

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expositor* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expositor-series-1.php

ascent to the heaven of perfect confidence in God can care safely tread the earth once more. And as the world has grown older and the scope of work has widened, the disciples of Jesus have learned, in greater and greater fulness, to gather all their common life within the sphere of "the kingdom;" and so near as each has come to "bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ," so far has he progressed towards the goal at which even care for the things of the morrow becomes care for the "things of the Lord."¹

JOHN MASSIE.

*THE VALUE OF THE PATRISTIC WRITINGS FOR
THE CRITICISM AND EXEGESIS OF THE BIBLE.*

III.—EXEGESIS (*continued*).

So far as the definition of principles is concerned the story of patristic exegesis may be said to be now told. There were but two main streams of tendency in the early Church—the study of the letter in the school of Antioch, and allegory, of which the chief representative was Origen. Of each of these we have spoken, and to pursue them further in connection with every name which may be mentioned on the one side or on the other does not lie within the scope of these papers.² But three great personalities tower above the rest—

¹ Matt. vi. 34 (μεριμνᾶν εἰς τὴν αὔριον), and I Cor. vii. 32 (μεριμνᾶν τὰ τοῦ κυρίου).

² As the Antiochene school numbered in all but few members, it may be worth while to mention in passing the one who with Theodore, Chrysostom, and Theodoret seems to have possessed the characteristic merits of the school in the greatest measure. Severianus, bishop of Gabala, comes out in anything but an amiable light in the life of Chrysostom, whose friend at one time he was. Delitzsch, however (*Genesis*, p. 63), speaks of his Homilies on the Creation as "striking out bold ideas, often very happy, and throughout interesting and suggestive." Many fragments of his commentaries upon the New Testament have been preserved in Cramer's *Catena*. See Lightfoot, *Galatians*, p. 225.

Chrysostom, Jerome, and Augustine. And though no one of the three gives such distinct and logical expression to a single principle as Origen and Theodore of Mopsuestia, their reputation stands, and has always stood, so high, and their merits are in different ways so conspicuous, that some account will be expected of them.

Chrysostom was a contemporary—indeed, a somewhat older contemporary—of Theodore. They both sate together as disciples at the feet of Diodorus of Tarsus, and the earliest works that we have from Chrysostom's pen are two touching letters addressed to his friend Theodore, who had fallen passionately in love with a girl named Hermione, and was tempted to renounce the ascetic life which he had begun to take up. With such a teacher and in such companionship Chrysostom could not fail to imbibe the Antiochene principles of interpretation, more especially as his own natural clear-sightedness and good sense predisposed him to them. He did not, however, carry them as far as his fellow-pupil. Though Theodore, like Chrysostom, had for a great part of his life the cares of a diocese, and though he too not seldom introduces practical matter in his commentaries, still the practical element did not predominate as it did with Chrysostom. The purely intellectual bent in Theodore was more pronounced; his boldness and tenacity of character were greater; and it is therefore not to be wondered at if his logic was more rigorous and his views more uncompromising.

Naturally it is in dealing with the Old Testament that the divergence between the two friends is most perceptible. There is, indeed, a general agreement. Chrysostom too lays the main stress on the literal and

historical sense of the Old Testament as well as of the New. He does not altogether exclude allegory, but he admits it only sparingly, and as a rule more with the license of the preacher than as strict exegesis. The following, for instance, clearly expresses his own standpoint. Speaking of the words (Isa. i. 22) "thy silver is become dross, thy wine mixed with water," "some," he says, "understanding the marvellous wisdom of God have taken this passage anagogically. For it is urged that the great and sublime Isaiah would not have spoken of usurers of villany and traders of destruction. But it is said that silver here means the 'oracles of God,' and that wine means 'teaching.' . . . For my part I do not disparage (*ἀτιμάζω*) this explanation, but at the same time I should say that the other is nearer the truth" (*ἀληθεστέραν*).¹ Types Chrysostom admits more freely; but the doctrine of types, as we saw, is peculiarly Antiochene. It is, however, doubtful whether Theodore would have gone quite so far as this: "The Church is the ark, Noah is Christ, the door is the Holy Ghost, the olive leaf is the kindness of God towards men" (*ἡ φιλανθρωπία τοῦ θεοῦ*).² But it is in the more characteristic tenets of Theodore—as to the distinction between the two Testaments and as to the nature of prophecy—that the Antiochene system received the greatest modification at the hands of Chrysostom. Here again there is a certain approximation. Chrysostom allows that there was a "condescension" (*συγκατάβασις*) to human infirmity in the language used under the older dispensation. To this were to be set down anthropopathic expressions such

¹ Foerster, *Chrysostomus in seinem Verhältniss zur antiochenischen Schule*, p. 21.

² *Ibid.* p. 23, n.

as "the anger," or "the wrath," of God. They were adapted to the dulness of the hearer's understanding—"just as in conversing with barbarians we make use of their own tongue."¹ Chrysostom has also caught the principle which underlies the Sermon on the Mount. He sees that the precept, "Whosoever is angry with his brother," &c., cuts at the root of the vice of which the sixth commandment prohibits the overt expression. In such points there is a recognition of development in the New Testament as compared with the Old. But Chrysostom is much less careful than Theodore in admitting allusions to the Trinity and to detailed facts in the New Testament history. In the Homilies against the Jews, for instance, "such passages as *Their sound is gone out unto all lands, That thou mayest make princes in all lands*, are cited as if exclusively predictive of the propagation of Christianity. In such words as *The virgins that be her fellows shall bear her company*, he sees a distinct foreshadowing of the honour to be paid to virginity under Christianity. In other passages, again, he is misled by ignorance of the Hebrew, and a too literal adherence to the Septuagint translation. In the passage, *I will make thy officers peace*, thine 'extractors' being rendered in the Septuagint bishops or overseers, he extracts from this word a direct reference to the Christian priesthood. *He shall descend like rain into a fleece of wool* is interpreted as significant of the extreme secrecy of Christ's birth, and the noiseless gentleness with which his kingdom was founded."² The prophecies are pressed even into the prediction of minute details. "So great was the accuracy of the

¹ Foerster, *Chrysostomus*, &c., p. 36.

² Stephens, *Life of Saint Chrysostom*, p. 125.

Prophets that they omit none of these things, but foretell his very journeyings and changes of place, and the intent with which he acted therein ; that thou mightest learn how they spake all by the Spirit." The Trinitarian dogma is found in such passages as Genesis i. 26, " Let us make man in our image ;" Genesis xi. 7, " Let us go down and there confound their language ;" Genesis xix. 24, " Then the Lord rained . . . brimstone and fire from the Lord out of heaven ;" Isaiah vi. 3, " Holy, holy, holy," &c ;¹ in this doing no more than many a modern divine, and with more excuse.

It is not in the direction of a scientific apprehension of principles that the chief excellence of Chrysostom as a commentator on the Old Testament scriptures is to be sought, but rather in his power of giving to them a practical application. His commentaries were at the same time sermons, and sermons of the most telling kind. " No other of the Fathers is at all comparable to him in the skill with which, while keeping as closely as possible to the literal sense of the Old Testament, he yet extracts from it a wealth of real edification. It is the combination of these two sides which secures for him a permanent importance in the history of Old Testament interpretation. This is, however, rather the result of feeling and of the school to which he belonged than of deliberate choice and conscious penetration. He cared less ' to understand all mysteries ' than to produce holiness of life, and so he came to conceive of the Scriptures rather as the supreme guide of conduct than as the source of knowledge, and was content to take the Old Testament as he found it." ² As to the worth of the particular

¹ See Foerster, *Chrysostomus*, &c., p. 27.

² Diestel, *Gesch. d. A. T.* p. 135.

commentaries critics do not seem to be quite agreed. The principal are sixty-seven Homilies upon Genesis, Homilies on fifty-eight of the Psalms, and Homilies on Isaiah, of which eight chapters have come down to us. The first of these Diestel¹ describes as excellent (ausgezeichneten); whereas to Delitzsch² they contributed little of value. Of the Homilies on the Psalms the latter says that "Photius and Suidas placed it in the highest rank among the works of Chrysostom: they are composed in the form of sermons, the style brilliant, the matter ethical rather than dogmatic; sometimes the Hebrew text is quoted from Origen's Hexapla, the divergent Greek translations are frequently compared, but unfortunately without names. Of the grammatical and historical method for which the school of Antioch was famous there is here little trace."³

However it may have been in ancient times, in modern Chrysostom is no doubt known best by his works on the New Testament. Here all his powers had full play, and the combination just noticed of close literal exegesis with pointed and eloquent exhortation is especially remarkable. It was from Chrysostom and Augustine that the Dean of St. Paul's drew most of the features in that sketch of the characteristics of patristic exposition with which this section of our subject was prefaced. We do not need to turn over many pages to see how true those features are. Here is the opening of the Homilies upon Romans: "As I keep hearing the Epistles of the blessed Paul read, and that twice every week, and often three or four times, whenever we are celebrating the memorials of the holy

¹ Diestel. *Gesch. d. A. T.* p. 135.

² *Genesis*, p. 63.

³ *Psalmen*, p. 38.

martyrs, gladly do I enjoy the spiritual trumpet, and get roused and warmed with desire at recognizing the voice so dear to me, and seem to fancy him all but present to my sight, and to behold him conversing with me. But I grieve and am pained that all people do not know the man as much as they ought to know him; but some are so far ignorant of him as not even to know for certainty the number of his Epistles. And this comes not of incapacity, but of their not having the will to be continually conversing with this blessed man. For it is not through any natural readiness and sharpness of wit that even I am acquainted with as much as I do know, if I do know anything, but owing to a continual cleaving to the man, and an earnest affection towards him. For what belongs to men beloved, they who love them know above all others; inasmuch as they have them in their thoughts. And thus also the blessed Apostle shews in what he said to the Philippians: *Even as it is meet for me to think this of you all, because I have you in my heart, in my bonds and in the defence and confirmation of the gospel.* And so ye also, if ye be willing to apply to the reading of him with a ready mind will need no other aid. For the word of Christ is true which saith, *Seek and ye shall find; knock and it shall be opened unto you.*"¹

A passage like this clearly contains the key to Chrysostom's greatness as a commentator. What Wordsworth says about the way to understand a poet applies to the understanding of other writers as well—

. . . you must love him, ere to you
He will seem worthy of your love.

¹ The quotations from the Homilies in this paper are for the most part taken, with some slight alterations, from the Oxford *Library of the Fathers*.

It was in this spirit that Chrysostom approached the New Testament scriptures—not merely with reverence and a profound sense of their importance and value, but with ardent personal affection and admiration. In some respects the very divinity which “hedges” in the Bible, and shuts it off from common books, has acted prejudicially to it. It is regarded as a code of laws, a repository of dogmas, which, though divine, still are remote and cold. The intense and tingling life which runs through every fibre in the organism of Scripture, its close and constant contact with humanity, is lost sight of. And where an effort is made to break through the trammels of conventionality and penetrate to this, it is too often by way of reaction, and the ark of the Lord is touched by rash and irreverent hands. Chrysostom lived at a time when there was much less danger of falling into either of these two extremes. His attitude is reverent and yet perfectly simple and unaffected. It may truly be said of him that he regards “passages of Scripture as we do the language that meets us with power and interest from real and present life.” After such an introduction as that which has just been quoted to the writings of St. Paul, we see that he could not do otherwise. He approaches them not coldly, but

. . . ingenti percussus amore,

and the flame of this enthusiasm burns in him while he speaks.

And yet Chrysostom had a large share of the critical faculty. His quick intelligence, his clearness of apprehension, his unfailing good sense and sobriety of judgment, are not unworthy of the name. We have an example of Chrysostom's treatment of critical topics

in the passage which forms the continuation of that just quoted. After a few more words of preface, he goes on to take a rapid survey of St. Paul's Epistles, assigning to each its proper place. It is a mistake, he says, to suppose that the Epistle to the Romans was written first. The two Epistles to the Corinthians were written before it, for in them the Apostle speaks of a possibility that he may go up to Jerusalem with money collected for the poor Christians of the mother Church. When he wrote to the Corinthians this intention was still uncertain; when he wrote to the Romans it was decided and apparently near at hand. A similar allusion to the collection of alms shews that the Epistles to the Corinthians come after those to the Thessalonians. Galatians, Chrysostom thinks, also preceded Romans. But the latter is before the Epistles that were written from Rome, such as the Philippians, which contains a salutation "from Cæsar's household," and the Hebrews, in which greeting is sent from "them of Italy." The latest of all the Epistles, the Second to Timothy, was also written from Rome. In this the Apostle speaks of his approaching end. In like manner in the letter to Philemon he describes himself as "Paul the aged." The mention of Onesimus along with Archippus is proof that Colossians and Philemon were written about the same time. The order in which the Epistles usually came determined no more than it did in the case of the Minor Prophets, where considerable intervals of time were disregarded.

Nor was it to be thought that an inquiry such as this into the dates and succession of the Epistles was a piece of superfluous curiosity. On the contrary, it often served to throw light upon the subject of the

Epistle. Thus in the Romans and the Colossians the Apostle touched upon a similar topic, the distinction of meats; but in the one case mildly (Rom. xiv. 1), in the other with greater boldness of speech (Col. ii. 16-23). The cause of this was to be sought in the different date at which the two Epistles were written, just as a physician treats the first stages of a disease differently from advanced convalescence, or as a teacher treats young children differently from those who are older.

In observing this difference in tone between the Epistles to the Romans and the Colossians, Chrysostom makes a point which had escaped the attention of Theodore. In his general views as to the sequence and date of the Pauline Epistles he and Theodore resemble each other, and Chrysostom is the less faulty of the two. He is not only for the most part right in his conclusions, but the indications on which he relies are well selected. It is, however, curious that the phrase "they of Italy" (*οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰταλίας*) should be singled out as proof that the Epistle to the Hebrews was written from Rome. Some modern scholars (notably Bleek) have maintained the direct opposite of this, arguing that the phrase denotes persons who, though once inhabitants of Italy, were so no longer, *i.e.*, an Italian colony in some city such as Alexandria or Ephesus. And this is at least the *primâ facie* view of the case. Greek usage will indeed defend Chrysostom's interpretation—and we have in this an instance of the value of the Greek Fathers from the knowledge which they possessed of their own mother tongue—but at the same time it certainly cannot be pressed to the exclusion of the other possibility.

Of the historical and critical questions which fill so

large a place in modern commentaries Chrysostom does not say much, and what little he does say is of no great value. He sees—or at least notices—no difficulty in the mention of Theudas and Judas of Galilee (Acts v. 36, 37). The names of Felix and Festus lead him into no historical digression. In regard to the Egyptian of Acts xxi. 38 he is content to say that he was “a cheat and impostor.” The hearing of St. Paul before King Agrippa only draws from him the remark that this is a “different Agrippa, after him of James’s time, so that this is the fourth Herod.” In the Homilies on St. Matthew he mentions three different accounts that were given of “Zacharias the son of Barachias,” who was slain between the temple and the altar: “Some say” [*e.g.*, Origen, Basil, and other Fathers] “that he was the father of John; some the prophet; some a priest with two different names, whom the Scripture also called the son of Jehoiada.” He will not admit that the “true yokefellow” of Philippians iv. 3 means the wife of St. Paul—an ancient fancy revived in modern times by M. Renan.¹ He leaves it an open question whether the word translated “yokefellow” (*syzygus*) may not be a proper name. It is not surprising if, with Theodore of Mopsuestia and Theodoret, Chrysostom also took the word “prætorium” in Philippians i. 13 in the sense of palace, asserting that this was the older usage, though no clear example of this sense of the word can be adduced.² The argument for the identity of “bishops” with “presbyters,” in the opening salutation of the same Epistle, Chrysostom states with even more fulness and

¹ *Saint Paul*, p. 148.

² See Lightfoot, *Philippians*, p. 98.

vivacity than the two Antiochene commentators just named.

There is, however, one instance where Chrysostom has fallen into an extraordinary blunder. The Homilies on the Acts are said to be among his "feeblest works,"¹ and, whether or not this verdict is justified as a whole, in one place at least his good genius certainly forsook him. The allusion of St. James to the previous speech of St. Peter in the debates at the Council of Jerusalem, "Symeon hath declared how God at the first did visit the Gentiles," &c., Chrysostom takes as if it referred to the prophetic language of the aged Symeon in Luke ii. 25, 32, "A light to lighten the Gentiles!"² The substitution of "Symeon" for the more ordinary "Simon" has quite bewildered him.

It is not, however, in this department of exegesis that the excellence of Chrysostom would naturally be

¹ "The fifty-five homilies on the Acts are among Chrysostom's feeblest works. The style is inelegant, the language unrefined, and the line of interpretation jejune' (Photius, cod. 174). 'Multa plumbea' is Savile's verdict, while that of Erasmus is harsher still, 'Ebrius et stertens scriberem meliora'" (Canon Venables, in *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, i. p. 533). Against this, however, should be set a very different estimate by the editor of the *Speaker's Commentary*: "Among the ancients Chrysostom stands predominant in this as in all other departments of Biblical exegesis. The Homilies on the Acts belong to the later part of his life; they were delivered in the third year of his episcopate at Constantinople, and, like other productions of that period, are less distinguished for vigour and eloquence than those of earlier years; but they present the same combination of a devout and reverential spirit with keen discernment, sound judgment, and a genuine historical instinct, which preserves him from grave errors into which some considerable scholars of our own time have been betrayed" (*N. T.* ii. p. 347).

² I have followed here the carefully revised text used by the Oxford editors. In the Benedictine text (which is based for the most part on a single MS. of the tenth century, and does not agree with the early quotations) the passage reads quite differently: "Some say that this is he who is mentioned by St. Luke; others that he is some other person of the same name. But whether it be the one person or the other is a point about which there is no need to be particular; but only to receive as necessary the things which the person declared." If this were the true text (which it pretty certainly is not, though there may be a doubt as to the alternative for it), it would only bring out still more clearly the indifference of the commentator to historical precision.

sought. He is too late to contribute traditions of much value, and the age to which he belonged cared little for historical or antiquarian illustration. Chrysostom probably represents the best type of grammatical scholarship among the Fathers. Bishop Ellicott entertains for him "often as a scholar, always as an exegete, the greatest respect and admiration."¹ Bishop Lightfoot describes his Homilies on Galatians as "an eloquent popular exposition, based on fine scholarship."² The modern reader will be surprised to find how carefully and frequently the rules with which he is himself familiar are applied by this ancient writer, whose habitual use of the language in which the New Testament was written might be supposed to be a drawback rather than an advantage to the conscious analysis of its structure. Thus on John xii. 39 ("They could not believe, because Isaiah said," &c.) he notes that the use of ὅτι is "not causal but ecbatic" (οὐχὶ αἰτιολογίας ἀλλ' ἐκβάσεως): "it was not because Isaiah spake that they believed not, but because they were not about to believe that he spake." On 2 Corinthians iii. 17, Chrysostom has an elaborate argument turning on the presence or the absence of the article with the predicate: "Since some maintain that the expression *when one shall have turned to the Lord* is spoken of the Son, in contradiction to what is quite acknowledged, let us examine the point more accurately, having first stated the ground on which they think to establish this. What, then, is this? Like, saith one, as it is said, *God is a Spirit*; so also here, 'The Lord is a Spirit.' But he did not say, 'The Lord is a Spirit,' but *The Spirit is that (the) Lord*. And there is a great dif-

¹ *Galatians*, p. xxvii.

² *Ibid.* p. 225.

ference between this construction and that. For when he is desirous of speaking so as you say, he does not join the article to the predicate (τῷ ἐπιθέτω ἄρθρον οὐ ποστίθησιν).” Chrysostom can hardly be right in making τὸ πνεῦμα the subject here, but he is perfectly justified in the distinction which he draws as to the use of the article. The Apostle says not “The Lord is *a* Spirit,” but “The Lord is *the* Spirit;” in other words, the relation of union or fellowship into which the believer enters with Christ is at the same time a relation of fellowship with the Holy Ghost. These two passages are especially interesting because of the technical terms of grammar introduced into them, showing that Chrysostom had made a definite study of this subject. Less direct indications of his accuracy as a grammarian meet us constantly.

In his definitions and explanations of words Chrysostom is always clear, often happy, and generally sound. Thus on Galatians i. 18 he remarks that the word *ἰστορήσαι* (“to see Peter”) is the word specially used by those who “make acquaintance with great and illustrious cities;” on Galatians iv. 5, “that we might receive the adoption of sons,” he notes that *ἀπολάβωμεν* means to receive that which is destined for one, or “which is one’s due;” on the combined phrase “bite and devour” in Galatians v. 15 he has a good comment: “he does not say merely, *ye bite*, which one might do in a passion, but also *ye devour*, which implies persistent malice; to bite is to satisfy the feeling of anger, but to devour is a proof of the most savage ferocity.” Here again is his note on *ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι* in Ephesians i. 10: “What is the meaning of this word *brought under one head*? It is *to knit together*.”

Let us, however, endeavour to get near the exact import. With ourselves, then, in common conversation, the word means the summing into a brief compass things spoken at length, the concise account of matters described in detail. And it has this meaning. For Christ hath gathered up in Himself the dispensations carried on through a lengthened period, that is to say, He hath cut them short." In commenting on Ephesians ii. 18 he emphasizes an important distinction which is lost sight of in the Authorized Version: "On this account it is that when he speaks of our having *access*, he does not use the word which means our coming to God (*πρόσοδον*), but which implies God's bringing us to Himself (*προσαγωγήν*), for we came not of ourselves, but it was He that brought us."

Examples like these might very readily be multiplied. Here Chrysostom is upon his strong ground. His mind is eminently clear, intelligent, highly-trained. He is quick in seizing an idea, apt in giving it expression, bright and vivid in impressing it upon his hearers. His own intense desire of personal holiness gives him a never failing eloquence on this theme. It is upon the profound doctrinal side of Christian teaching that he is most disappointing. Dr. Westcott remarks¹ upon his Homilies on St. John that "the reader will probably miss the signs of a spontaneous sympathy with the more mysterious aspects of the Gospel." Instances of this may be found not only in the deeper parts of St. John's Gospel, but also in passages like

¹ *Speaker's Commentary*, N. T. ii. p. xcvi. It may be noted in reference to this that Neander (*Der heilige Johannes Chrysostomus*, p. 6), speaks of Chrysostom as possessing in large measure "a Johannean clement," while Augustine rather represents the spirit of St. Paul. I suspect that the affinity is more clearly marked in the latter case than in the former.

Romans iii. 21-26, the keystone of St. Paul's teaching, where Chrysostom's exposition is thin and superficial. Chrysostom was strictly orthodox; and yet though even Augustine himself defended him from the charge of Pelagianism, he had certainly leanings in that direction. His continual exhortations to holiness of life assumed in man a power of self-reformation. He believed that the Fall had only weakened the impulse towards good in human nature, not that it was radically infected with evil. And hence he was hopeful as to the result of efforts after a higher life, even though those efforts did not claim to rest entirely upon the Divine aid and prompting. In fact, it may be said that Chrysostom's conception of the relation of the human soul to the work of grace represented a simple *primâ facie* view in which the brighter lights and darker shadows of the Augustinian theory were wanting, but which along with the sombre tones of that theology lost also something of its tragic grandeur. It is not to be wondered at that Chrysostom, like most of the writers of his time, should use materialistic language respecting both the sacraments, but he also brings out vividly the moral and spiritual side of the teaching expressed in each. These are the terms in which he speaks of the sacrament of baptism: "In baptism are fulfilled the pledges of our covenant with God—burial and death, resurrection and life; and these take place all at once. For when we immerse our heads in the water, the old man is buried as in a tomb below, and wholly sunk for ever; then as we raise them again the new man rises in its stead. As it is easy for us to dip and to lift our heads again, so is it easy for God to bury the old man and to shew forth

the new. And this is done thrice that you may learn that the power of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost fulfilleth all this."¹ And this is what he says in regard to the Eucharist: "On this account He hath mixed up Himself with us; He hath kneaded up His body with ours, that we might be a certain One Thing, like a body joined to a head. For this belongs to those who love strongly; this for instance Job implied, speaking of his servants, by whom he was beloved so exceedingly that they desired to cleave unto his flesh. For they said, to shew the strong love which they felt, *Who would give us to be satisfied with his flesh?*"² Wherefore this also Christ hath done, to lead us to a closer friendship, and to shew His love for us; He hath given to those who desire Him not only to see Him, but even to touch and eat Him, and to fix their teeth in His flesh, and to embrace Him and satisfy all their love."³ There is certainly a strong materializing element here, but it is capable of being separated from the idea which it encloses, and that idea is presented with Chrysostom's usual vividness and force.

The field in which such a commentator will be seen at his best is the borderland between faith and practice, the point at which doctrine is translated from the abstract into the concrete, where theoretic statement ends and the inculcation of Christian duty begins. And the present paper shall close with selections from a passage of this kind, chosen rather with the double object of at once exhibiting the characteristics of Chrysostom's mind, his lucid exposition, his accurate scholarship, his vivacity of style, and his earnestness

¹ *Hom. in Joh.* iii. 5.

² The meaning of the original (Job xxxi. 31) is "to be satisfied with meat from his table."

³ *Hom. in Joh.* vi. 52.

of appeal ; and also at the same time of shewing what his opinion was upon several points which have been somewhat debated amongst modern scholars. The quotations are taken from the Homilies upon Romans xii. "*Present your bodies a living sacrifice. And how is the body, it may be said, to become a sacrifice ? Let the eye look upon no evil thing, and it hath become a sacrifice ; let thy tongue speak nothing filthy, and it hath become an offering ; let thine hand do no lawless deed, and it hath become a whole burnt-offering. Or rather this is not enough, but we must have good works also : let the hand do alms, the mouth bless them that revile, and the hearing find leisure evermore for lections of Scripture. . . . Such a sacrifice is well-pleasing, as that of the Jews was even unclean ; for their sacrifices, it says, are unto them as the bread of mourning. Not so ours. That presented the thing sacrificed dead : this maketh the thing sacrificed to be living. . . . And be not fashioned after this world ; but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind.* For the fashion of this world is grovelling and worthless, and but for a time ; neither hath ought of loftiness, or lastingness, or straightforwardness, but is wholly perverted. If, then, thou wouldest walk upright, figure not thyself after the fashion of this life present. For in it there is nought abiding or stable. And this is why he calls it a fashion (*σχῆμα*) ; and so in another passage, *for the fashion of this world passeth away.* For it hath no durability or fixedness, but all in it is but for a season ; and so he calls it this age (*αἰῶνι*), hereby to indicate its liableness to misfortune, and by the word *fashion* its unsubstantialness. For speak of riches, or of glory or beauty of person, or of luxury, or of whatever other of its seem-

ingly great things you will, it is a fashion only, not reality; a show and a mask, not any abiding substance. But *be not thou fashioned after this, but be transformed*, he says, *by the renewing of your mind*. He says not change the fashion, but *be transformed*, to shew that the world's ways are a fashion, but virtue's not a fashion, but a kind of real *form* with a natural beauty of its own, needing not the trickeries and fashions of outward things, which no sooner appear than they go to nought. For all these things, even before they come to light, are dissolving. If, then, thou throwest the fashion aside, thou wilt speedily come to the *form*." [It will be observed how fully and accurately Chrysostom brings out the difference between *σχῆμα* and *μορφή*, on which Trench and Lightfoot insist.]¹ . . . " *Whether prophecy, let us prophesy according to the proportion of faith*. For though it is a grace, yet it is not poured forth at random, but, framing its measure according to the recipients, it letteth as much flow as it may find the vessel that is brought to be capable of." [A happy paraphrase of *κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως*, excluding the mistaken notion, held, *e.g.*, by Wordsworth, that by "faith" is meant here, "the body of Christian doctrine."] . . . " *In honour preferring one another*. . . . There is nothing which makes friends so much as the earnest endeavour to overcome one's neighbour in honouring him." [*προηγέσθαι* = *νικᾶν*.] . . . " *Mind not high things, but condescend to men of low estate*. That is, bring thyself down to their humble condition; ride or walk with them; do not be humbled in mind only, but help them also, and reach forth thy

¹ See Trench, *New Testament Synonyms*, pp. 252-257; Lightfoot, *Philippians*, pp. 125-131.

hand to them, not by means of others, but in thine own person, as a father taking care of a child, as the head taking care of the body. As he says in another place, *being bound with them that are in bonds*. But here he means by those of low estate, not merely the lowly-minded, but those of a low rank, and which one is apt to think scorn of." [Chrysostom clearly takes τοῖς ταπεινοῖς to mean "lowly persons," not as Meyer, De Wette, and others, "lowly things."] . . . "Dearly beloved, *avenge not yourselves, but rather give place unto wrath*. Unto what wrath? To the wrath of God. Now, since what the injured man desires to see is himself having the pleasure of revenge, this very thing he gives him in full measure, that if thou dost not avenge thyself, God will be thy avenger. Leave it then, he means, to Him to follow up thy wrongs. For this is the force of *give place unto wrath*."¹ [So Lightfoot, Meyer, Beet, and a majority of the best authorities.]

I will add just one more passage to shew how eagerly Chrysostom catches a suggestion of poetry, and how finely he works it out. "*The night is far spent, the day is at hand*. This, then, is upon ending, and the latter is drawing near. Let us henceforth do what belongs to the latter, not to the former. For this is what is done in the things of this life. And when we see the night pressing on towards the morning, and hear the swallow twittering, we each of us awake our neighbour, although it be night still. But, so soon as it is actually departing, we hasten one another, and say, It is day now! And we all set about the works of the day, dressing and leaving our dreams, and

¹ *Hom. in Rom.* xii. 1, 2, 6, 10, 15, 19.

shaking our sleep thoroughly off, that the day may find us ready, and we may not have to begin getting up, and stretching ourselves, when the sunlight is up. What, then, we do in that case let us do here also. Let us put off imaginings; let us get clear of the dreams of this life present; let us lay aside its deep slumber, and be clad in virtue for garments. For it is to point out all this that he says, *Let us, therefore, cast off the works of darkness, and let us put on the armour of light.* Yes, for the day is calling us to battle-array, and to the fight. Yet fear not at hearing of array and arms. For in the case of the visible suit of armour, to put it on is a heavy and abhorred task. But here it is desirable, and worth being prayed for; for it is of Light the arms are! Hence they will set thee forth brighter than the sunbeam, and giving out a great glistening: and they place thee in security; for they are arms: and glittering do they make thee; for arms of light are they! What then? Is there no necessity for thee to fight? Yea, needful is it to fight, yet not to be distressed, and toil. For it is not, in fact, war, but a solemn dance and feast-day.”¹

W. SANDAY.

THE BOOK OF JOB.

VIII. THE THEOPHANY.

I. FIRST DIVINE REMONSTRANCE (CH. XXXVIII. II—XL. 5).

WHEN the Majesty of Heaven appears to his afflicted servant, He is very far from doing that which Job had demanded and expected of Him; but, if He does other,

¹ *Ihom. in Rom. xiii. 12.*