be condemned in God's court in the future:

have here is a treatise on correcting the errors and passions of the soul that could have been written by Galen or one of the Stoic-Epicurean practical-ethical philosophers."

¹⁵⁰ De Wet, *Preaching Bondage*, 75 and 77-78.

¹⁵¹ Chrys. *Hom. 40.4 in Jo.* (PG 59:234.4-13; Goggin, *Commentary on Saint John*, FC 33, 413, modified).

¹⁵² De Wet, *Preaching Bondage*, 77-78.

Then all our deeds will be set before our eyes, while both those whom we have wronged and those whom we have stripped of their possessions deprive us of all defenses. If Lazarus, who had not been wronged by the rich man, except that he had not enjoyed a share of the latter's possessions, stood forth at that tribunal as his stern accuser and prevented him from obtaining any pardon, what defense, tell me, will they have who, in addition to not sharing their own fortune, both take the possessions of others and upset the homes of orphans? If they who did not give nourishment to Christ when he was hungry have drawn so much fiery punishment on their heads, what consolation will they enjoy who seize unlawfully upon what does not belong to them, conjure up numberless law-suits, and unjustly attribute to themselves the possessions of all people?¹⁵³

Employing forensic rhetoric, Chrysostom argues that the exploiter cannot assert his innocence when the victims are in court, bearing witness to how they were harmed materially and mentally.¹⁵⁴ The examples of judgments against the unmerciful found in the Bible are adduced to make plain that God's punishment is only waiting for the sinner. His message is clear: if the rich and those who did not give food to the hungry Christ could not avoid damnation due to lack of sympathetic generosity, the extortioner will never obtain mercy and forgiveness from God. What is interesting here is that the diagnosis of the spiritual illness also functions as serious rebuke to correct moral errors. Frank speech was an essential skill in the guidance of the soul in philosophical therapy, and Chrysostom uses the threat of hell as this harsh speech. In particular, a comparison of the psychic patient with the rich raises the intensity of this warning.¹⁵⁵

After dealing with the serious consequences of greed, Chrysostom suggests a vision of the holistic therapeutics of almsgiving. On the basis of the portrait regarding the unfortunate fate of the unmerciful that is presented earlier, logotherapy is first formulated to cure the psychological ailment. As observed above in *De ira*, Seneca also adduces both cognitive and behavioural treatments to treat anger. Chrysostom insists that the unmerciful

¹⁵³ Chrys. *Hom.* 40.4 in *Jo.* (PG 59:234.15-28; Goggin, *Commentary on Saint John*, FC 33, 413-14, modified).

¹⁵⁴ Katos, "Socratic Dialogue or Courtroom Debate?", 49-50 n. 26; and n. 52 above.

¹⁵⁵ See 3. 2 in chapter 2 above. For also the detailed treatment of Chrysostom's use of the Lazarus and the rich man, see Cardman, "Poverty and Wealth as Theater," 159-75; and Mayer, "John Chrysostom's Use of Luke 16:19-31," 45-59.

are suffering eternal judgement and unbearable pain due to their greed, urging his congregations not to be these foolish persons who endured all kinds of hardships to gain wealth in this world, but cannot enjoy any fruit of their efforts in the next world.¹⁵⁶ This discourse that awakens the souls with fear of hell leads to offering the treatment of almsgiving. If the sin of greed harms the health of the soul and results in eternal destruction, almsgiving naturally removes all its negative effects:

It is possible for us even here to live in happiness (τρυφᾶν) (for nothing causes so much pleasure (ἡδονήν) as almsgiving and a clear conscience), and, on departing to the next world, to be freed from all sufferings and to attain to numberless blessings. Just as a vice (κακία) usually punishes those who commit it, even before [they reach] hell, so also virtue (ἀρετή) causes those who practice it to enjoy happiness here (τρυφᾶν), even before [they come to] the kingdom, by making them dwell amid hopes (ἐλπίσι) of good things to come and uninterrupted pleasure (ἡδονῆ). Therefore, let us apply ourselves to good works in order that *we may attain to this, both here and in the life to come*. Thus, indeed, we shall obtain our future crown (Italics is mine).¹⁵⁷

This passage is quite important in that it plainly attests Chrysostom's comprehensive approach to psychic therapeutics which indicates his transformed virtue ethics. Although the word 'happiness' (εὐδαιμονία) does not appear, this part focuses on how happiness will be realized. The realization of happiness is the ultimate goal in ancient moral philosophy, and philosophers have discussed its concept and devised various ways to reach it.¹⁵⁸ Chrysostom maintains that happiness is fulfilled by almsgiving, that is, the love of one's neighbour.¹⁵⁹ This happiness is related to the wellbeing of the soul both in

¹⁵⁶ Chrys. *Hom. 40.4 in Jo.* (PG 59:234.29-37).

¹⁵⁷ Chrys. *Hom. 40.4 in Jo.* (PG 59:234.37-49; Goggin, *Commentary on Saint John*, FC 33, 414, modified).

¹⁵⁸ Hadot, *Philosophy as a Way of Life*, 83; Sherman, "Ancient Conceptions of Happiness," 913-19; Miller, "A Distinction Regarding Happiness," 595-624; Gill, "Philosophical Therapy," 349; and Rabbas, *The Quest for the Good Life*.

¹⁵⁹ Similarly, Lai, "John Chrysostom and the Hermeneutics of Exemplar Portraits," 50-51, argues that "if *aretē* is essentially the *epistēmē* of a loving God, the corollary must be that human *eudaimonia* cannot be the self-sufficient autonomy, or *autarkeia*, commonly propounded by Aristotle or the Stoics. Neither is it attained through the mere cultivation of human *aretai* or living a life that is *kata phusin*. Rather, *eudaimonia* is to be

this world and the next world. The givers who gain in psychic health with joy and hope do not need to fear God's judgement. In this homily, the concept of happiness (the healing of the soul) is Christianized, embracing philosophical therapy. In this respect, we need to reconsider Cook's arguments:

Chrysostom's cure of souls was much more focused on preparing his congregation for death and the judgement that will come afterwards, rather than on obtaining well-being here in the present life. . . . For the philosophers, a person was ill if, 'consumed by worries, torn by passions, he does not live a genuine life, nor is he truly himself.' For Chrysostom, being ill meant, to a large degree, being in a state of facing God's judgement.¹⁶⁰

A limit of Cook's reading is that his overemphasis on the differences between Chrysostom and philosophers leads him not to give sufficient consideration on their continuities. In the case of psychic therapy, Chrysostom's approach does not involve a matter of an either/or. The health of the soul in this life is linked to future salvation (deliverance from the final judgement). As repeatedly stated before, we must keep in mind that he changed philosophers' concepts of illness and health, not rejected them. If a person does not abandon passions and desires in the present life, he or she is far from salvation. Indeed, Chrysostom focuses equally on how to "prepare for death and the judgement that will come afterwards," and how to "obtain well-being here in the present life" in his large picture of restoration. Mayer seems to make this point:

The key difference between secular moral philosophy, with its attendant emphasis on therapy of the *pathē* /emotions, and Christianized version of it, . . . , is that the first is oriented towards happiness and health in this life, the orientation of the second is eschatological. Nonetheless, this does not mean that Chrysostom is concerned only with salvation and the fate of the human person after death, but rather with the tension between

found in one's participation in the *agapē* of God, which, as Chrysostom puts it elsewhere, is also bound up with the love of one's neighbour."

¹⁶⁰ Cook, "Preaching and Christianization," 150.

restoration of the soul-health of the human person in this life and restoration of an individuals' relationship with God, both of which have soteriological consequences.¹⁶¹

Mayer points out that for Chrysostom the therapy of passions in this life is related to eschatological salvation, but the two concepts of the Christian doctrine of soteriology and philosophical healing are still separated in her argument.

Now, we try to focus on Chrysostom's use of medical metaphors. The metaphors of sickness and treatment hardly featured in discourse on almsgiving in the Judeo-Christian tradition until the emergence of early Church. In the scriptures and Jewish tradition, sin is primarily connected with the images of debt, stain, and slavery, and the almsgiving that eliminates sin is expressed in accordance with each metaphor: its debt is paid off, the stain of the soul is cleansed, and the soul is liberated from its slavery.¹⁶² As a result, it is reasonable to assume that Chrysostom's use of medical metaphors in his discourse on almsgiving resulted mainly from his interaction with Greco-Roman philosophy and medicine.¹⁶³ What is essential here is that this usage can be a vehicle which reflects how Chrysostom understood Christian therapy corresponding to ancient psychagogy. If both the therapeutic and redemptive functions of almsgiving are formulated in medical metaphors of sickness, treatment, and health, this demonstrates that these two traditions are holistically unified in his mind.¹⁶⁴

¹⁶¹ Mayer, "John Chrysostom," 205.

¹⁶² See 1. 1. 2-3 above; and Anderson, *Sin*, 3-14.

¹⁶³ Merideth, "Illness and Healing," 153-70; Ferngren, *Medicine and Health Care*, 29-31; Dörnemann, "Einer ist Arzt, Christus," 102; and Emmenegger, *Wie die Jungfrau zum Kind kam*, 18-65. Indeed, recent investigation on Chrysostom's use of medical metaphors is accomplished within the context of ancient philosophy and medicine, see 3. 3 in the introduction above. In a narrow sense, psychic-therapeutic almsgiving and redemptive almsgiving can be distinguished not only by contents but also by metaphors. The metaphors of sickness and healing are not the absolute standard for defining Chrysostom's therapeutics of almsgiving. Literary context is much more crucial in grasping it because he occasionally uses medical and redemptive language interchangeably. Nonetheless, his medicalized discourse on almsgiving can be a useful tool in distinguishing therapeutic almsgiving from redemptive almsgiving.

¹⁶⁴ This is also supported by conceptual metaphor theory (CMT) introduced by George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980), 4-7. They note that a metaphor often says many things, asserting that it is not merely a matter of language, but deeply concerned

In Matthaëum hom. 64 elaborates this point. Firstly, the preacher deals with the doctrine of redemptive almsgiving by using medical language. The pathological diagnosis of sin is provided in terms of eschatological horizon.¹⁶⁵ Sins are referred to as psychic wounds (τραύματα) that results in the punishment of hell. On the ground of the scriptures, Chrysostom claims that each sin is subject to the judgement of fire. Like the five foolish virgins, the rich man, and those who did not feed hungry Christ, the unmerciful will fall into hell. The same is true of revilement as it is stated that those who call another person a fool will face eternal judgement (Matt 5:22). The immoderate cannot see God (Heb 12:14). Arrogance destroys all merits of good works, like the case of the Pharisee. Furthermore, Chrysostom states that a virtue of imperfection will be condemned in God's court. He, as found in Matthew 5:20, argues that his congregation cannot be saved unless they give alms more than the Scribes and Pharisees.¹⁶⁶ His pathological description of the sick souls ends with rhetorical questions:

with a cognitive structure of an individual. If a person uses the conceptual metaphor that states that 'argument is war,' this shows that he understands the whole process of reasoning in terms of a war. For the evaluation of CMT and its further implications for metaphor theories and cognitive science, see Raymond W. Gibbs Jr, "Evaluating Conceptual Metaphor Theory," *Discourse Processes* 48 (2011): 529-62.

¹⁶⁵ Chrysostom often addresses only therapeutic almsgiving in some homilies and only redemptive almsgiving in other homilies. Interestingly, medical metaphors are equally employed to describe both cases. This is evident when we explore his medical discourse where only almsgiving and salvation are treated. In *In Matthaëum hom. 66*, the rich who spend a great deal of money on entertainment, but are very stingy when the poor seek help, suffer from mental illness (παραπληξία), the spiritual patients who choose hell by themselves. To treat their mental illness, Chrysostom presents eschatological reward and judgment as gentle and harsh speeches. The promise of reward is based on Prov 19:17, and Chrysostom states that charitable giving to the poor not only heals the sick souls of the wealthy, but also leads to accumulate their children's wealth as well as theirs in heaven (Chrys. *hom. 66.3-5 in Mt.* [PG 58:629.49-632.48]; and see chapter 2 above). This homily is identical to the structure of *In epistulam ad Colossenses hom. 7*, which gives account of the spiritual diagnosis and treatment of the wealthy women according to ancient psychagogy, who have their own silver chamber pots (Chrys. *hom. 7.4-5 in Col.* [PG 62:348.12-352.9]; see 2. 3. 2. 4 in chapter 1 above). For other homilies which express a medicalized discourse of atoning charity, see Chrys. *hom. 34.3 in Jo.* (PG 59:196.35-198.42); and *hom. 59.4 in Jo.* (PG 59:326.24-328.37). The structure of these homilies is similar to Chrys. *hom. 20.2-6 in Mt.* (PG 57:288.59-294.49); and see 4. 1 in chapter 2 above; and *hom. 63.2-4 in Mt.* (PG 58:605.43-610.5) which reflect philosophical therapy.

¹⁶⁶ Chrys. *Hom. 64.4 in Mt.* (PG 58:614.47-615.14).

Let us not, then, despise the care of our life. For if one portion of it despised brings so great a destruction, when on every hand we are subject to the sentence of condemnation, how shall we escape the punishment? What manner of penalty shall we not suffer? What manner of hope of salvation (σωτηρίας) shall we have, one may ask, if each of things we have numbered threatens us with hell? I too say this.¹⁶⁷

For Chrysostom, salvation signifies the health of the soul. Given the fact that a wound of the soul seriously threatens its health, the wounds-laden soul is in a critical condition. Kristi Upson-Saia argues that wounds found in both ancient medical writings and early Christian works are not mere cuts or bruises, but are in a serious condition accompanied by pus and inflammation, which escalate into life-threatening necrotic illnesses.¹⁶⁸

However, Chrysostom points out that there is still hope for recovery for spiritual patients. Prescribing almsgiving as a therapeutic drug of olive oil, he claims that if it is applied, the sinners do not have to fear divine judgement because all wounds will be fully healed: “If we give heed, we may be saved, preparing the medicines (φάρμακα) of almsgiving and healing our wounds (τραύματα). For oil (έλαιον) does not so strengthen the body, as benevolence strengthens the soul.”¹⁶⁹ Chrysostom’s remarks, as will be showed, reflect the medical knowledge about the functions of oil for treating athletes, especially wrestlers’ injuries. There were several steps in healing them. First of all, the athletes scraped sweat, dust and the oil on the body with a strigil, a curved tool. Then they cleaned the body with a sponge. After bathing, their body was gently rubbed by a massage trainer with oil. Through this massage, bodily wounds were treated. It also promotes blood circulation and relieves muscle pain.¹⁷⁰ Exploiting the ancient practice of oil treatment, Chrysostom argues that charity cures the wounds of sin.

¹⁶⁷ Chrys. *Hom. 64.5 in Mt.* (PG 58:615.33-39; NPNF 1.10, 396, modified).

¹⁶⁸ Upson-Saia, “Wounded by Divine Love,” 89-92.

¹⁶⁹ Chrys. *Hom. 64.5 in Mt.* (PG 58:615.39-43; NPNF 1.10, 396, modified).

¹⁷⁰ Nikitas N. Nomikos, George N. Nomikos, and Demetrios S. Kores, “The Use of Deep Friction Massage with Olive Oil as a Means of Prevention and Treatment of Sports Injuries in Ancient Times,” *Archives Of Medical Science* 6 (2010): 643-44. See also Sarah E. Bond, “‘As Trainers for the Healthy’: Massage Therapists, Anointers, and Healing in the Late Latin West,” *JLA* 8 (2015): 386-404.

The olive oil of charitable giving not only heals psychological wounds, but also prevents them.¹⁷¹ The ascription of a preventive role to virtue in terms of medicine, strictly speaking, is concerned with philosophical therapy. Chrysostom states:

Benevolence makes the soul invincible to all and impregnable to the devil. For wherever he may seize us, his hold then slips because this oil (ἐλαίου) does not permit his grasp to fix on our back. With this oil (ἐλαίω) therefore let us anoint ourselves continually. For it is the foundation of health, the abundance of light and the origin of joyfulness (ὑγείας ἔστιν ὑπόθεσις, καὶ φωτὸς χορηγία, καὶ φαιδρότητος ἀφορμή).¹⁷²

This passage presupposes the prevention of injuries through sports massage in ancient times. In general, wrestlers received an oil massage before the match to warm the body and relax the muscles, which prevents injuries. Serious injuries during the game were often caused by a sudden neck or back hold, and they could avert the risk of such injuries as their opponents could not hold their slippery bodies with oil.¹⁷³ Chrysostom claims that his audiences will not be injured by any attacks of the devil if they smeared themselves in the olive oil of almsgiving. That is because the devil cannot catch the slippery souls. This homily demonstrates that both philosophical therapy and redemptive almsgiving are united in the perspective of ancient medical practice regarding olive oil.

2. 2. A Possible Hermeneutical Principle: Interpretation of the Biblical Passages on Redemptive Almsgiving

We discover that for Chrysostom the convergence of therapeutics in ancient philosophy and the doctrine of redemptive almsgiving centres on an axis of Christian soteriology. In this section, we attempt to take one step further, fully exploring how this process is fulfilled. In addressing this, we focus on Chrysostom's interpretation of biblical passages as a hermeneutical principle that underpinned the formation of the early Christian

¹⁷¹ The same logical flow of the redemption of sin and the prevention of psychic illnesses also appears in Chrys. *hom.* 60.4-5 in *Jo.* (PG 59:332.20-336.46).

¹⁷² Chrys. *Hom.* 64.5 in *Mt.* (PG 58:615.43-49; NPNF 1.10, 396, modified).

¹⁷³ Nomikos, "The Use of Deep Friction Massage," 643-44.

idea of redemptive almsgiving.¹⁷⁴ These verses are mainly analysed by way of quotation or allusion: the account for the atoning effect of almsgiving is first given, and biblical passages are cited to prove it. This method of interpretation seems to be similar to a reading of proof text, which, as Manlio Simonetti points out, often gives modern readers the impression that Chrysostom's biblical exegesis is somewhat superficial.¹⁷⁵ However, we must bear in mind the fact that for him the interpretation of the Bible was closely linked to rhetorical practices in his times. Frances M. Young argues that one of the main pedagogical methods of ancient rhetoric was to memorize the writings of outstanding classical authors. Quotation and allusion were so taken for granted in a speech that ancient textbooks of rhetoric did not handle them in a separate discussion. Quoting quality sentences, Young maintains, did not merely embellish the oration, but enhanced its persuasive power.¹⁷⁶ The church fathers such as Chrysostom borrowed this rhetorical technique as an effective vehicle for shaping Christian practice and culture.¹⁷⁷

The LXX Daniel 4:27 (MT 4:24); Proverbs 15:27 (MT 16:6); Sirach 3:30; and Luke 11:41 were essential texts for the Christian writers including Chrysostom who advocated the link between almsgiving and the atonement of sin.¹⁷⁸ In *In Matthaeum hom.* 52, Chrysostom compares the givers with sophists and rhetoricians, claiming that the skill of almsgiving is better than that of words. First, orators are the subjects of envy and hate, but the givers are respectable, and the receivers pray for them. Furthermore, almsgiving

¹⁷⁴ In this section, terms such as 'interpretation,' 'exegesis,' and 'commentary' are used interchangeably. Theodore Stylianopoulos, "Comments on Chrysostom, Patristic Interpretation, and Contemporary Biblical Scholarship," *GOTR* 54 (2009): 189-90, claims that Chrysostom was a biblical interpreter, not an exegete. That is because, in the strict sense, he did not historically-culturally-grammatically analyse a text of the Bible to look for its original meaning, unlike modern biblical scholars. His argument seems right at first glance, but it is an anachronistic approach. In the time of Chrysostom, biblical exegesis as modern theological discipline was non-existent, and for him biblical exegesis was equivalent to biblical interpretation.

¹⁷⁵ Manlio Simonetti, *Biblical interpretation in the Early Church: An Historical Introduction to Patristic Exegesis*, trans. John A. Hughes (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994), 74. For similar criticism of Cyprian, see Downs, *Alms: Charity, Reward, and Atonement*, 257-60.

¹⁷⁶ Frances M. Young, *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2002), 99-102.

¹⁷⁷ Mitchell, *The Heavenly Trumpet*, 22; and Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 299.

¹⁷⁸ See 1. 1. 2-3 above.

plays a role in ruling in favour of the benefactors in the heavenly court, while rhetoric is used to defend victims or criminals in secular courts. Chrysostom cites Luke 11:41 to support this redemptive effect of almsgiving: “give alms, and all things shall be clean.”¹⁷⁹ *In epistulam ad Titum hom. 6* shows that Chrysostom’s emphasis on the benefits of charity to those who practise it is underpinned by Daniel 4:27. He states that charity is not only for the poor, but also for the salvation of the givers:

See that when the prophet gave that excellent counsel to Nebuchadnezzar, he did not merely consider the poor. For he did not simply say, give to the poor. Then, what? “Redeem your sins by almsgiving and your iniquities by showing mercy to the poor (Dan 4:27).” In other words, part, he said, with your wealth not only that others may be fed, but also that you may escape punishment.¹⁸⁰

Chrysostom’s transformation of philosophical therapy through biblical exegesis is found in *In Johannem hom. 7*, which provides the diagnosis of heretical sickness and its treatment. Chrysostom claims that the Sabellians and the followers of Marcellus are mentally ill (μανία).¹⁸¹ Recent studies indicate that for him religious deviation also is regarded as a pathological phenomenon, like the passions.¹⁸² The medical reference to heresiology was a common literary theme in the early church.¹⁸³ It is argued that heretics were often mixed with other people in Chrysostom’s congregations.¹⁸⁴ In this homily, he seems to assume that the followers of Sabellius and Marcellus attend the worship. According to Chrysostom, the wrong mindset of these spiritual patients is problematic: they deny the person (ὑπόστασις) of Christ, and the main symptom of this madness is futile reasoning beyond the boundary that God has set, which ultimately incurs the wrath of God.

¹⁷⁹ Chrys. *Hom. 52.4 in Mt.* (PG 58:524.4-15).

¹⁸⁰ Chrys. *Hom. 6.2 in Tit.* (PG 62:698.6-13; NPNF 1.13, 542, modified).

¹⁸¹ Chrys. *Hom. 7.2 in Jo.* (PG 59:64.12-14).

¹⁸² Salem, “Sanity, Insanity, and Man’s Being,” 101-2; and VanVeller, “Paul’s Therapy of the Soul,” 133-60. According to Wright, “Brain and Soul in Late Antiquity,” 280-311, Augustine compares heretics to sufferers with brain fever, that is mental illness.

¹⁸³ See n. 7 in chapter 1 above.

¹⁸⁴ Maxwell, *Christianization and Communication in Late Antiquity*, 85-86

Repentance (μετάνοια) is presented as a remedy for eliminating the psychological madness of heresies. They must remain in the teachings of the gospel that were handed down by the apostles to them and repent their past errors.¹⁸⁵

Well, then, avoiding this destructive meddlesomeness, let us crush our hearts; let us grieve for our sins, even as Christ has enjoined upon us; let us have compunction for our offenses; let us carefully recall everything we dared to do in the past; let us earnestly strive to wipe these offenses out altogether.¹⁸⁶

Here, five ways of repentance occur: confession, forgiveness, almsgiving, prayer, and fasting. For Chrysostom repentance is not merely the psychological state, but engages in specific action.¹⁸⁷ Since he saw repentance as a crucial element in the salvation of believers, he frequently repeats this list.¹⁸⁸ As mentioned earlier, the early Christian debate on penitential discipline lies behind this mention of repentant methods. Early church authors disputed whether baptism forgives all sins or not. Since the third century C.E, it has been generally taught that postbaptismal sins are cleansed by various repentant practices.¹⁸⁹ Chrysostom supports this position. In *In Johannem hom. 73*, he looks at how sin defiles the soul, stating that:

¹⁸⁵ Chrys. *Hom. 7.2 in Jo.* (PG 59:64.14-47).

¹⁸⁶ Chrys. *Hom. 7.2 in Jo.* (PG 59:64.41-47; Goggin, *Commentary on Saint John*, FC 33, 79).

¹⁸⁷ Chrys. *Hom. 34.3 in Jo.* (PG 59:197.15-20); and Vasile Răducă, "Metanoia in the Thinking of Saint John Chrysostom," *Icoana Credinței* 4 (2016): 6.

¹⁸⁸ Chrys. *Paen. hom. 3.1* (PG 49:292.15-21 ab imo; Christo, *On Repentance and Almsgiving*, 29, modified). "We were saying that there are many and diverse roads toward repentance for salvation to become easy for you to achieve. If God had given us one road toward repentance, we would have adjourned our discourse. If we do not pursue repentance, we cannot be saved. Now, however, he cuts off this excuse from you, and he has given you not one road, not two, not three, but many and diverse ones so that with this multitude of roads you can easily make your ascent into heaven."

¹⁸⁹ Hays, "By Almsgiving and Faith Sins Are Purged?" 266-68. For a reassessment of previous scholarship on the teachings about repentance, see Kevin Uhalde, *Expectations of Justice in the Age of Augustine* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007); and Alexis C. Torrance, *Repentance in Late Antiquity: Eastern Asceticism and the Framing of the Christian Life c. 400-650 CE*, Oxford Theology and Religion Monographs (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 64-87.

Let us, then, do everything so as to cleanse away the defilement of sin. First of all the laver of baptism cleanses it; afterwards, there are many and various other methods. For, since God is merciful, he has granted us, even after baptism, manifold means of being freed from sin.¹⁹⁰

In *In Johannem hom. 7*, what is important is that even though medical metaphors (madness, sickness) in the diagnosis of the sickness of heretics suddenly switch to Christian language (sin, repentance) when prescribing how to cure it, Chrysostom still discusses the traditional Christian practices associated with the forgiveness of postbaptismal sins in terms of philosophical therapy. That is, these practices are applied to the treatment of the mental disorder of heresies.¹⁹¹ As implied so far, a combination of

¹⁹⁰ Chrys. *Hom. 73.3 in Jo.* (PG 59:397.49-53; Goggin, *Commentary on Saint John*, FC 41, 288). See also Chrys. *Hom. 34.3 in Jo.* (PG 59:197.13-15).

¹⁹¹ See also 2. 3. 2. 1 in chapter 1 above (the treatment of anger). Some homilies explicitly refer to repentance as a spiritual remedy within the eschatological context. *In Johannem hom. 34* states that “if anyone should not wish to become a spectacle in that fearful day, let him apply the remedy of repentance (φάρμακα τῆς μετανοίας) and let him thus heal his wounds (τραύματα). . . . We must, then, refrain both in deed and thought from former sins, and while refraining from them we must apply to the wounds remedies which are the opposite (έναντία) to our sins. What sort do I mean? Have you robbed and acted greedily? Refrain from rapacity, and apply almsgiving to the wound. Have you been sexually impure (έπόρνευσας)? Refrain from impurity, and apply purity to the sore. Have you spoken evil of your brother and done him harm? Cease from evil-speaking, and apply kindness.” (Chrys. *hom. 34.3 in Jo.* [PG 59:197.7-9, 20-28]; Goggin, *Commentary on Saint John*, FC 33, 340, modified). Chrysostom, *hom. 41.4. in Mt.* (PG 57:450.13-451.4), also shows that almsgiving is a comprehensive treatment for many different kinds of passions which result in damnation. According to Chrysostom, no one is free from passions, and we commit sins everyday such as fornication, adultery, secret plotting, false accusations, slander, swearing oaths, perjury, enslavement to money, lust, vainglory, envy, insult, arrogance, and anger. Our souls are sick with these various wounds (τραύματα). Chrysostom asserts that God gives us the remedy of almsgiving to heal these wounds, and if we diligently use this medicine, our soul will be restored to a sound state, resulting in avoiding the eternal punishment of hell. In this homily, Chrysostom, *hom. 41.4. in Mt.* (PG 57:451.4-452.5), lists a wide range of spiritual medicines which include almsgiving, prayer, compunction, repentance, humility, a contrite heart, the contempt of possessions, forgiveness, thanksgiving to God, and fasting: “ if each of those sins throws you into hell (γέενναν), when they all assemble together, what will not happen? Someone says, “Then how are we saved?” Apply countervailing medicines (άντίρροπα φάρμακα) against them, such as almsgiving, prayers (εύχάς), compunction (κατάνυξι), repentance (μεάνοιαν), humility (ταπεινοφροσύνην), a contrite heart

Christian and pagan therapy in Chrysostom's intellectual world results in his having a great command of interchangeably harnessing the language of two traditions and even their therapeutic tools. In this regard, it is necessary to reconsider Cook's argument that could well state that therapeutic strategies are separate in Chrysostom's care for the soul: he suggests Christian methods, such as repentance and sacraments to treat sin and God's punishment, while offering the disciplines of philosophers to correct the psychic disorder.¹⁹² However, it is markedly shown that for Chrysostom this boundary is blurred, which indicates that we need to focus on the context and content more than language as we explore his discourse on almsgiving. If sufficient attention is not paid to context, this homily is likely to be easily misunderstood as the advocacy of redemptive almsgiving.

This part of treatment indicates that philosophical therapy is Christianized through Chrysostom's exegesis of biblical passages with regard to the idea of redemptive almsgiving. In the list of forms of repentance, almsgiving is followed by the confession of sins and forgiveness, and is considered as a remedy treating spiritual insanity with two citations.¹⁹³ First is the LXX 4:27. Chrysostom states: "do you wish to learn a third way, also? Listen to Daniel saying, "Wherefore, redeem your sins with almsgiving and your iniquities with works of mercy to the poor.""¹⁹⁴ Second, Sirach 3:30 is directly quoted. After prayer and fasting are listed,¹⁹⁵ Chrysostom asserts on the basis of this passage that fasting assuages God's anger much more when mercy on the poor accompanies it:

(συντετριμμένην καρδίαν) and the contempt of possessions (ὑπεροψίαν τῶν ὄντων). For God invented the innumerable ways of salvation, if we are willing to pay attention. Therefore, let us attend and cleanse our wounds (τραύματα) through all these means, showing mercy (ἐλεοῦντες), remitting anger (ὀργὴν ἀφιέντες) against those annoying us, giving thanks (εὐχαριστοῦντες) to God for all things, fasting (νηστεύοντες) according to our power, praying sincerely and making friends for ourselves with the money of injustice." (NPNF 1.10, 268, modified). The therapeutic strategy in these homilies reflect the philosophical and medical practice of treating contraries by contraries (Sorabji, *Emotion and Peace of Mind*, 222; and Leyerle, "The Etiology of Sorrow," 372 n. 16).

¹⁹² N. 116 above.

¹⁹³ Chrys. *Hom. 7.2 in Jo.* (PG 59:64.47-57).

¹⁹⁴ Chrys. *Hom. 7.2 in Jo.* (PG 59:64.57-60; Goggin, *Commentary on Saint John*, FC 33, 80).

¹⁹⁵ Chrys. *Hom. 7.2 in Jo.* (PG 59:64.60-65.2).

Fasting also brings to us no small palliation and remission of our sins, when it is joined with kindness toward others, and it quenches the fury of the anger of God. For, “water quenches a flaming fire and almsgiving resists sins.”¹⁹⁶

Commenting on these verses that underlie the established doctrine of redemptive almsgiving, Chrysostom maintains that charity corrects the disordered souls caused by spiritual insanity. The false notions of Christ psychologically derange the heretics, but almsgiving restores their souls to the normal state.

The hermeneutics of psychic therapy extends to eschatological dimension. This expansion of meaning is regarded as natural given that the redemptive impact of almsgiving is essentially related to God’s judgement in the future:

Let us, then, travel all these roads. If we are always on them, and if we spend our leisure in them, not only shall we efface past offenses, but we shall gain the greatest profit for the future. We shall not make it easy for the devil to tempt us either to laziness or to destructive questioning. Through these and other imperfections he draws us on to foolish questionings and hurtful disputations, because he sees us idle or wasting time and taking no thought for virtue in our lives. Let us block up this approach to him, let us be watchful, let us be wary, in order that, having worked a little in this short time, we may possess imperishable good things in the endless ages.¹⁹⁷

Through biblical exegesis, Chrysostom demonstrates the Christianized therapeutics of almsgiving. If the spiritual patients diligently practise merciful giving, the madness of false teachings is healed and will be recur. It prevents them from falling into useless curiosity caused by the devil. Psychic health in the present life leads to salvation in

¹⁹⁶ Chrys. *Hom. 7.2 in Jo.* (PG 59:65.2-7; Goggin, *Commentary on Saint John*, FC 33, 80, modified).

¹⁹⁷ Chrys. *Hom. 7.2 in Jo.* (PG 59:65.7-66.9; Goggin, *Commentary on Saint John*, FC 33, 80, modified).

the future.¹⁹⁸ In this homily, we can find that biblical exegesis, theology, philosophy, and moral advice form the integrated discourse of therapeutics.¹⁹⁹

Conclusion

How the two major flows of the Greek-Roman and Judeo-Christian ideas of healing situate themselves in Chrysostom has been explored, indicating the continuities and discontinuities between him and philosophers. In the philosophical tradition, Chrysostom regards false ideas or passions as psychic sickness and intends to resolve the broken order of the soul by prescribing almsgiving as spiritual treatment. Along with this philosophical therapy, he also supports the doctrine of redemptive almsgiving in the Judeo-Christian tradition that argues for the forgiveness of sin and deliverance from divine judgement through assistance to the poor. Almsgiving cleanses all post-baptismal sins, guiding the givers to the gates of heaven. For Chrysostom, the redemptive efficacy of charity does not denote salvation by works; instead caring for the disadvantaged demonstrates a sign of true faith and ultimately an ecclesiological means of becoming God-like in the eastern Christian tradition.

On the basis of the doctrine of soteriology, especially the exegesis of biblical passages that underpin the formation of the early Christian idea of redemptive almsgiving, these two traditions are fused into a Christianized version of soul therapy. In a larger picture of Christian eschatology, Chrysostom argues that the state of eternal bliss will be realized by merciful giving to the poor that heals all sickness of soul and maintains its health. The sickness of soul means not only the loss of temporal happiness due to passions, but also the terrible state under the judgement of God. Almsgiving resolves this spiritual

¹⁹⁸ *In Johannem hom.* 81 also illustrates the relationship between biblical commentary and the holistic idea of psychic-therapeutic almsgiving. This thought is presented through the exegesis of Dan 4:27 and Luke 11:41. Chrysostom claims that the souls of his congregations are injured every day by passions such as lust, anger, sloth, envy and so on. Giving alms heals all these wounds. In addition, it makes the souls stronger by supplying sufficient spiritual nutrients, like olives which was a health-giving food in ancient times. As a result, the soul maintains healthy state and ultimately possesses eternal blessings (*Chrys. hom.* 81.3 in *Jo.* [PG 59:441.20-442.28]).

¹⁹⁹ Mayer, "Shaping the Sick Soul," 156-57.

unhappiness from the present life to the eschatological one in the future. The health of the soul in this life is related to the future destiny of the soul, and vice versa. Based on the integrated therapy of the soul, Chrysostom is indicative of a skilled soul healer who interchangeably uses both philosophical and redemptive language at his command according to certain pastoral contexts. He reinterprets philosophical therapy through the angles of the Bible and Christian theology, suggesting the extensive horizon of the Christianized psychic therapeutics of almsgiving which embraces the peace of mind and deification.

CONCLUSION. ALMSGIVING: FOR YOUR SOUL

Introduction: Aim and Previous Research Gaps

We have investigated how Chrysostom appropriated ancient philosophical therapy for pastoral care of sick souls through his exhortation of Christian love toward the poor in the previous three chapters. This study began with the recognition of the limitations of recent studies on Chrysostom. In recent years, as seen above, a significant scholarly focus has been on Chrysostom's appropriation of ancient psychagogy, demonstrating that he was a skilled Christian physician of the soul who sought to promote the somatic and psychological health of his congregation by proposing preaching and various ascetic disciplines as medical treatments. In these studies, however, relatively little attention has been devoted to his use of philosophical therapy in relation to almsgiving. To address this, my project aimed to take a closer look at Chrysostom's view of almsgiving and soul therapy within the context of ancient philosophical therapy. This thesis attempted to seek interdisciplinary research between Greco-Roman philosophy and social ethics in early Christianity, in particular in the tradition of the Greek fathers, and to pursue a givers-centered analysis which has largely been ignored in the previous receivers-oriented approach.

1. Findings of the Chapters

Following the introductory chapter, the thesis was divided into three chapters. Chapter 1 looked at how almsgiving heals the diseases of the soul. For Chrysostom, passions are spiritual sickness, which breaks one's peace of mind and ultimately destroys the soul. The sickness of the soul is caused by the loss of control of the reason over passions, and therefore Christians should diligently take care of their mind for their spiritual health. Almsgiving is presented as an affordable spiritual remedy that heals sick souls. The givers should be humble and not give alms from injustice to enjoy the fruitful results of their charitable giving. As behavioural therapy, almsgiving cures the sick soul and maintained its health. Chrysostom's therapeutic discourse consists of diagnosis and prescription, and in some cases the cognitive shift of therapeutic *logoi* is suggested to

facilitate the curative process of the soul.

Chapter 2 analysed the psychagogical role of eschatology within Chrysostom's discourse of psychic-therapeutic almsgiving. Ancient moral philosophers supported the balanced use of praise and rebuke to avoid both despair and laziness. As a doctor of the soul Chrysostom reinterpreted the Christian ideas of future reward and punishment through the angle of this ancient strategy of philosophical therapy. Reward as gentle speech motivates the sick soul to progress towards a virtuous life, by arousing the hope of future blessings. It is particularly useful for the therapy of the weak soul, helping it easily receive the divine commandment and strengthening tenacity in the face of various trials and sufferings, in addition to the hope of future blessings. Chrysostom also offered the fearful place of hell as harsh speech to awaken the lazy soul and correct its moral errors through fear. He often used deliberate means to strengthen the sense of hope and fear. Almsgiving, reward, and punishment harmonize with each other for the cure of the soul: as gentle and harsh therapy speech reward and punishment arouse both hope and fear, which results in regaining peace of the mind in harmonious combination with almsgiving.

The last chapter explored Chrysostom's idea of Christianized psychic-therapeutic almsgiving. For Chrysostom Christian giving is also understood as an important means of cleansing sin and avoiding God's eternal punishment. On the basis of his doctrine of soteriology (deification), especially the exegesis of biblical passage which formed the basis of the formation of redemptive almsgiving (LXX Dan 4:27; Prov 15:27; and Luke 11:41), both Christian and philosophical traditions are holistically unified into a new kind of theoretical system of therapy in Chrysostom's thought. There we find that the concepts of philosophical sickness and its consequences are absorbed and altered within the framework of Christian ideas of sin and punishment. For Chrysostom sin is not only a disordering of passions or distorted thought which destroys psychological calmness, but also the terrible state which provokes the judgement of God and damnation due to disobedience to God's words. Almsgiving solves this spiritual crisis. In short, it removes vices and promotes virtues, so that the soul becomes healthy, and heaven will be for the givers, and ultimately God's image is restored. Far from rejecting the Greco-Roman concept of philosophical therapy, Chrysostom transformed its scope and objective according to his pastoral concerns, and formed Christian discourse of therapeutic almsgiving. This integrated horizon of Christian therapy gives a broader vision of salvation from the accomplishment of

happiness to participation to a divine life.

2. Synthetic Analysis and Further Implications

2. 1. Almsgiving as the Best Medical Remedy

Summarizing these findings from the close analysis of Chrysostom's homiletic series on Matthew and John, we propose three crucial points in relation to late-antique poverty studies on Chrysostom. First, for Chrysostom almsgiving, alongside preaching, is one of the most important treatments for healing sick souls. Ancient philosophers identified passions (πάθη), desires, and distorted thought as the diseases of the soul and developed various kinds of cognitive and behavioural remedies. Chrysostom adapted and transformed Greco-Roman discourse of medicalization, forming his own version of Christian therapeutic almsgiving. He saw sin as a disordering of the passions or distorted thought that destroys psychological calmness. Passions are portrayed as the sickness of the soul in terms of both bodily and mental medical language. The soul sickens with desires and becomes insensitive to sins. For Chrysostom psychic illness is also the terrible state which provokes the judgement of God and damnation. In this sense, passions, desires, and sins negatively affect the welfare of the soul in both this world and the next. Merciful giving, Chrysostom maintains, solves all these problems of unhappiness: it restores the peace of the mind by treating all kinds of psychic diseases, and strengthens the immune system of the soul to prevent a spiritual ailment. Almsgiving cures not only each psychological illness, but also all its complications. In addition, the givers also will ultimately avoid the future judgement of God. With the assistance of the psychic-therapeutic efficacy of almsgiving, the power of mind is restored, and the old self weakens, but the new self grows lively, which results in the imitation of God, that is, deification. Chrysostom repeatedly notes that no matter how many good works a Christian performs, he/she can never enter heaven without the virtue of almsgiving.

2. 2. Holistic Nature of Chrysostom's View and Discourse on Almsgiving

Second, this dissertation demonstrated that Chrysostom's view of almsgiving and his discourse on it are holistically shaped in a larger framework of the Christianized concept of the therapy of the soul (salvation). Once Chrysostom's approach to almsgiving is treated

through medical themes of illness and healing, it is indicated that the theoretical fragments scattered across his homilies are indeed harmoniously interconnected: Chrysostom addresses issues such as the definition of a psychic disease, its reason, degree, complications, infection, the price of almsgiving as healing treatment, the scope of treatment, cautions, and so on throughout his sermons. Passions, desires, and God's judgement as their consequence are the sickness of soul, which are caused by the loss of the proper roles of the soul due to disobedience to the words of God. Like bodily sickness, psychic diseases show differentiation in severity. Greed (luxury), pride, and extortion pose a serious threat to the state of the soul. Some diseases cause numerous complications, such as pride, vanity, anxiety, and grief springing from luxury. Other diseases also spread to other people. Chrysostom points out that a mother's spiritual laziness influences all members of her household. Almsgiving is a powerful remedy for treating spiritual illnesses, and can be referred to as the various methods of medical treatments, such as drugs, cautery, and surgery according to the types of spiritual illness. Since almsgiving is engaged in everything related to the benevolent attitude toward one's neighbour, it has a broad range from pity and sympathy, kind words, to material help. People can give alms according to their condition, and the mindset is the most essential. Therefore, almsgiving is affordable enough to be provided by anyone. As pride and vainglory totally destroy the healing effect of almsgiving, the givers should guard against these vices. The possessions acquired by extortion are also inefficacious. Almsgiving is definitely an outstanding treatment, but its remedial function is not great if it is done as only a one-off action. As the ancients continued to consume olives to maintain their health, believers must keep going to great lengths to care for the disadvantaged. Although Chrysostom did not write a book on the theory of psycho-therapeutic almsgiving, this idea was systematically formulated in his mind.

In addition, we found that each element in Chrysostom's homilies on almsgiving plays a certain role in the therapeutic process of the soul. His harsh criticism against the passions is largely related to the diagnosis of spiritual sickness, and a variety of moral exhortations function as cognitive therapy which corrects the misconceptions of the congregation. Eschatological reward and judgment are reinterpreted as gentle and harsh speeches in ancient psychagogy to evoke both hope and fear. Various factors of biblical exegesis, theology, philosophy, and practical advice in Chrysostom's therapeutics of

almsgiving unite to form a Christianized medico-philosophical discourse in a large picture of salvation which itself substitutes for a therapeutic treatise and letter of philosophers. Despite the unclear chronology of the sources and the possibility of textual alteration, it is not easily overlooked that Chrysostom's texts themselves speak consistently of his idea of psychic-therapeutic almsgiving.

2. 3. Call for Reshaping the Traditional Identity of Chrysostom

Lastly, my research called for a fundamental rethinking of the traditional approach represented by the title of 'champion of the poor,' by indicating Chrysostom's new identity as a soul healer for the givers, in particular the well-to-do. Previous scholarship has tended to be overly weighted toward Chrysostom's focus on the receivers (the poor). However, this study showed that he was not a champion of the poor in the sense supposed. That is because his consistent interest in the givers and his passionate advocacy for their spiritual healing which has been previously overlooked by most scholars remarkably dominate in his discourse on almsgiving in the homilies on Matthew and John. As a psychic therapist Chrysostom anatomized the soul, diagnosed a spiritual disease, and cured the sick soul by means of almsgiving as drugs or surgery. This means that for him almsgiving does not require only one-sided commitment, and its benefits eventually return to those themselves who practise it. In other words, merciful giving not only addresses the needs of the poor, but also, makes the souls of the benefactors healthy. We need to take into account the fact that Chrysostom was a priest for both the poor (the recipients) and the rich (the givers), and he even urged the poor to be the generous givers for their salvation. Indeed, he was a Christian psychic physician for all people, because a spiritual illness is a universal issue. Although the composition of Chrysostom's audiences is controversial, it is also suggested that people from diverse social and economic backgrounds would have heard his preaching. Therefore, we need to question the tilted scale and reshape Chrysostom's conventional identity in a more balanced and nuanced way, keeping in mind that he had a great interest in the givers as well as the receivers.

Concluding Remarks

To summarize, for Chrysostom almsgiving is one of the most powerful remedies

for healing the sick souls, and the concept of Christianized soul therapy is a new key framework for understanding his approach to almsgiving and his homilies on it holistically and systematically. These findings suggest that the Christianized therapy of the soul will be a vital interpretive methodology which has the potential to offer a new reading of discourse on almsgiving in late antiquity. Chrysostom still gives the same message to modern audiences as he did in the past: 'give alms and your soul will be healed.'

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- Anonymous author(s). *Didache*. Edited and Translated by Michael W. Holmes. *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2007. 334-69.
- Aristotle. *Rhetorica*. Text and Translated by John H. Freese. LCL 193. 1926.
- Cicero. *De Officiis*. Text and Translated by Walter Miller. LCL 30. 1913.
- . *Tusculan Disputations*. Text and Translated by J. E. King. LCL 141. 1927.
- Clement of Alexandria. *Quis dives salvetur*. Text and Translated by G. W. Butterworth. LCL 92. 1919. 265-367.
- Cyprian of Carthage. *De opere et eleemosynis*. CSEL 3.1:371-94. Translated by Roy J. Deferrari. *Saint Cyprian: Treatises*. FC 36. Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1958. 225-57.
- Dio Chrysostom. *Orationes*. Text and Translated by H. L. Crosby and J. W. Cohoon. LCL 358. 1940; and H. Lamar Crosby. LCL 385. 1951.
- Epictetus. *Dissertationes ab Arriano digestae*. Text and Translated by W. A. Oldfather. LCL 218. 1928. 2-439.
- Epicurus. *Letter to Menoeceus*. Text and Translated by R. D. Hicks. LCL 185. 1925. 648-59.
- John Chrysostom. *Contra ludos et theatre*. PG 56:263-270. Translated by Wendy Mayer and Pauline Allen. *John Chrysostom*. London: Routledge, 2000. 118-25.
- . *De Lazaro homiliae 1-7*. PG 48:963-1054. Translated by Catharine P. Roth. *St. John Chrysostom: On Wealth and Poverty*. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1984.
- . *De paenitentia homiliae 1-9*. PG 49:277-350. Translated by Gus G. Christo. *On Repentance and Almsgiving*. FC 96. Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1998. 1-130.
- . *De sacerdotio 1-6*. Edited by Anne M. Malingrey. *Sur le Sacerdoce: Dialogue et Homélie*. SC 272. 1980. Translated by Graham Neville. *Six Books on the Priesthood*. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1984.
- . *De eleemosyna*. PG 51:262-72. Translated by Gus G. Christo. *On Repentance and Almsgiving*. FC 96. Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 1998. 131-51.
- . *In epistulam ad Colossenses homiliae. 1-12*. PG 62:299-392. Translated by John A. Broadus. NPNF 1.13:350-438.
- . *In epistulam ad Ephesios homiliae. 1-24*. PG 62:9-176. Translated by Gross Alexander. NPNF

1.13:74-246.

- ___ *In epistulam ii ad Thessalonicenses homiliae 1-5*. PG 62:467-500. Translated by J. Broadus. NPNF 1.13:377-98.
- ___ *In epistulam ad Titum homiliae 1-6*. PG 62:663-700. Translated by Philip Schaff. NPNF 1.13:519-43.
- ___ *In Johannem homiliae 1-88*. PG 59:23-482. Translated by Thomas A. Goggin. *St. John Chrysostom: Commentary on Saint John the Apostle and Evangelist 1-88*. 2 vols. FC 33 and 41. 1956 and 1959.
- ___ *In Matthaem homiliae 1-90*. PG 57-58. Translated by W. R. W. Stephens. NPNF 1:10.
- Musonius Rufus. *C. Musonii Rufi reliquiae*. Edited by Otto Hense. Leipzig: Teubner, 1905. Translated by Cora E. Lutz, "Musonius Rufus: the Roman Socrates." *Yale Classical Studies* 10 (1947): 32-147.
- Philodemus. *De libertate dicendi*. Text and Translated by David Konstan, Diskin Clay, Clarence E. Glad, Johan C. Thom, and Jame Ware. *Philodemus: On Frank Criticism: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*. Texts and Translations 43, Graeco-Roman 13. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press. 1998.
- Plato. *Phaedrus*. Text and Translated by Harold N. Fowler. LCL 184. 1914. 405-580.
- ___ *Sophista*. Text and Translated by Harold N. Fowler. LCL 123. 1921. 259-460.
- Plutarch. *De garrulitate*. Text and Translated by W. C. Helmbold. LCL 337. 1939. 393-468.
- De liberis educandis*. Text and Translated by Frank. C. Babbitt. LCL 197. 1927. 1-70.
- ___ *De virtute morali*. Text and Translated by W. C. Helmbold. LCL 337. 1939. 15-88.
- ___ *Quomodo aducator ab amico internoscatur*. Text and Translated by Frank C. Babbitt. LCL 197. 1927. 261-396.
- Quintilian. *Institutio oratoria*. Text and Translated by Donald A. Russell. LCL 124-27. 2002.
- Seneca. *Ad Lucilium epistulae morales I and II*. Text and Translated by Richard M. Gummere. LCL 75. 1917 and 1920.
- ___ *De Ira*. Text and Translated by John W. Basore. LCL 214. 1928. 106-355.
- Sextus Empircus, *Πυρρώνειοι ὑποτυπώσεις*, Text and Translated by R. G. Bury. LCL 273. 1933.

Secondary Sources

- Allen, Pauline. "John Chrysostom's Homilies on I and II Thessalonians: the Preacher and His Audience." *SP* 31 (1997): 3-21.
- Allen, Pauline, Bronwen Neil, and Wendy Mayer. "Reading the Texts: A Methodology of Approach to Genre." In *Preaching Poverty in Late Antiquity: Perceptions and Realities*. Edited by Pauline

- Allen, Bronwen Neil, and Wendy Mayer. *Arbeiten zur Kirchen- und Theologiegeschichte* 28. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2009. 35-67.
- Allen, Pauline and Wendy Mayer. "Chrysostom and the Preaching of Homilies in Series: A New Approach to the Twelve Homilies *In epistulam ad Colossenses* (CPG 4433)." *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 60 (1994): 21-39.
- . "Chrysostom and the Preaching of Homilies in Series: A Re-Examination of the Fifteen Homilies *In Epistulam ad Philippenses* (CPG 4432)." *VC* 49 (1995): 270-89.
- . "The Thirty-Four Homilies on Hebrews: The Last Series Delivered by Chrysostom in Constantinople?" *Byzantion* 65 (1995): 309-48.
- Anderson, Gary A. "Redeem Your Sins by the Giving of Alms: Sin, Debt, and the 'Treasury of Merit' in Early Jewish and Christian Tradition." *Letter & Spirit* 3 (2007): 39-69.
- . *Sin: A History*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.
- Aune, David E. "The Problem of the Passions in Cynicism." In *Passions and Moral Progress in Greco-Roman Thought*. Edited by John T. Fitzgerald. London: Routledge, 2007. 48-64.
- Arlen, Jesse S. "'Let Us Mourn Continuously': John Chrysostom and the Early Christian Transformation of Mourning." *SP* 83 (2017): 289-312.
- Barbu, Liviu. "The 'Poor in Spirit' and Our Life in Christ: An Eastern Orthodox Perspective on Christian Discipleship." *Studies in Christian Ethics* 22 (2009): 261-74.
- Barry, Jennifer Barry. "Diagnosing Heresy: Ps.-Martyrius's Funerary Speech for John Chrysostom." *JECS* 24 (2016): 395-418.
- Barsella, Susanna. "Ars and Theology: Work, Salvation, and Social Doctrine in the Early Church Fathers." *Annali d'Italianistica* 32 (2014): 53-72.
- Bauer, C. *John Chrysostom and His Time*. Translated by M. Gonzaga. Vol. 1. London: Sands, 1959.
- Bebis, George S. "Saint John Chrysostom: On Materialism and Christian Virtue." *GOTR* 32 (1987): 227-37.
- Blackburn, Lee. "'Let the Men be Ashamed': Public Insults, Angry Words, and Figures of Shame in Chrysostom's *Homilies on Acts*." *SP* 47 (2010): 295-300.
- Bond, Sarah E. "'As Trainers for the Healthy': Massage Therapists, Anointers, and Healing in the Late Latin West." *JLA* 8 (2015): 386-404.
- Bosinis, Constantine. "Two Platonic Images in the Rhetoric of John Chrysostom: 'The Wings of Love' and 'The Charioteer of the Soul'." *SP* 41 (2006): 433-38.
- Brändle, Rudolf. "Jean Chrysostome: l'importance de Matth 25:31-46 pour son éthique." *VC* 31 (1977): 47-52.
- . *Matthäus 25:31-46 im Werk des Johannes Chrysostomus: Ein Beitrag zur Auslegungsgeschichte und zur Erforschung der Ethik der griechischen Kirche um die Wende vom 4. Zum 5. Jahrhundert*.

- Beiträge zur Geschichte der biblischen Exegese 22. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1979.
- ___ . “This Sweetest Passage: Matthew 25:31-46 and Assistance to the Poor in the Homilies of John Chrysostom.” In *Wealth and Poverty in Early Church and Society*. Edited by Susan R. Holman. Holy Cross Studies in Patristic Theology and History. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2008. 127-39.
- Broc-Schmezer, Catherine. “De l’aumône faite au pauvre à l’aumône du pauvre: Pauvreté et spiritualité chez Jean Chrysostome.” In *Les pères de l’Église et la voix des pauvres: Actes du IIe Colloque de la Rochelle, 2-4 septembre 2005*. Edited by Pascal Delage. La Rochelle: Histoire et Culture, 2006. 131-48.
- ___ . *Les figures féminines du Nouveau Testament dans L’œuvre de Jean Chrysostome: Exégèse et pastorale*. Collection des Études Augustiniennes, Série Antiquité 185. Paris: Institut d’études Augustiniennes, 2010.
- Brottier, Laurence. ““Et la fournaise devint source’: l’épisode des trois jeunes gens dans la fournaise (Dan 3) lu par Jean Chrysostome.” *RHPR* 71 (1991): 309-27.
- Brown, Peter. *Power and Persuasion in Late Antiquity: Towards a Christian Empire*. The Curti Lectures. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1988.
- ___ . *Poverty and Leadership in the Later Roman Empire*. The Menahem Stern Jerusalem lectures. Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 2002.
- ___ . *The Body and Society: Men, Women and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity*. 2nd edn. Columbia Classics in Religion. New York: Columbia University Press, 2008.
- ___ . *The Ransom of the Soul: Afterlife and Wealth in Early Western Christianity*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2015.
- Bruck, Eberhard F. *Kirchenväter und soziales Erbrecht: Wanderungen religiöser Ideen durch die Rechte der östlichen und westlichen Welt*. Berlin: Springer, 1956.
- Cameron, Averil. *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire: The Development of Christian Discourse*. Sather Classical Lectures 55. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1991.
- Cardman, Francine. “Poverty and Wealth as Theater: John Chrysostom’s Homilies on Lazarus and the Rich Man.” In *Wealth and Poverty in Early Church*. 159-75.
- Childers, Jeff W. *The Syriac Version of John Chrysostom’s Commentary on John: I. Mêmêrê 1-43*. Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium 652. Leuven: Peeters, 2013.
- Clapsis, Emmanuel. “The Dignity of the Poor and Almsgiving in St. John Chrysostom.” *GOTR* 56 (2011): 55-87.
- Clodoveo, Maria Lisa, Salvatore Camposeo, Bernardo De Gennaro, Simone Pascuzzi, and Luigi Roselli. “In the Ancient World, Virgin Olive Oil was Called “Liquid Gold” by Homer and “the Great Healer” by Hippocrates. Why has this Mythic Image been Forgotten?” *Food Research*

- International* 62 (2014): 1062-68.
- Constantelos, Demetrios J. "The Hellenic Background and Nature of Patristic Philanthropy in the Early Byzantine Era." In *Wealth and Poverty in Early Church*. 187-208.
- Cook, James. "Preaching and Christianization: Reading the Sermons of John Chrysostom." PhD diss., Oxford University, 2016.
- . "'Hear and Shudder!': John Chrysostom's Therapy of the Soul." In *Revisioning John Chrysostom: New Perspectives, Theories, and Approaches*. Edited by Chris L. de Wet and Wendy Mayer. Leiden: Brill, forthcoming.
- Costanzo, Eric. *Harbor for the Poor: A Missiological Analysis of Almsgiving in the View and Practice of John Chrysostom*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publication, 2013.
- Craig, Barry M. "Potency, not Preciousness: Cyprian's Cup and a Modern Controversy." *Worship* 81 (2007): 290-313.
- Crépey, Cyrille. "La récompense, un thème majeur dans le discours pastoral de Jean Chrysostome." *RevScRel* 83 (2009): 97-113.
- Criboire, Raffaella. *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2001.
- Crislip, Andrew T. *From Monastery to Hospital: Christian Monasticism and the Transformation of Health Care in Late Antiquity*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2005.
- . *Thorns in the Flesh: Illness and Sanctity in Late Ancient Christianity*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013.
- Cunningham, Mary B. and Pauline Allen. "Introduction." In *Preacher and Audience: Studies in Early Christian and Byzantine Homiletics*. Edited by Mary B Cunningham and Pauline Allen. New History of the Sermon 1. Leiden: Brill, 1998. 1-20.
- Daley, Brian E. *The Hope of the Early Church: A Handbook of Patristic Eschatology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- De Aldama, J.A. *Repertorium Pseudochrysostomicum*. Documents, études et répertoires publiés par l'Institut de Recherche et d'Histoire des Textes 10. Paris: Centre national de la recherche scientifique, 1965.
- De Vinne, Michael J. "The Advocacy of Empty Bellies: Episcopal Representation of the Poor in the Late Roman Empire." PhD diss., Stanford University, 1995.
- De Wet, Chris L. "John Chrysostom on Envy." *SP* 47 (2010): 255-60.
- . "Vilification of the Rich in John Chrysostom's Homily 40 *On First Corinthians*." *Acta Patristica et Byzantina* 21 (2010): 82-94.
- . "Between the Domestic and Agoric Somatoscape: John Chrysostom on the Appearance of Female Roman Aristocrats in the Marketplace," *Religion & Theology* 20 (2013): 202-18.

- ___ "Virtue and the (Un-) Making of Men in the Thought of John Chrysostom." In *Men and Women in the Early Christian Centuries*. Edited by Wendy Mayer and Ian J. Elmer. Early Christian Studies 18. Strathfield, NSW: St. Pauls Publications, 2014. 227-50.
- ___ *Preaching Bondage: John Chrysostom and the Discourse of Slavery in Early Christianity*. Oakland, CA: University of California Press, 2015.
- ___ "Grumpy Old Men?: Gender, Gerontology, and the Geriatrics of the Soul in John Chrysostom." *J ECS* 24 (2016): 491-521.
- ___ "The Preacher's Diet: Gluttony, Regimen, and Psycho-Somatic Health in the Thought of John Chrysostom," In *Revisioning John Chrysostom*. forthcoming.
- Dörnemann, Michael. *Krankheit und Heilung in der Theologie der frühen Kirchenväter*. Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 20. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.
- ___ "Einer ist Arzt, Christus: Medizinale Verstandnis von Erlösung in der Theologie der griechischen Kirchenvater des zweiten bis vierten Jahrhunderts." *ZAC* 17 (2013): 102-24.
- Downs, David J. *Downs, Alms: Charity, Reward, and Atonement in Early Christianity*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press 2016.
- Dubrulle, Luc. "Entre archétype et scandale, la mise en place théologique de la catégorie morale du pauvre." *Transversalités* 111 (2009): 23-33.
- Dunkle, Brian. "John Chrysostom's Community of Anger Management." *SP* 83 (2017): 217-30.
- Dunn, Geoffrey D. "Cyprian's Care for the Poor: The Evidence of *De Opere et Eleemosynis*." *SP* 42 (2006): 363-68.
- Durand, M. G. de. "La colère chez S Jean Chrysostome." *RevScRel* 67 (1993): 61-77.
- Elm, Susanna. *Sons of Hellenism, Fathers of the Church: Emperor Julian, Gregory of Nazianzus, and the Vision of Rome*. Transformation of the Classical Heritage 49. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2012.
- Emmenegger, Gregor Emmenegger. *Wie die Jungfrau zum Kind kam: zum Einfluss antiker medizinischer und naturphilosophischer Theorien auf die Entwicklung des christlichen Dogmas*. Paradosis 56. Fribourg: Academic Press Fribourg, 2014.
- Ferngren, Gary B. *Medicine and Health Care in Early Christianity*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2009.
- Finn, Richard. D. *Almsgiving in the Later Roman Empire: Christian Promotion and Practice (313-450)*. Oxford Classical Monographs. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.
- Fitzgerald, John T., ed. *Friendship, Flattery, and Frankness of Speech: Studies on Friendship in the New Testament World*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 82. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- ___, ed. *Passions and Moral Progress in Greco-Roman Thought*. London: Routledge, 2007.
- ___ "The Passions and Moral Progress: An Introduction." In *Passions and Moral Progress*. 1-26.

- Florovsky, Georges. "St. John Chrysostom: the Prophet of Charity." *St Vladimir's Seminary Quarterly* 3 (1955): 37-42.
- Fortenbaugh, William W. "Aristotle and Theophrastus on the Emotions." In *Passions and Moral Progress*. 29-44.
- Freddoso, Margaret B. "The Value of Job's Grief in John Chrysostom's Commentary on Job: How John Blesses with Job's Tears." *SP* 83 (2017): 271-88.
- Garrison, Roman. *Redemptive Almsgiving in Early Christianity*. JSNTSup 77. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.
- Ghormley, Justus T. "Gratitude: A Panacea for the Passions in John Chrysostom's Commentary on the *Psalms*." *SP* 83 (2017): 203-16.
- Gibbs Jr, Raymond W. "Evaluating Conceptual Metaphor Theory." *Discourse Processes* 48 (2011): 529-62.
- Gill, Christopher. "Philosophical Therapy as Preventive Psychological Medicine." In *Mental Disorders in the Classical World*. Edited by William V. Harris. Columbia Studies in the Classical Tradition 38. Leiden: Brill, 2013. 339-60.
- Glad, Clarence E. *Paul and Philodemus: Adaptability in Epicurean and Early Christian Psychagogy*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 81. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Glazebrook, Allison and Kelly Olson. "Greek and Roman Marriage." In *A Companion to Greek and Roman Sexualities*. Edited by Thomas K. Hubbard. Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, 2013. 69-82.
- Gordon, Barry. "The Problem of Scarcity and the Christian Fathers: John Chrysostom and Some Contemporaries." *SP* 22 (1989): 108-20.
- Gray, Alyssa M. "Redemptive Almsgiving and the Rabbis of Late Antiquity." *Jewish Studies Quarterly* 18 (2011):144-84.
- Greeley, Dolores. "St. John Chrysostom: Prophet of Social Justice." *SP* 17 (1982): 1163-68.
- Hadot, Pierre. *Philosophy as a Way of Life: Spiritual Exercises from Socrates to Foucault*. Edited by Arnold I. Davidson. Translated by Michael Chases. New York: Blackwell 1995.
- Hall, Christopher. "John Chrysostom's *On Providence*: A Translation and Theological Interpretation." PhD diss., Drew University, 1991.
- Hartney, Aideen M. "Men, Woman, and Money: John Chrysostom and the Transformation of the City." *SP* 37 (2001): 527-34.
- . *John Chrysostom and the Transformation of the city*. London: Duckworth, 2004.
- Hays, Christopher M. "By Almsgiving and Faith Sins Are Purged? The Theological Underpinnings of Early Christian Care for the Poor." In *Engaging Economics: New Testament Scenarios and Early Christian Reception*. Edited by Bruce W. Longenecker and Kelly D. Liebengood. Grand

- Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2009. 260-80.
- Heiser, Andreas. *Die paulusinszenierung des Johannes Chrysostomus: Epitheta und ihre Vorgeschichte*. Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 70. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.
- Henning, Meghan. *Educating Early Christians through the Rhetoric of Hell: "Weeping and Gnashing of Teeth" as Paideia in Matthew and the Early Church*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe 382. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.
- Hill, Robert C. "Akribeia: A Principle of Chrysostom's Exegesis." *Colloquium* 14 (1981): 32-36.
- Holman, Susan R. *The Hungry are Dying: Beggars and Bishops in Roman Cappadocia*. Oxford Studies in Historical Theology. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Holmes, Brooke. "Disturbing Connections: Sympathetic Affections, Mental Disorder, and the Elusive Soul in Galen." In *Mental Disorders*. 147-76.
- Hunter, David G. *A Comparison between a King and a Monk : Against the Opponents of the Monastic Life*. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen, 1988.
- Ihssen, Brenda L. *They Who Give from Evil: The Response of the Eastern Church to Moneylending in the Early Christian Era*. Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2012.
- Ingalls, Matthew. "Golden Mouth, Empty Pockets: An Investigation of the Motivations and Aims behind John Chrysostom's Theology of Wealth and Poverty." MA thesis, George Fox University, 2013.
- Jacob, Christoph Jacob. *Das geistige Theater: Ästhetik und Moral bei Johannes Chrysostomus*. Münster: Aschendorff 2010.
- Katos, Demetrios S. "Socratic Dialogue or Courtroom Debate?: Judicial Rhetoric and Stasis Theory in the *Dialogue on the Life of St. John Chrysostom*." *VC* 61 (2007): 42-69.
- Karmann, Thomas R. "Barmherzigkeit als Thema spätantiker Großstadtpastoral: Eine Spurensuche im oeuvre des Johannes Chrysostomus." *ZKTh* 138 (2016): 348-67.
- Kelly, J.N.D. *Golden Mouth: the Story of John Chrysostom – Ascetic, Preacher, Bishop*. New York: Cornell University Press, 1995.
- Klasvogt, Peter. *Leben zur Verherrlichung Gottes: Botschaft des Johannes Chrysostomos: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Pastoral*. Hereditas 7. Bonn: Borengässer, 1992.
- Kolbet, Paul R. *Augustine and the Cure of Souls: Revising a Classical Ideal*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2009.
- Kourtobelides, Kleanthis X. "The Use and Misuse of Wealth according to St. John Chrysostom." MA thesis, Durham University, 1995.
- Kovacs, Judith Kovacs. "Divine Pedagogy and the Gnostic Teacher according to Clement of Alexandria." *J ECS* 9 (2001): 3-25.
- Knuuttila, Simo. *Emotions in Ancient and Medieval Philosophy*. Oxford: Clarendon, 2004.

- Lai, Pak-Wah. "John Chrysostom and the Hermeneutics of Exemplar Portraits." PhD diss., Durham University, 2010.
- . "The Monk as Christian Saint and Exemplar in St. John Chrysostom's Writings," *SCH* 47 (2011): 19-28
- . "The Imago Dei and Salvation among the Antiochenes: A Comparison of John Chrysostom with Theodore of Mopsuestia." *SP* 67 (2013): 393-402.
- . "Exemplar Portraits and the Interpretation of John Chrysostom's Doctrine of Recapitulation." In *Revisoning John Chrysostom*. forthcoming.
- Laird, Raymond. *Mindset, Moral Choice, and Sin in the Anthropology of John Chrysostom*. Early Christian Studies 15. Strathfield, NSW: St. Pauls Publications, 2012.
- . "John Chrysostom and the Anomoeans: Shaping an Antiochene Perspective on Christology." In *Religious Conflict from Early Christianity to the Rise of Islam*. Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte 121. Edited by Wendy Mayer and Bronwen Neil. Berlin : De Gruyter, 2013. 129-49.
- . "It's All in the Mindset: John Chrysostom and the Great Moments of Personal Destiny." In *Men and Women*. 194-210.
- . "Mindset (γνώμη) in John Chrysostom." In *The Oxford Handbook of Maximus the Confessor*. Edited by Pauline Allen and Bronwen Neil. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015. 194-211.
- Lakoff, George and Mark Johnson, *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.
- Lavalle, Dawn. "Divine Breastfeeding: Milk, Blood, and *Pneuma* in Clement of Alexandria's *Paedagogus*." *JLA* 8 (2015): 322-36.
- Lawrenz, Mel. *The Christology of John Chrysostom*. Lewiston, NY: Mellen University Press, 1996.
- Law, Timothy M. *When God Spoke Greek: The Septuagint and the Making of the Christian Bible*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Leyerle, Blake. "John Chrysostom on the Gaze," *JECS* 1 (1993): 159-74.
- . "John Chrysostom on Almsgiving and the Use of Money." *HTR* 87 (1994): 29-47.
- . "Appealing to Children." *JECS* 5 (1997): 243-69.
- . *Theatrical Shows and Ascetic Lives: John Chrysostom's Attack on Spiritual Marriage*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001.
- . "Refuse, Filth, and Excrement in the Homilies of John Chrysostom." *JLA* 2 (2009): 337-56.
- . "The Consolation of Nature: Fields and Gardens in the Preaching of John Chrysostom." In *Ascetic Culture: Essays in Honor of Philip Rousseau*. Edited by Blake Leyerle and Robin D. Young. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2013. 269-92.
- . "The Etiology of Sorrow and its Therapeutic Benefits in the Preaching of John Chrysostom." *JLA* 8 (2015): 368-85.

- ___ "Animal Passions: Chrysostom's Use of Animal Imagery." *SP* 83 (2017): 185-202.
- ___ "Locating Animals in John Chrysostom's Thought." In *Revisioning John Chrysostom*. Forthcoming.
- Long, A.A. and D.N. Sedley. *The Hellenistic Philosophers*. Vol. 2: Greek and Latin Texts with Notes and Bibliography. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Macmullen, Ramsay. "The Preacher's Audience (AD 350-400)." *JTS* n.s. 40 (1989): 503-11.
- Malingrey, Anne-Marie. *Philosophia; étude d'un groupe de mots dans la littérature grecque des présocratiques au IVe siècle après J. C.* Études et Commentaires 40. Paris: C. Klincksieck, 1961.
- Marrou, Henri I. *A History of Education in Antiquity*. Translated by George Lamb. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1956.
- Marx-Wolf, Heidi and Kristi Upson-Saia, "The State of the Question: Religion, Medicine, Disability, and Health in Late Antiquity." *JLA* 8 (2015): 257-72.
- Maxwell, Jaclyn L. *Christianization and Communication in Late Antiquity: John Chrysostom and His Congregation in Antioch*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- Mayer, Wendy. "John Chrysostom and His Audiences: Distinguishing Different Congregations at Antioch and Constantinople." *SP* 31 (1997): 70-75.
- ___ "John Chrysostom: Extraordinary Preacher, Ordinary Audience." In *Preacher and Audience*. 105-37.
- ___ "Constantinopolitan Women in Chrysostom's Circle." *VC* 53 (1999): 265-88.
- ___ "Female Participation and the Late Fourth-Century Preacher's Audience." *Augustinianum* 39 (1999): 139-47.
- ___ "'Les homélies de s. Jean Chrysostome en juillet 399': A Second Look at Pargoire's Sequence and the Chronology of the *Novae homiliae* (CPG 4441)." *Byzantinoslavica* 60 (1999): 273-303.
- ___ "Who came to hear John Chrysostom preach?: Recovering a Late Fourth-Century Preacher's Audience." *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 76 (2000): 73-87.
- ___ "Patronage, Pastoral Care, and the Role of the Bishop at Antioch." *VC* 55 (2001): 58-70.
- ___ *The Homilies of St John Chrysostom – Provenance: Reshaping the Foundations*. *Orientalia Christiana Analecta* 273. Roma: Pontificio Istituto Orientale, 2005.
- ___ "Les Homélies de Jean Chrysostome: Problèmes concernant la provenance, l'ordre et la datation." *Revue d'Etudes Augustiniennes et Patristiques* 52 (2006): 329-53.
- ___ "Homiletics." In *the Oxford Handbook of Early Christian Studies*. Edited by Susan A. Harvey and David G Hunter. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008. 566-83.
- ___ "John Chrysostom's Use of Luke 16:19-31." *Scrinium* 4 (2008): 45-59.
- ___ "Poverty and Generosity towards the Poor in the Time of John Chrysostom." In *Wealth and Poverty in Early Church*. 140-58.

- ___ . “John Chrysostom on Poverty.” In *Preaching Poverty in Late Antiquity*. 69-111.
- ___ . “The Audience(s) for Patristic Social Teaching: A Case Study.” In *Reading Patristic Texts on Social Ethics: Issues and Challenges for Twenty-First-Century Christian Social Thought*. Edited by Johan Leemans, Brian J. Matz and Johan Verstraeten. CUA Studies in Early Christianity. Washington, DC: The Catholic University of America Press, 2011. 85-99.
- ___ . “Medicine in Transition: Christian Adaptation in the Later Fourth-Century East.” In *Shifting Genres in Late Antiquity*. Edited by Geoffrey Greatrex and Hugh Elton, with the assistance of Lucas McMahon. Farnham: Ashgate, 2015. 11-26.
- ___ . “Madness in the Works of John Chrysostom: A Snapshot from Late Antiquity.” In *Concept of Madness from Homer to Byzantium: Manifestations and Aspects of Mental Illness and Disorder*. Edited by Hélène Perdicoyianni-Paléologou. Byzantinische Forschungen 32. Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert, 2016. 349-73.
- ___ . “The Persistence in Late Antiquity of Medico-Philosophical Psychic Therapy.” *JLA* 8 (2015): 337-51.
- ___ . “Shaping the Sick Soul: Reshaping the Identity of John Chrysostom.” In *Christian Shaping Identity from the Roman Empire to Byzantium: Studies Inspired by Pauline Allen*. Edited by Geoffrey D. Dunn and Wendy Mayer. Supplements to *Vigiliae Christianae* 132. Leiden: Brill, 2015. 140-64.
- ___ . “Solving Poverty by Treating the Soul: Connecting Philanthropy, Medicine and Moral Philosophy.” *Shifting Frontiers in Late Antiquity XI*. Iowa, March 26-29 2015.
- ___ . “John Chrysostom: Moral Philosopher and Physician of the Soul.” In *John Chrysostom: Past, Present, Future*. Edited by Doru Costache and Mario Baghos. Sydney: AIOCS Press, 2017. 193-216.
- ___ . “A Son of Hellenism: Viewing John Chrysostom’s Anti-Intellectualism through the Lens of Antiochene *Paideia*.” In *Intellektueller Austausch und religiöse Diversität in Antiochien 350-450*. Edited by Silke-Petra Bergjan and Susanna Elm. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, forthcoming.
- Mayer, Wendy and Vittorino Grossi. “The Sequence and Provenance of John Chrysostom’s Homilies *In illud: si esurierit Inimicus* (CPG 4375), *De mutatione nominum* (CPG 4372) and *In principium actorum* (CPG 4371).” *Augustinianum* 46 (2006): 169-86.
- Mazzini, Innocenzo. “Use of Olive Oil in Medicine in the Ancient World.” *Medizinhistorisches Journal* 35 (2000): 105-26.
- Mellas, Andrew. “Tears of Compunction in John Chrysostom’s *On Eutropius*.” *SP* 83 (2017): 159-72.
- Merideth, Anne E. “Illness and Healing in the Early Christian East.” PhD diss., Princeton University, 1999.

- Miller, Jon. "A Distinction Regarding Happiness in Ancient Philosophy." *Social Research* 77 (2010): 595-624.
- Miller, Samantha. "Chrysostom's Monks as Living Exhortations to Poverty and the Rich Life." *GOTR* 58 (2013): 79-98.
- __. "No Sympathy for the Devil: The Significance of Demons in John Chrysostom's Soteriology." PhD diss., Marquette University, 2016.
- Miller, Timothy S. *The Birth of the Hospital in the Byzantine Empire*. (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997.
- Mitchell, Margaret M. *The Heavenly Trumpet: John Chrysostom and the Art of Pauline Interpretation*. Hermeneutische Untersuchungen zur Theologie 40. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.
- __. "Silver Chamber Pots and Other Goods Which Are Not Good: John Chrysostom's Discourse against Wealth and Possessions." In *Having: Property and Possession in Religious and Social Life*. Edited by William Schweiker and Charles Mathews. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans 2004. 88-121.
- __. "John Chrysostom." In *The Sermon on the Mount through the Centuries*. Edited by Jeffrey P. Greenman, Timothy Larsen, and Stephen R. Spencer. Grand Rapids, MI: Brazos Press, 2007. 19-42.
- Moore, Peter. "Chrysostom's Concept of γνώμη: How 'Chosen Life's Orientation' Undergirds Chrysostom's Strategy in Preaching." *SP* 54 (2013): 351-58.
- __. "Gold without Dross: An Assessment of the Debt to John Chrysostom in John Calvin's Oratory." PhD diss., Macquarie University, 2013.
- __. "Deploying Emotional Intelligence: John Chrysostom's Relational Emotional Vocabulary in his Beatitude Homilies." *SP* 83 (2017): 131-38.
- Musurillo, Herbert. "John Chrysostom's *Homilies on Matthew* and the Version of Annianus." In *Kyriakon: Festschrift Johannes Quasten*. Edited by Johannes Quasten, Patrick Granfield, and Josef A. Jungmann. Münster: Aschendorff, 1970. 452-60.
- Naidu, Ashish J. *Transformed in Christ: Christology and the Christian Life in John Chrysostom*. Princeton Theological Monograph Series 188. Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2012.
- Nassif, Bradley. "The 'Spiritual Exegesis' of Scripture: The School of Antioch Revisited." *ATHR* 75 (1993): 437-70.
- Natali, A. "Eglise et évergétisme à Antioche à fin du siècle d'après Jean Chrysostome." *SP* 17 (1982): 1176-84.
- Neil, Bronwen. "Conclusions." In *Preaching Poverty in Late Antiquity*. 209-28.
- __. "Models of Gift Giving in the Preaching of Leo the Great." *J ECS* 18 (2010): 225-59.

- Neureiter, Livia. "Health and Healing as Recurrent Topics of John Chrysostom's Correspondence with Olympias." *SP* 47 (2010): 267-72.
- Newman, J. K. "Lucan and John Chrysostom: A Parallel of Imagination." *Illinois Classical Studies* 38 (2013): 245-54.
- Nomikos, Nikitas N., George N. Nomikos, and Demetrios S. Kores. "The Use of Deep Friction Massage with Olive Oil as a Means of Prevention and Treatment of Sports Injuries in Ancient Times." *Archives Of Medical Science* 6 (2010): 642-45.
- Nussbaum, Martha C. *The Therapy of Desire: Theory and Practice in Hellenistic Ethics*. Martin Classical Lectures, n.s., 2. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1994.
- Nutton, Vivian. *Ancient Medicine*. Sciences of Antiquity. London: Routledge, 2004.
- Papadogiannakis, Yannis. "Homiletics and the History of Emotions: The Case of John Chrysostom." In *Revisoning John Chrysostom*. Forthcoming.
- Papageorgiou, Panayiotis. "A Theological Analysis of Selected Themes in the Homilies of St. John Chrysostom on the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans." PhD diss., The Catholic University of America, 1995.
- . "Chrysostom and Augustine on the Sin of Adam and Its Consequences." *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 39 (1995): 361-78.
- Patlagean, Evelyne. *Pauvreté économique et Pauvreté sociale à Byzance, 4e-7e siècles*. Civilisations et Sociétés. Paris: Mouton, 1977.
- Penniman John D. "'The Health-Giving Cup': Cyprian's Ep. 63 and the Medicinal Power of Eucharistic Wine." *J ECS* 23 (2015): 189-211.
- Pierson, Lloyd G. "An Analysis of John Chrysostom's Underlying Theory of Christ's Redemption in the Letters of St. Paul." PhD diss., Saint Louis University, 2004.
- Plassmann, Otto. *Das Almosen bei Johannes Chrysostomus*. Münster: Aschendorff, 1961.
- Quantin, Jean-Louis. "A propos de la traduction de 'philosophia' dan l'Adversus oppugnatores vitae monasticae de Saint Jean Chrysostome," *RevScRel* 61 (1987):187-97.
- Quasten, J. *Patorology*. Vol. 3. 1950. Reprint, Westminster: Christian Classics, 1986.
- Rabbas, Oyvind, Eyjolfur K. Emilsson, Hallvard Fossheim, and Miira Tuominen. *The Quest for the Good Life: Ancient Philosophers on Happiness*. Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2015.
- Răducă, Vasile. "Metanoia in the Thinking of Saint John Chrysostom." *Icoana Credinței* 4 (2016): 5-12.
- Ramsey, Boniface. "Almsgiving in the Latin Church: The Late Fourth and Early Fifth Centuries." *TS* 43 (1982): 226-59.
- Ramelli, Ilaria. *The Christian Doctrine of Apokatastasis: A Critical Assessment from the New Testament to Eriugena*. Supplements to Vigiliae Christianae 120. Leiden: Brill, 2013.

- Rhee, Helen. *Loving the Poor, Saving the Rich: Wealth, Poverty, and Early Christian Formation*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2012.
- Ritter, Adolf M. "Between 'Theocracy' and 'Simple Life': Dio Chrysostom, John Chrysostom and the Problem of Humanizing Society." *SP* 22 (1989): 170-80.
- . *Studia Chrysostomica: Aufsätze Zu Weg, Werk Und Wirkung Des Johannes Chrysostomos (Ca. 349-407)*. Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 71. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.
- Roskam, Geert. "John Chrysostom on Pagan Euergetism: A Reading of the First Part of *De inani gloria et de educandis liberis*." *SE* 53 (2014): 147-69.
- Rylaarsdam, David. *John Chrysostom on Divine Pedagogy: The Coherence of his Theology and Preaching*. Oxford Early Christian Studies. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014.
- Salem, Claire. E. "Sanity, Insanity, and Man's Being as Understood by St. John Chrysostom." PhD diss., University of Durham, 2010.
- Samellas, Antigone. *Death in the Eastern Mediterranean (50-600 A.D): The Christianization of the East: An Interpretation*. Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 12. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002.
- . "The Anti-Usury Arguments of the Church Fathers of the East in Their Historical Context and the Accommodation of the Church to the Prevailing 'Credit Economy' in Late Antiquity." *Journal of Ancient History* 5 (2017): 134-78.
- Schatkin, Margaret A. *John Chrysostom as Apologist: With Special Reference to De incomprehensibili, Quod nemo laeditur, Ad eos qui scandalizati sunt, and Adversus oppugnatores vitae monasticae*. Analekta Vlatadōn 50. Thessalonikē: Patriarchikon Hidryma Paterikōn Meletōn, 1987.
- Schäublin, Christopf. *Untersuchungen zu Methode und Herkunft der Antiochenischen Exegese*. Theophaneia 23. Cologne and Bonn: Hanstein, 1974.
- Shaw, Teresa M. *The Burden of the Flesh: Fasting and Sexuality in Early Christianity*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1998.
- Sherman, Nancy. "Ancient Conceptions of Happiness." *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 55 (1995): 913-19.
- Sherwin, Michael Sherwin. "Friends at the Table of the Lord: Friendship with God and the Transformation of Patronage in the Thought of John Chrysostom." *New Blackfriars* 85 (2004): 387-98.
- Sifoniou, A. "Les fondements juridiques de l'aumône et de la charite chez Jean Chrysostomc." *Revue de Droit Canonique* 14 (1964): 241-69.
- Simonetti, Manlio. *Biblical interpretation in the Early Church: An Historical Introduction to Patristic Exegesis*. Translated by John A. Hughes. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994.

- Sitzler Silke. "Identity: The indigent and the Wealthy in the Homilies of John Chrysostom." *VC* 63 (2009): 468-79.
- __. "Deviance and Destitution: Social Poverty in the Homilies of John Chrysostom." *SP* 47 (2010): 261-66.
- Slusser, Michael. "Salvation." In *Encyclopedia of Early Christianity*. Edited by Everett Ferguson, Michael P. McHugh, Frederick W. Norris, and David M. Scholer. Garland Reference Library of the Humanities 846. New York: Garland, 1990. 823-26.
- Stander, Hendrik F. "Eer en skaamte as sleutelkonsepte in Chrysostomos se eksegesi van 1 Korintiërs." *NedGeref Teologiese Tydskrif* 44 (2003): 518-26.
- __. "Honour and Shame as Key Concepts in Chrysostom's Exegesis of the Gospel of John." *Hervormde Teologiese Tydskrif* 58 (2003): 899-913.
- __. "The Role of Honour and Shame in Chrysostom's Commentaries on the Pauline Epistles." *Ekklesiastikos Pharos* 86 (2004): 136-45.
- __. "Chrysostom's Interpretation of the Narrative of the Three Confessors in the Fiery Furnace." *Acta Patristica et Byzantina* 16 (2005): 91-105.
- __. "The Concept of Honour/Shame in Chrysostom's Commentary on Matthew." *SP* 41 (2006): 469-75.
- Sterk, Andrea. *Renouncing the World yet Leading the Church: the Monk-Bishop in Late Antiquity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004.
- Stewart-Sykes, Alistair. *The Apostolic Church Order: The Greek Text with Introduction, Translation and Annotation*. Early Christian Studies 10. Strathfield, NSW: St. Pauls Publications, 2006.
- Sturdevant, Jason S. *The Adaptable Jesus of the Fourth Gospel: The Pedagogy of the Logos*. Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 78. Leiden: Brill, 2015.
- Sorabji, Richard. *Emotion and Peace of Mind: From Stoic Agitation to Christian Temptation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Spinks, Bryan D. Spinks. "The Growth of Liturgy and the Church Year." In *Constantine to c. 600*. Edited by Augustine Casiday and Frederick W. Norris. The Cambridge History of Christianity vol. 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007. 601-17.
- Stenger, Jan R. "Where to Find Christian Philosophy?: Spatiality in John Chrysostom's Counter to Greek Paideia." *J ECS* 24 (2016): 173-98.
- __. "Text Worlds and Imagination in Chrysostom's Pedagogy." In *Revisioning John Chrysostom*. Forthcoming.
- Stötzel, Arnold. *Kirche als 'neue Gesellschaft': die humanisierende Wirkung des Christentums nach Johannes Chrysostomos*. Münsterische Beiträge zur Theologie 51. Münster: Aschendorff, 1984.
- Stylianopoulos, Theodore. "Comments on Chrysostom, Patristic Interpretation, and Contemporary

- Biblical Scholarship.” *GOTR* 54 (2009): 189-204.
- Sandwell, Isabella. “Preaching and Christianisation: Communication, Cognition and Audience Reception.” In *Revisioning John Chrysostom*. Forthcoming.
- Taylor, Justin. “The Text of St. John Chrysostom’s *Homilies on John*.” *SP* 25 (1993): 172-75.
- Tloka, Jutta. *Griechische Christen. Christliche Griechen. Plausibilisierungsstrategien des antiken Christentums bei Origenes und Johannes Chrysostomos*. Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 30. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.
- Tonias, Demetrios E. *Abraham in the Works of John Chrysostom*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2014.
- . “The Iconic Abraham as John Chrysostom’s High Priest of Philanthropy.” In *Revisioning John Chrysostom*. Forthcoming.
- Torrance, Alexis C. *Repentance in Late Antiquity: Eastern Asceticism and the Framing of the Christian Life c. 400-650 CE*. Oxford Theology and Religion Monographs. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2013.
- Torrance, Iain R. “God the Physician: Ecclesiology, Sin, and Forgiveness in the Preaching of St. John Chrysostom.” *GOTR* 44 (1999): 163-76.
- Tucker Jr. W. Dennis. “The Early Wirkungsgeschichte of Daniel 3: Representative Examples.” *Journal of Theological Interpretation* 6 (2012): 295-306.
- Uhalde, Kevin. *Expectations of Justice in the Age of Augustine*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2007.
- Upson-Saia, Kristi. “Wounded by Divine Love.” In *Melania: Early Christianity through the Life of One Family*.” Edited by Catherine M. Chin and Caroline T. Schroeder. Christianity in Late Antiquity 2. Oakland, CA: University of California Press, 2016. 86-105.
- Van der Bergh, Ronald H. “Chrysostom’s Reception of Luke 19:8b (the Declaration of Zacchaeus).” *Hervormde Teologiese Studies* 70 (2014): 1-6.
- Van der Eijk, Philip J. *Medicine and Philosophy in Classical Antiquity: Doctors and Philosophers on Nature, Soul, Health and Disease*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Van Hoof, Lieve “Performing Paideia: Greek Culture as an Instrument for Social Promotion in the Fourth Century A.D.” *CQ* 63 (2013): 387-406.
- Van Nuffelen, Peter. “Social Ethics and Moral Discourse in Late Antiquity.” In *Reading Patristic Texts on Social Ethics*. 45-63.
- . “A War of Words: Sermons and Social Status in Constantinople under the Theodosian Dynasty.” In *Literature and Society in the Fourth Century AD Performing Paideia, Constructing the Present, Presenting the Self*. Edited by Lieve Van Hoof and Peter Van Nuffelen. Mnemosyne Supplements 373. Leiden: Brill, 2014. 202-17.

- Van Veller, Courtney W. "Paul's Therapy of the Soul: A New Approach to John Chrysostom and Anti-Judaism." PhD diss., Boston University, 2015.
- __. "John Chrysostom and the Troubling Jewishness of Paul." In *Revisioning John Chrysostom*. Forthcoming.
- Verhoeff, Maria. "A Genuine Friend Wishes to be a Debtor: John Chrysostom's Discourse on Almsgiving Reinterpreted." *SE* 52 (2013): 47-66.
- __. "'God on Earth, Man in Heaven': John Chrysostom's Use of Celestial Imagery for the Christian Life." In *Seeing through the Eyes of Faith: New Approaches to the Mystagogy of the Church Fathers*. Edited by Paul van Geest. Late Antique History and Religion 11. Leuven: Peeters, 2016. 251-68.
- __. "More Desirable than Light Itself: Friendship Discourse in John Chrysostom's Soteriology." PhD diss., Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, 2016.
- Viansino, G. "Aspetti dell'opera di Giovanni Crisostomo." *Koinonia* 25 (2001): 137-202.
- Volp, Ulrich. "'That Unclean Spirit Has Assaulted You from the Very Beginning': John Chrysostom and Suicide." *SP* 47 (2010): 273-86.
- Wessel, Susan. *Passion and Compassion in Early Christianity*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- Whitley, Thomas J. "Poison in the Panarion: Beasts, Heretics, and Sexual Deviants." *VC* 70 (2016): 237-258.
- White, L. Michael. "Moral Pathology: Passions, Progress, and Protreptic in Clement of Alexandria." In *Passions and Moral Progress*. 284-321.
- Willoughby, Russell E. "The Use and Misuse of Wealth in Selected Homilies of John Chrysostom." In *Church Divinity, 1987: National Student Essay Competition in Divinity*. Church Divinity Monograph Series 7. Edited by John H. Morgan. Bristol, Ind: Wyndham Hall, 1987. 1-19.
- Woodington, J. David. "Fear and Love: The Emotions of the Household in Chrysostom." *SP* 83 (2017): 19-36.
- Wright, Jessica. "Between Despondency and the Demon: Diagnosing and Treating Spiritual Disorders in John Chrysostom's *Letter to Stageirios*." *JLA* 8 (2015): 352-67.
- __. "Brain and Soul in Late Antiquity." PhD diss., Princeton University, 2016.
- __. "Physicians of Orthodoxy." Annual Meeting of Society of Biblical Literature, San Antonio, TX, November 19-22, 2016.
- __. "John Chrysostom and the Rhetoric of Cerebral Vulnerability." *SP* 81 (2017): 109-26.
- __. "Brain, Nerves, and Ecclesial Membership in John Chrysostom," In *Revisioning John Chrysostom*. Forthcoming.
- Xenophontos, Sophia. "Psychotherapy and Moralising Rhetoric in Galen's Newly Discovered

- Avoiding Distress (Peri Alypias).*” *Medical History* 58 (2014): 585-603.
- Yang, Jung Suk. “Five Key Recommendations for a Korean Protestant Pastor concerning Understanding and Applying Biblical Ethics in Finances: John Chrysostom as a Model for Ministry.” DMin diss., Liberty Baptist Theological Seminary, 2011.
- Young, Frances M. *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2002.
- Zincone, Sergio. “Essere simili a Dio: l’esegesi crisostomiana di Mt 5:45.” *SP* 18 (1986): 353-58.